Errata and Comments

1. Section 2.3
   a. Elena Marchisotto suggests that my dates for the Aristotle’s *Posterior Analytics* and Euclid’s *Elements* on pages 26 and 29 are incorrect: twenty years too early.

2. Section 3.5
   a. Page 69, line 4 of the proof of the SSS theorem: $\text{XYZ}$ not $\text{X’Y’Z’}$.

3. Section 3.6
   a. Page 70: replace the one-line paragraph after the proof of theorem 5 by “The following result is needed later in the proof of the Hinge Theorem.” Also change “Lemma 6” to “Theorem 6” twice after that.

4. Section 3.10
   a. Elena Marchisotto derives the volume of a box more nicely without using Cavalieri.

5. Section 3.12
   a. Page 107, after the proof of theorem 5: case (3) not (4).

6. Section 3.13

7. Section 3.14
   a. Page 119: replace “hinge theorem” to “theorem 3.6.6”. (An earlier erratum indicates that that result should be raised from lemma to theorem status.)

8. Section 4.5
   a. Page 139, exercise 5: the last sentence should end “... heading Exercises on polyhedra.”
   b. Exercise 4.5.3 is misstated: “Incongruent” should be replaced by “impossible to label in such a way as to be congruent”.

9. Section 4.7
   a. Exercise 4.7.4: the edges of the inner equilateral triangle should be specified as perpendicular to those of the outer one.
   b. Exercise 4.7.7: delete “with radius 1”.

10. Section 6.11
    a. Exercise 6.11.18 solution: are there six possibilities, resulting from permutation of vertices?
    b. Exercise 6.11.19: the two tangents should be specified as different.

11. Section 8.4
    a. Page 404: the first two paragraphs are incorrect. No fourfold rotational symmetry of the cube is a symmetry of the dodecahedron, and no $\mathcal{O}_h$ group
is conjugate to any subgroup of an \( I_h \) group. This issue is explained thorough-ly in the paper


Lloyd noted that the same mistake had occurred decades earlier in Hilbert and Cohn-Vosson’s [1932] 1952 *Geometry and the Imagination*, 92–93. The present author, as an undergraduate, probably did first encounter this material in that classic text, and should have been more critical in adapting it for the present work. Lloyd remarked that if this failure could have happened to Hilbert, “there’s hope for the rest of us!”

12. *Bibliography*
   a. Hilbert 1900: “Physikalische” not “Physikalisich”.

13. *Index*
   a. Pappus: 140 not 141.