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Abstract
We study baryons in multicolour QCD$_{1+1}$ via Rajeev’s gauge-invariant reformulation as a nonlinear classical theory of a bilocal meson field constrained to lie on a Grassmannian. It is known to reproduce ’t Hooft’s meson spectrum via small oscillations around the vacuum, while baryons arise as topological solitons. The lightest baryon has zero mass per colour in the chiral limit; we find its form factor. It moves at the speed of light through a family of massless states. To model excitations of this baryon, we linearize equations for motion in the tangent space to the Grassmannian, parameterized by a bilocal field $U$. A redundancy in $U$ is removed and an approximation is made in lieu of a consistency condition on $U$. The baryon spectrum is given by an eigenvalue problem for a Hermitian singular integral operator on such tangent vectors. Excited baryons are like bound states of the lightest one with a meson. Using a rank-1 ansatz for $U$ in a variational formulation, we estimate the mass and form factor of the first excitation.
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1. Introduction and summary

An interesting problem of theoretical physics is to find the spectrum and structure of hadrons [1] from QCD. Besides direct numerical approaches, we are far from formulating this problem in (3+1)D, though there has been recent progress in the (2+1)D pure-gauge model [6, 7]. In (1+1)D, ’t Hooft obtained [2] an equation for masses and form factors of mesons in the multicolour $N \to \infty$ limit of QCD. There are an infinite number of them with squared masses growing linearly $M_n^2 \sim g_0^2 n$. The coupling $g_0^2 = g_Y^2 N$ has dimensions of mass$^2$, so the
model is UV finite. Our aim is to do the same for the spectrum of baryons in QCD\textsubscript{1+1}. Baryons are more subtle than mesons; it has not been possible to extend ’t Hooft’s summation of planar diagrams to find the baryon spectrum [3]. A way forward was shown in Rajeev’s formulation [4, 5] of QCD\textsubscript{1+1}\textsuperscript{∞} as a nonlinear classical theory of quark bilinears (meson fields) on a curved phase space. As $N \to \infty$, the gauge-invariant bilinears $M$ have small fluctuations and satisfy nonlinear classical equations, though $\hbar = 1$. Some nonlinearities are due to a constraint on $M$ encoding Pauli exclusion. ’t Hooft’s meson equation was rederived by considering oscillations around the vacuum, with masses of $\mathcal{O}(N^0)$. But the model also has large departures from the vacuum, describing baryons with masses of $\mathcal{O}(N)$. They live on a disconnected component of phase space, an infinite Grassmannian with components labelled by the baryon number. This formulation gave a qualitative picture [10, 12] of the baryon (as a soliton of the meson field and as a bound state of quarks) and estimates for the mass and form factor of the lightest baryon [9]. The latter was in reasonable agreement with numerical calculations [8]. They were also used to model the $x_B$-dependence of the nucleon structure function $F_2(x_B, Q^2)$ measured in deep inelastic scattering [10, 11].

Here we derive an equation for the spectrum of small oscillations around the lightest baryon, to describe excited baryons or baryon–meson bound states. For simplicity we consider one quark flavour, so these correspond to the nucleon resonances $P_{11}, D_{13}, S_{11}, D_{15}$, etc [1]. There may also exist heavier baryonic extrema of energy, analogues of $\Delta, \Lambda$. Their investigation and oscillations around them are postponed. Oscillations near a baryon are harder to study than near the vacuum (section 3). To begin, we need the precise baryon ground state (g.s.). The form factor of the lightest baryon is well described by a single valence quark wavefunction $\psi$. In the chiral limit of massless quarks, the g.s. is exactly determined via $\psi$. We find $\psi$ exactly and establish that the lightest baryon has zero mass/colour (section 4), like the lightest meson [2]. The soliton has a size $\sim P^{-1}$, where $P$ is the mean null-momentum/colour of the baryon. Being massless, the baryon moves at the speed of light traversing a one-parameter family of even parity massless states. The probability of finding a valence quark of the baryon. Being massless, the baryon moves at the speed of light traversing a one-parameter family of even parity massless states. The probability of finding a valence quark with positive null-momentum between $[p, p + dp]$ in a baryon is $P^{-1} \exp \left(-\frac{p}{P}\right) dp$. Away from the chiral limit, the g.s. of the baryon is massive, containing sea and antiquarks [11]. Here we work in the simpler chiral limit. It is possible to derive [10] this soliton picture as a Hartree–Fock approximation to $N$ quarks interacting via a linear potential, with a wavefunction antisymmetric in colour but symmetric otherwise. This is a way of seeing that the baryon is a fermion and that $N$ is an integer.

As in ’t Hooft’s work, excitations around the translation-invariant Dirac vacuum were described by Rajeev [4] using a meson ‘wavefunction’ $\tilde{\chi}(\xi)$. Around a non-translation-invariant baryon, we need the $N \to \infty$ limit of a bilocal field $M(x, y) \sim q^a(x)q_a(y)/N$. The vacuum is $M = 0$ while the baryon g.s. is $M_0 = -\psi \psi^\dagger$. A complication arises from a quadratic constraint $(\epsilon + M)^2 = 1$; the ‘quark density matrix’ must be a projection operator, up to normal ordering. We ensure that it is satisfied at all times (section 1.2), and when making approximations (section 5.4). Pleasantly, when linearized around the baryon $M = M_0 + V$, the constraint $[\epsilon + M_0, V]$ encodes an ‘orthogonality’ of ground and excited states crucial for consistency of the linearized equations (section 5.5). This condition generalizes the vanishing dot product of radius $\epsilon + M_0$ and tangent $V$ to a sphere. Roughly, $V$ is a meson and $M_0 + V$ is a meson–baryon pair. If $M_0 = 0$, we return to mesonic oscillations around the Dirac vacuum. Due to translation invariance around $M_0 = 0$, the bilocal field $V(p, q) \sim \tilde{\chi}(\xi)$ could be taken to depend only on $\xi = p/(p-q)$ and not on the ‘total momentum’ $p-q$. This simplification is absent near the baryon (section 5.6). So in section 5.1, we solve the constraint $[\epsilon + M_0, V]$.
via another bilocal field \( V = i[\epsilon + M, U] \). But there is a gauge freedom under \( U \to U + U_y \) where \( [\epsilon + M, U_y] = 0 \). We gauge-fix the redundancy (section 5.2) by writing \( U \) in terms of a vector \( u \) and another bilocal field \( U^{++} \) one-fourth the size of \( U \). Roughly, \( u \) is a correction to the valence quarks \( \psi \), due to the excitation. \( U^{++} \) has the corresponding data on sea/antiquarks in the excited baryon. The gauge-fixing conditions \( \psi^\dagger u = 0 \) and \( \psi^\dagger U^{++} = 0 \) are interpreted as orthogonality of ground and excited states. But the naively linearized equations do not preserve these conditions! The gauge freedom at each time step is used to derive linearized equations respecting the gauge conditions (section 5.7). Though the equations for \( U^{++} \) and \( u \) are linear, we were not able to find oscillatory solutions by separation of variables. For, they couple \( u \), \( U^{++} \) and their adjoints, like a Schrödinger equation where the Hamiltonian depends on the wavefunction and its conjugate! So in section 5.8 we put \( u = 0 \), allowing us to separate variables and find oscillatory solutions, at the cost of a consistency condition on \( U^{++} \) (66). Regarding \( V \) as a meson, we expect it contains a quark–antiquark sea but no valence quarks \( u \). This motivates the \( u = 0 \) ansatz.

We are left with an eigenvalue problem \( \hat{K}(U) = \omega U \) (68) for the form factor \( U^{++} \). We show that the linearized Hamiltonian \( \hat{K} \) is Hermitian using the gauge condition and the ansatz \( u = 0 \). In the chiral limit, the mass\( ^2 \) of excited baryons are \( M^2 = 2\alpha P \), where \( P \) is the lightest baryon’s momentum. But the eigenvalue problem for \( \hat{K} \) is quite non-trivial. It is a singular integral operator on a ‘physical subspace’ of Hermitian operators. This space of physical states \( U^{++} \) consists of Hilbert–Schmidt operators subject to the gauge and consistency conditions (appendix G). The eigenvalue problem for the baryon spectrum follows from a variational energy \( \mathcal{E} \). In section 5.9 we suggest a rank-1 variational ansatz \( U^{++} = \phi\eta^\dagger \). Here \( \phi, \eta \) are the sea/antiquark wavefunctions of the excited baryon. The kinetic terms in \( \mathcal{E} \) differ from the naive ones due to linearization around a time-dependent g.s. The potential energy is a sum of Coulomb energy (attraction between anti- and sea-quarks) and exchange energy (between sea-partons and ‘background’ valence quarks \( \psi \)). In section 5.10 we obtain a crude estimate for the mass and form factor of the first excited baryon by minimizing \( \mathcal{E} \) in a parameter controlling the decay of the sea quark wavefunction. But our estimate for the mass of the first excited baryon 0.3 \( gN \) is not expected to be accurate\(^2 \) or an upper bound, as we imposed the gauge-fixing condition but not the consistency condition from the ansatz \( u = 0 \). In appendix G, we try to solve this consistency condition. A more careful treatment will hopefully give a quantitative understanding of the baryon spectrum.

### 1.1. Summary of classical hadrondynamics

We begin by recalling Rajeev’s reformulation \(^4\) of QCD\(^{N=\infty}_1\) as a classical theory of meson fields. In the null coordinates \( x = x^1, t = x^0 - x^1 \) we specify initial values on the null line \( t = 0 \). The energy \( E = p_t = p_0 \) and null-momentum \( p = p_\epsilon = p_0 + p_1 \) obey\(^3\) \( m^2 = 2Ep - p^2 \). In the gauge \( A_x = A_0 + A_1 = 0 \), one component of quarks and the gluon \( A_1 \) are eliminated. For quarks of one flavour and \( N \) colours \( a, b \), the action of \( SU(N) \) QCD\(_{1+1} \) represents fermions \( \chi_a \) interacting via a linear potential

\[
S = \int dt \, dx \chi^a \left[ -i\partial_t - \frac{1}{2} \left( p + \frac{m^2}{p} \right) \right]\chi_a
\]

\[
- g^2 \frac{1}{4N} \int dt \, dy \, \chi^a(y)\chi_b(y)|x - y|\chi^b(x)\chi_a(x).
\]

\(^2\) From ’t Hooft’s work [2] the mass of the first excited meson in the chiral limit is about 1.4\( g \).

\(^3\) Under a Lorentz boost of rapidity \( \theta \), \( t \to t e^{\theta} \) and \( x \to e^{-\theta} x - \theta \sin \theta \).
\( \hat{M}(x, y) = -\frac{2}{\pi} : \chi^{10}(x) \chi^{10}(y) : \), with \( x, y \) being null-separated, defines a gauge-invariant bilocal field. Normal ordering is with respect to the Dirac vacuum. \( E \) and \( p \) have the same sign, so negative momentum states are filled in the vacuum and we split the one-particle Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{H}_- \oplus \mathcal{H}_+ \) into \( \mathbb{R} \) momentum states. Canonical anti-commutation relations (CAR) for \( \chi, \chi \) from (1) imply commutation relations for \( M, \) with fluctuations of order \( 1/N. \) As \( N \to \infty, \) \( \hat{M} \) tends to a classical field \( M, \) the integral kernel \( G \) of a Hermitian operator on \( \mathcal{H}. \) The Poisson brackets (PB) of \( M \) are given by

\[
(1/2)\{M(x, y), M(z, u)\} = \delta(z - y) \Phi(x, u) - \delta(x - u) \Phi(z, y).
\]

(2) \( \Phi = \epsilon + M \) where \( \epsilon \) is the Hilbert transform kernel \( \hat{\epsilon}(p, q) = 2\pi \sigma(p - q) \text{sgn} p, \) or \( \epsilon(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{P}(x - y)^{-1}. \) The CAR imply a constraint as \( N \to \infty, \) \( \Phi^2 = I; \) the eigenvalues of \( \Phi \) are \(-1\) (singly-occupied) or \( 1 \) (unoccupied). \( \Phi = \epsilon \) is the vacuum. Thus the phase space is a Grassmannian [4]:

\[
Gr_1 = \{ M : M^\dagger = M, (\epsilon + M)^2 = I, \text{tr}[\epsilon, M]^2 < \infty \},
\]

(3) the symplectic leaf of \( \Phi = \epsilon \) under the coadjoint action of a restricted unitary group [4]. The coadjoint orbit formula for Poisson brackets of linear functions of \( M, f_u, f_v, \) is

\[
\{ f_u, f_v \} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[u, v] \Phi = f_{-i[u, v]} + \frac{i}{2} \text{tr}[u, v] \epsilon.
\]

(4) The connected components of \( Gr_1 \) are labelled by an integer \( B = -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \ M \) (appendix E), quark number per colour, or baryon number. An analogue of parity is \( \mathbf{P} \hat{M}_{pq}(t) = \hat{M}_{qp}(-t) \) or \( \hat{P} \hat{M}_{pq}(t) = \hat{M}_{pq}^*(t). \) For example, the static real symmetric \( \hat{M} \) are even and the imaginary antisymmetric \( \hat{M} \) are odd. From (1), the energy/colour is a parity-invariant quadratic function on \( Gr_1: \)

\[
E(M) = -\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{(p + \mu^2/p)}{2} \hat{M}(p, p) [\text{d}p] + \frac{\hat{\pi}^2}{16} \int |M(x, y)|^2 |x - y| \text{ d}x \text{ d}y.
\]

(5) The current quark mass \( m \) is renormalized as \( \mu^2 = m^2 - \frac{\hat{\pi}^2}{2} \) while reordering quark bilinears. The kinetic energy \( T = -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \ h \hat{M} \) is expressed in terms of the dispersion kernel \( \hat{h}(p, q) = 2\pi \sigma(p - q) h(p), \) where \( 2h(p) = p + \mu^2 p^{-1}. \)

(6) Define a positive ‘interaction operator’ on Hermitian matrices \( \hat{G} : M \mapsto G(M) \equiv G_M \) with the kernel \( \hat{G}(M)_{xy} = \frac{1}{2} M_{xy}[x - y] \) (appendix C). Then the potential energy is

\[
U = \frac{\hat{\pi}^2}{8} \text{tr} \ M \hat{G}(M) = \frac{\hat{\pi}^2}{16} \int \text{ d}x \text{ d}y |M(x, y)|^2 |x - y| \geq 0.
\]

(7) In Fourier space, \( \hat{G}(M)_{pq} = -\int [\text{d}k] \hat{M}_{pr,q+r}. \) We also associate with \( M \) a constant of motion (appendix A), its mean momentum per colour \( P_M. \) Under a boost, \( P \to e^{i\theta} P, \)

\[
E \to e^{-i\theta} E + p \sin \theta;
\]

\[
P_M = -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \ p \hat{M} = -\frac{1}{2} \int p \hat{M}(p, p) [\text{d}p] \quad \text{where} \quad p(p, q) = 2\pi \sigma(p - q) p.
\]

(8) The squared-mass/colour \( M^2 = 2EP - P^2 \) is a Lorentz-invariant constant of motion. Hamilton’s equations of motion (eom) are the initial value problem (IVP)

