

## Addenda for the sixth imprinting

The variable convention (keeping the names of bound variables as much different as convenient from those of the free variables) is used throughout the book and is convenient in an informal precise setting. This method was brought to my attention by Thomas Ottmann in 1972 and ever since I used it without referring to him (as it is so natural). After the appearance of this book the convention became baptized with my name. This is unjustified to Ottmann and for this reason I mention explicitly his name in these corrections.

Each row in the list below has generally five items: the page number; the line number skipping to count the lines of pictures (a negative number indicates that one has to count from below); the item to be changed; the sign ‘ $\mapsto$ ’; the modified item. In some cases that are self-explanatory a different way of indicating the erratum was used.

A wealth of corrections came from Harold Hodes and participants of a seminar directed by Hidetaka Kondoh: Hironobu Kuruma, Jun-ichi Matsuda, Yuuji Nagamatsu, Takanori Nishio and Tetsuo Tanaka. Other corrections were found by to Ingemar Bethke, Pierre-Louis Curien, Herman Geuvers, Bart Jacobs, Gerard Renardel, Piet Rodenburg and Yiqing Zhu. The more important ones are indicated by the symbol  $\blacktriangleright$  in the margin.

A few words about progress in theory will be given. In section 6.5 the double fixed-point is stated and proved in two different ways. The first proof is a proof also valid in the  $\lambda$ -calculus. The second proof easily generalizes to the  $n$ -fold case. Here we present a third proof, due to Smullyan, that has both virtues.

**THEOREM (Multiple fixed-point theorem).** Given  $F_1, \dots, F_n \in \Lambda$ . Then there are  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \Lambda$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= F_1 A_1 \dots A_n \\ &\dots \\ A_n &= F_n A_1 \dots A_n \end{aligned}$$

**PROOF.** Given  $\vec{F}$ , define by the ordinary fixed-point theorem a term  $A$  such that

$$A = \lambda f \vec{a}. f(A a_1 \vec{a}) \dots (A a_n \vec{a}),$$

where  $\vec{a} = a_1, \dots, a_n$ . Take  $A_i \equiv A F_i \vec{F}$ . Then indeed for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  one has

$$\begin{aligned} A_i &\equiv A F_i \vec{F} \\ &= F_i (A F_1 \vec{F}) \dots (A F_n \vec{F}) \\ &\equiv F_i A_1 \dots A_n. \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

A second result is the solution of several hundred pages in the thesis of Enno Volkerts to problem 21.4.9, see Folkerts [1998].

**THEOREM.** Let  $F$  be a closed term considered as a map  $\Lambda^\circ / \equiv_{\beta\eta} \rightarrow \Lambda^\circ / \equiv_{\beta\eta}$ . Then

$$F \text{ is a bijection} \iff F \text{ is } \beta\eta\text{-invertible.}$$

Finally conjecture 17.4.15, concerning the place in the projective hierarchy of the  $\lambda$ -theory  $\mathcal{H}\omega$  axiomatized by equating all unsolvables and the  $\omega$ -rule, is proved by a complex argument due to Intrigila and Statman [2004].

THEOREM.  $\mathcal{H}\omega$  is a  $\Pi_1^1$ -complete  $\lambda$ -theory.

This settles most open problems of the book. One conjecture that remains open is the range property for  $\mathcal{H}$ , i.e. the question whether for a closed term  $F$  its range modulo equating the unsolvables has cardinality either 1 or  $\aleph_0$ .

Nijmegen  
Henk Barendregt

April, 2004

# Errata

Preface & Contents			
x	16	$\omega$ -rule $\lambda\eta$	$\mapsto$ $\omega$ -rule in $\lambda\eta$
xiv	In diagram	Add solid line from 10 to 14.	
Chapter 1			
3	-13	18.5.30	$\mapsto$ 18.4.30
4	-21	Aczel [1980].	$\mapsto$ Aczel [1980]. See also Barendregt et al. [1993] for progress on Curry's program.
	-19	[1980]	$\mapsto$ [1979]
10	-11	$D = (D', \sqsubseteq')$	$\mapsto$ $D' = (D', \sqsubseteq')$
13	3	$(x, x'_0)$	$\mapsto$ $\langle x, x'_0 \rangle$
15	4	is the least fixed point of $f$ .	$\mapsto$ <i>is the least fixed point of <math>f</math>.</i>
	-4	cpo's.	$\mapsto$ cpo's if $f_i(\perp) = \perp$ (strictness).
16	-11	<i>retract</i> of $D$	$\mapsto$ <i>retract</i> of $D$ , notation $X \triangleleft D$ ,
18	1.2.28	<i>coherent</i>	$\mapsto$ <i>coherent</i> (or <i>consistently complete</i> )
	-2	$x \ll y$	$\mapsto$ $x \ll y^1$
21	1.3.15	coherent algebraic cpo.	$\mapsto$ coherent <sup>2</sup> algebraic cpo.
►	21	1.3.16(i)	This is incorrect, but holds if each bounded set $Y \subseteq X$ (i.e. $\exists x \in X. Y \sqsubseteq x$ ) has a supremum in $X$ ; Jung [1989]
Chapter 2			
24	8	$F(WW) = FX$	$\mapsto$ $F(WW) \equiv FX$
►	30	and the	$\mapsto$ and, if $n > 1$ , then the
►	26	VARIABLE CONVENTION	$\mapsto$ OTTMANN VARIABLE CONVENTION
35	2	$\lambda$	$\mapsto$ $\lambda$
36	17	<i>Par abus de langage</i>	$\mapsto$ <i>Par abus de langage</i>
41	15	$I$	$\mapsto$ $I$
46	7	<i>Applications of CL to <math>\lambda</math></i>	$\mapsto$ <i>Bases and enumeration</i>
	-4	$\psi(n)$	$\mapsto$ $\lceil \psi(n) \rceil$
47	7	$M$	$\mapsto$ $M$
48	-11	Böhm out technique	$\mapsto$ The Böhm out technique
48	-2	for the	$\mapsto$ in the

