However, when $k=n$, the effect of the mixing is less pronounced in terms of modifying the first few peaks and one does not get the complete interchange of $\Delta\epsilon_1$ and $\Delta\epsilon_2$ in the limit of large β. For $\beta > 3$, the shape of $\langle\Delta\epsilon\rangle$ is the same as for $\beta = 3$, while the magnitude decreases as $1/\beta$.

We have found the line shapes shown in Figs. 1 and 2 to be of great value in our experimental work and we hope that others will find them as useful.

*Supported by the Advanced Research Projects Agency under Contract No. SD-131, The U. S. Army Research Office (Durham) under Contract No. DA-HC04-67-0025, and the Office of Naval Research.

[1]D. E. Aspnes, Phys. Rev. 147, 554 (1966); 153, 972 (1967).

[2]M. Cardona, *Solid State Physics*, edited by F. Seitz, D. Turnbull, and H. Ehrenreich (Academic, New York, 1969), Suppl. 11, Chap. 7.

[3]D. F. Blossey, Phys. Rev. B 2, 3976 (1970).

[4]B. O. Seraphin and N. Bottka, Phys. Rev. 145, 628 (1966).

[5]D. E. Aspnes and A. Frova, Solid State Commun. 7, 155 (1969).

[6]A. Frova and D. E. Aspnes, Phys. Rev. 182, 795 (1969).

[7]S. Jasperson, S. Koeppen, and P. Handler, in Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on the Physics of Semiconductors, Cambridge, Mass., 1970, p. 432 (unpublished).

[8]S. Koeppen, P. Handler, and S. Jasperson, Phys. Rev. Letters (to be published).

[9]S. Pond (unpublished).

[10]Reference 2, pp. 172, 173, and 180. There seem to be some errors present in the definition of the two-dimensional electro-optic functions on p. 180. The correct expressions are given in Eqs. (1).

[11]S. Koeppen and P. Handler, Phys. Rev. 187, 1182 (1969).

PHYSICAL REVIEW B VOLUME 4, NUMBER 8 15 OCTOBER 1971

ERRATA

Raman Scattering in Gray Tin. C. J. Buchenauer, M. Cardona, and F. H. Pollak [Phys. Rev. B 3, 1243 (1971)]. Because of errors in composition, the associations of Figs. 1 and 2 with their captions were incorrect. These figures, but not their captions, should be interchanged.

Phase Transition in a Wigner Lattice, Leslie L. Foldy [Phys. Rev. B 3, 3472 (1971)]. The accuracy of the moments given in Table I should have been specificed to be "one part in 10^4 or better" rather than "one part in 10^5 or better." However, the uncovering of a small error in the program has revealed that even this claim is not correct, but that the error in the table never exceeds 0.00028. The corrected moments of maximum interest are (a) for the bcc lattice: $u_1 = 0.511\,389$, $u_4 = 0.203\,078$, $u_6 = 0.149\,391$, $u_8 = 0.117\,720$; (b) for the fcc lattice: $u_1 = 0.513\,194$, $u_4 = 0.202\,642$, $u_6 = 0.149\,074$, $u_8 = 0.117\,414$. These values are believed to be correct to about one unit in the last quoted digit. A check of the calculation of Ingham and Jones [Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) 107, 636 (1925)] of the inverse-sixth-power lattice sums reveals that their sum for the bcc lattice is not correct to the accuracy quoted but should be $12.253\,662$ rather than 12.2533^{70}_{66}. The check between the spectral determination of u_4 and this value is then validated to almost one part in 10^6. The quoted value of the sum s_3 should be changed to 2.0389×10^{-2}, while s_4 is unchanged. These changes cause the lower end of the transition line in Fig. 4 to lie slightly higher without any change in the conclusions. The vibrational spectra are not changed to the accuracy quoted.

The following reference was inadvertently omitted from Ref. 10: F. W. de Wette, Phys. Rev. 135, A287 (1964).

The equation for the transition line on p. 3477 should have $\Delta h(\tau)$ rather than $h(\tau)$ on the left-hand side. The fifth sentence starting on p. 3478 should end with 10^2 rather than 10^{-2}.

Anisotropic X-Ray Absorption in a Single Crystal of Gallium, A. I. Kostarev and W. M. Weber [Phys. Rev. B 3, 4124 (1971)]. In line 1 of the abstract "unpolarized" should read "unpolarized and polarized." On p. 4130, paragraph 1, "$\phi_1 = 84°$ in (10)..." should read "$\phi_0 = 84°$ in (10)...."

Energy Levels of Bloch Electrons in Magnetic Fields, H. H. Hosack and P. L. Taylor [Phys. Rev. B 3, 4091 (1971)]. In the last term of Eq. (2) the denominator

$$2\mathcal{E}_g[1-(n+\tfrac{1}{2})\hbar\omega/\mathcal{E}_g$$

should be replaced by

$$2\mathcal{E}_g[1-(n+\tfrac{1}{2})\hbar\omega/\mathcal{E}_g]^{1/2}.$$