

Solvable Models Of Infrared Gupta-Bleuler Quantum Electrodynamics

Simone Zerella*

Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università, I-56126 Pisa, Italy

Abstract

Hamiltonian models based on two different infrared approximations are studied in order to obtain an explicit comparison with the standard analysis of the infrared contributions, occurring in the relativistically covariant perturbative formulation of Quantum Electrodynamics.

Möller operators, preserving respectively the Hilbert scalar product, for the Coulomb-gauge models, and an indefinite metric, for the models formulated in Feynman's gauge, are obtained in the presence of an infrared cutoff, after the removal of an adiabatic switching and with the aid of a suitable mass renormalization.

In the presence of a dipole approximation, spurious contributions to the infrared factors are shown to necessarily arise in Feynman's gauge, with respect both to the Coulomb-gauge model and to the amplitudes of Quantum Electrodynamics, and the connection of this result with a recent work on the Gupta-Bleuler formulation of non-relativistic models is discussed. It is finally proven that by dropping the dipole approximation and adopting an expansion around a fixed charged particle four-momentum, first introduced and employed in the study of the infrared problem by Bloch and Nordsieck, the infrared diagrammatic is fully reproduced and spurious low-energy effects are avoided.

Key words: quantum electrodynamics; infrared problem; local and covariant gauge; indefinite metric; solvable models

*email address:simone.zerella@gmail.com

Introduction

In Quantum Electrodynamics (QED), the description of states at asymptotic times and the derivation of the scattering matrix are still open issues; it is customary to refer to such questions as the infrared (IR) problem.

At the perturbative level, transition amplitudes between states containing a finite number of photons are ill-defined, since radiative corrections due to soft photons typically exhibit logarithmic divergences [Wei95, JR76]. As a consequence, in contrast with ordinary quantum field theories, Dyson's S -matrix [Dys49, Dys51] is defined only in the presence of a low-energy cutoff and the problem of a proper identification of asymptotic states arises.

As early as 1937, in their pioneering paper on the subject [BN37], Bloch and Nordsieck proved that IR singularities arise in the perturbative expansion because of basic physical facts; they argued that, on the basis of the correspondence principle, one has to expect a vanishing probability for the emission of a finite number of photons in any collision process involving electrically charged particles.

Exponentiation of the low-energy photon contributions was conjectured by Schwinger [Sch49] and then proved by Yennie, Frautschi and Suura (YFS) in [YFS61] within the framework of the local and covariant Gupta-Bleuler formulation [Gup50, Ble50] of QED . This led to a pragmatic approach to circumvent the soft-photon divergences; one introduces an IR cutoff, sums the transition rates over all final photon states with energy below the threshold of the photon detectors and removes the regularization in the resulting expression. The finiteness of the so-obtained inclusive cross-sections is ensured by cancellations, at each order in perturbation theory, between the virtual IR divergences and those due to soft-photon emission [Wei95, JR76].

It is important to remark that such a recipe somehow avoids to take into account the properties arising in the characterization of physical charged states, such as the spontaneous breaking of the Lorentz boosts in the charged superselection sectors and the absence of a sharp eigenvalue for the mass operator of an electrically charged particle. These features were established in past decades through several model-independent investigations [SW74, FPS74, FPS77, FMS79a, FMS79b, Buc82, Buc86], mostly within the algebraic approach to quantum field theory and independently of the perturbative-theoretic framework.

Quite generally, since its early days perturbation theory has been mostly applied to extract physical predictions (notable exceptions are [Sym71, MS83, Steinb]) and its relation with the above-mentioned structural (non-perturbative) properties of QED is still unclear; in particular, local and covariant quantizations are incompatible with positivity [St67] and are only consistent with a generalization of the Wightman axioms.

The above discussion provides motivations to understand and possibly fill the gap that separates the Feynman-Dyson formulation from a collision theory in which the structural aspects of the infrared problem are taken into account; such an issue is important both conceptually and practically, since perturbation theory remains the only source of detailed information on QED and its local and covariant version is the best controlled one regarding the renormalization procedure.

As a starting point to address this issue, in the present paper we seek for a mathematical formalization of the hypotheses underlying the local and covariant treatment of the IR divergences occurring in QED . In particular, we compare the infrared amplitudes of the standard analysis with those obtained from solvable hamiltonian models based on two different approximations, which might seem to be equally suited, from a physical point of view, for an investigation of low-energy photon effects; the electric dipole approximation and the expansion around a fixed (asymptotic) charged particle four-momentum.

Non-relativistic Coulomb-gauge models with a dipole approximation have been studied rigorously in [Bla69, Ara83] in order to obtain non-perturbative constructions, in particular of asymptotic electromagnetic fields and of one-particle charged states. More recently [HS09], asymptotic e.m. fields and a scattering operator have been constructed within the Gupta-Bleuler formulation of non-relativistic QED , still in the presence of a dipole approximation, by addressing the questions connected with the existence and uniqueness of the dynamics of Heisenberg operators in the presence of an indefinite metric.

The problem of the comparison of such models with the perturbative structures and results has however not been addressed explicitly, thus leaving the validity of perturbative procedures in a dubious condition. In addition, as we shall see, the Gupta-Bleuler formulation of non-relativistic models with a dipole approximation suffers from substantial limitations in the comparison with the Feynman-Dyson expansion.

Our main result [PhDth] is that (only) within hamiltonian models of the “four-vector Bloch-Nordsieck type” the infrared diagrammatic of the local and covariant expansion of *QED* is reproduced by Möller operators, obtained as weak limits in the presence of a low-energy regularization and a suitable mass counterterm, after the removal of an adiabatic switching. In contrast, the dipole approximation prevents to recover fundamental features of the infrared contributions to Feynman’s amplitudes; basically, its effects on current conservation, also recognized and studied in [HS09], give rise to substantial additional contributions to the Möller operators, resulting in particular in a discrepancy by a factor $3/2$ with respect to the Coulomb-gauge result (and to covariant perturbation theory in *QED*), in the exponential factors describing soft-photon effects.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 1 is devoted to the analysis of the Pauli-Fierz model [FP38], a non-relativistic model formulated in the Coulomb gauge and based on the dipole approximation, taking Blanchard’s treatment [Bla69] as a starting point. We prove the existence and uniqueness of the dynamics and obtain Möller operators as strong limits of the corresponding evolution operator in the interaction representation, for a fixed value of an infrared cutoff.

In order to set up a comparison with the perturbative procedures and results we introduce a four-vector model, retaining the approximations of the Pauli-Fierz Hamiltonian. Within a simpler setting with respect to [HS09], we define the dynamics of the model and prove its uniqueness; then we construct Möller operators as weak asymptotic limits of the evolution operator (in the interaction representation) for a fixed infrared cutoff, and discuss the spurious effects induced by the dipole approximation.

In Section 2 we introduce models based on an expansion already implicit in [BN37], hereafter referred to as Bloch-Nordsieck (*BN*) models. We will first consider a model formulated in the Coulomb gauge and then its four-vector version. The existence and uniqueness of the dynamics of the models and the control of the asymptotic limits of the evolution operators are achieved within the same framework of Section 1. We show that the infrared amplitudes of *QED* are reproduced by means of Möller operators and that the contributions arising in the presence of the dipole approximation disappear.

We conclude the paper with an outlook for future research.

Notations

The metric $g^{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$ of Minkowski space is adopted and natural units are used ($\hbar = c = 1$). A four-vector is indicated with v^μ or simply with v , while the symbol \mathbf{v} denotes a three-vector. We use the symbol $c \cdot d$ for the indefinite inner product between four-vectors c and d .

The norm of a vector $\phi \in L^2$ is indicated by $\|\phi\|_2$, the Hilbert scalar product by (\cdot, \cdot) and indefinite inner products by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$.

The Hilbert-space adjoint of an operator A is denoted by A^* , while the symbol B^\dagger stands for the hermitian conjugate, with respect to the indefinite inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, of an operator B defined on an indefinite-metric space.

We denote by \mathcal{F} the symmetric Fock space, by $\|\cdot\|$ the norm of \mathcal{F} and by N the number operator. The projection of $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ onto the n -particle space is denoted by $\phi^{(n)} \equiv S_n \phi$, where the orthogonal projection S_n is the symmetrization operator defined in terms of the permutation group of degree n .

In the Coulomb-gauge formulation, $a_s(a_s^*)$ will stand for the photon annihilation (creation) operator-valued distribution, fulfilling the canonical commutation relations (*CCR*)

$$[a_s(\mathbf{k}), a_{s'}^*(\mathbf{k}')] = \delta_{ss'} \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'), \quad (1)$$

with s and s' polarization indices.