<sup>1</sup>This definition is due to Scott [1972]. If  $D$  is a continuous lattice, then it is equivalent to

$$x \ll y \Leftrightarrow \forall \text{ directed } X \subseteq D. [y \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup X \Rightarrow \exists z \in X. x \sqsubseteq z],$$

see Gierz et al. [1980], p. 110-111.

<sup>2</sup>The condition of coherence may be dropped.

Chapter 3		
51	2	$R \mapsto \succ$
57	3.1.22(ii)	$R\text{-}\infty(M) \mapsto R\text{-}\infty(M) \text{ or } \infty_R(M)$
	3.1.22(iii)	$R \mapsto \mathbf{R}$
67	2	corollary $\mapsto$ theorem
	10	Conservation theorem $\mapsto$ The conservation theorem
71	-3	Sequentiality $\mapsto$ Sequentiality and stability
72	-4	$\beta\eta\Omega$ -reduction $\mapsto \beta\eta\Omega$ -reduction
73	1	$\Delta$ -reduction $\mapsto$ Delta reduction
75	19	$\exists x_1, \dots, x_n x = x_1 \succ x_2 \mapsto \exists x_0, \dots, x_n x = x_0 \succ x_1$
Chapter 4		
83	14	17.2 $\mapsto$ 16.2
	-10	16. $\mapsto$ 16.1.
	-1	$\simeq_\eta \mapsto \widetilde{\simeq}_\eta$
84	-4	$\omega$ -rule $\mapsto \omega$ -rule in $\lambda\eta$
85	1	Omega incompleteness $\mapsto$ The $\omega$ -rule and $\mathcal{H}\eta$
	-2 (2 $\times$ )	$I \mapsto \mathbf{I}$
Chapter 5		
86	11	Plotkins $\mapsto$ Plotkin's
87	17	Scott [1980] $\mapsto$ Scott [1980a]
90	14	$(\lambda^*x, Q) \mapsto (\lambda^*x.Q), \text{ otherwise.}$
91	6	$\mathfrak{M}_1 \mapsto$ (iv) $\mathfrak{M}_1$
	8	(iv) $\mapsto$ (v)
	5.1.14 all over	} 5 $\times$ $\llbracket , \rrbracket \mapsto ( , )$ (respectively)
92	-5	
	-1	$\llbracket \mathfrak{M} \mapsto \llbracket \mathfrak{M}$
93	(6 $\times$ )	$\lambda \vdash \mapsto \lambda \vdash$
	-4	$\lambda \vdash A_\lambda = B_\lambda \Rightarrow \mathfrak{M} \models A_{\lambda,CL} = B_{\lambda,CL}, \text{ by 1, } \mapsto$ $\lambda \vdash A_\lambda = B_\lambda \Rightarrow \mathfrak{M} \models A_\lambda = B_\lambda, \text{ by 1,}$ $\Rightarrow \mathfrak{M} \models A_{\lambda,CL} = B_{\lambda,CL}, \text{ by definition of } \llbracket A_\lambda \rrbracket_\rho^{\mathfrak{M}}$
	-1	$\Lambda(\mathfrak{M}) \mapsto \Lambda(\mathfrak{M}_1)$
94	-4	5.5.8 $\mapsto$ 5.6.8
	-1	$\langle \text{not exactly} \rangle \mathcal{M} \models \mapsto \mathfrak{M} \models$
	-1 (2 $\times$ )	$\lambda \mapsto \lambda^*$
95	1	Meyer [1980] $\mapsto$ Meyer [1982]
	2	Scott [1980] $\mapsto$ Scott [1980a]
	5.2.8 (11 $\times$ )	$\lambda \mapsto \lambda^*$
	5.2.9 (8 $\times$ )	$\lambda \mapsto \lambda^*$
	5.2.10 (4 $\times$ )	$\lambda \mapsto \lambda^*$

Chapter 5 (continued)

