## Corrigenda

Ahmad S and Newman D J 1979 J. Phys. C: Solid St. Phys. 12 1245-54
Factors $1 / 5$ were omitted in equations (7) and (8) and in the corresponding results given in tables 2 and 4 . In table 2 all results of 'Types' B and C should be divided by 5.

A corrected version of table 4 summarising our results is given below:

Table 4. Contributions to $\gamma_{\infty}$.

| First-order contributions (table 1) | -66.82 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Second-order contributions (table 2) $k=0$ | -23.25 |
| $\quad k \neq 0$ | 4.11 |
| Higher-order (ladder sum) contribution from the |  |
| $\quad 5 p \rightarrow \mathbf{p}$ excitations | -3.87 |
| Correction for the difference between Hartree-Fock |  |
| and Hartree-Fock-Slater potentials (table 3) | 20.46 |
| Total calculated value | -69.37 |

These changes bring our results into much closer agreement with those of previous workers and, in particular, now agree with the usual assertion that first-order contribution to $\gamma_{\infty}$ is dominant. Some of our qualitative conclusions must therefore be revised.

The authors are grateful to J Andriessen (Department of Applied physics, Technische Hogeschool, Delft, The Nertherlands) for his help in discovering this error.

Barberan N, Tasker P W and Stoneham A M 1979 J. Phys. C: Solid St. Phys. 12 3827-35
An error was made in figure 3. The correct figure is printed below.

$\mathrm{Fe}^{3+}(0,0,0)$

$\mathrm{Fe}^{3+}\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\right)$

$F e^{2+}\left(\frac{3}{2},-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$

