arXiv:1307.3469v2 [hep-th] 25 Jul 2013

Interactions with quadratic dependence on string-localized massive vectormesons: massive scalar QED

Dedicated to Roberto Longo on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday

Bert Schroer
permanent address: Institut für Theoretische Physik
FU-Berlin, Arnimallee 14, 14195 Berlin, Germany
present address: CBPF, Rua Dr. Xavier Sigaud 150,
22290-180 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

June 2, 2013

Abstract

Wigner's famous 1939 classification of positive energy representations, combined with the more recent modular localization principle, has led to a significant conceptual and computational extension of renormalized perturbation theory to interactions involving fields of higher spin s$\geq$ 1. The starting observation was that the well-known clash between point-localized gauge theories and the Hilbert space, which hitherto has been solved by using a Krein space setting, can also be solved by preserving the Hilbert space setting; in this case the theory selects the tightest covariant localization which is consistent with the Hilbert space positivity. The resulting semiinfinite spacelike string-localization for all (m=0,s$\geq$ 1) representations does not only lead to a new insight into the origin of infrared problems (including confinement), but also improves the short-distance behavior of massive s$\geq$ 1 fields to the extend that the power-counting criterion admits candidates for renormalizable interactions for arbitrary high spins. In this work the new situation is exemplified for the interaction of massive vectormesons with scalar charged- and neutral- (Higgs) matter, for which the new "adiabatic equivalence principle" leads to a local relation between a renormalizable stringlike and a nonrenormalizable (but nevertheless finite-parametric) pointlike interaction.

1 Introduction

It is well-known that in d=1+3 the number of renormalizable couplings between pointlike fields is finite. Interactions among scalar and s=1/2 fields permit a

formulation in Hilbert space and maintain a particle interpretation even in the massless limit, whereas the extension to s=1 requires a formulation in Krein space which, apart from the charge-carrying matter fields, permits a return to Hilbert space (the Gupta-Bleuler or BRST formalism).

The clash between the Hilbert space positivity and localization, which forces to *either abandon pointlike localization or the Hilbert space description* of quantum physics, manifests itself for all massless $s \geq 1$ potentials[1]. The BRST formalism presents the Krein-space matter field as a pointlike renormalizable field but the existing literature does not provide *physical renormalizable* interacting matter fields which remain after the cohomologic descent (based on ghost charges) to a Hilbert space. The main theme of the present work is the physical preference for the Hilbert space formulation which will be illustrated in the context of scalar massive QED[2] and in the closely related Higgs model (i.e. the coupling of massive vectormesons to neutral scalar matter).

For zero mass abelian vectorpotentials the unphysical (gauge-dependent) covariant matter fields in Krein space develop the well-known mass-shell (in the sequel referred to as on-shell) infrared divergencies, which are related to the loss of the standard Lehmann-Symanzik-Zimmermann (LSZ) asymptotic relation between fields and particles; the linear BRST ghost charge formalism of Krein spaces says nothing (for good reasons) about physical (Q-invariant) matter fields. For theories involving selfinteracting massless vectorpotentials (Yang-Mills models), the situation in Krein space worsens since *even the covariant fundamental unphysical Y-M fields* suffer from *off-shell infrared divergencies*; one has to go to gauge-invariant composites (which poses quite demanding computational problems) in order to return to pointlike physical fields (local observables). Whereas in the abelian case the infrared finite prescription for photon-inclusive cross sections established at least a weak connection between fields and physical particles, and more recently a more radical spacetime idea to recover on-shell finiteness from first principles was proposed [1]), analogous results or ideas in the selfinteracting case are not known and (as shown in subsequent sections) should not be expected.

Recently the concept of stringlike instead of pointlike localization[3] led to a vast extension of the standard setting to fields of arbitrary high spins [9][2][3][17][5] (section 3 in [6]). These discoveries were made in the course of unravelling the localization which is hiding behind Wigner's third class of positive energy representation of the Poincaré group (the so-called zero mass "infinite spin" class with the help of the new concept of *modular localization* [8][9] more remarks in the conclusions).

[1]Interestingly, this is also the the range of representations for which the Haag duality for multiply-connected spacetime regions breaks down (the generalized Aharonov-Bohm loop effect [4]). More on this surprising relation will be the subject of a separate paper.

[2]For massive spinor QED a more detailed mathematical physics paper will appear parallel to the present work in [5].

[3]As pointlike fields can be considered as singular limits of compact localized operators (whose causal completions are double cones), semiinfinite spacelike strings are the cores of spacelike cones. Equivalently: as pointlike fields are singular generators for compact localized operators, stringlike fields generate spacelike cone localized operators.

The presentation in this note will not follow the historical path, but rather present some concrete second order calculations involving stringlocal covariant vectorpotential acting in Hilbert space. Whereas Krein space methods uphold the standard pointlike renormalization techniques and ban infrared divergent (in particular confined) objects into unphysical indefinite metric corners which resist the cohomological descent to the Hilbert space, the setting of string-localization presents all fields in Hilbert space.

Actually there was an early attempt by Mandelstam [10] to obtain a Hilbert space formulation of QED. It failed on introducing the right objects which lead to renormalizabilty; they are precisely the covariant stringlocal vectorpotentials $A_\mu(x,e)$ localized on spacelike semi-infinite strings $x+\mathbb{R}_+e,\ \ (e,e)=-1$ which play the main role in the present paper. It is their fluctuation property in x *and* in the spacelike direction e which relieves the x-flucuations and lower the short distance dimension; in this way the covariant stringlocal vectorpotentials are made fit for interactions within the power-counting restriction.

Since in this Hilbert space description all operators are physical (but not necessarily compact localizable observables) the new setting explains why e.g. for electrically charged particles in abelian gauge theories[4] the mass-shell of matter fields becomes dissolved into the continuum. For the first time it also provides a realistic physical setting for the gluon/quark confinement in massless Y-M models by exposing a clash between the appearance of noncompact spacelike localized objects from a compact interaction region and the fundamental causality principle of QFT (section 4). Unconfined free string-localization, as it occurs in Wigner's third positive energy representation class (zero mass infinite spin representations), may also play the main role in the "invisibility" in the sense of reactive inertness of dark matter [12].

In all those cases these unusual properties result from the preservation of causality in the face of noncompact spacelike localized objects. Causal localization in the form of *modular localization* (a formulation which is more intrinsic i.e. independent of which generating fields one uses for the description of models) is *the* foundational principle of QFT, and it is truly surprising how many different ways nature has in store for the realization of this unique principle. Although massless fields play a fundamental role in these phenomena, zero mass alone is not sufficient; the clash between Hilbert space positivity and pointlike localization, which is the cause of all infrared problems, only exists for $(m=0, s\geq 1)$ representations; this is the reason why infrared divergencies which wreck the standard field-particle connection *do not occur in zero mass low spin interactions*.

The reason why string-localization is necessary for interacting *massive* vectormesons is also related to localization, although it is not of representation theoretical origin as the before mentioned clash; it rather is a consequence of the more subtle role which causality plays in renormalization theory where pointlike interactions with $s\geq 1$ are nonrenormalizable in a pointlike Hilbert space set-

[4]Without the qualification "massive" the vectorpotentials in the present work are always massless.

ting but, as a consequence of the reduced short distance dimension of stringlocal potentials become renormalizable in the new setting.

String-localized fields[5] are covariant operator-valued distributions $\Psi(x,e)$ which are localized on a semiinfinite spacelike line $x + R_0^+ e,\ (e,e) = -1$

$$[\Psi(x,e), \Psi(x',e')]_{gr} = 0,\ x + R_0^+ e >< x' + R_0^+ e' \qquad (1)$$
$$U(a,\Lambda)\Psi(x,e)U(a,\Lambda)^* = \Psi(\Lambda x + a, \Lambda e)$$

The Ψ may also carry finite dimensional spinorial $(A, \dot{B})$ indices but string-localization loosens their relation to the physical spin (2) so that scalar string fields can describe any integer physical spin.

