The remainder of the proof goes through without change. Therefore (3.13) holds without exception.

We now substitute from (3.6) and (3.12) in (2.10) to get

$$(hk)^{-p}S_p = \frac{p}{p+1}(hk)^{-p}B_{p+1}(\zeta)+\frac{(hk)^{-p}}{p+1}(Bhk+B+\zeta)^{p+1}+\tfrac{1}{2}(hk)^{1-p}B_p(\zeta)-$$
$$-\frac{(hk)^{-p}}{p-1}\{(hkB+B+\zeta)^{p+1}-(hB+kB+z)^{p+1}-$$
$$-(hk)^{1-p}(B+\zeta)^{p}+\tfrac{1}{2}(hk)^{1-p}\bar{B}_p(z)$$
$$=\frac{p}{p+1}(hk)^{-p}B_{p+1}(\zeta)+\frac{(hk)^{-p}}{p+1}(hB+kB+hy+ky)^{p+1}.$$

This evidently completes the proof of (1.10) when $p \geqslant 1$.

When $p = 0$, we have

$$S_0(h, k; x, y) = \sum_{\mu \,(\mathrm{mod}\, k)} \bar{B}_1\left(\frac{\mu+y}{k}\right) = \bar{B}_1(y),$$

so that

$$S_0 = hs_0(h, k; x, y)+ks_0(k, h; y, x) = h\bar{B}_1(y)+k\bar{B}_1(x).$$

On the other hand,

$$(Bh+Bk+hy+kx)^1 = hB_1(y)+kB_1(x).$$

Since $0 \leqslant x < 1$, $0 \leqslant y < 1$, it is clear that (1.10) holds when $p = 0$.

References

[1] T. M. Apostol, *Generalized Dedekind sums and the transformation formulae of certain Lambert series*, Duke Math Journ. 17 (1950), pp. 147 - 157.

[2] — *Theorems on generalized Dedekind sums*, Pacific. Journ. Math. 2 (1952), pp. 1 - 9.

[3] L. Carlitz, *Generalized Dedekind sums*, Math. Zeitschr. 85 (1964), pp. 83 - 90.

[4] — *Note on the integral of the product of several Bernoulli polynomials*, Journ. London Math. 34 (1959), pp. 361 - 363.

[5] — *The reciprocity theorem for Dedekind sums*, Pacific Journ. Math. 3 (1953), pp. 523 - 527.

[6] H. Rademacher, *Some remarks on certain generalized Dedekind sums*, Acta Arith. 9 (1964), pp. 97 - 105.

Reçu par la Rédaction le 23. 12. 1964

ACTA ARITHMETICA
XI (1965)

Errata zur Arbeit „Eine Bemerkung zur Fermatschen Vermutung"

(Acta Arithmetica 11 (1965), S. 129-131)

von

M. Eichler (Basel)

S. 129[8] statt „zu 1 teilerfremden Zahlen" lies „zu l teilerfremden Zahlen";

S. 131[4] statt „$r(r+1)+1 < l_{-1}$" lies „$r(r+1) < l_{-1}$".