96	all over (3×)	<b>K, S</b>	$\mapsto$ <b>K, S</b> , ⟨respectively⟩
	−11, −10, −9	$\lambda$	$\mapsto$ $\lambda$
97	1	$\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$	$\mapsto$ $(\cdot, \cdot)$ ⟨respectively⟩
	−5	Jacopini [1975a]	$\mapsto$ Jacopini [1975]
	−4, −3, −2	<b>K</b>	$\mapsto$ <b>K</b>
	−4, −3, −2, −1	<b>S</b>	$\mapsto$ <b>S</b>
98	4	<b>K</b>	$\mapsto$ <b>K</b>
		<b>S</b>	$\mapsto$ <b>S</b>
99	8	<b>S</b> <i>yxz</i>	$\mapsto$ <b>S</b> <i>xyz</i>
▶	13	$(\lambda)_c \vdash M = N \Leftrightarrow \lambda \vdash M = N$	$\mapsto$ $(\lambda)_c \vdash A = B \Leftrightarrow \lambda \vdash A_\lambda = B_\lambda$
	−1	<b>R</b> -axiom.	$\mapsto$ <b>R</b> -ax.
100	11	$\in \lambda$	$\mapsto$ $\in \Lambda$
	15	$\xi$ -ax	$\mapsto$ $\xi$ -ax
	−2	$\xi$ -ax	$\mapsto$ $\xi$ -ax
	−2, −1	-rule	$\mapsto$ -rule
101	2	By corollary 5.2.23.	$\mapsto$ Left to the reader.
	3 − 6 (4×)	$\omega$	$\mapsto$ $\omega$
	6	theorem 4.1.15(i).	$\mapsto$ proposition 4.1.15(i).
	8	-rule	$\mapsto$ -rule
	10	$\mathcal{T} \models \mathbf{R}$	$\mapsto$ $\mathcal{T} \vdash \mathbf{R}$
	11	5.2.12(ii)	$\mapsto$ 5.2.12(iii)
103	−11	$(x := \llbracket N \rrbracket_\rho)$	$\mapsto$ $(x := \llbracket z \rrbracket_{\rho(z := \llbracket N \rrbracket_\rho)})$
104	4	$\Lambda(\mathfrak{M})$	$\mapsto$ $\Lambda(\mathfrak{M}_1)$
105	5	$x.y$	$\mapsto$ $x \cdot y$
	14	$\llbracket D \rrbracket$	$\mapsto$ $\llbracket P \rrbracket$
107	−13	5.7.7.	$\mapsto$ 5.8.7.
		18.5.29	$\mapsto$ 18.4.29
		18.4.31	$\mapsto$ 20.6.22
	−7	categorical	$\mapsto$ categorical
108	5	$p_2)$	$\mapsto$ $p_2)$
	7	$A, B \in \mathcal{C}$	$\mapsto$ $A, B \in \mathbb{C}$
	14	⟨Delete⟩ It then follows that the same holds for all $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ .	
109	−11	$\lambda$	$\mapsto$ $\lambda$
110	8	by 4.1.(1)	$\mapsto$ by the note after 5.5.1.(ii)
111	8, 9	⟨Delete two lines.⟩	
	10	$\Rightarrow \llbracket P \rrbracket_{\Delta, x} = \llbracket Q \rrbracket_{\Delta, x}$	$\mapsto$ $\llbracket P \rrbracket_{\Delta, x} = \llbracket Q \rrbracket_{\Delta, x}$ , by the IH,
	13	$\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{C})$	$\mapsto$ $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbb{C})$
	−5, −4 (2×)	$\Rightarrow$	$\mapsto$ $\Rightarrow \forall x \in \mathfrak{M}$

Chapter 5 (continued)			
112	6	$F \circ G = \text{id},$	$\mapsto F \circ G = \text{id}, G$ is mono,
	8	$g$	$\mapsto g,$ since $p_2$ is epi.
113	5.5.10	$M$	$\mapsto P$
		$N$	$\mapsto Q$
114	-16	1	$\mapsto \mathbf{1}$
	-8	Scott [1980]	$\mapsto$ Scott [1980a]
115	5.5.7 until end of 5.6, except 5.6.3	$\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{S}$	$\mapsto \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{S}$ (respectively)
	-5	$t \rightarrow \mathbf{I}$	$\mapsto T \rightarrow \mathbf{I}$
117	9	Scott [1980]	$\mapsto$ Scott [1980a]
	-10	1	$\mapsto \mathbf{1}$
	5.6.3	$\lambda$	$\mapsto \lambda^*$
118	5.6.3	$\lambda$	$\mapsto \lambda^*$
	14	1	$\mapsto \mathbf{1}$
	16	$\mathbf{K1}_n$	$\mapsto \mathbf{K1}_p$
	17	$\mathbf{1}_n$	$\mapsto \mathbf{1}_p$
	-4	$\lambda$	$\mapsto \lambda^*$
120	13	1	$\mapsto \mathbf{1}$
124	14	$(X, \cdot, \lambda)$	$\mapsto (X, \cdot, \sqsubseteq)$
	-1	$\mathbf{B}$	$\mapsto \mathcal{B}$
125	-12	is	$\mapsto$ vs.
126	5	$M(\mathcal{J})$	$\mapsto \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{J})$
	18	$\mathcal{B}$	$\mapsto \mathfrak{B}$
127	18	<b>21.4 Exercises</b>	$\mapsto$ <i>21.4 Exercises</i>
	-7	$\mathcal{F} = (X, \cdot)$	$\mapsto \mathfrak{M} = (X, \cdot)$
128	15, 16	$\subsetneq$	$\mapsto \sqsubsetneq$
	21	$\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{\Omega}$	$\mapsto \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{\Omega}$
Chapter 6			
150	-16	2.3.5	$\mapsto$ 2.4.5

