

so

$$\begin{aligned} N_i &= S^{-1}_{i\mu} \bar{N}_\mu, \\ N_i^0 &= S^{-1}_{i\mu} \bar{N}_\mu^0 \quad \text{for } i=1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.5}')$$

Equations (III.4') can be inverted by the Wiener-Hopf method to give:

$$\bar{N}_i = O_i \bar{N}_i^0 \quad \text{for } i=1, \dots, n. \quad (\text{III.6}')$$

Thus we have:

$$\begin{aligned} N_i(s) &= B_i(s) + \int_{s_\mu}^{s_M} U_{i\mu}(s, s') N_\mu(s') ds' \\ &+ S^{-1}_{i\mu} \int_{s_M}^{\sigma} (U_{i\mu} O_\nu)(s, s') \bar{N}_\nu^0(s') ds' \end{aligned}$$

for $s < s_M$ $i=1, \dots, n$ (III.7'a)

where

$$\begin{aligned} (U_{i\mu} O_\nu)(s, s') &= \int_{s_M}^{\sigma} ds'' U_{i\mu}(s, s'') O_\nu(s'', s'), \\ N_i^0(s) &= B_i(s) + \int_{s_\mu}^{s_M} U_{i\mu}(s, s') N_\mu(s') ds' \\ &+ \int_{s_M}^{\sigma} K_{i\mu}(s, s') N_\mu(s') ds' \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N}_i^0(s) &= \bar{B}_i(s) + S_{i\mu} \int_{s_\mu}^{s_M} U_{\mu\nu}(s, s') N_\nu(s') ds' \\ &+ S_{i\mu} S^{-1}_{\nu\rho} \int_{s_M}^{\sigma} (K_{\mu\nu} O_\rho)(s, s') \bar{N}_\rho^0(s') ds' \end{aligned}$$

for $s_M < s < \sigma$; $i=1, \dots, n$ (III.7'b)

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B}_i(s) &= S_{i\mu} B_\mu(s), \\ (K_{\mu\nu} O_\rho)(s, s') &= \int_{s_M}^{\sigma} ds'' K_{\mu\nu}(s, s'') O_\rho(s'', s'). \end{aligned}$$

Equations (III.7') are a system of coupled integral equations with $N_i(s)$ for $s_1 < s < s_M$ and $\bar{N}_i^0(s)$ for $s_M < s < \sigma$ as unknown functions. The functions $U_{ij}(s, s')$ are square integrable for $s_1 < s < s_M$, $s_1 < s' < \sigma$, and the functions $K_{ij}(s, s')$ are square integrable for $s_M < s, s' < \sigma$. The singular function $O_\nu(s'', s')$ no longer appears alone but only folded with these nonsingular functions, so the difficulty explained at the beginning of this erratum will not arise. The functions $(U_{i\mu} O_\nu)(s, s')$ can easily be shown to be square integrable for $s_1 < s < s_M$, $s_1 < s' < \sigma$ and likewise the functions $(K_{\mu\nu} O_\rho)(s, s')$ for $s_M < s, s' < \sigma$. Thus, we have achieved a system of Fredholm equations.

Electric Polarization of the Deuteron by a Point Charge, RICHARD J. DRACHMAN [Phys. Rev. **132**, 374 (1963)]. An algebraic error was responsible for several incorrect results. In Eq. (17), the coefficient of the last term should be 3, rather than $\frac{3}{2}$. Two subsequent equations should now read as follows:

$$V_2^{(1)}(t) = \frac{2Z^2 M e^4}{3\hbar^2 t^4} \left\{ -\frac{3}{8} + e^{-2t} [-2t^3 + t^4 - t^3 + 3t^2 - \frac{3}{2}t + \frac{3}{2}] - 9e^{-4t}/8 - 4t^6 \text{Ei}(-2t) \right\}, \quad (18)$$

$$V_2^{(1)}(t) \sim -\frac{Z^2 M e^4}{4\hbar^2 t^4} \left\{ 1 - e^{-2t}(4t^2 + 4t - 16) + 3e^{-4t} - \frac{16}{3} t^5 e^{-2t} \sum_{n=6}^{\infty} \frac{n!(-1)^n}{(2t)^n} \right\}. \quad (20)$$

Using the exact equation (18) instead of the asymptotic equation (20), one obtains new and smaller entries in Table I:

TABLE I. The deviation of the dipole polarization potential from t^{-4} form: $V_2^{(1)}(t) = -(Z^2 M e^4 / 4\hbar^2 t^4)(1 + D)$, where $x = t/2\gamma = 2.2t$ F.

t	D
3	-0.103
4	-0.024
5	-0.005
6	-0.001

Finally, the limiting value discussed in the first two sentences of p. 377 should read $V_2^{(1)}(0) = 0$. Delete the remainder of the paragraph.

Decay of Pd¹⁰⁰ to Odd-Odd Rh¹⁰⁰, J. S. EVANS AND R. A. NAUMANN [Phys. Rev. **138**, B1017 (1965)]. We have incorrectly used the ambiguous word "lifetime" in our paper. If "lifetime" be replaced by "half-life" everywhere, then the calculations and conclusions are numerically correct.

Doubly Excited States in Lithium, J. D. GARCIA AND J. E. MACK [Phys. Rev. **138**, A987 (1965)]. Parts of Table IV and the accompanying discussion are incorrect, partly in view of the work of Werner¹³ and of Toresson and Edlén,¹⁴ to which we should have referred, and partly on account of a printer's misalignment. In Table IV, first column, for line (5) "1420 Å (8.72 eV)" should be deleted, and instead of "9572 Å (1.30 eV)," which was aligned with line (7), there should be "8517 Å (1.45 eV)," placed between lines (6) and (7) to indicate ambiguity; actually the line may be a transition between (unlisted) doublet terms. The terms associated with the four new assignments should have been listed in a new Table V, which must be considered approximate and incomplete pending further studies of the fine and hyperfine structure and isotope shift