arXiv:quant-ph/9510011v1 11 Oct 1995

Isolation and Expulsion of Divergences in Quantum Field Theory

John R. Klauder
Departments of Physics and Mathematics
University of Florida
Gainesville, Fl 32611

January 16, 2022

Abstract

Divergences that arise in the quantization of scalar quantum field models by means of a lattice-space functional integration may be attributed to a single integration variable, and this fact is demonstrated by showing that if the integrand for that single integration variable is appropriately changed, then a perturbation expansion becomes order-by-order finite and divergence free. The paper concludes with a brief review of a current proposal of how an auxiliary, nonclassical potential added to the lattice action of a relativistic scalar field quantization may automatically render an analogous change of the integrand, and thus may lead, as well, to nontrivial and divergence-free results.

1 Introduction and Overview

Traditional formulations of quantum field theory often encounter one or another divergence in the course of calculation. For a self-interacting, relativistic scalar field, for example, the divergences are often classified on the basis of those that are encountered in the course of a perturbation analysis. If we let n denote the number of space-time dimensions, then a typical classical

action functional is given by

$$I = \int \{ \tfrac{1}{2}[\partial_\mu \phi(x)]^2 - \tfrac{1}{2} m^2 \phi(x)^2 - g\phi(x)^p \}\, d^n x$$

appropriate to a p^{th} power interaction term. This is the action for the so-called φ_n^p model, and we shall confine attention to such models. Here, there is a sum over the indices μ from 0 to $s = n-1$, and the metric signature is $[+1, -1, -1, \ldots, -1]$. The kind of divergences that arise in quantization depend strongly on the space-time dimension n. For example, for $n = 2$, the only divergences that arise have to do with normal ordering which amounts to a (re)definition of the local product for operators. For $n \geq 3$ the kind of divergences includes those covered by normal ordering and generally additional divergences as well. In particular, whenever $p < n/(n-2)$ it follows that normal ordering cures all divergences on a term by term basis within a perturbation expansion. When $p < 2n/(n-2)$ we are in the so-called super-renormalizable regime, in which case infinite renormalization counterterms are generally required, such as a divergent mass renormalization counterterm for the φ_3^4 model. When $p = 2n/(n-2)$ we are in the strictly renormalizable case where there is generally both coupling constant and wave function renormalization. Finally, when $p > 2n/(n-2)$ we are in the nonrenormalizable situation and the number of divergent interaction counterterms that need to be added grows without limit. This brief survey indicates the normal situation viewed from the point of view of perturbation theory. For further details see [1].

One may also formulate things differently. If we choose a Euclidean lattice space functional integral formulation, then on the basis of the renormalization group, for example, and outside of perturbation theory, one can show that the nonrenormalizable cases, i.e., where $p > 2n/(n-2)$ actually pass to a *free* theory, or at least a generalized free theory, in the continuum limit. Thus for the very important case where $p = 4$, it follows that for $n \geq 5$ the theory becomes trivial in the continuum limit [2]. Although the full proof has not yet been established there is every indication that the same conclusion actually holds in the case $p = 4$, $n = 4$. Thus we observe that different calculational schemes may very well lead to distinct answers relative to the question of divergences.

Let us recall the appearance of the Euclidean-space lattice formulation for the φ_n^p model. We let $k = (k_0, k_1, \ldots, k_s)$, $k_j \in \mathbb{Z} \equiv \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots\}$,

denote a lattice site, k^* denote any one of the nearest neighbors (in the positive direction) to the point k, and a denote the lattice spacing. Then the generating function for the Euclidean-space correlation functions on the lattice is given by

$$S(h) = C_N \int \exp\{\ \Sigma h_k \phi_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2} Y (\phi_{k^*} - \phi_k)^2 a^{n-2} \\ -\tfrac{1}{2} m_0^2 \Sigma \phi_k^2 a^n - g_0 \Sigma \phi_k^p a^n\ \} \, \Pi \, d\phi_k \ .$$

