Weakened linearity for quantum fields

Peter Morgan

Physics Department, Yale University.

Abstract

There are still no interacting models of the Wightman axioms, suggesting that the axioms are too tightly drawn. Here a weakening of linearity for quantum fields is proposed, with the algebra still linear but with the quantum fields no longer required to be tempered distributions, allowing explicit interacting quantum field models. In Local Quantum Physics terms, the algebraic models constructed here do not satisfy the additivity property.

Key words: quantum field theory, measurement *PACS:* 03.70.+k, 03.65.Bz

1 Introduction

The free Klein-Gordon quantum field is an operator valued *linear* map from a suitable space of functions, $\hat{\phi} : f \mapsto \hat{\phi}_f$. We will take f to be from a Schwartz space of functions[1, §II.1.2], so that f(x) is infinitely often differentiable and decreases as well as its derivatives faster than any power as x moves to infinity in any direction. For the free Klein-Gordon quantum field, $\hat{\phi}$ is then a tempered distribution. This is the linearity we will weaken: we will allow the operator valued map $\hat{\phi} : f \mapsto \hat{\phi}_f$ to be *non*linear, so that the linear operators $\hat{\phi}_f$, $\hat{\phi}_g$ and $\hat{\phi}_{f+g}$ will in general not satisfy the linear dependence $\hat{\phi}_f + \hat{\phi}_g = \hat{\phi}_{f+g}$. With this weakening, we cannot take a quantum field to be an operator-valued distribution $\hat{\phi}(x)$, we will be concerned *only* with operators $\hat{\phi}_f$. Note, however, that allowing $\hat{\phi}$ to be nonlinear does not weaken the linearity of the algebra generated by the operators $\hat{\phi}_f$, and we will be able to construct a linear Hilbert space representation of the algebra of observables.

Email address: peter.w.morgan@yale.edu (Peter Morgan).

URL: http://pantheon.yale.edu/~PWM22 (Peter Morgan).

If $\hat{\phi}_f$, $\hat{\phi}_g$ and $\hat{\phi}_{f+g}$ represent incompatible measurements there is no way to experimentally verify the conventional linear dependence, so it should be considered to be theoretically imposed. This weakening of linearity is partly inspired by Bell's critique of von Neumann's no-go theorem for hidden variables^[2]. von Neumann assumed that $\varphi(A+B) = \varphi(A) + \varphi(B)$ for every state φ and every pair of hermitian operators; Bell pointed out that this is empirically justifiable only if A and B are comeasurable, "A measurement of a sum of noncommuting operators cannot be made by combining trivially the results of separate observations on the two terms – it requires a quite distinct experiment". By a similar argument, the linear dependence $\hat{\phi}_f + \hat{\phi}_g = \hat{\phi}_{f+g}$ is generally not empirically justifiable, but the weakening of linear dependencies between elements of an algebra of observables is much more innocuous than Bell's critique of von Neumann's linearity, which goes firmly against the conventional linear spirit of quantum mechanics. We will retain the linearity of a state over the algebra of observables — for us $\varphi(A+B)$ will be the same as $\varphi(A) + \varphi(B)$ — which enables a linear Hilbert space representation of the algebra of observables.

The nonlinear quantum fields constructed here do not satisfy the additivity property of Local Quantum Physics [1, Axiom **B**, §III.1]. This axiom requires that two algebras of observables, associated with regions \mathcal{O}_1 and \mathcal{O}_2 in spacetime, together generate the algebra of observables associated with their union, $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \mathcal{O}_2) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}_1) \vee \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{O}_2)$, but this is generally not possible if, for f and g with support in \mathcal{O}_1 and \mathcal{O}_2 respectively, $\hat{\phi}_{f+g} \neq \hat{\phi}_f + \hat{\phi}_g$.

Section 2 first discusses free quantum fields, then section 3 introduces a large class of models that weaken the linearity of the quantum field in the way just described. Section 4 applies the methods of section 3 to an interacting electromagnetic field.