In the same gauge, the Hamiltonian of the free e.m. field is denoted by $H_{0,tr}^{e.m.}$ and the vector potential at time $t = 0$ by

$$\mathbf{A}_{tr}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \sum_s \int \frac{d^3 k}{\sqrt{2 \omega_{\mathbf{k}}}} \epsilon_s(\mathbf{k}) [a_s(\mathbf{k}) e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} + a_s^*(\mathbf{k}) e^{-i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}], \quad (2)$$

where ϵ_s , $s = 1, 2$, are orthonormal vectors, satisfying the transversality condition $\mathbf{k} \cdot \epsilon_s(\mathbf{k}) = 0$.

The annihilation and creation operator-valued distributions in the *FGB* gauge, denoted respectively by $a^\mu(\mathbf{k})$ and $a^{\mu\dagger}(\mathbf{k})$, fulfill the *CCR*

$$[a^\mu(\mathbf{k}), a^{\nu\dagger}(\mathbf{k}')] = -g^{\mu\nu} \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'). \quad (3)$$

In the same gauge, the Hamiltonian of the free e.m. field is denoted by $H_0^{e.m.}$ and the vector potential at time $t = 0$ by

$$A^\mu(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \int \frac{d^3 k}{\sqrt{2 \omega_{\mathbf{k}}}} [a^\mu(\mathbf{k}) e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} + a^{\mu\dagger}(\mathbf{k}) e^{-i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}]. \quad (4)$$

We write

$$F^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \partial^\mu A^\nu(\mathbf{x}) - \partial^\nu A^\mu(\mathbf{x}) \quad (5)$$

for the e.m field tensor at $t = 0$.

The convolution with a form factor ρ is indicated by

$$A^\mu(\rho, \mathbf{x}) \equiv \int d^3 \xi \rho(\xi) A^\mu(\mathbf{x} - \xi), \quad (6)$$

and similarly for \mathbf{A}_{tr} . For brevity we write

$$a(f(t)) \equiv \int d^3 k a^\mu(\mathbf{k}) f_\mu(\mathbf{k}, t) \quad (7)$$

and denote the corresponding sum in the Coulomb gauge by $a_{tr}(f(t))$.

$\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ will stand for the Schwartz space of C^∞ functions of rapid decrease on \mathbb{R}^3 .

1 Pauli-Fierz-Blanchard Models

In the present Section we discuss the Pauli-Fierz-Blanchard (*PFB*) model and formulate a suitable four-vector model, retaining the approximation of the Pauli-Fierz hamiltonian.

The model [FP38] describes the interaction of a spinless Schrödinger particle with the quantum electromagnetic field, under suitable infrared approximations. It was reconsidered three decades later by Blanchard, who investigated the questions connected with a mathematical formulation of the fact that an infinite number of photons is emitted in any collision process involving electrically charged particles. In [Bla69], he proved the existence of the dynamics and showed that a unitary operator can be obtained as the limit of evolution operators *in the sense of morphisms of a suitable (C^* -) algebra*. Furthermore, he established the existence of Möller operators *interpolating between the Pauli-Fierz Hamiltonian and its perturbation by a potential term*, for a large class of potentials.

The model was further studied by Arai [Ara83], who was able to construct one charged-particle states and obtained a scattering operator at fixed charged particle momentum, also allowing for the inclusion in the hamiltonian of the bilinear term in the gauge field. In the sequel we shall take Blanchard's treatment as a starting point, although our analysis will require some changes with respect to his setting.

First, since we wish to employ the model in order to investigate the methods at the basis of the local and covariant perturbative treatment of the infrared divergences, we adopt an *IR* cutoff throughout the analysis. Even in its presence, the limits considered by Blanchard

for the Möller operators only exist in the weak topology and do not define unitary operators; in order to obtain strong convergence and unitarity, a mass renormalization and an adiabatic switching of the interaction will be essential.

Second, we introduce a four-vector version of the model, prove the existence and uniqueness of the dynamics and control the large-time limits of the time-evolution operator in the interaction representation, yielding Möller operators as isometries on an indefinite vector space.

We consider the infrared-regularized *PFB* Hamiltonian

$$H_\lambda^{(PFB)} = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m} + H_{0, tr}^{e, m.} + H_{int, tr} \equiv H_0 + H_{int, tr}, \quad (8)$$

$$H_{int, tr} = -\frac{e}{m} \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{tr}(\rho, \mathbf{x} = 0). \quad (9)$$

The particle, of mass m , charge e and rotationally invariant distribution of charge $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, will also be called electron. The subscript λ on the left-hand side of (8) denotes the fictitious photon mass employed as an infrared-regularization method as in *QED*, by setting $\omega_{\mathbf{k}}^2 \equiv \mathbf{k}^2 + \lambda^2$, and the λ -dependence in $H_{0, tr}^{e, m.}$ and in (9) is understood. The functional form of the interaction is dictated by the electric dipole approximation and implies that the electron momentum is conserved, while the total one is not.

The Hilbert space of states of the model is $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathcal{F}$, with L^2 the one-particle space and \mathcal{F} the Fock space of photons. Since H_0 is the sum of two positive and commuting self-adjoint operators, it is self-adjoint; in particular, it is essentially self-adjoint (e.s.a.) on $D_0 = \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes D_{F_0}$, with $D_{F_0} \equiv (\psi \in F_0; \psi^{(n)} \in S_n \otimes_{k=1}^n \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3), \forall n)$, F_0 the set of finite particle vectors of \mathcal{F} .

Next we prove the essential self-adjointness of the Hamiltonian (8), making use of techniques already exploited in [Nel64, Ara81].

By the estimate $\|b_s(f) \Psi\| \leq \|f\|_2 \|(N + \mathbb{I})^{1/2} \Psi\|$, $\forall \Psi \in \text{Dom}(N^{1/2})$, where $b_s(f)$, $f \in L^2$, stands for either $a_s(f)$ or $a_s^*(f)$, one finds

$$\|\mathbf{A}_{tr}^i(\rho, \mathbf{x} = 0) \Psi\| \leq c(\rho) \|(N + \mathbb{I})^{1/2} \Psi\|, \quad \forall \Psi \in D_{F_0}, \quad (10)$$

with $c(\rho)$ is a (positive) constant, provided the form factor ρ is held fixed. Further, for any $\lambda > 0$, $\|(N + \mathbb{I}) \Psi\| \leq \lambda^{-1} \|H_{0, tr}^{e, m.} \Psi\| + \|\Psi\|$, $\forall \Psi \in D_{F_0}$, hence, by virtue of the estimate

$$2 \|(A \otimes B) \Phi\| \leq \|(A^2 \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes B^2) \Phi\|, \quad \forall \Phi \in D_0,$$

with $A = \mathbf{p}$, $B = (N + \mathbb{I})^{1/2}$, one gets the bound

$$\|H_\lambda^{(PFB)} \Phi\| \leq d(e, \lambda; \rho) \|(H_0 + \mathbb{I}) \Phi\|, \quad \forall \Phi \in D_0, \quad (11)$$

for a suitable function $d(e, \lambda; \rho)$. By the bound (11) and the *CCR*, there exists $g(e, \lambda; \rho)$ such that $|\langle \Phi, [H_\lambda^{(PFB)}, H_0] \Phi \rangle| \leq g(e, \lambda; \rho) \|(H_0 + \mathbb{I})^{1/2} \Phi\|$, $\forall \Phi \in D_0$; Nelson's commutator theorem, in the formulation given by Faris and Lavine [FL74, RSII], then implies that $H_\lambda^{(PFB)}$ is e.s.a. on D_0 , for all $|e|$, $\lambda > 0$.

Since the Hamiltonian commutes with the electron momentum operator, it is e.s.a. on (almost) any of the subspaces, on which \mathbf{p} takes a constant value, obtained by decomposing D_0 on the joint spectrum of the components of \mathbf{p} ; without losing generality we consider therefore \mathbf{p} fixed in the rest of the analysis of the *PFB* model.

