

AN ADDENDUM TO MY PAPER "A CATEGORICAL
 EQUIVALENCE OF PROOFS"

MANFRED E. SZABO

The definition of *canonical proofs* on page 183 of [1] should be amended as follows:

(0) If the active term of an application of (R_7) in P was an active term of an application of an application of (R_2) in a path terminating with that application of (R_7) , then the relevant application of (R_2) is replaced by an application of the following new rule of inference:

$$(R_2') \frac{\Gamma, B, B, \Delta, [\Theta] \rightarrow A}{\Gamma, B, \Delta, [\Theta], [B] \rightarrow A} ,$$

where $[\Theta]$ denotes a sequence of bracketed terms. Moreover, all rules of inference are modified to allow bracketed terms on the extreme right of their antecedents. (R_5) and (R_6) , in particular, are modified as follows:

$$(R_5') \frac{\Gamma, [\Phi] \rightarrow A \quad \Delta, [\Psi] \rightarrow B}{\Gamma, \Delta, [\Phi], [\Psi] \rightarrow A \wedge B} \quad (R_6') \frac{\Gamma, [\Phi] \rightarrow A \quad \Delta, B, \Theta, [\Psi] \rightarrow C}{\Delta, \Gamma, A \supset B, \Theta, [\Phi], [\Psi] \rightarrow C} .$$

These replacements are to be carried out from the top left to the bottom right hand corners of P , so that the resulting sequence $[\Theta]$ of bracketed terms in the conclusion of the new proof Q_0 which results from P in this way is uniquely determined.

The meaning of the proof Q_0 is considered to be the same as that of P . In particular, Q_0 proves the same *formula* as P , and is included as a new member in the equivalence class of P .

REMARK: The presence of bracketed terms is required for the definition of the *generality* of canonical proofs.

REFERENCE

- [1] Szabo, M. E., "A categorical equivalence of proofs," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, vol. XV (1974), pp. 177-191.

Sir George Williams University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Received May 13, 1974