

to test the existence of the ND 106 zero-shift error. They stopped short of a full scale redetermination of e/h because a determination of e/h was then in progress using a different method promising significantly higher accuracy. We hesitate to put forward as a new value of e/h the result of such a brief series of experiments. On the other hand, our understanding and appreciation of the various error contributing factors in the present experiments *were* considerably improved over the earlier experiments. We therefore incline slightly toward our present value of e/h as the best representation of the results of our work to date. In any case, neither the value nor the associated uncertainty of the present result really differ significantly from those of the result quoted by Parker *et al.*, and none of the conclusions of Taylor *et al.*² would be appreciably modified if our present value were substituted for the earlier one.

All of this then might be characterized as "much ado about nothing"; we have expended con-

siderable time and effort and seem to have succeeded only in returning to our starting point. However, we feel the exercise was not without merit. We have laid to rest the ghost of a potentially serious flaw in previous work, and we have added substantially to the confidence which can be placed in the conclusions of that work. We also feel that the fact that a measurement of e/h can be repeated with a precision of 1 ppm in a few days portends well for the ultimate utility of the Josephson effect as a standard of emf.⁴

We acknowledge with thanks useful conversations about precision dc measurements with W. G. Eicke, F. K. Harris, and L. Julie. We thank W. J. Hamer for arranging the calibration of the standard cells. One of us (A. D.) thanks the National Research Council for a NRC-NAS-NAE Postdoctoral Research Associateship which he held at the National Bureau of Standards during part of the period in which the present work was done.

*Work supported in part by the National Science Foundation and the Advanced Research Projects Agency.

†Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Fellow.

¹W. H. Parker, D. N. Langenberg, A. Denenstein, and B. N. Taylor, Phys. Rev. **177**, 639 (1969).

²B. N. Taylor, W. H. Parker, and D. N. Langenberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **41**, 375 (1969).

³B. W. Petley and K. Morris, Phys. Letters **29A**,

289 (1969); B. W. Petley and K. Morris, Metrologia (to be published). The value with which we compare here is the final value given in the second reference; this is 0.3 ppm higher than the preliminary value reported in the first reference.

⁴B. N. Taylor, W. H. Parker, D. N. Langenberg, and A. Denenstein, Metrologia **3**, 89 (1967).

ERRATA

Magnetic Ordering in Materials with Singlet Crystal-Field Ground State. II. Behavior in the Ordered State or in an Applied Field, Yung-Li Wang and Bernard R. Cooper [Phys. Rev. **185**, 696 (1969)]. The correct molecular field theory expression for the internal energy in the ferromagnetic regime differs by a factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ from that given in Eq. (5.11) (and also contains a constant). The correct expression is

$$U/R = -(\Delta/4 \cos 2\theta) \tanh(\Delta/2T \cos 2\theta) - \Delta/2A.$$

Corresponding to this change, the correct molecular field values for the specific heat, C_V/R , in the ferromagnetic regime are one-half the values shown in Fig. 11. The molecular field curve for C_V/R in the paramagnetic regime and in the ab-

sence of ordering is unchanged.

Also, in the development of our expression for the pseudospin Hamiltonian, a term $+Ng(0)\langle J \rangle^2$ was omitted, in transcription, from the intermediate Eq. (2.10). However, this term has been correctly included in obtaining the final expression for the pseudospin Hamiltonian, Eq. (2.13).

Faraday Rotation in Rare-Earth Iron Garnets, W. A. Crossley, R. W. Cooper, J. L. Page, and R. P. van Staple [Phys. Rev. **181**, 896 (1969)]. The intermediate steps in Eq. (A16) are incorrect, although the same result is obtained. In place of (A16) insert