

THE PION WAVE FUNCTION AND QCD SUM RULES WITH NONLOCAL CONDENSATES ¹

CEBAF

The Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility
Theory Group Preprint Series

Additional copies are available from the authors.

The Southeastern Universities Research Association (SURA) operates the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility for the United States Department of Energy under contract DE-AC05-84ER40150

S.V. MIKHAILOV

Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, JINR, Dubna, USSR
and

Rostov State University, Rostov on Don, USSR

A.V. RADYUSHKIN

Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility,
Newport News, VA 23606, USA

and

Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, JINR, Dubna, USSR

Abstract,

The QCD sum rule calculation of the pion wave function by Chernyak and Zhitnitsky is implicitly assuming that the correlation length of vacuum fluctuations is large compared to the typical hadronic scale $\sim 1/m_\pi$, so that one can substitute the original nonlocal objects like $\langle \bar{q}(0)q(z) \rangle$ by constant $\langle \bar{q}(0)q(0) \rangle$ -type values. We outline a formalism enabling one to work directly with the nonlocal condensates, and construct a modified sum rule for the moments $\langle \xi^N \rangle$ of the pion wave function. The results are rather sensitive to the value of the parameter $\lambda_0^2 = \langle \bar{q}D^2q \rangle / \langle \bar{q}q \rangle$ specifying the average virtuality of the vacuum quarks. Varying it from the most popular value $\lambda_0^2 = 0.4 \text{ GeV}^2$ up to the value $\lambda_0^2 = 1.2 \text{ GeV}^2$ suggested by the instanton liquid model, we obtain $\langle \xi^2 \rangle = 0.25 - 0.20$, to be compared to the CZ value $\langle \xi^2 \rangle = 0.43$ obtained with $\lambda_0^2 = 0$.

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States government. Neither the United States nor the United States Department of Energy, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, mark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or any agency thereof.

¹This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC05-84ER40150

1 *Introductory remarks.* The standard trick incorporated in all the approaches based on the asymptotic freedom of QCD and factorization is the introduction of some phenomenological functions and/or numbers accumulating necessary information about nonperturbative long-distance dynamics of the theory. The most important examples are:

- parton distribution functions $f_{p/H}(\tau)$ used in the perturbative QCD approaches to hard inclusive processes [1],
- hadronic wave functions $\varphi_n(x), \varphi_N(x_1, x_2, x_3)$, etc., which naturally emerge in the asymptotic QCD analyses of hard exclusive processes [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]
- quark and gluon condensates $\langle \bar{q}(0)q(0) \rangle, \langle G(0)G(0) \rangle$, the basic parameters of the QCD sum rule approach [7], describing the nonperturbative nature of the QCD vacuum.

The hope is that in some future approach they all will be calculated from the first principles of QCD without any model and/or *ad hoc* assumptions. A less ambitious program is to calculate the hadronic functions $f(x), \varphi(\{x\})$ using the QCD sum rules [7], with only the condensate values treated as input parameters.

While the parton distribution functions can be extracted rather reliably from experimental data, the situation with the hadronic wave functions is much more complicated. Normally, they appear only in an integrated form. Furthermore, the very applicability of the perturbative QCD formulae at accessible energies is questionable [8, 9]. In this situation, the QCD sum rule approach and lattice calculations are the only reliable way to get information about the form of the hadronic wave functions. In particular, the most popular set of hadronic wave functions [10], due to Chernyak, A. Zhitnitsky and I. Zhitnitsky (CZ), was produced with the help of QCD sum rules.

One should remember, however, that the operator product expansion, the starting point of any QCD sum rule analysis, has different forms depending on the situation. Presence of a large (or small) extra parameter might essentially modify the expansion. The most well studied example is the modification of the OPE for the form factors at small momentum transfer q [11, 12]. In that case a simple-minded extrapolation from the region of moderately large q is completely unjustified: one cannot reproduce in that way even the normalization conditions like $F_\pi(0) = 1$. Our goal in the present paper is to show that calculating the $N \geq 2$ moments of the pion wave function one faces another situation requiring a modification of the underlying expansion. We construct a modified sum rule and show that, for a standard choice of the condensate values, it produces the pion wave function that strongly differs from the CZ form.

