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#### Abstract

T he recent concept ofm odular localization of w edge algebras suggests tw o m ethods of classifying and constructing Q FT s, one based on particlelike generators of w edge algebras using on-shell concepts ( $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{m}$ atrix, form factors. crossing property) and the other using the o -shell sim pli cation of lightfront holography (chiral theories).

The lack of an operator interpretation of the crossing property is a serious obstacle in on-shellconstructions. In special cases one can de ne a \m aster eld" whose connected form factors constitute an auxiliary therm al QFT for which the KMS cyclicity equation is identical to the crossing property of the form factors of the $m$ aster eld.

Further progress is expected to result from a conceptualunderstanding of the role of on-shell concepts as particle states and the $S-m$ atrix $w$ ith in the holographic lightfront projection .


## 1 H istory of the crossing property

The so-called crossing property of the $S \cdot m$ atrix and form factors ${ }^{1}$ is a deep and im portant, but at the sam e tim e incom pletely understood structure in particle physics. As a result of its inexorable link $w$ th analyticity properties in the quantum eld theoretic setting of scattering theory, crossing is not a sym $m$ etry in the standard sense (ofW igner), even though it is often referred to as \crossing sym m etry".

[^0]In contrast to the underlying causality principles which are \o -shell", i.e. are form ulated in term s of local observables or elds w ith unrestricted Fourier transform $s$, the crossing property is \on-shell", that is to say it refers to particle states which are described by wave functions on the forw ard $m$ ass hyperboloid $p^{2}=m^{2} ; p^{0} \quad 0$. Particle properties are intrinsic to a theory, whereas elds are (point-like [1] or string-like[2][3][4]) \coordinatizations" of local algebras; only localequivalence classes of elds or the local algebras generated by elds are truely \intrinsic" ${ }^{2}$. The use of the notion of \intrinsicness" in local quantum physics ( $L Q P$ ) is rem iniscent of the use of \invariant" (as opposed to coordinate-dependent) in geom etry; in this analogy the coordinates in geom etry correspond to the coordinatization of spacetim e-indexed algebras by pointlike eld generators. M ore speci cally, the use of pointlike elds is analogous to the use of singular coordinates (coordinate system $s$ which becom e singular som ewhere) since quantum elds are \operator-valued distributions" which require sm earing w ith test functions.

In the Lagrangian quantization approach to QFT, as well as in the more intrinsic algebraic approach to LQP, crossing plays no signi cant role. O nly in form ulations of particle physics which start with on-shell quantities and aim at the construction of spacetim e-indexed local algebras or local equivalence classes of elds, the crossing becom es an im portant structural tool.

E xam plespar exœllence ofpure on-shellapproaches are the various attem pts at S-m atrix theories which aim at direct constructions of scattering data without the use of local elds and local observables. The $m$ otivation behind such attem pts was for the rst time spelled out by $H$ eisenberg [5] and am ounts to the idea that by lim iting oneself to particles and their m ass-shells, one avoids (integration over) uctuation on a scale of arbitrarily sm all spacelike distances which are the cause of ultraviolet divergencies.

This idea of giving constructive prom inence to \on-shell" aspects is quite di erent and certainly $m$ ore conservative than attem pts at im proving shortdistance properties by introducing non-local interactions in a eld theoretic fram ew ork (for a historical review of non-localattem pts see [6]) which generally causes grave problem sw ith the causality properties underlying particle physics. $T$ he $m$ ain purpose of approaches using scattering concepts ( $\backslash o n$-shell") is to avoid such inherently singular ob jects as pointlike elds in calculational steps, which is a reasonable aim independent of whether one believes that a form ulation of interactions in term $s$ of singular pointlike elds exists in the $m$ athem atical physics sense or not.

H eisenberg's $S-m$ atrix proposalcan be seen as the rst attem pt in this direction. It incorporated unitarity, P oincare invariance and certain analytic properties, but already run into problem swith the im plem entation of chuster factorization properties for the m ultiparticle scattering.

There exists a m ore recent schem e of \direct particle interaction" which

[^1]solved this cluster factorization problem for the $m$ ulti-particle representations of the $P$ oincare group in the presence of interactions by an iterative construction [7]. To understand the problem with clustering, it is helpful to recall that in $m$ ultiparticles Schrodinger quantum $m$ echanics the step from $n$ to $n+1$ particles by sim ply adding the tw o-particle interactions of the new particle w th the n previous ones $m$ anifestly com plies (for su ciently short range interactions) w th the cluster factorizability of the unitary representors of the 10-param etric G alilei-group; the system and its symm etries factorizes into previously constructed subsystem $s$. But this in nite \R ussian matrushka" picture of particle physics (iteratively adding particles together $w$ ith their interactions and in tum recovering the previous sm aller system $s$ by translating one of the particle to in nity) runs into serious problem $s$ in the relativistic context. In $m$ athem atical term $s$ there exists a $m$ ism atch betw een the adding-on of particles and their $L$ covariant interactions on the one hand, and the cluster factorizability property i.e. the tensor factorization of the representation into the representation of the previously encountered multi-particle subsystem s on the other hand. For the tw o-particle system $s$ there is no problem w ith clustering if one de nes the interaction in term sof an additive $m$ odi cation of the invariant tw o-particle $m$ ass operator as rst proposed by B akam ijan and $T$ hom as [8]. H ow ever the iteration of this B-T procedure to 3 particles leads to a P oincare covariant representation which fails to cluster (the H am iltonian and the L-boosts are not asym ptotically additive); although the 3 -particle $S-m$ atrix ${ }^{3}$ does cluster [9]. Adding a fourth particle in the B-T way would also lead to the breakdown of the 4-particle S$m$ atrix chustering. The solution to this obstruction was later found in [7]; it consisted in modifying the 3-particle system by adding a connected 3-particle interaction in such a way that the 3 -particle $S-m$ atrix does not change. This is done by a so-called \scattering equivalence" [10] i.e. a unitary transform ation which changes the (B akam ijan-T hom as) 3-particle representation w thout a ecting the 3-particle $S-m$ atrix ${ }^{4}$.

It tums out that this process of adding on interactions to the $m$ ass operator and then enforcing clustering by invoking scattering equivalence works iteratively [7] and yields an $n$-particle interacting representation of the $P$ oincare group; in particular one obtains M ller operators and an S-m atrix which ful $1 l$ the cluster factorization property. T here is a prize to pay, nam ely the use ofscattering equivalences prevent the use of a second quantization form alism known from Schrodinger QM, thus separating relativistic direct particle interactions from QFT even on a form allevel. Nevertheless it does secure the m acro-locality expressed by the (rapid in case of short range interactions) fall-o properties of the connected parts of the representation of the P oincare group and the S-

[^2]$m$ atrix. D i erent from them ass superselection rule in $G$ alilei invariant quantum $m$ echanics, there is no selection rule involving particle $m$ asses $w h i c h$ requires the absence of particle creation processes com ing from Poincare sym m etry in this relativistic direct particle interaction form alism [7]. This poses the interesting question whether by coupling channels which lead to an increasing num ber of created particles one can approxim ate eld theoretic $m$ odels by $m$ athem atically controllable direct particle interactions. A fter this interlude about the feasibilIty ofm acro-causal relativistic particle theory (for a m ore detailed presentation see [6]) we now retum to the setting of FT.

Since the early 1950s, in the afterm ath ofrenom alization theory, the relation betw een particles and elds received signi cant elucidation through the derivation oftim e-dependent scattering theory. It also becam e clear that H eisenberg's $S-m$ atrix proposal had to be am ended by the addition of the crossing property i.e. a prescription ofhow to analytically continue particle $m$ om enta on the com plex $m$ ass shell in order to relate $m$ atrix elem ents of local operators betw een incom ing ket and outgoing bra states $w$ ith a xed total sum of in + out particles in term $s$ of one \m asterfiunction". In physical term $s$ it allow s to relate $m$ atrix elem ents $w$ ith particles in both the incom ing ket- and outgoing brastates to the vacuum polarization $m$ atrix elem ents where the ket-state (or the bra state) is the vacuum vector.

W hereas H eisenberg's requirem ents on a relativistic $S-m$ atrix can be im ple$m$ ented in a direct particle interaction schem $e$, the im plem entation of crossing is conceptually related to the presence of vacuum polarization for which QFT w ith its m icro-causality is the natural arena. At this point it should be clear to the reader why we highlighted the little known direct particle interaction theory; if one wants to shed som e light on the $m$ ysterious crossing sym $m$ etry, it $m$ ay be helpfill to contrast it $w$ ith theories of relativistic particle scattering in which this property is absent.

The LSZ tim e-dependent scattering theory and the associated reduction for$m$ alism relates such a $m$ atrix elem ent (referred to as a generalized form factor) in a naturalw ay to one in which an incom ing particle becom es \crossed" into an antiparticle on the backw ard realm ass shell; it is at this point where analytic continuation from a physicalprocess enters. T he im portant rem ark here is that the use of particle states requires the restriction of the analytic continuation to the com plex m ass shell ( $\backslash o n-s h e l l ")$. If one were to allow 0 -shell analytic continuations, the derivation of the crossing would be m uch easier since it w ould then follow from o -shell spectral representations of the Jost-Lehm ann-D yson kind or perturbatively from Feynm an diagram $s$ and tim e-ordered functions. In this paper the notion of crossing will only be used in the restrictive on-shell analytic continuation as it is needed for on-shell relation betw een form factors.

A rigorous on-shellderivation for tw o-particle scattering am plitude has been given by Bros ${ }^{5}$, Epstein and G laser [11]. The $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{m}$ atrix is the form factor of the identity operator. In the special case of the elastic scattering am plitude, the

[^3]crossing of only one particle from the incom ing state has to be accom panied by a reverse crossing of one of the outgoing particles in order to arrive at a physical process allow ed by energy-m om entum conservation. This crossing of a pair of particles from the in/out elastic con guration is actually the origin of the term inology \crossing" and was the $m$ ain object of rigorous analytic investigations [11]. A derivation of crossing in the setting of QFT for general $m$ ulti-particle scattering con gurations and for form factors, as one needs it for the derivation of a bootstrap-form factor program (see later) from the general principles of local quantum physics, does not yet exist. It is not clear to me whether the present state of art in QFT w ould perm it to go signi cantly beyond the old and still im pressive results quoted before [11].

The crossing property becam e the comerstone of the so-called bootstrap $S-m$ atrix program and several ad hoc representations of analytic scattering am plitudes w ere proposed ( $M$ andelstam , Regge...) in order to inconporate crossing in a $m$ ore $m$ anageable form.

An interesting early historical chance to approach QFT from a di erent direction by using on-shell global ob jects w thout short distance singularities w as wasted when the S-m atrix bootstrap approach ended in a verbal cleansing rage against QFT ${ }^{6}$ instead of serving in its construction as attem pted in this paper.

Som e of the $S-m$ atrix boot strap ideas were later used by Veneziano [12] in the construction of the \dualm odel". But there is an essentialdi erence in the way crossing was im plem ented. W hereas the eld theoretic crossing involves a nite num ber of particles w th the scattering continuum participating in an essential way, the dual m odel im plem ents crossing w thout the continuum by using instead as a start discrete in nite \particle tow er" w ith ever increasing $m$ asses (the origin of what w as later called \stringyness"). T his tow er structure w as afterw ards interpreted in term s of the particle excitations of a relativistic string. It is im portant to note that Veneziano's successful $m$ athem atical experim ent to im plem ent crossing with properties of $G$ am m a functions was m ore than a $m$ athem aticalinvention. In the late 60 s there som e of the dom inant phenom enological ideas about Regge poles called for a one-particle \saturation" of the crossing property in the setting of $M$ andelstam 's representation of the 2 -particle scattering am plitude. The popularity which the dualm odel en joyed before QCD appeared on the scene wasm ore related to these phenom enological aspects rather then to its role in carrying some of the legacy of the $S$-m atrix bootstrap approach.

There is som e irony in the fact that Chew and his follow ers, who tried to nd a philosophicalbasis for their $S-m$ atrix bootstrap ideas to attain the status of a theory of everything (T O E), did not succeed in these attem pts ${ }^{7}$, whereas

[^4]Veneziano, who had no such aim s, laid the seeds of string theory. C ontrary to the originalphenom enologicalintentions of the dualm odel, its string theoretical re-interpretation elevated it in the eyes of som e physicist to the status of a TOE (th is tim e including gravity). W hether one subscribes to such view or not, there can be little doubt that string theory becam equite speculative and acquired a som ew hat ideological stance. C ontrary to the bootstrap of the Chew school how ever, it led to signi cant $m$ athem aticalenrichm ents even though its role for particle physics becam e increasingly $m$ ysterious.
$T$ he $m$ ain reason why the old bootstrap approach ended in the dustbin of history was its clinging to its dism issive view of QFT even at a timewhen the success of gauge theories w as already obvious. O $n$ a deeper level and in and in relation to the content of the present paper it is obvious that it did not succeed in its own tem s since it was unable convert the analyticity based bootstrap ideas by a $m$ athem atically well-de ned operator form alism which inconporates the crossing property in a naturalway.

In recent years the sim ilarity of the cyclic crossing property of form factors w ith the better understood cyclic KM S condition for wedge-localized algebras (the R indler Unruh them al aspect) led to the conjecture that the form er is an on-shell consequence of the latter. W hereas this tums out to be true for $d=1+1$ factorizing $m$ odels, the nature of the connection betw een these tw o cyclic properties in the generalsetting rem ains obscure and needs further clari cations.
$T$ he content of the paper is organized as follow s . In the next section we set the stage for the concept of $m$ odular localization $w$ hich $w$ ill be our $m$ ain new constructive tool. $W$ hereas $w$ thout interactions there is a com plete parallelism betw een particle- and eld-m odular localization, the presence of interactions has a de-localizing e ect on the side of particles as a result of interaction-caused vacuum polarization. A usefiul concept which captures this de-localization aspect is that of vacuum -polarization-free generators (PFG) which high lights the wedge localization as representing the best com prom ise betw een particle- and eld- localization. In the third section we recall that the requirem ent of translation invariant dom ains for PFGs ( $\backslash$ tem pered" PFGs) essentially leads to the Zam olodchikov Faddeev algebra structure which characterize d=1+1 factorizing theories. This is a m odest realization of the old \bootstrap dream ", but now as a valuable constructive tool of QFT w ithout the unfounded claim of a TOE.

In the fourth section the idea of a \m aster eld" $w$ ill be set forth whose connected form factors de ne a nonlocal QFT in $m$ om entum space for which the KM S condition is identical w ith crossing. W hereas for factorizing models this idea reduces to Lukyanov's \free eld representations", in a m ore general setting the hypothesis rem ains a $m$ atter of interesting speculation and a sub ject for future research.
$F$ inally $m$ odular localization is used to form ulate \algebraic lightfront holography" which relatesm assive quantum eld theories to generalized chiralm odels on the lightfront. A s a result of its m anchoring in AQFT and is conceptual tightness, one would expect this new idea to play an im portant role in future construction $m$ ethods. Its confrontation $w$ th the setting for $d=1+1$ factorizing
$m$ odels reveals that the $m$ assive particle aspects including crossing and scattering data and the chiral conform al eld based holographic properties coexist as tw o descriptions of the sam e theory in one and the sam e H ilbert space.

## 2 M odular Localization for $P$ articles and $F$ ields

The concept of m odular localization, which will be review ed in this section, has signi cantly enriched ideas about the relation between particles and elds. In particular it has led to a profound understanding of those properties in the particle- eld relation which persist in the presence of interactions and which in tum are im portant in an intrinsic understanding of interaction; this is the understanding which, borrow ing an aphorism of Pascual Jordan [14], does not rely on \classical crutches", as does the standard Lagrangian quantization.