The time-evolution in the interaction picture, corresponding to an Hamiltonian $H = H_0 + H_{int}$, with H_0 the free part and H_{int} a time-independent interaction, is governed by the operator

$$U_I(t) \equiv \exp(i H_0 t) \exp(-i H t) \quad (12)$$

and satisfies, on D_0 ,

$$i \frac{d U_I(t)}{d t} = H_I(t) U_I(t), \quad (13)$$

The e.s.a. of the hamiltonian at fixed \mathbf{p} also follows by the Kato-Rellich theorem.

with

$$H_I(t) \equiv \exp(i H_0 t) H_{int} \exp(-i H_0 t).$$

(13) identifies $U_I(t)$ (a more general result, also applying to time-dependent interactions, is stated below). Since the commutator of H_I evaluated at different times is a multiple of the identity operator at each definite momentum, we make use of the formula [Wil67]

$$e^{A+B} = e^A e^B e^{-\frac{1}{2}[A,B]}. \quad (14)$$

Here and in the following, (14) will be used to compute evolution operators, with an a posteriori verification that the so-obtained operators satisfy the evolution equation on a suitable domain, here on a core of the common domain of the operators $H_I(t)$. We obtain

$$U_I(t) = \exp\left(-i \int_0^t dt' H_I(t')\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t dt' \int_0^{t'} dt'' [H_I(t'), H_I(t'')]\right), \quad (15)$$

hence $U(t) = \exp(-i H_0 t) U_I(t)$. By explicit calculations one gets

$$U_I(t) = c(t) \exp\left(i e (a_{tr}^*(f_{\mathbf{p}}(t)) + a_{tr}(\bar{f}_{\mathbf{p}}(t)))\right), \quad (16)$$

$$c(t) = \exp\left(\frac{i e^2 \mathbf{p}^2}{3 m^2} \int \frac{d^3 k}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k}) \left(t - \frac{\sin \omega_{\mathbf{k}} t}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}\right)\right), \quad (17)$$

$$f_{\mathbf{p}s}(\mathbf{k}, t) = \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k})}{\sqrt{2} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{\mathbf{p} \cdot \epsilon_s(\mathbf{k})}{m} \frac{e^{i \omega_{\mathbf{k}} t} - 1}{i \omega_{\mathbf{k}}}. \quad (18)$$

It is easy to check that $U_I(t)$ does not converge for large times; thus we introduce a mass counterterm and a regularization of the oscillating terms occurring in (17), (18), by replacing the electric coupling by $e^{(ad)}(t) \equiv e e^{-\epsilon |t|}$. The resulting Hamiltonian is

$$H_{\lambda, R}^{(PFB)} = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2 m} + H_{0, tr}^{e.m.} + H_{int, tr, R}^{(\epsilon)}, \quad (19)$$

$$H_{int, tr, R}^{(\epsilon)} \equiv H_{int, tr} e^{-\epsilon |t|} + z e^2 \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2 m} e^{-2 \epsilon |t|}, \quad (20)$$

$$z = \frac{2}{3 m} \int \frac{d^3 k}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k}). \quad (21)$$

In the sequel, we state the results for positive times; in order to obtain the corresponding expressions for $t < 0$, it suffices to replace ϵ by $-\epsilon$. Although the above Hamiltonian is time dependent, existence and uniqueness of the time-evolution unitary operators follow from the independence of time of their selfadjointness domain and strong differentiability of $(H(t) - i)(H(0) - i)^{-1}$, through the results of [Kat56].

Upon inserting (20), (21) into the right-hand side (r.h.s.) of (15) we obtain

$$U_{I, tr, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \equiv c_z^{(\epsilon)}(t) \exp\left(i e (a_{tr}^*(f_{\mathbf{p}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)) + a_{tr}(\bar{f}_{\mathbf{p}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)))\right), \quad (22)$$

with

$$c_z^{(\epsilon)}(t) \equiv \exp\left(\frac{i e^2 \mathbf{p}^2}{3 m^2} d^{(\epsilon)}(t)\right) \exp\left(i e^2 z \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2 m} \frac{e^{-2 \epsilon t} - 1}{2 \epsilon}\right), \quad (23)$$

$$d^{(\epsilon)}(t) = - \int \frac{d^3 k}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}} (\omega_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \epsilon^2)} \tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k}) \left(e^{-\epsilon t} \sin \omega_{\mathbf{k}} t + \frac{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}{2 \epsilon} (e^{-2 \epsilon t} - 1)\right), \quad (24)$$

$$f_{\mathbf{p}s}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}, t) = \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k})}{\sqrt{2} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{\mathbf{p} \cdot \epsilon_s(\mathbf{k})}{m} \frac{e^{(i \omega_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon) t} - 1}{i \omega_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon}. \quad (25)$$

(23),(24) provide a regularization of (17); in particular, the oscillating term on the r.h.s. of (24) vanishes for $t \rightarrow \infty$, due to the presence of the adiabatic factor, and the residual contribution of order $1/\epsilon$ from $d^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ to the first exponential on the r.h.s of (23) is canceled, for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, by the z -dependent exponential. Hence the existence of the asymptotic time limits and of the adiabatic limit of (23) is proven.

The strong convergence of the evolution operator (22) can now be established:

Proposition 1. *By choosing the coefficient of the mass counterterm as in (21), both the large-time limits and the adiabatic limit of the evolution operator (22), defining the Möller operators, exist in the strong topology of \mathcal{H} :*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\pm, tr} &= s - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow \mp\infty} U_{I, tr, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(-t) = \\ &= \exp(-ie \sum_s [a_s^*(f_{\mathbf{p}s}) + a_s(\bar{f}_{\mathbf{p}s})]), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\mathbf{p}s}(\mathbf{k}) &\equiv L^2 - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} f_{\mathbf{p}s}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}) \equiv L^2 - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow \mp\infty} f_{\mathbf{p}s}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}, t) = \\ &= \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k})}{\sqrt{2} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{\mathbf{p} \cdot \epsilon_s(\mathbf{k})}{m} \frac{i}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Proof. The limits of $f_{\mathbf{p}s}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}, t)$ exist pointwise and thus in the strong L^2 topology by the dominated convergence theorem.

The operator $\Phi(f_{\mathbf{p}}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}, t)) \equiv a_{tr}(f_{\mathbf{p}}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}, t)) + a_{tr}^*(\bar{f}_{\mathbf{p}}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}, t))$ admits F_0 as a dense and invariant set of analytic vectors and is therefore e.s.a. on F_0 due to Nelson's analytic vector theorem [RSII]. Linearity and Fock-space estimates imply that $\Phi(f_{\mathbf{p}}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}, t))$ converges strongly to $\Phi(f_{\mathbf{p}}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}))$ on F_0 . Since $\Phi(f_{\mathbf{p}}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}))$ is e.s.a. on F_0 , one has convergence in the strong generalized sense and by Trotter's theorem [RSI] the existence of the time-limits in (26) follows. A similar proof allows to establish the strong convergence of $\Phi(f_{\mathbf{p}}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}))$ for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

We wish to remark that without the adiabatic regularization the time limits of the operators considered above would only exist as weak limits; as a matter of fact, the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma implies the existence of the weak limits $w - \lim_{t \rightarrow \mp\infty} f_{\mathbf{p}s}^{(\epsilon=0)}(\mathbf{k}, t) = f_{\mathbf{p}s}(\mathbf{k})$, while $\|f_{\mathbf{p}s}^{(\epsilon=0)}(t) - f_{\mathbf{p}s}\|_2$ does not converge to zero.

Treating the model as a description of the soft-photon effects in *QED* and introducing a unitary operator \mathcal{W} on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$, interpreted as a scattering operator for electrons, acting at time zero, a non-trivial S -matrix is given, at fixed λ , by

$$S_{\lambda} \equiv s - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t, t' \rightarrow +\infty} U_{I, tr, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \mathcal{W} U_{I, tr, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t'). \quad (28)$$

In order to compare the infrared diagrammatic of *QED* with the expansion of Möller's operators in powers of the electric charge, it is necessary to formulate a model in a gauge employing four independent photon degrees of freedom, such as Feynman's gauge. With this aim, we introduce, as in [HS09], a four-vector model retaining the approximations of the Pauli-Fierz Hamiltonian.

The model is defined in the tensor product space $\mathcal{V} \equiv L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathcal{G}$, \mathcal{G} an indefinite-metric photon space to be constructed below. The Hamiltonian is given, on the domain \mathcal{V}_0 defined in (36), by

$$H_{\lambda}^{(PFBR)} = m + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 + H_0^{e.m.} + e \tilde{v} \cdot A(\rho, \mathbf{x}=0) = H_0 + H_{int}, \quad (29)$$

with $\tilde{v}^{\mu} = (1 + \mathbf{v}^2/2, \mathbf{v})$, $\mathbf{v} \equiv \mathbf{p}/m$, and will be referred to as *PFBR* Hamiltonian.

In general, for models employing covariant vector potentials, non positivity of the scalar product raises substantial questions on selfadjointness and existence and uniqueness of time

evolution. In [HS09] such problems have been treated on a slightly different version of the model, providing a general framework for existence and uniqueness of the Heisenberg time-evolution within a Hilbert-space formulation.