2 Free field preliminaries

A simple way to construct the free Klein-Gordon quantum field[3] is to project $\hat{\phi}_f$ into two parts, $\hat{\phi}_f = \hat{a}_f + \hat{a}_f^{\dagger}$, and specify the algebraic properties of \hat{a}_f^{\dagger} and \hat{a}_f by the commutation relations

$$\left[\hat{a}_g, \hat{a}_f^{\dagger}\right] = (f, g), \qquad \left[\hat{a}_g, \hat{a}_f\right] = 0. \tag{1}$$

The manifestly Poincaré invariant hermitian inner product (f, g) is given by

$$(f,g) = \hbar \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} 2\pi \delta(k^{\mu} k_{\mu} - m^2) \theta(k_0) \tilde{f}^*(k) \tilde{g}(k).$$
(2)

This fixes the algebraic structure of the observables $\hat{\phi}_f$, $[\hat{\phi}_f, \hat{\phi}_g] = i\omega(f, g)$, where $\omega(f, g) = i((f, g) - (g, f)) = -\omega(g, f)$. Note that the self-adjoint operators $\hat{\phi}'_f = i(\hat{a}_f - \hat{a}_f^{\dagger})$ are taken *not* to be observable (if they were observable then we would be able to send messages faster than light because $[\hat{\phi}'_f, \hat{\phi}_g] = i((g, f) + (f, g))$ is non-zero when f and g have space-like separated supports). The vacuum expectation values are fixed by the trivial action of the operators \hat{a}_f on the vacuum state, $\hat{a}_f |0\rangle = 0$, and the normalization $\langle 0|0\rangle = 1$. To compute any vacuum expectation value, apply the commutation relations above repeatedly, eliminating any terms in which $\hat{a}_f |0\rangle$ or $\langle 0|\hat{a}_f^{\dagger}$ appear, until we obtain a number by finally applying $\langle 0|0\rangle = 1$. For example, $\langle 0|\hat{\phi}_f \hat{\phi}_g |0\rangle = \langle 0|\hat{a}_f \hat{a}_g^{\dagger} |0\rangle = \langle 0|((g, f) + \hat{a}_g^{\dagger} \hat{a}_f) |0\rangle = (g, f)$.

The commutator algebra and the specification of the vacuum state fix the Wightman functions of the theory at all times, which effectively encodes all dynamical information, so that a Hamiltonian and Lagrangian are superfluous in this approach to quantum fields. Since the algebra and the definition of the vacuum are the only structures in this approach, those are what we have to deform to create an interacting field theory.

The free field algebra determines that the probability density associated with an observable $\hat{\phi}_f$ in the vacuum state is Gaussian. The characteristic function can be computed as $\langle 0 | e^{i\lambda\hat{\phi}_f} | 0 \rangle = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2(f,f)}$ by applying a Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula, leading to the probability density $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(f,f)}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2(f,f)}\right)$, which is well-defined if we take f to be a Schwartz space function, but not if we take f to be a point-like delta function. In a similar way, we can compute the joint quasiprobability density associated with two observables $\hat{\phi}_f$ and $\hat{\phi}_g$ in the vacuum state, which is also Gaussian. The characteristic function is $\langle 0 | e^{i\lambda\hat{\phi}_f + i\mu\hat{\phi}_g} | 0 \rangle = e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\lambda f + \mu g, \lambda f + \mu g)}$, leading to the quasiprobability density

$$\frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{(xg-yf,xg-yf)}{(f,f)(g,g)-|(f,g)|^2}\right)}{2\pi\sqrt{(f,f)(g,g)-|(f,g)|^2}}.$$
(3)

Although this joint distribution is a probability density for arbitrary functions f and g when computed for the vacuum state, in the mathematical sense that it is positive semi-definite, for general states in the vacuum sector it is only positive semi-definite if $[\hat{\phi}_f, \hat{\phi}_g] = i\omega(f, g) = 0$. Finally for the vacuum state, for a set of observables $\{\hat{\phi}_{f_j}\}$ we obtain a characteristic function $\langle 0| e^{i\sum_j \lambda_j \hat{\phi}_{f_j}} |0\rangle = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\underline{\lambda}^T F \underline{\lambda}}$, where the matrix $F_{ij} = (f_i, f_j)$ describes the relative geometry of the n joint measurements for the purposes of the free field theory, leading to the n-measurement joint quasiprobability density

$$\frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}\underline{x}^T F^{-1}\underline{x}}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^n \det(F)}}.$$
(4)

The singular condition det(F) = 0 is fairly innocuous, since it is the expectation values that are significant rather than any characteristic functions that can be used to generate them.