This integral is to run over $N \equiv (2L+1)^n$ lattice sites of a (hyper)cubic lattice, and the continuum limit is one in which $a \to 0$ as well as $L \to \infty$ in such a way, ultimately, that the volume of the space-time integration region becomes all of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The constant C_N is fixed by the requirement that $S(0) = 1$. Here we have introduced unknown parameters which are to be determined, if possible, so that a consistent and nontrivial (non-Gaussian) theory emerges in the continuum limit. It is this formulation which, even allowing for arbitrary choices of the parameters $Y > 0$, m_0^2, and $g_0 \geq 0$, nevertheless results in a trivial, Gaussian behavior in the continuum limit, i.e., when $a \to 0$, for $n \geq 5$ ($n = 4$). These results emerge from an application of the renormalization group and/or the random-walk representation [2].

In the present paper we wish to sketch an argument which leads to a qualitative appreciation of various divergences and which at the same time *isolates a single parameter* which, in a manner of speaking, can be said to be 'responsible' for *all the divergences*. This identification is significant because in work reported elsewhere [3]—and very briefly summarized in the final section of the present paper—we have shown how one may effectively eliminate an analogous parameter in lattice formulations of more physical models. This procedure, when carried out to its potential—a task, unfortunately, that has yet not been fully accomplished—has the capability of offering a quantum field theory the perturbation theory of which is *order-by-order divergence free!*

2 Hyper-extreme Spherical Coordinates

The lattice-space functional integral involves an integration over N fields on the N distinct lattice sites. Let us reexpress that integral in *new coordinates* which we shall refer to as *hyper-extreme spherical coordinates*. To that end,

consider the measure

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi\, d\phi_k &= \Pi\, d\phi_k\, \delta(\kappa^2 - \Sigma\phi_k^2)\, d\kappa^2 = \delta(\kappa^2 - \Sigma\phi_k^2)\, d\kappa^2\, \Pi\, d\phi_k \\ &= \kappa^{N-2}\, d\kappa^2\, \delta(1 - \Sigma\eta_k^2)\, \Pi\, d\eta_k = 2\kappa^{N-1}\, d\kappa\, \delta(1 - \Sigma\eta_k^2)\, \Pi\, d\eta_k\ .\end{aligned}$$

In the last line we have introduced $\phi_k \equiv \kappa\eta_k$ for all sites k in the lattice. Observe that κ represents the *radius* of all the N fields while $\{\eta_k\}$ denotes the *direction field* of the N field amplitudes $\{\phi_k\}$. The direction field satisfies $\Sigma\eta_k^2 \equiv 1$, and thus this field lies on (the surface of) the $(N-1)$-sphere, S^{N-1}. Let us introduce these variables into the lattice regularized functional integral. It follows (with C_N absorbing the factor 2) that

$$\begin{aligned}S(h) = C_N \int \exp\{\kappa\, \Sigma h_k\eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2}\kappa^2 Y\Sigma(\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2 a^{n-2} - \tfrac{1}{2}m_0^2\kappa^2\Sigma\eta_k^2 a^n \\ -g_0\kappa^p\Sigma\eta_k^p a^n\ \}\ \kappa^{N-1}\, d\kappa\, \delta(1 - \Sigma\eta_k^2)\, \Pi\, d\eta_k\ .\end{aligned}$$

Now observe that there are two qualitatively different kinds of integration variables. On the one hand, there are the η_k variables constrained so that the sum of their squares lies on the unit sphere. Such variables are quite 'tame' in their behavior, and as we shall see they are not responsible for the divergences even though there are a great many of them. On the other hand, there is the single variable κ which enters into the integrand in one factor with a large power, namely the term κ^{N-1}. If we look at the behavior of the κ integral we see that it is largely controlled by that term with a high power $(N-1)$. A steepest descent integration for κ is suggested and leads to the fact that $\kappa \propto \sqrt{N}$ whenever p and n satisfy $p \leq 2n/(n-2)$ (see below). Not only does the steepest descent approach lead to a large value for κ, it also leads to a relatively very narrow width of order one. Of course, a change of variable given by rescaling κ could put the new support of order one, but then it would be extremely sharply concentrated. *Essentially, it is the fact that the support of κ is extremely sharply concentrated that ultimately leads to a divergent perturbation expansion.* Let us illustrate and thereby clarify this remark.

