1. **p.91.** Exercise 2.10, in the second line, “... implies \( f(X) \subseteq F(Y). \)” should be: “... implies \( f(X) \subseteq f(Y). \)”

2. **p.111.** Several occurrences of “may not” should be changed to “does not”, namely, at lines:
   - 10-11: “... on \( x \) but may not halt...” should be “... on \( x \) but does not halt...”
   - -13: “...YES, but may not halt...” should be “...YES, but does not halt...”
   - -9: “...NO, but may not halt...” should be “...NO, but does not halt...”

3. **p.180.** Exercise 6.4, the boolean table for \( \uparrow \). The 1 and 0 along the diagonal should be swapped, i.e., the table should be:

   \[
   \begin{array}{cc}
   x \uparrow y & 1 & 0 \\
   x & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
   0 & 1 & 1 \\
   \end{array}
   \]

4. **p.211.** In Definition 8.22, conclusion of the rule MP has missing \( \Gamma \) on the left of \( \vdash \). The conclusion of the rule should be: \( \Gamma \vdash B \).

5. **p.237.** The proof of Lemma 10.2 is by induction on the complexity of the context \( F[\_], \) not of \( F[A] \). The first special case is \( F[\_] = [\_], \) atomic case of \( F[\_] \) gives special case or no substitution, and the inductive cases should all have \( [A] \) replaced by \( [\_] \) on the left of ::.

6. **p.273.** The example rules i) and ii) should have added \( \Gamma \) to the left of \( \vdash \). They illustrate general situation, and not only when the example formulae are provable without any \( \Gamma \).