Whereas the short distance dimension d_{sd} of pointlike fields increases with spin, string-localized fields with $d_{sd} = 1$ which lead to couplings within the power-counting limit exist for all spins. This does not mean that all these interactions are physical. In the selection of physically acceptable stringlike interactions the adiabatic equivalence principle plays an important role; it guaranties that the physical content is the same as that which one attributed to the pointlike coupling (before one realized that it is nonrenormalizable in the standard setting) by insuring that the stringlike field remains in the same localization class ("Borchers class") i.e. that both fields remain local with respect to each other. Stringlocal fields $\Psi(x,e)$ achieve this optimal short distance behavior by *fluctuating in both x and e*; the distribution of fluctuations over the whole infinite string lowers the fluctuation strength at the endpoint x which however continues to be the source of strongest fluctuations. In other words unless the points x and x'coalesce, the nonvanishing of the graded commutator from string crossings remains rather mild [5] and does not have much effect on the renormalization (the extension problem of test functions [13]). The string fluctuations for the "irreducible" infinite spin spin representation are stronger than those of the first two Wigner representations [9]. Wheras the nonexistence of pointlike representations for massless vectorpotential-matter couplings is related to large distance behavior, the use of string-like representations in the massive case is the bad short distance behavior (non-renormalizability) for short distances.

As mentioned there exist couplings between string- and point-localized fields for any spin which stay below the power-counting limit of renormalization theory, but according to present understanding, only those interactions are of physical interest which also admit pointlike (composite) Wightman generating fields leading to compact localizable observable operator subalgebras are physically relevant. The prototype interaction is that of massive vectorpotentials among themselves and with other fields. Since the pointlike Proca field has $d_{sd} = 2$ instead of 1, such interactions are nonrenormalizable in the sense of power-counting. The new principle of "adiabatic equivalence" in short AE, the perturbative version of "belonging to the same localization class" (Borchers class [14]) relates the Proca field to its renormalizable stringlike counterpart and in this way attaches a physical meaning to it. Different from the Krein space BRST

[5]There is no relation to "string theory" [6].

setting, string-localized fields live in Hilbert space and hence do not require the introduction of the unphysical (purely auxiliary) ghost fields, whose presence was necessary in order to be able to descend (with the help of cohomological properties of the ghost charge) to a Hilbert space and pointlike physical fields. In fact the ghost charge Q-formalism takes pains with the "nonrenormalizable" (nontemperate) pointlike physical matter ceases to exist in the zero mass limit; in that limit the string-localized matter fields are the only physical fields.

In the Krein space description of massless Y-M couplings even the fundamental gluon and quark pointlike Krein fields in covariant gauges are incurably infrared divergence, but there are good reasons to expect that the stringlocal description in Hilbert space has a infrared finite on-shell perturbation theory. This would contradict the popular opinion of a long-distance breakdown of perturbation theory; what really does break down is the description in terms of pointlike fields. The use of (necessarily gauge-dependent) unphysical pointlike fields is physically void and any statements concerning a breakdown of perturbation theory based on such objects is misleading. This situation has interesting consequences for the asymptotic freedom issue to which we will return in future work.

The good news is that in the massive case the S-matrix (on-shell correlations) does not depend on what description one uses, it is the same in the Krein space description or in the physical stringlocal setting. The reason is obvious since the S-matrix only depends on pointlike gauge invariant or e-independent currents which are quadratic in the matter fields. Hence the applications of the S-matrix formalism to the massive charged Z vectorbosons of the standard model all the descriptions coalesce even though their off-shell extensions are different (but they remain in the same locality class) and this even includes the S-matrix calculations in the BRST formalism which one finds in Scharf's book [24].

In the massive case the main role of the string-localization is the preservation of renormalizability; as far as entering and leaving collision regions the matter manifests itself in the form of compactly localizable particles. The consistency of the standard asymptotic particle picture with massive vectormesons is guarantied by a theorem [15].

For abelian zero mass vectorpotential-matter couplings the standard asymptotic field-particle relation (the concept of mass shell) breaks down and one has to take use prescriptions for photon inclusive cross sections which at least saves the picture of an "infraparticle" i.e. an infinite extended spacelike infrared cloud which sticks to a charged particle and prevents the existence of a mass-shell.

This description however breaks down in Y-M couplings; in that case it turns out that the appearance of the (necessary spacelike string-localized) fundamental objects (gluons and quarks) would violate the causal localization principle of QFT. In other words confinement does not happen because matter "gets stuck" in indefinite metric regions of a BRST Krein space, but rather because its Hilbert space description enforces a noncompact spacelike localization so that the appearance of such "stuff" from a compact localized interaction region would grossly violate relativistic causality. Whereas in the massive Y-M case the origin of the string-localization is the more technical requirement to uphold

renormalizability, renormalizable gluon and quark fields have simply no point-like counterpart, not even in form of a non-temperate field which in perturbation theory would be classified as nonrenormalizable. Any property of QFT finds is foundational explanation in the causal localization principle and confinement is no exception.

Although the terminology "confinement" was introduces in the 60s in connection with confining quantum mechanical potentials, it changes its meanings, but does not completely loose it if the noncompactness of its localization and the ensuing contradiction with causality is the reason for its non-appearance from collision of normal (compact localized) matter. Practically it amounts to the same, but philosophically it is quite different. For models in which stringlike potentials can be written as semiinfinite spacelike integrals in the e-direction over field strengths (abelian gauge theories as QED) the consequences are less drastic since such strings can be chopped up or manipulated at spacelike infinity (spacetime infrared regularization). The momentun space rules of perturbation theory somehow hide the fact that compact localizable matter leads to the standard field-particle connection and only interacting "stuff" which by its instrinsic nature cannot be compactly localized (best illustration: the stuff associated with the third Wigner representation class [12]) can cause different behavior. What is surprising however are the multifold ways in which nature is capable of realizing the unique foundational causal localization principle.

In this work the rather new stringlocal setting is exemplified for massive scalar QED i.e. a model which couples massive vectormesons to a complex scalar field. This is similar to the case of spinor coupling[6] [5], but some differences arise as the result of the presence of quadratic terms in the vectorpotential. Such quadratic terms occur also in the Higgs model which, apart from some remarks in section 3, will be treated together with Y-M couplings in a separate paper. The next section prepares the concepts and notations whereas the computations for the concrete model are presented in section 3.

In this work we will abstain from going into general structural problems of stringlocal fields as the definition of Wick- and time-ordering. A systematic account of the new mathematical setting and the solutions of such problems will be available in forthcoming work of Mund [5], and for the understanding of our second order calculations this is not really necessary.

2 Some background information

The possibility to outwit the power-counting limit of renormalizable couplings was based on the "short distance reducing aspect" of Krein spaces (BRST-formalism) as compared to Hilbert spaces. Its use was not without a price, the return to the Hilbert space does not include the physically important matter fields; the formalism as it appears in the literature is restricted to the ghost

[6]For mathematical properties of string-local fields, in particular the definition of time-ordered products and Wick-products, as well as to a more detailed formulation of the new principle of "adiabatic equivalence", we refer the reader to [5].

charge-dependent unphysical (gauge dependent) matter fields in Krein space $\Psi^K(x)$. In more down to earth gauge-theoretic terminology this problem is the notorious ill-understood relation between the gauge dependent renormalizable field and its physical counterpart in the "unitary gauge". As well-known, the use of indefinite metric is unavoidable in Lagrangian quantization but, and this is the new message, the clash between pointlike localization and the Hilbert space positivity is better resolved if one starts the construction of fields in a more intrinsic way.

The latter consists in following the intrinsic logic of Wigner's positive energy representations of the Poincaré group in combination with the more recent *modular localization* [7][8], which implements causal localization already on the level of states which then becomes transferred by "the second quantization functor" to free fields and noninteracting operator algebras [11]. The result is that massive Wigner and m=0 finite helicity representations are point-generated (compact-localized), whereas the third massless infinite helicity positive energy representation class (called by Wigner "infinite spin" representations) is string-generated (non-compact localized) and, as a consequence of this unusual localization property, constitutes the ideal candidates for dark matter [12].

In the present work we will direct our attention to the first two Wigner classes which are the basis of ordinary (compact localizable) matter. The covariantization of massless finite helicity repesentations within the ("undotted/dotted") spinorial representation formalism does not allow the full range of covariant pointlike realizations (see below); field strengths are allowed whereas vector-potentials and their s>1 analogs have no pointlike realizations but only admit stringlike realizations. Localization plays a more subtle behind the scene role in interactions; in that case all potentials, whether massive or massless have string-like realization of lowest short distance dinmension $d_{sd} = 1$; hence there exist an infinite family of renormalizable (in the sense of power-counting) stringlocal couplings of polynomial degree ≤ 4 for arbitrary high spin, which should be contrasted with the finite number of $(s < 1)$ pointlike couplings which is only slightly enlarged by the Krein space setting of $s = 1$ gauge theories.

