

Goldstone Boson's Valence-Quark Distribution*

C.D. Roberts

Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne IL 60439, USA;
and Fachbereich Physik, Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany

Dynamical chiral symmetry breaking (DCSB) is one of the keystones of low-energy hadronic phenomena. Dyson-Schwinger equations provide a model-independent quark-level understanding and correlate that with the behaviour of the pion's Bethe-Salpeter amplitude. This amplitude is a core element in the calculation of pion observables and combined with the dressed-quark Schwinger function required by DCSB it yields a valence-quark distribution function for the pion that behaves as $(1-x)^2$ for $x \sim 1$, in accordance with perturbative analyses. This behaviour can be verified at contemporary experimental facilities.

1. DCSB and the Gap Equation

Dynamical chiral symmetry breaking (DCSB) is a signature characteristic of the strong interaction spectrum and it is a feature of QCD that can only be understood via nonperturbative analysis.¹ In this connection one particularly insightful tool is the QCD gap equation; i.e., the Dyson-Schwinger equation (DSE) [1] for the dressed-quark self-energy:

$$S(p)^{-1} = Z_2(i\gamma \cdot p + m_{\text{bare}}) + Z_1 \int_q^\Lambda g^2 D_{\mu\nu}(p-q) \frac{\lambda^a}{2} \gamma_\mu S(q) \Gamma_\nu^a(q,p). \quad (1)$$

In Eq. (1): $D_{\mu\nu}(k)$ is the renormalised dressed-gluon propagator; $\Gamma_\nu^a(q;p)$ is the renormalised dressed-quark-gluon vertex; m_{bare} is the Λ -dependent current-quark bare mass that appears in the Lagrangian; and $\int_q^\Lambda := \int^\Lambda d^4q/(2\pi)^4$ represents mnemonically a *translationally-invariant* regularisation of the integral, with Λ the regularisation mass-scale. Also, $Z_1(\zeta^2, \Lambda^2)$ and $Z_2(\zeta^2, \Lambda^2)$ are the quark-gluon-vertex and quark wave function renormalisation constants, which depend on the renormalisation point, ζ , and the

regularisation mass-scale, as does the mass renormalisation constant:

$$Z_m(\zeta^2, \Lambda^2) = Z_4(\zeta^2, \Lambda^2)/Z_2(\zeta^2, \Lambda^2), \quad (2)$$

with the renormalised mass given by $m(\zeta) := m_{\text{bare}}(\Lambda)/Z_m(\zeta^2, \Lambda^2)$.

The solution of Eq. (1) has the form

$$S(p)^{-1} = i\gamma \cdot p A(p^2, \zeta^2) + B(p^2, \zeta^2) \quad (3)$$

$$= \frac{1}{Z(p^2, \zeta^2)} [i\gamma \cdot p + M(p^2, \zeta^2)], \quad (4)$$

where the functions $A(p^2, \zeta^2)$, $B(p^2, \zeta^2)$ express the effects of dressing induced by the quark's interaction with its own gluon field. Equation (1) must be solved subject to a renormalisation condition, and in QCD it is practical to impose the requirement that at a large spacelike ζ^2

$$S(p)^{-1}|_{p^2=\zeta^2} = i\gamma \cdot p + m(\zeta). \quad (5)$$

A weak coupling expansion of the DSEs reproduces every diagram in perturbation theory and in connection with Eq. (1) this means that at large spacelike- p^2 the solution for massive quarks is, in Landau gauge,

$$M(p^2) = \frac{\hat{m}}{\left(\frac{1}{2} \ln [p^2/\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2]\right)^{\gamma_m}}, \quad (6)$$

*I thank M.B. Hecht and S.M. Schmidt for useful communications. This work was supported by: the US Department of Energy, Nuclear Physics Division, under contract no. W-31-109-ENG-38; and in part by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through the Mercator Visiting Professor Programme under contract no. Ro 1146/3-1.

¹These observations are also true of confinement but model-independent statements harder to make.

