More particularly, the geometric meaning of alternative division rings was first studied by Ruth Moufang (see the references in [2] or [6]) and characterized by the uniqueness of the projective construction of a fourth harmonic point. Later Hall [2] gave an independent characterization in terms of his Theorem L. Theorem L is a projective axiom which, in two of its Euclidean forms, becomes* respectively the vector axiom and the distributive axiom. The characterization of Veblen-Wedderburn systems is originally due to Hall.

One final remark. It is an amusing fact that Theorem 6.4 of Hall [2], although true, was not completely proved until 1953, just ten years after the publication date of Hall's paper. By a trivial slip, the theorem contains the word "two" where "three" would have been appropriate. In 1950 I had a rude awakening in this connection which led to Theorem 2. The record shows that a similar experience led Skornyakov to the study of right alternative division rings.-May there be more such slips!

Appendix I. Planar ternary rings. A planar ternary ring is a system ( $R, F)$ consisting of a set $R$ and a ternary operation $F$ subject to the following postulates:
(i) 0 and 1 are two distinct elements of $R$.
(ii) If $a, b, c$ are in $R, F(a, b, c)$ is a uniquely defined element of $R$.
(iii) $F(0, b, c)=F(a, 0, c)=c$ for all $a, b, c$ of $R$.
(iv) $F(a, 1,0)=F(1, a, 0)=a$ for each $a$ in $R$.
(v) If $b, b^{\prime}, c, c^{\prime}$ are in $R$, with $b \neq b^{\prime}$, the equation $F(x, b, c)=F\left(x, b^{\prime}, c^{\prime}\right)$ has a unique solution $x$ in $R$.
(vi) If $a, a^{\prime}, b, b^{\prime}$ are in $R$, with $a \neq a^{\prime}$, the system of equations $F(a, x, y)=b$, $F\left(a^{\prime}, x, y\right)=b^{\prime}$ has a unique solution $x, y$ in $R$.
(vii) If $a, b, c$ are in $R$, the equation $F(a, b, x)=c$ has a unique solution $x$ in $R$.

A planar ternary ring $(R, F)$ determines a unique Euclidean plane defined as follows: The points of the plane are the ordered pairs $(x, y)$ of elements $x, y$ of $R$. Each ordered pair [ $m, b$ ] of elements $m, b$ of $R$ is a line of the plane which passes through those points $(x, y)$ such that $y=F(x, m, b)$. Each symbol $[a], a$ in $R$, is a line of the plane which passes through those points $(x, y)$ such that $x=a$.

Addition is defined for a planar ternary ring $(R, F)$ by $a+b=F(a, b, 0)$. The system $(R,+)$ is a loop. That is:
(viii) In the equation $x+y=z$, if any two of $x, y, z$ are assigned as elements of $R$, the third is uniquely determined as an element of $R$.

[^0](ix) There exists an element 0 of $R$ such that $0+a=a+0=a$ for every $a$ in $R$. A loop $(R,+)$ is a group provided:
(x) $(a+b)+c=a+(b+c)$ for all $a, b, c$ of $R$, and is an abelian group if also (xi) $a+b=b+a$ for all $a, b$ of $R$.

Multiplication is defined for a planar ternary ring $(R, F)$ by $a b=F(a, b, 0)$. In particular,
(xii) $0 a=a 0=0$ for all $a$ in $R$.

If $R^{*}$ consists of $R$ with 0 removed, ( $R^{*}, \cdot$ ) is a loop; that is, (viii), (ix) hold with $R,+, 0$ replaced by $R^{*}, \cdot, 1$ respectively.

Appendix II. Special planar ternary rings. A Veblen-Wedderburn system is a system $(R,+, \cdot)$ consisting of a set $R$ and two binary operations,$+ \cdot$, subject to the following postulates:
(I) $(R,+)$ is an abelian group with zero 0 .
(II.1) $(a+b) c=a c+b c$ for all $a, b, c$ of $R$.
(III) $\left(R^{*}, \cdot\right)$ is a loop with identity 1 .
(IV) $a 0=0$ for each $a$ of $R$.
(V) If $a, a^{\prime}, b$ are in $R$, with $a \neq a^{\prime}$, the equation $x a=x a^{\prime}+b$ has a unique solution $x$ in $R$.

A Veblen-Wedderburn system $(R,+, \cdot)$ becomes a planar ternary ring $(R, F)$ when $F$ is defined by $F(a, b, c)=a b+c$.

A division ring (with identity element 1 ) is a system $(R,+, \cdot)$ which satisfies (I), (II.1), (III) and
(II.2) $c(a+b)=c a+c b$ for all $a, b, c$ of $R$.

Every division ring (with identity) is a Veblen-Wedderburn system, but not conversely.
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[^0]:    (e.g., $R S, X Y$ ) appear parallel. You should recognize the figure for the vector axiom (triangles $Z X Y, T R S)$. Then note that Theorem L can be interpreted as the vector axiom: $Z Y$ is parallel to $T S$. Now begin afresh with Hall's Figure 4 (or, equivalently, restore the deleted line $A M N B$ and its points). This time delete line $A R X$ and its points and apply the same process. Theorem L , as now interpreted, gives a statement about triangles $N Z T, M Y S$ which is slightly different from but clearly equivalent to the distributive axiom.-As an alternative suggestion, the reader may prefer to consult a pamphlet by H. G. Forder [12] which (I am told-I have not yet seen it) covers much the same ground as the present paper with more emphasis on the projective formulation.

    * See footnote pp. 15-16.