Consider first the case of a free field in n dimensions; specifically we consider

$$S(h) = C_N \int \exp\{\kappa\Sigma h_k\eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2}\kappa^2\Sigma(\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2 a^{n-2} - \tfrac{1}{2}m^2\kappa^2 a^n\}\ \kappa^{N-1}\, d\kappa\, d\sigma(\eta)$$

where we have set $Y = 1$ and $m_0 = m$, as is appropriate for this example. We have also explicitly used the fact that $\Sigma\eta_k^2 = 1$ in the coefficient of the mass term, and introduced the abbreviation

$$d\sigma(\eta) \equiv \delta(1 - \Sigma\eta_k^2)\,\Pi\, d\eta_k \ .$$

We also introduce the notation for an average over σ given by $\langle(\cdot)\rangle \equiv \int(\cdot)d\sigma(\eta)/\int d\sigma(\eta)$. First we observe that $\langle\eta_k^2\rangle \equiv (1/N)$ because every axis is treated identically. For all $n \geq 2$, we next observe that $0 \leq \langle(\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2\rangle \simeq (1/N)$ as well, as follows from the previous equality plus the Schwarz inequality. The implication of this fact is that there may be relatively little correlation between nearest neighbor values. [On the other hand, for $n = 1$, it follows that $\langle(\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2\rangle \simeq (a/N)$, indicating some significant correlation between nearest neighbor η values.] We assume, and will later confirm, that the gradient term is generally the dominant term in the exponent. With that assumption it follows that the entire gradient term is of order N, i.e.,

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\kappa^2\Sigma(\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2 a^{n-2} \simeq N \ .$$

This relation holds for the simple reason that each of the N terms in that sum will be of order one just as would be the integrand for any single (N-independent) integral. The value of κ is well approximated by the result of a steepest descent approximation, namely as given by $(N/\kappa) = \kappa a^{n-2}$ where we have already used the (upper limit of the) estimate for $(\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2$ and set $N - 1 \simeq N$. We conclude that $\kappa \simeq \sqrt{Na^{2-n}}$. With this choice for κ it follows that the entire gradient term is $O(N)$ as desired. With these expressions we also learn that

$$\tfrac{1}{2}m^2\kappa^2 a^n \simeq m^2(Na^{2-n})a^n \simeq Na^2$$

which is of lower order than the gradient term justifying our neglect of it in performing the steepest descent approximation. For comparison of relative terms we may also examine a 'unit volume' where $Na^n = 1$. In that case, when $n \geq 3$, the gradient term is $O(a^{-n})$ while the mass term is $O(a^{2-n})$; for $n = 2$ the latter term should be interpreted as $a^0 \equiv -\ln(ma)$ for some mass m. Thus for all $n \geq 2$ the mass term is divergent as $N \to \infty$ although it diverges at a slower rate than the gradient term. Let us see what is the consequence of the divergence of the mass term.

Suppose we want to consider the relation of $S(h)$ for one mass term compared to that for another by means of a perturbation in the difference

Δm^2 of the two masses. In particular, consider

$$\begin{aligned} S(h) &= C_N \int \exp\{\kappa\Sigma h_k\eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2}\kappa^2\Sigma(\eta_{k^*}-\eta_k)^2 a^{n-2} \\ &\qquad\qquad -\tfrac{1}{2}(m^2+\Delta m^2)\kappa^2 a^n\}\,\kappa^{N-1}\,d\kappa\,d\sigma(\eta) \\ &= C_N \int \exp\{\kappa\Sigma h_k\eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2}\kappa^2\Sigma(\eta_{k^*}-\eta_k)^2 a^{n-2} \\ &\qquad\qquad -\tfrac{1}{2}m^2\kappa^2 a^n\}(1-\tfrac{1}{2}\Delta m^2\kappa^2 a^n+\cdots)\,\kappa^{N-1}\,d\kappa\,d\sigma(\eta)\ . \end{aligned}$$