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{dM}{dt} = \frac{1}{2} [E(M), M] = [E'(M), \epsilon + M].
\]

(9) Our convention for Fourier transforms is \( \hat{\phi}(x) = \int [\text{d}p] e^{ipx} \phi(p), \) where \( 2\pi [\text{d}p] = dp. \)

In Fourier space, \( \hat{M}(p, q) = \int [\text{d}k] e^{-ik(q-p)} \hat{M}_{xy}. \) We write \( \hat{M}_{pq} \) for \( \hat{M}(p, q, q) \) and \( M_{pq} \) for \( M(x, y). \)

This uses \( \tau(x) = \frac{1}{2} [x] = -\int \frac{[dx]}{x} e^{-ix} \) obtained by solving \( \nu'(x) = \delta(x) \) with \( \nu(0) = \nu'(0) = 0. \) We used the definition of finite part integrals (appendix B) to put \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{[dx]}{x} = 0 \) and \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{[dx]}{x^2} = 0. \)
The PB is expressed via the commutator using the variational derivative of energy, which is inhomogeneous linear in \( M, E' = T' + U' = -\hbar/2 + (\hat{g}^2/4)\tilde{G}(M) \). Its matrix elements are

\[
E'(M)_{pq} = -\pi\delta(p - q)h(p) + \frac{\hat{g}^2}{4}\tilde{G}(M)_{pq},
\]

where

\[
U'(M)_{xy} = \frac{\delta U(M)}{\delta M_{yx}} = \frac{\hat{g}^2}{2} |x - y| M_{xy}.
\] (10)

1.2. Preservation of quadratic constraint under time evolution

We check that (9) preserves the constraint \( \Phi^2 = I \). Define the constraint matrix \( C(t) = \Phi^2 - I \) and let \( C(0) = 0 \). We have an autonomous system of first-order nonlinear ODEs:

\[
\partial_t C = \partial_t(\epsilon + M)^2 = [\epsilon + M, \partial_t M]_s = -2i[\Phi, [E', \Phi]]_s = -2i[E'(M(t)), \Phi^2(t)].
\] (11)

Under suitable hypotheses, it should have a unique solution\(^7\) given \( C(0) \). Now consider the guess \( C_g(t) \equiv 0 \). It obeys (11) as both sides vanish: \( \partial_t C_g(t) = 0 \) and \(-2i[E', \Phi^2(t)] = -2i[E', I] = 0 \). Thus, \( C_g(t) \equiv 0 \) is the solution: constraint is always satisfied.

2. Ground state in the \( B = 0 \) meson sector

In the non-interacting case \( \hat{g} = 0 \), \( M = 0 \) is a static solution since the eom are

\[
\frac{i}{2} M_{pq} = \frac{1}{4} M_{pq} \left[ q - p + m^2 \left( \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \right] \quad \text{when} \quad \hat{g} \rightarrow 0.
\] (12)

Here, rhs \( \equiv 0 \) if \( M = 0 \), so it is the only static solution if \( \hat{g} = 0 \). Even with interactions, \( M = 0 \) is static: \( \partial_t M = [E(M), M] = 0 \) at \( M = 0 \) (5). But even at \( M = 0, E'(0) = -\pi\delta(p - q)h(p) \) does not vanish! Does the gradient of energy vanish at \( M = 0? \) Yes. To see why, first note that \( M = 0 \) is a static solution as \( E'(0) \) and \( \epsilon \) are diagonal in momentum space. By (9)

\[
\partial_t M = -2i[E'(M), \epsilon + M]|_{M=0} = -2i[E'(0), \epsilon] = 0.
\] (13)

\( E'(M) = 0 \) is sufficient, but not necessary for a static solution. \(-2i[E'(M), \Phi] \) is the symplectic gradient of energy at \( M \). The contraction of the exterior derivative of energy with the Poisson bivector field produces the Hamiltonian vector field. So the (symplectic) gradient of energy does vanish at \( M = 0 \). The state \( M = 0 \) has zero mass \( M \) and qualifies as a g.s.

3. Small oscillations about vacuum and ‘t Hooft’s meson equation

We recall the equation for mesons [2, 4] by considering small oscillations about the vacuum. Let \( V \) be a tangent vector at the translation-invariant \( M = 0 \). The constraint \( \Phi^2 = I \) becomes\(^8\)

\[
[\epsilon, V]_s = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \tilde{V}_{pq}(\text{sgn} \ p + \text{sgn} \ q) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \tilde{V} = (0, \tilde{V}^{-+}, 0).
\] (14)

\( \tilde{V}_{pp} = 0 \), so \( V \) has zero mean momentum \( P_V(8) \). But the generator \( P_l = p - q \) of translations \( M_{xy} \rightarrow M_{xy} + \epsilon \mathbf{r}_x \), \( M_{pq} \rightarrow \epsilon^{q}(p-q)\mathbf{M}_{pq} \) may be regarded as the total momentum. So we

\(^7\) The rhs is a cubic function of \( \Phi \). Picard iteration should establish that the solution to (11) exists and is unique. We may need technical hypotheses (besides \( \text{tr}[(\epsilon, M(0))]^2 < \infty \ \text{appendix E}) on \( \Phi(0) \) to ensure that observables (e.g. energy) remain finite.

\(^8\) \( V_{pp}^{-+} : \mathcal{H}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_s \) has entries with \( p > 0 > q, (V^{++})_s = V^{-+} \). We separate matrix rows with \( \).
pick independent variables \( P_t \) and \( \xi = p/P_t \). We write \( \bar{V}^{\pm} = \bar{\chi}(P_t, \xi, t) \). Hermiticity implies
\[
\bar{V}^{\pm}(p, q, t) = \bar{\chi}(P_t, \xi, t) \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{\chi}^*(P_t, \xi, t) = \bar{\chi}(-P_t, 1 - \xi, t).
\]
(15)
\( \xi \) is the quark momentum fraction. For small oscillations about \( M = 0 \) of energy \( \omega = p_0 \), we put
\[
\bar{V}^{\pm}_{pq}(t) = \bar{\chi}(P_t, \xi, t) e^{i\omega t} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{V}^{\pm'}_{pq}(t) = \bar{\chi}(P_t, \xi, t) e^{-i\omega t} \quad \text{for} \quad \omega \in \mathbb{R}.
\]
(16)
Parity acts as \( \bar{\chi} = \bar{\chi}^* \). The simplest \( \bar{\chi} \) obeying (15) are independent of \( P_t \) with \( \bar{\chi}^*(\xi) = \bar{\chi}(1 - \xi) \). So even parity states are real with \( \bar{\chi}(\xi) = \bar{\chi}(1 - \xi) \). The norm (appendix E) on \( V \) implies the \( L^2 \) norm on \( \bar{\chi}(\xi) \) up to a divergent constant. The linearized eom are
\[
\frac{i}{2} \partial_t \bar{V} = [E'(V), \Phi] = \left[ T' + \frac{1}{4} \hat{s}^2 G(V), \Phi \right] = \left[ T', V \right] + \frac{s^2}{4} [G(V), \epsilon] + O(V^2),
\]
\[
\frac{i}{2} \partial_t \bar{V}_{pq} = -\frac{1}{2} \{h(p) - h(q)\} \bar{V}_{pq} - \frac{s^2}{4} (\text{sgn} q - \text{sgn} p) \int \frac{d\xi}{s^2} \bar{V}_{pq,sq\xi}.
\]
(17)
Put \( q' = s/P_t \) to get an eigenvalue problem for \( \omega \). It is rewritten as 't Hooft’s equation for the squared masses \( M_n^2 = 2\omega P_t - P_t^2 \) with quarks of equal mass [2] \( \mu^2 = m^2 - \frac{\pi}{2}, \eta = \xi + \eta' \). For instance, with \( \mu^2 = 0 \), the eigenstates alternate in parity \( \bar{\chi}_n(\xi) \approx i^{n-1} \sin(n\pi \xi) \) with squared-masses \( M_n^2 \approx n\pi \hat{g}^2 \):
\[
-\frac{\omega}{2} \bar{\chi}(\xi) = -\frac{1}{4} \left[ P_t + \frac{\mu^2}{P_t} \right] \bar{\chi}(\xi) + \frac{s^2}{2} \int \frac{d\xi}{\eta^2} \bar{\chi}(\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad M_n^2 \bar{\chi}(\xi) = \left( \frac{\mu^2}{\xi} + \frac{\mu^2}{1 - \xi} \right) \bar{\chi}(\xi) - \frac{s^2}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{\bar{\chi}(\eta)}{(\xi - \eta)^2} d\eta.
\]
(18)

4. Ground state of baryon

The trajectories \( M_0(t) \) of the least mass on the \( B = 1 \) component are the baryonic g.s.; they depend on \( m, \hat{g} \). The chiral limit is \( m \to 0 \) holding \( \hat{g} \) fixed, \( v = m^2/\hat{g}^2 \to 0 \). Regarding QCD_{4+1} as an approximation to QCD_{3+1} on integrating out directions \( \perp \) to hadron propagation, \( \hat{g}^{-1} \sim O \) (transverse hadron size). So the chiral limit should describe u/d quarks that are much lighter than the size of hadrons. But it is hard to find the g.s. from the nonlinear eom (9). Inspired by valence partons, we found that the g.s. is approximately of rank 1 [9, 10, 12]. \( M = -2\psi \bar{\psi} \) lies on the \( B = 1 \) component if \( \psi \) is a positive momentum \( (\epsilon \bar{\psi} = \psi) \) unit vector. We guessed that a minimum mass +parity state is
\[
M_{0pq} = -\frac{4\pi}{P_t} e^{-\epsilon \bar{\theta}(p)\theta(q)} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\psi}_0(p) = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{P_t}} e^{\bar{\epsilon} \bar{\theta}(p)}.
\]
(19)
In section 4.1 we show that (19) has zero mass as \( v \to 0 \). In section 4.2 we show that it is one of a family of degenerate massless states connected by time evolution. \( M_t \) is thus a baryon g.s.:
\[
M_{0pq} = M_{0pq} e^{i\mu P_{q}u/2}, \quad \bar{\psi}_t(p) = e^{i\mu P_{t}/2} \bar{\psi}_0(p),
\]
(20)
\( p-q \) is not a constant, unlike near the translation-invariant \( M = 0 \) (section 3). Since \( M_{xx} \sim [(x + t/2)^2 + (2t)^{-1}]^{-1} \), the baryon is localized at \( x = -t/2 \) at time \( t \) and has a size \( \sim 1/P \). As \( x = x^3, t = x^0 - x^1 \), the massless baryon travels at the speed of light along \( x^1 = -x^0 \). The probability of finding a valence quark of momentum \( p \) in the baryon is \(-\frac{i}{2} M(p, p)\)\(^{12}\). So the degeneracy and time dependence are consequences of relativity: a massless soliton cannot be at rest. Time-dependent vacua are unusual\(^{13}\). Continuously connected static vacua (states of neutral equilibrium) are more common, e.g. the g.s. of a ball on a horizontal plane. There are time-dependent states of arbitrarily small energy greater than zero, where the ball adiabatically rolls between vacua. What is remarkable about \( M \) is that there is no ‘additional kinetic energy of rolling between vacua’, due to the masslessness of the quarks. But this massless baryon is special to the chiral limit. Away from \( M = 0 \), the g.s. of the baryon is roughly \( M = -2\psi \psi^\dagger \), with \( \psi(p) \propto p^s e^{-p^2/2n} \theta(p), a \approx \sqrt{3\nu/\pi} \) and \( M^2 \approx \tilde{g}^2 \sqrt{3} \nu/3 \) for small \( \nu \) [9].

4.1. Mass of the separable exponential ansatz

To find the mass of (19), we split energy (5) as \( 2E = P + m^2 KE + \tilde{g}^2 (SE + PE) \), where \( g^2 (SE/2) \) is a self-energy. In terms of \( v = m^2/\tilde{g}^2 \), the mass \( 2E P - P^2 \) is given by

\[
M^2 = \tilde{g}^2 P (vKE + SE + PE) \rightarrow \tilde{g}^2 P (SE + PE),
\]

where

\[
PE = \frac{1}{4} \int dx dy |M_{xy}|^2 \left| \frac{x - y}{2} \right|,
\]

\( SE = \frac{1}{2} \int \hat{M}_{pp} \frac{[dp]}{p} \),

\( KE = -\frac{1}{2} \int \hat{M}_{pp} \frac{[dp]}{p} \).

(21)

For \( M = -2\psi \psi^\dagger \), \( PE = \int dx |\psi|^2 V(x) \), where \( V = \frac{1}{2} \int dy |\psi(y)|^2 |x - y| \) obtains \( V'' = |\psi|^2 \),

\( V(0) = \frac{1}{2} \int dy |\psi(y)|^2 |y| \) and \( V'(0) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy |\psi(y)|^2 \text{sgn} \ y \).

(22)

Thus, \( PE = \int [dp] \tilde{\psi}(p) \int [dr] \tilde{\psi}^*(p + r) \tilde{V}(r) \),

where

\[
\tilde{V} = \frac{-1}{r} \int [dq] \tilde{\psi}(q) \tilde{\psi}^*(q - r).
\]

(23)

Here, \( |\psi_0(y)|^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \tilde{V} do = (2P)^{-1} + \int \tilde{V} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq e^{-q^2} e^{-\frac{q^2}{2\pi P}} \)

\( = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx s^{-1} e^{-s^2} - \int_{0}^{\infty} dx s^2 e^{-s^2} \).

(24)

These terms are equal by integration by parts if we ignore the boundary term. So for \( PE + SE = 0 \), we must define

\( (\pi P) SE = \int_{0}^{\infty} dx s^{-1} e^{-s^2} = -\int_{0}^{\infty} dx s^2 e^{-s^2} \text{ or } s^{-1} e^{-s^2} |_{s=0} = 0 \).

