[14]T. Worthington, P. Lindenfeld, and G. Deutscher, Phys. Rev. Lett. 41, 316 (1978), and references, in particular, to unpublished work by de Gennes, cited therein. A recent calculation in three dimensions by W. L. McLean and M. J. Stephen [Phys. Rev. B 19, 5925 (1979)] gives similar results.

[15]S. Nakahara, results of transmission electron microscopy analysis, to be published.

[16]W. C. Stewart, Appl. Phys. Lett. 12, 277 (1968); D. E. McCumber, J. Appl. Phys. 39, 3113 (1968).

[17]Preliminary measurements at temperatures down to 50 mK, done in collaboration with D. J. Bishop, confirm this behavior.

[18]C. J. Adkins, Philos. Mag. 36, 1285 (1977).

ERRATA

GIANT DIPOLE RESONANCE IN ^{4}He WITH NON-CENTRAL FORCES AND TARGET RECOIL CORRECTIONS. Dean Halderson and R. J. Philpott [Phys. Rev. Lett. 42, 36 (1979)].

References to "Solution II" and "Solution I" of Werntz and Meyerhof[1] should be interchanged. We thank Carl Werntz for pointing out the transposition. The theoretical curves on Fig. 1 should be multiplied by a factor of 1.44.

[1]C. Werntz and W. E. Meyerhof, Nucl. Phys. A121, 38 (1968).

LOW-ENERGY PION PRODUCTION AT 0° WITH HEAVY IONS FROM 125 to 400 MeV/NUCLEON. W. Benenson, G. Bertsch, G. M. Crawley, E. Kashy, J. A. Nolen, Jr., H. Bowman, J. G. Ingersoll, J. O. Rasmussen, J. Sullivan, M. Koike, M. Sasao, J. Pêter, and T. E. Ward [Phys. Rev. Lett. 43, 683 (1979)].

The incident beam energies cited were not corrected for energy loss in the beam transport system. Recent range measurements have shown that these corrections are substantial. Also, the average beam energies in the targets should have been corrected to take account of the sharply dropping production rate as a function of bean energy.

Table I gives the nominal energies quoted in the paper and the corresponding corrected incident and cross-section–averaged beam energies. The resulting shift puts the observed peak in the π^- spectrum closer to the projectile velocity and thereby strengthens the proposal that it is due to the existence of a projectilelike object after the collision. An important consequence of these new energies is to make the cross section exceed the predictions of the models described in the Letter by a factor of 5–10 at the lower beam energies.

TABLE I. The corrected beam energy (in units of MeV/u) and its average value in the targets as compared to the nominal values cited in the paper.

Nominal beam energy	Corrected beam energy	Average in the target NaF	Cu	U
125	101 ± 5	80 ± 10	...	...
150	130 ± 4	110 ± 7	...	118 ± 7
200	182 ± 3	164 ± 8	...	172 ± 8
250	235 ± 3	219 ± 5	214 ± 5	226 ± 5
400	388 ± 2	383 ± 3	377 ± 3	381 ± 3