2. *Pion wave function and QCD sum rules: criticism of the CZ-approach.* The first application of the QCD sum rules to the pion wave function $\varphi_\pi(x)$ was the calculation of its zero moment, i.e., the pion decay constant f_π , in the pioneering SVZ paper [7]. It was calculated there within 5% accuracy. This success inspired Chernyak and A. Zhitnitsky [13] to calculate the whole pion WF by reconstructing it from the next moments $\langle \xi^N \rangle$ (where $\xi = 2x - 1$). They extracted $\langle \xi^2 \rangle$ and $\langle \xi^4 \rangle$ from the relevant SR precisely in the same way

as the f_π value. However, the nonperturbative terms in their sum rule

$$f_\pi^2 \langle \xi^N \rangle = \frac{M^2}{4\pi^2} \frac{3}{(N+1)(N+3)} (1 - e^{-s_0/M^2}) + \frac{\alpha_s \langle GG \rangle}{12\pi M^2} + \frac{16\pi\alpha_s \langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2}{81 M^4} (11 + 4N) \quad (1)$$

have a completely different N -dependence compared to the perturbative one and, *a priori*, it is not clear whether a straightforward use of the $N = 0$ technology can be justified for higher N . The scale determining the magnitude of all the hadronic parameters including s_0 (the "continuum threshold" [7]) is eventually settled by the ratios of the condensate contributions to the perturbative term. If the condensate contributions in the CZ sum rule (1) would have the same N -behavior as the perturbative term, then the N -dependence of $\langle \xi^N \rangle$ would be determined by the overall factor $3/(N+1)(N+3)$ and the resulting wave function $\varphi(x)$ would coincide with the "asymptotic" form [4, 6]

$$\varphi_\pi^{**}(x) = 6f_\pi x(1-x). \quad (2)$$

However, the ratios of the $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$ and $\langle GG \rangle$ -corrections to the perturbative term in eq (1) are growing functions of N . In particular, in the $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$ case, the above mentioned ratio for $N = 2$ is by factor 95/11 larger than that in the $N = 0$ case. For $N = 4$ the enhancement factor equals 315/11. As a result, the effective vacuum scales of (mass)² dimension are by factors $(95/11)^{1/2} \approx 2.1$ and $(315/11)^{1/2} \approx 3.1$ larger than that for the $N = 0$ case. Approximately the same factors $(5^{1/2} \approx 2.2$ and $(35/3)^{1/2} \approx 3.4$) one obtains also for the gluon condensate term. Hence, the parameters $s_0^{(N)}$ and the combinations $f_\pi^2 \langle \xi^N \rangle$ straightforwardly extracted from the SR (1) must be larger than the "asymptotic" values $s_0^{N=0} \approx 0.75(\Lambda^2)^2$ and $f_\pi^2 \langle \xi^N \rangle^* = 3f_\pi^2/(N+1)(N+3)$ just by the factors 2 (for $N = 2$) and 3 (for $N = 4$). These are just the results obtained in Ref [13].

To better understand the structure of the relevant power series it is instructive to rewrite the SR for the pion wave function $\varphi_\pi(x)$ itself [14]:

$$f_\pi^2 \varphi_\pi(x) = \frac{M^2}{4\pi^2} (1 - e^{-s_0/M^2}) \varphi_\pi^{**}(x) + \frac{\alpha_s \langle GG \rangle}{24\pi M^2} [\delta(x) + \delta(1-x)] + \frac{8\pi\alpha_s \langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2}{81 M^4} \{11[\delta(x) + \delta(1-x)] + 2[\delta'(x) + \delta'(1-x)]\}. \quad (3)$$

The $O(1)$ and $O(N)$ terms in eq. (1) correspond to the $\delta(x)$ and $\delta'(x)$ -terms in eq (3). In its turn, presence of the $\delta(x)$ -functions in eq (3) is evidently indicating that the vacuum fields are treated as carrying zero fraction of the pion momentum. This can be easily understood by observing that the operator product expansion (underlying eqs (1),(3)) is, in fact, a power series expansion over small momenta k of vacuum quarks and gluons. Retaining only the $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$ and $\langle GG \rangle$ -terms (like in eqs (1),(3)) is just equivalent to the assumption that k is not simply small but exactly equals zero.