The same methods could be used to discuss the evolution operators as unbounded operators on the Hilbert space, preserving the indefinite scalar product on a dense domain. Since, however, the Hamiltonian (29) is quadratic in the e.m. field variables and only involves a commutative algebra in the charged particle variables, a more pragmatic approach is enough for our purposes, with time-evolution operators defined in terms of Weyl exponentials of fields, introduced starting from their algebraic relations, on a suitable invariant vector space.

Uniqueness of the solution will be obtained by observing that our space can be identified with a dense domain of the Hilbert space introduced in [HS09], that our time-evolution operators, although unbounded, are continuous and differentiable on \mathcal{V}_0 in the Hilbert strong topology and that any group of isometries of \mathcal{V}_0 , differentiable in the strong sense and with derivative given by (29), coincides with them.

The space \mathcal{G} is defined as follows. Let $\mathcal{A}_{ext}^{e.m.}$ be the $*$ -algebra generated by the photon canonical variables and by variables (Weyl operators in momentum space) $W(g, h)$, indexed by four-vector real-valued functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$, fulfilling

$$W(g, h)^* = W(-g, -h), \quad W(g, h)^* W(g, h) = 1, \quad (30)$$

$$W(g, h) W(l, m) = \exp(i(\langle g, m \rangle - \langle h, l \rangle)) W(l, m) W(g, h), \quad (31)$$

$$[a(\bar{f}), W(g, h)] = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \langle f, n \rangle W(g, h), \quad n \equiv g + i h. \quad (32)$$

In the above formulae the symbol $*$ stands for the algebra involution and

$$\langle f, g \rangle \equiv (f^0, g^0) - \sum_i (f^i, g^i). \quad (33)$$

The Fock functional is characterized by the following expectations over $\mathcal{A}_{ext}^{e.m.}$

$$\omega_F(a(\bar{f}_1) a^*(f_2)) = -\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad (34)$$

$$\omega_F(W(g, h)) \equiv \exp\left(\frac{1}{4}(\langle g, g \rangle + \langle h, h \rangle)\right). \quad (35)$$

In fact, expectations over monomials of a and a^* can be expressed in terms of (34) with the aid of Wick's theorem [Wic50], while those over monomials of W are identified by (35) up to a phase factor, given by (31), and the other expectations follow from (32).

The Gelfand-Naimark-Segal (GNS) construction [Nai59] on a $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} and a linear (non-positive) functional ω proceeds as in the positive case, resulting in a non-degenerate indefinite vector space, a representation of \mathcal{A} on it, with the $*$ operation represented by the indefinite-space adjoint † , and expectations over a cyclic vector representing ω .

The space \mathcal{G} is obtained via the GNS construction over $\omega_F(\mathcal{A}_{ext}^{e.m.})$ and its indefinite inner product is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. In the sequel, \mathcal{V} is regarded as a topological space with the weak topology τ_w , defined by the family of seminorms $p_y(x) = |\langle y, x \rangle|$, with $y \in \mathcal{V}$. The domain \mathcal{V}_0 is given by

$$\mathcal{V}_0 \equiv \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathcal{G}_0, \quad (36)$$

with \mathcal{G}_0 obtained by performing the same construction described above for \mathcal{G} , for canonical and Weyl operators with test functions in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Since no confusion should arise, the indefinite inner product of \mathcal{G}_0 is again denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. \mathcal{G}_0 is weakly dense in \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{V}_0 is weakly dense in \mathcal{V} by density of the Schwartz space in L^2 and Schwartz's inequality, applied to the explicit expression of the inner product.

The representation of the Weyl operators defines the corresponding exponentials of the creation and annihilation operators on \mathcal{G} ; such exponentials are also given by their series, which converge weakly on \mathcal{G} , a fact which is not needed in the following. The above

construction is suggested by the fact that the formal time-evolution operator defined by the Hamiltonian (29) contains exponentials of the canonical variables of the soft-photon field.

We recall that indefinite-metric spaces obtained via a *GNS* procedure, starting from a non-positive functional and a $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} , are neither complete nor do they admit a unique completion. In some generality, complete spaces can be introduced as Hilbert-space completions of vector spaces obtained through *GNS* constructions. While in general the Hilbert structure can be very relevant for the existence and control of limits (the role of Hilbert space structures in the formulation of models of indefinite metric quantum field theories has been discussed at length in [MS80]), in the case of simple models, only involving polynomials and exponentials of fields, the use of a vector space looks simpler and even more intrinsic; a strong topology will only be needed for the formulation and control of uniqueness of time-evolution operators.

The standard positive scalar product on \mathcal{G} , obtained through the change of the sign of the summation over the space indices on the r.h.s. of (33), gives rise to the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} introduced in [HS09].

The free and full dynamics of the model are determined by isometries of \mathcal{V} leaving \mathcal{V}_0 invariant and differentiable on \mathcal{V}_0 in the strong topology of \mathcal{H} , with derivative respectively given by H_0 and $H_\lambda^{(PFBR)}$.

Notice that isometries U of a non-degenerate indefinite space \mathcal{L} are determined by their restriction to a weakly dense subspace; in fact, by non degeneracy, Ux , $x \in \mathcal{L}$, is determined by

$$\langle y, Ux \rangle = \langle U^{-1}y, x \rangle = \lim_n \langle U^{-1}y, x_n \rangle = \lim_n \langle y, Ux_n \rangle,$$

with $y \in \mathcal{L}$, x_n in a weakly dense subspace.

The uniqueness of the evolution operators is a consequence of the following observation, only requiring the existence of a positive scalar product (\cdot, \cdot) majorizing the indefinite product, $|\langle y, x \rangle| \leq (x, x)^{1/2} (y, y)^{1/2}$:

Lemma 1. *If two one-parameter families of isometries $U(a)$ and $V(a)$ of a vector space V_0 , endowed with a non-degenerate indefinite inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ which is majorized by a positive scalar product, are differentiable on V_0 in the corresponding strong Hilbert topology with the same derivative $-iH(a)$, then they coincide.*

Proof. Since strong differentiability implies strong continuity and hermiticity of $H(a)$ on V_0 , one has, $\forall x, y \in V_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{da} \langle x, V(-a)U(a)y \rangle &= \frac{d}{da} \langle V(a)x, U(a)y \rangle \\ &= -i \langle V(a)x, H(a)U(a)y \rangle + i \langle H(a)V(a)x, U(a)y \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The dynamics of the model in the interaction representation is determined by an operator $U_I : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ such that the spectral component $U_{I, \mathbf{v}}$, obtained from the decomposition of U_I with respect to the joint spectrum of the components of \mathbf{v} , is $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ -isometric for (almost) all \mathbf{v} and leaves invariant a τ_w -dense subspace of \mathcal{V} , on which it is strongly differentiable with a time-derivative satisfying (13). By employing formula (14), one obtains a formal solution of the form

$$U_{I, \mathbf{v}}(t) = \exp(-ie(a^\dagger(f_{\tilde{v}}(t)) + a(\overline{f_{\tilde{v}}}(t))), \quad (37)$$

$$f_{\tilde{v}}^\mu(\mathbf{k}, t) = \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k}) \tilde{v}^\mu}{\sqrt{2\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}} \frac{e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t} - 1}{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}. \quad (38)$$

The operators (37) fulfill (13) in the strong topology, on \mathcal{V}_0 , which is left invariant.

Proceeding as for the *PFB* model, we introduce the adiabatic mean and the renormalization counterterm,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\lambda, R}^{(\epsilon)} &= m + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 + H_0^{e.m.} + e \tilde{v} \cdot A(\rho, \mathbf{x} = 0) e^{-\epsilon |t|} \\ &- \frac{3}{4} e^2 m z e^{-2\epsilon |t|} \equiv m + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 + H_0^{e.m.} + H_{int, R}^{(\epsilon)}, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

and determine the corresponding evolution operator $U_{I, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ in the interaction picture. For positive times, $U_{I, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ is of the form

$$U_{I, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \tilde{h}_z^{(\epsilon)}(t) \exp(-i e (a^\dagger (f_{\tilde{v}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)) + a (\bar{f}_{\tilde{v}}^{(\epsilon)}(t))))), \quad (40)$$

with

$$f_{\tilde{v}, \mu}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}, t) = \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k}) \tilde{v}_\mu}{\sqrt{2} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{e^{(i \omega_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon) t} - 1}{i \omega_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon}. \quad (41)$$

Considering that the above interaction Hamiltonian is Lorentz covariant only up to the second order in the four-velocity of the particle, it is not surprising that the above mass renormalization term, of the same form as that occurring in *QED*, only allows for the construction of the Möller operators up to higher (fourth order) terms in the four-velocity. We drop therefore the fourth order terms in \tilde{h}_z and consider the (interaction representation) evolution defined by (40), (41), with

$$\tilde{h}_z^{(\epsilon)}(t) \equiv \exp\left(-\frac{i e^2}{2} d^{(\epsilon)}(t)\right) \exp\left(-3 i e^2 m z \frac{e^{-2\epsilon t} - 1}{8 \epsilon}\right). \quad (42)$$

For $t < 0$, one has to replace ϵ by $-\epsilon$ in the expressions above.