Unlike in Lagrangian- and functional integral- quantization, the formulation of *causal perturbation theory* does not require the coupled fields to be of Euler-Lagrange type; any of the infinitely many covariant realizations of the (for fixed (m,s) unique) Wigner representations can in principle be used and also covariant stringlocal representations have turned out to be perfectly good fields in an iterative Epstein-Glaser "causal perturbation" setting in which only the interaction polynomial but not the Euler-Lagrange origin plays a role.

The following relations between physical spin/helicity and spinorial covariantization in terms of generating wave functions $\Psi^{(A,\dot{B})}$ and their second quantized fields holds [16]

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|A-\dot{B}\right| \leqslant s \leqslant A+\dot{B},\ m>0 \\ &h = A-\dot{B},\ m=0 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where the gaps in the $(A, \dot{B})$ spectrum for a given helicity express the clash between localization and Hilbert space for given h. The resulting fields written in terms of intertwiners look as follows

$$\Psi^{(A,\dot{B})}(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int (e^{-ipx} \sum_{s_3=-s}^{s} u^{(A,\dot{B})}(p,s_3)a(p,s_3) + \\ + e^{ipx} \sum_{s_3=\pm s} v^{(A,\dot{B})}(p,s_3)b^*(p,s_3)) \frac{d^3p}{2\omega} \tag{3}$$

In the massless case the the sum goes over the two helicities $\pm h$. For the intertwiners of stringlocal fields it is convenient to use the abbreviated notation $u(p) \cdot a(p)$ where the dot stands for the inner product in Wigner's little Hilbert space

$$\Psi^{(A,\dot{B})}(x,e) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int (e^{-ipx} u^{(A,\dot{B})}(p,e) \cdot a(p,s_3) + \\ e^{ipx} v^{(A,\dot{B})}(p,e)b^*(p)) \frac{d^3p}{2\omega} \tag{4}$$

For the third Wigner class (infinite spin) there are no spinorial labels and the Wigner "little space" is the representation space of faithful unitary representation of the noncompact two-dimensional Euclidean group $E(2)$. Explicit expressions for stringlocal intertwiners can be found in [9][17]. It is remarkable that QFT does not necessitate the introduction of generating fields beyond stringlocalization[7].

As should be clear from previous remarks we will call pointlike fields with $\dot{B} = \dot{A}$ "field strengths" and all other fields "potentials". As an illustration for s=2: for massless s=2 the linearized Riemann tensor is a field strength, whereas the symmetric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ is a potential. The above representation theoretical result is that massless *pointlike* potentials do not exist; as a result of a clash between localization and the positivity of Hilbert space one can either use a well-defined string-localized potential (and solve the problem of renormalization theory for stringlike covariant fields), or enforce an unphysical point localization which renders the theory renormalizable but hides the renormalizable *physical* matter fields. What alleviates the application to the Standard Model is the fact that the S-matric for the interaction of massive vectormesons turns out to be independent on what description one uses: stringlocal or pointlocal in Hilbert space, or even pointlocal in Krein space [24].

The improvement of singular short distance behavior via indefinite metric is an old idea; apart from the Gupta-Bleuler formalism of QED it appeared for example in the Heisenberg-Pauli discussion of the pointlike limit of the nonrelativistic T. D. Lee model and in many other places. But one should always

[7]Be aware of the fact that string-localized fields have no relation to ideas of embedding chiral conformal theories into a "target" spacetime, which comes from a misunderstanding of the meaning of causal localization [6].

keep in mind that it is only a temporary placeholder for certain properties which one has "quarantined" into unphysical corners, so that at least part of the theory (the gauge-invariant part) can be correctly described and the rest (usually the matter fields) is left to more refined future considerations. The conceptual-technical investment into a stringlike formulation of interactions is more elaborate because everything has to be understood on the same level; there is no "quarantine corner" in Hilbert space. This is in particular the case with problems of confinement in which the pointlike description of interacting Y-M interactions simply does not exist. But it also affects massive vectormesons where the direct pointlike interactions lead to nonrenormalizabilty, whereas the stringlike formulation remains covariant *and* renormalizable. The latter also sheds light (through the *adiabatic equivalence principle*) on why the short distance dimension keeps increasing with perturbative order even though the other collateral phenomenon of standard nonrenormalizability, namely the increase of independent coupling parameters, does not occur; the massive theory does not depend on more parameters as its zero mass counterpart, namely 1 in the case of massive spinor QED and 2 for the massive scalar case.

As we will see, the conceptual difficulty of finding back to physics (constructing physical *charged matter fields* in QED) in a Krein space setting outweighs that of adapting renormalization to string-localization. String-localized vector-potentials have the additional advantage that their short distance dimension can, without loss of generality, always be chosen as $d_{sd} = 1$, whereas massive Proca potentials have $d^P_{sd} = 2$. This suggests to use $d_{sd} = 1$ stringlocal massive potentials for the same purpose as the pointlike but unphysical $d^K_{sd} = 1$ potential, namely as a short distance improving device for polynomial couplings with highst degree 4. Indeed every massive potential of lowest d_{sd} (for s=1 Proca, for s=2 $g_{\mu\nu}$-tensor,...) admits a stringlocal counterpart of $d_{sd} = 1$ which is *independent of the value of s* [9]!

Whereas in the case of zero mass string-localization the requirement to use strings instead of points for localized generating fields comes directly from (modular) localization within the Wigner representation setting [8][9], the locality principle enters *massive* QFTs in a more subtle way in form of the renormalizability of localizable interactions; in this case the pointlike formulation is nonrenormalizable, which makes it unusable for a standard renormalization treatment. The stringlike formulation has precisely those properties which are formally expected from the pointlike formulation before one becomes aware that it is nonrenormalizable. In fact the adiabatic equivalence principle (AE), which will be used in calculations of the next section, is a perturbative implementation of the idea that the pointlike field belongs to the same local equivalence class[8] (Borchers class [18]) as the string-localized field which assures the same physical content (similar to two different coordinates in geometry). Even though the polynomial momentum space bound of pointlike matter fields increases with the perturbative order, the theory remains nevertheless finite-parametric. Outside

[8]Both fields commute as long as the the pointlike field remains in a spacelike distance to the string (and not only to its endpoint).

of perturbation theory this means that these pointlike fields are not operator-valued Schwartz distributions; but there are convincing arguments that they are members of the class of *strictly localizable fields* (SLF) in the sense of Jaffe[9] [20].

The renormalizable stringlocal perturbation theory shows a very interesting aspect about its formally nonrenormalizable pointlike partner. The AE principle, which connects the stringlike to the pointlike formulation, reveals that the high dimensional terms which get in the way of this connection can all be collected into boundary (derivative) terms which vanish at infinity [5]. This is precisely what keeps the pointlike formulation finite-parametric, even though its momentum space powers increase in each perturbative order. It is precisely this property which is missed in a direct pointlike approach and only shows up in the adiabatic relation between stringlocal fields and their pointlike albeit rather singular siblings within the same localization class. This renders the new idea of adiabatic equivalence the most important tool in order to separate *remediable nonrenormalizable pointlike couplings* from the rest. The characteristic feature of this remediable class is that there exist a subalgebra which is generated by standard pointlike fields (operator-valued Schwartz distributions). This is a generalization of the idea underlying "local gauge invariance", except that adiabatic equivalence is completely intrinsic i.e. does not refer to classical field theories through the classical-quantization parallelism of pointlike matter fields in Krein space.