However, it is much more reasonable to expect that the vacuum quanta have a smooth distribution with a finite width μ . In configuration space, this means that vacuum fluctuations have a finite correlation length of the order of $1/\mu$, so that the two-point condensates

like $\langle \bar{q}(0)q(z) \rangle$ die away for $|z|$ large compared to $1/\mu$. Of course, one can always expand $\langle \bar{q}(0)q(z) \rangle$ in powers of z starting with the constant term $\langle \bar{q}(0)q(0) \rangle$ that produces eventually the $\delta(z)$ -term. The question is, whether it is reasonable to do this, since the expansion resulting from such a Taylor series will not necessarily behave well.

According to the standard estimate [15], the average virtuality of the vacuum quarks

$$\lambda_q^2 \equiv \langle \bar{q} D^2 q \rangle / \langle \bar{q} q \rangle = 0.4 \pm 0.1 \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (4)$$

(here D is the covariant derivative) is not small compared to the relevant hadronic scale

$$s_0^{N=0} \approx 4\pi^2 f_\pi^2 = 0.7 \text{ GeV}^2.$$

Even a larger value (by factor of 3) was obtained for λ_q^2 in the instanton liquid model by Shuryak [16]. Thus, the correlation length of vacuum fluctuations is not much larger than the hadronic size, and the constant-field approximation for the vacuum fields might not work, i.e., the higher power corrections might well ruin the conclusions derived from the SR (1).

In what follows, we outline a formalism (its preliminary version can be found in ref.[17]) that enables one to take into account the effects due to the k (or x) distribution of vacuum fluctuations. To this end we note that in all standard calculations of the power corrections via the OPE one starts with some *nonlocal condensates* like $\langle \bar{q}(0)q(z) \rangle$, $\langle \bar{q}(0)\gamma A(y)q(z) \rangle$, etc. (such objects are discussed for almost 10 years now, see, e.g., [18]), which are subsequently expanded over the local condensates (LC) $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$, $\langle \bar{q} D^2 q \rangle$, etc. Our strategy is to avoid such an expansion and deal directly with the nonlocal condensates (NLC).

3 Nonlocal condensates. The simplest bilocal condensate $M(z) \equiv \langle \bar{q}(0)q(z) \rangle$ is just the nonperturbative part of the quark propagator. So, it is convenient to parameterize it a la the well-known α -representation for a propagator:

$$\langle \bar{q}(0)q(z) \rangle = \langle \bar{q}(0)q(0) \rangle \int_0^\infty e^{\nu z^2/4} f_S(\nu) d\nu \quad (5)$$

Of course, due to the gauge invariance, the quark fields $q(z)$ are always accompanied by an appropriate Wilson line operator. But here and in the following we take quark and gluon fields in the Fock-Schwinger gauge $x^\mu A_\mu(z) = 0$ where the path-ordered exponentials are equal to 1 and the covariant derivatives are converted into the ordinary ones. Another comment concerning eq.(5) is that deriving a QCD sum rule one can always perform the Wick rotation $x_0 \rightarrow ix_0$ and treat all the coordinates as Euclidean, with $z^2 < 0$.

The functions like $f_S(\nu)$ describe the distribution of the vacuum fields in virtuality. Note, that the moments of $f_S(\nu)$ are proportional to the vacuum matrix elements of the local operators

$$\langle \bar{q}(0)q(0) \rangle \int_0^\infty f_S(\nu) \nu^N d\nu \sim \frac{1}{(N+1)!} \langle \bar{q}(0)(D^2)^N q(0) \rangle \quad (6)$$

with increasing number of derivatives. By analogy with the hadronic distribution functions, one can call $f(\nu)$ the "vacuum distribution functions".

The expansion of the condensate $M(z^2)$ over the local condensates corresponds to that of the distribution function $f_S(\nu)$ over the $\delta^{(n)}$ -functions:

$$f_S(\nu) = \delta(\nu) - L_S \delta'(\nu) + \dots \quad (7)$$

with L_S fixed just by the average virtuality of the vacuum quarks (eq (4)): $L_S = \lambda_q^2/2$.