(25)

Let us use an IR regulator to ensure that PE and SE are finite. Let

\[ \tilde{V}(r) = -\frac{1}{r^2 P} e^{r/P} \int_0^\infty e^{-q/P} dq = -\frac{1}{r^2} \exp \left( -\frac{|r|}{2P} \right); \]

\[ \text{SE} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \frac{dp}{p} \int M_{pp} \left[ \frac{dp}{p} \right] = -\frac{1}{\pi P} \int_0^\infty e^{-q/P} dq \quad \text{and} \]

\[ \text{PE} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2 P} \int dx \ dy \frac{|x - y|}{(1 + x^2)(1 + y^2)}. \quad (26) \]

### 4.1.1. Regularized/variational estimation of the baryon ground state.

Let us use an IR variational estimation of the baryon ground state.

\[ \tilde{\psi}_a(p) = \frac{2^{1+s} \sqrt{\pi}}{\Gamma(1/2 + a)} p^a e^{-\theta(p)}, \quad \psi_a(x) = \sqrt{\Gamma(1 + 2a)} \frac{1}{2\pi \Gamma(1/2 + a)} (1 - ix)^{s+a} \]

for which

\[ P(a) = \int \left| \tilde{\psi}_a(p) \right|^2 \left[ \frac{dp}{p} \right] = \frac{1}{2} + a, \quad \text{KE} = \int \left| \tilde{\psi}_a \right|^2 \left[ \frac{dp}{2p} \right] = \frac{1}{a}, \]

\[ \text{SE} = -\int \left| \tilde{\psi}_a \right|^2 \left[ \frac{dp}{p} \right] = \frac{-1}{\pi a}. \quad (27) \]

Integrating and imposing the initial condition \( V_a(0) = \Gamma(a) / [2\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(a + 1/2)] \):

\[ V_a'(x) = \frac{x \Gamma(a + 1/2) F_1 \left( \frac{1}{2}, a + 1; \frac{3}{2}; -x^2 \right)}{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(a + \frac{1}{2})}, \]

\[ V_a(x) = \frac{\Gamma(a) (2ax^2) F_1 \left( \frac{1}{2}, a + 1; \frac{3}{2}; -x^2 \right) + (x^2 + 1)^a}{2\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(a + \frac{1}{2})}. \quad (28) \]

Note that \( 2F_1 \left( \frac{1}{2}, a + 1; \frac{3}{2}; -x^2 \right) \propto x^{-1} \) for large \( x \) and \( a > 0 \), so \( V_a(x) \propto |x|^{-2a} \) as \( |x| \to \infty \). However, we could not do the final integral to get \( \text{PE} = \int dx V_a |\psi_a|^2 \). It converges for \( a > 0 \) as \( V_a |\psi_a|^2 \sim |x|^{-2a} \) as \( |x| \to \infty \). On integrating for some simple values of \( a \) we find that \( \text{SE} + \text{PE} \to 0 \) as \( a \to 0 \). We fit a series\(^{15} \) to the calculated PE (table 1) for several \( a \in [10^{-2}, 10^{-4}] \). It is plausible that the coefficient of \( 1/a \) is exactly \( 1/\pi \approx 0.3183 \) and cancels \( \text{SE} \approx -1/\pi \) a and moreover that \( \text{PE} + \text{SE} \) vanishes at \( a = 0 \). Encouraged by this, we calculated PE(a) using Mathematica for several round values of \( a^{-1} \). There was a pattern and we conjectured (31), which was confirmed for hundreds of \( a \)'s. We are confident that \( \text{PE} + \text{SE} \) vanishes as \( a \to 0 \).

\(^{15} \) It is tempting to Laurent expand the integrand in \( a \) and integrate term by term. But this does not work as the operations of integration and Laurent expansion do not commute:

\[ V_a(x) = (2\pi a)^{-1/2} (2\pi)^{-1/2} (2\pi \arctan(x - \log((1 + x^2)/4))) + \cdots = V_{-a} a^{-1} + V_0 + V_1 a + \cdots \]

\[ |\psi_a(x)|^2 = (\pi(1 + x^2))^{-1/2} \cdots = |\psi_0|^2 + |\psi_1|^2 a + \cdots. \quad (29) \]

Integrating term by term, the first converges \( \frac{1}{\pi} \int V_{-1} |\psi_0|^2 = \frac{1}{\pi a} \), but to half the numerical value:

\[ \text{PE} = \int dx V_a(x) |\psi_a(x)|^2 \approx \frac{1}{\pi} \int V_{-1} |\psi_0|^2 + \int (V_{-1} |\psi_1|^2 + V_0 |\psi_1|^2 + V_1 |\psi_2|^2 + V_2 |\psi_2|^2 + \cdots). \quad (30) \]

The \( a^0 \) term diverges \( V_0 |\psi_1|^2 \sim |x|^{-1} \), \( \int V_0 |\psi_1|^2 \) also diverges: expanding in \( a \) destroys convergence of the integral!
Though PE ≈ 6.9 × 10^{-7} + 0.3183/a + 1.046a - 4.3a^2 grows as a → 0, SE + PE ∝ M^2 decreases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.01</th>
<th>0.005</th>
<th>0.0033</th>
<th>0.00167</th>
<th>0.00125</th>
<th>0.001</th>
<th>0.0001</th>
<th>0.0001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>3.255</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>63.67</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>190.99</td>
<td>254.65</td>
<td>318.3</td>
<td>3183</td>
<td>3183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE + PE</td>
<td>0.072 09</td>
<td>0.010 03</td>
<td>0.005 123</td>
<td>0.003 44</td>
<td>0.001 733</td>
<td>0.001 302</td>
<td>0.001 043</td>
<td>0.001 043</td>
<td>0.000 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So \( M_o = -2\varphi \varphi_i^\dagger \) (19) is a massless baryon in the chiral limit: \( \lim_{a \to 0} M_o^2 / \tilde{g}^2 = 0 \). From (21), its energy/colour is \( E_o = P/2 \), where \( P \) is its momentum/colour.

\[
\text{PE}(a) = \frac{1}{4} \pi a + \pi a - \frac{12\xi(3)}{\pi} a^2 + O(a^3).
\]

### 4.2. Degeneracy and time dependence of massless baryon states in the chiral limit

We generalize the massless baryon \( M_o \) (19) to a family \( M_t \) (20). \( M_t \) clearly lie on the \( B = 1 \) component. Further, \( P(t) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \varphi M_0(t) = P(0) = P \), KE \((t) = \text{KE}(0), \text{SE}(t) = \text{SE}(0) \) and by going to position space, PE \((t) = \text{PE}(0) \). So \( M_t \) is massless (21) like \( M_o \) (19). We found \( M_t \) by time-evolving \( M_0 \) in the chiral limit, so \( t \) is time. \( M_t \) evolves according to \( \dot{M} = \{E(M), M\} \) (9):

\[
\frac{i}{2} M_{pq} = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{M}_{pq} [h(q) - h(p)] - \frac{\tilde{g}^2}{4} G(M)_{pq} \{\dim, G_M\}_{pq}.
\]

We must show that \( M_t \) obeys the eqn \( \frac{i}{2} \tilde{M}_{pq} = \frac{1}{4}(q - p)M_{pq} + \frac{\tilde{g}^2}{4} Z(M)_{pq} \), where

\[
Z(M)_{pq} = \frac{1}{\pi} \left( \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} \right) \tilde{M}_{pq} - G(M)_{pq} \{\dim, G_M\}_{pq}.
\]

In appendix D we show that \( Z(M(t)) = 0 \) for all \( t \), so the interactions cancel out! Now

\[
M(t)_{pq} = M_{pq}(0) e^{i(p-q)t} \Rightarrow \frac{i}{2} \tilde{M}_{pq}(t) = \frac{1}{4}(q-p)M_{pq}(t).
\]

So \( M_0 \) evolves to \( M_t \) with energy \( P/2 \), describing a baryon moving at the speed of light.

### 5. Small oscillations about the lightest baryon

#### 5.1. Linearization and solution of constraint on perturbation V

Suppose \( M_o(t) \) is the g.s. for \( B = 1 \) with momentum \( \varphi_o = -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \varphi M_o \). Write \( M = M_o + V \), where \( V \) is a small perturbation tangent to \( G \) at \( M_o(t) \). Then \( V^\dagger = V \) and \( \text{tr} V = 0 \). \( V \) is a meson and \( M_0 + V \) a baryon-meson pair. What are the masses and form factors of excited baryons? The constraint \( \Phi^2 = 1 \) linearizes to \( [\epsilon + M_o, V]_+ = 0 \). This generalizes \( v \cdot \phi + \phi \cdot v = 0 \) for tangent vectors to \( S^3 \). Now

\[
\epsilon + M_o = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + M_o^{++} \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow [\epsilon + M_o, V]_+ = \begin{pmatrix} -2V^{++} & V^{--}M_o^{++} \\ M_o^{++}V^{--} & 2V^{++} + [M_o^{++}, V^{++}]_+ \end{pmatrix} = 0.
\]

In particular, \( V^{--} = 0 \). Roughly, \( V^{--}M_o^{++} \) expresses orthogonality of the ground and excited states. Equation (35) is solved\(^{16}\) by introducing a Hermitian matrix \( U \) and a ‘potential’

\(^{16}\)We have not shown that this is the most general solution of (35). By analogy with the sphere, we suspect that the anti-commutant of \( \Phi \) is the image of the adjoint action \( \text{id}_\Phi \) on Hermitian matrices.
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for $V, V = i[Φ_o, U]$ is automatically traceless, Hermitian and anti-commutes with $Φ_o$. This generalizes $v = φ × u$ for a tangent vector to $φ : φ = 1$. Motivated by (20), let $M_o(i) = -2ψψ^+$ be a separable baryon state; then

$$V = i\left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & -(M_o^+)U^+ \\ (M_o^+, U^+) & U^+ \end{array}\right) = 2i\left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & -(1 - ψψ^+) \\ (1 - ψψ^+)U^+ & U^+ \end{array}\right).$$

(36)

Here, $1 = I^+$ is the identity on $H_+$. We let $U^{--} = 0$ since it does not contribute. $U^{++}$ and $U^+$ are the unknowns. Recall that for mesonic oscillations around $M = 0$, the constraint implied $V^{++} = 0 = U^{++}$.

5.2. Gauge-fixing freedom in the choice of $U$ for fixed $V = i[Φ_o, U]$

Our solution $V = i[Φ_o, U]$ to constraint (35) is unchanged under $U \mapsto U + U_g$, if $[U_g, Φ_o] = 0$. This generalizes the fact that if $φ × u = v$ is tangent to $S^2_{Φ}$ at $φ$, then so is $φ × (u + u_g)$ for any $u_g$ parallel to $φ$. We eliminate this redundancy by imposing a gauge condition picking out one member from each equivalence class $U \sim U + U_g$. A convenient condition can be used to kill some entries of $U$. To understand the extent of the gauge freedom, we first find the commutant $[Φ_o]^'$, i.e. the pure-gauge matrices $[Φ_o, U] = 0$. For $M_o = -2ψψ^+$ with $ψ = ψ$ and $ψ^+ψ = 1$, this becomes

(i) $[P_ψ, U^{++}] = 0$ and (ii) $P_ψ U^{++}_g = U^{++}_g.$

(37)

$P_ψ$ projects to span($ψ$) in $H_+$. (i) states that $U^{++}_g ∈ [P_ψ]^'$, which we characterize by extending $ψ_0 ≡ ψ$ to an orthonormal basis for $H_+, \{ψ_k\}^∞$. The commutant of $P_ψ$ consists of the Hermitian matrices

$$U^{++}_g = a_0ψ_0ψ_0^+ + \sum_{k,l \geq 0} a_{kl}ψ_kψ_l^+ = (a_{00}, 0|A) \quad \text{with} \quad a_{00} ∈ \mathbb{R}. \quad (38)$$

Here $A : \text{span}_ψ → \text{span}_ψ$. To find $U^{++}_g$, let $\{η_k\}^∞$ be an orthonormal basis for $H_-$. and write (37) (ii) as

$$U^{++}_g = \sum_{k,l \geq 0} a_{kl}ψ_kη_l^+ = P_ψ U^{++}_g = \sum_{l \geq 0} u_{l0}ψ_lη_l^+. \quad (39)$$

The solution is $u_{l0} = 0$ for $k \neq 0$ and $u_{00}$ is arbitrary. Equations (38) and (40) characterize the pure-gauge $U_g$:

$$U^{++}_g = \sum_{l \geq 0} u_{l0}ψ_lη_l^+ = \left(\begin{array}{cccc} u_{00} & u_{01} & \cdots & u_{0l} \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{array}\right) \quad \text{with} \quad u_{0l} \text{ being arbitrary.} \quad (40)$$

Gauge-fixing conditions: the gauge freedom (40) is used to kill the first row of $U^{++}$. This is equivalent to imposing $P_ψ U^{++} = 0$ or $ψ^+ U^{++} = 0$. Similarly, the pure-gauge $U^{++}_g$’s (38) can be used to kill the 00 entry and all but the first row and column of $U^{++}$. So most of $U^{++}$ is pure gauge. Thus in the mostly zero gauge, $U$ may be taken in the form (0 and $\bar{u}$ represent column vectors)

$$U^{--} = 0, \quad U^+ = \left(\begin{array}{c} \bar{0} \end{array}\right), \quad U^{++} = \left(\begin{array}{c} u \end{array}\right), \quad \psi^+ = ψ\psi^+ \quad \psi^+U^{++} = \psi^+ \quad \text{where} \quad W : \text{span}_ψ → H_+: \quad \bar{u} = (u_1u_2\cdots)^+, \quad \psi_0 ⊥ u = \sum_{k \geq 1} u_kψ_k ∈ H_+. \quad (41)$$

For mesonic oscillations $V^{++} = U^{++} = 0$ (14) but around a baryon, $U^{++}$ can be taken of rank 2. The physical degrees of freedom are encoded in a vector $u ∈ H_+$ and a matrix $(U^{--})^+ = \psi^+U^{++}$ in the mostly zero gauge:

$$ψ^+u = 0, \quad ψ^+U^{++} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad U^{--} = 0. \quad (42)$$
So $\psi$ is $\perp$ to the excitation $U$. For example the rank-1 ansatz $U'' = \eta \phi\psi$ with $\phi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}_\perp$ and $\phi \psi = 0$. The g.s. time dependence is simple, $\psi_t(p) = \psi_0(p) e^{i|p|M/2}$ (20). So if at $t = 0$, $\phi_0\psi_0 = 0$, then orthogonality is maintained if $\phi(p) = \phi_0(p) e^{-i|p|/2}$. To summarize, if $U$ is picked in gauge (42), then by (36)

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V^- \\ V^+ & V^+ \end{pmatrix} = i \left( (2 + M_o)U^+ - U^+ (2 + M_o) \right) \approx 2 i \left( 0 \quad -U^+ \right).$$

(43)

Conversely, $U(V)$ is defined up to addition of a pure-gauge $U_g$. Given $V$, we can find a convenient representative in the equivalence class of $U$'s that it corresponds to. In the mostly zero gauge, upon using $U' \psi = 0$, we get $u = \frac{i}{2} V^{++}_\psi$. Thus, $U'' = u \psi^+ + \psi u^+ = -\frac{i}{2} [V^{++}, 2 \psi \psi^+]$. In this gauge, $U'' \propto V^{++}$. Given $V$, the most general corresponding $U$ is the sum of any $U_{\perp} \in [\Phi_\perp] (38)$ and (40) and

$$U_{\text{mostly zero gauge}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & U'' \\ U'^- & U'' \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2i} \left( 0 \quad -V^- \right).$$

(44)

5.3. Linearized equations of motion for perturbation $V$

For $M(t) = M_o(t) + V(t)$, (9) becomes $i\dot{\theta}(M_o + V) = 2[E'M_o + \Phi_o + V]$. The solution describes a curve $M(t)$ on the $B = 1$ component of phase space. Our g.s. is time dependent, so this is like the effect of Jupiter on the motion of Mercury. For the nucleon, we refer to resonances created by scattering a $\pi, e^-$ or $v$ off the proton. From (10), $E'(M_o + V) = E(M_o) + \frac{\beta^2}{4} G V$, so linearizing,

$$\frac{i}{2} \dot{V} = \left( -\frac{i}{2} \dot{\theta} M_o + [E'(M_o), \Phi_o] \right) + [E'(M_o), V] + \frac{\beta^2}{4} [G V, \Phi_o] + O(V^2).$$