The point to observe in this calculation is that the term proportional to Δm^2 is, as compared to the first term of the series, proportional to Na^2 due to the presence of $\kappa^2 a^n$ in the expansion. Thus we see that a perturbation in the mass is automatically divergent as $N\to\infty$ whenever $n\geq 2$, a fact already well known in conventional treatments of relativistic perturbation theory. Observe further that this divergence arises from the *single* variable κ and is not a consequence of integrations over the many η_k variables.

Let us next consider the case of a quartic perturbation term, namely

$$\begin{aligned} S(h) = C_N \int \exp\{\kappa\Sigma h_k\eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2}\kappa^2\Sigma(\eta_{k^*}-\eta_k)^2 a^{n-2} \\ -\tfrac{1}{2}m_0^2\kappa^2 a^n - g_0\kappa^4\Sigma\eta_k^4 a^n\}\,\kappa^{N-1}\,d\kappa\,d\sigma(\eta)\ . \end{aligned}$$

Once again we assume to begin with that the gradient term is the most dominant term in the exponent, an assumption that leads to the same estimate for κ, namely $\kappa\simeq\sqrt{Na^{2-n}}$. The mass term is the same as before, while the new term is the quartic coupling which becomes

$$g_0\kappa^4\Sigma\eta_k^4 a^n \simeq g_0(Na^{2-n})^2 N N^{-2} a^n \simeq Na^{4-n}\ .$$

In this expression the factor $1/N^2$ in the middle arises from the estimate that $\langle\eta_k^4\rangle\simeq 1/N^2$. In fact, this value can be determined from

$$\langle\eta_k^2\eta_l^2\rangle = \frac{1+2\delta_{kl}}{N(N+2)}$$

which holds exactly. Observe for $n<4$ that the quartic term is strictly smaller than the gradient term, while for $n=4$ the two terms are of the same order of magnitude. On the other hand, for $n>4$ the quartic term is strictly larger than the gradient (or the mass term) and thus our assumption

of determining the behavior of κ is unjustified. These three cases correspond exactly to the three cases of superrenormalizable, renormalizable, and nonrenormalizable fields in the usual perturbation analysis [1]. Here we see how these three different situations appear in the hyper-extreme spherical coordinates of the present paper.

As an example of estimation obtained in this picture, let us determine the contribution to the vacuum polarization of the two-vertex bubble graph for $n \geq 3$ when estimated in hyper-extreme spherical coordinates. In particular, let us estimate the expression

$$C_N \int (\Sigma : \kappa^4 \eta_k^4 : a^n)^2 \exp\{-\tfrac{1}{2}\kappa^2 \Sigma (\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2 a^{n-2} - \tfrac{1}{2} m^2 \kappa^2 a^n\} \, \kappa^{N-1} \, d\kappa \, d\sigma(\eta) \; .$$

Recall the usual prescription for normal ordering given by

$$: \phi_k^4 : = \phi_k^4 - 6\phi_k^2 \langle \phi_k^2 \rangle + 3 \langle \phi_k^2 \rangle^2 \; .$$

In terms of hyper-extreme spherical coordinates we see that

$$: \kappa^4 \eta_k^4 : = \kappa^4 \eta_k^2 - 6\kappa^2 \eta_k^2 \langle \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 \rangle + 3 \langle \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 \rangle^2 \; .$$