The present work is restricted to $s = 1$. The important clue, which is the germ of the AE property, is an observation about the connection of the pointlike massive free vectormeson fields field (the Proca field) with its string-localized counterpart [5]

$$A_\mu(x,e) = A^P_\mu(x) + \partial_\mu \phi(x,e) \tag{5}$$

$$\langle A_\mu(x,e) A_\nu(x',e')\rangle = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int \frac{d^3p}{2p_0} e^{-ip(x-x')}\{-g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{p_\mu p_\nu\, e\cdot e'}{(pe-i\varepsilon)\,(p\cdot e'+i\varepsilon)} + \\ + \frac{p_\mu e_v}{p\cdot e - i\varepsilon} + \frac{p_\mu e'_v}{p\cdot e' + i\varepsilon}\}$$

The mixed $A_\mu - \phi$ correlation functions and the ϕ-ϕ correlators follow from this equation together with the pointlike correlation of the Proca field

$$\left\langle A^P_\mu(x) A^P_v(x)\right\rangle = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int \frac{d^3p}{2p_0} e^{-ip(x-x')}\{-g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{p_\mu p_\nu}{m^2}\} \tag{6}$$

The scalar string-localized field (intrinsic Stückelberg field) whose correlations

[9] Interestingly enough Jaffe refers to prior work in which the main motivation was to separate a subclass of nonrenormalizable models susceptible to perturbative resummations in which the coupling of a massive vectormeson to a scalar neutral field, a precursor of the Higgs model appears for the first time [19].

can be computed from the previous 2 two-point-functions

$$\langle\phi(x,e)\phi(x',e')\rangle = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int\frac{d^3p}{2p_0}e^{-ip(x-x')}\left\{\frac{1}{m^2}-\frac{ee'}{(pe-i\varepsilon)\,(pe'+i\varepsilon)}\right\} \quad (7)$$

$$\langle A_\mu(x,e)\phi(x',e')\rangle = \frac{1}{i}\{\frac{e'_\mu}{pe+i\varepsilon}-\frac{p_\mu ee'}{(pe-i\varepsilon)(pe'+i\varepsilon)}\}$$

is somewhat unusual since it relates the vacuum to the s=1 particle state; string-localized scalar functions break the connection between spinorial indices and spin s (2); in principle they may have transition matrix elements from the vacuum to any integer spin state [9]. The free scalar string-localized Stückelberg field connects the vacuum to the $s = 1$ particle.

The AE requirement turns out to relate the stringlike matter field φ to its pointlike analog as[10]

$$\varphi(x,f) = e^{ig\phi(x,f)}\varphi(x), \quad \phi(x,f) := \int de\phi(x,e)f(e) \quad (8)$$

where the smearing over the spacelike string directions has been written in order to indicate the nonlinear dependence of the stringlocal[11] matter field, which develops a strong string dependence even though it starts as a pointlike free field in zero order. For abelian vectormeson interaction with matter the vectormesons remain linear in the $f(e)$-smearing, the string-dependence is much weaker and disappears under the curl operation which leads to the field strength (apart from a normalization factor $\int def(e)$). The product of interacting operators has to be interpreted as a normal product (a substitute of the Wick product in the presence of interactions) whose perturbative definition is part of the implementation of the AE principle which assures that the physical A^P_μ and the (formally nonrenormalizable) matter field φ are in the same field class. The relations (5) and (6) look like operator-gauge transformation, but in contrast to the gauge principle entering the QFT through quantization from its classical counterpart, their intrinsic physical role is to *secure the relative locality between the interacting pointlike and stringlike formulation.* In contradistinction to the standard approach to gauge theories, which leads to the physical subalgebra of gauge invariant observables, the present setting leads to a larger algebra which includes the stringlike matter fields.

A physical intuitive picture which explains the lowering of the short distance dimension is that string-localized fields do not only fluctuate in x but also in the direction e. The e-fluctuations are weaker and do not allow to assign a dimension for causal e-crossing as the short distance dimensions for coalescent x's, but spread over the whole string they account for the reduction of the $d_{st} = 2$ pointlike singularity as compared to $d^{string}_{st} = 1$.

[10] As for the vectorpotentials the stringlike matter field appears on the left hand side, but one should keep in mind that this is really defines the interacting formally nonrenormalizable pointlike physical matter field.

[11] The directional spacelike e-smearing is equivalent to smearing with test functions on a d=1+2 de Sitter spacetime.

The Krein space renormalization theory is well known. In QED it dates back to the work of Gupta and Bleuler in the 50s. Massive gauge theories required the more powerful and detailed BRST Krein space setting, we refer in particular to the presentation in [21][22] which later was incorporated into a book [24]. The main result in those works was the proof that the S-matrix (in second order) is a unitary operator in Hilbert space. Operators which can be projected onto the physical Hilbert space as field strengths and their associated currents are gauge invariant in the sense of the BRST operator formalism. In fact the BRST setting is often viewed as adaptation of the classical local gauge idea to the quantum operator setting. It shares however some of the same shortcomings, as the standard gauge formulation: one ends up with a physical matter field whose d_{sd} keeps growing with the perturbative order and hence the conceptual status of the resulting pointlike field is unclear apart from the fact that it cannot be a Wightman.

The above string-localized setting suggest a way to accomplish this by adapting the above relations to the Krein setting

$$\begin{aligned} A_\mu^K(x) &= A_\mu^P(x) + \partial_\mu \phi^K(x) \\ \varphi^K(x) &= e^{ig\phi^K(x)}\varphi(x) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

As in the previous case (5) (8), the AE secures the adherence of the physical fields $A_\mu^P(x),\ \varphi(x)$ to the same locality class as the Krein fields, although the physical implications of this relation remains somewhat obscure. An important difference is the fact that the pointlike Stückelberg field $\phi^K(x)$ is now an *independent* scalar pointlike indefinite metric field; the Krein formulation enforces the better short distance property by adding indefinite metric degrees of freedom, whereas the stringlocal setting achieves this by letting the theory decide about the best covariant localization of fields which is consistent with the positivity of Hilbert space (no adding of degrees of freedom). It turns out that one never has to go beyond semiinfinite spacelike string-localization in order to describe causal relativistic matter[9]. Relaxing the localization from the preconceived willfully imposed pointlike locality to that which the theory need for intrinsic physical reasons does the job. Since both settings follow the same strategy[12], the physical $A_\mu^P(x),\ \varphi(x)$ fields must coincide: in fact the AE principle shows the way how to construct a well-defined pointlike field in every order of perturbation theory which is absent in the Krein space formalism of the existing literature. These pointlike physical fields are in both cases formally nonrenormalizable with the small but important difference that, unlike generic nonrenormalizable theory, the number of coupling parameters remains finite.

The oldest stringlike expression for interacting matter fields (which already appear in the early work of Dirac and Jordan) are the well-known formal expressions

$$\varphi(x,e) = \varphi^K(x) e^{ig\int_0^\infty A_\mu^K(x+se)e^\mu ds} \tag{10}$$

[12]Note that the standard formalism which works with a ghost charge cannot incorporate the nonlinear φ-φ^K relation and has to be replaced by the AE principle.

They represent stringlike matter fields in Hilbert space which are written in terms of Krein space vectorpotentials $A^K_\mu(x)$ and matter fields $\varphi^K(x)$. Since $d_{sd}(A^K_\mu) = 1$, the line integrals only have logarithmic short distance singularities which leads to stringlocal Wightman fields. Perturbative calculations with such matter fields lead to the unsolved complications of dealing with nonpolynomial composites; the better strategy is to obtain such $\varphi(x, e)$ directly through the coupling of stringlocal Hilbert space potentials with matter fields $\varphi(x)$.

It is well-known that for the extraction of physical properties of massive vectormeson interactions stringlike operator-valued Schwartz distributions serve as well as pointlike ones; in particular the mass-gap situation permits in both cases a derivation of the LSZ scattering theory [15][14]. Although one is not forced to work with pointlike physical fields one may ask what nonrenormalizability means in terms of their operator nature; saying simply that they are not operator-valued Schwartz distributions open Pandora's box since the world of non-temparate singular objects contains infinitely many possibilities where most are not localizable at all; only a few non-temperate subclasses can still be smeared with a (model-dependent) *dense set of compactly supported test functions*. A cautious attempt to answer this academic but legitimate question is the remark made before, namely that they belong to the subclass of SLF fields [20]. This class had up to now no physical realization; it was introduced to present a mathematical/conceptual clear setting for some prior speculations about nonrenormalizable subclasses [19] (which already included Higgs-like couplings of massive vectormesons to scalar neutral fields). Since such pointlike fields are not pointlike localizable in the usual sense (SLF can only be smeared with a dense set of finitely supported wave functions whose precise nature is model-dependent), it is questionable if such fields can generate nets of local operator algebras since there is no guaranty that they share a common dense domain. In an algebraic setting presumably only their well-behaved stringlocal counterparts can be used as covariant generators of algebras.