H istorically the rst step into a direction of intrinsic form ulation of relativistic quantum physics was undertaken by W igner when in 1939 he identi ed relativistic particle states w ith irreducible positive energy representations of the Poincare group. These representations com e with tw o localization concepts: the $N$ ew ton-W igner localization [15] and the $m$ ore recent $m$ odular localization [16][17][18].

The N W localization is the result of the adaptation of B om's quantum $\mathrm{me} \mathrm{e}^{-}$ chanical localization probability density to W igner's relativistic setting. This localization is im portant in relativistic scattering theory since it leads to the probability interpretation of cross sections, which was actually the setting in which Bom introduced probabilities into QM (the x-space probability interpretation of the Schroedinger w ave function appears later in P auli's $H$ andbuch article). It is not Lorentz-covariant nor local for nite distances, but the fact that it acquires these tw o properties in the asym ptotic region is su cient for obtaining a relativistic asym ptotic particle description and in particular a P oincare invariant $S$ m atrix [23]. It should not com e as a surprise that its use for propagation over nite distances leads to nonsensical results on the feasibility of superlum inalpropagation [24].

O $n$ the other hand the $m$ odular localization is the localization which is m plicit in the form alism of local quantum eld theory. It is well known that if one applies sm eared elds w ith localized $O$-support of the $s m$ earing function suppf $O$ to the vacuum, the resulting vectors $w i l l$ belong to a dense subspace $\mathrm{H}(\mathrm{O})^{9}$ which will change its position in the am bient space $w$ ith the change of the localization region

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(f) 2 H(O) \quad H \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

M odular localization theory is a relatively new conceptual fram ew ork which places this kind of relation between spactim e regions of vacuum excitations and positions of dense subspaces on a m ore intrinsic and rigorous footing, so

[^5]that it becom es independent of the use of eld coordinatizations. This is done by trading the subspace generated by sm eared elds with the dom ain of the O dependent T om ita S-operatorH (O) dom So (see next section) which is directly associated w ith the localized algebra and does not refer to its coordinatization in term sof elds.

This encoding of $M$ inkow skispacetim e localization into relative position of subspaces (or equivalently in term sofrealsubspaces (3) ofwhich H (O) tumsout to be the com plex com bination) is a characteristic phenom enon of local quantum physics; it essentially depends on the presence of a nite maxim al causal propagation speed and hence has no counterpart in the Schrodinger QM.T he denseness of the localization spaces prevents a description in term $s$ of pro jectors onto com plex subspaces and hence evades the assum ptions of the $m$ entioned no-go theorem [22].

This unusual situation, which goes som ew hat against quantum $m$ echanical intuition, is inexorably linked w ith a structural change of the local algebras as com pared to the algebraic structure of quantum $m$ echanics. W hereas the algebra of QM has minim al projectors (corresponding to best observations), the structure of projection operators w ithin local relativistic algebras is very different from that of pro jectors in the global algebra associated w th the entire M inkow skispacetim e. All these changes can be traced back to the om nipresence of vacuum polarizationswhich in tum are inexorably related to relativistic causality in the setting of quantum theories.
$T$ he di erence betw een quantum $m$ echanicaland $m$ odular localization show $s$ up in a dram atic fashion in a fam ousG edankenexperim ent which Ferm iproposed [25] in order to show that the velocity of light rem ains the lim iting propagation velocity in the quantum setting of relativistic eld theory. An updated argum ent con m ing Ferm i's conclusion which takes into account the conceptual progress on the issue of causallocalization and $m$ athem atical rigor can be found, as $m$ entioned before, in [24]. A lthough all quantum mechanical situations associated w ith Bell's inequalities can be transferred to QFT w th the help of the split property, there are problem swith achieving the vacuum polarization free two-particle state postulated by Ferm i ${ }^{10}$. This does how ever not a ect the conclusion that localized exitations of the vacuum cannot propagate $w$ ith $a$ superlum inal speed.

The m odular localization theory associated w ith localized algebras in Q FT has a sim pler spatial counterpart which can be directly applied to the $W$ igner representation theory of the P oincare group. In the next section we w ill study this spatial m odular localization. In addition of being interesting in its own right, this $w$ ill facilitate the subsequent presentation of algebraic $m$ odular localization theory which is indispensable in order to inconporate interactions in a eld-coordinatization independent way.

[^6]
### 2.1 M odular localization in the absence of interactions

M odular localization as an intrinsic concept of localquantum physics (i.e. w thout reference to any pointlike eld coordinatization), has its origin in the $B$ isognanoW ichm ann theorem forwedge-localized algebras in QFT [26][27]. In the context ofW igner's description ofelem entary relativistic system $s$ in term s of irreducible positive energy representations of the $P$ oincare group, the construction of this localization proceeds as follow s [16] [17][18]

1. Fix a reference wedge region, e.g. $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{R}}=\mathrm{x} 2 \mathrm{R}^{4} ; \mathrm{x}^{1}>\mathrm{x}^{0}$ and use the $W$ igner representation of the $W_{R}$-a liated boost group $W_{R}()$ and the $x^{0} \quad x^{1}$ re ection ${ }^{11}$ along the edge of the $w e d g e j_{N_{R}}$ in order to de ne the follow ing antilinear unbounded closable operator ( w ith closS $=$ clos $\frac{1}{2}$ ). $R$ etaining the sam e notation for the closed operators, one de nes

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{W_{R}}=J_{W_{R}} \quad \frac{1}{2}  \tag{2}\\
& J_{W_{R}}=U\left(j_{N_{R}}\right) ; \quad \text { it }:=U\left(W_{R}(2 t)\right)
\end{align*}
$$

The comm utativity of $J_{W_{R}}$ with it together $w$ ith the antiunitarity of $J_{W_{R}}$ yield the property which characterize a Tom ita operator ${ }^{12} S_{W_{R}}^{2}$ whose dom ain is identicalto its range: Such operators are well-know $n$ to be equivalent to their real standard subspaces of the $W$ igner representation space $H$ which arise as their closed real + 1 eigenspaces $K$ (W)

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{K}\left(\mathbb{W}_{\mathrm{R}}\right) & =\mathrm{f} 2 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{R}}}=\mathrm{g}  \tag{3}\\
\mathrm{~K}\left(\mathbb{W}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)+\mathrm{i} \mathrm{~K}\left(\mathbb{W}_{\mathrm{R}}\right) & =\mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{K}\left(\mathbb{W}_{\mathrm{R}}\right) \backslash \mathrm{i}\left(\mathbb{W}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)=0 \\
\mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{~K}\left(\mathbb{W}_{\mathrm{R}}\right) & =\mathrm{K}\left(\mathbb{W}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)^{?}
\end{align*}
$$

$T$ he real subspace $K\left(W_{R}\right)$ is closed in $H$, whereas the com plex subspace spanned together $w$ ith the -1 eigenspace $i K\left(W_{R}\right)$ is the dense dom ain of the Tom ita operator $S_{W_{R}}$ and form $s$ a H ilbert space in the graph norm of $S_{W}{ }_{R}$. The denseness in $H$ of this span $K\left(W_{R}\right)+i K\left(W_{R}\right)$ and the absence of nontrivial vectors in the intersection $K\left(W_{R}\right) \backslash i K\left(W_{R}\right)$ is called \standardness". T he right hand side in the third line refers to the sym plectic com plem ent i.e. a kind of \orthogonality" in the sense of the sym plectic form $\operatorname{Im}(;)$ :

A dditional com $m$ ents. The denseness of the com plex spans of $m$ odular $l$ calization spaces is a one-particle analog of the $R$ eeh-Schlieder theorem [23]. Each Tom ita operator $S_{W}$ encodes physicalinform ation about localization into

[^7]the position of its dense dom ain (which equals its dense range) within $H$ : Equivalently real standard subspaces or their com plex dense span determ ine uniquely an abstract Tom ita operator (which in general is not related to geom etry or group representation theory). The application of P oincare transform ations to the reference situation generates a consistent fam ily of wedge spaces $K(\mathbb{W})=U(; a) K_{( }\left(W_{R}\right)$ if $W=(; a) W_{R}:$

O ne of the surprises of this modular localization setting is the fact that it already preem pts the spin-statistics connection on the level of one-particle representation theory by producing a $m$ ism atch betw een the sym plectic and the geom etric com plem ent which is related to the spin-statistics factor [17][18]

$$
\begin{align*}
K(\mathbb{W})^{?} & =Z K\left(\mathbb{W}^{0}\right)  \tag{4}\\
Z^{2} & =e^{2} \text { is }
\end{align*}
$$

A nother surprising fact is that the $m$ odular setting prepares the ground for the crossing property, since the equation characterizing the realm odular localization subspaces in $m$ ore details reads

$$
\begin{equation*}
J{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}(p)=\overline{c(p)}=(p) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

i.e. the com plex conjugate of the analytically continued w ave function but now referring to the charge-conjugate situation) is up to a matrix which acts on the spin indices equal to the originalw ave function.

2 T he sharpening of localization is obtained by intersecting wedges in order to obtain real subspaces as causally closed subw edge regions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
K(O):=\_{W} \quad \circ K(\mathbb{W}) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The crucial question is whether they are \standard". A ccording to an im portant theorem of B runetti, G uido and Longo [16] standardness holds for spacelike cones $O=C$ in allpositive energy representations. In case of nite spin/helicity representations the standardness also holds for (arbitrary sm all) double cones D. The double cone regions D are conveniently envisaged as intersections of a forw ard cone w th a backw ard cone whose apex is inside the forw ard cone; the sim plest description of a spacelike cone C with apex $a$ is in term sof a scaled up double cone C $=a+[\quad 0 \quad D$ where D is spacelike separated from the origin. B oth regions are characteristic for sim ply connected Poincare-invariant causally closed fam ilies of com pact or noncom pact extension resulting from intersecting wedges in $M$ inkow ski spacetim $e$. In those cases where the double cone localized spaces $w$ ith pointlike "cores" are trivial ( $m$ assless in nite spin, $m$ assive $d=1+2$ anyons), the sm allest localization regions are spacelike cones $w$ ith sem in nite strings as cores.

A dditional com $m$ ents. A thhough the connection betw een standard real subspaces and Tom ita operators $S$ holds in both directions (and hence standard
intersections alw ays have an associated Tom ita operator $S$ ); the com ponents of their polar decom position it and $J$ have generally no relations to di eom onphism s of the underlying spacetim e. W hile leaving the localization regions invariant (or transform ing them into their causal disjoint) and hence still encoding the full inform ation of localization, their actions within $O$ as well on its causal com plem ent $O^{0}$ are \fuzzy", which at best $m$ ay be expressed (in the W ightm an setting of F T ) in term sofactions on test function spaces $w$ th $x e d$ localization supports (see below 12).

3 In the absence of interactions the transition from free particles to algebras of elds is m ost appropriately done in a functorial way by applying the $W$ eyl (CCR) (or in case of hal nteger spin the CAR functor) to the localization K -spaces ${ }^{13}$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
A(O) & =\operatorname{alg} f \mathrm{~W} \operatorname{eyl}(\mathrm{l}) \quad 2 \mathrm{~K}(\mathrm{O}) \mathrm{g}  \tag{7}\\
\mathrm{~W} \operatorname{eyl}(\mathrm{f}) & =\operatorname{expi} \quad \text { a }(\mathrm{p} ; \mathrm{s}) \quad(\mathrm{p} ; \mathrm{s}) \frac{d^{3} \mathrm{p}}{2!(\mathrm{p})}+\mathrm{h}: \mathrm{a}:
\end{align*}
$$

functorial relation betw een realsubspaces and von N eum ann algebras preserves the causal localization structure [19] and commutes with the im provem ent of localization through intersections (6) (denoted by <br>) as expressed in the follow ing com $m$ uting square

| $\mathrm{K}_{W}$ | $!$ | $\mathrm{A}(\mathbb{W})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\# \backslash$ |  | $\# \backslash$ |
| $\mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{O}}$ | $!$ | $\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{O})$ |

i.e. $w$ ithout interactions there is a perfect $m$ atch betw een particle- and eldlocalization ${ }^{14}$. For later purposes we introduce the follow ing de nition [28].

De n ition 1 A vacuum-polarization-free generator (PFG) for a region O is an operator a liated with the algebra $A(O)$ which created a vacuum-polarizationfree one-particle vector

$$
\begin{align*}
& G \quad A(O)  \tag{9}\\
G & =1 \quad \text { particle }
\end{align*}
$$

It is easy to see that (in case of Bosons) PFGs are necessarily unbounded operators. In the absence of interactions they tum out to consist precisely of those $O$-localized operators which are linear in the $W$ igner creation/annihilation operators. In that case a denum erable covariant pointlike basis of PFGs is conveniently described in term s of the well-known set of interw ining functions

[^8]$u(p ; s)$ (and their charge conjugates $v(p ; s)$ ) which relate the given canonical $(m ; s) W$ igner representation $w$ th the various tensorial (spinorial) covariant free elds
\[

$$
\begin{align*}
A(x) & ={ }^{Z} e^{i p x} x  \tag{10}\\
p^{0} & =p_{\left(p ; s_{3}\right) a\left(p ; s_{3}\right)+e^{i p x}}^{p^{2}+m^{2}} v\left(p ; s_{3}\right) b\left(p ; s_{3}\right)^{\circ} \frac{d^{3} p}{2 p^{0}} \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$
\]

W hereas the ( $m$; s) $W$ igner creation/annihilation operators $a^{\#}(p ; s)$ and the above localized algebras are unique, there exists an denum erable set (labeled by pairs of undotted/dotted spinorial indiges) of covariant intertw inw ers for xed ( $m$; s) [20]. Their $m$ ain role $w$ ith respect to the issue of $m$ odular localization consists in relating the quantum concept of $m$ odular localization to the $m$ ore classical notion of localization via support properties of test functions

$$
K(O)=\operatorname{clos} E_{m} \tilde{f}^{(p) u_{k}(p ; s) j s u p p f} \quad 0 ; k=1:: \mathbb{N}^{\circ}
$$

where $E_{m} f(p)$ stands for the $m$ ass-shell projection ${ }^{15}$ of the Fourier transform of the realtest function $f$ and the closure is taken in the linear span $w$ ith i runs over all Lorentz (spinorial) com ponents N and f running over all O -supported test functions; as before the closure w ithin the W igner representation space is restricted to real linear com binations. T his way of relating $m$ odular localization to classical test function supports is (whenever it is possible) the easiest way to show the standardness property. W hen the appearance ofm assless in nite spin representations only allow s standardness of spacelike cone-localized spaces, the analogs of the above intertw iners lead to sem in nite spacelike string-localized elds A (x;e) (w the being a spacelike unit vector [2]) which have no interpretation in term $s$ of Lagrangian quantization (and should not be confused with ob jects of string theory).

A s expected, the crossing relation for connected $m$ atrix elem ents (connected form factors) of a wedge-localized operator B 2 A (W) (p denotes the charge conjugate particle $w$ ith $m$ om entum $p$ )

$$
\begin{align*}
& h \mathrm{p}_{1} ;::: ; \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}}-\mathrm{B} j \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}+1} ;::: ; \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{n}} i_{\text {conn }}  \tag{13}\\
& =\mathrm{h} \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{n}} ; \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}} ;::: ; \mathrm{p}_{1}-\mathrm{B} \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}+1} ;::: ; \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{n}} \quad 1 i_{\mathrm{conn}}
\end{align*}
$$

results from the KM S property of the wedge-restricted vacuum state (suppf $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i}}$ W )

$$
\begin{align*}
& h A\left(f_{1}\right)::: A\left(f_{k}\right) B A\left(f_{k+1}\right)::: A\left(f_{n}\right) i  \tag{14}\\
& =\operatorname{hAd}\left(A\left(f_{n}\right)\right) A\left(f_{1}\right)::: A\left(f_{k}\right) B A\left(f_{k+1}\right)::: A\left(f_{n}\right) i
\end{align*}
$$

by taking the connected part and using the density of the W -supported product of test functions in the multiparticle tensor-product $W$ igner spaces.