For the non-vacuum state $\hat{a}_{g}^{\dagger} |0\rangle / \sqrt{(g,g)}$ and a set of observables $\{\hat{\phi}_{f_{j}}\}$, we obtain a characteristic function $\langle 0| \hat{a}_{g} e^{i \sum_{j} \lambda_{j} \hat{\phi}_{f_{j}}} \hat{a}_{g}^{\dagger} |0\rangle / (g,g) = (1 - |\underline{\lambda}.\underline{S}|^{2})e^{-\frac{1}{2}\underline{\lambda}^{T}F\underline{\lambda}}$, where $S_{i} = (f_{i},g)/\sqrt{(g,g)}$ describes the relation between the state preparation and the chosen measurements. This leads to the *n*-measurement joint quasiprobability density

$$\left[|\underline{x}^T F^{-1} \underline{S}|^2 + (1 - \underline{S}^{\dagger} F^{-1} \underline{S})\right] \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} \underline{x}^T F^{-1} \underline{x}}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^n \det(F)}}.$$
(5)

Whereas the vacuum state is Gaussian, this quasiprobability is not Gaussian, if <u>S</u> is non-zero. It is straightforward, but progressively more time-consuming, to compute *n*-measurement joint quasiprobability densities for higher states, which locally introduce increasing deviations from a Gaussian distribution. We can in principle also compute probability densities straightforwardly for higher order observables such as $\hat{\phi}_{f_1}\hat{\phi}_{f_2} + \hat{\phi}_{f_2}\hat{\phi}_{f_1}$.

The intention of this rather lengthy elementary discussion of characteristic functions and quasiprobabilities is to give some sense of how we can compute empirical results very effectively by only considering the relations between explicit measurement and state descriptions without ever considering operatorvalued distributions $\phi(x)$. We have exclusively used inner products between the functions f_i and q that were used above to construct measurements and states. By using test functions universally, we can ensure manifest Lorentz invariance of the resulting formalism very straightforwardly. Note that we have used the term "n-measurement" correlations instead of "n-point", because we never measure anything at a point, and the idealization of point-like measurements will become impossible when we introduce nonlinearity. All calculations involve only Schwartz space functions, which are much easier to manipulate than distributions, in particular because Schwartz space is closed under multiplication. In a simple-minded way, it is arguable that the infinities profusely generated by the conventional perturbation of free quantum fields are caused by the introduction of higher than quadratic products of distributions into a Hamiltonian operator that is already an infinite quantity in its action on Fock space.

In more abstract terms, for free fields the properties of the vacuum state define a state φ_0 over the *-algebra \mathcal{A} generated by a finite number of creation and annihilation operators, a linear map satisfying $\varphi_0(A^{\dagger}) = \overline{\varphi_0(A)}, \varphi_0(A^{\dagger}A) \ge 0$, $\varphi_0(1) = 1$, which allows the Gelfand-Naimark-Segal construction of a pre-Hilbert space acted on by \mathcal{A} , which can be closed in the norm to obtain a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{φ_0} (see Haag[1, §III.2]).

The algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\varphi_0})$ of bounded observables that act on \mathcal{H}_{φ_0} excludes any operator constructed as a multinomial in $\hat{\phi}_{f_i}$, because all such operators are unbounded, so we generally have to pay attention to the domain of $A \in \mathcal{A}$. The insistence on at least a Banach \star -algebra structure for the algebra of observables makes analysis much easier, but for constructive calculations of expectation values, characteristic functions, and probability distributions in particular states, as above, if $\langle \psi | A | \psi \rangle$ is finite for a normalized vector $|\psi\rangle \in$ \mathcal{H}_{φ_0} then we can interpret A as an observable for that state. This is a nontrivial extension of the pre-Hilbert space because, for example, the normalized vector $e^{\hat{a}_g^{\dagger}} |0\rangle / \sqrt{e^{(g,g)}}$ gives us a finite state over \mathcal{A} . As well as extending the pre-Hilbert space, we have already implicitly extended the algebra \mathcal{A} by using $e^{i\lambda\hat{\phi}_f}$ above as a characteristic function, since this operator is not a polynomial in the field.