3 S-matrix of massive scalar QED

Massless scalar QED is a model with two coupling parameter which is known to be renormalizable in a BRST- Krein space setting. The cyclic action of its gauge-invariant part on the vacuum, which excludes the scalar matter field, generates a Hilbert subspace. Already in the 70s it became clear that its massive spinor counterpart stayed renormalizable in a Krein space setting [25], but there remained some doubts about the status of the physical matter field (the "unitary gauge"). Its status also remained unresolved in later BRST Krein space formulations [23]. In recent work this problem was clarified in the new Hilbert space setting of string-localization [5]; the adiabatic equivalence principle also serves to construct nontemparate physical pointlike matter fields in the BRST setting. The present paper extends these ideas to scalar massive QED.

One starts conveniently from Bogoliubov's formal generating S-functional

$$S(\mathcal{L}(g,f)) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int d^4x_1..d^4x_n g(x_1)..g(x_n) T_n(\mathcal{L}(x_1,f)..\mathcal{L}(x_n,f)) \tag{11}$$

$$\mathcal{L}(x,f) = \; j_\mu(x) A^\mu(x,f), \quad j_\mu = \frac{1}{2}\varphi^* \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}_\mu \varphi, \; A_\mu(x,f) = \int f(e) A_\mu(x,e) de$$

The adiabatic equivalence (AE) is part of the renormalization formalism; its role is to secure that the string-localized formulation[13] remains connected with the pointlike Proca formulation; in fact it attributes the role of a "short distance softener" to $A_\mu(x,f)$ and in this way guaranties that the model maintains temperate point-localized observables (the field $F_{\mu\nu}$ strengths and charge-neutral composites) i.e. does not escape into an unphysical total "stringy world". The test function $f(e)$ (temperate on 3-dim. de Sitter space) is chosen in such a way that $\int f = 1$ and the Minkowski spacetime picture is that of a spacelike cone with apex x. Since the S-matrix is insensitive against changes of localization (an invariant of the string-extended Borchers class) one expects that the implementation of AE shows the independence on f.

The basis of the second order AE is the following identity ($\mathcal{L}^P$ denotes the pointlike interaction in terms of the Proca field)

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^P + \partial_\mu V^\mu, \; V^\mu(x,e) = j^\mu(x)\phi(x,e) \tag{12}$$

$$T\mathcal{L} \; \mathcal{L}' - \partial_\mu T \; V^\mu \mathcal{L}' - \partial'_\nu T\mathcal{L} \; V^{\nu\prime} + \partial_\mu \partial'_v T V^\mu V^{\nu\prime} = T\mathcal{L}^P \mathcal{L}'^P \tag{13}$$

which results from the use of the relation (9) in time-ordered products. The renormalization consists in verifying that the time ordering can be defined in such a way that (13) the derivatives are outside the time-ordering. In that case the derivative terms can be omitted in the adiabatic limit $g(x) \to g$ since in massive theories correlations with operators localized at infinity vanish. The simpler differential formulation of (13) is that the partial derivatives in e-directions d_e in the following expression must vanish [5]

$$d_e(T\mathcal{L}W' - \partial_\mu T V^\mu W') = 0, \; W' = L', V^{\mu\prime} \tag{14}$$

It is easy to verify that this is also sufficient for the independence of the left hand side (13) of e and e' which establishes the equality with the pointlike right hand side. It is sufficient to proof the of e independence is simplified by showing first the independence of e. Expressing the time-ordered products in terms of Wick-ordering it is clear that term without Wick contractions fulfills this relation so that the f-independence of the second order amounts to establish its validity for tree graphs and one-loop terms.

[13] In terms of the directional smearing $f(e)$ the $A_\mu(x,f)$ becomes a spacelike cone localized field. It is still singular in the apex coordinate x.

- Tree contributions (1-contraction terms) from the derivative term are of the form

$$\partial_\mu T V^\mu \mathcal{L}'|_{1-cont} = \partial_\mu T j^\mu(x) j^\nu(x')|_{1-cont} \phi(x,e) A_\nu(x',e')|_{0-cont} + \quad (15)$$
$$+ j^\mu(x) j^\nu(x')|_{0-cont} \partial_\mu \langle T\phi(x,e) A_\nu(x',e')\rangle$$

The subsequent d_e differentiation acts only on the e-dependent operator ϕ. For $x \neq x'$ the currents conservation only leaves the second contribution in which ∂_μ acts on ϕ, and since $d_e \partial_\mu \phi = d_e A_\mu$ as well as $d_e \partial_\mu \langle T\phi A'_\nu\rangle = d_e \langle T A_\mu A'_\nu\rangle$, one obtains

$$d_e \partial_\mu T V^\mu \mathcal{L}'|_{1cont} = d_e T \mathcal{L}\mathcal{L}',\ x \neq x' \quad (16)$$

The extension problem to the diagonal $x = x'$ is solved by realizing that the only term which contributes to the diagonal comes from the ∂_μ acting on the 1-contration terms of the time-ordered current product. Choosing for the time-ordered function of the derivatives of φ the multiplication of the Fourier transform the multiplied with the momentum vector, it is of the form

$$d_e i\delta(x-x') : \bar\varphi(x)\varphi(x')\partial_\nu\phi(x,e)A^\nu(x',e') : \quad (17)$$
$$= d_e i\delta(x-x')\bar\varphi(x)\varphi(x')|_{0-cont} A_\nu(x,e)A^\nu(x',e')$$

but this is after integration over x' (modulo derivatives which vanish after integration) proportional to the looked for term which by using again $d_e\partial_\mu\phi = d_e A_\mu$ leads to

$$d_e : \bar\varphi\varphi(\partial_\mu\phi)A'^\nu := d_e : \bar\varphi\varphi A_\mu A'_\nu :,\ A'_\nu = A(x,e') \quad (18)$$

This means that one obtains the desired e-independence only if one modifies the Lagrangian (12) by a g^2 second order contribution whose d_e compensates this second order contribution from the tree approximation of the second order S-matrix; this leads to the expected (from gauge theory $\partial \to D$) form which together with the first order $\mathcal{L}$ is the "gauge invariant" interaction involving the gauge invariant derivative

$$\mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}_{g.i.} = g j^\mu_{g.i.}(x) A_\mu(x,e) \quad (19)$$

$$j^\mu_{g.i.}(x) = \frac{1}{2} i\varphi^* D^\mu \varphi + h.c.,\ D^\mu = \partial_\mu - igA_\mu(x,e) \quad (20)$$

The proof of the corresponding relation for $V^{\nu\prime}$ instead of $\mathcal{L}'$ is similar.

- The verification of $d_e(loop) = 0$ amounts to ($\partial_\mu T j^\mu j'^v = 0,\ x \neq x'$) a distributional extension problem for to the diagonal

$$d_e\partial_\mu \left\{ T j^\mu j'^v|_{1-cont} \langle T\phi(x,e)A_\nu(x',e')\rangle \right\} = d_e T\mathcal{L}\mathcal{L}'|^{jj}_{1-cont},\ x \neq x' \quad (21)$$

where the contraction on the right-hand side only affects the jj terms. This is analogous to [5].

Proofs There are 4 contributions to $Tj^\mu j'^\nu|_{1-cont}$ to the tree approximation which result from the 4 different positions of the ∂ and ∂' with respect to $\varphi^\#$ and $\varphi^{\#\prime}$. Delta function contributions from $\partial_\mu Tj^\mu j'^\nu|_{1-cont}$ only arise from terms

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi\partial'_\nu\bar{\varphi}|'_{0-cont}\partial^2\left\langle T\varphi\bar{\varphi}'\right\rangle + \varphi\bar{\varphi}'\partial^2\left\langle T\varphi\partial'_\nu\bar{\varphi}'\right\rangle + h.c. \\ &\partial^2\left\langle T\varphi(x)\bar{\varphi}'(x')\right\rangle = i\delta(x-x') - m_\varphi^2\left\langle T\varphi(x)\bar{\varphi}'(x')\right\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

As in the case of [5], the matter mass terms are compensated by contributions in which the ∂^2 acts on the $\varphi^\#(x)$ inside the Wickproduct, this accounts for the above result (19).

