

rane, and W. Thomlinson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **39**, 1164 (1977).

⁶L. P. Gor'kov and A. I. Rusinov, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **46**, 1363 (1964) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **19**, 922 (1964)].

⁷See the review by Ø. Fischer and M. Petera, in *Magnetism*, edited by H. Suhl (Academic, New York, 1973), Vol. V, and references therein.

⁸T. Jarlborg, A. J. Freeman, and T. J. Watson-Yang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **39**, 1032 (1977).

⁹A longer paper including details of the calculations, as well as quantitative comparison with the experiments, is in preparation.

¹⁰We use definition of magnetization which includes a

factor 4π .

¹¹In a more general case screening fields in Eqs. (4) and (5) should be taken as $H_{\text{ext}} + \lambda_f H_f$ and $H_{\text{ext}} + \lambda_s H_s$, respectively. For simplicity we take $\lambda_f = \lambda_s = 1$.

¹²The molecular field should be in general taken as λH_f .

¹³Because of the chosen infinite slope in h_s at $h = 0$ [c.f. Eq. (7)], $T_{L1} = T_s$ in the present calculation.

¹⁴H. R. Ott, W. A. Fertig, D. C. Johnston, M. B. Maple, and B. T. Matthias, to be published.

¹⁵It is for that reason, for example, that in the calculation presented, the uppermost transition temperature is equal to the larger of T_s and T_f .

ERRATA

EXCITATION OF ATOMIC HYDROGEN TO THE $n=2$ STATE BY HELIUM IONS. Victor Franco [*Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 759 (1979)].

The left-hand side of Eq. (7) should read $F_{fi}(\vec{q}, k)$.

In the acknowledgement, "City University of New York Public Service Commission-Bureau of Higher Education research award" should be replaced by "grant from the PSC-BHE Research Award Program of the City University of New York."

FURTHER EVIDENCE FOR FRACTIONAL CHARGE OF $\frac{1}{3}e$ ON MATTER. George S. LaRue, William M. Fairbank, and James Douglas Phillips [*Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 142 (1979)].

There were several typographical errors in the set of residual charge values listed in the second column of page 144. These values as presented in Fig. 3, however, are correct. The list should have been as follows: Results reported in Ref. 1 are [1] $(-0.007 \pm 0.039)e$; [2] $(0.089 \pm 0.073)e$; [3] $(-0.331 \pm 0.070)e$; [4] $(-0.016 \pm 0.030)e$; [1] $(-0.015 \pm 0.054)e$; [3] $(0.060 \pm 0.092)e$; [5] $(-0.034 \pm 0.093)e$; [6] $(0.313 \pm 0.019)e$; [7] $(0.030 \pm 0.023)e$; [8] $(-0.001 \pm 0.026)e$; [6] $(0.327 \pm 0.010)e$. Results obtained since Ref. 1 are [6] $(0.016 \pm 0.024)e$; [6] $(0.304 \pm 0.040)e$; [6] $(-0.029 \pm 0.017)e$; [6] $(-0.026 \pm 0.016)e$; [7] $(0.023 \pm 0.015)e$; [9] $(0.325 \pm 0.043)e$; [7] $0e$ assumed; [9] $(0.361 \pm 0.040)e$.

On line 9, page 143, ΔE_{Batt} should be replaced by ΔF_{Batt} and on line 6 of the last paragraph on page 144 $-\frac{1}{3}e$ should be replaced by $+\frac{1}{3}e$.