(45)

The terms in round brackets add to zero if $M_o(t)$ satisfies the eom, as does our baryon g.s. (20). So

$$\frac{i}{2} \dot{V} = i[V, E'(M_o)] - \frac{i\beta^2}{4} [G V, \Phi_o] = i[V, T'] - \frac{i\beta^2}{4} [[G_{M_o}, V] + [G V, \Phi_o]].$$

(46)

Here $T' = -\hbar/2$. To see the departure from 't Hooft’s meson equation write $V = H_1 + H_2$ with

$$H_1 = i[h, V] - \frac{i\beta^2}{2} [G V, \epsilon] \quad \text{and} \quad H_2 = -\frac{i\beta^2}{2} [[G_{M_o}, V] + [G V, M_o]].$$

(47)

$H_1$ is independent of $M_o$ and leads to 't Hooft’s meson equation (17) if $M_o = 0$. $H_2$ has ‘baryon–meson’ interactions leading to many complications. In blocks, the eom are

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & V^- \\ V^+ & V^+ \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & [h, V^-] \\ [h, V^+] & [h, V^+] \end{pmatrix} - \frac{i\beta^2}{2} \begin{pmatrix} [G_{M_o}, V]^- & [G_{M_o}, V]^+ + G_{\nu}^+ (2 + M''^+) \\ -\text{h.c.} & [G_{M_o}, V]^+ + [G_{\nu}^+, M''^+] \end{pmatrix}.$$
5.4. Linearized time evolution preserves constraints

Equation (46) describes the motion of a point \( V(t) \) in the tangent bundle of the Grassmannian restricted to the base \( M_o(t) \). To establish this, we show that (46) preserves hermiticity of \( V \) and the linear constraint (35). If \( V \) is Hermitian at time \( t \), then so are \( G_V, G_{M_o} \) and \( H(V) \). By (46), \( V(t + \delta t) \) is also Hermitian. As for the linear constraint, suppose \( \Phi_o(t) \) is the solution of (9) about which we perturb by \( V(t) \), and define a constraint function \( C(t) = [\Phi_o(t), V(t)] \), which satisfies \( C(0) = 0 \). Then using (46)

\[
\frac{i}{2} \dot{C} = \frac{i}{2} \{[\Phi_o, V]_s + [\Phi_o, V]_s\} = \{[E'_{M_o}, v], V\}_s + \{\Phi_o, [E'_{M_o}, V]\}_s + \frac{g^2}{4}\{[\Phi_o, [G_V, \Phi_o]]\}_s.
\]  

(49)

To find the unique solution of this autonomous linear system of first-order ODEs, we make the guess \( C(t) \equiv 0 \) which annihilates the lhs. On the rhs, the first two terms cancel as \( [\Phi_o, V] = 0 \). The third term vanishes as \( \Phi_o^2 = I \) (section 1.2). So \( C(t) = 0 \) is the unique solution and (46) preserves the linear constraint. Corollary: As both \( V(t) \) and \( V(t + \delta t) \) satisfy the constraint, so does the difference quotient \( V(\delta t) \). This is always Hermitian:

\[
G(M_o) = V^+ = V^- = G(M_o)'.
\]  

(50)

Using the constraint \( V^- M^+ = 0 \) (35), we show that \( V^- G_{M_o}^- \equiv 0 \)! Our argument uses the exponential form of the g.s. \( M_o(t) \) (20), but there may be a more general proof. We simplify (50) using the fact that the g.s. interaction operator \( C(9) \) is always of rank 1. Putting

\[
\tilde{G}(M_o)_{pq} = (2/P) e^{-r/2P} e^{-\frac{i\pi t}{2}} e^{-p/2P} e^{\frac{i\pi t}{2}} I_2(-p)
\]  

in (50),

\[
\int_0^\infty [dr] e^{i(p-r)/2} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2P}} I_2(-p) V_{rq}^+ = \int_0^\infty [dr] V_{pr}^+ e^{i(r-q)/2} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2P}} I_2(-q)
\]  

(51)

for all \( p, q < 0 \). Dividing by \( I_2 \neq 0 \) (C.4) and using \( \tilde{\psi}_r(r) \propto \theta(r) e^{-r(1/2P)} \) (20), we get

\[
\int_0^\infty [dr] \tilde{\psi}_r(r) V_{rq}^+ = \int_0^\infty [dr] V_{pr}^+ e^{i(r-q)/2} = c(t), \quad \forall p, q < 0.
\]  

(52)

The lhs and rhs depend on \( p, q \), respectively, so they must be equal! \( c(t) \in \mathbb{R} \) by hermiticity. So (50) becomes

\[
\int_0^\infty [dr] V_{pr}^+ \tilde{\psi}_r(r) = c(t) e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}(p-q)} I_2(-p), \quad \forall p < 0.
\]  

(53)

\( V^- \) maps the g.s. to \( c(t) \times a \) vector in \( \mathcal{H}_- \). But \( V \) annihilates the g.s. \( V^- M^+ = 0 \) (35)!. So \( c(t) \equiv 0 \), \( V^- G_{M_o}^- = 0 \) and \( [G_{M_o}, V]^- = 0 \). It states that the excited states are \( \perp \) to the g.s.

5.5. Equation of motion in ‘——’ block: orthogonality of excited states

The ‘——’ block of the eom (48) is simplest as it is non-dynamical, \( [G(M_o), V(t)]^- = 0 \). This is necessary for consistency of the eom. It states that \( V^- G_{M_o}^+ \) is non-dynamical, \( \perp \) to the g.s.

\[
G(M_o) = V^+ = V^- = G(M_o)'.
\]  

(50)

Using the constraint \( V^- M^+ = 0 \) (35), we show that \( V^- G_{M_o}^- \equiv 0 \)! Our argument uses the exponential form of the g.s. \( M_o(t) \) (20), but there may be a more general proof. We simplify (50) using the fact that the g.s. interaction operator \( C(9) \) is always of rank 1. Putting

\[
\tilde{G}(M_o)_{pq} = (2/P) e^{-r/2P} e^{-\frac{i\pi t}{2}} e^{-p/2P} e^{\frac{i\pi t}{2}} I_2(-p)
\]  

in (50),

\[
\int_0^\infty [dr] e^{i(p-r)/2} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2P}} I_2(-p) V_{rq}^+ = \int_0^\infty [dr] V_{pr}^+ e^{i(r-q)/2} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2P}} I_2(-q)
\]  

(51)

for all \( p, q < 0 \). Dividing by \( I_2 \neq 0 \) (C.4) and using \( \tilde{\psi}_r(r) \propto \theta(r) e^{-r(1/2P)} \) (20), we get

\[
\int_0^\infty [dr] \tilde{\psi}_r(r) V_{rq}^+ = \int_0^\infty [dr] V_{pr}^+ e^{i(r-q)/2} = c(t), \quad \forall p, q < 0.
\]  

(52)

The lhs and rhs depend on \( p, q \), respectively, so they must be equal! \( c(t) \in \mathbb{R} \) by hermiticity. So (50) becomes

\[
\int_0^\infty [dr] V_{pr}^+ \tilde{\psi}_r(r) = c(t) e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}(p-q)} I_2(-p), \quad \forall p < 0.
\]  

(53)

\( V^- \) maps the g.s. to \( c(t) \times a \) vector in \( \mathcal{H}_- \). But \( V \) annihilates the g.s. \( V^- M^+ = 0 \) (35)!. So \( c(t) \equiv 0 \), \( V^- G_{M_o}^- = 0 \) and \( [G_{M_o}, V]^- = 0 \). It states that the excited states are \( \perp \) to the g.s.

5.6. Lack of translation invariance: failure of the ansatz \( V^+_{pq}(t) = \tilde{\chi}_t(\xi) \)

In the ‘——’ block of the eom (48), let us try what worked for mesons (section 3). Around the translation-invariant \( M = 0 \) vacuum, \( V^+_{pq}(t) = \tilde{\chi}_t(\xi, P) \) could be taken independent of
\[ P_t = p - q \] (16). For oscillations around a non-translation-invariant baryon \( M_o \) (19), such an ansatz does not work; \( P_t \) cannot be regarded as the momentum of \( V \). The orthogonality constraint \( V^{-\gamma} M^{\gamma*} = 0 \) (35) is violated if \( \tilde{\chi} \) is independent of \( p - q \). To see this, \( V^{-\gamma} M^{\gamma*} = 0 \) is expressed using \( \ddot{\chi} = -2\dot{\psi} \) as

\[
\int_0^\infty \dot{\chi}(\xi, t) \dot{\psi}(q) \, dq = 0, \quad \forall p < 0 \Leftrightarrow \int_0^1 \dot{\chi}(\xi, t) \dot{\psi}(p(1 - \xi^{-1})) \frac{d\xi}{\xi^2} = 0, \quad \forall p < 0. \tag{54}
\]

\( \tilde{\chi} \), must be \( \perp \) to each of \( f_p(\xi; t) = \dot{\psi}(p(1 - 1/\xi))/\xi^2 \) for \( p < 0 \) at all times \( t \). For example, at \( t = 0 \),

\[
f_p(\xi) = \xi^{-2} \dot{\psi}_o(p(1 - 1/\xi)) \sim \xi^{-2} \exp\{-p(1 - 1/\xi)\} \quad \text{for} \quad p < 0. \tag{55}
\]

\( f_p(\xi) \) are linearly independent positive functions going from \( f_p(0) = 0 \) to \( f_p(1) = 1 \) with maxima shifting rightwards as \( 0 \geq p \geq -\infty \). Plausibly, for \( \tilde{\chi} \) to be \( \perp \) in \( (L^2(0, 1)) \) all of them requires \( \tilde{\chi} \equiv 0 \). So non-trivial \( \tilde{V}_{pq}^- \) must depend on \( p - q \). It seems prudent to work instead with the unconstrained \( U \).

5.7. Linearized evolution of the unconstrained perturbation \( U \)

To find the linearized evolution of \( U \), we put \( V = i[\Phi_o, U] \) in (46)

\[ i[\Phi_o, U] = [\Phi_o, U], \ h] + \frac{\tilde{g}}{2} [G_{[\Phi_o, U], \ e} + \frac{\tilde{g}}{2} [G_{\Phi_o, U}] + [G_{[\Phi_o, U}, M_o]]. \tag{56} \]

Some entries of \( U \) are redundant due to gauge freedom. So we derive the eom in the mostly zero gauge in terms of the vector \( u \) and matrix \( U^+ \) (41). This requires some care. The eom do not know our gauge choice, and we must not expect them to preserve the gauge conditions (42) \( \psi^\dagger U = 0 \) and \( \psi^\dagger U^- = 0 \). Using (43), we begin by writing (the tentative nature of this evolution is conveyed by \( \hat{=} \))

\[
2i\dot{u} = V^+ \dot{\psi} + V^\dagger \psi, \quad 2i\dot{U}^+ = \tilde{V}^+. \tag{57}
\]

Here, \( \dot{\psi}_o(p) = \frac{1}{i} p \dot{\psi}_o(p) \), if \( \psi \) is chosen as the g.s. valence quark wavefunction in the chiral limit (20). We use the eom (48) for \( V \) and (43) to express the rhs in terms of \( u, U^+ \). For example,

\[
2i\dot{u} = 2i(u^\dagger - \psi^\dagger u) \psi + 2[u^\dagger - \psi^\dagger, h] \psi - \tilde{g}^2 \left[ (u^\dagger - \psi^\dagger, G^+_{M_o}) + G^+_M U^+ + U^+ G^+_M \right] \psi - i\tilde{g}^2 \left[ \psi^\dagger, G^+_M \right] \psi. \tag{58}
\]

\( G_M \) is given in appendix C.1. We regard these as equations for \( (u, U^+) \) given \( (u, U) \) satisfying the gauge conditions (42). So on the rhs we can use (42) to simplify

\[
i\dot{u} = i(u^\dagger - \psi^\dagger u) \psi + (u^\dagger - \psi^\dagger - \psi^\dagger u) h \psi - hu \]

\[
+ \tilde{g}^2 \left[ G^+_M u - (u^\dagger - \psi^\dagger u) G^+_M \psi - U^+ G^+_M \psi - i P \psi G^+_V \psi + i G^+_V \psi \right]. \tag{59}
\]

But we have a problem. This evolution does not preserve the gauge-fixing conditions:

\[
i \frac{d}{dt}(\psi^\dagger u) \hat{=} i \psi^\dagger u - u^\dagger h \psi - \psi^\dagger hu + \tilde{g}^2 \left[ \psi^\dagger G^+_M u + u^\dagger G^+_M \psi \right] \neq 0, \tag{60}
\]

\[
i \frac{d}{dt}(\psi^\dagger U^+) \hat{=} i \psi^\dagger U^+ - 2 \psi^\dagger h U^+ + \tilde{g}^2 \left[ u^\dagger G^+_M + \psi^\dagger G^+_M U^+ \right] \neq 0.
\]
But at each time step, we may add to $U(t + \delta t)$ a pure-gauge $U_\psi(t + \delta t)$ to bring it to the mostly zero gauge, so that at $t + \delta t$, $\psi^i u = 0$ and $\psi^i U^{++} = 0$. This corresponds to subtracting out the instantaneous projections on $\psi$ and defining a new time evolution that preserves (42)

$$i\dot{u} := \frac{i}{2}(1 - P_\psi)(V^{++}\psi + V^{++}\psi)$$

and $i\dot{U}^{++} := \frac{i}{2}(1 - P_\psi)V^{++}$. (61)

This projection involves no approximation. We use (42) to simplify the rhs to get\(^\dagger\)

$$i\dot{u} = -i = iu\psi^i + \{\psi^i h\psi - [1 - P_\psi]h\}u$$

$$= \frac{\bar{g}^2}{2}\left\{\psi^i G^+_{M^+}\psi u + U^{++} G^+_{M^+}\psi - [1 - P_\psi](G^+_{M^+}u + iG^+_{V^+})\right\}$$

$$i\dot{U}^{++} = -L^{++} = U^{++} - [1 - P_\psi]hU^{++}$$

$$= \frac{\bar{g}^2}{2}\left\{u\psi^i G^+_{M^+} + U^{++} G^+_{M^+} - [1 - P_\psi](G^+_{M^+}U^{++} + iG^+_{V^+})\right\}.$$ (62)

Our goal is small oscillations around the baryon. We write (62) as a Schrödinger equation, where the wavefunction consists of a vector $u$ and a matrix $U^{++}$ and the Hamiltonian is the pair $(l, L^{++})$:

$$-i\frac{d}{dt}\left(\begin{array}{c} u \\ U^{++} \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} (1(u, u^i, U^{++}, U^{++}) \\ L^{++}(u, u^i, U^{++}) \end{array}\right).$$ (63)

However, $(l, L^{++})$ depend on $u$, $U^{++}$ and $u^i$, $U^{++}$ through $G_V$ in (62). Indeed, from appendix C.1,

$$G^+_{V^+} = 2iG(u\psi^i - \psi u^i + U^{++})\psi, \quad \frac{1}{2i}G^+_{V^+} = G^+_{u\psi^i - \psi u^i} - G^+_{U^{++} - U^{++}}.$$ (64)

So the time dependence does not factorize under separation of variables\(^\dagger\). This prevented us from finding oscillatory solutions to the full system (62) using ($\omega$ is complex a priori)

$$\tilde{u}(t) = \tilde{u}_p e^{i(\omega p + \pi/2)t}$$

and $\tilde{U}^{++} = \tilde{U}^{++}_{pq} e^{i(\omega p - q)/2t}$. (65)

5.8. Eigenvalue problem for oscillations in approximation $u = 0$

We make an ansatz that permits us to find oscillations around the baryon. $V$ is a meson bound to $M_\psi$ whose valence-quark wavefunction is $\psi$. $u$ and $U^{++}$ represent valence and sea/antiquarks in $V$, respectively. Mesons are usually described as a quark–antiquark sea. This suggests putting $u = 0$. Moreover, for mesons around the vacuum, $V^{++} \propto U^{++} \neq 0$ (section 3), and our analysis should reduce to that far from the baryon. For $u$ to remain zero under time evolution (62), a consistency condition must hold for $\tilde{g} \neq 0$:

$$i\dot{u} = -\frac{\bar{g}^2}{2}\left\{U^{++} G^{+}_{M^+} - i(1 - P_\psi)G^{+}_{V^+}\right\}\psi = 0,$$

where $G^{+}_{V^+} = 2i\left\{G^{+}_{U^{++}} - G^{+}_{U^{++}}\right\}$. (66)

It states that $\psi$ is in the kernel of a certain operator. Equation (66) is studied in appendix G: Hilbert–Schmidt $U^{++}$ obeying (66) and $\psi^i U^{++} = 0$ form the physical subspace

\(^\dagger\) Signs of $l$, $L^{++}$ are chosen so that the Hamiltonian in section 5.8 is positive. Some integrals are IR divergent if $\tilde{\psi}(p) \propto e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \theta(p)$ is the exact chiral g.s. For example for the regulator of section 4.1.1, $\tilde{\psi}^i \psi = \frac{i}{2}(1 + \alpha + \frac{a}{2})$. We suspect that all divergences cancel in physical quantities, as for the lightest baryon. Also, most of these divergences disappear for the ansatz $u = 0$ studied in sections 5.8–5.10.