The asymptotic limits of such evolution operators are given by the following

Proposition 2. *The large-time limits and the adiabatic limit of the evolution operator (40) exist on \mathcal{V}_0 and define Möller operators as isometries of \mathcal{V} :*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\pm}^{(\lambda)} &= \tau_w - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow \mp \infty} U_{I, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(-t) \\ &= \tilde{h}_{\mp, z} \exp(i e [a^\dagger (f_{\tilde{v}}) + a (\bar{f}_{\tilde{v}})]), \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

$$\tilde{h}_{\mp, z} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow \mp \infty} \tilde{h}_z^{(\epsilon)}(t) = 1 + O(\mathbf{v}^2), \quad (44)$$

$$f_{\tilde{v}}^\mu(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k}) \tilde{v}^\mu}{\sqrt{2} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{i}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}. \quad (45)$$

Proof. By (31)-(35), the convergence of the coherence functions (41) in L^2 implies the weak convergence of the corresponding expectations on \mathcal{G}_0 of polynomials and exponentials of the smeared photon variables. $\Omega_{\pm}^{(\lambda)}$ are invertible and preserve the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ as a consequence of the *GNS* representation of (30),(31). They define therefore isometries of \mathcal{V} , uniquely determined by their restrictions to \mathcal{V}_0 . \square

As before, one can define a scattering operator

$$S_\lambda^{(PFB)} = \tau_w - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t, t' \rightarrow +\infty} U_{I, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \mathcal{W} U_{I, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t') \quad (46)$$

taking \mathcal{W} as an isometric operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathcal{G}$, with the same role as in (28); in the comparison with the diagrammatic expansion, its matrix elements are interpreted as the non-infrared contributions to the corresponding scattering process.

The expansion in powers of the electric charge of suitable matrix elements of the Möller operators of the *PFB* model reproduces qualitatively the infrared contributions of Dyson's

power series, with modifications only due to the dipole approximation and to the non-relativistic limit. For instance, consider the transition amplitude for the scattering between two single-particle states ψ_v and $\psi_{v'}$, without external (massive) photons,

$$\begin{aligned} (S_\lambda^{(PFB)})_{v',v} &\equiv \langle \Omega_-^{(\lambda)}(\psi_{v'} \otimes \Psi_F), \mathscr{W} \Omega_+^{(\lambda)}(\psi_v \otimes \Psi_F) \rangle \\ &= \langle \Omega_{-, \mathbf{v}'}^{(\lambda)} \Psi_F, \Omega_{+, \mathbf{v}}^{(\lambda)} \Psi_F \rangle \mathscr{W}_{v',v}, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $\Omega_{+, \mathbf{v}}^{(\lambda)}$ is obtained from the decomposition of $\Omega_+^{(\lambda)}$ with respect to the joint spectrum of the components of \mathbf{v} . The radiative soft-photon corrections to the basic process are reproduced by the term in brackets in the second line of (47). The exponentiation of the low-energy radiative corrections is thus a consequence of (14) and the compatibility of the dipole approximation with the renormalization procedure, with the limitation to the second order in the particle four-velocity discussed above, is also displayed.

However, the transition amplitude (47) is *not* equal to the corresponding expression in the Coulomb gauge, given by $(S_\lambda^{(PFB)})_{v',v}$, namely, it is not gauge invariant. For clarity of exposition, we point out that statements about the property of gauge-independence are not referred in this work to the concept of gauge invariance in its broad sense. Rather, since we employ the interaction representation and the adiabatic approximation, the asymptotic states obey a free evolution; the notion of gauge-independence of the transition amplitudes between physical scattering states in our models thus coincides with that of a free theory, namely with “the cancellation of the contributions from unphysical polarizations” to such amplitudes.

A first indication that problems may arise comes from the fact that the dipole approximation prevents the local conservation of the electric charge in a gauge involving four independent photon degrees of freedom; as a consequence, the standard argument explaining the cancellation of the contributions from longitudinal and scalar photons to the Feynman amplitudes no longer applies, since it requires the free-field character of $\partial \cdot A$, which in turn relies on the continuity equation. The occurrence of infrared effects, due to the lack of (local) charge-conservation, can be explicitly checked; a simple calculation yields in fact

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Omega_{-, \mathbf{v}'}^{(\lambda)} \Psi_F, \Omega_{+, \mathbf{v}}^{(\lambda)} \Psi_F \rangle &= \exp\left(-\frac{e^2}{4} |\mathbf{v}' - \mathbf{v}|^2 \int \frac{d^3 k}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}^3} \tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k})\right) \\ &\neq \exp\left(-\frac{e^2}{6} |\mathbf{v}' - \mathbf{v}|^2 \int \frac{d^3 k}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}^3} \tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k})\right). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

An extra factor 3/2 thus arises in the first exponent on the r.h.s. of (48) with respect to the exponent on the second line, which is obtained by evaluating the scalar product $(\Omega_{-, tr, \mathbf{v}'}^{(\lambda)} \Psi_F, \Omega_{+, tr, \mathbf{v}}^{(\lambda)} \Psi_F)$ involving the Möller operators of the *PFB* model; consequently one has a different behaviour for the vanishing of (47) in the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, with respect to the corresponding Coulomb-gauge amplitude. The extra factor arises basically from the fact that the space components of the coherence functions (45) are of first order in the velocity, while only two components appear in (27).

The relevant point is that the lack of gauge-invariance of (47) depends neither on the dropping of the second order term in the interaction Hamiltonian nor on the approximation adopted in the computation of the evolution operator (40), but is rather a difficulty common to all four-vector gauge quantizations in the presence of a dipole approximation.

In order to trace back the origin of such effects, it suffices to notice that the expansion of Dyson’s *S*-matrix elements for, say, the scattering of an electron by a potential contains, in the non-relativistic limit, powers of the scalar photon term $(p'^0/(p' \cdot k) - p^0/(p \cdot k))^2 \simeq \omega_{\mathbf{k}}^{-2} [(\mathbf{v}' - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}}]^2$, which do not appear in the presence of the dipole approximation; the residual contributions to the corresponding scattering amplitudes are thus due to the longitudinal photons.

In [HS09], it has been pointed out that the dipole approximation prevents a straightforward application of the Gupta-Bleuler procedure, since the $\partial \cdot A$ field no longer obeys a free evolution. As stressed in the above discussion, the difficulties with such an approximation

are indeed not limited to the implementation of the Gupta-Bleuler condition, but are even more basic; spurious gauge-dependent contributions, also relevant in the infrared regime, are in fact introduced into the Möller operators, thus not allowing to reproduce substantial features of the perturbative treatment of soft-photon effects in a local and covariant gauge. The discrepancy with the perturbative results extends [PhDth] to the explicit expressions of the infrared-finite inclusive cross-sections [Wei95, JR76].

As it will be shown in the forthcoming Section, such difficulties do not arise in models based on a Bloch-Nordsieck approximation.

2 Bloch-Nordsieck Models

In the present Section we introduce hamiltonian models based on an approximation first devised by Bloch and Nordsieck [BN37], which turns out to amount to a first-order expansion around a fixed four-momentum of each charged particle, with respect to the energy-momentum transfer. Since this fact is not transparent in the original treatment, a brief discussion may be useful.

Consider the one-particle Dirac Hamiltonian with minimal coupling,

$$H = \alpha \cdot (\mathbf{p} - e \mathbf{A}) + \beta m + e A^0 \equiv H_D - e \alpha \cdot \mathbf{A} + e A^0, \quad (49)$$

and an eigenstate $\psi_{+,p}(x) = e^{-i p \cdot x} u_r(\mathbf{p})$ of H_D with momentum \mathbf{p} and positive energy $E_{\mathbf{p}}$, $u_r(\mathbf{p})$ being a spinor with helicity r .