For free fields, $\varphi_0(A) = \langle 0 | A | 0 \rangle$ satisfies $\varphi_0(A^{\dagger}A) = \langle 0 | A^{\dagger}A | 0 \rangle \ge 0$ because

$$\langle 0| \left[\prod_{k=1}^{K} a_{f_k}\right] \left[\prod_{j=1}^{J} a_{g_j}^{\dagger}\right] |0\rangle = \delta_{J,K} \operatorname{per}[(g_j, f_k)], \tag{6}$$

where per[(g_j, f_k)] is the **permanent**¹ of the $K \times K$ complex matrix (g_j, f_k) . It is well-known[4,5] that

$$\mathcal{S}^{\otimes K} \times \mathcal{S}^{\otimes K} \to \mathbb{C}; (g_1 \otimes g_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes g_K, f_1 \otimes f_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes f_K) \mapsto \operatorname{per}[(g_i, f_k)], (7)$$

is a complex hermitian positive semi-definite inner product on the symmetrized tensor product space $\mathcal{S}^{\otimes K}$, so that equation (6) defines a complex hermitian positive semi-definite inner product on a direct sum of symmetrized tensor product spaces.

¹ The permanent of a $K \times K$ matrix M is a sum over the symmetric group, per $(M) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_K} M_{1\sigma(1)} M_{2\sigma(2)} \dots M_{K\sigma(K)}$. This is the determinant without the sign of the permutation. The normalized permanent per $[(g_j, g_k)] / \prod_{i=1}^K (g_i, g_i)$ of a complex hermitian positive semi-definite matrix that is generated as an inner product (g_j, g_k) measures how close the K functions g_i are to being parallel, except in the singular case when $\prod_{i=1}^K (g_i, g_i) = 0$. If they are all parallel, the normalized permanent is K!; if they are all orthogonal, the normalized permanent is 1. Comparably, the normalized determinant is zero if *any* subset of the functions is linearly dependent; if all the functions are orthogonal the normalized determinant is 1.

3 Weakened linearity

Suppose now that we replace equation (1) by a commutation relation that depends nonlinearly on f and g,

$$\left[\hat{a}_g, \hat{a}_f^{\dagger}\right] = \xi(f, g), \qquad \left[\hat{a}_g, \hat{a}_f\right] = 0, \tag{8}$$

where $\xi(f,g)$ must be complex hermitian positive semi-definite on Schwartz space (in the sense that the matrix (f_i, f_j) is complex hermitian positive semidefinite for any finite set of Schwartz space functions $\{f_i\}$). We will call $\xi(f,g)$ a "nonlinear inner product"; the term "inner product" historically indicates a sesquilinear form, so we will always be explicit about nonlinearity. The operator valued map $\hat{\phi} : f \mapsto \hat{\phi}_f$ cannot be linear if $\xi(f,g)$ is nonlinear. The algebra \mathcal{A}_d generated by $\hat{\phi}_f$ is still linear, but the linear dependence $\hat{\phi}_f + \hat{\phi}_g = \hat{\phi}_{f+g}$ generally does not hold.

Essentially, for any set of vectors $\{g_i\}$ used to construct an operator in the deformed free field algebra, we obtain a complex hermitian positive semi-definite matrix $\xi(g_i, g_j)$. As a complex hermitian positive semi-definite matrix, it is a Gram matrix based on some other functions $\{f_i\}$ chosen so that $(f_i, f_j) = \xi(g_i, g_j)$. The action of the vacuum state on an operator A^*A in \mathcal{A}_d that is constructed using $\{a_{g_i}^{\dagger}\}$ is positive semi-definite, therefore, just because the action of the vacuum state on an operator constructed in the same way in \mathcal{A} using $\{a_{f_i}^{\dagger}\}$ is positive semi-definite.