\(^\ddagger\) We are looking for vibrations about a time-dependent state $\tilde{\psi}_s(p) = \tilde{\psi}_s(p)e^{ip^0/2}$. The momentum-dependent phases in $u$ and $U^{++}$ guarantee that the gauge conditions $\tilde{\psi}^i u_i = 0$ and $\tilde{\psi}^i U^{++} = 0$ remain satisfied if they initially were.
for the ansatz \( u = 0 \). Now we assume oscillatory behaviour about the time-dependent g.s.

\[
U_{pq}^{+}(t) = U_{pq}^{\pm} e^{i(t - \frac{t_0}{2})t} \Rightarrow \left( \omega + \frac{p - d}{2} \right) U_{pq}^{\pm} e^{i(t - \frac{t_0}{2})t} = L_{pq}^{\pm}(U^{+}) e^{i(t - \frac{t_0}{2})t}.
\]

(67)

Let \( K^{+}(U^{+}) = L^{+}(U^{+}) + \left[ U^{+}, \frac{p}{2} \right] \). We get an eigenvalue problem for the excitation energies \( \omega \) above the g.s. of the baryon. The correction \( \left[ U^{+}, \frac{p}{2} \right] \) accounts for the time dependence of the g.s.:

\[
K^{+}(U^{+}) = \left[ U^{+, m} \right] + (1 - P_{\psi}) hU^{+} - U^{+}h + \frac{g^{2}}{2} \left( U^{+}G_{U}^{-} - (1 - P_{\psi})(G_{M}^{+}U^{+} - 2G_{U}^{+}) \right) = \omega U^{+}.
\]

The eigenvector is a matrix \( U^{+} \) with \( \psi \) in its left nullspace and constrained by (66). Similarly,

\[
K^{+}(U^{+}) = \left[ U^{+, m} \right] + U^{+}h(1 - P_{\psi}) - hU^{+} + \frac{g^{2}}{2} \left( G_{U}^{-}U^{+} - (U^{+}G_{U}^{+} - 2G_{U}^{+}) \right) = \omega^{*} U^{+}.
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \hat{K}(U) = \left[ \begin{array}{cc}
0 & K^{+}(U^{+}) \\
0 & 0
\end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{cc}
0 & \omega^{*} U^{+} \\
0 & 0
\end{array} \right].
\]

(69)

An advantage of the ansatz \( u = 0 \) is that \( K^{+} \) depends only on \( U^{+} \). \( \hat{K} \) is Hermitian with respect to the Hilbert–Schmidt inner-product defined in appendix E:

\[
(U, \hat{K}(U)) = (\hat{K}(U), U) \ i.e. \Re \text{tr} U^{+} \hat{K}(U)^{+} = \Re \text{tr} \hat{K}(U) U^{+}.
\]

(70)

Indeed, cyclicity of tr, the gauge condition \( U^{+} \psi = 0 \) and self-adjointness of \( \hat{G} \) (C.1) imply

\[
\text{tr} U^{+} \hat{K}(U)^{+} = \text{tr} \left[ U^{+} \left[ U^{+, m} \right] + U^{+}h(1 - P_{\psi}) - hU^{+} \right]
\]

\[
+ \frac{g^{2}}{2} \left[ U^{+}G_{U}^{-} - (1 - P_{\psi})(G_{M}^{+}U^{+} - 2G_{U}^{+}) \right] = \text{tr} \left[ \frac{P}{2}, U^{+} \right] + U^{+}h U^{+} - h U^{+} U^{+}
\]

\[
+ \frac{g^{2}}{2} \left[ G_{U}^{-}U^{+} - U^{+}G_{U}^{+} + 2G_{U}^{+} \right] = \text{tr} \hat{K}(U) U^{+}.
\]

(71)

The original linearized \( H(V) \) (47) is not self-adjoint. By passing from \( V \mapsto U \), eliminating redundant variables and imposing \( u = 0 \), we isolated a subspace on which the linearized evolution admits harmonic time dependance and is formally self-adjoint. \( \hat{K} \) implies \( \hat{\omega} = \omega^{*} \).

The eigenmodes \( U^{+} \) thus describe oscillations about the baryon. Without translation invariance, we use \( P_{M} = -\text{tr} p(M_{e} + V) / 2 = P + P_{V} \) (appendix A) as the excitation momentum instead of \( P_{t} \) (section 5.6). So the mass\(^2\) per colour is \( M_{M}^{2} = P_{M}(2E_{M} - P_{M}) \). For small oscillations, \( E_{M + V} \approx E_{o} + \omega \) where \( E_{o} \) is the g.s. energy. \( 2E_{o} \geq P \) where \( P \) is the g.s. momentum. In the chiral limit, \( 2E_{o} = P \) (section 4.1.1), so

\[
M_{M + V}^{2} = P_{M}(2E_{M} - P_{M}) \approx (P + P_{V})(2E_{o} + 2\omega - P - P_{V}) \Rightarrow (P + P_{V})(2\omega - P_{V}).
\]

(72)

\(^{21}\) Recall (8) that \( p \) is the Hermitian operator with kernel \( \Lambda_{pp} = 2\pi \delta(p - q)p \).

\(^{22}\) This means that \( \text{tr} U^{-} G_{U}^{+} = \text{tr} G_{U}^{-}, U^{+} \), which follows from the definition of \( G(U)_{pq} \).
Since $V \ll M$, we expect $|P_V| \ll P$, so $P + P_V \approx P > 0$. To ensure $\mathcal{M}_{M,V}^2 \geq 0$, we need $2\omega \geq P_V - (2E_0 - P)$ or in the chiral limit, $2\omega \geq P_V$. But for $u = 0$, $P_V = 0$ by (43). So

$$u = 0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{M}^2 = P(2E_M - P) \approx P(2E_0 + 2\omega - P) \xrightarrow{\omega \to 0} 2\omega P.$$  (73)

So $\hat{K}$ and $\omega$ should be $\geq 0$ in the chiral limit. Define the parity of meson $V$ as even if $V_{pq}$ is real symmetric and odd if it is imaginary antisymmetric. For the ansatz $u = 0$, the eigenvalue equation (68) and (69) follows from a variational principle. If we extremize $\mathcal{E} = (U, \hat{K}(U)) = \text{tr} U^{-h} \hat{K}(U)^{++}$,

$$\mathcal{E} = \text{tr} \left[ \left( h - \frac{P}{2} \right) \{U^{++}U^{-h} - U^{-h}U^{++} \right]$$

$$+ \frac{\bar{g}^2}{2} \left[ G^{-}_{M}U^{-h}U^{++} - G^{++}_{M}U^{++}U^{-h} + 2G^{-+}_{U}U^{++} \right],$$  (74)

holding $\|U\|^2 = (U, U) = \text{tr} U^{-h} U^{++}$ fixed via the Lagrange multiplier $\omega$, we get (68)

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta U_{qp}} \left[ \text{tr} U_{rs} ^{++} \hat{K}(U)^{++}_{sr} - \omega \text{tr} U_{rs} ^{++} U_{rs} ^{-h} \right] = 0 \Rightarrow \hat{K}(U)^{++}_{pq} = \omega U^{++}_{pq}.$$  (75)

We treated $U_{rs} ^{++} = U_{rs} ^{++}$ and $U_{rs} ^{-h} = U_{rs} ^{-h}$ as independent variables and used the fact that $\hat{K}^{++}$ depends only on $U^{++}$. We must solve the eigenvalue problem (68) on a space of $U^{++}$ examined in appendix G. In section 5.9 we interpret the terms in the variational energy $\mathcal{E}$, and approximately minimize it in section 5.10.

### 5.9. Rank-1 ansatz $U^{++} = \phi \eta$: sea quarks and antiquarks

Let $U^{++} = \phi \eta$, with $\phi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}_\pm$ being the sea/antiquark wavefunctions of the excited baryon. They have antiquarks even if the lightest one does not, just as mesons have antiquarks though the vacuum does not. Equation (75) states to hold $\text{tr} U^{++}U^{-h} = \|\phi\|^2\|\eta\|^2$ fixed and extremize the linearized energy $(U, \hat{K}(U))$

$$\mathcal{E}(U) = \text{tr} \left( h - \frac{P}{2} \right) \{\|\eta\|^2\phi\phi^\dagger - \|\phi\|^2\eta\eta^\dagger \right]$$

$$+ \frac{\bar{g}^2}{2} \text{tr} \left[ \|\phi\|^2 G^{-}_{M} \eta\eta^\dagger - \|\eta\|^2 G^{++}_{M} \phi\phi^\dagger + 2G^{-+}_{U}\phi\phi^\dagger \right],$$  (76)

on the physical subspace. If we factor out $\|U\|^2 = \|\phi\|^2\|\eta\|^2$ and work with unit vectors $\phi$ and $\eta$,

$$\mathcal{E}(U)/\|U\|^2 = \text{tr} \left( h - \frac{P}{2} \right) (P_\phi - P_\eta) + \frac{\bar{g}^2}{2} \left[ G^{-+}_{U}\phi\phi^\dagger + \frac{1}{2} P_\eta G^{++}_{M} - \frac{1}{2} P_\phi G^{-}_{M} \right],$$  (77)

Here $P_\eta = \eta\eta^\dagger$ and $P_\phi = \phi\phi^\dagger$. The variational principle cannot determine $\|\phi\|$ or $\|\eta\|$. Recall that $2\hbar = p + \mu^2/p$ with $\mu^2 = m^2 - \bar{g}^2/\pi$, so the kinetic and self-energies $T$ of sea-partons are

$$T = \text{tr} \left( h - \frac{P}{2} \right) (P_\phi - P_\eta) = \frac{\mu^2}{2} \int \frac{[dp]}{p} \{[\phi_p]^2 - [\bar{\eta}_p]^2 \}. $$  (78)

In the chiral limit $T < 0$ is purely self-energy. Equation (78) is valid for excitations around the massless $M_o(t)$ (20). If the lightest baryon were static, then $h - p/2 \leftrightarrow h$. Interactions are simply interpreted in position space. As $\phi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}_\pm$ the block designations in (77) are

---

23 $2\omega \geq P$, for 't Hooft’s meson operator (18), since meson mass²’s were $\geq 0$ if $m \geq 0$ [2].
automatic (tr \( P_\eta G_M^{-} = tr P_\eta G_M \), etc). Thus, the Coulomb energy \( \tilde{g}^2 \nu_c \) of the sea quarks \( \phi \) interacting with antiquarks \( \eta \) is positive

\[
\nu_c = tr G_{\eta\phi} \phi \eta = \int dx dy |\phi(x)|^2 \frac{1}{2} |x - y||\eta(y)|^2 = \int dx |\phi_x|^2 \nu(x) > 0. \quad (79)
\]

Here \( \nu(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\eta_x|^2 |x - y| dy \) obeys Poisson’s equation. The exchange interaction of sea-partons and ‘background’ valence quarks \( \psi \) is \( \tilde{g}^2 \nu_c = \tilde{g}^2 (\nu_{\phi \phi} + \nu_{\psi \psi}) \):

\[
\nu_c = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[P_\eta G_M - P_\phi G_M] = \int dx dy \nu^*(x) \nu(y) \frac{1}{2} |x - y||\phi(x)|^2 |\phi(y)|^2 - |\eta(x)|^2 |\eta(y)|^2 \). \quad (80)
\]

Now \( \nu(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int \psi_x \phi_x^* |x - y| dy \) and \( w(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int \psi_x \eta_x^* |x - y| dy \) both obey Poisson’s equation. Then \( \nu_{2\eta} = \int |w(x)|^2 dx > 0 \) and \( \nu_{\phi \phi} = -\int |\nu(x)|^2 dx < 0 \). However, \( \text{sgn} \nu_c \) is not clear a priori. Thus, the energy \( E = T + \tilde{g}^2 (\nu_c + \nu_{\phi \phi}) \) has a simple relativistic potential-model meaning. In the chiral limit, the mass of an excited baryon is \( M^2 = 2P\omega \), where \( P \) is the g.s. momentum and \( \omega = \min E \) (73).