Let $u_r(\mathbf{p}) = u_r(\mathbf{p}_0) + O(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_0)$; by the algebraic relations for Dirac's matrices one finds

$$\begin{aligned} H_D \psi_{0,p}(x) &= [\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \sqrt{1 - \mathbf{v}^2} m] \psi_{0,p}(x) + O(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_0), \\ \psi_{0,p}(x) &\equiv e^{-i p \cdot x} u_r(\mathbf{p}_0), \quad \mathbf{v} \equiv E_{\mathbf{p}_0} / \mathbf{p}_0. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

The \mathbf{v} -dependent terms on the r.h.s of (50) could also be obtained by formally replacing the matrices α and β in H_D respectively by the (diagonal in the spinor indices) matrices \mathbf{v} and $\sqrt{1 - \mathbf{v}^2}$. Although this result may seem to rely on the linearity of H_D with respect to the α matrices, it is indeed more general; for instance, it would also be obtained by performing a similar expansion on the eigenvalue equation for the Klein-Gordon Hamiltonian.

According to the above discussion, we introduce the models defined by the Hamiltonians, respectively in the Coulomb gauge and in the *FGB* gauge,

$$H_\lambda^C = \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{v} + H_{0,tr}^{e.m.} - e \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{tr}(\rho, \mathbf{x}) \equiv H_0^C + H_{int}^C, \quad (51)$$

$$H_\lambda^F = \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{v} + H_{0,tr}^{e.m.} + e v \cdot A(\rho, \mathbf{x}) \equiv H_0^F + H_{int}^F, \quad (52)$$

with $v \equiv (1, \mathbf{v})$, \mathbf{v} a triple of self-adjoint operators in a Hilbert space, to be identified as the observable corresponding to the asymptotic velocity of the particle. They commute with the Weyl algebra \mathcal{A}_{ch} generated by the canonical variables of the electron and with the polynomial algebras generated in the Feynman gauge by the photon canonical variables. Due to the appearance of the operators \mathbf{x} , the above Hamiltonians *do commute with space translations*. The e.m. potentials occurring in (51), (52) will be interpreted as describing soft-photon degrees of freedom.

First we consider the model formulated in the Coulomb gauge. With the same notation as in Section 1, the Hilbert space is

$$\mathcal{H} \equiv L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 d^3v) \otimes \mathcal{F} \equiv \int d^3v \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{v}},$$

\mathbf{v} is a multiple of the identity on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{v}}$ and the model can be studied at fixed \mathbf{v} , with Hamiltonian $H_\lambda^{C,(\mathbf{v})}$ given by (51).

Proceeding in a similar way as in the proof of the self-adjointness of the Pauli-Fierz Hamiltonian, one finds that $H_\lambda^{C,(\mathbf{v})}$ is e.s.a. on $D_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{v}}$; existence and uniqueness of

the dynamics thus follow by Stone's theorem. The equations of the motion in the interaction representation, with the aid of (14), give

$$\mathcal{U}_{I, tr, \lambda}(t) = c_1(t) \exp(i e (a_{tr}^*(f_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{x}}(t)) + a_{tr}(\overline{f}_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{x}}(t)))) , \quad (53)$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(t) &= \exp\left(\frac{i e^2 \mathbf{v}^2}{3} d_1(t)\right), \\ d_1(t) &= \int \frac{d^3 k}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}} v \cdot \mathbf{k}} \tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k}) \left(t - \frac{\sin v \cdot \mathbf{k} t}{v \cdot \mathbf{k}}\right), \\ f_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{k}, t) &= e^{-i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k})}{\sqrt{2} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \mathbf{v} \cdot \epsilon_s(\mathbf{k}) \frac{e^{i v \cdot \mathbf{k} t} - 1}{i v \cdot \mathbf{k}}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

With the same motivations and following the same treatment as in the first Section, we introduce the adiabatic renormalized Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\lambda, R}^{(\mathbf{v}), (\epsilon)} &= H_0^{(\mathbf{v})} + H_{int}^{(\mathbf{v})} e^{-\epsilon |t|} + e^2 z_1(v) \mathbf{v}^2 e^{-2 \epsilon |t|} \\ &\equiv H_0^{(\mathbf{v})} + H_{int, R}^{(\mathbf{v}), (\epsilon)}, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

$$z_1(v) = \frac{1}{3} \int \frac{d^3 k}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k})}{v \cdot \mathbf{k}}. \quad (56)$$

Kato's result on time-dependent Hamiltonians applies as in Section 1 and, using (14), one obtains the corresponding evolution operator in the interaction representation; for positive times

$$\mathcal{U}_{I, tr, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = h_{z_1}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \exp(i e (a_{tr}^*(f_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{x}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)) + a_{tr}(\overline{f}_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{x}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)))) , \quad (57)$$

$$h_{z_1}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \exp\left(\frac{i e^2 \mathbf{v}^2}{3} d_1^{(\epsilon)}(t)\right) \exp\left(i e^2 z_1(v) \mathbf{v}^2 \frac{e^{-2 \epsilon t} - 1}{2 \epsilon}\right), \quad (58)$$

$$\begin{aligned} d_1^{(\epsilon)}(t) &= - \int \frac{d^3 k}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}} ((v \cdot \mathbf{k})^2 + \epsilon^2)} \tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k}) (e^{-\epsilon t} \sin v \cdot \mathbf{k} t \\ &\quad + \frac{v \cdot \mathbf{k}}{2 \epsilon} (e^{-2 \epsilon t} - 1)), \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

$$f_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{x}}^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{k}, t) = e^{-i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k})}{\sqrt{2} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \mathbf{v} \cdot \epsilon_s(\mathbf{k}) \frac{e^{i v \cdot \mathbf{k} t - \epsilon t} - 1}{i v \cdot \mathbf{k} - \epsilon}. \quad (60)$$

The results for $t < 0$ are obtained by replacing ϵ with $-\epsilon$ in the expressions above. One can then prove the following

Proposition 3. *The evolution operator in the interaction representation corresponding to the Hamiltonian (55), with the counterterm given by (56), admits asymptotic limits, yielding the Möller operators in the Coulomb gauge*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\pm, tr}^{(\lambda)} &= s - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow \mp \infty} \mathcal{U}_{I, tr, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(-t) \\ &= \exp\left(-i e \sum_s [a_s^*(f_{\mathbf{v}\mp s \mathbf{x}}) + a_s(\overline{f}_{\mathbf{v}\mp s \mathbf{x}})]\right), \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

$$f_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{k}) = e^{-i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k})}{\sqrt{2} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{i \mathbf{v} \cdot \epsilon_s(\mathbf{k})}{v \cdot \mathbf{k}}. \quad (62)$$

The $t \rightarrow \pm \infty$ and $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limits in (61) exists in the strong topology.

Proof. The control of the limits is very similar to the case discussed in Proposition 1. \square

Scattering operators can be introduced as before in terms of operators acting on the “asymptotic velocity Hilbert space” $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 d^3 v)$.

We shall now turn to the analysis of the model defined by the Hamiltonian (52), which will be also referred to as four-vector BN model. Concerning the problems posed by the absence of a positive scalar product, we adopt the same choices as in Section 1, following the same steps with identical results. The construction of the space of the model demands some modifications due to the effects of translation invariance, which requires the introduction of e.m. canonical and Weyl operators, fulfilling equations of the same form as (30)-(32), smeared with test functions of the form

$$g_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \cos(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{k}), \quad h_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{k}) \equiv -\sin(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{k}), \quad (63)$$

with f^μ real valued and square integrable.

The GNS construction over such an algebra and the Fock vacuum yields an indefinite space \mathcal{G}^{BN} and a weakly dense domain \mathcal{G}_0^{BN} ; the tensor product with the same particle space as for the Coulomb-gauge version of the model gives the indefinite-metric space

$$\mathcal{V}^{BN} \equiv L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 d^3 v) \otimes \mathcal{G}^{BN}$$

and the weakly dense subspace

$$\mathcal{V}_0^{BN} \equiv \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathcal{G}_0^{BN};$$

\mathcal{V}^{BN} and \mathcal{V}_0^{BN} will be decomposed on the spectrum of \mathbf{v} as above.