Now we can use the fact that $\langle \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 \rangle \simeq N a^{2-n} N^{-1} = a^{2-n}$. All these terms then become of comparable value, and to the accuracy we are working we cannot distinguish a cancellation of a divergence (as with $\langle : \phi_k^4 \phi_l^4 : \rangle = 0$) from a noncancellation (as with $\langle : \phi_k^4 :: \phi_l^4 : \rangle \neq 0$). Rather we use the normal ordering to establish the proper combinatorics of the correlations. Thus we determine, at least to the correct order of magnitude, that the leading divergence of the expression given above, relative to the unperturbed term, is given by

$$(N a^{2-n})^4 a^{2n} \Sigma \langle \eta_k^4 \eta_l^4 \rangle \simeq N^4 a^{8-2n} a^{-n} N N^{-4} = N a^{8-3n} \; .$$

In the middle estimate, and apart from κ^8, we have used the fact that the first sum would lead to a convergent integral were there a volume element (a^{-n}), the second sum is translationally invariant (N), and the expectation of the η variables involves $1/N^4$. The net result is proportional to the volume (N) as it should be. The remaining divergence is ultraviolet as it should be. It is readily confirmed that the result is appropriate for $n \geq 3$.

The virtue of using hyper-extreme spherical coordinates is not necessarily for calculational purposes, but rather to gain an overview of where, in some

sense, the divergences that appear in quantum field theory originate. With the choice of hyper-extreme spherical coordinates we have exposed that the radius κ—and especially its appearance in the integrand in the form κ^{N-1}—is the source of all the divergences. Let us make this point even more convincing by discussing what happens if that large power is removed!

3 Divergence-free Quantum Field Theory

For the sake of discussion let us replace the term that we have identified as the source of the divergences by something harmless. In particular, let us replace κ^{N-1} by 1, i.e., effectively, in this term and *in this term alone*, setting $N = 1$. This is a very drastic change and it has a number of consequences not the least of which is the loss of a local interaction with which to make a relativistic model. We will comment on this very point later, where we will briefly recall the principal argument, which is presented elsewhere [3], in which an analogous replacement appears in such a way that locality in the continuum limit is retained. For the present—and this is the main point of the present paper—we wish to emphasize the profound consequences that arise when such a change is made in a lattice space functional integral.

With the indicated change in the integration measure, the lattice space generating functional of interest becomes

$$S'(h) = C'_N \int \exp\{\kappa\, \Sigma h_k \eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2}\kappa^2 Y \Sigma(\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2 a^{n-2} - \tfrac{1}{2} m_0^2 \kappa^2 \Sigma \eta_k^2 a^n \\ - g_0 \kappa^p \Sigma \eta_k^p a^n \,\}\, d\kappa\, \delta(1 - \Sigma \eta_k^2)\, \Pi\, d\eta_k \ .$$

One immediately sees that the integration over the single variable κ is normal and without any special feature. On the other hand, the parameters of the model, i.e., Y, m_0, and g_0, need not behave as they previously did, and indeed, the cutoff dependence of these parameters is one of the interesting features that needs to be determined. To that end let us first examine the special case in which $Y = 0 = g_0$ and only m_0 remains. In that case

$$S'(h) = C'_N \int \exp\{\kappa \Sigma h_k \eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2} m_0^2 \kappa^2 a^n \,\}\, d\kappa\, \delta(1 - \Sigma \eta_k^2)\, \Pi\, d\eta_k \ .$$

Although $\kappa > 0$, the symmetry of the measure under $\eta \to -\eta$ lets us treat the integral over κ as a simple Gaussian integral, and the result (changing

C'_N as needed) becomes

$$S'(h) = C'_N \int \exp\{\, \tfrac{1}{2} m_0^{-2} (\Sigma h_k \eta_k)^2 a^n \,\} \, \delta(1 - \Sigma \eta_k^2) \, \Pi \, d\eta_k \; .$$