5.10. Crude estimate for mass and shape of the first excited baryon in the chiral limit

To estimate the mass and form factor \( U^+ = \eta \eta^\dagger \) of the first excited baryon (19), we must extremize \( E(77) \) holding \( \|U\| = 1 \) and restrict to \( U^+ \), satisfying the gauge and consistency conditions (appendix G). We have not yet solved the consistency condition (G.2), an intricate orthogonality condition. But even without it, the interacting parton model derived in section 5.9 may be postulated as a mean-field description of excited baryons. So as an approximation, we impose \( \nu^\dagger \phi = 0 \) but ignore (G.2). Our ansatz for the unit norm \( \eta, \phi \) contains two parameters \( a, b \) controlling the decay of sea-parton wavefunctions

\[
\tilde{\psi}_p = \sqrt{4\pi} c e^{-ip\theta(p)}, \quad \tilde{\phi}_p = \sqrt{\frac{8\pi b b^2 (b + c)}{b^2 + 3c^2}} p - \frac{2}{b + c} e^{-ip\theta(p)},
\]

\[
\hat{\eta}_p = -ap \sqrt{\frac{8\pi a}{c}} e^{ip\theta(-p)}. \quad (81)
\]

A boost rescales \( p \). We choose our frame by fixing the momentum \( P = 1/2c \) of the g.s. Since \( \tilde{\phi}, \hat{\eta} \) have been chosen real, \( \hat{V} = [\hat{\phi}, \hat{V}] = 2i(0, -\hat{\phi}^T |\phi\eta^T, 0) \) has odd parity, \( \hat{V}^T = -\hat{V} \). The minimum of \( E = T + \tilde{g}^2 (\nu_c + \nu_{\phi \phi}) \) among (81) is the (approx.) energy of the first excited baryon. But it is not an upper-bound, as we ignored (G.2). In the chiral limit, the self-energy is \( T = T_\phi + T_\eta \):

\[
T_\phi = \text{tr} \left( \hat{h} - \frac{P}{2} \right) P_\phi = -\frac{\tilde{g}^2 (3b^2 - 2bc + 3c^2)}{4\pi (b^2 + 3c^2)} / b, \quad T_\eta = \text{tr} \left( \frac{P}{2} - \hat{h} \right) P_\eta = -\frac{\tilde{g}^2 a}{2\pi} \quad (82)
\]

\( T_\phi, T_\eta \) are minimized as \( a, b \to \infty \). By real symmetry of \( G(M) \) (appendix C) and \( P_\eta \), the exchange integral

\[
\nu_{\phi \phi} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} P_\eta G_M^{-} = \int [dp] \hat{\eta}_p \int [dq] \hat{\eta}_q G(M)_{p\rightarrow q}^{-} = \frac{4a^2 P}{\pi (1 - 2a P)^2} \left( (1 - 2a P)^2 + 8a P \log \frac{8a P}{(1 + 2a P)^2} \right). \quad (83)
\]

\( 24 \) To be accurate in the chiral limit \( m \to 0 \), \( \phi_p \) and \( \eta_p \) should probably vanish like small positive powers of \( p \) as \( p \to 0^+ \), just as the valence quark wavefunction \( \psi \) does. But to keep the calculation of \( E \) simple, we chose the smallest integer powers (\( \phi_p \sim p^2 \) and \( \eta_p \sim p \)) that ensure the absence of IR divergences and orthogonality \( \psi^\dagger \phi = 0 \).
\[ V_{\text{et}} > 0 \text{ since } G(M)_{pq}^{-} \text{ and } \tilde{\eta} \text{ are positive. } V_{\text{et}} \text{ increases with } \alpha; \text{ it vanishes at } \alpha = 0. \]

We cross-checked this using \( V_{\text{et}} = \int |w(x)|^2 \, dx \) (80). \( V_{\text{et}} = \int dx \, v(x) \phi_v(x)^2 \) (80) is minimized as \( b \to \infty \):

\[
\frac{1}{2} \int P \phi \frac{G^*_{\mathcal{M}}}{M} = - \int_0^\infty \left[ dp \right] \left[ dq \right] G(M)^+/p=-\frac{2b^2P}{\pi(3+4b^2P^2)} < 0. \quad (84)
\]

So the exchange energy is the difference of two positive quantities \( \tilde{\xi}^2 V_e = \tilde{\xi}^2 (V_{\text{et}} + V_{\phi}) \). As for the Coulomb energy (79), \( V_e = \int \phi(x) v(x) \, dx \), with \( v(x) = \frac{1}{2} (a + x \text{ arctan } \frac{x}{a}) \).

\[
V_e = \frac{a^2(a + 2b)(b^2 + 3c^2) + 2b^2(a + b)(b^2 + c^2)}{\pi(a + b)^2(b^2 + 3c^2)} \quad \text{where } 2P_c = 1. \quad (85)
\]

So \( T \) and \( V_{\phi} \) prefer large, while \( V_c \) and \( V_{\text{et}} \) prefer small values of \( a \) and \( b \). What about \( \mathcal{E} = T + \tilde{\xi}^2 (V_{\phi} + V_{\text{et}} + V_c) \)? \( a \) and \( b \) are lengths, so define dimensionless parameters \( \alpha = aP \) and \( \beta = bP \). In the chiral limit, the minimum of \( \mathcal{M}_1^2 \tau \) of \( 2\mathcal{E}P \) is the mass of the first excited baryon (73), so it must be Lorentz invariant: independent of \( P \), \( \tilde{\xi} \) is the only other dimensional quantity, so \( \mathcal{E} = \tilde{\xi}^2 e(\alpha, \beta) / P \), where \( e \) is a function of the dimensionless variational parameters. We find

\[ \pi \tau = \frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{12\beta^3 - 4\beta^2 + 3\beta}{4(4\beta^2 + 3)} + \frac{\alpha + 2\beta + 12\alpha\beta^2 + 8\beta^3}{\beta^2(4\beta^2 + 3)} - \frac{2\beta^2}{4\beta^2 + 3} \]

\[ + \frac{(1 - 2\alpha)^2 + 8\alpha \log \frac{\tilde{\xi}}{(2\alpha+1)^2}}{(4\alpha)^2 (1 - 2\alpha)^2}. \quad (86) \]

As there is no other scale, the minimum of \( e \) should be at \( \alpha, \beta \sim O(1) \). But as figure 1(a) of level curves of \( e \) indicates, the minimum is \( e = 0 \) as \( \alpha, \beta \to 0^+ \), corresponding to the pathological state where both \( \phi \) and \( \tilde{\eta} \) (81) tend point-wise to zero! If both \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are the free parameters, the minimum occurs on the boundary of the space of rank-1 states \( U_0^+ = \phi n \) obeying the gauge condition. Perhaps this was to be expected: without imposing (G.2), we are exploring unphysical states! In the spirit of getting a crude estimate sans imposing (G.2), we put \( \alpha = 1 \), and minimize in \( \beta \) to find \( \beta_{\min} = 0.445 \) with \( e(1, \beta_{\min}) = 0.205 \). So our crude estimate\(^{25}\) for the mass/colour of the first excited baryon in the chiral limit is \( \mathcal{M}_1 = 0.29\tilde{\xi} \). Figure 1(b) has the approximate valence, sea and antiquark densities (81) with the parameters \( aP = 1, bP = \beta_{\min} \) and \( 2\mathcal{E}P = 1 \). The momentum/colour \( P \) of the lightest baryon sets the frame of reference. However, this is not an upper-bound on the mass gap, \( \mathcal{M}_1 \) could be an underestimate as we did not impose (G.2). There is still the unlikely possibility of zero modes other than the one-parameter family of states associated with the motion of the lightest baryon (section 4).

6. Discussion

We found that the lightest baryon has zero mass/colour in the chiral limit of large-\( N \) QCD\(_{1+1} \). There is no spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking in this sense. Being massless, it evolves at the speed of light into a family of massless even parity states (section 2). They have the same quark distributions \( M(p, p) \), differing only in off-diagonal form factors \( M_0(p, q) e^{i(p-q)\phi/2} \).

The other modulus of the baryon is its size \( 1/P \). \( P \) is its mean momentum/colour, fixed by the frame. Excited baryons (small oscillations around \( M_c \)) are like bound states of a meson \( M \) with \( M_c \). On eliminating redundant variables, we derived an approximate eigenvalue problem for a

\(^{25}\) As the plot shows, if we set \( \beta = 1 \) and minimize in \( \alpha \), then \( \alpha_{\min} = 0.212 \) with \( \mathcal{M} = 0.32\tilde{\xi} \), which is roughly the same.
Figure 1. (a) Level curves of the dimensionless energy $e$($\alpha, \beta$). (b) Valence, sea and anti-quark densities in the excited baryon for $P = 1, \alpha = 1, \beta = .445$. The orthogonality of sea and valence ($\phi\psi = 0$ gauge condition) implies that $\tilde{\phi}(p)$ has a node. The normalization of anti/sea distributions is arbitrary and small compared to the valence distribution. One may contrast these with the first excited meson for which $|\tilde{\chi}(\xi)|^2 \approx \sin^2 \pi \xi$ where $\xi, 1 - \xi$ are the quark and antiquark momentum fractions.

Based on the ansatz $U^{+\mp} = \phi\eta$, we derived an interacting mean-field parton model for the structure of excited baryons (section 5.9). Using simple trial anti/seaquark wavefunctions $\eta, \phi$, we estimated the mass and shape of the first excited baryon for which $V$ has odd parity (analogue of Roper resonance). The baryon $M_{\eta}$ breaks translation invariance, deforms the vacuum and consequently deforms the shape of the meson $V$. Unlike the mesons $\tilde{\chi}(\xi)$ near the Dirac vacuum, where $\xi \leftrightarrow 1 - \xi$ relates quark and antiquark distributions; the distribution of quarks $|\tilde{\phi}(p)|^2$ and antiquarks $|\tilde{\eta}(p)|^2$ in $V$ is not simply related. By linearizing around $M_{\eta}$, we approximated these excited baryons as non-interacting and stable. The nonlinear treatment of $M_{\eta}/V$ also prevented us from assigning a parity to excited baryons. But their nonlinear time evolution (9) should contain information on interactions and decay. Our approach is summarized in figure 2.
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Appendix A. Conservation of the mean momentum $P_M = -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} pM$

$E_M$ and $P_M$ were used to define the mass (21) of the baryon and of oscillations above a non-translation-invariant $M(p, q)$, where the other concept of momentum $P_r = p - q$ is not meaningful (see section 3). Here we show that $P_M = -\frac{1}{2} \int pM_{pp}[dp]$ is conserved even if $M(x, y; t)$ is not static, as long as it decays sufficiently fast: $|M_{xy}|^2 \sim |x|^{-1-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$

However, we have not quite solved the consistency condition for the approximation $u = 0$ (appendix G) which restricts the space of physical states $U^{+\mp}$. It is also of interest to find a way of proceeding without this approximation.
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as $|x| \to \infty$ for each $y, t$. When $\bar{g} = 0$, energy $T = -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} M$ is linear. Also, $\bar{p}, \bar{h}$ and $\bar{c}$ are diagonal, so their commutators vanish. From (4),

$$\partial_t P = \{T(M), P\} = \{f_h, f_p\} = f - i\hbar [h, p] + \frac{i}{2} \text{tr}[h, p]c = 0. \quad (A.1)$$

So for $g \neq 0$ only $U(7)$ contributes to $\partial_t P_M$. $U$ is simpler in position space, so write

$$P_M = -\frac{1}{2} \int [dp] \int dx \, dy \, e^{-i p(x-y)} M_{xy} = -\frac{1}{2} \int dx \, dy \, M_{xy} D_{xy}, \quad (A.2)$$

where $D_{xy} = \int [dp] p e^{-i p(x-y)} = i\hbar \delta(x-y)$ is Hermitian. So we have a quadruple integral

$$\partial_t P = \{E(M), P\} = \{U, P\} = -i\bar{g} \frac{\bar{g}}{8} \int dx \, dy \, dz \, du \frac{|x-y|}{2} D_{zw}(M_{xz} M_{yz} + M_{zw}). \quad (A.3)$$

We do two integrals and integrate by parts elsewhere to show $\partial_t P = 0!$ By (2), the PB is

$$i[M_{xy} M_{yz}, M_{zw}] = \delta_{xz} M_{yw} \Phi_{iu} - \delta_{yw} M_{xz} \Phi_{iz} + (x \leftrightarrow y). \quad (A.4)$$

After one integration and relabelling variables, $\partial_t P = -\frac{\bar{g}^2}{8} \Im I$, where $I = i \int dy \, dz \Phi_{yz} \int dx \, |x-y| M_{yz} \partial_x \delta_{yz}$. Integrate by parts on $x$ noting that the boundary term $B_1(y, z) = \int (z-y) \delta_{yz} \Phi_{x}^{\infty} = 0$,

$$I = -i \int dy \, dz \Phi_{yz} |z-y| \partial_x M_{xy} - i \int dy \, dz \Phi_{yz} \operatorname{sgn}(z-y) M_{zy}. \quad (A.5)$$

The second term is real and does not contribute to $\Im I$. So

$$\partial_t P = \frac{\bar{g}^2}{8} \Re \int dx \, dy \Phi(y, x) |x-y| \partial_x M(x, y) = \frac{\bar{g}^2}{8} \Re J. \quad (A.6)$$

Figure 2. Flowchart of our approach to the baryon spectrum of large-$N$ QCD$_{1+1}$. 
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Integrating by parts, the boundary term vanishes if $M$ falls off sufficiently fast:\footnote{From \eqref{eg:epsilon} $\epsilon_{yx} \sim i(\pi x)^{-1}$ as $|x| \to \infty$ for any fixed $y$. So the first term in $B_2$ vanishes if $M_{sx} \to 0$ as $|x| \to \infty$:

$$B_2 = \int dy (\epsilon_{sx} + M_{sx})(x - y)|M_{sx}|^2_{\infty}.$$}

\begin{equation}
J = B_2 - \int dx \, dy M_{xy} \Phi_{xy} \text{sgn} (x - y) - \int dx \, dy M_{xy} |x - y| \partial_x \epsilon_{yx} - \int dx \, dy M_{xy} |x - y| \partial_x M_{xy}.
\end{equation}

(A.8)

The first two integrals are imaginary and do not contribute to $\Re J$, so

$$\partial_t P = -\frac{1}{\delta} L^2 \Re K, \quad \text{where} \quad K = \int dx \, dy M_{xy} |x - y| \partial_x M_{xy}. \quad (A.9)$$

Integrating by parts we express $L = K + K^* = 2 \Re K = -\int dx \, dy |M_{xy}|^2 \text{sgn} (x - y) + B_3$.

$B_3 = \int dy |M_{xy}|^2 (x - y)|^{\infty}_{-\infty}$ is familiar to B2 (A.7), and vanishes under the same hypothesis.

Finally, sgn is odd, so $\partial_t P = -\frac{1}{\delta} L^2 L/16 = 0$. So $P_M$ is conserved if $|M_{xy}|^2$ decays as $x^{-1 - \delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$.