$\gamma_m = 12/(33 - 2N_f)$, where \hat{m} is the renormalisation-point-independent current-quark mass, and the mass renormalisation constant, Eq. (2), is $Z_m(\zeta^2, \Lambda^2) = [\alpha(\Lambda^2)/\alpha(\zeta^2)]^{\gamma_m}$. At one-loop $Z_2 \equiv 1 \equiv Z(p^2)$. In perturbation theory each contribution to the dressed-quark mass function is proportional to the current-quark mass and hence $M(p^2) \equiv 0$ in the chiral limit, which is unambiguously defined by $\hat{m} = 0$ [2].

Dynamical chiral symmetry breaking is the appearance of a $B(p^2, \zeta^2) \neq 0$ solution of Eq. (1) in the chiral limit. This guarantees a nonzero value of the vacuum quark condensate [2]:

$$-\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\zeta^0 = Z_4(\zeta^2, \Lambda^2) N_c \text{tr}_D \int_q^\Lambda S^0(q, \zeta), \quad (7)$$

where tr_D identifies a trace over Dirac indices only and the superscript “0” indicates the quantity was calculated in the chiral limit. (NB. The factor of Z_4 here guarantees that the condensate is gauge-parameter- and cutoff-independent. Its omission yields a formula that is incorrect.)

As I have just observed, $B(p^2, \zeta^2) \neq 0$ is impossible in perturbation theory. Hence a non-perturbative analysis of QCD’s gap equation is required to explore this possibility. To arrive at model-independent conclusions a systematic, symmetry-preserving truncation scheme for the n -point functions in the gap equation must be used.

1.1. Goldstone’s Theorem

At least one such scheme is known [3] and it has been used to good effect. For example, the pion’s Bethe-Salpeter amplitude has the general form

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_\pi^j(k; P) = & \tau^j \gamma_5 [iE_\pi(k; P) + \gamma \cdot P F_\pi(k; P) + \\ & + \gamma \cdot k k \cdot P G_\pi(k; P) + \sigma_{\mu\nu} k_\mu P_\nu H_\pi(k; P)], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where P is the pion’s total momentum and k is the relative momentum between the bound state’s constituents. The scheme of Ref. [3] guarantees that the axial-vector Ward-Takahashi identity (here written for $\hat{m} = 0$, $k_\pm = k \pm P/2$):

$$\begin{aligned} -iP_\mu \Gamma_{5\mu}^j(k; P) \\ = S^{-1}(k_+) \gamma_5 \frac{\tau^j}{2} + \gamma_5 \frac{\tau^j}{2} S^{-1}(k_-), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{5\mu}^j(k; P) = & \frac{\tau^j}{2} \gamma_5 [\gamma_\mu F_R(k; P) + \\ & \gamma \cdot k k_\mu G_R(k; P) - \sigma_{\mu\nu} k_\nu H_R(k; P)] + [\dots], \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with $F_R(k; P)$, $G_R(k; P)$, $H_R(k; P)$ regular at $P^2 = 0$, is satisfied at every order. This identity, which is fundamental to the successful application of chiral perturbation theory, leads to the following quark-level Goldberger-Treiman relations [2], which are exact in QCD:

$$f_\pi^0 E_\pi(k; 0) = B(k^2), \quad (11)$$

$$F_R(k; 0) + 2f_\pi^0 F_\pi(k; 0) = A(k^2), \quad (12)$$

$$G_R(k; 0) + 2f_\pi^0 G_\pi(k; 0) = 2A'(k^2), \quad (13)$$

$$H_R(k; 0) + 2f_\pi^0 H_\pi(k; 0) = 0, \quad (14)$$

where f_π^0 is the pion’s chiral-limit leptonic decay constant, obtained in general from

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{ij} f_\pi P_\mu = \\ Z_2 \int_q^\Lambda \text{tr} \left[\frac{\tau^i}{2} \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu S(q_+) \Gamma_\pi^j(q; P) S(q_-) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

with the factor of Z_2 on the right-hand-side guaranteeing that f_π is independent of the renormalisation point, cutoff and gauge parameter. (A formula without Z_2 is incorrect.) Equations (11)–(14) form an essential part of the proof [2] that if, and only if, a theory exhibits DCSB then the homogeneous, isovector, pseudoscalar Bethe-Salpeter equation has a massless, $P^2 = 0$, solution and the axial-vector vertex is dominated by the pion pole for $P^2 \simeq 0$; i.e., a proof of Goldstone’s theorem in QCD.

