Errata

Landau Damping to All Orders, DAVID MONTGOMERY AND DAVID GORMAN [Phys. Rev. **124**, 1309 (1961)]. We should like to note the following typographical errors, none of which alters the conclusion of the paper, but one of which (iii) is essential to reaching it.

(i) In the fifth line after Eq. (11), for "$t \rightarrow \%$", read "$t \rightarrow \infty$."

(ii) In Eq. (17),

for "$\int_{-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} dp'$," read "$\int_{\sigma-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} dp'$."

(iii) In Eq. (23), for

$$p = p_j(k') + p_{n-j}(k'),$$

read

$$p = p_j(k') + p_{n-j}(k-k').$$

(iv) In Eq. (28) delete the symbol "e" appearing before the second integral.

Finally, we should note that in Sec. III, the normalization of the function $F(v)$ has been incorrectly stated; $F(v)$ should be given by $(m/KTN_0)vf_0(v)$. The remaining equations are correct, however.

Ferrimagnetic Resonance in Rare-Earth Doped Yttrium Iron Garnet. II. Terbium Substitution, J. F. DILLON, JR., AND L. R. WALKER [Phys. Rev. **124**, 1401 (1961)]. In the Appendix, $\nu_0' = -6300.9$ should read $\nu_0' = 4791.7$; $\nu_2' = 28\,850.5$ should read $\nu_2' = -909.5$; $\nu_4' = 909.5$ should read $\nu_4' = 28\,850.6$; $\nu_6' = 4791.7$ should read $\nu_6' = -6300.9$; $L_0 = 1.2376 \times 10^{-8}$ cm should read 1.2376×10^{-7} cm.

In Eq. (8a), $U_2^0 = 2m^2 - 42$ should read

$$U_2^0 = 3m^2 - 42.$$

Equation (8b) should read

$$U_4^0 = 35m^4 - 1235m^2 + 5040,$$
$$U_4^4 = \tfrac{1}{2}[J_+^4 + \text{c.c.}].$$

Equation (8c) should read

$$U_6^2 = \tfrac{1}{2}J_+^2[\cdots] + \text{c.c.},$$
$$U_6^4 = \tfrac{1}{2}J_+^4[\cdots] + \text{c.c.},$$
$$U_6^6 = \tfrac{1}{2}[J_+^6 + \cdots].$$

The axes for the crystal field were chosen in the following way. The basic dodecahedral site is that for which the displacements of the neighboring oxygens are $\frac{1}{8}-x, \frac{1}{4}-z, -y$; $\frac{1}{8}-x, -\frac{1}{4}+z, y$; $\frac{1}{8}-z, \frac{1}{4}-y, -x$; $\frac{1}{8}-z, -\frac{1}{4}+y, x$; $-\frac{1}{8}+x, -y, \frac{1}{4}-z$; $-\frac{1}{8}+x, y, -\frac{1}{4}+z$; $-\frac{1}{8}+z, -x, \frac{1}{4}-y$; $-\frac{1}{8}+z, x, -\frac{1}{4}+y$, where x, y, and z are the oxygen parameters. The new *coordinates* x, y, z (as used in the expressions for V) are related to the X, Y, Z referred to the crystal axes by

$$x = X, \quad y = 2^{-\frac{1}{2}}(Y+Z), \quad z = 2^{-\frac{1}{2}}(-Y+Z).$$

The caption of Fig. 15 should read $\cdots, \lambda = 0.37, \cdots$.

A numerical error has been detected in the coefficient of one of the sixth-order terms used in the calculation. The curves of Figs. 15 and 16 have been run again with no greater change than a 0.5% variation in the height of one peak. The conclusions of the paper are not affected in any way.

Cyclotron Resonance in Aluminum, T. W. MOORE AND F. W. SPONG [Phys. Rev. **125**, 846 (1962)]. Through an error in interpretation of x-ray orientation data, the ⟨100⟩ and ⟨110⟩ axes of the aluminum single crystal were interchanged. On both Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, the labels ⟨100⟩ and ⟨110⟩ should be interchanged and the label ⟨111⟩ moved to the $35\frac{1}{4}°$ position. The abscissa angle θ should now be interpreted throughout as the angle between the magnetic field and the ⟨110⟩ axis, rather than the ⟨100⟩ axis. In Fig. 4 the dashed theoretical curve should be reversed along with the axes.

The low-field, low-mass anisotropy as shown in Fig. 3 is now consistent with the interpretation that both curves are associated with orbits around the maximum portions of the "arms" of the third-zone Fermi surface. This interpretation is satisfying in that it removes the disturbing failure to observe the orbits labeled H in Fig. 1, for the field in a ⟨110⟩ direction. The curve labeled A in Fig. 3 obviously corresponds to such H orbits. Note that the curves A and B intersect exactly in the ⟨111⟩ direction as they must by symmetry, for in that direction the two orbits become equivalent. The minimum of the curve B should occur where it does, namely at $35\frac{1}{4}°$ from a ⟨100⟩ direction, and not, as erroneously stated, along the ⟨111⟩ direction.

The tentative assignment of curves C and D of Fig. 4 to orbits around the inner and outer surfaces of four contacting arms in the third zone is now incorrect. Very little can be said at present regarding contact between arms in the third zone. The interpretation of masses tentatively assigned to orbits in the second zone is uncertain in a number of respects, and clarification must await further data now being obtained with additional samples and more flexible control of the directions of microwave polarization and field tipping.

Relativistic Lee Model, MARIAN GÜNTHER [Phys. Rev. **125**, 1061 (1962)]. The right-hand side of the formula (3.2), instead of

$$g_0 \epsilon Z^{-\frac{1}{2}}[\mathbf{m}_V m_N]^{\frac{1}{2}}[2\Omega]^{-\frac{1}{2}}[\omega_N(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})\omega_\theta(\mathbf{k})\omega_V(\mathbf{p})]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \times \{i(p-k)+m_N\}^{-1}u_N(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})\beta Q_0 \mathbf{u}_V(\mathbf{p}),$$