There is another (vector) bilocal condensate $M_\mu \equiv \langle \bar{q}(0)\gamma_\mu q(z) \rangle$, containing a γ -matrix

$$\langle \bar{q}(0)\gamma_\mu q(z) \rangle = i z_\mu A \int_0^\infty e^{\nu z^2/4} f_V(\nu) d\nu \quad (8)$$

where $A = \frac{1}{8} \pi \alpha_s \langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2$. The zeroth moment of $f_V(\nu)$ is zero in the limit of massless quarks, and that is why the $\delta^{(n)}$ -expansion for $f_V(\nu)$ starts with the $\delta'(\nu)$ term:

$$f_V(\nu) = \delta'(\nu) - L_V \delta''(\nu) + \dots \quad (9)$$

with the parameter L_V determined by the magnitude of the condensates of dimension 8

For the gluonic nonlocal condensate, in the Fock-Schwinger gauge, one has

$$\langle A_\mu^a(z) A_\nu^b(y) \rangle = \delta^{ab} (y_\mu z_\nu - g_{\mu\nu}(zy)) \frac{\langle GG \rangle}{384} M_G((z-y)^2, z^2, y^2) + \dots \quad (10)$$

where the M_G -function depends not only on the interval $(z-y)^2$, but also on z^2 and y^2 . However, since the coefficients in front of z^2 and y^2 in the expansion

$$M_G = 1 - \frac{\langle GD^2G \rangle - \frac{3}{2}\langle J^2 \rangle}{18\langle GG \rangle} \left\{ (y-z)^2 + \frac{y^2+z^2}{8} \right\} + \dots \quad (11)$$

are rather small, one can start with the approximation

$$M_G(z^2, y^2, (z-y)^2) \simeq \int_0^\infty e^{\nu(z-y)^2/4} f_G(\nu) d\nu \quad (12)$$

introducing the distribution function $f_G(\nu)$.

There are three simplest trilocal quark-gluon condensates

$$M_{\mu\nu}(y, z) \equiv \langle \bar{q}(0)\gamma_\nu A_\mu(y)q(z) \rangle = (z_\mu y_\nu - g_{\mu\nu}(zy)) M_1 + (y_\mu y_\nu - g_{\mu\nu}y^2) M_2 \quad (13)$$

$$\tilde{M}_{\mu\nu}(y, z) \equiv \langle \bar{q}(0)\gamma_\nu \gamma_5 A_\mu(y)q(z) \rangle = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} y^\rho z^\sigma M_3 + \dots \quad (14)$$

The functions M_{1-3} can be parameterized by the triple integral representation:

$$M_i(z^2, y^2, (z-y)^2) = A_i \int_0^\infty e^{\nu_1 z^2/4 + \nu_2 y^2/4 + \nu_3 (z-y)^2/4} f_i(\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3) d\nu_1 d\nu_2 d\nu_3 \quad (15)$$

where $A_i = \{-\frac{3}{2}A, 2A, \frac{3}{2}A\}$. The limiting case of the standard local condensates (corresponding to $\lambda_q^2 \rightarrow 0$) is obtained by the substitution $f_i(\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3) \rightarrow \delta(\nu_1)\delta(\nu_2)\delta(\nu_3)$

Incorporating the nonlocal condensates as described above, one arrives at a modified diagram technique, with some lines and vertices being the ordinary perturbative ones, and

some corresponding to the nonlocal condensates. Increasing the number of loops, one should consider the condensates containing more and more fields. We restrict our analysis here by the two-loop level. Then, in addition to those already listed, one encounters the four-quark condensate. To simplify the calculation, we apply the vacuum dominance hypothesis and factorize it into a product of two bilocal ones.

4 *Sum rule.* Using the representations (4)-(7), and calculating the coefficient functions we obtain a modified QCD sum rule, with the δ -functions of eq (3) substituted by the functionals $\delta\Phi_i(x)$ of 6 vacuum distribution functions:

$$f_2^2\varphi_*(x) = \frac{M^2}{4\pi^2}(1 - e^{-x/M^2})\Phi^{pert}(x) + \{4\bar{x}f_V(xM^2) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \delta\Phi_i(x) + \delta\Phi_G(x)\} + (x \rightarrow \bar{x}) \quad (16)$$

where $\bar{x} = 1 - x$, M^2 is the Borel parameter and

$$\Phi^{pert}(x) = 6x\bar{x}\{1 + C_F\frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}[5 - \frac{\pi^2}{3} + \log^2(\frac{\bar{x}}{x})]\}$$

is the "perturbative" contribution (free quark loop plus $O(\alpha_s)$ radiative corrections).

