

Errata for *Mathematical Writing*, second printing

(last updated 24 August 2002)

(the first printing contained several errors that were corrected in the second)

[On the copyright page about the MAA Notes series, delete the bottom line that says “A version of these notes...”.]

Page 4, the last line of rule 22

when it should be $\wedge\rightarrow$ when the proper word is

Page 8, line 18

$k(b_i - b_j) \wedge\rightarrow k(b_j - b_i)$

Page 9, line 9

alternate spellings $\wedge\rightarrow$ alternative spellings

Page 9, line 13

some of solutions $\wedge\rightarrow$ some of the solutions

Page 10, line 14

should omitted $\wedge\rightarrow$ should be omitted

Page 11, line 21

sentence; No $\wedge\rightarrow$ sentence. No

Page 12, line 11 from the bottom

$(c_i - c_j + 1)$ remans as a unit $\wedge\rightarrow c_i - c_j + 1$ remains as a unit

Page 14, line 19

at the authors request $\wedge\rightarrow$ at the authors' request

Page 15, line 12

close them”. $\wedge\rightarrow$ close them.”

Page 15, line 5 from the bottom

that had been $\wedge\rightarrow$ that it had been

Page 15, line 4 from the bottom

Concrete Math draft $\wedge\rightarrow$ Concrete Maths draft

Page 17, line 7 from the bottom

$(r/2 - k)'$. $\wedge\rightarrow (r/2 - k)'$.)

Page 20, line 5 from the bottom

letters in variable $\wedge\rightarrow$ letters in variable-

Page 21, line 3

fixed width type $\wedge\rightarrow$ fixed-width type

Page 24, line 11

idea idea $\wedge\rightarrow$ idea

Page 26, line 3

piece of code $\wedge\rightarrow$ piece of software

Page 26, line 14 from the bottom

good and gave a nice intuition of $\wedge\rightarrow$ good, and said that it gave a nice intuition about

Page 26, line 7 from the bottom
phases can replicate $\wedge \rightarrow$ places can replicate

Page 26, line 2 from the bottom
sistences $\wedge \rightarrow$ sistencies

Page 27, line 2 from the bottom
had called a certain variable called ‘*scan*’ $\wedge \rightarrow$ had given a certain variable the name ‘*scan*’

Page 29, line 1
enter ‘Type of message (1-6):’ $\wedge \rightarrow$ enter data by the words ‘Type of message (1-6):’.

Page 31, line 8
now famous $\wedge \rightarrow$ now-famous

Page 31, line 11
journal”, $\wedge \rightarrow$ journal,”

Page 31, line 17
accepted” replied $\wedge \rightarrow$ accepted,” replied

Page 31, line 4 from the bottom
the 1960’s $\wedge \rightarrow$ 1960s

Page 33, line 6 from the bottom
(and most damning indictment) $\wedge \rightarrow$ (the most damning indictment)

Page 34, line 12
some few journals $\wedge \rightarrow$ a few journals

Page 34, line 13
can strongly effect $\wedge \rightarrow$ can strongly affect

Page 35, line 9
refereees $\wedge \rightarrow$ referees

Page 37, line 8
It an extremely $\wedge \rightarrow$ It is an extremely

Page 37, line 16
Algorithmic translation $\wedge \rightarrow$ Algebraic translation

Page 38, line 13
Grimm’s $\wedge \rightarrow$ Grimms’

Page 38, line 16
Grimm’s $\wedge \rightarrow$ *Grimms’*

Page 38, line 4 from the bottom
line-width $\wedge \rightarrow$ line width

Page 39, line 1
Quantatative $\wedge \rightarrow$ *Quantitative*

Page 39, line 7 from the bottom
asynchonus $\wedge \rightarrow$ asynchronous

Page 42, line 9 from the bottom
From 1900–1960 $\wedge \rightarrow$ From 1900 to 1960

Page 46, bottom line
must be $\text{spec}(\alpha) \not\sim$ must be in $\text{spec}(\alpha)$

Page 47, line 11
malheur a' $\not\sim$ malheur à

Page 47, line 15
Il est l'aime $\not\sim$ il est l'âme

Page 48, line 9 from the bottom
Grimm's $\not\sim$ *Grimms'*

Page 49, line 15 from the bottom
a little about the the book $\not\sim$ a little about the book

Page 49, line 14 from the bottom
Concrete Math $\not\sim$ *Concrete Mathematics*

Page 49, line 8 from the bottom
and Holidays $\not\sim$ and holidays

Page 50, line 23
back from Mr. Flanagan $\not\sim$ back from Mr. Flanagan

Page 51, line 6 from the bottom
hoard $\not\sim$ horde

Page 52, line 24
Academie $\not\sim$ Académie

Page 53, line 9
Fine, said, Don $\not\sim$ Fine, said Don

Page 54, line 6
punchline $\not\sim$ punch line

Page 55, line 2
(June 1987) is $\not\sim$ (June 1987), is

Page 55, lines 13 and following
[These lines needn't be indented.]

Page 59, line 11
research Journal $\not\sim$ research journal

Page 59, line 16 from the bottom
by by $\not\sim$ by

Page 60, line 2
bleachers.''' $\not\sim$ bleachers.''')

Page 60, line 5
of Analysis $\not\sim$ *in Analysis*

Page 60, line 11
Introduction to The Theory $\not\sim$ *An Introduction to the Theory*

Page 60, line 15
Mathematical $\not\sim$ *Principles of Mathematical*

Page 64, line 7

to get thee $\wedge \rightarrow$ to get the

Page 68, line 4

to starts $\wedge \rightarrow$ to start

Page 71, line 4

Ginsburg $\wedge \rightarrow$ Ginsberg

Page 72, at the bottom

[See Lamport's article "How to write a proof," *American Mathematical Monthly* **102** (1995), 600–608.]