To ensure locality,

$$[\hat{\phi}_f, \hat{\phi}_g] = \xi(g, f) - \xi(f, g), \tag{9}$$

must be zero when f and g have space-like separated supports. There is a wide range of possibilities for $\xi(f,g)$: we can use the sum of any number of complex hermitian positive semi-definite inner products such as

$$(f,g), (f+f^2,g+g^2), (f^2,g^2), ..., (f^n,g^n), ...,$$
 (10)

just because the sum of positive semi-definite matrices is positive semi-definite. All these terms satisfy locality because $f^n(x) = (f(x))^n$ has the same support as f, so that, for example, $\omega(f^n, g^n)$ is zero if f and g have space-like separated support. Furthermore, we need not restrict ourselves to one inner product (f, g), we can introduce Poincaré invariant inner products for many different masses. If the free quantum field is a 4-vector or other nontrivial representation space of the Lorentz group, " f^n ", perhaps contracted in some way, will usually require a different inner product than f (see the next section for a concrete example).

Even when f = g or f and g have space-like separated supports, we cannot expect the linear dependence $\hat{\phi}_f + \hat{\phi}_g = \hat{\phi}_{f+g}$ to hold. In general also $\hat{\phi}_{\lambda f} \neq$ $\lambda \hat{\phi}_f$. This requires a fresh understanding of what we do when we describe a measurement using a function f + g or λf , which we must derive from the mathematical structure of the nonlinear inner product. In the linear case, we can imagine in folk terms that when we use the operator $\hat{\phi}_f$ we are asking how much f "resonates" with the quantum state, insofar as the inner product of f with the functions g_i that are used to construct the state is a measure of similarity between the on-shell fourier components of the functions. There is of course a minimal "resonance" of f with vacuum state fluctuations. In the nonlinear case, in the same folk terms, the nonlinear inner product is a measure of similarity between not only the on-shell components of f and g_i , but also between the on-shell components of f^2 and g_i^2 , $f + f^2$ and $g_i + g_i^2$, etc. We cannot, therefore, just add the results of measuring $\hat{\phi}_f$ and $\hat{\phi}_g$ to compute what we would have observed if we had measured $\hat{\phi}_{f+q}$, because the nonlinear resonances are not taken into account by simple addition of the operators, and we cannot expect the linear dependencies $\hat{\phi}_f + \hat{\phi}_g = \hat{\phi}_{f+g}$ and $\hat{\phi}_{\lambda f} = \lambda \hat{\phi}_f$ to hold.

Analogously to equations (4) and (5), we can construct the pseudoprobabilities

$$\frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}\underline{x}^T F^{-1}\underline{x}}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^n \det(F)}},\qquad \qquad F_{ij} = \xi(f_i, f_j),\qquad(11)$$

$$\left[|\underline{x}^T F^{-1}\underline{S}|^2 + (1 - \underline{S}^{\dagger} F^{-1}\underline{S})\right] \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}\underline{x}^T F^{-1}\underline{x}}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^n \det(F)}}, \qquad S_i = \frac{\xi(f_i, g)}{\sqrt{\xi(g, g)}} \tag{12}$$

in which the only change, predictably enough, is that we replace the inner product (f,g) by the nonlinear "inner product" $\xi(f,g)$ wherever it occurs. The probability densities generated for the vacuum state are still Gaussian, but, for example, the fall-off of the 2-measurement correlation coefficient with increasing distance is controlled by $\xi(f,g)$, so the fall-off is in general nontrivially different from the fall-off for the free field. If we observe non-Gaussian probability densities, we can model them by acting on the vacuum state with as many creation operators as necessary, spread over as large a region of spacetime as necessary, or if necessary by constructing inequivalent representations of the nonlinear commutation relations.