The remaining integrals over the η variables may be approximated by simply replacing the factor $\eta_k \eta_l$ by its average value of δ_{kl}/N. When this is done the result becomes

$$S'(h) = \exp\{\, \tfrac{1}{2} m_0^{-2} N^{-1} \Sigma h_k^2 a^n \,\} \; ,$$

and in the continuum limit the only way for the result to be nontrivial is that $m_0^2 = m^2/N$, where m^2 is a cutoff independent quantity. This dependence of the bare mass is of course quite different than in the usual case. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that a perturbation in the mass term leads to a series that is order-by-order *finite*. In particular, consider the expression

$$\begin{aligned} S'(h) &= C'_N \int \exp\{\kappa \Sigma h_k \eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2}(m^2 + \Delta m^2) N^{-1} \kappa^2 a^n \,\} \, d\kappa \, \delta(1 - \Sigma \eta_k^2) \, \Pi \, d\eta_k \\ &= C'_N \int \exp\{\kappa \Sigma h_k \eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2} m^2 N^{-1} \kappa^2 a^n \,\} \\ &\qquad \times (1 - \tfrac{1}{2} \Delta m^2 N^{-1} \kappa^2 a^n + \cdots) \, d\kappa \, \delta(1 - \Sigma \eta_k^2) \, \Pi \, d\eta_k \; . \end{aligned}$$

The essential fact to observe about this equation is that the term of order Δm^2 is actually $O(1)$ due to the fact that κ^2 is large of order $N a^{-n}$. Thus there is no divergence in the perturbation series as long as we choose the mass renormalization as indicated.

Next let us introduce a nonlinear coupling term. This leads to the expression

$$\begin{aligned} S'(h) = C'_N \int \exp\{\kappa \, \Sigma h_k \eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2} m_0^2 \kappa^2 \Sigma \eta_k^2 a^n \\ - g_0 \kappa^p \Sigma \eta_k^p a^n \,\} \, d\kappa \, \delta(1 - \Sigma \eta_k^2) \, \Pi \, d\eta_k \; . \end{aligned}$$

In view of the behavior of the integral over κ, it follows that this expression will be well defined and contributing if and only if

$$g_0 = g N^{-1} a^{(p/2-1)n}$$

in which case the integral is equivalent (using $\kappa = \varrho N^{1/2} a^{-n/2}$) to

$$\begin{aligned} S'(h) = C'_N \int \exp\{\varrho N^{1/2} \Sigma h_k \eta_k a^{n/2} - \tfrac{1}{2} m^2 \varrho^2 \\ - g \varrho^p N^{p/2-1} \Sigma \eta_k^p \,\} \, d\varrho \, \delta(1 - \Sigma \eta_k^2) \, \Pi \, d\eta_k \; , \end{aligned}$$

where, as usual, the constant C'_N has been readjusted to account for the change of variable. A perturbation expansion in the nonlinear coupling constant leads to

$$S'(h) = C'_N \int \exp\{\varrho N^{1/2} \Sigma h_k \eta_k a^{n/2} - \tfrac{1}{2} m^2 \varrho^2 \} \times (1 - g\varrho^p N^{p/2-1} \Sigma \eta_k^p + \cdots)\, d\varrho\, \delta(1 - \Sigma \eta_k^2) \prod d\eta_k \ ,$$

It follows, relative to the first term, that the first-order correction is $O(1)$. A similar analysis shows that each of the terms in the perturbation series is finite. In other words, the perturbation series is *order-by-order finite*. It is particularly noteworthy in this regard that g_0 is *small* (specifically $g_0 \propto N^{-1} a^{(p/2-1)n}$), meaning that the factors that it multiplies need to be allowed to become large in order for the nonlinear term to contribute. A large value for the factors multiplying the coupling constant is analogous to what happens in the usual case where the factor κ^{N-1} is present in the integrand. But not only are these large, they also have a broad range of values, and that situation is quite unlike what happens in the usual case when the factor κ^{N-1} is present.

