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

∘	0	1
0	0	1
1	1	0

□	0	1
0	0	0
1	0	0

may be employed.—L. E. D.

E. KASNER: *The generalized Beltrami problem* ....

P. 149, l. 4 up. *For* point of transformation *read* point transformation.

E. J. WILCZYNSKI: *On a certain congruence* ....

P. 190, l. 33. It is also assumed that $u_{11} = 0$, i. e. that S' is developable.

P. 191, l. 4. *For* $4q_{22}$ *read* $4q'_{22}$.

P. 194. The proof here given for the case $\theta_4 = 0$ is incorrect, owing to the fact that $v_{12} = 0$. It is still true that the surface S belongs to a linear complex; it has in fact a straight line directrix. Moreover all surfaces S' of the congruence Γ in this case have the property in question, instead of merely a double infinity.—E. J. W.

E. KASNER: *On the point-line as element* ....

Pp. 213–233. Since the publication of this essay, I have learned of the memoir by Professor E. VENERONI, *Sopra i connessi bilineari fra punti e rette nello spazio ordinario*, published in the Memorie di Torino, ser II^a, vol. 4 (1902), pp. 115–159, in which many of my results are anticipated. The two treatments of the bilinear connex are quite independent. VENERONI's includes an elaborate discussion of the various special cases, while mine is devoted entirely to the general case. Among the results, concerning this general case, which do not appear in the Italian memoir may be mentioned: the group of the connex and its relation to known groups, the general representation of the various invariants and covariants arising, the normal form with respect to cogredient transformation, and the determination of the connex from its fundamental configuration.—E. K.

P. 214, l. 10. *For the second exponent* m *read* n.
P. 231, l. 18. " *the subscripts* 4 " κ.

L. E. DICKSON: *On the subgroups of order* ....

P. 371, l. 8. *For* canonican *read* canonical.