1.2. A Pseudoscalar Meson Mass Formula

Similar analysis of the $\hat{m} \neq 0$ axial-vector Ward-Takahashi identity yields the following mass formula for flavour nonsinglet pseudoscalar mesons:

$$f_H^2 m_H^2 = -\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\zeta^H \mathcal{M}_\zeta^H, \quad (16)$$

where: $\mathcal{M}_\zeta^H = m_{q_1}^\zeta + m_{q_2}^\zeta$ is the sum of the current-quark masses of the meson’s constituents; f_H is the meson’s leptonic decay constant, obtained via obvious analogy with Eq. (15); and the

in-meson condensate is defined via

$$i \frac{1}{f_H} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\zeta^H = Z_4 \int_q^\Lambda \text{tr} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} T^H \right)^t \gamma_5 \mathcal{S}(q_+) \Gamma^H(q; P) \mathcal{S}(q_-) \right], \quad (17)$$

with, e.g., $T^{\pi^+} = (\lambda^1 + i\lambda^2)/2$, where $\{\lambda^j, j = 1, \dots, 8\}$ are the Gell-Mann matrices, and $(\cdot)^t$ denoting matrix transpose.

A number of observations are now in order. Equation (11) makes plain that in the presence of DCSB the magnitude of f_π is set by the constituent-quark mass: $M(p^2 \simeq 0)$. The same is true of $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\zeta^H$, which, in the chiral limit, is identical to the vacuum quark condensate, Eq. (7). This hints at a corollary of Eq. (16): in the chiral limit it yields the Gell-Mann–Oakes–Renner relation, a primary element in the application of chiral perturbation theory to light-quark mesons. Furthermore, while it is not readily apparent from the material presented heretofore, the DSE derivation of Eq. (16) assumes nothing about the magnitude of m_{q_1, q_2}^ζ . Hence Eq. (16) is a single mass formula that unifies the light- and heavy-quark domains and it has consequently been used to prove that the mass of an heavy pseudoscalar meson rises linearly with the mass of its heaviest constituent [5,6].

2. Realising DCSB

The truncation scheme of Ref. [3] also provides the foundation for a phenomenological model that has been used to very good effect in describing light-quark mesons [4,7–9]. The model is founded on the assumption that the leading order term in the truncation of QCD’s gap equation is well represented by a renormalisation group improved rainbow approximation [4]:

$$S(p)^{-1} = Z_2 (i\gamma \cdot p + m_{\text{bare}}) + \int_q^\Lambda \mathcal{G}((p-q)^2) D_{\mu\nu}^{\text{free}}(p-q) \frac{\lambda^\alpha}{2} \gamma_\mu S(q) \frac{\lambda^\alpha}{2} \gamma_\nu, \quad (18)$$

where $D_{\mu\nu}^{\text{free}}(k)$ is the free gauge boson propagator. In Eq. (18), $\mathcal{G}(k^2)$ is an “effective coupling:”

$\mathcal{G}(k^2) = 4\pi\alpha(k^2)$ for $k^2 \gtrsim 1 \text{ GeV}^2$, where $\alpha(k^2)$ is the strong running coupling constant, but the behaviour of $\mathcal{G}(k^2)$ for $k^2 < 1 \text{ GeV}^2$; i.e., at infrared length-scales ($\gtrsim 0.2 \text{ fm}$), is currently unknown.

