

ERRATA

In the paper "Oscillator Strength for the $3s\ 3p^2\ ^2S-3s^2\ 3p\ ^2P$ Transition in Al I" by John A. Eddy, Lewis L. House, and Harold Zirin (*Ap. J.*, **133**, 299, 1961), the equivalence of the electrons is improperly accounted for, and the f -values given there must all be multiplied by the factor $\frac{1}{3}$. We are indebted to Professor R. H. Garstang for pointing this out to us.

The proper relative multiplet strengths for the supermultiplet $3s^2\ 3p-3s\ 3p^2$ may be found from equation (14) of Rohrlich (*Ap. J.*, **129**, 441, 1959), which, however, is misprinted and should read:

$$\mathfrak{S}(p^n(S_1L) sSL; p^{n-1}(SL') s^2(^1S)SL') = n g(S_1L) (p^n S_1L \llbracket p^{n-1}(SL') p S_1L \rrbracket^2$$

It is also given by Condon and Shortley (*Theory of Atomic Spectra* [Cambridge, 1951], p. 251), but the value there has an error of a factor 2 and should be multiplied by this transition. In any event the values of the line strength S for $^2P-^2S$, $^2P-^2D$, and $^2P-^2P$ and $2\sigma^2$, $10\sigma^2$, and $18\sigma^2$, respectively.

In the article "Nucleosynthesis in Supernovae," by F. Hoyle and William A. Fowler (*Ap. J.*, **132**, 565, 1960), Dr. Hubert Reeves has pointed out to us that the binding-energy calculation on page 587 in the line just after equation (36) should yield 4.3×10^{50} ergs rather than 1.7×10^{50} ergs. This same correction should be made in the second line of the table on page 589, so that the total energy-budget requirement should read $\sim 8 \times 10^{50}$ ergs. This is to be compared with the explosive release of energy, $\sim 7 \times 10^{50}$ ergs. This correction would not seem to impair the validity of our model for type I supernovae. We wish to express our thanks to Dr. Reeves.

F. HOYLE
WILLIAM A. FOWLER

In equation (8) of the paper "Distribution of Pre-Main-Sequence Stars in the H-R Diagram," which appears in Vol. **134**, page 12, the exponent of \mathfrak{M} in the denominator should read 2.35 instead of 1.35. Consequently, x and y should be given by

$$x = -\frac{2.5\alpha - 0.65 - 0.325\beta}{\alpha},$$

$$y = \frac{\alpha - 1.3\beta}{\alpha},$$

instead of by equations (11) and (12). However, all conclusions derived in the paper remain valid as the result of this change.

SU-SHU HUANG

Our attention has been drawn to a paper, "Oscillator Strengths and Matrix Elements for the Electric Dipole Moment in Hydrogen" by L. C. Green, P. P. Rush, and C. D. Chandler, in the *Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, Supplement 26, Volume III, page 37, 1957, which contains to a further place of decimals nearly all the numerical values computed in our note (*Ap. J.*, **133**, 294, 1961), together with many others. We much regret overlooking this valuable contribution. Those values computed in both papers all agree to within one unit in the fourth decimal place.

R. HERDAN
T. P. HUGHES

In equation (9) of the paper "The Coefficient of Thermal Conductivity in the Sun's Atmosphere" (*Ap. J.*, **134**, 63, 1961) the numerical value should read 34.92×10^{-8} instead of 3.42×10^{-8} . This is a typographical error only and does not affect the results of the rest of the paper.

F. Q. ORRALL
J. B. ZIRKER