Although we have principally done violence to the linearity assumption of the Wightman axioms, we have also ignored the axiomatic requirement that the energy-momentum 4-vector of the free field theory must lie in the forward light-

cone. As already pointed out in section 2, however, the expected value of the Hamiltonian is infinite for states in the vacuum sector, so it should be ignored just because of a prejudice in favour of finiteness. There *is* an explicit arrow of time in the definition of the Poincaré invariant inner product (f, g), introduced by the term $\theta(k_0)$, but this is necessary to allow $\omega(f, g)$ to be zero at space-like separation, not because of a constraint on the infinite energy of the system. It is expected values and correlations between finite commuting observables that can be measured, and a theory stands or falls on its ability to construct effective and plausible models which match correlations between more-or-less local measurements that are observed in experiments. The expected value of the Hamiltonian operator is infinite and infinitely nonlocal, so an unobservable constraint on the energy-momentum is decidedly theoretical.

4 A deformation of electromagnetism

The electromagnetic potential and Dirac spinors are not observable fields, so we will here deform the quantized electromagnetic field. The dynamics of the electromagnetic field in terms of an inner product on test functions is given by Menikoff and Sharp[6, equation (3.27)] (except for a missing factor of $(2\pi)^{-3}$ that is present in their equation (3.25)):

$$(f_1, f_2)_{EM} = \hbar \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} 2\pi \delta(k_\alpha k^\alpha) \theta(k_0) k^\mu \tilde{f}^*_{1\mu\beta}(k) k^\nu \tilde{f}^{\ \beta}_{2\nu}(k).$$
(13)

Note (with apologies to everyone to whom it is obvious) that $f_{1\mu\beta}$ and $f_{2\mu\beta}$ are *not* electromagnetic field tensors, they are classical test functions that contribute to a description of measurement and/or state preparation of the quantized electromagnetic field. The electromagnetic field in an interacting theory of the sort introduced here is not measurable at a point, so we always have to consider $\hat{\phi}_f$.

Supposing there is an observable 4-current field, and that $J_{1\mu}$ and $J_{2\mu}$ are test functions for it, we can introduce a massive free field inner product

$$(J_1, J_2)_V = \hbar \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} 2\pi \delta(k_\alpha k^\alpha - m^2) \theta(k_0) \left(\sigma_T k^\mu k_\nu - \sigma_S m^2 \delta^\mu_\nu\right) \tilde{J}^*_{1\mu}(k) \tilde{J}^\nu_2(k), (14)$$

where $\sigma_T \geq \sigma_S \geq 0$ determine the relative significance of space-like and timelike components (relative to k_{μ}) of the 4-current. In terms of these free field inner products, we can introduce an interacting nonlinear inner product,

$$((J_1, f_1), (J_2, f_2))_I = (J_1, J_2)_V + (f_1, f_2)_{EM}$$

$$+\lambda_1 (J_1^{\alpha} + \kappa J_{1\mu} f_1^{\mu\alpha}, J_2^{\alpha} + \kappa J_{2\nu} f_2^{\nu\beta})_V +\lambda_2 (J_{1\mu} f_1^{\mu\alpha}, J_{2\nu} f_2^{\nu\beta})_V +\lambda_3 (\epsilon^{\mu\rho\sigma\alpha} J_{1\mu} f_{1\rho\sigma}, \epsilon^{\nu\tau\nu\beta} J_{2\nu} f_{2\tau\nu})_V,$$
(15)

with λ_1 , λ_2 , and λ_3 all ≥ 0 . Degrees of freedom that make no contribution to an noninteracting inner product may make a contribution after we introduce a new term to a nonlinear inner product. Fourier components of J_1 that are not on mass-shell, for example, so that they make no contribution to $(J_1, J_2)_V$, may contribute to the on mass-shell fourier components of $J_{1\mu}f_1^{\mu\alpha}$. Introducing nonlinearity in this way, therefore, effectively adds new degrees of freedom as well.

