[16]B. Mashhoon, J. Math. Phys. (N.Y.) 12, 1075 (1971).

[17]E. Corinaldesi and A. Papapetrou, Proc. Roy. Soc., Ser. A 209, 259 (1951).

[18]R. Micoulaut, Z. Phys. 206, 394 (1968).

[19]A dot over a 4-vector denotes the usual covariant derivative along a curve. See, for example, R. Adler, M. Bazin, and M. Schiffer, *Introduction to General Relativity* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965), p. 91. $A\wedge B\wedge C$ is the 4-vector with covariant components $\sqrt{-g}\,\epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\kappa}A^{\nu}B^{\lambda}C^{\kappa}$. Units are such that $G=c=1$.

[20]∇_μ denotes the covariant derivative operator in the direction of the basis vector e_μ.

[21]The restriction of Eq. (3) reduces Eqs. (1) to those of W. G. Dixon, Nuovo Cimento 34, 317 (1964), established in the pole-dipole approximation for an extended body where terms higher than first order in the spin have been neglected. The neglect of terms of order s^2 and smaller is consistent with our test body approach.

[22]B. Carter, Phys. Rev. 174, 1559 (1968).

[23]C. Moller, Commun. Dublin Inst. Advan. Studies, Ser. A., No. 5 (1949), has pointed out that a spinning particle must have a certain minimum size implying that the test-particle ideal is realizable only for $s<1$.

ERRATA

LOCALIZED STATES IN AMORPHOUS TELLURIUM. L. D. Laude, R. F. Willis, and B. Fitton [Phys. Rev. Lett. 29, 472 (1972)].

The vertical scale on Fig. 1 is too low by a factor of 10 as a result of a scale error. We are indebted to Professor W. E. Spicer for bringing this to our attention and providing comparison data. This correction does not affect the point of this Letter, which is to show the behavior of amorphous-Te yields compared to trigonal-Te yields, i.e., the nonmonotonicity of the amorphous-Te curves at about $h\nu = 5.0$ eV.

EVIDENCE FOR THE MOTT MODEL OF HOPPING CONDUCTION IN THE ANNEAL STABLE STATE OF AMORPHOUS SILICON. Adam Lewis [Phys. Rev. Lett. 29, 1555 (1972)].

In the discussion on p. 1557, the sentence "Brodsky and Gambino[1] ··· criticized Mott's model because they obtained reasonable numbers for γ and N" should read "Brodsky and Gambino[1] ··· criticized Mott's model because they obtained unreasonable numbers for γ and N."

O(4) TREATMENT OF THE ELECTROMAGNETIC-WEAK SYNTHESIS. A. Pais [Phys. Rev. Lett. 29, 1712 (1972)].

The following misprints occur: On the second line of page 1712, read $\bar{\nu}_\mu \mu$ for $\bar{\nu}_\mu \nu$. In Eq. (2), $\{W_\mu^{\,1}(t_+ - \rho_+) + \text{H.c.}\}$ should read $\{W_\mu^{\,1}(t_+ - \rho_+) + W_\mu^{\,2}(t_+ + \rho_+) + \text{H.c.}\}$. On the second line of Eq. (5), read $-\frac{1}{2}[\mathfrak{N} - \lambda + r^0\sqrt{2}]$ for $\frac{1}{2}[\mathfrak{N} - \lambda + r^0\sqrt{2}]$; and $Q_L^{\,2}$ for $Q_L^{\,1}$ on the second half of that line. In Eq. (7), $f^+f^+ - f^-f^-$ should read $\bar{f}^+f^+ - \bar{f}^-f^-$. In Eq. (11), $\bar{\mathfrak{N}} + A_1^{\,0}$ should read $\bar{\mathfrak{N}} + \bar{A}_1^{\,0}$. Seven lines below Eq. (11), $(M_{0,1,2})$ should read $(M_{0,1,2})^2$.

Further, nine lines from the end of page 1714, read "options[12] $(\vec{u},\vec{v}) = (\vec{t},\vec{t}),\ (\vec{p},\vec{p})$" for "options[12] $(\vec{u},\vec{v}) = (\vec{t},\vec{t}),\ (\vec{p},\vec{p}),\ (\vec{t},\vec{p}),\ (\vec{p},\vec{t})$." The lines between Eqs. (12) and (13) should read as follows: "$(\vec{p},\vec{p})$ interchanges $x^+ \leftrightarrow e$ in Eq. (12). If $H(a,a')$ is a self-adjoint scalar quartet, then $a=a'$, so that then $(\vec{t},\vec{t})$ yields $a=a'=-b$, hence[3] ···." On page 1715, line 11, read $(\vec{p},\vec{p})$ for $(\vec{t},\vec{p})$; on line 12 read iy^+, ϵy^0 for $-iy^+$, $-\epsilon y^0$.