Chapter 7			
152	18	$CL \vdash$	$\mapsto \mathbf{CL} \vdash$
	-8	$(\lambda^*x.Q).$	$\mapsto (\lambda^*x.Q),$ otherwise.
153	-8	Suppose $\vec{x} \notin \text{FV}(\vec{Q})$ . Then	$\mapsto$ Then
155	2	remark 3.1.7	$\mapsto$ definition 3.1.5
	8	$\lambda$ -term	$\mapsto$ $\lambda$ -term
	§7.2	$M, N, L$	$\mapsto P, Q, R$ (respectively)
156	-1	$\lambda \vdash$	$\mapsto \lambda \vdash$
157	2	$\lambda \vdash$	$\mapsto \lambda \vdash$
161	11	$= \mathbf{S(KK)(S(S(KS)(S(KK)(SKK)))(K(SKK)))} \mapsto$ $\mathbf{S(KK)(S(S(KS)K)(K(SKK)))}$	
▶	-1	$\lambda x.l \mapsto_{\beta} \lambda x.l$	$\mapsto \lambda x.lx \mapsto_{\beta} l$
▶	162	$\mathbf{S(KI)(KI)} \not\mapsto_w \mathbf{KI}$	$\mapsto \mathbf{S(KI)I} \not\mapsto_w \mathbf{I}$
162	8	w-solvable	$\mapsto w$ -solvable
	-5	$S's$	$\mapsto \mathbf{S}'s$
163	4	$I$	$\mapsto \mathbf{I}$
	16	$K, S$	$\mapsto \mathbf{K, S}$ (respectively)
	-7	$\overset{!}{\mapsto}$	$\mapsto \overset{!}{\mapsto}$
	-5	$K, S$	$\mapsto \mathbf{K, S}$ (respectively)
Chapter 8			
162	-2	Pettorossi	$\mapsto$ Pettorossi
167 – 168	(6×)	#	$\mapsto$ #
169	-9	PROOF.	$\mapsto$ PROOF. (i)
171	13	$x \notin F$	$\mapsto x \notin \text{FV}(F)$
173	9	$N_1N_2 \dots N_n$	$\mapsto N_1N_2 \dots N_k$
177	2	$\vec{x}, \vec{w}$	$\mapsto \vec{x}\vec{w}$
178	7	$M_{CL}N_{CL}$	$\mapsto M_{CL}\vec{N}_{CL}$
179	13	one has $\psi$	$\mapsto$ one has $\phi$
180	11	occurrences if redexes	$\mapsto$ occurrences of redexes
181	2	$M = M_0$	$\mapsto M \equiv M_0$
	10	$n \in N$	$\mapsto n \in \mathbb{N}$
(3×)	14, 15, 19	=	$\mapsto \equiv$
182	-8	$m$ is solvable	$\mapsto \lceil m \rceil$ is solvable
184	11	$KH_4$	$\mapsto \mathbf{KH}_4$
	15	$\mathbf{K}^3\mathbf{I}$	$\mapsto \mathbf{K}^4\mathbf{I}$
	-4	16.3.15	$\mapsto$ 17.3.15
	-2	$S$	$\mapsto \mathbf{S}$

Chapter 9			
186	14	$M \in \Lambda$	$\mapsto \lambda x.M \in \Lambda$
	-5, -4	$I$	$\mapsto I$
193	-8	$N_m$	$\mapsto N_n$
198	-2 (2×)	$\#$	$\mapsto \#$
▶ 201	-2	$\forall k \leq \text{lh}(\alpha) \alpha(2k) \leq m$	$\mapsto \forall k \leq n \alpha(2k) \leq m$
203	19	$k = m + k_0$	$\mapsto k = m + k_0 + 1$
	-8	$MI \sim^p$	$\mapsto MI \sim^{p+1}$
	-8	$\in$	$\mapsto \in_\beta$
205	-16	$P_{n+1}, \dots, P_p$	$\mapsto P_{n+1} \dots P_p$
208	2	$\supset$	$\mapsto \supset$
209	-6	9.1.7	$\mapsto$ 9.1.6
211	14, 16 (2×)	$P_p$	$\mapsto P_{p'}$
Chapter 10			
216	-6	Böhm tree	$\mapsto$ Böhm tree
220	-4, -3 (2×)	$\uparrow$	$\mapsto = \perp$
222	20	$i > m$	$\mapsto i \geq m$
	-3	$M_{(0)} = \Omega$	$\mapsto M_{(0)} \equiv \Omega$
223	-3	$\uparrow$ else.	$\mapsto \perp$ if $\text{lh}(\alpha) = k$ and $\alpha \in A$ ; $\uparrow\uparrow$ else.
226	15	$\#B_\alpha$	$\mapsto \#B_\alpha$
227	-9	$\vec{x}_\alpha, y_\alpha$	$\mapsto \vec{x}_\alpha, y_\alpha, m_\alpha$
228	1	THEOREM.	$\mapsto$ THEOREM (Bergstra and Klop [1980]).
	-12	$\lceil \alpha * \langle 0 \rangle \rceil$	$\mapsto \lfloor \alpha * \langle 0 \rangle \rfloor$
	-11	$\#B_\alpha$	$\mapsto \#B_\alpha$
▶	-3	$\forall \alpha \{ \vec{x}_\alpha \} \subseteq \bigcup \{ \text{FV}_A(\beta) \mid \beta > \alpha \}$	$\mapsto$ $\forall \alpha [A(\alpha) \Rightarrow \{ \vec{x}_\alpha \} \subseteq \{ y_\alpha \} \cup \bigcup \{ \text{FV}(A_{\alpha*(i)}) \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_\alpha \}]$ .
229	-5	PROOF.	$\mapsto$ PROOF. (i)
230	6	tree topology	$\mapsto$ tree topology
	7	$BT : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$	$\mapsto BT : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$
	-9 (3×)	$BT$	$\mapsto BT$
231	-5	$\lambda x.x$	$\mapsto \langle \lambda x.x, 0 \rangle$
232	10.2.9	$BT$	$\mapsto BT$
233	1	$A : X$	$\mapsto A; X$
▶ 236	-5	$x_n \leq_\eta A_m$	$\mapsto x_n \leq_\eta A_m \ \& \ x_n \neq y$
▶ 237	-4	$(M; X_\alpha)_\alpha$	$\mapsto M(BT(M); X_\alpha)_\alpha$
238	-11	$\Sigma_1$	$\mapsto \Sigma_1 \times \mathbb{N}$
245 – 246	(3×)	$BT$	$\mapsto BT$
247	5	$(\lambda \vec{x}.M) \vec{N}^*$	$\mapsto (\lambda y \vec{x}.M) P \vec{N}^*$



