where p_K and p_π are the kaon and pion momenta, respectively.

We may use the branching ratios for $V \to l^+ + l^-$ to check Eq. (19). However, most of these have not been measured accurately enough to provide any sort of test. Therefore, a mixing model must be assumed[1] to relate θ_Y and θ_N. Once this is done, however, the mixing angles can be determined without resorting to perturbation theory, which is the usual method. For the mass-mixing model ($\theta_Y=\theta_N$) we obtain $38°\leq\theta_Y\leq 54°$. The perturbation-theory result[1] is $\theta_Y=32°$. A calculation based on SU_3 symmetry[1] yields $\theta_Y=39°$. For the vector-mixing or current-mixing model, we obtain $45°\leq\theta_Y\leq 61°$ and $30°\leq\theta_N\leq 45°$. The perturbation-theory result[1] is $\theta_Y=33°$ and $\theta_N=21°$. If we assume that the contributions to $F_{KK}(0,0,0)$ of the continuum and the pole are in the ratio $[m_K/(2m_\pi+m_K)]^4$, then we obtain a correction factor that brings our results closer to the perturbation results. However, we conclude that the current-algebra results are at least 20% larger.

Finally we note that the results of this paper are independent of whether Eqs. (1) and (2) are identities as in the "algebra of fields" or hold only in the case of infinite unrenormalized mass.[8] If the latter is the case, the hadron electromagnetic current would be a linear combination of unrenormalized vector-meson source currents which would become proportional to the vector-meson fields only in the limit of infinite unrenormalized meson mass. However, the algebra that is obeyed by these currents would be the usual current algebra, even though Eqs. (1) and (2) are satisfied. The difference between the "algebra of fields" and the conventional current algebra is the form of the Schwinger terms. However, the Schwinger terms do not contribute to the matrix elements which we have considered since the zero four-momentum limit is taken.

I would like to thank E. M. Henley for his hospitality at the 1966 Summer Institute in Theoretical Physics in Seattle, Washington, where some of this work was done, and A. P. Balachandran for a helpful discussion. Also, I wish to thank T. D. Lee for an informative conversation.

[8] T. D. Lee, S. Weinberg, and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. Letters 18, 1029 (1967).

Errata

Elastic Proton-Proton Scattering at 90° and Structure within the Proton, C. W. AKERLOF, R. H. HIEBER, A. D. KRISCH, K. W. EDWARDS, L. G. RATNER, AND K. RUDDICK [Phys. Rev. **159**, 1138 (1967)]. Figures 7, 8, 9, and 10 are incorrectly placed and have incorrect figure captions. The figure captions are in the correct order. However, Fig. 7 should be over figure caption 10 while Figs. 8, 9, and 10 should respectively be over figure captions 7, 8, and 9.

Covariance and the Cancellation of Schwinger and Seagull Terms in Applications of Current Algebras, STANLEY G. BROWN [Phys. Rev. **158**, 1444 (1967)]. On p. 1447, the first line of the *Note Added in Proof* should read: "The assumption (1.1) is necessary. . ."

Inelastic Scattering of Electrons by Protons, A. A. CONE, K. W. CHEN, J. R. DUNNING, JR., G. HARTWIG, NORMAN F. RAMSEY, J. K. WALKER, AND RICHARD WILSON [Phys. Rev. **156**, 1490 (1967)]. An arithmetic error has been found in the normalization of the cross sections taken at 4.874 BeV. In addition, newer data on *ep* cross sections[1] make improved normalization of the other points possible.

Tables and figures should be renormalized as follows: Data at 2.358 BeV, normalize to an elastic *ep* scattering cross section of 8.1×10^{-33} cm²/sr. Multiply all cross sections by 0.9 in Table I and Figs. 7, 10, and 16. Data at 2.988 BeV, normalize to an elastic *ep* scattering cross section of 2.1×10^{-33} cm²/sr. Multiply cross sections by 0.8 in Table II and Figs. 8, 11, and 17. Data at 4.874 BeV, normalize to an elastic *ep* scattering of 8.0×10^{-34} cm²/sr. Multiply cross sections by 1.44 in Table III and Figs. 9, 12, and 18. The factors $F\times\Delta E_f$ quoted on p. 1497 become 19.2, 4.91, and 83.4, respectively.

The cross sections in Tables IV and V and Figs. 13 and 14 should be multiplied by 0.85. In Tables VIII and IX and Figs. 20, 21, and 22 the points are appropriately changed. The changes are within the quoted errors and improve the agreement with theory.

[1] M. Goitein, R. J. Budnitz, L. Carroll, J. Chen, J. R. Dunning, Jr., K. Hanson, D. Imrie, C. Mistretta, J. K. Walker, and Richard Wilson, Phys. Rev. Letters 18, 1016 (1967).