is always smaller than the latter, so the star is always stable. In fact, as we proceed from the center $(\delta T/T)_R$ increases, but the temperature gradient also increases, and the displacement of the upper boundary of the energy-producing mass for the same δT is smaller than in deeper regions in the star. On the other hand, the density is also smaller there, so that the variation of this mass becomes smaller, and this compensates the increase of $(\delta T/T)_R$. Thus, such a model will not introduce any particular instability.

Finally, any reduction in the central condensation of the model used will also favor the instability since $\delta r/r$, $\delta \rho/\rho$, $\delta T/T$ will not reach such high values near the surface of the star. For instance, if the whole star is in convective equilibrium, T. G. Cowling[20] has shown for a star of small mass that vibrational instability could set in much more easily. However, in this case, for larger masses the central condensation would increase and would approach that of the standard model,[21] and this would work against the influence of the decrease of Γ with increasing mass so that, in this case, the condition of stability would be much less sensitive to the mass.

YERKES OBSERVATORY
August 1941

ERRATA

The two wave lengths λ 3330 and λ 3339 in the upper strip of Plate VIII (Vol. **94**) should read λ 3339 and λ 3355.

O. S.

In Table 4, page 325, of Volume **94**, the *NH* lines λλ 3364.7, 3369.1, and 3372.0 should not be attributed to the (1, 1) transition. The identifications should read as follows:

Comet	Laboratory	Notation
3364.7(2)	3364.0	$P_2(2)$ (0, 0)
3369.1(3)	3369.1	$P_1(2)$ (0, 0)
3372.0(1)	3372.1	$P_1(3)$ (0, 0)

The blending effect of the (1, 1) transition is probably unimportant. References to the (1, 1) band of *NH* should be dropped from the text.

P. SWINGS

October 1941

[20] *M.N.*, **98**, 528, 1938.

[21] L. Henrich, *Ap. J.*, **93**, 483, 1941.