Errata

Helv. Chim. Acta **1985,** *68,* 2238, No. 236, by W.-L. Tsai, K. Hermann, E. Hug, B. Rohde, and A. S. Dreiding:

Footnote 3 on p. 2238 should read as follows:

[3]) For the sake of clarity in our discussion, we use certain symbols with the following definitions: F = one enantiomer; Ꟊ = the other enantiomer. h = amount of F, n = amount of Ꟊ ($0 < h \geqslant n \geqslant 0$). Enantio-differentiating ability favoring F = eda(F) = $((h - n)/(h + n)) \cdot 100\%$, F and Ꟊ formed in a given enantio-differentiating process. Enantiomeric excess of F = ee(F) = $((h - n)/(h + n)) \cdot 100\%$, F and Ꟊ in a sample which may or may not contain impurities; equivalent expressions to ee are 'enantiomeric puriry' [3] or 'enantiomeric composition = h/n' [3]. Optical purity of F = op(F) = ($[\alpha]_\lambda^T$ of sample/$[\alpha]_\lambda^T$ of F) · 100%, F in a sample which may or may not contain other impurities than Ꟊ [4].

Helv. Chim. Acta **1985,** *68,* 2244, No. 237, by E. Kohl-Mines and H.-J. Hansen:

By changing the numbers of the compounds, an error has crept into the manuscript. Thus, compound **6** in *Scheme 2* and *3* as well as in the 4th line from below on p. 2246 represents *N*-methyl-2-pyridone.