Page 73, line 17 from the bottom

word-processor $\wedge \rightarrow$ wordprocessor

Page 73, line 16 from the bottom

pin-pointing $\wedge \rightarrow$ pinpointing

Page 73, line 9 from the bottom

organised—and got an A— $\wedge \rightarrow$ organised; and he got an A—

Page 75, line 7 from the bottom

asked what was for $\wedge \rightarrow$ asked what it was for

Page 77, line 2 from the bottom

Greek boys: Taking $\wedge \rightarrow$ Greek boys: taking

Page 78, line 15 from the bottom

to the word count $\wedge \rightarrow$ and the word count

Page 78, line 10 from the bottom

better not be the your $\wedge \rightarrow$ better not be your

Page 78, line 7 from the bottom

the the $\wedge \rightarrow$ the

Page 79, line 18 from the bottom

glue: Words $\wedge \rightarrow$ glue: words

Page 80, line 3

aware how $\wedge \rightarrow$ aware of how

Page 80, line 5

fountain pen." $\wedge \rightarrow$ fountain pen.")

Page 84, line 12

relator $\wedge \rightarrow$ realtor

Page 90, line 5 from the bottom

Seirpiński $\wedge \rightarrow$ Sierpiński

Page 90, line 2 from the bottom

write up $\wedge \rightarrow$ write-up

Page 91, line 15 from the bottom

readership". $\wedge \rightarrow$ readership."

Page 92, line 20

Chigaco Manual $\wedge \rightarrow$ *Chicago Manual*

Page 100, line 22

they were too). $\wedge\rightarrow$ they were, too.)

Page 101, line 4

Grimm's $\wedge\rightarrow$ Grimms'

Page 102, line 1

Grimm's $\wedge\rightarrow$ Grimms'

Page 105, line 2

vertices". $\wedge\rightarrow$ vertices."

Page 105, line 17

quality". $\wedge\rightarrow$ quality."

Page 108, line 10 from the bottom

balderdash". $\wedge\rightarrow$ balderdash."

Page 109, line 21

so fas as $\wedge\rightarrow$ so far as

Page 110, line 7

"the reader and I" $\wedge\rightarrow$ 'the reader and I'

Page 111, line 17

this thing?") was $\wedge\rightarrow$ this thing?") was

Page 111, bottom line

said $\wedge\rightarrow$ said Paul.

Page 114, line 5

the the people $\wedge\rightarrow$ the people

Page 114, line 8

'höffentlich' $\wedge\rightarrow$ 'hoffentlich'

Page 114, line 4 from the bottom

leaving out a that $\wedge\rightarrow$ leaving out a 'that'

Page 114, bottom line

repeat it twice $\wedge\rightarrow$ repeat it again

Page 115, line 21

before a which $\wedge\rightarrow$ before a 'which'

Page 116, new material for the end

Postscript about "God is in the details" (see page 48): William Safire's column on Language in the *New York Times* and the *International Herald Tribune*, July 31, 1989, discusses this mysterious phrase as well as its counterpart, "The Devil is in the details." Nobody has been able to trace either one to a definite source. Safire cites Shapiro who claims to cite Nietzsche—but without chapter and verse. Safire also says that Justin Kaplan, editor of *Bartlett's Familiar Quotations*, is searching too. According to Kaplan, "Flaubert has been suggested, but nobody can find it in his writings."

Perhaps the following facts will be helpful. A biography of Mies by Franz Schulze (Chicago, 1985) has a relevant footnote on page 281:

The aphorism, "God is in the details," has been endlessly attributed to Mies, though I have found no one who ever heard him say it. In *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (New York, 1955, p. 5), Erwin Panofsky quotes Flaubert: "Le bon Dieu est dans le détail."

Actually Schulze should have referred not to page ‘5’, but to page ‘v’—where Panofsky drops Flaubert’s name but gives no hint of location.

David Spaeth, another Mies biographer, answered a query from Don as follows on December 6, 1985:

The statement “God is in the details” was made by Mies. It [only] appeared in print in an article by Peter Blake entitled “The difficult art of simplicity” which was published in *Architecture Forum* vol. 108, May 1958, pages 126–131. However, it was a statement Mies made in class many times. George Danforth, one of Mies’ very first students, remembers Mies saying it in the early 1940s.

Paul Roberts (PMR) wrote to Nigel Rees, who produces a BBC radio show based on quotation identification, asking for his opinion. Rees found the phrase mentioned in the *New York Herald Tribune* obituary of Mies, 1969, and said that Mies “certainly popularized it even if he didn’t originate it.”

PMR also turned up a significant clue that might in fact be the true origin of the saying. At least it carries things back further than anyone else has been able to do so far: On pages 13, 14, 229, and 286 of E. H. Gombrich’s 1970 biography of Aby Warburg, a prominent historian of Renaissance art, Gombrich states that Warburg used the phrase “Der liebe Gott steckt im Detail” as the motto of a seminar series at Hamburg University in the fall of 1925; he also says that Warburg often repeated this motto.

Thus, Mies probably learned the phrase in Germany. But was it original with Warburg? We can’t rule out Flaubert and Nietzsche until their complete works have been made available in electronic form.

Particulars, as every one knows, make for virtue and happiness; generalities are intellectually necessary evils.

— Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*.