[^9]Since it is very convenient to consider the later lightfront holography (section 6) as part ofm odular wedge localization, we w illbrie y explain in the follow ing in a pedestrian way how this is done for a m assive $H$ em itian free eld $A(x)=$ A (x). Using the previous notation (12) one has for real test functions $w$ ith suppf W

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A(f)=\quad a(p) E_{m} f^{Z}(p)+h: c: \frac{d^{3} p}{2 p_{0}}=\quad a(p) E_{m} f^{Z}(p)+h: c: \frac{d}{2} d^{2} p^{2} \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& w \text { ith } p=\left(m_{\text {eff }} \text { cosh } ; m_{\text {eff }} \sinh ; p \text { ? }\right) ; m_{\text {eff }}=\overline{m^{2}+p_{?}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the $\mathrm{x}^{0} \quad \mathrm{x}^{1}$ localization in the 0-1 reference wedge im plies that $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{f}^{\sim}(\mathrm{p})$ of the real test function $f$ is a vector in the dense subspace $K_{r}(\mathbb{W})+i K_{r}(\mathbb{W})$ ofboundary value of analytic functions in the strip w ith respect to the $m$ easure $\frac{d}{2} d^{2} p_{\text {? }}$ : Since product functions $E_{m} f(p)=f_{+}() \tilde{f}_{\text {? }}^{(p}\left(p_{\text {? }}\right) w$ ith $f_{+}^{\prime}()$ stripanalytic are dense in $\mathrm{K}_{r}(\mathbb{W})+i \mathrm{~K}_{r}(\mathbb{W})$ it is convenient to use them in the follow ing way (pe)

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Z } \\
& a(p) f_{+}() \tilde{f}_{?}\left(p_{?}\right)+h: c: \frac{d}{2} d^{2} p_{?}=A\left(f_{+} f_{?}\right)  \tag{16}\\
& \text { Z } \\
& =A_{L F}(x) f_{+}\left(x_{+}\right) f_{?}\left(x_{?}\right) d x_{+} d x_{\text {? }} \\
& f_{+}\left(x_{+}\right) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{Z}^{Z_{1}} \underset{f_{+}}{ }(\ln p) e^{i p} x_{+} \frac{d p}{2 p} \\
& A_{L F}(x)=\frac{1}{(2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \quad \text { a }(p) e^{i p x_{+}+i p_{?} x_{?}}+h: c: d p d^{2} p_{\text {? }} \\
& {\left[\mathrm{a}(\mathrm{p}) ; \mathrm{a}\left(\mathrm{p}^{0}\right)\right]=2 \mathrm{p} \quad\left(\mathrm{p} \mathrm{Z}^{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{p}^{0}\right) \quad\left(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{p}_{?}^{0}\right)} \\
& y \operatorname{hA}_{L F}(x) A_{L F}\left(x^{0}\right) i=e^{i p\left(x_{+} x_{+}^{0}\right)} \frac{d p}{2 p} \quad\left(x \quad x_{?}^{0}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

where in the last line the two-point function has been rew ritten in the new lightfront variables. A s a consequence of the strip analyticity in the function $f_{+}\left(x_{+}\right)$is supported on the positive $x_{+}$axis. N ote that the vanishing of the Fourier transform at $\mathrm{p}=0$ is not im posed but results from the square integrability of $f()$ which forces the $\tilde{f_{+}}(\ln p)$ to vanish at the lower boundary $\mathrm{p}=0$ (this also holds $w$ thout the specialization to product functions):

W thout this vanishing property the infrared divergence in the Fourier representation for $A_{\text {LF }}(x)$ would not be com pensated and the expression would not be equal to the original one. The relevant testfunction spaces for lightcone quantization were rst introduced (w thout referring to m odular localization) in [21]. N ote also that the Fourier transform ed lightfront test functions $f_{+}\left(x_{+}\right) f_{\text {? }}\left(x_{\text {? }}\right)$ (unlike their original counterpart $f(x)$ ) are not sub ject to any $m$ ass shell restriction i.e. the lightfront localization relates the sm eared elds
w ith individual functions on the lightfront rather than m ass shell equivalence classes ${ }^{16}$ of am bient test functions..

The term inology \lightfront restriction" for this rew riping becom es m ore com prehensible in term $s$ of the follow ing form al steps ( $r=\frac{\mathrm{P}}{\mathrm{x}_{1}^{2}} \mathrm{x}_{0}^{2}$ )

$$
\begin{align*}
& A(x) \underset{\sim}{j}=\underset{Z}{A}\left(r \sinh ; r \cosh ; x_{\text {? }}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{(2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \quad \text { a }(p) e^{i m_{e f f} r \sinh (\quad)+i p_{?} x_{?}}+h: c: \frac{d}{2} d^{2} p_{?} \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{1}{(2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{ }^{Z} d^{2} p_{?}^{Z_{1}} \quad a(p) e^{i p} x_{+}+i p_{?} x_{?}+h: c: \frac{d p}{2 p}=A_{L F}(x)=: A(x) \dot{\eta}_{F}
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the last line we have absorbed $m$ ef $f$ into the de nition of the integration variable p : A though we obtain the same form ula as before, the form al way requires to add the restriction on test fiunction spaces whose Fourier transform $s$ vanish at $p=0 \backslash$ by hand". For $d=1+1$ the transverse $x_{\text {? }}$ and $p$ are absent.

Lightfront restriction does not $m$ ean pointw ise restriction of the correlation
 $T h$ is point was the source of occasional confiusion in the literature on lightcone quantization. In fact already the term inology \lightcone quantization" creates the im pression that one is aim ing at a di erent quantization leading to a possibly di erent theory, whereas in reality the physical problem is to describe the am bient local theory in term $s$ of a di erent locality structure associated $w$ ith the lightfront. T his LF locality structure, although being local in its ow n right, is relatively nonlocalw ith respect to the am bient locality structure. The pivotal problem of how these tw o structures are related was not addressed in the old approach.

In the absense of interactions the lightfront restriction A $\dot{\text { in }}_{\mathrm{F}}$ shares w ith the ambient free eld $A$ the vanishing of higher than two-point correlations. A s a consequence there is only one am bient theory associated w ith the above lightfront eld. As w ill be argued in section 6, in the presence of interactions one expects the relation of the am bient theories to their holographic pro jection to be $m$ any to one i.e. the concept of \holographic universality classes" becom es im portant in inverse holography (reconstruction ofam bient theories from a given LF description).
$T$ he im portant observation in the context of localization is that the algebras generated by sm earing $A(x)$ iv and $A(x)$ 主 w ith the corresponding test function spaces are identical

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{alg} f A(f) j s u p p f \quad W g=\operatorname{alg} f A_{L F}\left(f_{+} f_{?}\right) \text { jsuppf } f_{+} \quad R_{+} g \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^10]A though the equality of the wedge- w ith the lightfront- localized algebra tums out to be a general feature of QFT ${ }^{17}$, it is only in the free eld case that one can describe the localization aspects of the lightfront algebra by the above process of a restriction of the am bient free eld. For interacting elds the local net structure on the lightfront has to be recovered in an algebraic m anner referred to as \algebraic lightfront holography", which w ill be presented in section $6 . T$ his new approach dem ysti es and corrects to a considerable degree the old ideas on lightcone quantization.

### 2.2 M odular localization in the presence of interactions

There is a drastic weakening in the relation betw een particle- eld localization when interactions are present. T he parallelism expressed in the above com m uting square is lost. In particular interactions destroy the possibility of having subw edge-localized PFG s ${ }^{18}$. Q uantum elds also loose that kind of \individuality" (associated with the $m$ easurem ent of eld strength) which elds enjy in classical physics; the role of quantum elds (besides being the non-intrinsic im plem enters of the relativistic locality principle) is restricted to interpolate particles and to \coordinatize" (in the sense of singular generators) local nets of algebras. H ence it is som ew hat surprising that there are tw o rem arkable and potentially useful properties which survive the presence of interactions. As in the fram ew ork of LSZ scattering theory, in the follow ing we are assum ing the existence of a m ass gap.

1. W edge algebras A ( $W$ ) have the sm allest localization region which still perm its a liated PFGs [47], i.e. to every wedge-localized one-particle wave function $2 \mathrm{~K}(\mathbb{W})+i K(\mathbb{W})$ there exists a $G \quad A(\mathbb{W})$ with

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{G}=  \tag{20}\\
& \mathrm{G}=\mathrm{S}
\end{align*}
$$

$T$ his is the best com prom ise betw een particles and elds in the presence of interactions; any im provem ent on the level of particles (e.g. construction ofn-particle states for n> 1) w ould only be possible in the com pletely de-localized global algebra (w hich contains e.g. the creation/annihilation operators). V ice versa any im provem ent in the localization by passing to sulbw edge algebras w ould lead to the adm ixture of interaction-induced vacuum polarization (states w ith ill-de ned particle num ber) to the oneparticle com ponent. H ence the presence of this kind of vacuum polarization clouds for subw edge regions is an intrinsic signal of the presence of interactions. This raises the interesting question whether there is som e com m on feature to interaction-induced vacuum polarization clouds which perm its a ner classi cation of interactions; this is a problem which certainly $m$ ust be solved if one wants to use this intrinsic characterization

[^11]of interactions as a constructive altemative to the $m$ ore extrinsic eldcoordinatization dependent standard Lagrangian quantization approach.
2. In asym ptotically com plete Q FT, the $S-m$ atrix $S_{\text {scat }}$ is a relative $m$ odular invariant betw een the interacting and the free incom ing wedge algebras
\[

$$
\begin{align*}
& S=J{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}  \tag{21}\\
& \text { it }=\quad \text { it } \\
& \text { in }
\end{align*}
$$ ; J=J_{in} S_{scat} .
\]

$T$ his follow sfrom the T C P-invariance of the $S-m$ atrix and the fact that the m odular J di ers from TCP by a spatial -rotation [23]which (as allconnected P oincare transform ations) com $m$ utes $w$ th the scattering $m$ atrix. $T$ his structural property relates the position of the dense wedge-localized subspace $H_{F}$ (W ) w ithin the Fock space $H_{F}$ (de ned by e.g. the outoperators) to the $S-m$ atrix.
3. The split property [23] perm its to form ulate the notion of \statistical independence" (well-known from quantum $m$ echanics) which concems the construction of interacting statesw ith independently prescribed localcom ponents. $T$ his is needed in order to control the strong vacuum uctuations which result from shanp spacetim e localization and leads to a partial retum of quantum $m$ echanical structures. A though the split property has up to now not played a direct role in $m$ odel constructions, it is believed to be im portant in securing the standardness of intersections of wedge algebras and hence the nontriviality of $m$ odels [30].

Additional com $m$ ents. The interpretation of the scattering operator as a relative m odular invariant associated $w$ ith the wedge region leads to rather strong consequenœes if one assum es that the connected part of the form factors ful 11 the follow ing crossing relations

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { out } \mathrm{hp}_{1} ;::: ; \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}}-\mathcal{j} \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}+1} ;::: ; \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{n}} i_{\mathrm{conn}}^{\text {in }}=  \tag{22}\\
& \text { out } \mathrm{h} \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{n}} ; \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}} ;::: ; \mathrm{p}_{1}-\mathrm{\beta} \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}+1} ;::: ; \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{n}} 1 i_{\mathrm{conn}}^{\text {in }}
\end{align*}
$$

$w$ here $B$ is an operator a liated with $A(\mathbb{W})$ : It has the sameform as in the free case (13) except that the particles in the bra/ket vectors are referring to the di erent out/in particle states. Evidently this property perm its to relate the vacuum polarization com ponents

$$
\mathrm{hp}_{\mathrm{n}} ;::: ; \mathrm{p}_{1} \beta \text { i }
$$

w ith the general form factor by a succession of crossings. The position of the dense subspace generated by all operators B A (W ) a liated with A (W ) from the vacuum is determ ined by the dom ain of the Tom ita operator $S$ which is in tum determ ined by the scattering operator $S_{\text {scat }}$ : A ssum e that a given crossing sym $m$ etric scattering operator $S_{\text {scat }} w$ ould adm it tw o di erent w edge algebras
$A_{i}(\mathbb{W}) ; i=1 ; 2$ : Since these algebras $m$ ust have the sam $e T o m$ ita operator for each $B_{1} A_{1}(\mathbb{W})$ therem ust exist an operator $B_{2} \quad A_{1}(\mathbb{W})$ such that $B_{1}=B_{2}$ which $m$ eans that the vacuum polarization com ponents (23) are identical: But then the crossing property (22) lift this identity to the general form factors w hich requires $\mathrm{B}_{1}=\mathrm{B}_{2}$ and hence the desired equality $\mathrm{A}_{1}(\mathrm{~W})=\mathrm{A}_{2}(\mathrm{~W})$ : Since the net of localized algebras is uniquely xed in term s of intersections of wedge algebras, this w ould im ply the uniqueness of the inverse scattering problem [52]. $N$ ote how ever that the crossing property of form factors in the generalinteracting case is presently an additionalassum ption ${ }^{19}$; only for $\mathrm{d}=1+1$ factorizing m odels crossing it can be show $n$ to follow from the KM S property for the restriction of the vacuum to wedge algebras in a sim ilar fashion as for free elds (see section 4). W ithout assum ing the crossing property for form factors it does not appear to be possible to derive the uniqueness of the inverse scattering problem from the standard postulates of Q FT [31].
$T$ he prerequisites for form factor crossing are obtained from the LSZ scattering theory and in particular from the resulting reduction form ulas in term $s$ of tim e-ordered products. For the connected form factors one obtains


```
    i \(\quad{ }^{\text {out }} h_{q_{2}} ;::: q_{n} \quad \mathcal{K}_{y}\) TBA \(\quad(y) j_{1} ; p_{2}:: p_{n} i_{\text {con } n}^{\text {in }} d^{4} y e^{i q_{1} y}\)
        Z
```



Here the tim e-ordering $T$ involving the original operator $B 2 A(O)$ and the pointlike interpolating $H$ eisenberg $e^{20} A(x)$ : The latter appears in the reduction of a particle from the bra-or ket state. For the de nition of the time ordering betw een a xed nitely localized operator B and a eld with variable localization $y$ we may use TBA $(y)=(y) B A(y)+(y) A(y) B$; however as we place the $m$ om enta on-shell, the de nition of tim e ordering for y near locB fortunately tums out to be irrelevant ${ }^{21}$. These on-shell reduction form ulas re$m$ ain valid if one used as intenpolating operators instead of pointlike elds the translates ofbounded com pactly localized operators [32]. E ach such reduction is accom panied by another disconnected contribution in which the creation operator of an outgoing particle $a_{\text {out }}\left(q_{1}\right)$ changes to an incom ing annihilation $a_{\text {in }}$ ( $q_{1}$ ) acting on the incom ing con guration; there is a corresponding contraction term if we would reduce a particle from the incom ing state vector. These disconnected term s (which contain form factors w ith two particle less in the bra-and

[^12]ket-vectors) have been om itted since they do not contribute to generic nonoverlapping m om entum contributions and to the analytic continuations (and hence do not enter the connected part).

U nder the assum ption that there is an analytic path from $p!p$ (or
! $\quad i ; p$ ! $\quad$ ? in the rapidity param etrization of the standard wedge), the com parison betw een the tw o expressions gives the desired crossing property that is to say a particle of $m$ om entum $p$ in the incom ing ket state $w$ ithin the form factor is crossed into an outgoing bra antiparticle at the analytically continued $m$ om entum $-p$ (here denoted as -p ) and the connected and the connected form factor rem ains invariant.

