NOTES AND ERRATA: VOLUME 1, 3, 4, 5

VOLUME 1

F. R. MOULTON: *On a class of particular solutions* ....

P. 28, ll. 6 and 5 up. The numerical specifications are correct; the notice to the contrary (*Notes and errata*, vol. 3, p. 499) is in error. —F. R. M.

VOLUME 3

E. V. HUNTINGTON: *A complete set of postulates* ....

P. 267, l. 16 up. *For* one and only one *read* at least one.

E. H. MOORE: *A definition of abstract groups.*

P. 490, ll. 5–13. The independence of the postulates of

$$(M'') = (1, 2, 3'', 3_l'', 3_r'', 4_l'')$$

is not established, for the reasoning of the paragraph, ll. 5–13, p. 490, is in error, viz., (l. 5) from $(3_l, 3_r)$ does not follow $(3'', 3_l'', 3_r'')$, and (l. 12) the example for (3_r) in (M) does not suffice for $(3_r'')$ in (M'').

Now, in fact, in (M'') the postulate $(3_r'')$ is redundant, and we have the interesting definition,

$$(\bar{M}''): (1, 2, 3'', 3_l'', 4_l'').$$

In $\bar{M}''$ the postulates are mutually independent, and the same thing remains true when we add to the postulates of of $\bar{M}''$ the postulate that the multiplication or composition of elements is commutative. For proof of the statements here made I refer to a note to appear in volume 6 of the Transactions.—E. H. M.

VOLUME 4

L. E. DICKSON: *Definitions of a field by independent postulates.*

P. 19. As pointed out by Dr. E. V. HUNTINGTON, system $\Sigma_{8'}$ forms a field, $8'$ being satisfied by $u = -2$. I find that the following system