ERRATA, VOLUME 24

O. C. Hazlett, *A symbolic theory of formal modular covariants.*

Page 299, Theorem III. The proof given is evidently incorrect, inasmuch as a polynomial in the differences of the ratios α_2/α_1, β_2/β_1, etc. is not necessarily a polynomial in the symbolic invariants $\alpha_1\beta_2-\alpha_2\beta_1$, $\alpha_1\gamma_2-\alpha_2\gamma_1$, etc. On the other hand, Corollary 1 of Theorem III follows at once from Lemma V. For any isobaric formal modular invariant M of a system of forms S which is of degree d_i in the coefficients of f_i and of weight w is identically congruent, modulo p, to $a_0^{d_1}$ multiplied by a linear combination, K, of products of the differences of the type $(\beta_2/\beta_1)-(\alpha_2/\alpha_1)$, where the α's and β's may be symbols arising from the same form or may be symbols arising from different forms; moreover, K is homogeneous in the symbols for each form, f_i, and such that each ratio α_2/α_1 for this form occurs in exactly d_i factors in each product, and, finally, K is symmetric, modulo p, in these symbols for each form f_i. Hence, by a well known result of classic invariant theory, any isobaric formal modular invariant of S is congruent, modulo p, to an algebraic invariant, A, of S, although A is not necessarily rational and integral. Then Theorem III follows from Corollary 1, since any algebraic invariant is expressible as a polynomial in the symbolic invariants $\alpha_1\beta_2-\alpha_2\beta_1$, etc.

Olive C. Hazlett

ERRATA, VOLUME 30

C. R. Adams, *On the irregular cases of the linear ordinary difference equation.*

Page 526, equation (33). The minus sign between the two fractions should be a multiplication sign.

Page 527, equations (34). The superscript of all the γ's in these equations should be $(n-1)$.

Page 537. In the display six lines from the bottom of the page, $\gamma_1^{(n-2)}$ should be $\gamma_i^{(n-2)}$.