Page 420, line 27: Omit "$=H \times I$."

Page 420, line 29: Replace "H" by "$M(I, G)$."

Pages 421, 422: The modifications in the proof of Theorem 1, due to the above, will be clear.

Page 425, line 13: Insert between "(" and "see": "$H = (\beta \in M(I, G)$: $(\beta, a) \in W$ for some $a \in I$)."

University of West Virginia,
Morgantown, West Virginia

THE ISOMORPHISM OF CERTAIN CONTINUOUS RINGS*: CORRIGENDUM AND ADDENDUM

BRIAN P. DAWKINS AND ISRAEL HALPERIN

1. Page 1337, line 6: $v_{i,n-2}$ should be $v_{i,2n-2}$.
2. Page 1339, line 21: $\psi(u_{2n-1}\, v_{2n-1})$ should be $\psi(v_{2n-1}\, u_{2n-1})$.
3. Page 1340, line 13: $\bigcup_{A \in \mathfrak{A}} A(\mu)$ should be $\{A(\mu) | A \in \mathfrak{A}\}$.
4. Page 1341, line 10 should read: "when all $v_{2n+1}{}^{t}$ and all $v_j{}^{n+1}$ are replaced by 1."
5. Page 1341. Lemma 5 holds with hypothesis (i) omitted and even if the ring D fails to be a division ring (but U and V are required to be division rings). Moreover, Lemma 5 is an easy corollary of Lemma 1; to see this, observe first that (ii) of Lemma 5 implies

(ii)′ $\sum_{i=1}^{N} u_i v_i = 0$, $u_i \in U$, $v_i \in V$, *and* $v_1, \ldots, v_N$ *Z-independent, together imply all* $u_i = 0$.

(To deduce (ii)′, write

$$u_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r} w_j z_{ji}$$

with all $z_{ji} \in Z$ and $w_1, \ldots, w_r$ all in U and Z-independent.) Next, to prove Lemma 5 it suffices to consider the case that $v_1, \ldots, v_N$ are Z-independent; hence because of (ii)′ it can be assumed that all $v_i = 1$, i.e., that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} u_i{}^1 x u_i{}^2 = 0$$

for all $x \in U$. Lemma 1 now applies.

Carleton University and
University of Toronto

Received June 2, 1967.

*Published in Can. J. Math., *18* (1966), 1333–1344.