*Work supported by the National Science Foundation.

¹M. Sugawara and A. Tubis, Phys. Rev. (to be published).

²F. T. Meiere and M. Sugawara, to be published.

³For example, J. S. Ball and D. Y. Wong [Phys. Rev. Letters 7, 390 (1961)] point out that a far-away pole in the P -wave amplitude is indispensable in obtaining a resonance in the pion-pion problem. Recently, in their bootstrap approach to the pion-nucleon problem, K. Huang and F. E. Low [Phys. Rev. Letters 13, 596 (1964)] emphasize the necessity of introducing a subtraction into the partial-wave dispersion relation in order to obtain a bootstrap solution.

⁴M. Sugawara and A. Tubis, Phys. Rev. 130, 2127 (1963).

⁵The existence of a pair of zeros implies that $A(\omega)$ cannot vanish at infinity. In the case of the fastest ap-

proach of $A(\omega)$ to zero, however, $A(\omega)$ becomes pure real at infinity because $\delta(\infty)$ is then π or 0. Therefore, $A(\omega)$ cannot satisfy an unsubtracted dispersion relation. In the case when $A(\omega)$ approaches a finite pure imaginary limit, $A(\omega)$ can still satisfy an unsubtracted dispersion relation, as is discussed by M. Sugawara and A. Kanazawa, Phys. Rev. 123, 1895 (1961).

⁶The argument below is essentially the same as that given by M. Sugawara and A. Tubis, Phys. Rev. Letters 9, 355 (1962).

⁷If $A(\omega)$ is not even with respect to the sign change in ω , $A(\omega)$ is no longer real on the imaginary axis and, therefore, the preceding argument concerning a pair of zeros on the imaginary axis no longer holds.

⁸J. Hamilton and W. S. Woolcock, Rev. Mod. Phys. 35, 737 (1963).

ERRATA

$Y=2$ STATES IN SU(6) THEORY. Freeman J. Dyson and Nguyen-huu Xuong [Phys. Rev. Letters 13, 815 (1964)].

Experiment on π^- -D scattering at 140 MeV¹ shows a large ratio of inelastic to elastic scattering, indicating that many angular momenta contribute. The peak at 170 MeV ($E^*=2160$ MeV) is, therefore, not to be understood as belonging to a particular SU(6) representation. On the contrary, it seems to provide evidence that the splitting between SU(6) representation 490 and 1050 is small compared with the "SU(6)-violating" splitting between octet and decimet states of the single baryons. In this case, the hypothesis advanced in the second paragraph of our Letter is not valid. We thank Dr. R. Hofstadter for referring us to the experimental paper quoted above, and Dr. S. Treiman and Dr. W. Alles for criticism.

¹E. G. Pewitt, T. H. Fields, G. B. Yodh, J. G. Fetkovich, and M. Derrick, Phys. Rev. 131, 1826 (1963).

STUDY OF EXCHANGE INTEGRAL OF CRYSTALLINE ^3He AT 0°K. L. H. Nosanow and William J. Mullin [Phys. Rev. Letters 14, 133 (1965)].

There is a typographical error in Eq. (12). It should read

$$V_{ij} = v_{ij} - (\hbar^2/2mf_{ij}^2)(f_{ij}\nabla_i^2 f_{ij} - \vec{\nabla}_i f_{ij} \cdot \vec{\nabla}_i f_{ij}).$$