Chapter 10 (continued)

248	2	$= P_2   (P_2   y \Omega)$	$\mapsto$
249	11	$U_j^n$	$\mapsto U_j^m$
	13	$xM_1 \dots M_m$	$\mapsto xM_0 \dots M_m$
250	-5, -4 (2×)	$\vec{P}$	$\mapsto \vec{R}$
	-2	(1)	$\mapsto (i)$
251	9	$M \beta = N \beta$	$\mapsto M \beta \sim N \beta$
	18	$\lambda \vec{x}.yN_{i1} \dots N_{im}$	$\mapsto \lambda \vec{x}.yM_{i1} \dots M_{im}$
	-6	10.3.6 (ii).	$\mapsto$ 10.3.6 (ii), that also holds for virtual nodes.
253, 254	-13, 5	along	$\mapsto$ up to
254	-6	(i) By	$\mapsto$ (i) It suffices to show this for closed $P, Q$ . By
256	4	$\simeq_\eta$	$\mapsto \widetilde{\simeq}_\eta$
	7	along	$\mapsto$ up to
257	3	$\mathcal{F}$ if	$\mapsto \mathcal{F}$ is
	4	10.2.31	$\mapsto$ 10.2.13
258	-9, -6	$P_4$	$\mapsto P_4$
261	2	$\lambda \eta \vdash$	$\mapsto \lambda \eta \vdash$
	-3	(i)	$\mapsto$
263	-8	$xM_{11}^k \dots \dots \dots M_{1m_q}^k$	$\mapsto xM_{11}^q \dots \dots \dots M_{1m_q}^q$
265	10 - 21 (19×)	$\pi$	$\mapsto \pi_1$
	11, 13 (2×)	$k =$	$\mapsto p =$
	13	$\lambda \vec{y}_i.z_1$	$\mapsto \lambda \vec{y}_1.z_1$
	16	$k >$	$\mapsto p >$
	21, 22 (2×)	Max	$\mapsto$ min
▶ 265	26	Before 10.5.21 add the following definition. 10.5.20A. DEFINITION. (i) $\pi$ is called $\mathcal{F}$ -nonconfusing $\iff \forall M, N \in \mathcal{F}. [M \sim N \iff M^\pi \sim N^\pi]$ & $[M   \langle \rangle \downarrow \iff M^\pi \text{ solvable}]$ (ii) $\mathcal{F}_I^o = \{\pi \in I \mid \pi \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-nonconfusing and } M^\pi \text{ is solvable}\}$ .	
266	2	$b_p$	$\mapsto b_q$
	-12, 11, -9	$b_p$	$\mapsto b_q$
▶ 267	3	$\mathcal{F}$ -faithful	$\mapsto \mathcal{F}$ -nonconfusing
▶	8, 14, 15, 18,	$\mathcal{F}_I^*$	$\mapsto \mathcal{F}_I^o$
	-6, -1 (6×)		
▶ 268	2	$\mathcal{F}_I^*$	$\mapsto \mathcal{F}_I^o$
272	15	$x \in \text{BT}(Fx)$	$\mapsto x \in \text{BT}(Fx)$ , i.e. $x \in \text{FV}(\text{BT}(Fx))$ ,
	16	$\lambda \vdash$	$\mapsto \lambda \vdash$
	15	$\langle \text{something like} \rangle \Lambda_1 \mathcal{B}$	$\mapsto \Lambda_1 \mathfrak{B}$