Isometric evolution operators on \mathcal{V}_0^{BN} are constructed as in Section 1 and are unique in the same sense. As for the Coulomb gauge, the model can be studied at fixed \mathbf{v} . The evolution operator in the interaction representation is given by

$$\mathcal{U}_I(t) = c_2(t) \exp(-i e (a^\dagger(f_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{x}}(t)) + a(\overline{f_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{x}}(t)}))), \quad (64)$$

$$c_2(t) = \exp\left(-\frac{i e^2 v^2}{2} d_1(t)\right),$$

$$f_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{x}}^\mu(\mathbf{k}, t) = e^{-i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k}) v^\mu}{\sqrt{2} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{e^{i \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{k} t} - 1}{i \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{k}}.$$

In order to construct Möller operators, we introduce the renormalized Hamiltonian and the adiabatic factor,

$$H_{\lambda, R}^{(v), (\epsilon)} = \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{v} + H_{0, \lambda}^{e, m.} + e \mathbf{v} \cdot A(\rho, \mathbf{x}) e^{-\epsilon |t|} - e^2 z_2(v) v^2 e^{-2 \epsilon |t|} = H_{0, \lambda}^{(v)} + H_{int, R}^{(v), (\epsilon)}, \quad (65)$$

$$z_2(v) = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3 k}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k})}{v \cdot \mathbf{k}} = \frac{3}{2} z_1(v). \quad (66)$$

For $t > 0$, the corresponding evolution operator in the interaction representation is

$$\mathcal{U}_{I, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = h_{z_2}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \exp(i e (a^\dagger(f_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{x}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)) + a(\overline{f_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{x}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)}))), \quad (67)$$

$$h_{z_2}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \equiv \exp\left(-\frac{i e^2 v^2}{2} d_1^{(\epsilon)}(t)\right) \times \exp\left(-i e^2 z_2(v) v^2 \frac{e^{-2 \epsilon t} - 1}{2 \epsilon}\right), \quad (68)$$

$$f_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{x}}^{(\epsilon), \mu}(\mathbf{k}, t) = e^{-i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k}) v^\mu}{\sqrt{2} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{e^{i \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{k} t - \epsilon t} - 1}{i \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{k} - \epsilon}. \quad (69)$$

The results holding for $t < 0$ are obtained by replacing ϵ by $-\epsilon$ in the expressions above. The asymptotic limits are controlled by the following

Proposition 4. *The large-time limits and the adiabatic limit of the evolution operator (67), defining the Möller operators of the four-vector BN model, exist in the weak topology and define isometries in \mathcal{V}^{BN} , given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\pm}^{(\lambda)} &\equiv \tau_w - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow \mp \infty} \mathcal{U}_{I, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(-t) \equiv \tau_w - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Omega_{\pm, \epsilon}^{(\lambda)} \\ &= \exp(i e [a^\dagger(f_{v_{\mp} \mathbf{x}}) + a(\overline{f}_{v_{\mp} \mathbf{x}})]), \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

$$f_{v_{\mp} \mathbf{x}}^\mu(\mathbf{k}, t) = e^{-i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k}) v_{\mp}^\mu}{\sqrt{2} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{i}{v_{\mp} \cdot \mathbf{k}}. \quad (71)$$

Proof. The proof is the same as that of Proposition 2. \square

Scattering operators for the four-vector BN model, interpreted as the result of soft photon corrections to an isometric scattering operator \mathcal{W} in the velocity space, can be introduced by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\lambda}^{(FGB)} &= \tau_w - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t, t' \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{U}_{I, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \mathcal{W} \mathcal{U}_{I, \lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(t') \\ &\equiv \tau_w - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} S_{\lambda, (\epsilon)}^{(FGB)}. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

More generally, for the comparison of (72) with the Feynman-Dyson expansion, the isometry \mathcal{W} can be taken as acting on the entire space \mathcal{V}^{BN} and interpreted as yielding an infrared-finite S -matrix, obtained by factoring out from the scattering amplitudes the contributions given by the Möller operators of the model.

In the remainder of this Section, we prove that the infrared diagrammatic of *QED* is reproduced with the help of the operators (70). Regarding the infrared approximations and results within the perturbative-theoretic framework, we shall refer in the sequel to the streamlined treatment of [Wei95, JR76], while a more detailed analysis can be found in the classic work of Yennie, Frautschi and Suura [YFS61].

In what follows, we introduce an energy scale, say Λ , conventionally dividing the soft and the hard photons; for photon canonical operator-valued distributions smeared by solutions of the wave equation (with mass λ) with energy below and above Λ , we shall denote the corresponding subspaces of \mathcal{F} respectively by \mathcal{F}_{soft} and \mathcal{F}_{hard} .

For definiteness, we consider as a basic process $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ the scattering of an electron by a potential and suppose that the incoming (outgoing) particle is described by a state of definite momentum, with four-velocity v (v'). The process is supposed not to involve low-energy photons, while it may involve hard photons. Let $\eta_{e.m.}^{in}(\eta_{e.m.}^{out})$ be the state of the incoming (outgoing) e.m. field; under the above assumptions, $\eta_{e.m.}^{in(out)} = \Psi_F \otimes \gamma_{e.m.}^{in(out)}$, with Ψ_F the vacuum vector of \mathcal{F}_{soft} and $\gamma_{e.m.}^{in(out)}$ belonging to \mathcal{F}_{hard} .

The isometry \mathcal{W} in (72) is interpreted as the hard-photon part of the scattering operator, hence it is supposed to act as the identity operator on \mathcal{F}_{soft} ; moreover, according to the above interpretation of the models, the same property is assumed to hold for the restrictions of $\Omega_{\pm}^{(\lambda)}$ to \mathcal{F}_{hard} . The transition amplitude for the basic process $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ is therefore

$$\mathcal{W}_{\beta \alpha} \equiv \langle \psi_{v'} \otimes \gamma_{e.m.}^{out}, \mathcal{W}(\psi_v \otimes \gamma_{e.m.}^{in}) \rangle, \quad (73)$$

with ψ_v improper vectors describing a charged particle of four-velocity v , associated to the spectral resolution of the operators \mathbf{v} .

The matrix element for the same process, including the contributions due to the Möller operators, is

$$(S_{\lambda}^{(FGB)})_{\beta \alpha} = \langle \Omega_{-}^{(\lambda)}(\psi_{v'} \otimes \eta_{e.m.}^{out}), \mathcal{W} \Omega_{+}^{(\lambda)}(\psi_v \otimes \eta_{e.m.}^{in}) \rangle. \quad (74)$$

The first result is given by:

Proposition 5. *The soft-photon radiative corrections to the process $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ are reproduced by the following contributions to the transition amplitude (74):*

$$\langle \Omega_{-, v'}^{(\lambda)}, \Psi_F, \Psi_F \rangle \langle \Psi_F, \Omega_{+, v}^{(\lambda)} \Psi_F \rangle \exp(e^2 [a(\overline{f}_{v' \mathbf{x}}), a^\dagger(f_{v \mathbf{x}})]). \quad (75)$$

Proof. The proof is based on direct calculations.

The last term of (75) is related to “virtual soft photons” emitted from either the incoming or the outgoing external fermion leg and absorbed from the other, and is equal to

$$\exp \left(e^2 v \cdot v' \int \frac{d^3 k}{2 \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k}) \frac{i}{v \cdot \mathbf{k}} \frac{i}{v' \cdot \mathbf{k}} \right). \quad (76)$$

The first (second) expression in brackets in (75) is related to the electron wave-function renormalization relative to the outgoing (incoming) electron line; it is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{Z_{2,IR,\lambda}(v')} &= \exp \left(\frac{e^2 v^2}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}^3} \frac{\tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k})}{(1 - \hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{v})^2} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(-\frac{e^2}{2} \frac{\partial \Sigma_{R,\lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(v')}{\partial(i\epsilon)} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

with $Z_{2,IR,\lambda}(v')$ the infrared part of the wave-function renormalization constant relative to the outgoing leg and $\Sigma_{R,\lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(v')$ the self-energy insertion on the same line, the electron mass being renormalized:

$$i e^2 \Sigma_{R,\lambda}^{(\epsilon)}(v') = e^2 v^2 \epsilon \int \frac{d^3 k}{2 \omega_{\mathbf{k}}^3} \frac{\tilde{\rho}^2(\mathbf{k})}{(1 - \hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{v}')^2} + O(\epsilon^2),$$

with $\hat{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \mathbf{k}/\omega_{\mathbf{k}}$. Such a term is a residual infrared contribution, arising whenever “on-shell” mass-renormalization conditions are imposed [JR76].

