

Our results indicate that  $\pi$  exchange apparently dominates the cross sections at all  $|u|$ . If  $\rho$  or  $A_2$  exchange dominated, one would expect a much different momentum dependence. In addition, there appears to be very little or no momentum dependence of the shape of the cross sections. Most phenomenological models seem to agree with the shape at small  $|u|$ , but tend to disagree regarding the behavior at large  $|u|$ . We are currently investigating various theoretical explanations of our data.

We would like to thank the alternating gradient synchrotron staff and the members of the on-line data facility for their assistance during the experiment. T. McCorriston is to be thanked for his invaluable programming assistance with the on-line program. We would also like to thank N. Albers, T. Baker, C. Burch, W. Davidson, O. Haas, F. Ringia, and S. Wilson for their help during various phases of the experiment. In addition, we would like to thank A. Ramanauskas for the loan of some read-out logic.

\*Work supported in part by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission and the National Science Foundation.

†National Defense Education Act Predoctoral Fellow.

‡Present address: N. P. Division, CERN, Geneva, Switzerland.

§National Science Foundation Senior Foreign Scientist Fellow.

¶Present address: National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Ill.

<sup>1</sup>A. Chastel, M. B. Davis, C. M. Hoffman, M. N. Kreisler, and A. J. S. Smith, Nucl. Instrum. Methods **94**, 493 (1971).

<sup>2</sup>N. R. Stanton, Ohio State University Report No. COO-1545-92, 1971 (unpublished); adjustments have been made for the scintillation properties of the liquid (see Ref. 1).

<sup>3</sup>L. W. Jones, M. J. Longo, T. P. McCorriston, E. F. Parker, S. T. Powell, and M. N. Kreisler, Phys. Lett. **36B**, 509 (1971).

<sup>4</sup>M. J. Longo, L. W. Jones, D. D. O'Brien, J. C. Van der Velde, M. B. Davis, B. G. Gibbard, and M. N. Kreisler, Phys. Lett. **36B**, 560 (1971).

<sup>5</sup>See, for example, H. Lesniak and L. Lesniak, Phys. Lett. **34B**, 135 (1971); G. Cohen-Tannoudji, G. Kane, and C. Quigg, Nucl. Phys. **B37**, 77 (1972).

<sup>6</sup>Measurements of  $p+p \rightarrow p+N^*$  in this momentum region indicate little or no momentum dependence—at most  $P_{lab}^{-0.2}$ ; E. W. Anderson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16**, 855 (1966); F. Turkot, private communication.

<sup>7</sup>We emphasize that even if there is a significant momentum dependence in the diffraction dissociation cross section, it would have very little effect on our absolute normalizations between 18 and 26 GeV/c, near the peak in the neutron spectrum.

<sup>8</sup>G. Manning *et al.*, Nuovo Cimento **41**, 167 (1966).

<sup>9</sup>E. L. Miller *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **26**, 984 (1971).

<sup>10</sup>J. Engler *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **34B**, 528 (1971).

## ERRATA

LINewidth OF SPONTANEOUS SPIN-FLIP LIGHT SCATTERING IN InSb. S. R. J. Brueck and F. A. Blum [Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 1458 (1972)].

Equations (2) and (3) contain incorrectly written terms of the form  $\langle G(k_z) \rangle^{-1}$ , where  $G$  is a function of  $k_z$  and the angular brackets denote an average over  $k_z$ . These terms should read  $\langle G^{-1}(k_z) \rangle$ .

TIGHT BINDING MODEL OF ELECTRONIC STATES IN A LIQUID METAL. L. M. Roth [Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 1570 (1972)].

In Eqs. (4) and (5),  $\varphi_j$  should read  $\varphi_1$ . In Eq. (10)  $H_{\vec{k}}^{\uparrow'}$  should read  $\tilde{H}_{\vec{k}}^{\uparrow'}$ . In the second of Eqs. (13)  $\tilde{H}_{\vec{k}}^{\uparrow'} \tilde{H}_{\vec{k}}^{\uparrow'}$  should read  $\tilde{H}_{\vec{k}}^{\uparrow'} H_{\vec{k}}^{\uparrow'}$ , and in the third of Eqs. (13),  $H_{\vec{k}}^{\uparrow'}$  should read  $H_{\vec{k}}^{\uparrow''}$ .