Chapter 11			
279	2	$\dots(P_2[x_2 := (\dots\Delta'_1\dots)]) \mapsto \dots(P_2[x_2 := (\dots\Delta'_1\dots)])\dots$	
282	2-nd diagram	Arrow from $M^\sim$ to $N^\sim$ should have as label $\beta'$ (not $\beta$ ).	
285	5	$\{\Delta \mid \Delta \in P$	$\mapsto \{ \Delta  \mid \Delta \in P$
287	-11	an <i>weighting</i>	$\mapsto$ a <i>weighting</i>
288	-1	274	$\mapsto$ 278
289	-7	$\lambda_i x_2.P_0$	$\mapsto \lambda_j x_2.P_0$
291	4	$\{M \mid M \xrightarrow{\text{dev}} N\}$	$\mapsto \{N \mid M \xrightarrow{\text{dev}} N\}$
	-4	$M$	$\mapsto (M, \mathcal{F})$
292	-11	$\omega = \lambda x.xx$	$\mapsto \omega \equiv \lambda x.xx$
	-4	$\xrightarrow{1}$	$\mapsto \xrightarrow{1}$
294	5	$M' \rightarrow_{\beta_0} N'$	$\mapsto M' \twoheadrightarrow_{\beta_0} N'$
296	-3	$\sigma : M \rightarrow N$	$\mapsto \sigma : M \twoheadrightarrow N$
298	-3	$M' \xrightarrow{1,i} M$ even	$\mapsto$ even $M' \xrightarrow{1,i} N$
300	-12 - -4	Argument can be simplified by distinguishing $N \equiv \lambda x.N_0$ and $N \equiv N_0N_1$ .	
	-2 (2 $\times$ )	$\vec{M}$	$\mapsto \vec{P}$
	-1	$\vec{N}$	$\mapsto \vec{Q}$
	-1	$M_i \twoheadrightarrow N_i$	$\mapsto P_i \twoheadrightarrow Q_i$
301	2, 4, 7 (3 $\times$ )	$\vec{N}$	$\mapsto \vec{Q}$
Chapter 12			
302	6, 7 (2 $\times$ )	$\rightarrow$	$\mapsto \twoheadrightarrow$
303	9	12.1.1	$\mapsto$ 12.1.1A
303	16	<b>R</b> -=-reduction	$\mapsto$ <i>R</i> -=-reduction
304	2	$\cong$	$\mapsto \cong$
305	7	$D_4$	$\mapsto D_3$
	1 <sup>st</sup> diagram	$\sigma \rho, \rho \sigma$	$\mapsto \sigma/\rho, \rho/\sigma$ (respectively)
310	-7	Since by (2)	$\mapsto$ Since by (3)
316	-4	$\cong$ an	$\mapsto \cong$ is an
319	-1	$\Delta_{n-1}$	$\mapsto \Delta_{n+1}$
320, 321	1, 5	lemma 2.1.12	$\mapsto$ proposition 2.1.12
322	1	$(\sigma)$	$\mapsto (\sigma_k)$

Chapter 13

324	-7	effective	$\mapsto$	effective <sup>3</sup>
325	-7	$\beta$	$\mapsto$	$\beta$
327	-3	=	$\mapsto$	$\equiv$
328	-5	$\beta$	$\mapsto$	$\beta$
329	Fig. 13.3.	$\mathbb{N}'$	$\mapsto$	$\mathbb{N}$
330	3	=	$\mapsto$	$\equiv$
331	1	reduction	$\mapsto$	<i>reduction</i>
	-4	$M_1$	$\mapsto$	$M$
	Fig. 13.6	The gk-arrows should be dotted.		
332	7	PROOF.	$\mapsto$	PROOF. (i)
334	4, 5 (2 $\times$ )	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mapsto$	$\mathcal{C}_1$
▶	4	$\twoheadrightarrow$	$\mapsto$	=
338	-1	$0 \leq i \leq n$	$\mapsto$	$0 \leq i < n$
340	-11 (3 $\times$ )	$\rightarrow$	$\mapsto$	$\twoheadrightarrow$
342	6	order $i$	$\mapsto$	order $i - 1$
343	11	13.4.11 (i)	$\mapsto$	13.4.11 (ii)
	15	13.4.11 (ii)	$\mapsto$	13.4.11 (i)
	Fig. 13.9 (5 $\times$ )	Arrows labelled 'cp1' should have double heads.		
344	1	theorem 11.2.20	$\mapsto$	proposition 11.2.20
	11	Bergstra-Klop [198+]	$\mapsto$	Bergstra-Klop [1982]
▶	345	-6, -4 (3 $\times$ )	Replace $\ M\ , \ N\ $ by $\ M\ _1, \ N\ _1$ , respectively, where $\ \cdot\ _1$ is defined in the proof of 13.3.5.	
▶		-1	in $\Lambda_{\ M\ }$ . $\mapsto$ in $\Lambda_{\ M\ _1}$ and does not contain an $F$ -cycle.	
▶	346	1, 2	Between 'otherwise' and ' $F$ ' insert: 'at least one of the following two situations holds: 1. the $F$ -path of $M$ contains an $F$ -cycle; 2. the $F$ -path of $M$ does not lie within $\Lambda_{\ M\ _1}$ . Case 1 is impossible as $F$ is a $B$ -optimal normalizing strategy. If case 2 holds, then'	
		-9	AB	$\mapsto$ $AB$
347	5	$I$	$\mapsto$	$I$
	9	$l$ -1-optimal	$\mapsto$	$L$ -1-optimal
	-3	$B(\Pi) =$	$\mapsto$	$B(\Pi)) =$

<sup>3</sup>Some readers prefer the word 'efficient'.