The simplest contribution, proportional to the f_V -function taken at $\nu = xM^2$, is displayed explicitly in eq.(16). Other contributions have a more involved form (see ref.[17]).

The most intriguing conclusion to be drawn from eq.(16) is that $\varphi_*(x)$, the longitudinal momentum distribution of quarks inside the pion, is directly related to $f(\nu)$, the virtuality distribution of quarks and gluons in the vacuum. Therefore, it is very important to know the form of the latter to estimate the moments $\langle\xi^N\rangle_*$ for $N > 0$.

5 *Modelling $f(\nu)$.* To obtain the original SR (3), one should take the first term of the $S^{(N)}$ -expansion for the $f(\nu)$'s. It should be understood that this approximation is really the simplest model for the distribution functions $f(\nu)$. However, such a model (used, as a matter of fact, by CZ [13]) is evidently too crude if the L_i -parameters characterizing the width of $f_i(\nu)$ are comparable in magnitude with the relevant hadronic scale. In this situation, instead of the standard expansion over the local condensates we propose to use an expansion in which the (relatively) large average virtuality of the vacuum fields is taken into account just in the first term. For the functions $M(z^2)$ having a finite width of an order of μ^2 , it is much more preferable to use the expansion of $f(\nu)$ over $\delta^{(n)}(\nu - \mu^2)$. The first term of this expansion

$$M(z^2) = M(0)\{e^{z^2\mu^2/4} + \dots\} \quad (17)$$

takes into account the main effect caused by the finite width of the function $M(z^2)$, while subsequent terms describe effects due to the deviation of its form from the Gaussian one.

To construct the Gaussian ansatz one should know the second term of the z^2 -expansion of the relevant nonlocal condensates, e.g., incorporating eq.(4) we take $f_2(\nu) = \delta(\nu - \lambda_2^2/2)$.

For M_0 , the situation is more complicated: L_V is determined by 5 different LC, the values of which are poorly known. The simplest model is to assume that all the nonlocal distributions have the same width. So, we take $f_V^{(1)}(\nu) = \delta(\nu - \lambda_4^2/2)$. Of course, it is more reasonable to expect that the shift parameters L_i , though all of the same order of magnitude,

are still numerically different. Another model for L_V is to extract the part proportional to $\langle\bar{q}D^2q\rangle\langle\bar{q}q\rangle$ from all the relevant LC of dimension 8 and neglect the remaining contributions. This gives the value $L_V = \frac{\lambda_4^2}{20}$, rather close to the naive estimate.

In a similar way we construct the model for the trilocal functions:

$$f_i(\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3) = A_i\delta(\nu_1 - L_i^{(1)})\delta(\nu_2 - L_i^{(2)})\delta(\nu_3 - L_i^{(3)}) \quad (18)$$

One can try to determine $L_i^{(j)}$'s from the expansion of the relevant NLC by retaining only the $\langle\bar{q}D^2q\rangle\langle\bar{q}q\rangle$ part of the coefficients in front of z^2, y^2 or $(z-y)^2$, respectively. This gives $L_1' = \{\frac{23}{100}, -\frac{1}{14}, \frac{2}{3}\}\lambda_4^2$ for the f_1 -function, $L_2' = \{\frac{1}{10}, \frac{11}{100}, \frac{31}{10}\}\lambda_4^2$ for the f_2 -function and $L_3' = \{-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{19}{12}, \frac{1}{8}\}\lambda_4^2$ for the f_3 -function [17]. According to these estimates, the trilocal condensates in some directions decrease much slower than in the others, and sometimes even increase when the distance between the quarks increases, which is completely unrealistic. Hence, it is not safe to neglect other LC estimating the width parameters and, in the absence of a reliable model of the QCD vacuum, we simply assume that the trilocals decrease at the same rate in all directions and take $L_i^{(j)} = \lambda_4^2/2$.

