[5]A. Luther and V. J. Emery, Phys. Rev. Lett. 33, 589 (1974); S.-T. Chui and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 315 (1975).

[6]V. J. Emery, A. Luther, and I. Peschel, Phys. Rev. B 13, 1272 (1976); A. Luther, Phys. Rev. B 15, 403 (1977).

[7]V. J. Emery, in *Highly Conducting One-Dimensional Solids*, edited by J. T. Devreese *et al.* (Plenum, New York, 1979), Chap. 6.

[8]V. J. Emery, Phys. Rev. B 14, 2989 (1976); M. Fowler in *Organic Conductors and Semiconductors*, edited by L. Pâl, G. Grüner, A. Jánossy, and J. Sólyom, Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. 65 (Springer, Berlin, 1977).

[9]M. Fowler, Phys. Rev. B 17, 2989 (1978); M. Fowler and M. W. Puga, Phys. Rev. B 18, 421 (1978).

[10]H. Gutfreund and R. A. Klemm, Phys. Rev. B 14, 1073 (1976); V. J. Emery, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 107 (1976).

[11]H. Bergknoff and H. B. Thacker, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42, 135 (1979); A. Luther, Phys. Rev. B 14, 2135 (1976).

[12]L. D. Fadeev, to be published.

[13]B. Sutherland, Rocky Mountain J. Math. 8, 413 (1978).

[14]We have simplified our algebra by eliminating certain physical constants. To gain a formalism corresponding to the Hamiltonian $H=-2J\sum_i[S_i^zS_{i+1}^z-\frac{1}{4}+\gamma(S_i^xS_{i+1}^x+S_i^yS_{i+1}^y)]-g\mu_BH_M\sum_iS_i^z$ with k, Boltzmann's constant, not equal to 1, make the transform $\Delta\rightarrow\gamma^{-1}$, $T\rightarrow k_BT/2\gamma J$, and $H_0\rightarrow g\mu_BH_M/2\gamma J$ in all our formulas.

[15]H. A. Bethe, Z. Phys. 71, 205 (1931); L. Hulthén, Arkiv. Mat. Astron. Fys. 26A, 1 (1938).

[16]M. Gaudin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 26, 1301 (1971).

[17]J. D. Johnson and B. M. McCoy, Phys. Rev. A 6, 1613 (1972); J. D. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A 9, 1743 (1974).

[18]J. C. Bonner and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. 135, A640 (1964); J. C. Bonner, thesis, University of London, 1968 (unpublished).

[19]K. Huang, *Statistical Mechanics* (Wiley, New York, 1963). We are double counting the $n=1$ excitations with this procedure. However, the dispersion curve of the unwanted excitations lies higher than the true $n=1$ excitations. Thus the error is exponentially higher order than the terms we keep in our low-T expansion.

[20]For larger H_0 and $\Delta\geqslant 1$, except for an $O(T^0)$ neighborhood of $H_0=0$, $\Delta=1$, our answer is Eq. (4) with the square-root term replaced by $-H_0/2$. E in this case is exponentially higher order than the integral. All results for $H_0>O(T^2)$ have no structure and merge smoothly onto the $H_0<O(T)$ results. Therefore, in all that follows we restrict $H_0<O(T)$.

[21]M. Takahashi, Prog. Theor. Phys. 50, 1519 (1973). The author finds for the general XYZ model a low-temperature result that, when taken to the Ising-Heisenberg limit, agrees with our $H_0=0$ result for F. However, his derivation is *not* valid in the Ising-Heisenberg limit. He also has no finite-H_0 results.

[22]J. B. Torrance, Jr., and M. Tinkham, Phys. Rev. 187, 595 (1969).

[23]C. P. Landee and R. D. Willett, Phys. Rev. Lett. 43, 463 (1979).

[24]P. P. Kulish and E. K. Sklyanin, Phys. Lett. 70A, 461 (1979).

ERRATA

NEW APPROACH TO PERTURBATION THEORY. Y. Aharonov and C. K. Au [Phys. Rev. Lett. 42, 1582 (1979), and 43, 176(E) (1979)].

Equations (12) and (40) in this paper should read as follows:

$$-\tfrac{1}{2}(g^2-g')e^{-G}=(E-V_0-\lambda V_1)e^{-G}; \tag{12}$$

$$F_i(x)\equiv 2\alpha_{i-1}[g_1+g_0\alpha_1/(x-\alpha_0)]\exp(-2G_0)$$
$$+\sum_{m=2}^{i-1}\alpha_{i-m}\Big[\sum_{j=0}^{m}g_jg_{m-j}-g_m'+2E_m\Big](x-\alpha_0)\exp(-2G_0)-\sum_{j=1}^{i=1}g_jg_{i-j}(x-\alpha_0)^2\exp(-2G_0). \tag{40}$$