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#### Abstract

Recipes are presented for making quantum field theories whose ground states have finite energy. The recipe avoids the flaws of normal ordering.


## I. THE PROBLEM

A hamiltonian of the form

$$
\begin{gather*}
H=\int d^{3} x Q^{\dagger} Q  \tag{1}\\
2+2=4
\end{gather*}
$$

has only nonnegative eigenvalues

$$
\begin{equation*}
H|E\rangle=E|E\rangle \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

because

$$
\begin{equation*}
E=\langle E| H|E\rangle=\int d^{3} x\langle E| Q^{\dagger} Q|E\rangle \geq 0 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which for simplicity it was assumed that the state $|E\rangle$ is normalized to unity, $\langle E \mid E\rangle=1$.
So at least the nonnegative form (1) excludes energies that are infinitely negative.
The nonnegative form (1) has another advantage. The $E=0$ eigenvalue equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
H|0\rangle=0 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q|0\rangle=0 \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is easier to solve than the full $E=0$ eigenvalue equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
H|0\rangle=\int d^{3} x Q^{\dagger} Q|0\rangle=0 \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

But the ground state of the vacuum doesn't seem to have energy zero. Instead the energy density is $\rho_{\Lambda}=5.83(16) \times 10^{-30} \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}=5.83(16) \times 10^{-27} \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~m}^{-3}$. So if instead of $Q|0\rangle=0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q|0\rangle=\sqrt{\epsilon}|0\rangle \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]then the average energy of the vacuum is
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle 0| H|0\rangle=\langle 0| \int d^{3} x Q^{\dagger} Q|0\rangle=\epsilon V \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

in which $V$ is the volume of the universe. So the energy density of the vacuum is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho=\frac{\epsilon V}{V}=\epsilon \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Eigenvalue equations like (6 and 8) are easier to solve than ones that are quadratic in $Q$.
The problem is that anticommuting operators are supposed to have eigenvalues that are Grassmann variables not complex numbers. So one would expect that the eigenvalues $\chi(x)$ of a fermionic operator $Q(x)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q(x)|\chi\rangle=\chi(x)|\chi\rangle \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

would be Grassmann with a vanishing anticommutator $\{\chi(x), \chi(y)\}=0$.
Are there other possibilities? Let's consider one mode with operators $a$ and $a^{\dagger}$

$$
a=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1  \tag{11}\\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad a^{\dagger}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
1 & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

Each of these matrices has only one eigenvalue $e=0$

$$
\begin{equation*}
a|0\rangle=0 \quad \text { and } \quad a^{\dagger}|1\rangle=0 \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $a$ and $a^{\dagger}$ have only one eigenvalue each, they are defective matrices.
But $a+a^{\dagger}$ has two eigenvalues $e= \pm 1$, as does the complex linear combination $\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}$ whose two eigenvalues are

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{2}=\alpha \beta \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

$e= \pm \sqrt{\alpha \beta}$. The explicit eigenvector equations are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}\right)(x|0\rangle+y|1\rangle)=\alpha y|0\rangle+\beta x|1\rangle= \pm \sqrt{\alpha \beta}(x|0\rangle+y|1\rangle) \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

So $x= \pm \sqrt{\alpha / \beta} y$, and $y= \pm \sqrt{\beta / \alpha} x$. Normalization implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{2}=\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta} \quad \text { and } \quad y^{2}=\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

So altogether we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}\right)\left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}}|0\rangle \pm \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}}|1\rangle\right)= \pm \sqrt{\alpha \beta}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}}|0\rangle \pm \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}}|1\rangle\right) \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

The algebra for two modes $a, a^{\dagger}$ and $b, b^{\dagger}$ that anticommute

$$
\begin{equation*}
\{a, b\}=0, \quad\left\{a, b^{\dagger}\right\}=0, \quad \text { etc. } \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

is more complicated. We'll put $a$ quanta to the left of $b$ quanta:

$$
\begin{equation*}
a^{\dagger}|0,0\rangle=|1,0\rangle, \quad b^{\dagger}|0,0\rangle=|0,1\rangle, \quad \text { and } \quad a^{\dagger} b^{\dagger}|0,0\rangle=a^{\dagger}|0,1\rangle=|1,1\rangle . \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

An eigenstate of $\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}$ must satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}\right)(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)=f(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle) . \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

The $\alpha a$ terms in this equation are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha a(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)=\alpha y|0,0\rangle+\alpha w|0,1\rangle \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

while the $\beta a^{\dagger}$ terms are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta a^{\dagger}(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)=\beta x|1,0\rangle+\beta z|1,1\rangle . \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

So the eigenvalue equation (20) for mode $a$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha y|0,0\rangle+\alpha w|0,1\rangle+\beta x|1,0\rangle+\beta z|1,1\rangle=f(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle) . \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

So we need

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha y=f x, \quad \alpha w=f z, \quad \beta x=f y, \quad \beta z=f w \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

which imply that

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{2}=\alpha \beta \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{x}{y}=\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}=\frac{z}{w} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