Finally we turn our attention to the gradient term. For this purpose we first let $m_0 = 0 = g_0$ so that we may focus on the essentials. The expression of interest reads

$$S'(h) = C'_N \int \exp\{\kappa \Sigma h_k \eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2} \kappa^2 Y \Sigma (\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2 a^{n-2} \}\, d\kappa\, \delta(1 - \Sigma \eta_k^2) \prod d\eta_k \, .$$

Clearly the role of the gradient term is to introduce correlations into the direction field that have been, in the absence of that term, lacking. Nevertheless, since $\eta_k^2 \simeq 1/N$, we observe, as previously noted, that $0 \leq (\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2 \simeq 1/N$ as a consequence of the Schwarz inequality. Thus to make this term a contributor it is necessary that

$$\kappa^2 Y \Sigma (\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2 a^{n-2} \simeq 1$$

a condition that requires that

$$Y \simeq (N a^{-n})^{-1} a^{2-n} \langle \Sigma (\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2 \rangle^{-1} \simeq N^{-1} a^2 \ .$$

Finally, in this regard, we combine the several terms needed to make up the full theory (minus, of course, the factor κ^{N-1} in the integrand!). Based

on the fact that each of these terms has a bounded contribution, it follows that we may choose as our basic lattice-space expression

$$S'(h) = C'_N \int \exp\{\kappa\, \Sigma h_k \eta_k a^n - \tfrac{1}{2}\kappa^2 N^{-1} a^2 \Sigma (\eta_{k^*} - \eta_k)^2 a^{n-2} - \tfrac{1}{2} m^2 N^{-1} \kappa^2 a^n \\ - g N^{-1} a^{(p/2-1)n} \kappa^p \Sigma \eta_k^p a^n \,\}\, d\kappa\, \delta(1 - \Sigma \eta_k^2)\, \Pi\, d\eta_k \ .$$

This equation, with the indicated cutoff-dependent coefficients, represents our proposal for obtaining a nontrivial (and generally non-Gaussian) continuum limit in the special case that the factor κ^{N-1} is removed from the integrand.

Moreover—and this is of central significance—*the form of the renormalization of coefficients involved is entirely multiplicative and in no way involves normal ordering.* This has the general consequence that for a covariant quantum field theory defined in some way which is analogous to the present discussion, *subtractive* renormalizations would *not* be required; instead, all required renormalizations would be *strictly multiplicative.*

Let us now turn our attention to a very brief discussion of how we believe a scenario that is schematically similar to that of the present paper may well be adapted to a relativistic self-interacting scalar field.

4 Application to Relativistic Models

The quantization of any system entails ambiguities including the introduction of additional potential terms to the Hamiltonian operator or to the action that are proportional to $\hbar$. In field quantization it is generally acknowledged that some such additions are necessary. The proposal we have in mind adds an auxiliary, $\hbar$-dependent potential P to the lattice action designed to dramatically alter the continuum limit. Specifically, the potential P is designed to make the ground-state distribution of the field at a sharp time have a generalized Poisson distribution in the continuum limit. One way to arrange this is for the distribution to be chosen already on the lattice to have a generalized Poisson distribution. To illustrate this proposal we choose the characteristic function for the lattice-space, sharp-time field distribution $|\Psi(\phi)|^2$ to have the form given by

$$\int e^{i\Sigma' g_k \phi_k a^s} |\Psi(\phi)|^2\, \Pi'\, d\phi_k = \exp\{-\textstyle\int [1 - e^{i\Sigma' g_k \phi_k a^s}] \rho(\phi)\, \Pi'\, d\phi_k\}$$

where $\rho > 0$. Here, g_k denotes a test sequence at a constant lattice time, and the sums and products run over the set of lattice sites at a constant lattice time. To ensure that the model has a unique translationally invariant state it is necessary and sufficient that $\int \rho(\phi)\, \Pi' d\phi_k = \infty$, which implies that we deal with a generalized Poisson distribution [4]. This divergence can be traced to a necessary singularity in the integrand for small field values which is accommodated by the ansatz that

$$\rho(\phi) = \frac{J^2\, e^{-2W(\phi)}}{\Pi'_k[\Sigma'_l\, \beta_{k-l}\phi_l^2]^\gamma}\ .$$

