

## REPLACEMENT AND COLLECTION: A CORRECTION

NICOLAS D. GOODMAN

The argument of [2] is not correct. Specifically, Lemma 7 does not appear to be true in general. It does not seem worthwhile to publish a corrected version of the proof, since Friedman and Ščedrov [1], using a somewhat related argument, have now succeeded in proving the full theorem which eluded me. In the notation of [2], they show that  $ZF^-$  does not have the set existence property and therefore that  $ZFI$  does not imply the collection axiom.

### REFERENCES

- [1] HARVEY M. FRIEDMAN and ANDREJ ŠČEDROV, *The lack of definable witnesses and provably recursive functions in intuitionistic set theories*, *Advances in Mathematics*, vol. 57 (1985), pp. 1–13.  
[2] NICOLAS D. GOODMAN, *Replacement and collection in intuitionistic set theory*, this JOURNAL, vol. 50 (1985), pp. 344–348.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO  
BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14214