To the end of his days Schrödinger was convinced that the wave fields of his equation would describe physical realities. The then predominating conservative mechanistic views led to a gradually increasing unreality of the Schrödinger fields in the course of the interpreation controversy, and to the settlement on a particle-and-wave-model in the framework of the Copenhagen interpretation: the amplitude merely states where the particle could be. Schrödinger had to accept the dematerialization of his wave fields, especially since he himself had never been able to give a tenable interpretation. His hydrogen-interpretation, suggestive in view of the Rutherford-Bohr-model,

$$\psi\psi^* = \varrho \quad (\varrho\text{: "smeared charge" of the orbiting electron}) \tag{6}$$

proved to be untenable. At that time, in the thirties, it could not occur to anyone to regard the standing waves of the light-equation (5), or respectively (4), as standing light. There was the strong Rutherford model, seemingly secured to a convincing way by scattering experiments; and the Bohr model, which, especially through Sommerfeld's refinement, could meet almost all expectations.

Today the old pure-particle-models are, of course, just serving introductory means, whereas in research and development almost exclusively Born's wave-and-particle-model is used. Its successes testify to the great thruthfulness of that picture. Nevertheless, in view of the Maxwell-Dirac-isomorphism, today we have to ask ourselves: Had Schrödinger been right? Do his fields possess reality? Do we have to comprehend hydrogen as standing light?

[1] L. de Broglie, These de doctorat. J. de Physique **1,** 1 (1926).
[2] W. R. Hamilton, Trans. Roy. Irish Acad. **15,** 69 (1828); **16,** 4 and 93 (1830); **17,** 1 (1837).
[3] W. R. Hamilton, Math. Papers **1,** 484 (1837).
[4] P. Ehrenfest, Z. Physik **45,** 455 (1927).
[5] H. Sallhofer, Z. Naturforsch. **35 a,** 995 (1980).
[6] H. Sallhofer, Z. Naturforsch. **41 a,** 468 (1986) and Corrigenda in: H. Sallhofer, Z. Naturforsch. **41 a,** 1087 (1986).

Erratum

K. Murawski, A Note on Solutions of the Korteweg-de Vries Equation, Z. Naturforsch. **40 a,** 193–194 (1985).

The formula (17) should be written as follows

$$p_2 = g\,k^2\,\mathrm{sech}^2(g\,k\,\eta) + 4\,g\,k^2\,\frac{4\,k\,C_1\,\mathrm{sh}\,(2\,g\,k\,\eta) - \mathrm{ch}\,(2\,g\,\eta)}{[8\,k\,C_1\,\mathrm{ch}^2\,(g\,k\,\eta) - \mathrm{sh}\,(2\,g\,k\,\eta)]^2}, \tag{17a}$$

$$p_2 = -g\,k^2\,\mathrm{csch}^2(g\,k\,\eta) + 4\,g\,k^2\,\frac{4\,k\,C_1\,\mathrm{sh}\,(2\,g\,k\,\eta) + \mathrm{ch}\,(2\,g\,k\,\eta)}{[8\,k\,C_1\,\mathrm{sh}^2\,(g\,k\,\eta) + \mathrm{sh}\,(2\,g\,k\,\eta)]^2}. \tag{17b}$$

Verantwortlich für den Inhalt: A. KLEMM
Satz und Druck: Konrad Triltsch, Würzburg