ERRATA TO VOLUME 88

I. E. Segal, *Distributions in Hilbert space and canonical systems of operators*, pp. 12–41.

I am much indebted to J. S. Lew for questioning an important point in the proof of Theorem 5, which is in fact garbled. As Lew points out, the argument tacitly assumes the equality of $D_y(=dm_y/dm)$ and $D_{N,y}(=dm_{N,y}/dm_N$, where m_N denotes the restriction of m to the subspace N). This is invalid, but it is true that $D_{N,y}$ is the conditional expectation of D_y with respect to the ring of random variables for the distribution m_N, if $y \in N$,—i.e. if F is bounded and measurable with respect to this ring, then $\int D_y F = \int D_{N,y} F$. This is virtually a restatement of the definition of $D_{N,y}$. Thus D_y may be replaced by $D_{N,y}$ in the evaluation of the matrix element $(V_0(y)f, g)$, if f and g are bounded tame functions dependent on a subspace contained in N, and y is restricted to a subspace contained in N. It follows along the lines indicated in the cited proof that $V_0(\cdot)$ is weakly continuous, or what is the same thing for a unitary representation, strongly continuous, which is the point in question.

I. E. SEGAL