Appendix B. Finite part integrals (Hadamard’s partie finie)

A finite part integral is like an ODE; rules to integrate the singular measure are like boundary conditions (b.c.). Here we define the $1/p^2$ singular integrals appearing in the potential energy. In position space this is manifested in the linearly rising $|x - y|$ potential. ’t Hooft \cite{tHooft:1972tcz} defines them by averaging over contours that go above/below the singularity. Here we formulate them via real integrals and physically motivate and justify the definition by showing that it satisfies the relevant b.c. Both methods use analytic continuation. Consider the rank-1 baryon section 4.1 and suppose support $\psi \subseteq [0, P]$.

\begin{equation}
PE = \int [dp] \tilde{\psi}(p) \int [ds] \tilde{\psi}^*(p + s) \tilde{V}(s), \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{V}(s) = -s^{-2} \tilde{W}(s). \quad (B.1)
\end{equation}

Recall that $V'' = |\psi|^2$ with two b.c. \cite{Braun:2005uf}. So $\tilde{V}(s) = -s^{-2} \int [dq] \tilde{\psi}(s + q) \tilde{\psi}^*(q)$ is singular at $s = 0$. Here $\tilde{W}^*(s) = \tilde{W}(-s)$, i.e. $\Re \tilde{W}(s)$ is even and $\Im \tilde{W}(s)$ is odd. Now, the two b.c.

\begin{align}
V(0) &= -\int \Re \tilde{W}(s) \frac{[ds]}{s^2} = \int |\psi(y)|^2 \frac{|y|}{2} dy, \nonumber \\
V'(0) &= \int \Im \tilde{W}(s) \frac{[ds]}{s} = -\frac{1}{2} \int dy |\psi(y)|^2 \text{sgn} y. \quad (B.2)
\end{align}

The lhs of (B.2) do not exist as Riemann integrals since $\tilde{W}(0) = 1$. But the rhs exists quite often and can be used to define the lhs. For example, the rhs of $V(0)$ makes sense if $\psi$ decays faster than $1/y$. The rhs of $V'(0)$ makes sense as long as $\psi(y)$ decays faster than $|y|^{-2}$. This includes $|\psi(y)| \sim 1/|y|$ as $|y| \to \infty$ corresponding to $\psi(p)$ having a jump discontinuity. In particular, it can be used to define $\int \tilde{W}(s)x^{-1} dx$ even when $\tilde{W}(p)$ is discontinuous at $p = 0$.

Now we eliminate $\psi$ and express singular integrals of $W$ in terms of Riemann integrals of $\epsilon_{yx} \sim i(\pi x)^{-1}$ as $|x| \to \infty$ for any fixed $y$. So the first term in $B_2$ vanishes if $M_{sx} \to 0$ as $|x| \to \infty$:

$$B_2 = \int dy (\epsilon_{sx} + M_{sx})(x - y)|M_{sx}|^2_{\infty}.$$}

(A.7)

The second term in $B_2$ vanishes iff $\lim_{|x| \to \infty} |M_{sx}|^2(x - y) = 0$, for any fixed $y$. This second condition subsumes the first. So $B_2 = 0$ provided $|M_{sx}|^2 \sim |x|^{-1 - \delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$. This is easily satisfied by our ansatz $M_{sx}(x, y) \left(19\right)$ for the baryon g.s.

\footnote{From section 4.1.1, if $\tilde{\psi}(p)$ is (dis)continuous at $p = 0$, then so is $\tilde{W}(s)$ at $s = 0$. If $\tilde{\psi}(p) \sim p^\delta$, then $\tilde{W}(s) - 1 \sim |s|^{1+2\delta}$.}
Proof. We subtracted divergent terms and analytically continued what we would have got if \( \tilde{\psi}(p) \in \mathbb{R} \). Then, \( \tilde{\psi}(-x) = \tilde{\psi}^*(x) \), and \( \tilde{W} \) is real and even. The \( V'(0) \) b.c. (B.2) is satisfied. Let us also restrict our attention to wavefunctions such that \( \tilde{\psi}(p) \sim p^{\mu}, \ a > 0 \) as \( p \to 0 \). Our aim is to define \(-\int \frac{1}{\pi} \tilde{W}(s)[ds] \), so as to satisfy the first b.c. The rule should reduce to the Riemann integral, when this quantity is finite to begin with.

Claim. Let \( \tilde{W}(s) \) be even and \( \tilde{W}'(0) = 0 \) For \( P > 0 \), if we define

\[
\int_{-P}^{P} \frac{1}{s^2} \tilde{W}(s)[ds] := \int_{-P}^{P} \frac{\tilde{W}(s) - \tilde{W}(0)}{s^2}[ds] - \frac{\tilde{W}(0)}{\pi P}, \quad \text{then} \tag{B.3}
\]

\[
\int_{-P}^{P} \frac{1}{s^2} \tilde{W}(s)[ds] = -\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\tilde{\psi}(x)|^2 \frac{|x|}{2} dx.
\]

Moreover, \( \tilde{W}'(0) = -i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x|\tilde{\psi}(x)|^2 dx = 0 \) as the integrand is odd. Therefore, \( \tilde{W}(s) - \tilde{W}(0) \) vanishes at least as fast as \( s^{1+\epsilon}, \ \epsilon > 0 \) as \( s \to 0 \). For example, for \( \tilde{\psi}(p) \propto p^{\mu}e^{-p}, \ \tilde{W}(s) \sim 1 \propto -s^{2\mu+1} + O(s^2) \). Therefore, \( \int_{-P}^{P} (\tilde{W}(s) - \tilde{W}(0)) s^{-2}[ds] < \infty \). As the integrand is even it suffices to consider

\[
\int_{0}^{P} \frac{\tilde{W}(s) - \tilde{W}(0)}{s^2}[ds] = \int_{0}^{P} \frac{ds}{2\pi s^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx |\tilde{\psi}(x)|^2 (e^{-ix} - 1). \tag{B.5}
\]

Only the even part of \( (e^{-ix} - 1) \) contributes to the integral on \( x \). Reversing the integrals,

\[
\int_{0}^{P} \frac{\tilde{W}(s) - \tilde{W}(0)}{s^2}[ds] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx |\tilde{\psi}(x)|^2 \left( \frac{1}{2\pi P} - \nu(x) \right). \tag{B.6}
\]

This involves the sine integral \( 2\pi P \nu(x) = P \times \text{Si}(P x) + \cos(P x) \). Now \( \tilde{W}(0) = 1 \), so

\[
\int_{0}^{P} \frac{\tilde{W}(s) - \tilde{W}(0)}{s^2}[ds] - \frac{\tilde{W}(0)}{2\pi P} = -\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx |\tilde{\psi}(x)|^2 \nu(x). \tag{B.7}
\]

We must show that \( \nu(x) \) may be replaced by \( |x|/4 \) under the integral. Since \( \text{Si}(t) \) is odd, we have

\[
\nu(x) = \frac{|x|}{4} + \frac{1}{2\pi P} \left( P \times \text{Si}(P x) - \frac{P|x|\pi}{2} + \cos(P x) \right) = \frac{|x|}{4} + \frac{R(P x)}{2\pi P}, \tag{B.8}
\]

where \( R(t) = t \text{Si}(t) - |t|\pi/2 + \cos t \). We have the desired result except for a remainder term

\[
\int_{-P}^{P} \frac{\tilde{W}(s) - \tilde{W}(0)}{s^2}[ds] - \frac{\tilde{W}(0)}{\pi P} = -\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\tilde{\psi}(x)|^2 \frac{|x|}{2} dx - \frac{1}{\pi P} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\tilde{\psi}(x)|^2 R(P x) dx. \tag{B.9}
\]
When $P \to \infty$, the remainder term $\to 0$ as $|R(t)| \leq 1$. For finite $P$, $R(t) \sim -\frac{\sin t}{t}$, so we expect the remainder term to be small. But it is zero. Consider
\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx |\psi(x)|^2 R(Px) = \int_0^P |d\gamma| \int_{-\infty}^{P-\gamma} [d\gamma] \psi(q + r) \psi^*(q) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx e^{i\epsilon x} R(Px).
\] (B.10)

$R(t)$ is even and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx e^{i\epsilon x} R(Px) = 2 \int_0^{\infty} dx \cos(\epsilon x) R(Px) = 0,$
from the properties of $\psi$, provided $|t| < P$, which is the region of interest. Thus the remainder term vanishes, and we have shown that our definition of the ‘finite part’ integral satisfies the b.c.
This justifies our definition (B.3) when $W(s)$ is even and $W(0) = 0$. \[\square\]

According to (B.3), $\int_{-P}^{P} \frac{dt}{\pi t} = -\frac{2}{P}$. Moreover, it makes sense to define $\int_{-p}^{p} \frac{d\epsilon}{\epsilon} := 0$ since the integrand is odd. We use these to extend the definition to functions on an even interval $[-P, P]$ but with $W'(0)$ possibly non-zero. Suppose $W(s)$ is continuously differentiable at $s = 0$ with $W(s) - W(0) - sW'(0) \sim s^{1+\epsilon}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $s$ sufficiently small. Then we define
\[
\int_{-P}^{P} \frac{dx}{s^2} W(s) := \int_{-p}^{p} \frac{dx}{s^2} [W(s) - W(0) - sW'(0)] - \frac{2}{P} W(0).
\] (B.11)

This is used to evaluate $\hat{G}(M_o)$ in appendix C. In general, this rule is applied in a small neighbourhood $[-\epsilon, \epsilon]$ of the singularity. The first term on the rhs of (B.11) vanishes as $\epsilon \to 0$ giving
\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W(s) \frac{ds}{s^2} := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{-\epsilon} + \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \right] W(s) \frac{ds}{s^2} - \frac{2}{\epsilon} W(0).
\] (B.12)

Appendix C. Interaction operator $\hat{G}$ and $\hat{G}(M)$ for baryonic vacua

$\hat{G}$ is the operator on Hermitian $M$ defining (7) the potential energy $8U = \hat{g}^2 \text{tr} M \hat{G}(M)$. $\hat{G}(M)$ is a Hermitian matrix with the kernel $G(M)(x) = \frac{1}{2} M_{xy} |x - y|$ or $G(M)(pq) = - \int \frac{d|\gamma|}{\epsilon} M_{pqrs}$. The null-space of $\hat{G}$ consists of the diagonal $M_{xy} = m(x) \delta(x - y)$, which do not lie on the phase space (3) except for $M = 0$. $U$ is positive definite. The matrix elements of $\hat{G}$ are real
\[
\hat{G}^{\omega x} = \frac{1}{2} \{x - y |\delta(x - z) \delta(w - y), \text{ where } G(M)(xy) = \int d\omega \hat{G}^{\omega x} M_{\omega xy}.
\] (C.1)

The entries $\hat{G}^{\omega x}$ are symmetric under a left–right flip $\hat{G}^{\omega x} = \hat{G}^{\omega x}$, which means $M \mapsto G(M)$ preserves hermiticity. Moreover $\hat{G}^{\omega x} = \hat{G}^{\omega x}$, which implies that $\hat{G}$ is Hermitian as an operator on Hermitian matrices (appendix F). In momentum space, $G^{\omega x}_{pq} = G^{\omega x}_{qp} = G^{\omega x}_{pq}$ are real, with $G^{\omega x}_{pq} = \int [d\gamma] \hat{G}^{\omega x}_{pq} M_{\gamma xy}$. Here $G^{\omega x}_{pq} = - \int \frac{d|\gamma|}{\epsilon} G^{\omega x}_{pqrs} \delta^{\omega x}_{pq},$ and $\delta^{\omega x}_{pq} = 2\pi \delta(p - q)$. $G(M)(xy)$ is simple, but the Fourier transform $\hat{G}(M)(pq)$ is sometimes more convenient to solve the eom (e.g. section 4.2, (68)). At the baryon vacua $M(\tau)$ (20):
\[
\hat{G}(M(\tau))(pq) = -e^{i(p - q)^2t} \int \frac{[d\gamma]}{\tau^2} M(0)_{pqtsr} e^{i(p - q)^2t} G(M)(pq).
\] (C.2)

So it suffices to take $\tau = 0$. For $M = -2\psi_\omega |\psi_\omega^*|$ (19) with $\psi_\omega$ real, $\hat{G}_{\omega} M_{\omega}$ is symmetric. $G(M)(xy)$ is not of rank 1. But $\psi_\omega(p + r) \sim e^{-p - \epsilon \theta(p + r)}$ factorizes, ensuring that $G(M)(\pm \epsilon)$ are of rank 1. In general,
\[
\hat{G}(M)(pq) = \frac{2}{P} \exp \left( -\frac{p + q}{2P} \right) \int_{\max(0, -p - q)}^{\infty} \frac{dr}{r^2} e^{-r/P}.
\] (C.3)

29 The asymptotic expansion of $\pi(t)$ for large $t$ is $\pi(t) \sim \frac{2}{\pi} + (-\frac{1}{2} + O(t^{-1})) \cos t + (-\frac{1}{12} + O(t^{-4})) \sin t$. 
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If \( p \) or \( q < 0 \), then \( t \equiv \max(-p, -q) = -\min(p, q) > 0 \) and there is no singularity:

\[
I_2(t) = \int_t^\infty \frac{dr}{r^2} e^{-r/p} = \frac{e^{-t/p}}{t} + \frac{1}{p} \text{Ei}\left(-\frac{t}{p}\right) > 0, \quad \text{for } t > 0. \tag{C.4}
\]

Here \( \text{Ei}(z) = -\int_{-\infty}^z \frac{e^u}{u} \, du \). \( I_2(t) \) monotonically decays from \( \infty \) to 0 exponentially, as \( t \) goes from 0 to \( \infty \). Thus, in the \((p, q) = (++), (++)\) and \((---)\) quadrants,

\[
\tilde{G}(M_o)_{pq} = \frac{2}{p} \exp\left(-\frac{p + q}{2P}\right) \left(\frac{e^{-t/p}}{t} + \frac{1}{P} \text{Ei}\left(-\frac{t}{P}\right)\right), \quad \text{where } t = -\min(p, q) > 0.
\]

(C.5)

In the ++ quadrant, \( s = \min(p, q) > 0 \) so we may write

\[
\tilde{G}(M_o)_{pq}^+ = -\frac{1}{2\pi} M_o(p, q) I(s), \quad \text{where } I(s) = \left[\int_{-s}^s + \int_s^\infty\right] \frac{dr}{r^2} e^{-r/p} = I_1 + I_2.
\]

(C.6)

Here \( I_1(s) \) is a finite part integral defined in \((B.11)\), and expressed via the sinh integral

\[
I_1(s) = \int_s^\infty \frac{dr}{r^2} e^{-r/p} = \frac{2}{s} + \int_{-s}^s \frac{dr}{r^2} \left(e^{-r/p} - 1 + \frac{r}{P}\right) = -\frac{2}{s} \cosh\left(\frac{s}{P}\right) + \frac{2}{P} \text{Shi}\left(\frac{s}{P}\right).
\]

(C.7)

Here, \( \text{Shi}(z) = \int_0^z \frac{\sinh t}{t} \, dt \). Combining with the previously encountered \( I_2(s) \) \((C.4)\),

\[
I(s) = I_1 + I_2 = -\frac{1}{s} e^{s/p} + \frac{2}{P} \text{Shi}\left(\frac{s}{P}\right) + \frac{1}{P} \text{Ei}\left(-\frac{s}{P}\right)
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{s} e^{s/p} + \frac{1}{P} \left(\text{Chi}\left(\frac{s}{P}\right) + \text{Shi}\left(\frac{s}{P}\right)\right).
\]

(C.8)

\( \text{Chi}(z) = \gamma + \log z + \int_0^z \frac{\cosh t - 1}{t} \, dt \). Now we summarize \( \tilde{G}(M_o)_{pq} \) in all blocks. Let \( s = \min(p, q) \), then

\[
\tilde{G}(M_o)_{pq} = \frac{2}{P} \exp\left(-\frac{p + q}{2P}\right) \begin{cases} 
I_2(-s) = -\frac{1}{s} e^{s/p} + \frac{1}{P} \text{Ei}\left(\frac{s}{P}\right) & \text{if } s < 0 \\
I(s) = -\frac{1}{s} e^{s/p} + \frac{1}{P} \left(\text{Chi}\left(\frac{s}{P}\right) + \text{Shi}\left(\frac{s}{P}\right)\right) & \text{if } s > 0.
\end{cases}
\]

(C.9)

\( I_2(t) \) monotonically decays from \( \infty \) to 0 exponentially, as \( t \) goes from 0 to \( \infty \). \( I(s) \) monotonically grows from \( -\infty \) to \( \infty \) for \( 0 < s < \infty \). The factor \( \frac{2}{s} \exp\left(-\frac{s}{2P}\right) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} M_o(p, q) \), but only for \( p, q > 0 \). \( G(M_o) \) inherits some properties of \( M_o \); \( G(M_o)_{pq}^+ = f(p)g(q) \) is of rank 1 like \( M_o \) and \( V^{-1}M_o^{++} = 0 \) implies that \( V^{-1}G(M_o)^++ = 0 \) \((section 5.5)\).