It is immediately obvious from Eq. (1) that the effective coupling is a mnemonic for the contracted product of the dressed-gluon propagator and dressed-quark-gluon vertex. Hence the infrared strength of the kernel in the gap equation can be characterised by an interaction-tension:

$$\sigma^\Delta := \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2}^{\Lambda_{\text{pQCD}}^2} dk^2 k^2 [\Delta(k^2) - \Delta(\Lambda_{\text{pQCD}}^2)] \quad (19)$$

with $\Delta(k^2) = \mathcal{G}(k^2)/k^2$, and $\Lambda_{\text{pQCD}} = 10 \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ the boundary above which perturbation theory is unquestionably valid. Studies show [10] that DCSB cannot occur for $\sigma^\Delta \lesssim 0.5 \text{ GeV}^2 \sim 9\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$, which means that the existence of a dynamically generated, $B \neq 0$ solution of Eq. (1) is impossible without a significant infrared enhancement of the effective interaction. Reproducing observable phenomena requires

$$\sigma^\Delta \gtrsim 4 \text{ GeV}^2 \sim 70 \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2; \quad (20)$$

i.e., a ten-fold enhancement over the critical value. The origin of this enhancement, whether in the gluon or ghost vacuum polarisation, or elsewhere, is currently unknown but is actively being sought (see, e.g., Refs. [10–12]). That is a key to understanding the source of confinement as opposed to simply representing it.

References [4,7–9] employ a one-parameter model for $\mathcal{G}(k^2)$, with that parameter, and the $u = d$ - and s -current-quark masses, tuned to fit the experimental values of m_π , f_π , m_K . This fit yields: the value of $\sigma^\Delta \approx 70 \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$ in Eq. (20);

$$m_u^{1 \text{ GeV}} = 5.5 \text{ MeV}, \quad m_s^{1 \text{ GeV}} = 124 \text{ MeV}; \quad (21)$$

and a value of the vacuum quark condensate:

$$-\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{1 \text{ GeV}}^0 = (0.242 \text{ GeV})^3, \quad (22)$$

for which a comparison with the calculated value

$$-\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{1 \text{ GeV}}^\pi = (0.245 \text{ GeV})^3 \quad (23)$$

emphasises just how close one is to the chiral limit when dealing with pion observables. In addition, the essential character of the dressed-quark

propagator predicted by the model, which underlies these condensate values, has recently been confirmed in numerical simulations of lattice-QCD [13,14].

Fixing the single parameter at this fitted value, many observables are predicted and the model achieves a r.m.s. error over predicted quantities of $\lesssim 4\%$ [15]. Furthermore, it is the only model to predict [8] a behaviour for the pion's electromagnetic form factor that agrees with the results of a recent Hall C experiment [16]. The large- Q^2 behaviour of the form factor can be obtained algebraically and one finds [17] $Q^2 F_\pi(Q^2) = \text{const.}$, up to logarithmic corrections, in agreement with the perturbative-QCD expectation. This result relies on the presence of pseudovector components in the pion's Bethe-Salpeter amplitude, which is guaranteed by the quark-level Goldberger-Treiman relations in Eqs. (12), (13).

The unification of light- and heavy-meson masses via the mass formula in Eq. (16) has also been quantitatively explored using the model of Refs. [4,7–9]. This is illustrated in Fig. 1 wherein the calculated mass of a $u\bar{q}$ pseudoscalar meson is plotted as a function of m_q^ζ , with m_u^ζ fixed to a value corresponding to that in Eq. (21). The fitted curve is, in MeV [13]:

$$m_H = 83 + 500\sqrt{\mathcal{X}} + 310 \mathcal{X}, \quad \mathcal{X} = m_q^\zeta / \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}, \quad (24)$$

with the renormalisation mass-scale $\zeta = 19 \text{ GeV}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} = 0.234 \text{ GeV}$.

In this figure the curvature appears slight but that is misleading: the nonlinear term in Eq. (24) accounts for almost all of m_π (the Gell-Mann–Oakes–Renner relation is nearly exact for the pion) and 80% of m_K . NB. The dashed line in Fig. 1 fits the K, D, B subset of the data exactly. It is drawn to illustrate how easily one can be misled: without careful calculation one might infer from this apparent agreement that the large- m_q limit of Eq. (16) is already manifest at the s -quark mass. However, in reality, the linear term only becomes dominant for $m_q \gtrsim 1 \text{ GeV}$, providing 50% of m_D and 67% of m_B . The model predicts $m_c^{1 \text{ GeV}} = 1.1 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_b^{1 \text{ GeV}} = 4.2 \text{ GeV}$, values that are typical of Poincaré covariant treatments of heavy-meson systems [6].