To model the nonlocality effects for the gluonic contribution, we assume, by analogy with the quark case, that the $\delta(x)$ terms of the $O(\langle GG\rangle)$ contribution (eq (3)) should be substituted by $\delta(x - L_G/M^2)$ in eq.(16), with $L_G = \frac{2}{3}\lambda_4^2$, as suggested by eq.(11).

6 *Numerical estimates.* Within the simplified version of our Gaussian ("delta-function") model for the nonlocal condensates, the pion wave function sum rule has the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} f_2^2\varphi_*(x) = & \frac{M^2}{4\pi^2}(1 - e^{-x/M^2})\Phi^{pert}(x) + \frac{1}{24\pi}\alpha_s\langle GG\rangle\delta(x - \frac{2}{9}\Delta) + \\ & + \frac{8}{81M^4}\pi\alpha_s\langle\bar{q}q\rangle^2\left\{\bar{x}\delta'(x - \Delta) + 18\frac{\theta(x < \Delta)}{\Delta^2(1 - \Delta)}\bar{x}(x + (\Delta - x)\log(\bar{x})) + \right. \\ & + \frac{3}{1 - \Delta}\left[\frac{\delta(x - \Delta) - \delta(x - 2\Delta)}{\Delta} - (1 - \Delta)\delta(x - \Delta) + \frac{2}{3}(1 - 2\Delta)\frac{(2 + \Delta)}{\Delta}\delta(x - 2\Delta)\right] - \\ & \left. - 2\bar{x}\frac{\theta(\Delta < x < 2\Delta)}{\Delta}\left[\frac{3x}{1 - \Delta} + \frac{2}{\Delta}\left(3 - \frac{\Delta + 2\bar{x}}{1 - \Delta}\right)\right]\right\} + \\ & + (x \rightarrow \bar{x}) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $\Delta = \lambda_4^2/2M^2$.

Main observation is that in place of the $\delta(x)$ -type contributions we have now either the δ -functions with the shifted arguments or the functions that are smooth at $x = 0$. In both cases, the moments of such terms decrease as N increases. Hence, for sufficiently large values of λ_4 , there is no dramatic increase in the ratios of the condensate contributions to the perturbative term. Taking $\lambda_4^2 = 0.4 \text{ GeV}^2$ [15], we obtain for the lowest moments

$$\langle\xi^2\rangle = 0.25 \quad \langle\xi^4\rangle = 0.12 \quad \langle\xi^6\rangle = 0.07. \quad (20)$$

These values do not differ strongly from those corresponding to the asymptotic wave function. Therefore, it is not surprising that the model WF

$$\varphi_n^{mod,1}(x) = \frac{8}{\pi} f_* \sqrt{x(1-x)}, \quad \varphi_n^{mod,2}(x) = 6f_* x(1-x) \left(1 + \frac{8}{9}(1-5x(1-x))\right) \quad (21)$$

reproducing these values (20), are also close to the asymptotic wave function. The second model corresponds to the expansion over the Gegenbauer polynomials $C_n^{3/2}(\xi)$ (the eigenfunctions of the evolution equation [4, 6]).

Thus, the moments of the pion WF are rather sensitive to the functional form of the nonlocal condensates. The faster the NLC decrease with the distance, the faster is the decrease with N of the relevant contribution into the (ξ^N) sum rule. Of course, in the $\lambda_q \rightarrow 0$ limit, eq.(19) reduces to the original CZ sum rule (3),(1), and one obtains large CZ values for the moments. With $\lambda_q^2 = 0.4 \text{ GeV}^2$, the condensate terms still decrease more slowly with N than the perturbative contribution, and the (ξ^N) -values (20) are still larger than $(\xi^N)^{as}$. To get the asymptotic value for (ξ^2) , one should take $\lambda_q^2 = 1.2 \text{ GeV}^2$. Surprisingly enough, it is this huge value of λ_q^2 that is favoured by a calculation within a rather realistic QCD vacuum model developed by Shuryak [16]. The recent lattice result $(\xi^2) = 0.11$ [19], is still rather far from these values, but the disagreement might be essentially reduced by a renormalization factor (of order of 1.5) not included into the quoted lattice value.