Reduction form ulas and the crossing property are characteristic for pointlike localized elds (corresponding to double cone localization in the algebraic setting), their derivation breaks down [33] if interacting elds only perm it stringlike localization (corresponding to the singular lim it of spacelike cone localization). The reason for this is that it is not enough to control the localization of endpoints but one also m ust take care of the spacelike string direction; but the kinem atical requirem ent for having convergence to outgoing asym ptotic $m$ ulti-particle states is di erent from that for incom ing states so that there exist no single intenpolating eld which converges in both asym ptotic directions. The particle- eld relation and the constructions derived from it exclude string-localized elds. H ow ever this does not necessarily exclude string theory since there is no indication that string theory is string-localized (see also the concluding rem arks).

In order to obtain an analytic path on the com plex m ass-shell for e.g. the $2!2$ scattering amplitude it is convenient to pass from time ordering $T$ to retardation $R$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{TBA}(y)=R B A(y)+f B ; A(y) g \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

The unordered (anticom $m$ utator) term does not have the pole structure on which the $K$ lein-G ordon operator $K_{y}$ can have a nontrivial on-shell action and therefore drops out. T he application of the JLD spectral representation puts the $p$-dependence into the denom inator of the integrand of an integralrepresentation from where the construction of an analytic path interpolating the form factors w ith its crossed counterpart proceeds in an analog fashion to the derivation of crossing for the $S-m$ atrix [34][32]. W hereas it is fairly easy to nd an o -shell analytic path, the construction of an on-shell path i.e. one which rem ains in the com plex $m$ ass shell is a signi cantly $m$ ore di cult $m$ atter [11]. The LSZ reduction form alism is suggestive of crossing but for them selves too weak for securing the $m$ athem atical existence of paths on the com plex $m$ ass shell which link real forw ard and backw ard $m$ ass shells.

The sim pli cations of the LSZ form alism resulting from factorizability of m odels can be found in an appendix of [35]
$T$ he result of the com parison betw een the reduction (24) applied to outgoing and incom ing con gurationsm ay be w ritten in the follow ing suggestive w ay (for spinless particles)

$$
\begin{align*}
& { }^{\text {out }}{ }_{h p_{1}} ; p_{2} ;:: p_{1} \beta \text { jquk ik } 1::: \text { q. }_{2} ; q_{1} i^{\text {in }}=  \tag{26}\\
& q_{c}!: c_{q_{1}}{ }^{\text {out }} h_{q_{c}} ; p_{1} ; p_{2} ;:: p_{1} \beta j q_{k} ; q_{k} \quad 1:: \text { q }_{2} i^{\text {in }}+c . t \\
& =:^{\text {out }} \mathrm{h} q_{1} ; p_{1} ; p_{2} ;:: \mathrm{p}_{1}-B j q_{k} ; q_{k} \quad:: \mathrm{q}_{2} i^{\text {in }}+c . t:
\end{align*}
$$

where the contraction term sc.t. involve m om entum space -functions (w hich are part of the LSZ reduction theory) and the last line denotes a shorthand notation for the analytic continuation to the real negative $m$ ass shell. Instead ofcrossing from incom ing ket to outgoing bras onem ay ofcourse also cross in the reverse direction from bras to kets. The im portant physical role of the crossing property is to relate the vacuum polarization com ponents of an operator to the connected part of the transition it causes betw een in and out scattering states via iterated crossing

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }^{\text {out }} \mathrm{h}_{1} ; \mathrm{p}_{2} ;:: \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{n}} \nexists j i^{\text {iteration }} \text { out } h \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}} ; \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}+1} ;:: \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{n}} \nexists \mathrm{~B} \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}}::: \mathrm{p}_{2} ; \mathrm{p}_{1} i_{\mathrm{conn}}^{\text {in }} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

N ote that the vacuum polarization com ponents are alw ays connected. It is very im portant to realize that the sim plicity of the crossing property occurs only for the connected part of the $m$ atrix elem ents; in order to $w$ rite dow $n$ the relation for the full $m$ atrix elem ents one $m$ ust keep track of all the $m$ om entum space contraction term $s$ in the iterative application of the LSZ form alism. It is the connected part which is described by one analytic \m aster function" whose different boundary values correspond to the connected part of the di erent $m$ atrix elem ents. This already indicates that one should expect problem $s$ if one $w$ ants to understand crossing as an operationalproperty in the originaltheory ofoperators since taking connected parts of correlation functions is not expressible as an operator algebraic property. Indeed attem pts to relate crossing to the cyclicIy property of therm al expectation values in K M S states on operator algebras w ithin the general setting of Q FT failed ${ }^{22}$.
.

## 3 The bootstrap-form factor program in $d=1+1$ factorizing Q FT

A s m entioned in the introduction, a m odest but in its ow $n$ right very successful version of the $S-m$ atrix bootstrap with strong eld theoretic roots em erged in the second half of the 70s from som e prior quasiclassical integrability discoveries [38]. These seem ingly exact quasiclassical observations on the special tw o-dim ensional as the "Sine-G ordon" m odel of QFT required an explanation

[^13]beyond quasiclassical approxim ations [39]. This line of research led nally to a general program of a bootstrap-form factor construction of so-called $d=1+1$ factorizable m odels [13][41][42]. From this new nonperturbative schem e for constructing a particular class of eld theories cam e a steady ux of new models and it continues to be an im portant innovative area of research. O ur interest in the present setting lies in the potential $m$ essages it contains $w$ ith respect to $a$ m ass-shell based constructive approach without the \classical crutches" which underlie the Lagrangian quantization approach. In particular we are interested in a better understanding of form factor crossing.
$T$ his form factor program uses the very am bitious originalS $-m$ atrix bootstrap idea in the lim ited context of a $d=1+1 \mathrm{~S}-\mathrm{m}$ atrix A nsatz in which S factorizes into 2 -particle elastic com ponents $S^{(2)}$. A consequence of this simpli cation is that the classi cation and calculation of factorizing $S$-m atrices [43] can be separated from the problem from the construction of the associated o -shellQ FT. $H$ ence the $S-m$ atrix bootstrap becom es the rst step in a bootstrap-form factor program, followed by a second step which consists in calculating generalized form factors of elds and operators beyond the identity operator (which represents the $S-m$ atrix). O ne does not expect such a two-step approach to be possible beyond factorizable $m$ odels, rather the construction of the $S \cdot m$ atrix (w hich $m$ ay be considered as the special form factor of the identity operator betw een in-out m ulti-particle states) is expected to have to be carried out as part of the form factor construction.

It is interesting to note that the calculated form factors of those factorizing $m$ odels which possess continuously varying coupling param eters tum out to be analytic functions (below the threshold of form ation of bound states) w ith a nite radius of analyticity around zero coupling strength [35][44]. For the correlation function on the other hand one does not expect expandability into a power series since their perturbative structure is not visibly di erent from that of other strictly renorm alizable $m$ odels and there exist general argum ents against the convergence of perturbative series. This raises the interesting question of whether such a dichotom y between perturbatively converging on-shell ob jects versus nonconverging (at best asym ptotic) series for o -shellcorrelation functions $m$ ay continue to hold in general. It would be quite startling if on-shell quantities as form factors in renorm alizable eld theories have im proved perturbative convergence properties which are not shared by correlation functions.
$T$ he $m$ ain $m$ otivating idea in favor of an on-shell approach, nam ely the total avoidance of ultraviolet divergences, is convincingly vindicated in the setting of factorizing m odels. The pointlike elds, which in the present state of develop$m$ ent of factorizing $m$ odels are only know $n$ via their $m$ ulti-particle form factors [44], have an interesting interaction-induced vacuum structure in that they possess no P FG s localized in sulbw edge regions. In other w ords despite their lack of real particle creation through scattering processes, they nevertheless have the full vacuum polarization structure which one expects in an interacting QFT and which in tum is the prerequisite for the appearance of interaction-caused anom alous short distance dim ensions. In this respect of short distance behavior factorizing $m$ odels are $m$ ore realistic than the (non-factorizing) polynom ial
interactions in $d=1+1$ whose com plete $m$ athem atical controlw as achieved $w$ ith the m ethods of \constructive QFT" [45] (see also [46] for recent applications in a m ore algebraic QFT setting). It seem $s$ that the \hard analysis" m ethods of the constructivists are restricted to superrenorm alizable $m$ odels whose short distance behavior is not worse than that of free elds, whereas presently the m odularm ethods, which avoid using singular eld coordinatizations altogether, w ork best for factorizing m odels.

C ontrary to the chuster property and m acro-causality which, as w e have seen, are also im plem ented in the relativistic particle-based theory of \direct particle interactions" [7]), crossing is the characteristic im print which relativistic m icrocausality leaves in on-shell restrictions of Q FT. A though the on-shell aspects of $d=1+1$ factorizing $m$ odels appear at rst sight associated $w$ ith a kind of one-dim ensional relativistic particle-conserving quantum $m$ echanics (due to the absence of realparticle creation via scattering), a closer look reveals a signi cant di erence which already $m$ akes itself felt on the level of the particle-conserving Sm atrix. Its crossing property leads to a bound state picture which has becom e known under the nam e \nuclear dem ocracy" as opposed to the quantum $m$ echanical hierarchy $w$ th respect to the issue of bound versus elem entary issue. Nuclear dem ocracy is the statem ent that in interacting QFT all stable one-particle one-particle states are on the sam e footing apart from their superselected charges which are sub ject to hierarchical fusion law s. T he hierarchy is that betw een fiundam entaland com posite (fiused) superselected charges, whereas the particles are the asym ptotically stable carries of uncon ned charges.

If, as e.g. in the case of the Sine-G ordon $m$ odel, one still $m$ isses operators which carry fundam ental charges which cannot be obtained by fusion (but ratherperm it to represent the charges of the know $n$ particles as fused fundam ental charges), then the representation theoretical approach of the superselection theory in the setting of AQFT reconstructs the $m$ issing charges and particles. $T$ he reason w hy the presence of the latter is easily overlooked in the standard for$m$ alism is that these $m$ ore findam entalparticles do not appear directly, but only $m$ anifest them selves through particle-antiparticle vacuum polarization \clouds" in interm ediate states of correlation functions. T he theory of superselection sectors extends the original theory in such a way that these new charges and their possible particle carriers are naturally inconporated so that their scattering can be described in term s of interpolating elds. It is the principle of locality which perm its the construction of full- edged eld algebras from observable algebras and arrive in this way at a fundam ental understanding of the concept of internalsym $m$ etries as a consequence of the local representation theory of observable nets of operator algebras [23].

The fact that the bootstrap-form factor approach to factorizablem odels does not need special prescriptions, but that its \axiom s" [42] follow from general principles of Q FT becom es particularly transparent if the construction is placed into the setting of Tom ita-Takesaki m odular theory of operator algebras as adapted to the localquantum physics setting (also referred to as the $m$ ethod of m odular localization) [28][47][48]. T his will be illustrated in som e detail in the next section.

This setting also highlights the lexistence problem of QFT" in a new and prom ising fashion [30][49]. H ere we rem ind the reader that even after alm ost eight decades after its discovery, and despite im pressive perturbative and asym ptotic successes, the description of interacting particles by covariant elds in 4dim ensional M inkow ski spacetim e rem ained part of $m$ athem atically as well as conceptually uncharted territory. This applies in particular to the \standard m odel" which is a source of a very speci c perm anent discom fort unknown in other areas of theoretical physics. T he predictive success of this model, if anything, highlights the seriousness of this problem which without that success would be of a m ore academ ic nature.

The algebraic basis of the bootstrap-form factor program for the special fam ily of $d=1+1$ factorizable theories is the validity of a m om entum space Zam olodchikov Faddeev algebra [40]. The operators of this algebra are close to free elds in the sense that their Fourier transform s are on-shell (see 28 in next section) ob jects, but they are non-local in the pointlike sense. A closer look reveals that they are localizable in the weaker sense of generating wedge algebras $^{23}$ [28][48]. In fact the existence of \tem pered" (existence of a well-de ned Fourier transform ) wedge localized P FG swhich im plies the absence of real particle creation through scattering processes [47] tums out to be the prerequisite for the success of the bootstrap-form factor program for factorizable models in which one uses only form factors and avoids (short-distance singular) correlation functions.

A ccording to an old structural theorem which is based on certain analytic properties of a eld theoretic S-m atrix [50][47], virtual particle creation w thout realparticle creation is only possible in $d=1+1$ theories. $T$ his in principle leaves the possibility for direct 3-or higher-particle elastic processes beyond tw o particle scattering. A $n$ argum ent by $K$ arow ski (private com m unication) based on from factor crossing show s that this is inconsistent $w$ th the absence of real particle creation. In this sense the ZF algebra structure, which is at the heart of factorizing $m$ odels, tums out to be a consequence of special properties of P FG for $m$ odular wedge-localization, a fact which places the position of the factorizing m odels w ithin QFT into sharper focus. The crossing property is encoded into the tw o-particle scattering am plitude from where it is subsequently passed on to the form factors. In line w th the previous unicity argum ent of inverse scattering based on crossing, the bootstrap form factor approach associates precisely one localequivalence class of elds (one net of localized operator algebras) to a factorizing $S-m$ atrix. It also goes a long way in securing the existence of operators whose $m$ atrix elem ents in $m$ ulti-particle states give rise to these explicitly com puted form factors.

In agreem ent w ith the philosophy underlying AQ F T, which view s pointlike elds as coordinatizations of generators of localized algebras, the bootstrapform factor construction for $\mathrm{d}=1+1$ factorizing m odels prim arily aim s to determ ine coordinatization-independent double-cone algebras by com puting intersec-

[^14]tions of wedge algebras. The nontriviality of a theory is then tantam ount to the nontriviality ( C 1) of such intersections ${ }^{24}$. The com putation of a basis of pointlike eld generators of these algebras is analogous but m ore involved than the construction of the basis of com posites of free elds which are the $W$ ick polynom ials. Even for noninteracting theories the functorial description of the algebras (7) based on m odular localization is conceptually sim pler than the use of free elds (10) and their local equivalence class of $W$ ick-ordered com posites.
$T$ he crossing property is the crucialproperty w hich links scattering data $w$ ith - -shell operators spaces. A s explained in the previous section, it relates the m ultiparticle com ponent of vectors obtained by one-tim e application of a local (at least wedge-localized) operator to the vacuum with the connected form factors of this operator. It is im portanr to note that in factorizing $m$ odels crossing is not an assum ption but rather follow s from the properties of tem pered PFG s for wedge algebras.

It is not easy to think of a form factor approach beyond factorizing models. W ew illpresent an operationalidea ofcrossing which in principle does not su er from the above lim tations of tem perate PFGs, although one is presently only able to test it in the $d=1+1$ factorizing setting. It is based on the working hypothesis that each quantum eld theory possesses a distinguished eld called a \m aster eld" whose connected parts of its form factors de nes a global (i.e. no local substructure) quantum eld theory in the on-shell mom entum space variables. This auxiliary theory is in a therm al state at the KMS H aw king tem perature in such a way that the cyclic KM S property (the therm al aspect ofm odular theory) is identicalw ith the cyclic crossing property. By construction this theory obeys $m$ om entum space cluster decom position properties in the rapidity variables. The sim plicity of $d=1+1$ factorizing $m$ odels nds its expression in the fact that the auxiliary operator, w hose K M S correlation functions are identi ed $w$ th the connected form factors of the $m$ aster eld, is an exponential of a bilinear expression in free creation/annihilation operators. T here is a good chance that this structure is characteristic for factorizing $m$ odels.
$T$ he subsequent content of the paper is organ ized as follow S . T he next section recalls som e details about the role of the Zam olodchikov Faddeev algebra in the generation of the $m$ odular wedge-localized operator algebra. A fter that we w ill present two ideas which could be im portant in modular localization-based constructions w thout assum ing factorizability. O ne of these ideas consists in postulating the already $m$ entioned $\backslash m$ aster eld" which generalizes observations on cluster properties in m om entum -rapidity space [51] as well as observations on \free eld representations" of form factors in factorizing $m$ odels [53]. A nother less speculative idea is to classify and construct theories from their holographic lightfront pro jections, which will be the sub ject of the last section before we present som e conclusions.

