Errata and Remarks for *Reductive Logic and Proof-search: Proof Theory, Semantics, and Control*

`http://www0.cs.ucl.ac.uk/staff/D.Pym/reductive-logic-errata.pdf`

David J. Pym
HP Labs, Bristol
University of Bath

Eike Ritter
University of Birmingham

15 December, 2005

Abstract

We present corrections and clarifications known to-date for: Pym, David J. and Eike Ritter, *Reductive Logic and Proof-search: Proof Theory, Semantics, and Control*, Oxford Logic Guides, 45, Oxford University Press, 2004.

p. v, l. -4: "motiviation" should be "motivation".
p. 5, l. -1: "cover basics" should be "cover the basics".
p. vi, l. 20: "continutations" should be "continuations".
p. vi, l. 10: "intuitionisitic" should be "intuitionistic".
p. 1, l. 16: "λ-terms)" should be "λ-) terms".
p. 7, l. -15: "compuational" should be "computational".
p. 12, l. 18: delete "if".
p. 12, l. 12: "v" should be "w".
p. 13, l. 2: "prerquisites" should be "prerequisites".
p. 13, l. 6: "an" should be "and".
p. 13, l. 13: rightmost "ψ" should be "ϕ".
p. 19, l. -8: **Remark**. We abuse notation here and write "$0^{op} = 1$ and $1^{op} = 0$". Of course, we mean is that if 0 is initial in $\mathcal{C}$, then 0^{op} is terminal in $\mathcal{C}^{op}$, and that if 1 is terminal in $\mathcal{C}$, then 1^{op} is initial in $\mathcal{C}^{op}$.
p. 20, l. -5: "have evident" should be "have the evident".
p. 21, l. 7: "provide and example" should be "provide an example"
p. 22, l. 4: "is monad" should be "is a monad".
p. 22: each "T" in the box surrounding Definition 1.11 should be a "U".
p. 22, l. -1: "is co-monad" should be "is a co-monad".
p. 24, l. 8: "constuctions" should be "constructions".
p. 24, l. -10: "motiviation" should be "motivation".
p. 24, l. 19: "regimes" should be "régimes".
p. 25, l. 1: "intuitionisitic" should be "intuitionistic".
p. 25, l. 10: "continutations" should be "continuations".
p. 25, l. 18: "intuitionitic" should be "intuitionistic".
p. 47, Footnote 23: it should be added that the terms t_1 and t_2 arise as reducts of a common term s.
p. 59, l. -2: delete "not".
p. 87, l. 6: "the type $\neg\phi$" should be "being of the type $\neg\phi$".

p. 87, l. 11: "continuation $\neg\phi$" to "continuation of type $\neg\phi$".

p. 101, Table 4.3: the antecedents in this table should be considered to be sets (and so the presence of the Exchange rule is unnecessary).

p. 103, l. 1: insert "and the formula-occurrences affected by R and R' are distinct" between "... premiss of R" and the full stop.

p. 151, Table 5.1: the antecedents in this table should be considered to be sets (and so the presence of the Exchange rule is unnecessary).

p. 111, l. 20: "Julia" should be "Alan".

p.203, Reference 113: "J. Robinson" should be "J.A. Robinson".