falling off of the form factor. This conclusion is of course independent of the specific perturbation-theoretic model considered in the present paper. In view of what has been said, the occurrence of a mass differentiation in the meson production cross section Eq. (9) seems then quite suggestive.

The interesting question arises, whether a model for the t dependence of the form factor can be constructed or the present model be reinterpreted, such that the approximation of a spontaneous breakdown of the dilatation symmetry appears explicitly as the starting hypothesis.[19] Soft mesons would have to play the role of the Goldstone particles with $k=0$.

[19] A more detailed discussion is given in: G. Mack, Universität Bern, Switzerland, Report 1967 (unpublished).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

It is a pleasure to thank Professor E. P. Wigner, Professor G. Tiktopoulos, Professor M. Froissart, and Professor A. M. Jaffe for stimulating discussions. I am particularly grateful to Privatdozent Dr. H. A. Kastrup for many valuable suggestions, discussions, and encouragement. I am also very much indebted to the Physics Department at Princeton University for the kind hospitality extended to me. The final version of this paper was completed while on the Summer Symposium at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. I wish to thank Professor M. Dresden and the Physics Department for their kind hospitality. Finally I am indebted to the Stiftung Volkswagenwerk for financial support.

Erratum

Dispersion Theory of Three-Body Production and Decay Processes, I. J. R. Aitchison [Phys. Rev. **137**, B1070 (1965)]. The omission of the definition of the triangle graph amplitude has caused confusion. In obtaining Eqs. (22) and (22′) we used

$$f(s,\lambda^2)=2i\int\frac{d^4k}{(m_1^2-q_1^2)(m_2^2-q_2^2)(m_3^2-q_3^2)},$$

where q_i, m_i are the four-momenta and masses of the internal lines, and k is the loop four-momentum. The term "discontinuity of f across a cut" meant the difference [f(physical limit onto the cut)$-f$(unphysical limit onto the cut)], and we spoke of "the λ^2 discontinuity of f" when the cut was in the variable λ^2. With these definitions, Eq. (9) should read

$$\rho(s,\lambda^2)=2i(2\pi i)^2(\pi/2)[(s-4)/s]^{1/2}K(s,\lambda^2). \qquad (9)$$

The functions $d_i(s,\lambda^2)$ of Eq. (19) are $(1/2i)\times$[the λ^2 discontinuities of $\phi(s,\lambda^2)$], while the sentence after Eq. (23) should read "The $\Delta_i(s,\lambda^2)$ are $[1/4(\pi i)^3]\times$[the λ^2 discontinuities of $f(s,\lambda^2)$] [cf. Eq. (22)]." Despite these changes, Eqs. (28) and (29) are correct.

The last sentence of the paragraph after Eq. (32), and the last paragraph of Appendix B, are incorrect; Kacser has shown that Δ_3 does not acquire an imaginary part in III. In Eq. (33), the factor multiplying $D^{-1}(s)$ should read

$$\left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)k^{-1}(s,m^2,1)N,$$

a subtraction being understood if $N=b/(s+s_0)$ [cf. Eq. (22′)].

In Appendix A, there are a number of misprints and an error. The second denominator in Eq. (A1) should read $(p_2^2-2p_2\cdot k+k^2-1)$, and the figure referred to after Eq. (A1) is Fig. 13, not Fig. 9. M is the mass of the external (not internal) particle at vertex 1. It is incorrect (as Professor C. Kacser has pointed out to me) to take the θ integration in Eq. (A3) from 0 to 2π; since $|\mathbf{k}|$ must be positive, the correct limits are 0 to π. The quantity $\Delta_3(s,\lambda^2)$ is then given simply by the one term $\tilde{\Delta}_3(s,\lambda^2)$ which is, in fact, even in λ. Thus, Eq. (A8) should contain a factor $\frac{1}{2}$. Finally, in the caption of Fig. 14, the hyperbola is $k_0^2-|\mathbf{k}|^2=\lambda^2$.

Another expression for $\Delta_3(s,\lambda^2)$ has been obtained by Kacser (to be published) and by Pasquier (private communication) by two different methods, both different from ours. The identity of their results and our own (corrected) Eq. (A8) has been proved by Kacser.

I am very grateful to Professor C. Kacser for pointing out many of the above corrections.