The proof of e-independent loop renormalizability follows a similar pattern. Again it obviously holds for $x \neq x'$, hence the renormalization problem consists in constructing an extension for the time ordered function

$$\begin{aligned} &t_1^{\mu\nu}(x;e,e') = \left\langle T\bar{\varphi}\varphi' A^\mu A^{\nu\prime}\right\rangle,\ t_2^\nu(x;e,e') = \left\langle T\bar{\varphi}\varphi'\phi A'^\nu\right\rangle \\ &t_3^\mu(x;e,e') = \left\langle T\bar{\varphi}\varphi' A^\mu\phi'\right\rangle,\quad t_4 = \left\langle T\bar{\varphi}\varphi'\phi\phi'\right\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

which satisfies the equations for e-independence following from (21):

$$\begin{aligned} &d_e\left\{t_1^{\mu\nu} - \partial^\mu t_2^\nu\right\} = 0,\quad d_{e'}\left\{t_1^{\mu\nu} - \partial'^\nu t_3^\mu\right\} = 0 \\ &d_e\left\{t_3^\mu - \partial^\mu t_4\right\} = 0,\quad d_e\left\{t_2^\nu - \partial'^\nu t_4\right\} = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

The remaining freedom then consists in e-independent contact terms. Again these relations hold obviously for $x \neq x'$.

In the Epstein-Glaser causal method renormalization consists in the extension of distributions t_0 which are defined on testfunctions $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\})$ to Schwartz distributions for which the scaling degree d_0 is preserved. Such extensions always exist and they are unique up to derivatives of delta functions of order $\omega = [d_0 - 4]$. In particular there exists a reference extension [13], the so-called central solution, which is defined as

$$(t^c, f) = (t_0, f_\omega),\quad f_\omega(x) = f(x) - \sum \frac{x^\alpha}{\alpha!}\left(\partial_\alpha f\right)(0) \tag{25}$$

In our case $d_0(t_1^{\mu\nu}) = 4 = d_0(t_4),\ d_0(t_3^\nu) = 3 = d_0(t_2^\mu)$. The string-independence of the second order contribution is valid if the following differential relations hold From (5-7) one reads off the above short distance scale dimensions. The relations (24) are obviously fulfilled for $x \neq 0$; hence we may write (c=central extension)

$$t_1^{\mu\nu} = t_{1,c}^{\mu\nu} + k^{\mu\nu}(e,e')\delta(x),\ t_4 = t_{4,c} + k(e,e')\delta(x) \tag{26}$$

and t_2^μ, t_3^ν are of degree 3 i.e. convergent. The e, e' dependence of the k's are determined from (24); since the calculation parallels that in [5] and the actual form of these functions is of little interest (it would change if another distributional extension than the central extension would have been used), we

will skip their calculation. The closedness of the zero form in e (the above relations) only determine the counterterms up to e, e'-independent pointlike contributions i.e. the remaining ambiguity has the same form as for pointlike renormalizable interactions.

The S-matrix calculation only uses the the first line of the relation (8) or (9) which start already in zero order. The difference between the stringlike matter field and its pointlike counterpart and the analog relation between the pointlike Krein matter field and its corresponding physical partner only starts in first order. The simplest way to check its lowest order validity is the use adiabatic equivalence which in the Bogoliubov setting reads

$$S(g\mathcal{L}^P + f\varphi) \simeq S(g\mathcal{L}_e + f\varphi_e) \qquad (27)$$
$$\varphi_e \equiv \varphi(x,e) =: e^{-ig\phi(x,e)} : \varphi(x)$$

in words: the generating Bogoliubov S-functionals of the pointlike (P=Proca) and the stringlike (e-dependent) descriptions are equal up to boundary terms which vanish in the adiabatic limit $g(x) \to g$. The fields in the generating S-functional are free fields and Wickproducts of free fields. For our present argument we need the interacting matter field

$$\varphi_{lnt}(x) = S(g\mathcal{L}^P)^{-1}\frac{\delta}{\delta f(x)}S(g\mathcal{L}^P + f\varphi)|_{f=0} \qquad (28)$$

which formally leads to the second line in (8). The verification in first order is almost trivial but we will refrain from presenting it, preferring to return the adiabatic equivalence verification in a seperate paper.

The equations (13) result from (27) in second order; the "adiabatic" refers to the loss of the derivative terms in (13) after passing to the S-matrix by integrating over $x,\ x'$. This shows that the physical S-matrix does not depend on which description one uses for the matter field and this includes the use of the Krein description.

The verification of the second line in (9) is similar but simpler. It is interesting to note that in contrast to the relation for the potentials, this relation is not contained in the linear Q-charge cohomological formalism. This nonlinear connection even enters the derivation of the S-matrix for the massive Yang-Mills model (see (31) below). The original rational for the introduction of the Higgs model was the belief that massive gauge theories can only be consistently renormalized when one couples its massless QED version to a mass generating Higgs field. To say that this belief is incorrect may sound revolutionary to some but should not really be surprising.

Most of the people who believed and still believe in this argument are also perfectly aware that QED as well as its massive version are renormalizable within a Krein space setting as the BRST formalism. But particle theory cannot remove schizoid states of its practicioners and I have no scientific explanation why many people believe that Krein space renormalizable massive vectormesons (possible selfinteracting) and their coupled massive matter field need to be constructed via a Higgs mechanism from their massless counterpart. From a philosophical

viewpoint this adds an additional degree physical which, as the old ether, can be removed by Okham's razor. There may be a sociological explanation in that at the time of Higg's proposal the only well-known Krein space Gupta-Bleuler renormalization method at that time was not applicable to massive gauge theories.

The experimental LHC discovery of a scalar particles coupled to the massive Y-M potentials does not change the theoretical Okham's razor argument since alternative mechanisms of scalar massive boundstates within massive Y-M models have never been studied since the Higgs proposal more than 4 decades ago. The "Higgs or death to QFT" ideology (i.e. the idea that the Higgs mass generation is required by the principles of QFT) has taken roots before a critical dispute had time to develop. Actually this is not quite true; what really happened is that an alternative explanation at the time of the spontaneous broken symmetry idea, namely the *Schwinger-Swieca screening of massive Maxwell-charges*, was lost in the maelsrom of time [30] (for more see next section).

idea of mechanism which is related renormalization method was the GThis may attribute a new role to the physical stringlocal Stückelberg-field; the particle seen at LHC may be a scalar boundstate of it in a new mechanism which related bound states to the linear application of s stringlocal field to the vacuum[14].

4 Maxwell-currents, charge-screening and the Higgs issue

Additional information about the stringlocal setting for massive QED can be obtained from the extension of the Bogoliubov formalism to the construction of stringlocal fields and their pointlike composites. They reveal aspects which in the global S-matrix remain hidden. One such composite observable is the identically conserved Maxwell-current j which is defined as the divergence of the field strength

$$\partial^\nu F_{\mu\nu} = g j_\mu, \quad F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu, \; j_\mu = J_\mu + m^2 A^P_\mu(x) \tag{29}$$
$$J_\mu = \frac{1}{2} i\varphi^* D_\mu \varphi + h.c., \; Q = \int J_0(x) d^3x, Q_M = \int j_0(x) d^3x$$

where the integral over the Maxwell-current j_μ defines the Maxwell charge Q_M which in the massive case deviates from the matter current J_μ whose associated integral counts the charge Q of the complex scalar field φ. It is very important to notice that for massive gauge theories *these two currents are not identical*, although they coalesce in the zero mass limit of QED.

It is instructive to look first at the interaction-free situation with the same field content. In that case the identically conserved *Maxwell current* is proportional to $m^2 A^P_\mu$ which according to (6) leads to a zero charge. According to a

[14]The possibility of a stringlocal scalar field to carry arbitrary (integer) spin foemally allows this.

deep theorem by Swieca [26][27], this *screening* of the Maxwell charge is a general structural consequence of its definition (29) together with the assumption of a mass gaps i.e. it holds in all theories in which massive vectormesons couple to matter. In the massless limit of QED the two conserved currents coalesce and the "counting charge" is identical to the electric charge. In that case Swieca's screening mechanism breaks down and the important aspect of the nontrivial Maxwell charge that it reveals the global charge content

$$Q_0^M = Q \neq 0 \tag{30}$$

where Q_0^M refers to the Maxwell charge in (massless) QED and Q is the superselected global counting charge which comes with complex matter fields.