[^15]
## 4 The Zam olodchikov Faddeev algebra and its relation to $m$ odular localization

In this section we recall som e details about how the m odular localization for$m$ alism supports the bootstrap-form factor construction.

It has been $m y$ Leilm otiv for a num ber of years [36] that the spirit behind $W$ igner's representation theoretical approach enriched w ith the concept of m odular localization (as presented in the second section) could lead to a truly intrinsic constructive approach in QFT which avoids those classical quantization crutcheswhich already the protagonist of eld quantization $P$ ascualJordan $w$ anted to overcom e. It was natural to test this idea rst in $m$ odels which are sim ilar to free eld $m$ odels in that their wedge-localized algebras can be generated by elds which posses on-shellFourier transform s.

In the previous section we leamed that this class is related w ith the Zam olodchikovFaddeev algebra structure. In the sim plest case of a scalar chargeless particle w thout bound states ${ }^{25}$ the wedge generators are of the form [28]

$$
\begin{align*}
(x) & =p_{\frac{1}{2}}^{Z} \quad\left(e^{i p() x()} Z()+h: c:\right) d  \tag{28}\\
Z() Z\left({ }^{0}\right) & =S^{(2)}\left({ }^{0}\right) Z\left({ }^{0}\right) Z()+\left({ }^{0}\right) \\
Z() Z\left({ }^{0}\right) & =S^{(2)}\left({ }^{0} \quad\right) Z\left({ }^{0}\right) Z()
\end{align*}
$$

Here $p()=m(c h ; s h)$ is the rapidity param etrizations of the $d=1+1 \mathrm{~m}$ ass shell and $x=r(s h ; c h)$ param etrizes the right hand wedge in $M$ inkow ski spacetim e; $S^{(2)}()$ is a structure function of the ZF algebra which is a nonlocal -algebra generalization of canonical creation/annihilation operators. The notation preem pts the fact that $S^{(2)}()$ is the analytic continuation of the physical tw o-particle $S-m$ atrix $S^{(2)}(j j)$ which via the factorization form ula determ ines the general scattering operator $S_{\text {scat }}$ (31). The unitarity and crossing of $S_{\text {scat }}$ follow $s$ from the corresponding tw o-particle properties which in term $s$ of the analytic continuation are $S^{2}(z)=S^{(2)}(z)$ (unitarity) and $S^{(2)}(z)=S^{(2)}(i \quad z)$ (crossing) [43]. The Z ( ) operators applied to the vacuum in the naturalorder ${ }_{1}>{ }_{2}>$ :::> n are by de nition equal to the outgoing canonicalFock space creation operators whereas the re-ordering from any other ordering has to be calculated according to the ZF com mutation relations e.g.

$$
Z(1) a(1) a(2):: a(n)=Y_{i=1}^{Y^{k}} S^{(2)}(\quad i) a(1) a(2): a() a(n)
$$

where < $i \mathrm{i}=1: \mathrm{k}$; > $\mathrm{i} \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{k}+1$;:n:The generalZam olodchikovFaddeev algebra is a $m$ atrix generalization of this structure.

[^16]It is im portant not to identify the Fourier transform of the $m$ om entum w ith a localization variable. A though the $x$ in (x) behaves covariantly under Poincare transform ations, it is not $m$ arking a causal localization point; in fact it is non-local variable in the sense of the standard use of this term inology ${ }^{26}$. It is how ever wedge-localized in the sense that the generating fam ily of operator for the right-hand wedge $W$ W ightm an-like (polynom ial) algebra $\operatorname{alg} f(f) ;$ suppf $W$ g commutes w the the transform ed algebra alg $f J$ ( $g$ )J; suppg $W$ g which is the left wedge algebra [48]

$$
\begin{align*}
& {\left[\begin{array}{ll}
(f) ; J & (g) J
\end{array}\right]=0 }  \tag{30}\\
J & =J_{0} S_{\text {scat }}
\end{align*}
$$

H ere $J_{0}$ is the TCP sym m etry of the free eld theory associated w ith a\# ( ) and $S_{\text {scat }}$ is the factorizing $S-m$ atrix which on (outgoing) $n$-particle states has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\text {scat }}\left(1_{1}\right) a\left(~_{2}\right)::: a(n)=S_{i<j}^{Y} S_{i}^{(2)}\left({ }_{j}\right) a(2)::: a(n) \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

ifwe identify the $a^{\#}()$ with the incom ing creation/annihilation operators. It is then possible to give a rigorous proof [48] that the $W$ eyllike algebra generated by exponential unitaries is really wedge-localized and ful lls the B isognanoW ichm ann property

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A(\mathbb{W})=a l g e^{i(f)} j \text { suppf } \quad W \\
& A(\mathbb{W})^{0}=J A(\mathbb{W}) J=A\left(\mathbb{W}^{0}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

○
where the dash on operator algebras is the standard notation for their von $N$ eum ann com $m$ utant and the dash on spacetim e regions stands for the causal com plem ent. W ithin the $m$ odular setting the relative position of the causally disjoint A ( $\mathbb{W}^{0}$ ) depends via $S_{\text {scat }}$ on the dynam ics. The operator TCP operator $J$ is the (antiunitary) angular part of the polar decom position of $T$ om ita's algebraically de ned unbounded antilinear S-operator w ith the follow ing characterization

$$
\begin{align*}
& S A=A ; A 2 A(W)  \tag{33}\\
& S=J \quad \frac{1}{2} ; \quad \text { it }=U((2 \mathrm{t}))
\end{align*}
$$

w ith ( ) being the Lorentz boost at the rapidity :
At this point the setup looks like relativistic quantum $m$ echanics since the
(f) (sim ilar to genuine free elds if applied to the vacuum) do not generate vacuum polarization clouds. T he advantage of the algebraic $m$ odular localization setting is that vacuum polarization is generated by algebraic intersections

[^17]which is in agreem ent with the intrinsic de nition of the notion of interaction presented in term s ofPFGs in the previous section
\[

$$
\begin{gather*}
A(D) \quad A(\mathbb{W}) \backslash A\left(W_{a}^{0}\right)=A(\mathbb{W}) \backslash A\left(W_{a}\right)^{0}  \tag{34}\\
D=W \backslash W_{a}^{0}
\end{gather*}
$$
\]

This is the operator algebra associated with a double cone D (which is chosen sym $m$ etric around the origin by intersecting suitably translated wedges and their causalcom plem ents). N ote the di erence from the quantization approach, where pointlike localized elds are used from the outset and the sharpening of localization of sm eared products of elds is sim ply achieved by the classicalstep of restricting the spacetim e support of the test functions. The problem of com puting intersected von $N$ eum ann algebras is in general not only di cult (since there are no know $n$ general com putationaltechniques) but also very unusualas com pared to functional integral representation $m$ ethods related to Lagrangian quantization.

The problem becom es $m$ ore am enable if one considers instead of operators their form factors i.e. their $m$ atrix elem ents betw een incom ing ket and outgoing bra state vectors. In the spirit of the old LSZ form alism one can then $m$ ake an A nsatz in form of a power series in Z ( ) and Z ( ) Z (i ) (corresponding to the power series in the incom ing free eld in LSZ theory). In a shorthand notation which com bines both frequency parts we m ay w rite

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{X}{n!}{ }_{c}^{Z}:: \underbrace{Z}_{c} a_{n}\left(1 ;:::{ }_{n}\right): Z\left({ }_{1}\right)::: Z\left(_{n}\right): d_{1}::: d_{n} \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

where each integration path $C$ extends over the upper and lower part of the rim of the ( 0 ; i ) strip in the com plex -plane. T he strip-analyticity of the coe cient functions a $n$ expresses the wedge-localization of $A^{27}$ : It is easy to see that these coe cients on the upper part of C (the annihilation part) are identical to the vacuum polarization form factors of A
whereas the crossing of som $e$ of the particles into the left hand bra state (see the previous section) leads to the connected part of the form factors

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }^{\text {out }} \mathrm{hp}_{1} ;: \mathrm{P}_{1} \nexists \mathrm{~A} \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{n}} ;:: \mathrm{P}_{1+1} i_{\mathrm{conn}}^{\text {in }}=a_{\mathrm{n}}\left(1+i ;:::_{1}+i ; 1+1 ;::_{n}\right) \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

H ence the crossing property of form factors is encoded into the notation of the operator form alism (35) in that there is only one analytic function $a_{n}$ which describes the di erent possibilities of placing on the upper or lower rim of $C$ : $T$ his is analogous to the $G$ laser-Lehm ann-Z im $m$ em ann expansion form ulas [54] of the interacting $H$ eisenberg elds in term s of free elds in which the $n{ }^{\text {th }}$ term is the on-shell value of the Fourier transform of a retarded function which combines the di erent form factors for $x e d n$.

[^18]In term sof the form factors the relative com $m$ utant (34) results from restricting the series (35) by requiring that the $A{ }^{0} s$ com $m$ ute $w$ th the generators of the shifted algebra A ( $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{a}}$ )

$$
\begin{equation*}
[A ; U(a) \quad(f) U(a)]=0 \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thanks to the sim plicity of the wedge generators (f); the Z series of the com $m$ utator can be com puted in term $s$ of the $a_{n}$ :The linearity of ( $f$ ) in the $Z^{0} s$ results in the $n^{\text {th }}$ term being a linear com bination of $a_{n} 1$ and $a_{n+1}$ :The denseness of W localized functions and the analyticity in the open strip nally lead to the equivalence of the vanishing of this com $m$ utator $w$ th the fam ous $\backslash$ kinem aticalpole condition", nam ely the $a_{n} 1$ function can be expressed as a residuum of a pole in $a_{n+1}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Res}_{12}=\mathrm{i} \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{n}}\left(1 ; 2 ;:::_{\mathrm{n}}\right)=2 \operatorname{ia}_{\mathrm{n}} 2\left(3 ;:::{ }_{\mathrm{n}}\right)\left(1 \quad \mathrm{~S}_{2 \mathrm{n}}::: \mathrm{S}_{23}\right) ; 12=1 \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

This relation was rst postulated as one of the construction recipes by Sm imov [42]; it is the only relation betw een di erent com ponents in the absence ofbound states. $T$ his togetherw th the P ayley-w iener Schw artz analytic characterization of the localization region and the crossing property (which links the crossed form factor to the analytic continuation between the two rims of the -strip $R+i(0 ;)$ ) characterizes the space of form factors associated $w$ ith the algebra A (D) : A ttem pts to im prove the localization by restricting the support of $f$ in the A (W) generators (f) to a sm aller region suppf D $W$ would fail; the generator continues to be wedge-localized and by sharpening test function supports one can only en large but not reduce the localization region.

The multiplicative structure ${ }^{28}$ is outside ofm athem atical control as long as one is unable to take care of the convergence of the in nite sum $s$; in this respect the situation is at rst sight not better than that of the old GLZ expansion form ulas [54] for intenpolating $H$ eisenberg elds in term s of out/in free elds in which the coe cient functions are on-shell restrictions of retarded correlation functions. The linear space of form factors can be param etrized in term s of a covariant basis which corresponds to the form factors of a basis of \would be" com posite elds. It tums out that the dependence on the individual com posite
eld in the B orchers class of relatively local elds can be encodes into a polynom ial factor [35] (after splitting $o a \operatorname{com} m$ on factor which is the sam $e$ for all elds in the sam e class). This tells us that if we knew that those operator subalgebras characterized by the vanishing of the relative com m utant (38) are nontrivial, then the associated quantum eld theory exists as a algebraically nontrivial theory and we have a nonpertunbative form alism to com pute form factors of pointlike elds or ofm ore general operators in A (D):

Since the form alism only involves form factors but avoids correlation functions of pointlike elds, it is free of ultraviolet problems (and a fortiori does not require renorm alization of in nities). H ence the w orld of factorizing $m$ odels is a candidate for the rst explicit illustration of P ascual Jordan's envisaged

[^19]paradise of local quantum physics where one is able to walk without classical crutches.

There has been extensive work on the calculation of form factors of com posite elds. Sim ilar to W ick polynom ials there exists a basis of (com posite) elds in the sam e superselection sector. A s m entioned, the form factors of elds from the sam e local equivalence class contain one factor which is com $m$ on to all of them (the so-called m inim al form factor [35]); this factor is associated w th the lcore" of the vacuum polarization cloud which is com $m$ on to all states created by operators from the sam e spactim e region and w th the sam e charge. It is th is factor which carries the interaction; the rem aining polynom ial factor is in the exponential of the rapidities carries the inform ation about the di erent elds in the local equivalence class; this is analogous to the di erent $W$ idk polynom ials of free elds. ${ }^{29}$. The polynom ial factors actually com plicate the calculation of correlation functions as convergent series over form factors. In fact apart from tw o-point functions in very special cases, the program of controlling correlation functions of pointlike eldswas w ithout much success, despite many attem pts. The short distance aspects, which were banned thanks to the on-shell nature of the bootstrap form factor program, enter through the back door in the form of convergence problem s for the series (35).

In this context it is very interesting to note that recently Buchholz and Lechner [30] proposed an elegant criterion for the nontriviality of (D) in term s of an operator algebraic property of the wedge algebra $A(W)$ which allows to bypass the problem of controlling form factor series altogether. They found that the \nuclear m odularity" of A (W) insures the nontriviality of the A (D) intersection and its standardness (the $R$ eeh-Schlieder property) w ith respect to the vacuum. Lechner tested this criterion in the case of the Ising eld theory [49]. $T$ here seem s to be a w ell-founded hope that the already im pressive calculational results of the bootstrap-form factorprogram for factorizing $m$ odels $w$ illbe backed up by a structural argum ent of the existence of their local algebras w ithout having to control the convergence of in nite sum s over form factors. A though the know ledge of wedge algebras already determ ines the algebras associated w ith intersections uniquely, the Buchholz-Lechner idea applies only to $d=1+1$ theories.

In the follow ing tw o sections I will present ideas by which one hopes to generalize the form factor bootstrap approach.

## 5 The hypothesis of a M aster eld

For factorizablem odels, the crossing relation ofthe analytic coe cient functions in the series representation (35) is a consequence of the algebraic properties of the $Z^{0}$ S: Since there are no $Z F$ operators for models with non factorizing $S-$ $m$ atrioes, one $m$ ust look for a m ore general operational form ulation of crossing. In order to obtain an idea in what direction to look for, let us rst recall the

[^20]precise conceptual position of factoring $m$ odels $w$ thin the general setting of $m$ assive $m$ odels $w$ th a $m$ ass gap (to which scattering theory applies).