But \( G(M_o) \) does not commute with \( M_o \), \( \epsilon \) or \( \Phi_o \).

What if \( s = \min(p, q) = 0 \), which is the boundary of the ++ quadrant? From \((C.3)\), when \( s = 0 \), \( \tilde{G}(M_o)_{pq} \propto \int_0^\infty \frac{dy}{y} e^{-y} \), which cannot be prescribed a finite value. \( G(M_o)_{pq} \) is continuous everywhere except along \( s = 0 \). It approaches \( \pm\infty \) as \( s \to 0^\pm \). However, its derivative is discontinuous across the line \( p = q \). It decays exponentially to zero in all directions except along the positive \( p \)- or \( q \)-axes.

\[30\] Recall that \( \tilde{G}(M_o)_{pq} = \frac{1}{2} \int dxdy M_o(x, y) \varphi(x - y)e^{-i(p\varphi - q\omega)} \). For \( s = 0 \), an oscillatory phase is absent. As \( M_o(x, y) \varphi(x - y) \sim y^0 \), the integral diverges. The divergence is absent on a space of finite length or for \( M(x, y) \) decaying faster at infinity.
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C.1. Interaction operator $\bar{G}(V)$ in terms of $U$

Since $V^{\rightarrow-} = 0$ (35) for a tangent to the phase space at the lightest baryon $M_s(t)$, there are some simplifications in $G_V(t)$. Let $s = \max(p, q)$; then $G(V)_{pq} = -\int_{p+q}^{\infty} \frac{d\gamma}{\gamma} V_{ps, q\gamma}$. Due to the positive support of $\bar{M}_{pq}$, $G_V^{\rightarrow-}$ never appears in the eom. In the mostly zero gauge (43)

\[ G(V)_{p=q} = 2i\bar{G}((u\psi^\dagger - \psi u^\dagger + U^{\rightarrow+})_{p=q}, \quad \bar{G}(V)_{p<q} = 2i\bar{G}((u\psi^\dagger - \psi u^\dagger - U^{\rightarrow+})_{p<q}. \]

Of course, $u, \psi, V$ and $U$ are all time dependent. In particular, if $u = 0$ as in section 5.8, we write compactly

\[ G_V^{\rightarrow+} = 2iG_{U^{\rightarrow+}}, \quad G_V^{-} = -2iG_{U^{-}}, \quad G_V^{+} = 2i(G_{U^{-}} - G_{U^{\rightarrow+}}) = 2iG_{U^{-}} + \text{h.c.} \]

Appendix D. Completing proof that $M(t)$ solves equations of motion

In section 4.2 we studied the time evolution of the baryon states $M(t)$ (20). In the chiral limit, the eom is $i\dot{M}_t = \frac{1}{4} M_p + \frac{1}{2} Z(M(t))_{pq}$ (33). We show here that the interaction terms $\propto Z(t)$ identically vanish for our massless states $M(t)$ ($Z$ stands for zero). Recall that

\[ Z(t)_{pq} = \frac{1}{\pi} \left( \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} \right)^2 \bar{M}_{pq} = \frac{4}{p} e^{-(p+q)/2P} \left( \frac{1}{s} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \theta(p) \theta(q). \]

It is seen that $Z(t)_{pq} = Z(0)_{pq} \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2}(p - q)t \right]$. We show here that $Z_{pq} = 0$, so $Z_{pq} = 0$. Now $M_s$ and $G(M_s)$ (appendix C) are real symmetric, so $Z_{1,2,3}(p, q)$ are real antisymmetric. $Z_1$ is simplest

\[ Z_1(p, s) = \pi \left( \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{s} \right) \bar{M}_{ps} = \frac{4}{p} e^{-(p+q)/2P} \left( \frac{1}{s} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \theta(p) \theta(q). \]

$Z_2(p, s) = -G(M)_{ps}[\text{sgn} p - \text{sgn} q]$ vanishes in the $ps = ++, --$ quadrants while

\[ (Z_2)^{p\rightarrow p} = -2G(M)^{p\rightarrow p} \quad \text{and} \quad (Z_2)^{p\rightarrow -p} = 2G(M)^{p\rightarrow -p}. \]

Since $\bar{M}_s$ has positive support, $Z_3^{\rightarrow+} = [G(M_o), M_s]^{\rightarrow+} = 0$. So $Z^{\rightarrow+} = 0$. What about the other quadrants? To proceed, we need $G(M_o)_{pq}$ from (C.5). In the $-+, --, ++$ quadrants

\[ G(M_o)_{pq} = \frac{2}{p} e^{-\frac{(p+q)^2}{2P}} \begin{cases} \frac{1}{p} \theta(p) + \frac{1}{P} \text{Ei}(p/P) & \text{if } p < 0, p < q \\ -\frac{1}{q} \theta(q) + \frac{1}{P} \text{Ei}(q/P) & \text{if } q < 0, q < p. \end{cases} \]

This is enough to evaluate $Z_2^{\rightarrow+}$, (antisymmetry determines $Z_2^{-}$, while $Z_2^{+} = Z_2^{\rightarrow-} = 0$)

\[ Z_2^{\rightarrow+}(p, s) = \frac{4}{p} e^{-(p+q)/2P} \left( \frac{1}{s} e^{iP} - \frac{1}{P} \text{Ei} \left( \frac{s}{P} \right) \right) \quad \text{for } p > 0 > s. \]

This is also adequate to find $Z_3^{\rightarrow+}$ and $Z_3^{++}$. For example,

\[ Z_3^{+\rightarrow+}(p, s) = -\int_0^\infty [dq] \bar{M}_{pq} G(M_o)^{++}_{pq} = -\frac{4}{p} e^{-(p+q)/2P} \left( \frac{1}{s} e^{iP} - \frac{1}{P} \text{Ei} \left( \frac{s}{P} \right) \right). \]

We see that $Z_2^{++} + Z_3^{++} = 0$. As $Z_3^{\rightarrow+} = 0$, we conclude $Z^{++} = 0$. By antisymmetry, $Z^{+\rightarrow} = 0$. 25
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Appendix E. Convergence conditions and inner product on perturbations


From (D.2) and (D.8), \( Z^+ = Z_1^+ + Z_3^+ = 0 \). So \( Z(t) \equiv 0 \) and \( M(t) (20) \) solves the chiral em.

**Appendix F. Hermiticity of a linear operator on Hermitian matrices**

A transformation \( U \mapsto K(U) \) on Hermitian matrices must preserve hermiticity. If \( K(U)_{pq} = \bar{K}_{qp}^* U_{rs} \), this becomes \( \{ \bar{K}_{pq} - \bar{K}_{qp}^* \} U_{rs} = 0 \) \( \forall \) Hermitian \( U \). We cannot conclude \( \bar{K}_{pq} = \bar{K}_{qp}^* \); this is not necessary as \( U_{rs} = U_{sr}^* \) are not independent. We go to a basis for Hermitian matrices

\[
[R_{ab}]_{pq} = \delta_{ap}\delta_{bq} + \delta_{aq}\delta_{bp}, \quad [I_{ab}]_{pq} = i(\delta_{ap}\delta_{bq} - \delta_{aq}\delta_{bp}),
\]

and deduce the necessary and sufficient conditions\(^{31}\) for \( \bar{K} \) to preserve hermiticity of \( U \)

\[
\bar{K}_{pq}^{[rs]} = \bar{K}_{qp}^{[rs]^*} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{K}_{pq}^{[rs]} = -\bar{K}_{qp}^{[rs]^*}.
\]

\(^{31}\) Here, \( K_1^{[rs]} = K_r^{[rs]} + K_s^{[rs]} \) and \( K_1^{[rs]} = K_r^{[rs]} - K_s^{[rs]} \) while \( \bar{?} \) is held fixed.
What does it mean for such a $\hat{K}$ to be formally self-adjoint? The space of Hermitian matrices has the inner-product $(U, U') = \text{tr} U U'$. So self/skew-adjointness is the condition
\[(\hat{K} U, U') = \pm(U, \hat{K} U') \quad \text{or} \quad \text{tr} K (U) U' = \pm\text{tr} U K (U') \forall U, U' \text{ Hermitian.} \tag{F.3}\]

So $\forall$ Hermitian $U, U'$: $\hat{K}^{qp}_{\alpha\beta} U_{q\beta} U'_{r\gamma} = \pm \hat{K}^{r\gamma}_{\alpha\beta} U_{q\beta} U'_{r\gamma}$. A sufficient condition for $\hat{K}$ to be self/skew-adjoint is (anti-)symmetry under left–right and up–down flips of indices: $\hat{K}^{qp}_{sr} = \pm \hat{K}^{rs}_{pq}$. Using (F.1), necessary and sufficient conditions for self/skew-adjointness of $\hat{K}$ are
\[\hat{K}^{[ab]}_{[cd]} = \pm \hat{K}^{[cd]}_{[ab]}, \quad \hat{K}^{(ab)}_{(cd)} = \pm \hat{K}^{(cd)}_{(ab)} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{K}^{(ab)}_{[cd]} = \mp \hat{K}^{[cd]}_{(ab)}. \tag{F.4}\]

**Appendix G. Space of physical states consistent with $u = 0$ ansatz**

The physically motivated (section 5.8) ansatz $u = 0$ led to a Hermitian eigenvalue problem for the baryon spectrum (68). We imposed it so that the equation for perturbations around the g.s. (62) admits oscillatory solutions via variable separation, by removing simultaneous dependence on both $U^{++}$ and $U^{-+}$. $U^{++} : \mathcal{H}_- \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_+$ must be H-S (appendix E) and respect the gauge $\psi^\dagger U^{++} = 0$ and consistency condition (66) for $u(t)$ to remain 0. Here we examine (66). Momentum-dependent phases (67) cancel, leaving
\[e^{i\omega t} U^{++} G^{-+}_M \psi + 2(1 − P\psi)(e^{i\omega t} G^{++}_M \psi − e^{-i\omega t} G^{++}_M \psi) = 0. \tag{G.1}\]

So the coefficients of $e^{\pm i\omega t}$ must vanish, leaving two time-independent vector conditions
\[(A): \{U^{++} G^{++}_M + 2(1^{++} − P\psi)G^{++}_M \} \psi = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (B): (1^{++} − P\psi)G^{++}_M \psi = 0. \tag{G.2}\]
on a whole operator $U^{++}$. Equation (G.2) states that $\psi$ is annihilated by a pair of operators built from $U^{++}$: another type of orthogonality between the ground/excited states. (B) is simpler than (A). Introducing an arbitrary $n \in \mathcal{H}_-$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$,
\[(B): (1^{++} − P\psi)G^{++}_M \psi = 0 \iff G^{++}_M \psi = \lambda \psi + n. \tag{G.3}\]

Let us look for rank-1 solutions $U^{++} = \phi \eta^i$ with $\phi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}_{\pm}$, the sea and antiquark wavefunctions of the meson $V$ bound to the baryon $M$. We solve for $\phi^i(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\phi_{\pm}^i \eta^\dagger)^m(x)$. For $\phi$ to lie in $\mathcal{H}_+$, $\phi^i(x)$ must necessarily be analytic in $\mathbb{C}^-$.

For $\phi$ to lie in $\mathcal{H}_+$, $\phi^i(x)$ must necessarily be analytic in $\mathbb{C}^-$.

We have not yet solved (A) in such generality. Here we give a restricted class of solutions of (A), where each term of (A) is zero. For $U^{++} = \phi \eta^i$ we get two conditions on $\phi$ and $\eta$:
\[(A1) \phi \eta^i G^{-+}_M \psi = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (A2) (1^{++} − P\psi)G^{++}_M \phi^i \psi = 0. \tag{G.4}\]

32 A necessary (but not sufficient) condition for $\psi(p)$ to be a positive momentum function ($\psi \in \mathcal{H}_+$), is for $\psi(x)$ to be the boundary value of a function holomorphic in the upper half of the complex $x$ plane $\mathbb{C}^+$. 33 We have not proved that $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_+$. There may be more conditions on $n, \eta$ to guarantee $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_+$. 27
(A1) ⇒ \eta^{\dagger} G_{M}^{\pm} \psi = 0: the antiquark wavefunction must be \perp to \ G_{M}^{\pm} \psi. \text{\footnote{If } \psi_{0} \text{ is the baryon g.s. (19), } \eta \text{ must be } \perp to \ (G_{M}^{\pm} \psi)_{p=0} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{p}{2\sqrt{2}}} \left[ -\frac{e^{p}}{p} \right] \text{.}} \text{For } P = 1, \bar{\eta}_{p} = p(p + 0.474) e^{\theta_{-}(-p)} \text{ is such a function. (A2) } \leftrightarrow G_{\phi^{0}}^{\pm} \psi = \lambda' \psi + m \text{ for arbitrary } \lambda' \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and } m \in \mathbb{H}_{-}. \text{ (A2) resembles (B), but they are not the same though } G_{U^{\pm}}^{\dagger} = G_{U^{\mp}}^{\dagger}. \text{ We solve (A2) for } \eta^{*}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left( e^{\frac{\lambda'}{\pi}} \right)^{\gamma}}}. \text{ As before, there are conditions for this } \eta \text{ to lie in } \mathbb{H}_{-.} \text{. But it is possible that (A1) and (A2) form too small a class of solutions of (A). We have not yet combined (A) and (B) to find } U^{\pm} \text{ obeying (G.2). We hope to remedy this in the future.}
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\text{\footnote{If } \psi_{0} \text{ is the baryon g.s. (19), } \eta \text{ must be } \perp to \ (G_{M}^{\pm} \psi)_{p=0} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{p}{2\sqrt{2}}} \left[ -\frac{e^{p}}{p} \right] \text{.} \text{ and exponentially decays monotonically from } \infty \text{ to } 0 \text{ as } p \text{ goes from } 0 \text{ to } -\infty. \text{ (G}_{M}^{\pm} \psi)_{p} \text{ is positive and } (G_{M}^{\pm} \psi)_{p} \sim \frac{1}{p} \sqrt{2\pi \pi P} \text{ as } p \rightarrow 0^{-}. \text{ To avoid IR divergences, } \bar{\eta}(p) \sim (-p)^{\gamma} \text{ for some } \gamma > 0 \text{ as } p \rightarrow 0^{-}.}