Chapter 14			
348	5 (2×)	#	$\mapsto$ #
	11 (2×)	#	$\mapsto$ #
350	Fig. 13.10	Figure c should be upside down.	
351	-2	than	$\mapsto$ then
355	17	$\rightarrow lab.\beta$	$\mapsto \rightarrow_{lab,\beta}$
356	15	$L_1 = xV_1 \dots V_M$	$\mapsto L_1 \equiv xV_1 \dots V_M$
	-5	$M = M_1M_2$	$\mapsto M \equiv M_1M_2$
358	7	$(x\vec{N})^* \equiv \perp \vec{N}$	$\mapsto (x\vec{N})^* \equiv \perp \vec{N}^*$
360	4	an alternative proof	$\mapsto$ a proof
361	-9	$k = 0$	$\mapsto k \in \{0, 1\}$
	-9	$k > 0$	$\mapsto k > 1$
362	-5	14.2.8	$\mapsto$ 14.2.7
363	2	theorem	$\mapsto$ proposition
	5, 6	elementary and diagram	$\mapsto$ elementary diagram
	-11	$\Delta'_j$	$\mapsto \Delta'_i$
Chapter 15			
364	-7	$\beta(\perp)$	$\mapsto \beta\perp$
369	8	$P \equiv D[\perp, \dots, \perp]$	$\mapsto P_{\beta\leftarrow} D[\perp, \dots, \perp]$
	10	$C[\vec{P}] \equiv C[D[\vec{\perp}]]$	$\mapsto C[\vec{P}]_{\beta\leftarrow} C[D[\vec{\perp}]]$
371	15	lemma 14.3.15	$\mapsto$ lemma 14.3.14
372	8, 10 (2×)	$C[M] = N$	$\mapsto C[M] \equiv N$
373 – 374	(9×)	Replace superscripts $(n)$ and $(m)$ by $[n]$ , $[m]$ , respectively.	
382	16	(i) Suppose	$\mapsto$ Suppose
	16	redex. Show	$\mapsto$ redex. (i) Show
	-8	$M \in A$	$\mapsto M \in \Lambda$
385	10 (2×)	$\equiv$	$\mapsto =$
	-5	(3) and (1)	$\mapsto$ (2) and (1)
	-2	$(xP_1 \dots P_n)^\eta$	$\mapsto (\dots (x \dots P_1) \dots P_n)^\eta$
386	-6	redexes	$\mapsto \beta$ -redexes
387	-4	$\lambda x_1 \dots x_n. x_1 N_2 \dots N_n$	$\mapsto \lambda x_n \dots x_1. x_1 N_2 \dots N_n$
388	6	$NL_1 \dots L_n$	$\mapsto NL_n \dots L_1$
	7	$y_2 P_{11} \dots P_{1k_1}$	$\mapsto y_2 P_{21} \dots P_{2k_2}$
	-9	$M \neq \Omega$	$\mapsto M \neq \Omega$
	12 – 19 (5×)	$\Omega$	$\mapsto \Omega$
390	-8	$\downarrow\beta$	$\mapsto \downarrow\beta$
393	5	$((\lambda x.z(xx))\omega_3)$	$\mapsto ((\lambda x.z(xx))\omega_3)$
395	-10	15.2.4(ii)	$\mapsto$ 15.2.4(iii)

Chapter 15 (continued)		
396	Fig. 15.4	Interchange labels (1) and (2).
398	1	$\lambda y, M_0 \mapsto \lambda y.M_0$
	4	$H \subseteq M_i \mapsto H \subset M_i$
	-17	$\lambda x_m \cdot y \mapsto \lambda x_m.y$
400	-10	$\delta_C \mapsto \delta_C$
401	6	$\Lambda \delta \mapsto \Lambda^\circ \delta$
403	-3	$M_1, \dots, M_n \mapsto M_1 \dots M_n$
	-2	$\text{BT}(M_1) \text{ BT}(M_n) \mapsto \text{BT}(M_1) \dots \text{BT}(M_n)$
406	diagram	Left arrow with $\beta$ should be doubly headed.
Chapter 16		
413	-10	$M \approx N \mapsto M' \approx N'$
416	-10	19.2.12 $\mapsto$ 19.2.9
418	-7	19.2.12 $\mapsto$ 19.2.9
419	-11	$\pi_n \mapsto \pi_n$
420	-12	$M \not\equiv N' \mapsto M' \not\equiv N'$
	-3	$\simeq_\eta \mapsto \tilde{\simeq}_\eta$
422	2	$\Theta \mapsto \Upsilon$
	2	$B \rightarrow \mapsto Bx \rightarrow$
425	-10, -9 (4 $\times$ )	$BT \mapsto \text{BT}$
426	in fig. (2 $\times$ )	$BT \mapsto \text{BT}$
427	3	$\omega \mapsto \omega$
429	2	14.4.5 $\mapsto$ 15.1.5
	14	$\Theta(jxy.x(jy)) \mapsto \Theta(\lambda jxy.x(jy))$
429	17	$\sqsubseteq \mapsto \sqsubset$
	-8	$\forall z \in \Lambda^\circ \mapsto \forall Z \in \Lambda^\circ$
	-5	$AZ = AZ \mapsto AZ = AZ'$
	-4	$AZ = A'Z \mapsto AZ = AZ'$
430	9	$M \sqsubseteq N \mapsto M \sqsubset N$
▶	-4	$J = \lambda + \text{l} = \Omega_3 \equiv \omega_3 \omega_3 \mapsto J = \lambda + \text{l} = \Omega \text{ and } \Omega_3 \equiv \omega_3 \omega_3$
	-3	$=_J \mapsto =_J$
Chapter 17		
▶	435 -9, -10	$O_M = \{N \mid FM \in O\} \mapsto O_M = \{N \mid FN \in O\}$
	443 4	15.1.9 $\mapsto$ 16.1.9(ii)
	465 11	17.1.9 (ii) $\mapsto$ 17.1.9