A sw asm entioned in the second section, P FG sw ith generating properties for wedge-localized algebras only exist for $d=1+1$ theories $w$ ith $S-m$ atrices which factorize into 2 -particle contributions $S^{(2)}: T$ his is a very peculiar situation in which cluster separability does not distinguish betw een the tw o contributions in $S^{(2)}=1+T^{(2)}$ since they carry the sam e energy-m om entum delta functions:

So the crucial question is how can one get an operational form ulation of crossing in form factors ${ }^{30}$ beyond such special situations? W e already dism issed the idea of interpreting crossing as KM S property in the same theory as incorrect. The only altemative idea which m aintains a KM S interpretation of crossing, would consist in declaring sim ply the form factors of an operator A to be correlation functions in a KMS state at the H aw king-U nruh tem perature 2 of (nonlocal) operators $R^{(A)}$ in rapidity $m$ om entum space (the auxiliary $R^{0} \mathrm{~S} w$ ill be referred to as $\backslash R$ indler operators")

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{1} ;:::{ }_{n} \nexists j i \stackrel{?}{=} R^{(A)}\left({ }_{1}\right)::: R^{(A)}\left({ }_{n}\right)^{E} \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

But this idea only works if we nd special operators A in the original theory whose form factors de ne a system ofpositive R-correlation functions, since then the GNS reconstruction would lead to a global auxiliary operator eld theory. A necessary condition for such an interpretation is the validity of the chuster separation property. It is know $n$ that this property holds also in globaloperator algebras (i.e. algebras w thout a local net substructure) as long as the operator algebra is a von Neum ann factor in which case it is related to the property of asym ptotic abelieness [23][55]. In $m$ any factorizable $m$ odels one $w a s$ able to identify such elds with rapidity space clustering [56]. W e will form ulate a requirem ent, which we call the hypothesis of a "m aster eld"

Denition 2 A master eld M (x) associated to a QFT is a distinguished scalar B oson eld within the B orchers class of locally equivalent elds whose connected form factors de nes a therm alauxiliary $\backslash R$ indler QFT" at the $H$ awking tem perature $=2$ in tem s of a nonlocal eld $R(; p)$ in the sense of the above form ula (40) with $A$ being the $m$ aster eld $M(x)$ at $x=0$.

The KM S relation in reads

$$
\begin{align*}
& D_{R^{(M)}\left(1 ; p_{12}\right): \because R^{(M)}\left(n ; p_{n}\right) R^{(M)}\left(n i p_{n}\right)} \\
& R^{(M)}\left({ }_{1} ; p_{1 ?}\right):: R^{(M)}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\left.n_{1} ; p_{n} 1 ?\right)
\end{array} R^{(M)}\left(n_{n} ; p_{n}\right)\right)^{2} \quad E  \tag{41}\\
& =R^{(M)}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
n & 2
\end{array} \quad p_{n} ?\right) R^{(M)}\left(1 ; p_{1 ?}\right):: R^{(M)}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
n & i
\end{array} p_{n} 1 ?\right) \quad=2 \\
& =\left(\mathbb{R}^{(M)}\left({ }_{n} \quad 2 i ; p_{n} ?\right)=2 ; R^{(M)}\left(1 ; p_{1}\right)::: \mathbb{R}^{(M)}\left({ }_{n} \quad 1 ; p_{n} 1 ?\right)=2\right) \\
& =\left(J R^{(M)}\left({ }_{n} \quad i ; p_{n} ?\right)=2 ; R^{(M)}\left(1 ; p_{1 ?}\right):: \mathbb{R}^{(M)}\left({ }_{n} 1 ; p_{n} 1 ?\right)=2\right)
\end{align*}
$$

[^21]where in the last two lines we used the $m$ ore convenient state-vector notation for the them alexpectation values and m odular theory in order to convert $\frac{1}{2}$ into $J$. The identi cation of this expression $w$ th the crossing property of the form factor of $M$ ( 0 )
\[

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\left(J R ^ { ( M ) } \left(\begin{array}{ll}
n & \left.\left.i ; p_{n} ?\right)=2 ; R^{(M)}\left(1 ; p_{1} ?\right):: R^{(M)}\left(\begin{array}{lll}
n \\
1
\end{array} ; p_{n} 1 ?\right)=2\right)
\end{array}\right.\right. \tag{42}
\end{align*}
$$
\]

requires the action of the auxiliary $J$ as $J R^{(M)}\left({ }_{n} \quad\right.$ i; $p_{n}$ ? $)=2=R^{(M)}(n$ 2 i; $p_{n}$ ? $=2$ : In $d=1+1$ the interpretation of crossing in term $\operatorname{sofKM} S$ of an auxiliary theory sim pli es, since there is no transverse $m$ om entum $p$ ? .

It is im portant to notioe that the auxiliary eld theory associated w ith the form factors of them aster eld is not sub ject to the restriction of w edge-localized PFG s which led to factorizable models. In fact being a global (i.e. w thout a local net structure) K M S theory, the concept of particles and in particular the concept ofP FG becom es m eaningless.

Let us rst look at the rather trivialilhustration of a freem aster eld nam ely

$$
\begin{align*}
& M(x) \quad: e^{A(x)} ; ; A(x)=\text { freefield }  \tag{43}\\
& \left(M_{M}(0) j p\left(1 ; p_{1 ; ?}\right)::: p\left(n ; p_{n} ; ?\right)\right)=e^{c}
\end{align*}
$$

where the positive constant c is related to the vacuum -one particle norm alization of $A$ : C learly am ong all com posites of the free eld which lead to -independent connected form factors, the only case w ith the correct com binatorics com plying w ith clustering is the above exponential eld. The auxiliary algebra of $\mathrm{R}^{(\mathrm{M})}$ is the trivial abelian algebra which perm its states for every KM S tem perature. $T$ he free eld is also the only $m$ odel in which the form factors of the $m$ aster eld de ne an abelian auxiliary theory; a nontrivialS-m atrix prevents abelienness.

The m aster eld hypothesis rem ains nontrivial even in the setting of factorizable models. In the follow ing we use tw o quite di erent m odels to ilhustrate its working. $W$ e rst recall some form alism of $K$ M S states on free elds.

For bosonic quasifree KMS states at the KM S tem perature one obtains

$$
\begin{align*}
& h c(q) c\left(q^{0}\right) i=e^{q} h c(q) c\left(q^{0}\right) i \quad\left[c(q) ; c\left(q^{0}\right)\right]  \tag{44}\\
& y h c(q) c\left(q^{0}\right) i=\frac{e^{q}}{e^{q} 1}(q) \quad\left(q+q^{0}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

For the rst illustration we take the Sinh-G ordon theory. The eld which leads to form factors w hich have the cluster factorization property in the rapidity variable is again an exponentialM ( x ) = $e^{\prime}$ operator in term $s$ of the basic $S$ inh G ordon eld' [56]. They are known to have the follow ing structure

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Y } \\
& \left(\mathbb{M}_{\mathrm{M}}(0) \mathrm{jp}(1):: \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{n})\right)=K_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{~L}) \quad \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{ij})  \tag{45}\\
& \text { i< } \mathrm{j} \text { n }
\end{align*}
$$

where the coupling strength and are related by $\frac{1}{=} \frac{8}{2}: T$ he product factor involves the 2 -particle form factor $F$ and has the com binatorics of an exponential which is bilinear in $c(q)$ free B oson operators. This suggests to start from the com plex exponential

$$
\begin{align*}
& C()=e^{i a()}  \tag{46}\\
& a()=d^{i a w}(q) C(q) e^{i q\left(\quad i_{\overline{2}}\right)}
\end{align*}
$$

and look for a R indler operator $R^{31}$ as a $H$ em itian com bination of the form

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { n } \\
& \text { o } \\
& R()=N \quad e^{i} C\left(\quad i_{2}\right)+h a:  \tag{47}\\
& C() C\left({ }^{0}\right)=S S^{(2)}\left({ }^{0}\right) C\left({ }^{0}\right) C() ; S^{(2)}()=\exp \quad \operatorname{dqf}(q) \sinh q_{i}^{-}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{m} \text { in }}\left({ }^{0}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The function $F_{m}$ in () is the so-called $m$ in im al 2-particle form factor of the m odel i.e. the unique function which obeys $F()=S^{(2)}() F()$ and is holom orphic in the strip. For the present m odelw ithout bound states it agrees w ith $F$ : In the last line in (47) we used the fact that the KMS state at the inverse tem perature 2 xes the quasi-free state on the $R$ indler creation/annihilation operator algebra which in tum determ ines the therm al expectations of the C operators.

The Sinh-G ordon S-m atrix

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\mathrm{sh}}()=\frac{\operatorname{th} \frac{1}{2}(\quad i)}{\operatorname{th} \frac{1}{2}(+i)} ;=\frac{2}{8+2}=B \tag{48}
\end{equation*}
$$

xes the quasifree com $m$ utation relation of the $R$ indler operators $R() w$ ith

$$
f(q)=\frac{2 \operatorname{sh} \frac{q}{2} \operatorname{sh} \frac{q 8}{2^{2}}}{q \operatorname{ch} \frac{q}{2}}=\frac{2 \operatorname{sh} \frac{q}{2} B \operatorname{sh} \frac{q}{2}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
2 & B \tag{49}
\end{array}\right)}{q \operatorname{qch} \frac{q}{2}}
$$

$T$ he $n$-point function

$$
{ }^{D} C\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & i-
\end{array}\right):::: C\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{n} & \mathrm{i}-)_{2}  \tag{50}\\
\mathrm{D}_{2} & \mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{m} \text { in }}(\mathrm{ik})
\end{array}\right.
$$

ful lls the com $m$ utation relation of the $R$-algebra (which is identical to that of the C -algebra as well as the KM S condition. O ur interest lies in the Herm itian

[^22]eld operator R : For convenience we have adjusted our notation to the resulting com binatorics for the them all $Z$-expectation $w$ hich are sum $s$ of term $s w$ ith di erent $C_{1}():=C\left(\quad i \frac{7}{2}\right) ; l=$
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& h R(n):: R\left(l_{1}\right) i=2 \quad h C_{l_{n}}:::_{l_{1}} i_{2} \operatorname{expi} \quad\left(l_{1}+l_{2}+:::_{n}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

where depends on the num erical pre-factors.
$W$ th the present construction of an auxiliary global $R$ indler QFT for the form factors of the $m$ aster eld we have reproduced a curious observation by Lukyanov [53] which is known in the literature on factorizing $m$ odels as \free eld representations" (for a recent account see also [57]). The di erence to Lukyanov is in the underlying concepts and not in the actualcom putation. T he therm al state tumed out to be a R indler-U nruh KM S state at a xed H aw king tem perature rather than a tracial $G$ ibbs states in a heat bath setting. U nique KMS states on operator algebras lead to von $N$ eum ann factors which in tum ful 11 weak cluster property [55] and it was the cyclicity of crossing together $w$ th the som ew hat $m$ ysterious cluster properties in the rapidity variables [56] which suggested this operator K M S intenpretation of the crossing property for the form factors of a $m$ aster eld.

Since elds whose form factors cluster have been found in $m$ any sim ilar factorizing $m$ odels of Toda type ${ }^{32}$, one w ould expect that the idea of an auxiliary $R$ indler theory in $m$ om entum space works in all of them. $M$ oreover it would be tem pting to conjecture that the sim plifying feature of factorizing $m$ odels consists in the auxiliary form factor theory being bilinear exponential in $c^{\#}$ (q) creation/annihilation operators. This con jecture draws also support from a recent observation by Babu jian and K arow skiwho observed that a suitably generalized form of clustering for also holds in statistics changing $Z_{n}-m$ odels [58] of which the lowest one is the Ising eld theory. In that case a com bination of disorder/order eld form factors leads to chustering [51].

In the follow ing we brie y show that the $m$ aster eld idea also works in the Ising model; in that case the relevant state is a \tw isted" KM S state at the tem perature $=$. The twisting consists in changing the KMS formula by a -sign.

$$
\begin{align*}
& h c(q) c\left(q^{0}\right) i=e^{q^{n}} h c(q) c\left(q^{0}\right) i \quad\left[c(q) ; c\left(q^{0}\right)\right]  \tag{52}\\
& h c(q) c\left(q^{0}\right) i=\frac{e^{q}}{1+e^{q}}{ }^{\prime \prime}(q) \quad\left(q+q^{0}\right) \\
& h c(q) c\left(q^{0}\right) i=\frac{e^{\bar{z}^{q}}}{2 \cosh _{2} q^{\prime}}(q) \quad\left(q+q^{0}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

[^23]where the third line contains the KMS two-point function at $=$ which we are going to use together w ith the follow ing de nition of a ( )
\[

$$
\begin{gather*}
a()=Z^{Z}(q) d q \\
\text { ha } \left.() a\left({ }^{0}\right) i=Z_{1} \frac{\sinh q(i}{\cosh i^{2} q}+\frac{-}{2}\right) \frac{d q}{q}=\ln i \tanh \frac{0}{2} \tag{53}
\end{gather*}
$$
\]

which nally leads to the well-known disorder/order Ising form factors which is given by a com binatorialexpression in the two-particle form factor ofthe disorder operator (w hich correspond to an even num ber of particles)

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{\mathrm{D}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{a}\left({ }^{0}\right)^{E}}=\tanh \frac{0}{2} \tag{54}
\end{equation*}
$$

A s the $\operatorname{Sinh}-G$ ordon $m$ odel is the sim plest representative of the class of $A_{n} \quad 1$ a ne Toda models [58], the Ising eld theory is the rst in the fam ily of $Z \mathrm{n}$ m odels. These m odels are m ore di cult as a consequence of their preferred $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{n}}$ braid group statistics and a candidate for a m aster eld is not im m ediately visible. T he suggestion from the Ising case w ould be that a suitable com bination ofalldisorder/orderoperatorsw ould be a candidate for a eld which ful lls som e generalized clustering (i.e. adjusted to the exotic statistics).
$T$ he im portant point underlying the idea of a $m$ aster eld is that there exists an analytic correlation function (41) whose di erent boundary values in m om entum rapidity space (41) correspond to di erent operator ordering. For factorizing $S_{\text {scat }} m$ atrioes the close relation betw een transpositions and actions ofS ${ }^{(2)}$ suggested how to relate the di erent orderings to on-shell operator data. For general $S_{\text {scat }}-m$ atrioes we could the opposite -orderw ith the action of $S_{\text {scat }}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { in;n } 1 ;:: 2 ; 1 i=S_{\text {scat }} \boldsymbol{j} ; 2 ;:: \text { n } \quad 1 ; n i \tag{55}
\end{equation*}
$$

but it is not obvious what kind of operator relation one should use for other orderings. Perhaps the cluster property leads to further restrictions which together w ith the KM S property perm it to determ ine the auxiliary R-theory. In any case it seem $s$ to $m$ e that an operator interpretation of the di erent rapidity orderings in form factors and the KMS property is an indispensable part of a deeper operator understanding of crossing and a (perturbative) on-shell construction.

The on-shell bootstrap-form factor idea is not the only possibility to avoid short-distance problems resulting from the use of eld coordinatizations and their singular correlations. A nother less speculative but by no $m$ eans sim pler idea will be presented in the next section.

## 6 Lightfront H olography as a constructive tool?

In the previous sections we have used m odular theory together $w$ ith on-shell concepts in order to analyze wedge algebras in the presence of interactions. In
this section I w ill present a recent proposalw hich also uses m odular localization ideas in order to sim plify the problem ofclassifying and constructing Q FT s. But instead of particle concepts, as e.g. PFGs for wedge algebras and form factors, it is based on the good understanding of chiraltheories which are related to the actual theory by a process of \algebraic lightfront holography" (A LH ).

Of course no non-perturbative approach to higher dim ensional interacting Q FT can achieve m iracles; sim pli cation just m eans the partition of a com plex dynam ical problem into a sequence of less com plicated single steps. Perhaps the follow ing com parison w th the canonical form alism sheds additional light on this point. This ETC form alism tries to classify and construct QFTs by assum ing the validity of canonical equal tim e com mutation relations (ETCR). $T$ he shortcom ings of that approach are well-know $n$. A part from the fact that in higher dim ensional relativistic QFT the ETC structure is inconsistent w ith the presence of interactions, ETCR are not useful as a starting point for a rough intrinsic distinction betw een di erent (universality) classes of interactions since ETCR are totally universal.