A similar analysis of pseudoscalar mesons with




Figure 1. Solid line: pseudoscalar $u\bar{q}$ meson's mass as a function of m_q^ζ , $\zeta = 19 \text{ GeV}$, with a fixed value of m_u^ζ that corresponds to $m_u^{1 \text{ GeV}} = 5.5 \text{ MeV}$, Eq. (21). The experimental data points are taken from Ref. [18] as are the errors assigned to the associated heavy-quark masses. The dashed curve is a straight line drawn through the K, D, B masses.

equally massive constituents has also been performed [13] and this predicts [19]:

$$\frac{m_{H_{m=2m_s}}}{m_{H_{m=m_s}}} = 2.2, \quad (25)$$

in agreement with a result obtained in recent quenched lattice simulations [20]. The model calculation provides an understanding of the lattice result. It shows that the persistent dominance by the term nonlinear in the current-quark mass owes itself to a large value of the in-meson condensates for light-quark mesons; e.g., $-\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{1 \text{ GeV}}^{s\bar{s}} = (0.32 \text{ GeV})^3$ [4], and thereby provides a confirmation of the large condensate version of chiral perturbation theory.




Figure 2. DSE result for $x u_V^\pi(x)$ [21] evolved to $\mu^2 = 16 \text{ GeV}^2$ using the first-order, nonsinglet renormalisation group equation, for direct comparison with πN Drell-Yan data [22], filled circles. The filled squares illustrate the anticipated errors achievable in a proposed JLAB experiment [23].

3. Pion's Valence Quark Distribution

I have illustrated that the DSEs furnish a sound theoretical description of pion properties, providing a model-independent explanation of its essential dichotomous nature as both a Goldstone boson and a low-mass bound state of massive constituents, and also that they supply an efficacious phenomenological tool. This makes them ideal for exploring the nature of the parton distribution functions in the pion. These functions, while they provide a direct measure of the pion's quark-gluon substructure via perturbative QCD, cannot be calculated using perturbative methods.

The valence-quark distribution function, $u_V^\pi(x)$, is of particular interest because its pointwise behaviour is affected by aspects of confinement dynamics, e.g., by the mechanisms responsible for the finite extent and essentially nonpointlike nature of the pion. (NB. $u^{\pi^+} = \bar{d}^{\pi^+}$ in the \mathcal{G} -parity symmetric limit of QCD.) The low moments of these functions can be inferred from numerical simulations of lattice-QCD but such moments alone are insufficient to determine

the functions: they are only weakly sensitive to the behaviour of the distribution functions on the valence-quark domain, $x \gtrsim 0.5$.

The DSE model used in illustrating the framework's ability to unify the small- and large- Q^2 behaviour of the pion's form factors was used to calculate $u_V^\pi(x)$ [21]. This calculation of the appropriate "handbag diagrams" indicates that at a resolving scale $q_0 = 0.54 \text{ GeV} = 1/(0.37 \text{ fm})$ valence quarks, with a mass of 0.3 GeV , carry 71 % of the pion's momentum, and yields the distribution function depicted in Fig. 2.

Over the entire range of q_0 considered, the calculated distribution function is precisely fitted by a MSR form

$$u_V^\pi(x) = A_u x^{\eta_1 - 1} (1-x)^{\eta_2} (1 - \epsilon_u \sqrt{x} + \gamma_u x), \quad (26)$$

with exemplary, calculated parameter values:

q_0 (GeV)	A_u	η_1	η_2	ϵ_u	γ_u
0.54	11.24	1.43	1.90	2.44	2.54
2.0	4.25	0.97	2.43	1.82	2.46
4.05	3.56	0.89	2.61	1.62	2.30

At $q_0 = 2.0 \text{ GeV}$ two low moments of the distribution function are [21]:

	$\langle x^2 \rangle$	$\langle x^3 \rangle$
Calc.	0.098	0.049
Exp.	0.10 ± 0.01	0.058 ± 0.004
Latt.	0.11 ± 0.3	0.048 ± 0.020

with the experimental results from Ref. [22] and the lattice results from Ref. [24]. NB. Given the evident disagreement between the DSE calculation and the data, the agreement between the calculated moments emphasises the insensitivity of low moments to the x -dependence of the distribution function on the valence-quark domain.

