In NOTE 49:

The definition of Tr should be

$\forall x \exists u \exists f$ such that u is transitive and f is a function from x one to one and onto u.

Delete "(form 174)". (The statement TR$''$ is not form 174.)

In NOTE 94:

The relationship between Δ_3-finite and III-finite was discovered by Omar de la Cruz, neither implies the other. In the model $\mathcal{N}3$, A, the set of atoms, is not Δ_3-finite, but since $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is Dedekind finite, A is III-finite. In $\mathcal{N}1$, let X be the set of all finite subsets of A. X is not III-finite because $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is Dedekind infinite. However, X is Δ_3-finite because it has no infinite linearly ordered set.

Suppose X has an infinite linearly ordered set L and suppose E is a support for L and its linear ordering R. There must be an $n \in \omega$ such that $L' = \{x \in L : |x| = n\}$ is infinite. Otherwise, we can well order L by

$$x < y \text{ iff } |x| < |y|, \text{ or } |x| = |y| \text{ and } xRy.$$

Since E has only finitely many subsets there are elements u and v in L' such that $u \cap E = v \cap E$. It is easy to see that there is a permutation $\sigma \in G$ such that $\sigma(u) = v$ and $\sigma(v) = u$. This contradicts the assumption that E is a support of the linear ordering R.