Our results depend on the models we accepted for the nonlocal condensates. However, the sum rule is dominated by a single contribution (the second term in the braces in eq.(19)) which is due to the four-quark condensate $(\bar{q}(0)q(x)\bar{q}(y)q(z))$, factorized via the vacuum dominance hypothesis to the product of the simplest $(\bar{q}(0)q(z))$ -type condensates. This factorization amounts to neglecting the dependence on the distance between the two $\bar{q}q$ pairs. If one takes this dependence into account, then the dominant term of eq.(19) will produce the contributions that will faster decrease with N , and the resulting (ξ^N) will be even farther from the CZ values.

7 Conclusions. Our basic idea in the present paper is that the nonperturbative information about the QCD vacuum structure should be accumulated in the functions describing the momentum distribution of the vacuum quark and gluonic fields. For the vacuum, these functions play the role analogous to that of the parton distributions in the case of the hadrons. Ideally, the vacuum distribution functions should be calculated from the theory of the QCD vacuum. In the absence of such a theory, one can incorporate the fact that the same vacuum distribution functions appear in different NLC-modified QCD sum rules for hadronic wave functions, parton distribution functions, hadronic form factors etc. This opens a possibility of finding the vacuum distribution functions (universal for all the hadrons) from the experimentally known hadronic functions.

8 Acknowledgement. We are most grateful to I.I. Balitsky, V.L. Chernyak, A.V. Efremov, A.G. Grozin, B.L. Ioffe, V.A. Nesterenko, M.A. Shifman and I.R. Zhitnitsky for stimulating discussions. One of us (A.R.) is most grateful to N. Isgur for the warm hospitality at CEBAF.

References

- [1] R.P. Feynman, *The Photon-Hadron Interactions*, W.A. Benjamin, Inc., (1972)
- [2] V.L. Chernyak and A.R. Zhitnitsky, *JETP Letters*, 25 (1977) 510; V.L. Chernyak, A.R. Zhitnitsky and V.G. Serbo, *JETP Letters* 26, (1977) 594
- [3] A.V. Radyushkin, *JINR preprint P2-10717*, Dubna (1977)
- [4] A.V. Efremov and A.V. Radyushkin, *Phys. Lett.*, 94B (1980) 245
- [5] D.R. Jackson, Thesis, CALTECH (1977); G.R. Farrar and D.R. Jackson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 43 (1979) 246
- [6] S.J. Brodsky and G.P. Lepage, *Phys. Lett.*, 87B (1979) 359
- [7] M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys.*, B147 (1979) 385-419
- [8] A.V. Radyushkin, *Acta Physica Polonica*, B15 (1984) 403; preprint CEBAF-TH-91-07 (1991)
- [9] N. Isgur and C.H. Llewellyn Smith, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 52 (1984) 1080; *Phys. Lett.*, 217B (1989) 535
- [10] V.L. Chernyak and A.R. Zhitnitsky, *Phys. Reports*, 112 (1984) 173
- [11] B.L. Ioffe and A.V. Smilga, *Nucl. Phys.*, B232 (1984) 109
- [12] V.A. Nesterenko and A.V. Radyushkin, *JETP Lett.*, 39 (1984) 707
- [13] V.L. Chernyak and A.R. Zhitnitsky, *Nucl. Phys.*, B201 (1982) 492; B214 (1983) 547(E)
- [14] V.N. Baier and A.G. Grozin, *Novosibirsk INP preprint 82-92* (1982)
- [15] V.M. Belyaev and B.L. Ioffe, *ZhETF* 83 (1982) 876; A.A. Ovchinnikov and A.A. Pivovarov, *Yad. Fiz.* 48 (1988) 1135
- [16] E.V. Shuryak, *Nucl. Phys.*, B328 (1989) 85
- [17] S.V. Mikhailov and A.V. Radyushkin, *ZhETF Pis'ma*, 43 (1986) 551; *Yad. Fiz.* 49 (1988) 794
- [18] E.V. Shuryak, *Nucl. Phys.* B203 (1982) 116; V.N. Baier and Yu.F. Pinelis, *INP preprint 81-141*(Novosibirsk); D. Gromes, *Phys. Lett.* B115 (1982) 482; M. Campostrini, A. Di Giacomo and G. Mussardo, *Z. Phys.* C25 (1984) 173
- [19] D. Daniel, R. Gupta and D.G. Richards, *Phys. Rev.* D43 (1991) 3715