

errata et corrigenda (as of 23mar09)

Box Splines

C. de Boor, K. Höllig, S. Riemenschneider

xvi/2/-2: $\tau_j \rightarrow \tau^j$

3/(7)/: $\{x\} + \rightarrow x +$

21//10: (ii) $\rightarrow \backslash\text{par (ii)}$

31//5: smoothness of a box spline $\rightarrow \text{space } D(\Xi)$

35/2/1 that \rightarrow that the

38/(15)Lemma/: [The second equality is wrong as stated. The problem is that $\Xi \square$, taken literally, is smaller than whatever reasonable definition of “halfopen support of M ” (mentioned just prior to the lemma) one might come up with (as the simplest example, e.g., $\Xi = [101; 011]$, makes clear). At the same time, no version of the second equality is ever used in the book, nor can it be found in the quoted source for the Lemma, namely [Dahmen, Micchelli’85d]. Since it is not easy to come up with a simple definition of “halfopen support of M ”, it might be best to omit the last sentence prior to the lemma, omit the second equality in the lemma, and correspondingly simplify the proof. To be sure, a possible definition of ‘halfopen support of M ’ would be the union of the ‘halfopen’ parallelepipeds in a zonotopal tiling of the support, with a ‘halfopen’ parallelepiped one that includes only those facets from which a move in a certain fixed direction leads into the interior of that parallelepiped, with the fixed direction chosen not to be parallel to any hyperplane spanned by some directions of M .]

49//2: (52)Corollary to (53) \rightarrow (53)Corollary to (52)

59/3/4: $\ker M_i \rightarrow \ker M_i^*$

59/3/5: $\ker M_1 \rightarrow \ker M_1^*$

60/2/4:]the \rightarrow] the

67/Marsden Identity/5,6: [In 2006, Procesi et al. have pointed out the following formula:

$$L^{-1} = \prod_{\xi \in \Xi} B(D_\xi), \quad \text{with } B : x \mapsto \frac{x}{1 - e^{-x}},$$

whose lack is being lamented here. Once pointed out, this formula is easily derived from (III.16) and (III.34).]

137/Figure legend/-1: 1 3 \rightarrow 3 1

150/-1/-6: any \rightarrow any invertible

155-7: [the arguments given are doubtful]

163/(ii)/: $b^h \rightarrow b_\xi^h$

171/Corollary/2: . \rightarrow , $x \in \mathbb{R}^s$. [so as not to restrict x as in (30)Theorem]

200/unimodular, matrix:/: \rightarrow 41,