If there is also a observable axial 4-vector, and $S_{1\mu}$ and $S_{2\mu}$ are test functions for it, quite a few more terms become possible in an nonlinear inner product,

$$((J_1, S_1, f_1) , (J_2, S_2, f_2))_I = (J_1, J_2)_V + (S_1, S_2)_V + (f_1, f_2)_{EM} + \lambda_1 (J_1^{\alpha} + \kappa_1 J_{1\mu} f_1^{\mu\alpha}, J_2^{\beta} + \kappa_1 J_{2\nu} f_2^{\nu\beta})_V + \lambda_2 (J_{1\mu} f_1^{\mu\alpha}, J_{2\nu} f_2^{\nu\beta})_V + \lambda_3 (\epsilon^{\mu\rho\sigma\alpha} J_{1\mu} f_{1\rho\sigma}, \epsilon^{\nu\tau\nu\beta} J_{2\nu} f_{2\tau\nu})_V + \lambda_4 (S_{1\mu} f_1^{\mu\alpha} + \kappa_2 \epsilon^{\mu\rho\sigma\alpha} J_{1\mu} f_{1\rho\sigma}, S_{2\nu} f_2^{\nu\beta} + \kappa_2 \epsilon^{\nu\tau\nu\beta} J_{2\nu} f_{2\tau\nu})_V + \lambda_5 (S_{1\mu} f_1^{\mu\alpha}, S_{2\nu} f_2^{\nu\beta})_V + \lambda_6 (S_{1[\mu} J_{1\alpha]} + \kappa_3 \epsilon_{\mu\alpha}^{\rho\sigma} f_{1\rho\sigma}, S_{2[\nu} J_{2\beta]} + \kappa_3 \epsilon_{\nu\beta}^{\tau\nu} f_{2\tau\nu})_{EM} + \lambda_7 (S_{1[\mu} J_{1\alpha]}, S_{2[\nu} J_{1\beta]})_{EM}$$
 (16)

To these might also be added parity violating terms, and, with the introduction of a scalar inner product, terms involving $(J_{1\mu}J_1^{\mu}, J_{2\nu}J_2^{\nu})_S$, $(S_{1\mu}S_1^{\mu}, S_{2\nu}S_2^{\nu})_S$, $(J_{1\mu}S_1^{\mu}, J_{2\nu}S_2^{\nu})_S$, $(f_{1\mu\alpha}f_1^{\mu\alpha}, f_{2\nu\beta}f_2^{\nu\beta})_S$. Furthermore, every occurrence of an inner product could be modified to make each term have a unique mass (and a different contribution for the time-like and space-like components of each 4-current and axial 4-vector term).

In view of the number of parameters that are apparently possible in this approach, even in the case of electrodynamics, in contrast to the relatively tight constraints imposed by renormalization, equation (16) presumably has to be regarded as only (potentially) phenomenologically descriptive, not as a fundamental theory, unless a theoretically natural constraint on admissible terms emerges. With so many parameters, it seems likely that these nonlinear models can be used to describe *something*, but further analysis of how practically useful this approach to deformation of electrodynamics might be will be discussed in future papers. Note, however, that it is not necessary for this approach or some extension or modification of it to be equivalent to QED for it to be empirically useful.

5 Conclusion

With all computations being entirely finite, it should be possible to compute using these nonlinear quantum field models more easily and with less conceptual uncertainty than using conventional perturbation theory. The universal use of Schwartz space test functions to describe measurement and state preparation ensures that the infinities that usually emerge in perturbative quantum field theory are very closely controlled. The lowest correlation functions for measurements in a given state are straightforwardly computed in terms of the (nonlinear) inner products between all the functions used to generate a state and to describe measurements. It will be interesting to see what range of physical situations can be modelled with the nonlinear quantum fields introduced above. Free fields are already useful as a first approximation in quantum optics, so it seems possible that a nonlinear inner product might make a useful second approximation, but the nonlinear quantum fields introduced here seem to be conceptually significantly different from the interacting quantum fields of conventional perturbation theory, and are manifestly different from conventional constructive and axiomatic quantum fields.

References

- [1] R. Haag, Local Quantum Physics, 2nd Edition, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [2] J. S. Bell, Chapter 1 in "Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.
- [3] P. Morgan, Phys. Lett. A 338 (2005) 8; quant-ph/0411156.
- [4] H. Minc, Permanents, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 6, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1978.
- [5] M. Marcus and M. Newman, Ann. Math. 75 (1962) 47.
- [6] R. Menikoff and D. H. Sharp, J. Math. Phys. 18 (1977)471.