A material feature of the DSE result is the value of $\eta_2 \simeq 2$ because while perturbative QCD cannot be used to obtain the pointwise dependence of the distribution functions it does give a prediction for the power-law dependence at $x \simeq 1$. That prediction is [25]:

$$\text{pQCD: } u_V^\pi(x) \stackrel{x \simeq 1}{\propto} (1-x)^2, \quad (29)$$

in agreement with the DSE result. However, as will have been anticipated from Fig. 2, this pre-




Figure 3. Deep inelastic scattering from the proton's π -cloud could provide a means of measuring $u_V^\pi(x)$ at JLAB [23].

diction disagrees with the extant experimental data [22], an analysis of which yields:

$$\text{Drell Yan: } u_V^\pi(x) \stackrel{x \sim 1}{\propto} (1-x). \quad (30)$$

The disagreement is very disturbing because a verification of this experimental result would present a profound threat to QCD, even challenging the assumed vector-exchange nature of the force underlying the strong interaction.

The DSE study [21] has refocused attention on this disagreement, and is the catalyst for a resurgence of interest in $u_V^\pi(x)$ and proposals for its remeasurement. One proposal that could use existing facilities would employ the (Sullivan) process depicted in Fig. 3 at JLAB [23], with the anticipated accuracy illustrated in Fig. 2. This process could also be used efficaciously at a future electron-proton collider to accurately probe $u_V^\pi(x)$ on the valence-quark domain, as emphasised by Fig. 4 [26].

4. Epilogue

Dynamical chiral symmetry breaking (DCSB) is a keystone of hadron physics. It is the effect responsible for turning perturbative current-quark masses into nonperturbative constituent-quark masses, and for ensuring that the pion is light while the pion's electroweak decay constant nevertheless sets a large mass-scale: $4\pi f_\pi \sim 1 \text{ GeV}$. It is thereby the foundation for the successful application of chiral perturbation theory to low-energy hadronic phenomena.

The QCD gap equation supplies a quark-level explanation of DCSB and, as one of the tower of Dyson-Schwinger equations (DSEs), unifies that




Figure 4. Simulated errors for DIS events obtained in collisions of a 5 GeV electron beam and a 25 GeV proton beam with a luminosity of $10^{32} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and 10^6 s of running. (Figure adapted from Ref. [26].)

with a Poincaré covariant understanding of the structure of QCD's bound states and their interactions. In this way one finds, for example, that DCSB is also the main reason for the large $\pi - \rho$ and $\rho - a_1$ mass-splittings.

The fact that perturbation theory is recovered via a weak coupling expansion of the DSEs provides a tight constraint on the ultraviolet behaviour of the calculated Schwinger functions that describe hadronic interactions. Therefore their use in predicting and correlating observables, which necessarily sees the introduction of some model dependence, provides a means by which experimental results can be used to probe the infrared (long-range) behaviour of the quark-quark interaction; i.e., of exploring the mechanism of confinement. In this way the framework's adaptability to modelling is a material asset.

As reviewed in Refs. [15,27], modern applications of the DSEs have met with substantial success, even at nonzero temperature and chemical potential, but challenges remain, of course. The gap equation makes clear that the existence of DCSB signals a significant enhancement of the strong coupling over the perturbative expectation on the infrared domain: $k^2 \lesssim 1 \text{ GeV}^2$. However, the mechanism in QCD that supplies that enhancement is yet to be conclusively identified, and is being explored using DSE and lattice methods.

A direct bound state treatment of the scalar meson sector is also wanting. However, at least one now understands why the lowest order non-

perturbative truncation of the kernels in the relevant integral equations (rainbow-ladder), so successful for pseudoscalar and vector mesons, fails for the scalars [28]. Improvements, systematic and/or imaginative, are being explored.