Summing (76) and (77), the standard result for the soft-photon radiative corrections ((13.2.4),(13.2.5) in [Wei95]) is recovered. \square

We can now examine the effects due to the emission of low-energy radiation. For definiteness, we consider the contributions due to the emission of n soft photons from the outgoing fermion line. Let $\Psi_{k_1 \dots k_n}^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}$ denote the vector describing the n -photon state with polarization indices $\mu_1 \dots \mu_n$ and four-momenta $k_1 \dots k_n$. It is straightforward to establish the following:

Proposition 6. *The overall transition amplitude for the process $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$, with emission of n soft photons described by the state $\Psi_{k_1 \dots k_n}^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}$, is reproduced by the matrix element*

$$\langle \psi_{v'} \otimes \Psi_{k_1 \dots k_n}^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n} \otimes \gamma_{e.m.}^{out}, S_{\lambda,(\epsilon)}^{(FGB)}(\psi_v \otimes \Psi_F \otimes \gamma_{e.m.}^{in}) \rangle. \quad (78)$$

Proof. A simple calculation yields

$$\langle \Psi_{k_1 \dots k_n}^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}, \exp(-i e a^\dagger(f_{v',\mathbf{x}}^{(\epsilon)})) \Psi_F \rangle = \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{e \tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k}_j)}{\sqrt{2 \omega_{\mathbf{k}_j}}} \frac{v'^{\mu_j} e^{-i \mathbf{k}_j \cdot \mathbf{x}_j}}{-v' \cdot \mathbf{k}_j - i \epsilon}. \quad (79)$$

Recalling (70), (72) and (74) and employing (79) one gets

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \psi_{v'} \otimes \Psi_{k_1 \dots k_n}^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n} \otimes \gamma_{e.m.}^{out}, S_{\lambda,(\epsilon)}^{(FGB)}(\psi_v \otimes \Psi_F \otimes \gamma_{e.m.}^{in}) \rangle \\ &= (S_{\lambda,(\epsilon)}^{(FGB)})_{\beta\alpha} \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{k}_j)}{\sqrt{2 \omega_{\mathbf{k}_j}}} \sum_{l=1}^2 \frac{\eta_l e v_l^{\mu_j}}{-v_l \cdot \mathbf{k}_j - i \eta_l \epsilon}, \\ &\quad v_1 \equiv v, v_2 \equiv v', \eta_2 = 1 = -\eta_1, \end{aligned}$$

in agreement with the perturbative expression ((13.3.1) in [Wei95]). \square

The infrared phases occurring in the transition amplitude for a process described by the sum of one-particle Hamiltonians, with at least two charged particles in either the initial or the final state, can also be recovered by explicit calculations. For brevity we do not report the details.

Finally we remark that the Bloch-Nordsieck expansion preserves the free-field character of $\partial \cdot A$ and consequently the gauge-invariance of the transition amplitudes, in the sense that terms from unphysical photon polarizations cancel.

Outlook

By exploiting the control of the soft photon contributions to the Feynman-Dyson expansion of QED , gained through the four-vector Bloch-Nordsieck model, the recipes leading to infrared-finite inclusive cross-sections can also be formulated and discussed. In particular, it is possible to enlighten the non-perturbative limitations of such recipes, due to the superselection of particle momenta, taking advantage of the fact that within the hamiltonian approach here developed issues connected with an order-by-order diagrammatic treatment are avoided. We plan to report on these problems in a future paper.

Acknowledgments

The ideas at the basis of this work mainly stem from a preliminary analysis of hamiltonian models by Giovanni Morchio and Franco Strocchi, devoted to a better understanding of the role of local and covariant formulations in the treatment of the infrared problem in Quantum Electrodynamics. I would like to thank Giovanni Morchio for extensive discussions on these topics and for a number of comments on the manuscript.

References

- [Ara81] A. Arai. Self-adjointness and spectrum of Hamiltonians in nonrelativistic quantum electrodynamics. *J. Math. Phys.*, **22**(3):534–537, 1981.
- [Ara83] A. Arai. A note on scattering theory in non-relativistic quantum electrodynamics. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, **16**:49–70, 1983.
- [Bla69] P. Blanchard. Discussion mathématique du modèle de Pauli et Fierz relatif à la catastrophe infrarouge. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **19**(2):156–172, 1969.
- [Ble50] K. Bleuler. Eine neue Methode zur Behandlung der longitudinalen und skalaren photonen. *Helv. Phys. Acta*, **23**:567–586, 1950.
- [BN37] F. Bloch and A. Nordsieck. Note on the Radiation Field of the Electron. *Phys. Rev.*, **52**:54–59, 1937.
- [Buc82] D. Buchholz. The Physical State Space of Quantum Electrodynamics. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **85**(1):49–71, 1982.
- [Buc86] D. Buchholz. Gauss' law and the infraparticle problem. *Phys. Lett. B*, **174**(3):331–334, 1986.
- [Dys49] F. J. Dyson. The S Matrix in Quantum Electrodynamics. *Phys. Rev.*, **75**:1736–1755, 1949.
- [Dys51] F. J. Dyson. Heisenberg Operators in Quantum Electrodynamics. I. *Phys. Rev.*, **82**:428–439, 1951.
- [FL74] W. G. Faris and R. B. Lavine. Commutators and Self-Adjointness of Hamiltonian Operators. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **35**:39–48, 1974.
- [FMS79a] J. Fröhlich, G. Morchio and F. Strocchi. Charged sectors and scattering states in quantum electrodynamics. *Ann. Phys.*, **119**(2):241–284, 1979.

- [FMS79b] J. Fröhlich, G. Morchio and F. Strocchi. Infrared problem and spontaneous breaking of the Lorentz group in QED. *Phys. Lett. B*, **89**(1):61–64, 1979.
- [FP38] M. Fierz and W. Pauli. Zur Theorie der Emission langwelliger Lichtquanten. *Nuovo Cimento*, **15**(3):167–188, 1938.
- [FPS74] R. Ferrari, L. E. Picasso and F. Strocchi. Some remarks on local operators in quantum electrodynamics. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **35**:25–38, 1974.
- [FPS77] R. Ferrari, L. E. Picasso and F. Strocchi. Local operators and charged states in quantum electrodynamics. *Nuovo Cimento Soc. Ital. Fis.*, **A39**(1):1–8, 1977.
- [Gup50] S. N. Gupta. Theory of longitudinal photons in quantum electrodynamics. *Proc. Phys. Soc. Lond. A*, **63**(7):681–691, 1950.
- [HS09] F. Hiroshima and A. Suzuki. Physical State for Nonrelativistic Quantum Electrodynamics. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, **10**(5):913–953, 2009.
- [JR76] J. M. Jauch and F. Rohrlich. *The Theory of Photons and Electrons*. Springer, New York, second expanded edition, 1976.
- [Kat56] T. Kato. On linear differential equations in Banach spaces. *Comm. Pure App. Math.*, **9**(3):479–486, 1956.
- [MS80] G. Morchio and F. Strocchi. Infrared singularities, vacuum structure and pure phases in local quantum field theory. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, **33**(3):251–282, 1980.
- [MS83] G. Morchio and F. Strocchi. A non-perturbative approach to the infrared problem in QED: Construction of charged states. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 211:471–508, 1983.
- [Nai59] M. A. Naimark. *Normed Rings*. Noordhoff, Groningen, 1959.
- [Nel64] E. Nelson. Interaction of Nonrelativistic Particles with a Quantized Scalar Field. *J. Math. Phys.*, **5**(9):1190–1197, 1964.
- [RSII] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness*, volume II of *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*. Academic Press, 1972.
- [RSI] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Functional Analysis*, volume I of *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*. Academic Press, 1972.
- [Sch49] J. Schwinger. Quantum Electrodynamics. III. The Electromagnetic Properties of the Electron-Radiative Corrections to Scattering. *Phys. Rev.*, **76**:790–817, 1949.
- [Steinb] O. Steinmann. *Perturbative Quantum Electrodynamics and Axiomatic Field Theory*. Springer Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [St67] F. Strocchi. Gauge Problem in Quantum Field Theory. *Phys. Rev.*, **162**:1429–1438, 1967.
- [SW74] F. Strocchi and A. S. Wightman. Proof Of The Charge Superselection Rule In Local Relativistic Quantum Field Theory. *J. Math. Phys.*, **15**:2198–2224, 1974.
- [Sym71] K. Symanzik. Lectures on lagrangian field theory. Desy report T-71/1, 1971.
- [Wei95] S. Weinberg. *The Quantum Theory of Fields*, volume I. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [Wic50] G. C. Wick. The Evaluation of the Collision Matrix. *Phys. Rev.*, **80**:268–272, 1950.
- [Wil67] R. M. Wilcox. Exponential Operators and Parameter Differentiation in Quantum Physics. *J. Math. Phys.*, **8**:962–982, 1967.
- [YFS61] D. R. Yennie, S. C. Frautschi, and H. Suura. The Infrared Divergence Phenomena and High-Energy Processes. *Ann. Phys.*, **13**:379–452, 1961.
- [PhDth] S. Zerella. *Scattering Theories In Models Of Quantum Electrodynamics*. Ph.D. thesis, Università di Pisa, 2009. (unpublished).