The stringlocal description reveals that the massless limit is connected with several other important rather drastic changes. The loss of the pointlike Proca field leads to the loss of the intrinsic Stückelberg field (incurable infrared divergencies); the only objects which survive in this limit are the stringlike vectorpotential and its partner the stringlocal matter field (besides the pointlike composites which are the gauge-invariants in the BRST setting). The attempt to define pointlike (necessarily non-temperate) fields in terms of stringlike fields, which still worked in the massive case[15], breaks down in QED. The use of a stringlike formulation is the only way to obtain a renormalizable *perturbatively consistent physical* description. The massless limit does not make sense in the operator description; it should be performed for the stringlike Wightman functions from where an operator-formalism can be reconstructed by the GNS representation [14].

The pointlike matter fields φ^K in a Krein space setting (i.e. the matter fields of the gauge formulation in certain gauges), which are still well-defined in QED for many covariant gauges perturbation theory, are void of any physical meaning; for the same reasons their off-shell infrared divergences in covariant massless Y-M gauges cannot be taken as an indication of the breakdown of perturbation theory for long distances. It only means that, as a consequence of the nonexistence of pointlike matter fields, one must do the perturbative calculations in the stringlike setting.

The impossibility of compactly localized electrically charged matter in QED has been known a long time before its perturbative formulation in terms of stringlike potentials. Based on a sophisticated use of the quantum Gauss, law Buchholz [28][29] succeeded to prove that the tightest possible localization is that in arbitrary narrow noncompact spacelike cones (whose cores are semiinfinite spacelike strings). The directional fluctuations of the matter strings are stronger than those of the vectorpotential; they lead to a spontaneous breaking of the Lorentz covariance in charged sectors in QED [31]. Whereas in the massive case the asymptotic string directions can be changed in terms of uni-

[15]The relations (5,8) should be read as the definition of pointlike non-temperate fields in terms of renormalizable stringlike Wightman-type fields. In the massless limit these pointlike physical fields develop incurable infrared divergencies which means that electrically charged quantum matter exists only in non-compact localized form.

tary transformations, this is not possible in the massless limit since different asymptotic string directions belong to different superselection sectors [14].

It has been mentioned in the previous section that in the massive case the short distance singular physical matter fields can also be constructed in the BRST setting with the help of an appropriately adaptated adiabatic equivalence between $A^K_\mu(x),\ \varphi^K(x)$ and $A^P_\mu(x),\ \varphi(x)$; however the *zero mass Krein space formulation contains no physical matter field*. This limitation is more serious for zero mass Y-M interactions. In that case the AE principle suggests instead of (5) the nonlinear relation

$$A_\mu(x,e) = U(g\phi(x,e))A^P_\mu(x) + \partial_\mu\phi(x,e) \tag{31}$$

where U is a rotation of the "color" components whose infinitesimal form contains the operator-valued Stückelberg field components instead of the numerical rotation parameters. This relation would modify the S-matrix calculations in [24] which are based on the linear relation (8); it looks that the role of an external consistency-saving coupling to a Higgs multiplet in Scharf's setting [24] the adiabatic equivalence proof of (31) is played by the internal Stückelberg field $\phi(x,e)$ whose couplings to the Y-M potential appear if one uses (31) to pass from the pointlike to the stringlike description. As already mentiened at the end of the previous section, this opens the exiting possibility that the observed scalar particle in the LHC experiment is really a bound state of ϕ which would reconcile the Standard Model with the application of Okham's razor.

Apart from relating point- with string-like objects, (31) looks an operator gauge transformation, but its conceptual role is quite different from that in gauge theory. Here its purpose is to *insure that the better behaved (renormalizable) stringlocal potential remains in the same locality class as the pointlike Proca potential*; this is precisely what the implementation of the AE principle did in the second order S-matrix calculation in the previous section. So the gauge theoretic appearance of this relation is not the result of a "gauge principle" which has to be added to the foundational causality requirement of QFT in order to incorporate interacting vectormeson fields, but rather a consequence of the requirement that the two localizations belong to the same localization class and in this way describe the same physics.

A particularly interesting situation of the Schwinger-Swieca screening mechanism arises when the matter is a chargeless scalar field. The simplest model is the coupling of a neutral (hermitian) scalar matter field H with a massive vectormeson. The lack of global charge conservation permits the appearance of odd powers of H in the interaction density. In a pointlike description the $d_{sd} = 2$ Proca field would render the model non-renormalizable but the stringlike setting keeps it renormalizable, just as in massive scalar QED. As in all renormalizable models the renormalized interaction polynomial is uniquely determined by the power-counting restriction and the AE guaranties that the physical content is the same as that of the pointlike nonrenormalizable setting. According to Swieca's theorem [26] the (massive) Maxwell current leads to a screened Maxwell charge $Q_M = 0$ and in the neutral case this is the only current of this chargeless model.

Since the renormalizability requirement uniquely fixes a model in terms of its field content, this is the simplest version of the Higgs model. In his publications Swieca referred to its charge screening property as the *Schwinger-Higgs screening* [26]; but the reader should be aware that here "Higgs" refers to the model backed up by hisscreening theorem and not to the *Higgs-mechanism.* Indeed, couplings of massive vectormesons to both charged or neutral matter exhaust all renormalizable possibilities and, as always, renormalized model is uniquely defined by their field content and possible additionally imposed global inner symmetries (generalizations of globally conserved charges); there is simply no conceptual place for spontaneouly broken symmetries since the only conserved charge in the simple Higgs model (i.e. without additional charged matter fields). As explicit finite order calculations reveal and a rigorous theorem asserts in complete generality asserts, massive Maxwell currents are never spontaneously broken.

The rigorous theorem [34] about spontaneous broken symmetries (the Goldstones model is a special illustrations) based on the use of the Jost-Lehmann-Dyson representation shows that the unavoidable presence of a Goldstone boson (which couples to the conserved current) leads to a divergent charge, very different from the Maxwell charge which is the only conserved charge of the simple Higgs model.

Any metaphorical argument which leads to a new consistent model is perfectly legitimate, many important discoveries were obtained in this way. The problem starts if a "pons asini" is confused with the intrinsic conceptual content of a model. In QM computational manipulations are still closely related to the intrinsic physical content, but this is not the case in QFT. Lagrangians and their computational use are far removed from the intrinsic physical content of a model contained in its physical correlation functions, a fact which is often forgotten. Vacuum one-point functions in a Krein setting have no relation to physical symmetry breaking and the misunderstanding worsens if "gauge symmetry" is misread as a physical symmetry which can be broken. The stringlocal Hilbert space treatment avoids running into such misunderstandings.

But even before the more intrinsic non-Lagrangian stringlocal setting appeared on the scene, there were specific observations in the Krein setting which touched this problem. One of those observations is a a remark of Raymond Stora [36] that "local gauge symmetry" has nothing to do with a postulated Lagrangian symmetry, but rather results automatically from the consistency of renormalization. Inner symmetries, which can be spontaneously broken, are imposed in addition to the structure required by renormalization theory.

The Hilbert space formulation of renormalizable interactions in terms of stringlocal vectormesons is the formulation closest to "intrinsicness", the fully intrinsic physical objects being the Hilbert space correlation functions and the operators related to them through the GNS construction.

Another even more important old problem for which the stringlike formulation promises a solution is that of gluon/quark confinement. In the zero mass limit of abelian gauge theories the stringlike setting shows that *only stringlocalized matter fields survive in the massless limit.* What remains is the fact

that, although the relation with the Proca field is lost, the stringlocal $A_\mu(x,e)$ is still the semiinfinite line integral over the pointlike observable field strength. This allows the stringlocal field to be "chopped up" into stringy pieces and in particular the infinite tails of strings to be manipulated. The string-localization wrecks the mass-shells[16] of the matter fields and the existence of scattering amplitudes. The prescription for photon-inclusive cross sections amounts to such a manipulation of the tail (which corresponds to a e-directed spacelike infrared photon cloud); for a more covariant intrinsic observer-independent control of these tails see [35][1].

All this changes in a radical way in massless Y-M models. In this case the stringlike potentials in the physical Hilbert space cannot be represented as a line integral over pointlike densities; the semiinfinite string is algebraically irreducible (not a line-integral over a local field), it cannot be interpreted as an e-directed cloud of compact localized "stuff". In fact all observables are composites, there is no compact localizable stuff which is linearly related to the foundational stringlike gluon and quark fields. This changes the situation dramatically because the appearance of spacelike irreducible noncompact-localized matter from a compact interaction region would plainly contradict the most basic principle on which QFT is founded: causal localization. This aspect cannot be taken care of in a Krein space setting. Some of these properties should become visible even in a perturbative setting if one uses a more detailed spacetime description instead of momentum space Feynman graphs.