The relation $f^{2}=\alpha \beta$ echos $e^{2}=\alpha \beta$ derived earlier (14).
An eigenstate of $\gamma b+\delta b^{\dagger}$ must satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\gamma b+\delta b^{\dagger}\right)(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)=g(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle) . \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

The $\gamma b$ terms in this equation are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma b(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)=\gamma z|0,0\rangle-\gamma w|1,0\rangle \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

while the $\delta b^{\dagger}$ terms are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta b^{\dagger}(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)=\delta x|0,1\rangle-\delta y|1,1\rangle . \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

So the eigenvalue equation (26) for mode $b$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma z|0,0\rangle-\gamma w|1,0\rangle+\delta x|0,1\rangle-\delta y|1,1\rangle=g(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle) . \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

So we need

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma z=g x, \quad-\gamma w=g y, \quad \delta x=g z, \quad-\delta y=g w \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

which imply that

$$
\begin{equation*}
g^{2}=\gamma \delta \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{x}{z}=\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{\delta}}=-\frac{y}{w} \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

The relation $g^{2}=\gamma \delta$ echos $e^{2}=\alpha \beta$ derived earlier (14).
Are the two sets of eigenvalue conditions (25 and 31) consistent with each other? No. The $a$ conditions (25) imply that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{x}{y}=\frac{z}{w} \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

while the $b$ conditions (31) imply that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{x}{y}=-\frac{z}{w} . \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

The inconsistency arises from the incompatibility of the operators $\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}$ and $\gamma b+\delta b^{\dagger}$ which do not commute although and because they anticommute

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}, \gamma b+\delta b^{\dagger}\right\}=0 \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

That's why there's no eigenvector of both $\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}$ and $\gamma b+\delta b^{\dagger}$.
Yet every square matrix has eigenvectors and eigenvalues (section 1.27 of PM). That's why we were able to find an eigenvector (17) of $\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}$.

That's also why we can find an eigenvector of $A=\left(\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}\right)\left(\gamma b+\delta b^{\dagger}\right)$ and therefore of $-A=\left(\gamma b+\delta b^{\dagger}\right)\left(\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}\right)$. To do that, we carry out these steps:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left(\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}\right)\left(\gamma b+\delta b^{\dagger}\right)(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle) \\
=e(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)  \tag{34}\\
\begin{array}{r}
\left(\gamma b+\delta b^{\dagger}\right)\left(\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}\right)(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle) \\
\\
=-e(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)
\end{array}
\end{gather*}
$$

The $\gamma b$ terms in the first equation are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma b(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)=\gamma z|0,0\rangle-\gamma w|1,0\rangle \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

while the $\delta b^{\dagger}$ terms are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta b^{\dagger}(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)=\delta x|0,1\rangle-\delta y|1,1\rangle . \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

So we find from the first equation

$$
\begin{align*}
\left(\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}\right)(\gamma b+ & \left.\delta b^{\dagger}\right)(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle) \\
& =\left(\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}\right)(\gamma z|0,0\rangle-\gamma w|1,0\rangle+\delta x|0,1\rangle-\delta y|1,1\rangle) \\
& =-\alpha \gamma w|0,0\rangle-\alpha \delta y|0,1\rangle+\beta \gamma z|1,0\rangle+\beta \delta x|1,1\rangle \\
& =e(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle) \tag{38}
\end{align*}
$$

The $\alpha a$ terms in the second equation are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha a(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)=\alpha y|0,0\rangle+\alpha w|0,1\rangle \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

while the $\beta a^{\dagger}$ terms are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta a^{\dagger}(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle)=\beta x|1,0\rangle+\beta z|1,1\rangle . \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

So we find from the second equation

$$
\begin{align*}
(\gamma b+\delta & \left.\delta b^{\dagger}\right)\left(\alpha a+\beta a^{\dagger}\right)(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle) \\
& =\left(\gamma b+\delta b^{\dagger}\right)(\alpha y|0,0\rangle+\alpha w|0,1\rangle+\beta x|1,0\rangle+\beta z|1,1\rangle) \\
& =\gamma \alpha w|0,0\rangle-\gamma \beta z|1,0\rangle+\delta \alpha y|0,1\rangle-\delta \beta x|1,1\rangle \\
& =-e(x|0,0\rangle+y|1,0\rangle+z|0,1\rangle+w|1,1\rangle) . \tag{41}
\end{align*}
$$

So we have two sets of conditions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\alpha \gamma w=e x, \quad-\alpha \delta y=e z, \quad \beta \gamma z=e y, \quad \beta \delta x=e w \tag{42}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma \alpha w=-e x, \quad \gamma \beta z=e y, \quad \delta \alpha y=-e z, \quad \delta \beta x=e w \tag{43}
\end{equation*}
$$

which are consistent since $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$, and $\delta$ are complex numbers. So we have a solution to both equations ( 35 and 36 ) which are actually the same equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{2}=-\alpha \beta \gamma \delta \tag{44}
\end{equation*}
$$
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