Chapter 18		
468	4	Palamidessi Catuscia $\mapsto$ Catuscia Palamidessi
473	-6	$\lambda^G x.A$ $\mapsto$ $\lambda x.A$
▶ 476	12	$(\lambda x.A)\emptyset = \emptyset$ $\mapsto$ $(\lambda x.A)\emptyset \neq \emptyset$
	-2	$e_k \not\subseteq e_k$ $\mapsto$ $e_k \not\subseteq e_{k'}$
477	-2, -1 (2×)	$\psi(x)$ $\mapsto$ $\psi(x')$
481	12	$\langle \sqcup_n x_{\min}(n, i) \rangle_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ $\mapsto$ $\langle \sqcup_n x_{\min}(n, i) \rangle_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$
483	11	$y \in_n$ $\mapsto$ $y \in D_n$
485	-3	$\Phi_{n, \infty}(\lambda y \in D_n)$ $\mapsto$ $\Phi_{n+1, \infty}(\lambda y \in D_n)$
491	18.4.1	$P\omega \forall \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$ $\mapsto$ $P\omega \not\forall \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$
492	-10	15.3.4 $\mapsto$ 15.4.4
Chapter 19		
508	1	19.2.14 $\mapsto$ 19.2.11
509	-6	operators $\mapsto$ combinators
	-5	combinator $\mapsto$ operator
Chapter 20		
513		5.3.25 $\mapsto$ 5.2.23(i)
518	12	Wadsworth. $\mapsto$ Wadsworth. Write $x \in \text{BT}(M)$ for $x \in \text{FV}(\text{BT}(M))$ .
521	-5	19.3.15 $\mapsto$ 18.3.15
Appendices		
570	11	[198+] $\mapsto$ [1982]
576	-3	[1980] $\mapsto$ [1979]
581	6 (2×)	$v_2$ $\mapsto$ $v_1$
584	20	[198-] $\mapsto$ [198?]
Addenda		
582	6	$xz(yx)$ $\mapsto$ $xz(yz)$

References		
585	-4	[198-] $\mapsto$ [1983]
	-3	to appear. $\mapsto$ 48, pp. 931-940
586	-22	[1982] $\mapsto$ [1982a]
	-11	Add: BEZEM, M. A.
		[1985] Isomorphisms between $HEO$ and $HRO^E$ , $ECF$ and $ICF^E$ . <i>Journal of Symbolic Logic</i> , <b>50</b> , pp. 359-371.
	-8	[1980] $\mapsto$ [1979]
589	15 (2 $\times$ )	[1980] $\mapsto$ [1979]
595	5, 6	(to appear). $\mapsto$ no. 3, pp. 271–286, 287–302, 303–325.
597	-9	$\mathfrak{p}$ -functions $\mapsto$ $\mathfrak{p}$ -function
598	-8	$AGM$ $\mapsto$ $ACM$
Index of Names		
599	$R17$	Add: Bezem, M. [1985] 566
	$L-19$	516 $\mapsto$ 250, 516
	$R-16$	238, $\mapsto$ 238, 245,
600	$R13$	[1980] $\mapsto$ [1979]
601	$R21$	116 $\mapsto$ 116,107
	$R22$	[1983] 107 $\mapsto$ [1984] 494
602	$R11$	149 $\mapsto$ 150
	$L-17$	536 $\mapsto$ 534
	$L-13$	75 $\mapsto$
	$L-11$	O'Donell $\mapsto$ O'Donnell
Index of Definitions		
607		leftmost 179 $\mapsto$ leftmost 180
608	$L12$	$\mapsto$ Paradox Curry- 573, 575 Liar's- 573
Index of Symbols		
613	11	$\lambda I$ -terms $\mapsto$ $\lambda I$ -terms
614	8	$M\emptyset$ $\mapsto$ $M\vec{N}\emptyset$
	19	354 $\mapsto$ 355
618		Add: $A =_{\eta} B$ trees $A, B$ are equal up to (possibly 240 infinitely many) $\eta$ -conversions
619	-15	150 $\mapsto$ 160
620 (2 $\times$ )	11, 12	$\Vdash M = N$ $\mapsto$ $\models M = N$

# Bibliography

- Barendregt, H.P., M. Bunder and W. Dekkers [1993]. Systems of illative combinatory logic complete for first order propositional and predicate calculus, *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* **58**(3), pp. 89–108.
- Folkerts, E. [1998]. Invertibility in lambda-eta, *Conference on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 1998*, IEEE, pp. 418–429.
- Intrigila, B. and R. Statman [2004]. The omega rule is  $\Pi_2^0$ -hard in the  $\lambda\beta$ -calculus, *Conference on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2004*, IEEE. To appear.
- Jung, A. [1989]. *Cartesian closed categories of domains*, CWI Tract 66, Centrum voor Wiskunde en Informatica, Amsterdam.