On the opposite side of the coin is the "invisibility" of the string-localized third Wigner representation class (the $m=0$ infinite spin class). In this case all states of such a representation are string-localized and there are good arguments that the second quantization does not lead to compact localizable subalgebras [9]. If for some unknown cosmological reasons such matter exists in our universe than it cannot be destroyed for the same causality preserving reasons for which gluons/quarks are confined; such matter could "feel" gravity but otherwise be inert [12].

5 Outlook

New concepts which shed light on old insufficiently understood problems usually lead to new questions, and the extension of QFT to string-localized fields is no exception. In the present work the new concepts were used to expand the range of renormalizability to interactions involving interactions of massive vectormesons. But string-localized fields with $d_{s.d.}=1$ and hence renormalizable couplings in the sense of the power-counting requirement exist for all spins [9]. Physically relevant are only models which admit sufficiently many pointlike-generated local observables which in the old setting of interactions of low spin matter with s=1 vectorpotentials. In the old setting this was achieved with the help of gauge invariance in a Krein space gauge theory setting; in

[16]The mass shell delta functions are replaces by less singular cuts which leads to the vanishing of LSZ limits and the appearance of perturbative logarithmic on-shell divergencies.

the new Hilbert space setting gauge invariance is replaced by string independence $d_e Op(x,e) = 0 \curvearrowright Op(x)$. It is hard to generalize the gauge formulation to interactions involving higher spin. The construction of observable subalgebras being generated by string-independent i.e. pointlike observable fields seems to have a much larger range, since the role of the gauge formulation is taken over by the more natural intrinsic notion of the AE principle which is based on locality. The latter insures that the well behaved stringlike fields, in terms of which the calculations are done, are locally related to generally less well behaved pointlike fields (members of the same localization class). This de-mystifies the gauge principle in favor of the foundational causal localization principle to which all QFTs are subjected. It deprives gauge theory of their special status within QFT.

The pointlike matter fields which appear in the AE principle cannot be Wightman fields but may well be strictly local fields (SLF) in the sense of Jaffe. The existence of these fields plays an important rule for massive vectormeson couplings, but it is doubtful that their compact localization (which only can be done with a model-dependent dense set of wave functions) and their unknown domain properties permit the definition of operator algebras as it is possible for Wightman fields. Their role may be restricted to the implementation of the AE. In fact a proof of the impossibility to extract operator algebras from such fields would be very interesting because it would mean that the Buchholz-Fredenhagen theorem [27] of string-localization (the cores of their arbitrary narrow spacelike cones) from the mass gap assumption is optimal in the case of massive vectormesons. In fact the authors were led to their theory by their improvement of the Swieca screening result [15].

The nonexistence of pointlike fields in the zero mass limit (the breakdown of the AE) suggests to construct massless gauge theories by computing the massless limit of the correlation functions of the massive stringlocal fields and use the Wightman reconstruction theorem for the operator formulation. This is the general way to deal with changes of representations resulting in mathematical and physical mutations in limiting situation.

Historically the extension of perturbation theory to stringlike localized fields resulted from modular localization [8][9] which is the field-cordinatization independent operator-algebraic way to formulate the causal localization principle. Its important role for a more profound understanding of QFT had been anticipated in [37]. A first account of its power to repair historical misunderstandings and shed new light on some incomplete understood problems in the "Einstein-Jordan conundrum" at the 1926 birth of QFT, as well its important role in nonperturbative construction of integrable QFTs can be found in [6].

Acknowledgement: I am indebted to Jens Mund for numerous discussions. The technique for the establishing string-independence of the second order loop terms I owe to him. I also thank Raymond Stora for his interest in this project and for his penetrating questions which led to better formulations of some important points.

References

[1] D. Buchholz and J. Roberts, *New Light on Infrared Problems: Sectors, Statistics, Symmetries and Spectrum*, arXiv:1304.2794

[2] J. Mund, String–localized quantum fields, modular localization, and gauge theories, New Trends in Mathematical Physics (V. Sidoravicius, ed.), Selected contributions of the XVth Int. Congress on Math. Physics, Springer, Dordrecht, 2009, pp. 495

[3] J. Mund, Prog.Math. **25**, (2007),1199, arXiv:hep-th/0502014

[4] B. Schroer, *An alternative to the gauge theoretic setting*, Found. Phys. **41**, (2011) 1543, arXiv:1012.0013

[5] J. Mund, *String-localized massive vector Bosons without ghosts and indefinite metric: The example of massive QED*, to appear

[6] B. Schroer, *Modular localization and the holistic structure of causal quantum theory, a historical perspective*, to appear

[7] B. Schroer, Modular Wedge Localization and the d=1+1 Formfactor Program, Ann. Phys. 295 (1999), 190, and references therein

[8] R. Brunetti, D. Guido and R. Longo, *Modular localization and Wigner particles*, Rev. Math. Phys. **14**, (2002) 759

[9] J. Mund, B. Schroer and J. Yngvason, *String-localized quantum fields and modular localization*, CMP **268** (2006) 621, math-ph/0511042

[10] S. Mandelstam, Ann. of Phys. **19**, (1962) 1

[11] B. Schroer, *Localization and the interface between quantum mechanics, quantum field theory and quantum gravity I,* Stud. Hist. Phil. Mod. Phys. **41**,(2010) 104, arXiv:0912.2874; part II, Stud.Hist. Phil. Mod. Phys. **41**, (2010) 293, arXiv:0912.2886

[12] B. Schroer, *Dark matter and Wigner's third positive-energy representation class*, arXiv:1306.3876

[13] H. Epstein and V. Glaser, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré A XIX, (1973) 211

[14] R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics*, Springer 1996

[15] D. Buchholz and K. Fredenhagen, Nucl. Phys. **B154**, (1979) 226

[16] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields I,* Cambridge University Press

[17] M. Plaschke and J. Yngvason, *Massless string-localized Quantum Fields for any Helicity*, arXiv:1111.5164

[18] R. F. Streater and A. S. Wightman, *PCT, Spin And Statistics, And All That*, W. A. Benjamin, Inc. New York 1964

[19] K. Bardackci and B. Schroer, *Local Approximations in Renormalizable and Nonrenormalizable Theories II*, J. Math. Phys **7**, (1966) 16

[20] A. Jaffe, Phys. Rev. **158**, (1967) 1454

[21] A. Aste, G. Scharf and M. Duetsch, J. Phys. **A30**, (1997) 5785

[22] M. Duetsch and G. Scharf, Ann. Physik **8**, (1999) 359

[23] M. Duetsch, J. M. Gracia-Bondia, F. Scheck, J. C. Varilly, *Quantum gauge models without classical Higgs mechanism*, arXiv:1001.0932

[24] G. Scharf, *Quantum Gauge Theory, A True Ghost Story*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York 2001

[25] J. H. Lowenstein and B. Schroer, Phys. Rev. **D7**, (1975) 1929

[26] J. A. Swieca, Phys. Rev. D **12**, (1976) 312

[27] D. Buchholz and K. Fredenhagen, Commun. Math. Phys. **84**, (1982) 1

[28] D. Buchholz, Commun. Math. Phys. **85**, (1982) 40

[29] D. Buchholz, Phys. Lett. **B174**, (1986) 331

[30] B. Schroer, *Jorge A. Swieca's contributions to quantum field theory in the 60s and 70s and their relevance in present research*, Eur. Phys. J. H **35**, (2010), 53, arXiv:0712.0371

[31] J. Fröhlich, G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, Phys. Lett. **89B**, (1979) 61

[32] J. Mund, J. Yngvason and B. Schroer, in preparation

[33] J. Swieca, Goldstone's theorem and related topics, Cargese Lectures in Physics, Vol.**4**, (1970) 315

[34] H. Ezawa and J. A. Swieca, Commun. Math. Phys. **5**, (1967) 330 arXiv:1306.3876 [pdf, ps, other]

[35] D. Buchholz, *New Light on Infrared Problems: Sectors, Statistics, Spectrum and All That*, arXiv:1301.2516

[36] R. Stora, Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.**5**, (2008) 1345, arXiv:0901.3426

[37] H-J Borchers, *On revolutionizing quantum field theory with Tomita's modular theory*, J. Math. Phys. **41**, (2000) 8604