Lightfront holography tries to address this im balance by replacing the E T C R by the $m$ uch richer structure of chiral theories on the lightfront. Starting from a richer \kinem atical" setting than ETCR, one m ay hope for a m ore accessible \dynam ical" side. The holographic pro jection $m$ ay $m$ ap di erent am bient theories to the sam e chiral im age, but sim ilar to the better known scale invariant short distance universality classes, the holographic universality classes allow for $m$ ore realizations than the unique ETCR structure. H ow ever in contradistinction from scaling lim its, holographic projections live in the sam e H ilbert space as the ambient theory; in fact they just organize the spacetim e aspects of a shared algebraic structure in a radically di erent way.

Let us brie y recall the salient points of A LH ${ }^{33}$.
A LH $m$ ay be view ed as a kind of conceptually and $m$ athem atically updated \lightcone quantization" (or $\backslash p$ ! 1 fram e" description). W hereas the latter approaches never faced up to the question of how the new elds produced by the lightfront quantization prescriptions are related to the original local elds i.e. in which sense the new description addresses the original problem s posed by the ambient theory, the A LH is conceptually precise and $m$ athem atically rigorous on this points. It tums out that the idea of restricting elds to the lightfront is lim ited to free elds and certain superrenorm alizable interacting m odels w ith nite w ave function renorm alization (which only can be realized in $d=1+1$ ). Theories $w$ ith interaction-caused vacuum polarization which leads to $K$ allen-Lehm ann spectral functions $w$ th diverging $w$ ave fiunction renorm alization factors do not perm it lightfront restrictions for the sam e reason as they do

[^24]not have equal tim e restrictions; e.g. for scalar elds on has ${ }^{34}$

where in passing to the second line we used the rule (18) which replaces the am bient two-point function ofm ass by its zero $m$ ass lightfront restriction in the sense of the second section. As explained there, the infrared-divergence in the longitudinal factor is spurious if one view s the lightfront localization in the setting of m odular wedge localization. On the other hand the obstruction resulting from the large divergence of the $K-L$ spectralfunction (short distance regim e of interaction-caused vacuum polarization) is shared w ith that in ETCR i.e. in both cases the process of restriction is $m$ eaningless.

H ow ever whereas equal tim e restricted interacting elds in $d=1+3$ sim ply do not exist, there is no such lim itation on the short distance properties of generalized chiral conform al elds which tum out to generate the A LH. W hat breaks dow $n$ is only the idea that these lightfront generating elds can be gotten simply by restricting the elds of the am bient theory, as was the case in the example of free elds in the second section.

It tums out that in algebraic lightfront holography the connection betw een the am bient theory and its holographic projection requires the use ofm odular theory. A though the am bient theory $m$ ay well be given in term $s$ of pointlike elds and the A LH m ay also allow a pointlike description (see 62), there is no direct relation betw een these elds. This also sheds light on the old di culties w ith lightcone quantization which posed an obstacle to generations ofphysicists; even in the interaction-free case when the restriction works, the ALH net of algebras is nonlocal relative to the am bient algebra and hence the recovery of the am bient from the LF operators involves nonlocal steps. W hereas lightcone quantization was not able to address those subtle problem S, A LH solves them.

The intuitive physicalbasis of this algebraic approach is a lim iting form of the causal closure property. Let $O$ be a spacetim e region and $O^{\infty}$ its causal closure (the causal disjoint taken subsequently taken tw ioe) then the causal closure property is the follow ing equality

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(O)=A\left(O^{\infty}\right) \tag{57}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the case of free elds this abstract algebraic property is inherited via quantization from the C auchy propagation in the classical setting of hyperbolic differentialequations. $T$ he lightfront is a lim iting case (characteristic surface) of a C auchy surface. E ach lightray which passes through $O$ either m ust have passed or willpass through $O^{\infty}$ : For the case ofa $x^{0} \quad x^{3}$ wedge $W$ and its $x^{0} \quad x^{3}=0$ (upper) causal lightfront boundary LF B (W ) (which is half of a lightfront) the

[^25]relation
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(\operatorname{LFB}(\mathbb{W}))=A(\mathbb{W}) \tag{58}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

is a lim iting situation ofthe causalshadow property; a lightlike signalw hich goes through this boundary $m$ ust have passed through the wedge (or in the term inology of causality, the wedge is the backw ard causal com pletion of its lightfront boundary). C lassical data on the lightfront de ne a characteristic in itial value problem and the sm allest region which casts an am bient causal shadow is half the lightfront as in (58); for any transversely not two-sided in nite extended subregion, as well as for any region which is bounded in the lightray direction, the causal com pletion is triviali.e. $O=O^{\infty}$ :This unusualbehavior of the lightfront is related the fact that as a manifold $w$ ith its $m$ etric structure inherited from the am bient M inkow skispacetim e it is not even locally hyperbolic.

Som e of the symmetries which the lightfront inherits from the ambient Poincare group are obvious. It is clear that the lightlike translation together w th the two transverse translation and the transverse rotation are leaving the lightfront invariant and that the longitudinal Lorentz boost, which leaves the wedge invariant, acts as a dilatation on the lightray in the lightfront. There are two additional invariance transform ations of the lightfront which are less obvious. Their signi cance in the ambient space is that of the tw o \translations" in the 3-param etric $W$ igner little group E (2) (a E uclidean subgroup of the 6 -param etric Lorentz group) which leave the lightray in the lightfront invariant. P ro jected into the lightfront these \translations" look like transverse G alileitransform ations in the various $\left(x_{?}\right)_{i} \quad x_{+}$planes.

The resulting 7 -param etric sym $m$ etry group of the lightfront is used to construct the m odular localization structure of the A LH. For the longitudinal bcalization in the lightray direction the construction is based on the inclusion [59][61]

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(\mathbb{W}) \quad A\left(\mathbb{W}_{e_{+}}\right) \quad A d U\left(e_{+}\right) A(\mathbb{W}) \tag{59}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w h e r e A\left(W_{+}\right)$is the m age ofA ( $W$ ) under a translation $e_{+}$along the lightray. This inclusion is known to be \half-sided modular" (hsm) i.e. the modular group of the larger algebra ${\underset{\mathrm{W}}{\mathrm{W}}}_{\mathrm{it}}$ com presses the sm aller one for $t<0$ (+ halfsided m odular)

It is well-know $n$ [63] that such inclusions lead to $M$ oebius covariant chiral nets precisely if they are \standard" i.e. if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{A}\left(\mathbb{W}_{\mathrm{e}_{+}}\right)^{0} \backslash \mathrm{~A}(\mathbb{W}) \text { is dense in } H \tag{61}
\end{equation*}
$$

T he lightlike inclusion is the lim it of spacelike inclusions which in com pactly localizable theories are evidently standard (but not hsm). This property is known to hold in the absence of interactions where it can be traced back to the spatialstandardness of the respective subspaces of the $W$ igner representation space [62]. For factorizing $m$ odels in $d=1+1$ this algebraic requirem ent is the prerequisite for the existence of pointlike elds in the bootstrap form factor approach. $T$ he fact that the short distance behavior of these elds adm it anbitrary high
inverse pow ers suggests that this standardness assum ption (unlike the lightcone quantization and the above lightfront restriction $m$ ethod) is not a ected by short distance properties. Since our aim is the classi cation and construction of m odels, the range of validity of our $m$ ethod is at the end decided by its future success.

The interpretation of the chiral net obtained from the hsm inclusion for d> $1+1$ is that of a system of algebras associated w ith transverse \slioes" (stripes in case of $d=1+2$ ) i.e. regions of nite longitudinal and two-sided in nite transverse extension. N ote that the conform al rotation (or the proper conform al transform ation), which requires the one-point com pacti cation of the longitudinal coordinate, does not arise from the holographic projection of the P oincare transform ations, but rather results from the sym $m$ etry-im proving aspect of lightfront holography [70].

In order to obtain the com plete local resolution on the lightfront we still have to nd a mechanism which generates a transverse localization structure. This is done w the the help of $\backslash m$ odular intersections". For this purpose we now use the aforem entioned two \translations" in W igner's little group E (2): $T$ hese transform ations tillt the wedge $W$ in such a way that its upper boundary rem ains inside the lightfront. T he thickness of the slice in the lightray direction is $m$ aintained whereas the transverse directions are tilted in the sense of $G$ alilei group actions. It is easy to see that the intersection of the algebras localized in the original slice $w$ ith those of the tilted slice de nes an algebra localized in a nite region. The net structure of the lightfront algebra is de ned in term $s$ of this intersected slice algebras. A s m odular inclusions of wedges are inexorably linked to dilation-translation sym $m$ etries, $m$ odular intersections of wedges are related to $W$ igner's little group E (2) [64][65][66]: For m ore on the operator algebraic aspects of $m$ odular intersections we refer to the literature [67].
. The holographic projection $m$ ethod con ms that the vacuum polarization properties, which for free elds can be explicitly derived by the lightfront restriction $m$ ethod, continue to hold in the presence of interactions. T he m ost surprising aspect is certainly the total absence of transverse vacuum polarization which is a consequence of the follow ing theorem on tensor factorization [68]

Theorem 3 A von Neum ann subalgebra A of $B$ ( H ) which adm its a two-sided lightlike translation $w$ ith positive generator is of type I, i.e. it tensor factorizes as $B(H)=A \quad A^{0}$ associated with $H=H_{A} \quad H_{A} 0$ and the factorization of the vacuum vector $=A \quad A 0$

The transverse tensor factorization is corroborated by the application of the Takesaki theorem [29] which ts nicely into our m odular based approach since it relates the existence of preservation of subalgebras under the action of the m odular group of the am bient algebra to the existence of conditional expectations.

Theorem 4 The m odular group of an operator algebra in standard position ( $B$; ) leaves a subalgebra A $B$ invariant if and only if there exists a -
preserving conditional expectation $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{B}$ ! A . In that case the state ! ( ) = ( ; ) is a factor state on $\mathrm{A} \quad \mathrm{C}$ with $\mathrm{C} \quad \mathrm{A}^{0} \backslash \mathrm{~B}$ which leads a tensor factorization $H_{B}=H_{A} \quad H_{C}$ where the $H$ ibert spaces are cyclically generated from by the application of the respective algebras.

In the adaptation of this theorem to our problem we only have to set $\mathrm{B}=$ $A(L F B(W)) ; A=A\left(x_{?} 2 Q ; x_{+}>0\right)$; where $Q$ is a compact region in the transverse coordinates:

These theorem sclearly show that the holographic lightfront pro jection has a transverse quantum $m$ echanical structure since tensor factorization upon subdivisions of spatial regions and factorization of the vacuum vector are the characteristic features of $Q M$. This unexpected property of encountering quantum m echanicalstructures in relativistic Q FT w ithout having done any nonrelativistic approxim ation is a characteristic property of A LH. It is certainly related to the fact that the LF is not hyperbolic.

In addition to those sym $m$ etries inherited from the am bient theory there are new sym $m$ etries as the result of the \sym $m$ etry-im proving" lightfront pro jection [70]. O ne of them is the vacuum -preserving conform alrotation (see later section for $m$ ore com $m$ ents).

It is interesting and useful to ask what kind of generating pointlike elds could describe a holographic projection. The possibilities are severely lim ited by the transverse tensor factorization and the longitudinal chiral structure; they essentially am ount to the follow ing com $m$ utations structure (can be easily extended to inchude ferm ionic operators)

$$
\begin{align*}
& i\left(x_{?} ; x_{+}\right) ; j\left(x_{?}^{0} ; x_{+}^{0}\right)=  \tag{62}\\
= & \left(x_{?} \quad x_{?}^{0}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

$w$ here the com $m$ on -fiunction in the transverse direction takes care of the quantum $m$ echanical property and the longitudinal structure parallels that know $n$ from the Lie- eld structure of chiral observable algebras i.e. the $i$ constitute a ( nite or in nite) Lie- eld basis and the sum extends over nitely $m$ any term $s$. A $s$ in the pure chiral case of $W$-algebras the num ber of the derivatives in the longitudinal -fiunctions is controlled by the balance of scale dim ensions on both sides of the equation.

The operators obtained by sm earing with test functions $f\left(x_{\text {? }} ; x_{+}\right)$clearly produces the transverse quantum $m$ echanical factorization as a result of the presence of just one -fiunction w ithout derivatives. O bservables w th nonoverlapping transverse extension factorize according to

$$
\begin{equation*}
h A A^{0}{ }_{i}=h A i h A_{i} \tag{63}
\end{equation*}
$$

Ibelieve that the existence of generating elds (62) for A LH can be sim ilarly argued as in [69] where generating elds for ordinary chiral nets of algebras (w ithout transverse extension) were constructed.

It is well-known that the wedge localization, and hence also the localization on its causal boundary LF B (W ); causes a therm al behavior; in m ore speci c term S , the restriction of the vacuum to those localized algebras is indistinguishable from a therm alK M S state at a xed tem perature (the Unruh analog of the H aw king tem perature) whose H am iltonian is the generator of the W -a liated Lorentz boost. T he tem perature for the them al aspects caused by the quantum eld theoretic vacuum polarization aspects at the boundary of localization regions is related to the geom etry of these regions; this is in $m$ arked contrast to the standard heat bath them ality which leads to freely variable tem peratures and also exists in the classical setting. The absence of vacuum polarization in the transverse direction suggests that the localization-caused therm ality leads to an entropy density i.e. an entropy per unit transverse volum e which has the dim ension of an area [65]. This is in marked contrast to the volum e density of heat bath them ality and $m$ ay well tum out to be the QFT prerequisite for the Bekenstein area law in the quasiclassical treatm ent of black holes.

In a constructive use of these ideas one would start with a classi cation of QFT on the lightfront in term s of extended chiral theories and aim at the reconstruction of the am bient theory as a kind of inverse ALH. The action of the 7 -param etric invariance subgroup on the lightfront algebra is part of the A LH data. Their could be a restriction on the AHL data from the requirem ent that the three rem aining transform ation which together with the LF invariance group generate the ambient Poincare sym $m$ etry act in a consistent way. In analogy w th the $m$ any $H$ am iltonians one Certainly one has to expect $m$ any ways of $H$ aving arrived at the fam ily of wedge algebras in term $s$ of the A LH extended chiralalgebra the rem aining construction of the am bient algebraic net is then uniquely determ ined in term $s$ of intersections.

Further inside can be gained by com paring the particle-based m odular approach to factorizing $m$ odels $w$ th $A L H$. The representation of the generators (28) in term s of on-shell ZF creation/annihilation operators sim pli es the calculation of the lightray lim it $x=0: T$ hem ethod of lightfront restriction works exactly as in the case ofd=1+1 free elds (18) except that corresponding form ulas in term s of the ZF operators only serve as generators of half-line algebras. The algebras of nite intervals have to be calculated as relative com m utants by the $m$ odular inclusion form alism; the resulting in nite series in the ZF operators are com pletely analogous to (35) in section 4. In term $s$ of pointlike generating elds one has (p $\quad()=m e)$

$$
\begin{align*}
& A_{L F}\left(X_{+}\right)=\frac{X}{n!} C_{c}^{Z}:: e_{c}^{Z} e^{i x_{+}(p(1)+::: p(n))} a_{n}\left(1 ;:: n_{n}\right)  \tag{64}\\
& : Z(1)::: Z(n): d_{1}:: d_{n}
\end{align*}
$$

The corresponding am bient m assive pointlike localized elds are of the form

```
( \(\mathrm{p}_{+}\)( ) = me )
```



$$
\begin{align*}
& : Z\left({ }_{1}\right)::: Z(\mathrm{Z}): \mathrm{d}_{1}: \mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{n}}  \tag{65}\\
\mathrm{p}+\mathrm{p} & =\mathrm{m}^{2}
\end{align*}
$$

The additional exponents involving the total $P_{+} m$ om entum can be thought of originating from a nonlocal \H am iltonian" propagation law of the form $e^{i P+x}$

A pparently those chiral theories which arise as A LH pro jections ${ }^{35}$ from factorizing models (and hence have PFGs in term sof ZF variables) have a LF restriction which in term s of these variables is sim ilar to that for free elds. In particular the covariance of the $\mathrm{Z}^{0} \mathrm{~s}$ renders the extension into the am bient x direction unique. A s m entioned before we do not expect such a uniqueness of the inverse lightfront holography beyond factorizing $m$ odels, in particular for higher dim ensional theories.

