was discussed for example by A. Temkin and J. F. Walker, Phys. Rev. 140, A1520 (1965); and for the positron problem by M. H. Mittleman, *ibid.* 152, 76 (1966).

[8] It should be noted that the normalizations of X_{mt} do not affect the GVB result since both M and N are in the Q space so that, while the P part of X_{mt} drops out, the Q-part normalizations cancel out when $N(M^{-1})_t N$ is constructed. On the other hand, in obtaining E_n^M of the operator M, proper normalizations of QX_{mt} are essential. However, we do not know the values (QX_{mt}, QX_{nt}) in the present approach. Therefore, the trajectories shown in Fig. 1 are only approximate except at the point $E_N^M = 0$, where $E = E_N^Q$ is normalization independent. In fact, this is *all* we need to make definite statements on the bound property and spectrum of M. The main emphasis of the present calculation is thus in finding these points with $E_N^M = 0$.

[9] B. H. Bransden and Z. Jundi, Proc. Phys. Soc. (London) 92, 880 (1967).

[10] M. F. Fels and M. H. Mittleman, Phys. Rev. 163, 129 (1967).

PHYSICAL REVIEW A VOLUME 3, NUMBER 4 APRIL 1971

ERRATUM

Polarization Model for the Excited States of Neutral Helium. C. Deutsch [Phys. Rev. A 2, 43 (1970)]. Dr. U. Lutzen (University of Lund, Sweden) has kindly informed us that Eq. (21) should read

$$T_{nl} = T_\infty - R_{\mathrm{He}}{}^4 \left(n^{-2} + \langle nl \,|\, \tfrac{9}{32} R^{-4} - \tfrac{17.25}{64} R^{-6} - \tfrac{213}{256} R^{-7} + \ldots \,|\, nl \rangle\right)).$$

As a consequence, the entries in column 9 in Table II are given as follows:

n	l	T_{nl} [evaluated with Eq. (21)]
3	2	186 106.28
4	2	191 446.16
4	3	191 452.00
5	2	193 918.95
5	3	193 921.23
6	2	195 261.08
7	2	195 070.23
8	2	195 595.56
9	2	196 955.60
10	2	196 213.13

The agreement with the experimental singlet data (last column in Table II) is greatly enhanced.