Here J^2 is a normalization constant, $W(\phi)$, with $W(0) = 0$, accounts for the intermediate and large field behavior and leads to the finiteness of the moments, $\{\beta_k\}$, k a lattice point, is a set of positive constants (e.g., $\beta_k \propto \exp[-\Sigma_{j=1}^s |k_j|]\,)$ subject to the normalization condition $\Sigma'_k \beta_k = 1$ where the sum and product are over all $N' = (2L+1)^s$ lattice sites at a constant lattice time and with periodic boundary conditions, and finally $\gamma = 1/2 + \xi/(2N')$, $0 < \xi < 1$. With this implicit ansatz for the lattice ground state $\Psi(\phi)$, the lattice Hamiltonian is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} &= -\frac{1}{2} Y^{-1} a^{-s} \sum \Big[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi_k^2} - \frac{1}{\Psi(\phi)} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi(\phi)}{\partial \phi_k^2} \Big] \\ &\equiv -\frac{1}{2} Y^{-1} a^{-s} \sum \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi_k^2} + \mathcal{V}(\phi)\ .\end{aligned}$$

Although it is generally difficult to determine an analytic expression for the ground state $\Psi(\phi)$, it is possible to argue that in the continuum limit the local form of the auxiliary potential P is proportional to $\phi(x)^{-2}$ with a coefficient proportional to $\hbar^2$. By using the freedom to choose W we hope to ensure that the remainder of the potential $\mathcal{V}$ has the necessary lattice form for a covariant continuum limit. Of course, once the proper Hamiltonian is in hand, it is possible, in principle, to build various correlation functions.

We finally comment on the relation between the proposal of the present section for a relativistic field and the discussion in the foregoing sections. That connection is readily made when we once again introduce hyper-extreme spherical coordinates, this time on a *spatial slice* of the lattice. In particular, the form for the characteristic functional for the sharp-time field becomes

$$\exp\{-2J^2 \textstyle\int [1 - e^{i\kappa \Sigma' g_k \eta_k a^s}] e^{-2W(\kappa\eta)}\, \Pi'_k [\Sigma'_l \beta_{k-l} \eta_l^2]^{-\gamma} \kappa^{-1-\xi} d\kappa\, \delta(1 - \Sigma' \eta_k^2) \Pi' d\eta_k \}\ .$$

Observe that the factor $\kappa^{-1-\xi}$ is a result of a quotient between a factor $\kappa^{N'-1}$ in the numerator which arises from the measure and a factor $\kappa^{2\gamma N'} = \kappa^{N'+\xi}$ that appears in the denominator. The cancellation of the large power $\kappa^{N'}$ that arises is exactly analogous to the dropping of the factor κ^{N-1} in the previous section of this paper! Lastly, we note that the choice of the resultant power, i.e., $-1-\xi$, is designed to give a divergent result for $\int \rho(\phi)\Pi' d\phi_k$, and yet, with the help of W, make every moment of the smeared, sharp-time field $\Sigma' g_k \phi_k a^s = \kappa \Sigma' g_k \eta_k a^s$ finite.

Dedication

It is a pleasure as well as an honor to dedicate the present article to the memory of Hiroomi Umezawa, whose warmth and enthusiasm in all matters, scientific and otherwise, was universally recognized and appreciated.

References

[1] See, e.g., C. Itzykson and J.-B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980).

[2] See, e,g, R. Fernandez, J. Fröhlich, and A. Sokal, *Random Walks, Critical Phenomena, and Triviality in Quantum Field Theory* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1992).

[3] J.R. Klauder, "Poisson Distributions for Sharp-Time Fields: Antidote for Triviality", (submitted for publication).

[4] B. de Finetti, *Theory of Probability*, Vol.2 (John Wiley & Sons, London, 1987).