The calculation of the intersection spaces associated $w$ ith intervals on the lightray is entirely analogous to that of the double cone intersections, in both cases one obtains in nite series (35) which applied to the vacuum lead to rich vacuum polarization clouds. This interplay betw een a massive 2 -dim ensional and chiralmodels is a new aspect of QFT since it does not depend on any approxim ation or scaling lim it and is therefore som ew hat surprising. It show s that at least certain chiral theories adm it novel descriptions in term s of a $2-$ dim ensional particle basis. W hereas the dilation-translation subgroup of the $M$ oebius group leaves the vacuum as well as the holographic im ages of the $m$ assive one-particle states invariant, the M oebius rotation leaves the vacuum invariant but adds vacuum polarization clouds to the alias one-particle states. $M$ ore investigations on this interesting point are required.

A s a result of insu cient know ledge about higher dim ensionalm odels, there is presently no model illustration of the ALH in the presence of transverse directions.

## 7 C oncluding rem arks

In these notes we have been exploring nonperturbative ideas to access QFT w ithout using the classical \crutches" inherent in Lagrangian quantization and w ithout being subject to the severe short distance restrictions of the related

[^26]canonical com $m$ utation relations or those of the euclidean functional integral representations ${ }^{36}$ to m ake sense outside QM .

A com $m$ on aspect is the im portant role which $m$ odular localization plays in these attem pts. W thout interactions, m odular particle and eld localizations are functorially related as expressed by the \commuting square" (8), but as a result of interaction-induced vacuum polarization the particle localization is lost apart from the existence of w edge-localized P FG s i.e. w edge-localized operators which applied to the vacuum create one-particle states free of vacuum polarization adm ixtures. If one in addition requires these operators to have reasonable dom ain properties with respect to translations (tem pered PFGs), only the $d=1+1$ factorizing $m$ odels rem ain. In the latter case it is also possible to form ulate a quantum eld theory of the system of form factors of a distinguished eld called the $m$ aster eld. $W$ hether this $m$ aster eld idea has a higher dim ensional generalization rem ains a $m$ atter of speculation.

An interesting link between the old S-m atrix bootstrap program and the form factor approach to QFT is the uniqueness of the inverse scattering problem in QFT.A though it says nothing about the existence of a QFT, it at least show s that if form factors ful 11 the crossing property, there is only one localo shell extrapolation i.e. only one localnet w ith a given $\mathrm{S}_{\text {scat }}$ : T his is interesting in view of the historical relations of string theory to Veneziano's dualm odel in which crossing property was im plem ented with in nitely $m$ any particle states. A though this is quite distinct from how crossing is expected to be achieved in QFT where both the particle poles and the cuts from the scattering continuum enter the crossing relation (as can be exem pli ed by the $S-m$ atrices of factorizing $m$ odels), the idea that the string prescriptions $m$ ay tum out to be a just a di erently form ulated local quantum physics was never totally ruled out ${ }^{37}$, despite $m$ any con icting opinions.

O ne would feelm ore con dendent about this point, if crossing would have continued to play the sam e pivotal role in string theory as it did in the (genus zero) form ulation of the dualm odel. But a glance at contem porary string theory indicates that $\mathbb{i t}$ dropped out of sight; it is not even clear whether it holds at all. In this conceptually som ew hat opaque situation it is interesting to note that very recently the local quantum physics interpretation of bosonic string eld theory received som e support from one of the protagonists of string theory [71] by indicating the possible construction of a (presum ably in nite) set of local elds which interpolate the string eld theory S-m atrix. In the spirit of \intrinsicness" set forw ard in the present work, one $m$ ight add the rem ark that by investigating the crossing property associated with such an $S$-m atrix, the uniqueness of the inverse scattering problem based on crossing secures the uniqueness of the associated local quantum physics in a way which does not depend on the art (and luck) of nding local interpolating elds.

An altemative idea would be that the relevant objects of string eld theory

[^27]are really sem in nite string-localized [2][74] in the sense ofm odular localization (w hich is the only relativistic quantum localization). Since, as already rem arked before, such elds cannot be \intenpolating" and their S-m atrix could not even be crossing sym $m$ etric, to contem plate such a possibility w ould only m ake sense if the string eld theory $S-m$ atrix tumes out to really violate crossing.

In this context it is interesting to $m$ ention that recent results on string $10-$ calization lead to the apparent paradoxicalconclusion that quantum (m odular) string localization does not adm it a Lagrangian quantization representation and classicalLagrangian string theories (e.g. N am bu-G oto) do not lead to quantum string-localized ob jects. The coalescence of these two di erent notions of localizations via quantization was a lucky circum stance w ithout which P ascual Jordan could not have succeded with his \Q uantelung der W ellenfelder" and Q FT would have begun w th the 1939 representation theoretical approach of Eugene P.W igner.

W hereas the construction of w edge algebras and their intersections based on PFG particle properties seem $s$ to be lim ited to factorizing $m$ odels, the idea of getting to am bient w edge algebras and their intersections via A LH is com pletely general. The lightfront algebras tum out to be transverse quantum m echanical extensions of chiral QFT s and their classi cation does not appear to be much $m$ ore di cult than that of standard chiral theories on which a lot of progress has been made. Am ong the ideas to construct QFTs in an intrinsic manner, I consider the holographic pro jection setting the $m$ ost prom ising. C om pared to the canonicalETCR setting it places the kinem atics/dynam ics cut in such a way that the kinem atical side (chiral theories) becom es much richer and the dynam ical side am ounts to the reconstruction of the ambient theory (inverse holography). This resembles in som e way the role which chiral theories are supposed to play in the dynam ics of string theory.

A m ong the m any unsolved conceptionalproblem sof FT there is the question of how particle-based concepts ( $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{m}$ atrix, form factors crossing..) and the causality based algebraic lightfront holography (transverse extended chiraltheories) $t$ together, e.g. questions like what is the holographic intenpretation of the $S_{\text {scat }} m$ atrix? $T$ his is basically the old question conceming the particle- eld relation in a new context.
$T$ he very fact that there are fiundam entalunansw ered problem s suggests that despite its alm ost 80 years of existence, Q FT still rem ains a pro ject and is still quite a distance from having reached $m$ aturity. It has rem ained young in the sense of not having accom plished an ultim ate form ulation in purely intrinsic term S , w thout the use of quasiclassical crutches w th which P ascual Jordan introduced eld quantization, but from which he wanted to get aw ay [14].

A cknow ledgem ent: I am indebted to $H$ radjB abu jian and $M$ ichael $K$ arow ski for interesting discussions extending over $m$ any years, and I ow e special thanks to Jorg Teschner for draw ing my attention to the work of S. Lukyanov and explaining som e of its content.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In the setting of form factors i.e. $m$ atrix elem ents of operators betw een $m$ ultiparticle ket instates and bra out-states the $S-m$ atrix is a special case of a (generalized) form factor associated w ith the identity operator.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ The individuality of classical elds is lost in QFT where e.g. a m eson eld is any local (relative local w ith respect to the local obervables of the theory) covariant ob ject with a nonvanishing $m$ atrix elem ent betw een the vacuum and a one-m eson state ( $\backslash$ interpolating eld").

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ The possibility of two-particle bound states entering as incom ing particles requires the use of the fram ew ork of rearrangem ent collisions in which the space of (non interacting) frag$m$ ents is distinguished from the (H eisenberg) space on which the interacting Poincare group is represented [7].
    ${ }^{4} \mathrm{~W}$ hereas in Q FT the perm itted eld changes which m aintain the local net of algebras are described by the localequivalence classes (B orchers classes), the scattering equivalences in the $\mathrm{C} P$ schem e form a much bigger nonlocal class of changes.

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ Since the issue of crossing constitutes the $m$ ain subject of the BEG paper, I nd it particularly appropriate to dedicate this work to Jacques B ros on the occasion of his $70^{\text {th }}$ birthday.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6} \mathrm{O}$ ne glance at the old conference proceedings and review articles of the C hew $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{m}$ atrix school reveals that I am not exaggerating. N ow adays the ideological fervor against QFT is hard to understand, in particular in view of the fact that alm ost all the concepts originated from QFT.
    ${ }^{7}$ The $S-m$ atrix bootstrap retumed $m$ any years later as a valuable tool (but not a TOE) of the \form factor program " in the lim ited context of $d=1+1$ factorizing $m$ odels of Q FT [13].

[^5]:    ${ }^{8}$ Far from being a a peculiar shortcom ing of the $N$ ew ton-W igner localization, there exist a generalN o-G o theorem which rules out the existence of any Poincare-covariant localization in term s of projectors and probabilities in theories w ith positive energy [22].
    ${ }^{9} \mathrm{~T}$ he denseness of th is subspace is the m ain content of the R eeh-Sch lieder theorem [23].

[^6]:    ${ }^{10}$ I am indebted to Larry Landau for rem inding $m$ e of the problem sofusing the split property in connection with the realization of the Ferm iG edankenexperim ent in the relativistic setting.

[^7]:    ${ }^{11}$ In certain cases the irreducible representation has to be doubled in order to accom odate the antiunitary (tim $e$ is inverted) re ection. $T$ his is always the case $w$ ith zero $m$ ass nite helicity representations and $m$ ore generally if particles are not selfcon jugate.
    ${ }^{12}$ O perators $w$ ith th is property are the comer stones of the $T$ om ita-T akesakim odular theory [29] of operator algebras. H ere they arise in the spatial R ie el van D aele spatial setting of $m$ odular theory from a realization of the geom etric $B$ isognano-W ichm ann situation $w$ ith in the W igner representation theory.

[^8]:    ${ }^{13} \mathrm{To} m$ aintain sim plicity we lim it our presentation to the bosonic situation and refer to [17][18] for the general treatm ent.
    ${ }^{14} \mathrm{~W}$ e retain the traditional word $\backslash$ eld" in the sense of carriers of causal localization even though the present construction avoids the explicit use of pointlike operator-valued distributions.

[^9]:    ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~A} s$ a result of the m ass shell restriction a W igner $w$ ave function (and the sm eared elds) is represented in term $s$ of an equivalence class of test functions.

[^10]:    ${ }^{16} \mathrm{~W}$ e are referring to the fact that the relation between testfunctions $f$ and their $w$ ave functions $E_{m} f$ in the $W$ igner one-particle space is an equivalence class relation.

[^11]:    ${ }^{17} \mathrm{~T}$ he only exception is the case of m assless theories in $\mathrm{d}=1+1$.
    ${ }^{18} \mathrm{~T}$ he J-S theorem can easily be generalized to subw edge-localized P FG s [3].

[^12]:    ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~T}$ he assum ption of crossing for form factors as one needs it for the uniqueness of inverse scattering seem $s$ to go beyond what has derived by the analyticity techniques in [11], but a de nite conclusion on this $m$ atter can probably not obtained w ithout updating these old but still im pressive $m$ ethods.
    ${ }^{20} \mathrm{~T}$ he notion of interpolating elds and associated reduction form ulas cease to exist if the in/out particles require the application of sem in nite string-like H eisenberg operators to the vacuum.
    ${ }^{21}$ For far separated $y$ we m ay consider locB to be near zero; then ( $y$ ) ( $y$ locB ) agrees approxim ately $w$ ith the relative tim elike distance -function used for pointlike localization.

[^13]:    ${ }^{22} \mathrm{~T}$ he structural sim ilarity between the cyclicity of the crossing-w ith the KM S-property has lured $m$ any authors (including the present author [36]) into con jectures that crossing has a KM S interpretation in the setting of wedge-localized algebras of the original theory. T hese conjectures (including \proofs" [37]) are incorrect.

[^14]:    ${ }^{23} \mathrm{An}$ operator which is localizable in a certain causally closed spacetim e region is autom atically localized in any larger region but not necessarily in a sm aller region. The unspeci c tem inology $\backslash$ non-local" in the literature is used for any non pointlike localized eld.

[^15]:    ${ }^{24}$ See a recent review [51] in which the $m$ inim al form factor contributions, which are a joint property of the local equivalence class, have been separated from the polynom ial contributions (the $\backslash p$-finctions") which distinguish betw een the vacuum polarization contributions of individual elds.

[^16]:    ${ }^{25}$ A situation which in case of factorizing $m$ odels $w$ ith variable coupling (as e.g. the SineG ordon theory) can alw ays be obtained by choosing a su ciently sm all coupling. B ound state poles in the physical -strip require nontrivial changes (e.g. the -generator is only wedge localized on the subspace of $Z$-particles) which w ill be dealt w ith elesw here.

[^17]:    ${ }^{26} \mathrm{~T}$ he world local is reserved for \com m uting for spacelike distances". In this work we are dealing w ith non-local elds which are nevertheless localized in causally com plete subregions (wedges, double cones) of M inkow skispacetim e.

[^18]:    ${ }^{27} \mathrm{C}$ om pact localization leads to coe cient functions which are m erom orphic outside the open strip [35].

[^19]:    ${ }^{28}$ If the form factors are $m$ atrixelem ents of operators, they $m$ ust also have a $m$ ultiplicative structure which corresponds to sum sover in nitely many multi-particle states.

[^20]:    ${ }^{29} \mathrm{~T}$ h is factor is di erent for bounded operators A $2 \mathrm{~A}(\mathrm{D})$ where one obtains a decrease for large $m$ om enta which $m$ ay help in the control of the convergence in (35).

[^21]:    ${ }^{30} \mathrm{~W}$ e alw ays $m$ ean the connected part of the form factors $w$ hich is $w$ hat one gets by starting $w$ ith the outgoing com ponents of the one eld (or operator from a local algebra) state and crossing from outgoing bras to incom ing kets.

[^22]:    ${ }^{31} \mathrm{~W}$ e use the letter $Z$ for the particle physics representation of the $Z$ am olodchikov algebra (the M inkow skispacetim e operators which are related to the PFG wedge generators) whereas $R$ is used for the them al $R$ indler representation.

[^23]:    ${ }^{32}$ In [58] it $w a s$ show $n$ that distinguished elds $w$ ith clustering form factors exist for all $A_{n} 1$ a ne Toda eld theories of which the $\operatorname{Sinh}-G$ ordon is the low est $m$ em ber.

[^24]:    ${ }^{33} \mathrm{~W}$ e add this pre x \algebraic" in order to distinguish the present notion of holography from the gravitationalholography oft'H ooft [60]. M ore on sim ilarities and di erences betw een the two can be found in the concluding rem arks,

[^25]:    ${ }^{34}$ It is im portant to realize that the LF restriction is not a pointw ise procedure. $T$ he best understanding is ach ieved $w$ ithin the setting of $m$ odular localization (see below).

[^26]:    ${ }^{35} \mathrm{~T}$ he reader should note that the relation betw een the holograph ic chiralpro jection and the am bient factorizing m odel is exact, whereas Zam olodchikov's w orking hypothesis is based on a construction of factorizing $m$ odels from their chiral scaling lim its by speci c pertunbations. $N$ evertheless there $m$ ay be connection betw een holographic and scaling universality classes.

[^27]:    ${ }^{36}$ Functional integral representations su er the sam elim itations (for the sam em athem atical reasons) for interacting QFT as the previously explained lim itations of ETCR.
    ${ }^{37}$ A ctually the canonical second quantization of the classical N am bu-G oto string leads to pointlike local ob jects [72][73].