This, after all, is a core issue in DSE studies and the primary point of criticism: the system of integral equations must be truncated and how does one judge, *a priori*, the fidelity of a given procedure? Addressing this open question is a key focus of contemporary research but the question's existence does not itself diminish the efficacy nor the value of modern DSE phenomenology.

REFERENCES

1. C.D. Roberts and A.G. Williams, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **33** (1994) 477.
2. P. Maris, C.D. Roberts and P.C. Tandy, Phys. Lett. **B 420** (1998) 267.
3. A. Bender, C.D. Roberts and L. v. Smekal, Phys. Lett. **B 380**, 7 (1996).
4. P. Maris and C. D. Roberts, *Phys. Rev. C* **56**, 3369 (1997).
5. P. Maris and C.D. Roberts, "QCD bound states and their response to extremes of temperature and density," in Proc. of the *Workshop on Nonperturbative Methods in Quantum Field Theory*, edited by A.W. Schreiber, A.G. Williams and A.W. Thomas (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998) pp. 132-151.
6. M.A. Ivanov, Yu.L. Kalinovsky and C.D. Roberts, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 034018 (1999).
7. P. Maris and P.C. Tandy, *Phys. Rev. C* **60**, 055214 (1999);
8. P. Maris and P.C. Tandy, *Phys. Rev. C* **61**, 045202 (2000).
9. P. Maris and P.C. Tandy, *Phys. Rev. C* **62**, 055204 (2000); C.-R. Ji and P. Maris, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 014032 (2001).
10. F.T. Hawes, C.D. Roberts and A.G. Williams, *Phys. Rev. D* **49** (1994) 4683; F.T. Hawes, P. Maris and C.D. Roberts, *Phys. Lett. B* **440** (1998) 353.
11. L. von Smekal, A. Hauck and R. Alkofer, *Ann. Phys. (NY)* **267** (1998) 1 [Erratum-ibid. **269** (1998) 182].
12. D.B. Leinweber, J.I. Skullerud, A.G. Williams and C. Parrinello [UKQCD Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 094507 [Erratum-ibid. *D* **61** (1999) 079901]; A. Cucchieri, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 034508 (1999).
13. P. Maris, "Continuum QCD and light mesons," nucl-th/0009064.
14. P.C. Tandy, "Soft QCD modeling of meson electromagnetic form factors," nucl-th/0106031.
15. C.D. Roberts and S.M. Schmidt, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **45** (2000) S1.
16. J. Volmer *et al.* [Jefferson Lab F_π Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** (2001) 1713.
17. P. Maris and C.D. Roberts, *Phys. Rev. C* **58** (1998) 3659.
18. Particle Data Group (D.E. Groom *et al.*), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **15** (2000) 1.
19. M.B. Hecht, C.D. Roberts and S.M. Schmidt, "Contemporary applications of Dyson-Schwinger equations," nucl-th/0010024.
20. K. C. Bowler *et al.* [UKQCD Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 054506.
21. M.B. Hecht, C.D. Roberts and S.M. Schmidt, *Phys. Rev. C* **63**, 025213 (2001).
22. J.S. Conway *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **39**, 92 (1989).
23. K. Wijesooriya, *et al.*, "The $H(e, e'n)X$ Reaction and the Pion Structure Function," proposal no. JLab PR01-110.
24. C. Best *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 2743 (1997).
25. S.J. Brodsky, M. Burkardt and I. Schmidt, *Nucl. Phys. B* **441**, 197 (1995).
26. R.J. Holt and P.E. Reimer, "Structure of the Goldstone bosons," in Proc. of the *Second Workshop on Physics with an Electron Polarized Light-Ion Collider*, edited by R.G. Milner, AIP Conf. Proc. **588** (2001) 234.
27. R. Alkofer and L. v. Smekal, *Phys. Rept.* **353** (2001) 281.
28. C.D. Roberts, "Confinement, diquarks and Goldstone's theorem," in Proc. of Quark Confinement and the Hadron Spectrum, II, edited by N. Brambilla and G.M. Prosperi (World Scientific, Singapore, 1997) pp. 224-230.