ERRATA

Correction to

LOCALE GEOMETRY

B. J. DAY

Volume 83 (1979), 333-339

As regards [1] §4 (examples), the categories Lc and Lpc are not correctly defined. The equality on page 334 (line 4) should read $X'(fx, fy) \geqq X(x, y)$. The equality on page 334 (line 9) should read $(fx, fy, fz) \geqq (x, y, z)$. The equality in axiom C 5 should read:

C 5. $\sup_w (x, y, w) \wedge (x, z, w) \leqq X(y, z) \vee (x, y, z) \vee (x, z, y)$,

with appropriate alterations to the lemmas. With this larger class of geometries the results of the article remain valid. Moreover, the new category inclusion $Lc \subset Lpc$ satisfies the colimit claims of §4 and, consequently, has a right adjoint (whose counit is a set bijection). It can be shown (using the above C 5) that $E_n \cong E_1^n$ in Lc when $L = 2$ and E_n denotes n-dimensional Euclidern space with the usual 2-valued convexity structure.

Correction to

REGULAR FPF RINGS

S. PAGE

Volume 79 (1978), 169-176

In [2] Proposition 3 states that for a left FPF left nonsingular ring any left ideal is essential in a direct summand of the ring. Unfortunately the proof is lacking as was pointed out by E. P. Armendarie. The proof given only works for two sided ideals. The final results of the paper are in fact valid. The arguments of [2] do characterize the left self-injective left FPF regular rings. It is also easy to see (as is pointed out in [2]) that a strongly regular left FPF is left-injective. In [3] it is shown that if R is nonsingular and left FPF, then $Q(R)$, the maximal left quotient ring is also left FPF. So we know the structure of the maximal quotient ring. We will show that, if R is a left EPF regular ring, Proposition 3 does hold.