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

 $k(b_i - b_j) \rightsquigarrow k(b_j - b_i)$

Page 9, line 9

alternate spellings *∧*→ alternative spellings

Page 9, line 13

some of solutions \searrow some of the solutions

Page 10, line 14

should omitted \rightsquigarrow should be omitted

Page 11, line 21

sentence; No \→ sentence. No

Page 12, line 11 from the bottom

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

Page 14, line 19

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

Page 15, line 12

Page 15, line 5 from the bottom

that had been √→ that it had been

Page 15, line 4 from the bottom

Concrete Math draft *∧*→ Concrete Maths draft

Page 17, line 7 from the bottom

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

Page 20, line 5 from the bottom

letters in variable *→* letters in variable-

Page 21, line 3

fixed width type \searrow fixed-width type

Page 24, line 11

idea idea ∧→ idea

Page 26, line 3

piece of code *→* 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 *→* places can replicate

Page 26, line 2 from the bottom

sistences ✓→ sistencies

Page 27, line 2 from the bottom

had called a certain variable called 'scan' \rightarrow had given a certain variable the name 'scan'

Page 29, line 1

enter 'Type of message (1-6):' \rightarrow enter data by the words 'Type of message (1-6):'.

Page 31, line 8

now famous ∧→ now-famous

Page 31, line 11

journal", ✓→ journal,"

Page 31, line 17

accepted" replied \→ accepted," replied

Page 31, line 4 from the bottom

the 1960's $\searrow 1960$ s

Page 33, line 6 from the bottom

(and most damning indictment) *∧*→ (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

Page 37, line 8

Page 37, line 16

Algorithmic translation · ✓ Algebraic translation

Page 38, line 13

Grimm's ∕√→ Grimms'

Page 38, line 16

Grimm's ∧→ *Grimms'*

Page 38, line 4 from the bottom

Page 39, line 1

Quantitative \searrow Quantitative

Page 39, line 7 from the bottom

Page 42, line 9 from the bottom

From 1900–1960 \searrow From 1900 to 1960

Page 46, bottom line

must be $\operatorname{spec}(\alpha) \rightsquigarrow \operatorname{must} \operatorname{be in } \operatorname{spec}(\alpha)$

Page 47, line 11

malheur a' \ → malheur à

Page 47, line 15

Il est l'aime ✓ il est l'âme

Page 48, line 9 from the bottom

*Grimm's *→ *Grimms'*

Page 49, line 15 from the bottom

a little about the book \rightsquigarrow a little about the book

Page 49, line 14 from the bottom

Page 49, line 8 from the bottom

and Holidays $\wedge \rightarrow$ and holidays

Page 50, line 23

back from Mr. Flanagan ✓→ back from Mr. Flanagan

Page 51, line 6 from the bottom

 $hoard \searrow horde$

Page 52, line 24

Academie ∕√→ Académie

Page 53, line 9

Fine, said, Don ✓→ Fine, said Don

Page 54, line 6

punchline *→* punch line

Page 55, line 2

(June 1987) is \searrow (June 1987), is

Page 55, lines 13 and following

[These lines needn't be indented.]

Page 59, line 11

research Journal *∧→* research journal

Page 59, line 16 from the bottom

Page 60, line 2

Page 60, line 5

of Analysis $\wedge \rightarrow$ in Analysis

Page 60, line 11

Introduction to The Theory \searrow An Introduction to the Theory

Page 60, line 15

Mathematical \rightarrow Principles of Mathematical

Page 64, line 7

Page 68, line 4

Page 71, line 4

Ginsburg ∧→ 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 \longrightarrow word-processor

Page 73, line 16 from the bottom

pin-pointing ✓→ pinpointing

Page 73, line 9 from the bottom

organised—and got an $A- \longrightarrow$ 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

Page 78, line 15 from the bottom

Page 78, line 10 from the bottom

Page 78, line 7 from the bottom

Page 79, line 18 from the bottom

glue: Words ✓→ glue: words

Page 80, line 3

Page 80, line 5

fountain pen."

√→ fountain pen.")

Page 84, line 12

relator \rightsquigarrow realtor

Page 90, line 5 from the bottom

Seirpiński ∕√→ Sierpiński

Page 90, line 2 from the bottom

write up \→ write-up

Page 91, line 15 from the bottom

Page 92, line 20

Chigaco Manual *∧*→ Chicago Manual

Page 100, line 22

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

Page 101, line 4

Grimm's ∧→ *Grimms'*

Page 102, line 1

Grimm's ∧→ *Grimms'*

Page 105, line 2

vertices". ✓→ vertices."

Page 105, line 17

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

Page 108, line 10 from the bottom

Page 109, line 21

Page 110, line 7

Page 111, line 17

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

Page 111, bottom line

said \→ said Paul.

Page 114, line 5

Page 114, line 8

'höffentlich' \→ 'hoffentlich'

Page 114, line 4 from the bottom

leaving out a that \rightarrow leaving out a 'that'

Page 114, bottom line

repeat it twice \→ 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.