

What Is a Particle?

IDE-020 · Fundamental Ideas

Concept essays for *The Universe and Its Observers*

Author: Juan Segurola

Version: v0.12 EN · 19 September 2026

Status: Publication version

Article form: Concept essay

Scale / context: Subatomic physics, from detector signatures to relativistic quantum theory

Boundary: The particle concept itself. What a quantum field is belongs to IDE-021, light specifically to IDE-019, and the meaning of mass to IDE-022

Related works: IDE-021, IDE-019, IDE-022

Epistemic profile: Established knowledge with interpretive boundaries

Licence at publication: All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

The word particle survives in physics with almost none of its original content. A classical particle is a small object with a definite position at each moment, following a trajectory. Quantum states and amplitudes can interfere, and their predictions are not captured by a classical-particle trajectory ontology. What replaces the classical picture is a classification: Wigner showed that the possible one-particle states of a relativistic quantum theory correspond to irreducible representations of spacetime symmetry, labelled by invariants such as mass and spin.[1,2] This article follows what the word retains, including the surprising result that particle number is not an observer-independent quantity, and what it has to give up. What is left is discrete detection events, conserved quantum numbers and invariant labels, which is a different kind of answer from a picture.[3,4]

In 60 Seconds

Start with what survives measurement. Detectors register discrete events with definite quantum numbers, and those are the facts a particle concept has to accommodate.[5] What does not survive is the picture producing them. In quantum field theory particle number changes: interactions create and destroy quanta, so a fixed inventory of little objects is not available.[2] Identity also changes character. Wigner classified relativistic one-particle states by irreducible representations of the spacetime symmetry group, which is why mass and spin are the labels that persist while classical imagery fails.[1] The strongest result is that particle number is not absolute: an accelerated detector in the state a distinct observer calls empty registers particles, so what counts as a particle depends on the observer's state of motion.[4] The word survives; the small object it once named does not.

Why This Question Matters

Particle physics is presented to the public in terms of tiny balls, and the imagery is the source of most later confusion: about why particles of a kind are identical, about how one can be created from energy, about what happens between slits. Replacing the picture with what the theory actually says is not a

matter of precision for its own sake. It changes what questions make sense, and it is what makes the next article's subject, the field from which particles arise, intelligible rather than paradoxical.

1. The Classical Picture and Where It Fails

A classical particle is an idealized object with a position, a momentum, a mass and a path. The idealization is enormously successful for planets and billiard balls, and it survives into quantum physics as an approximation whenever the relevant wavelengths are small compared with everything else.

It fails in specific ways rather than vaguely. Quantum states and amplitudes can interfere, and their predictions are not captured by a classical-particle trajectory ontology.[2] This does not exclude formulations that add definite particle positions and their motion to the state description: the entire quantum formalism, including the uncertainty principle and quantum randomness, emerges from an analysis of that motion.[7] What is not optional is that the classical trajectory, the one with local definite values, is unavailable.

The right response is not to declare that particles are waves instead. It is to ask what the theory does provide: discrete detection events, conserved quantum numbers, and states classified by properties that survive changes of reference frame. That is a different kind of answer from a picture, and it is what the rest of the article develops.

Where That Leaves Us

Quantum states can be spread and can interfere, so a classical trajectory ontology is inadequate, although formulations restoring definite positions at the price of nonlocality exist.[2,7] Replacing the picture means asking what the theory supplies instead. The first thing it supplies is a classification, and it comes from symmetry rather than from imagery.

2. Particles as Representations of Symmetry

Wigner asked which quantum states are possible in a theory consistent with special relativity, and answered it by classifying the irreducible unitary representations of the symmetry group of spacetime.[1] The classification is exhaustive, and the labels that emerge are mass and a spin-like quantity: precisely the properties used to identify particle species.

This is a strong result and worth stating carefully. It does not say that particles are representations in the sense of being made of mathematics. It says that whatever a one-particle state is, its transformation properties under changes of inertial frame are fixed, and that those properties come in a discrete list.[2] Mass and spin are invariant labels because they are what the classification is built from.

It also explains a fact that is otherwise mysterious. Wigner classifies irreducible Poincaré-group representations by invariant labels.[1] Two electrons are indistinguishable. This is not a claim that they occupy the same state, which they generally do not; it is a claim about the labels. The theory encodes the consequence by admitting only multi-particle states with a definite behaviour under exchanging two of them. Identity is not a manufacturing achievement but a consequence of what a particle is.

Where That Leaves Us

Wigner classifies irreducible Poincaré-group representations by invariant labels. The classification concerns single states. What happens to the count when particles interact is a further and stranger matter.

3. Particle Number Is Not Fixed

In a relativistic quantum theory the number of particles is not conserved. Interactions create and annihilate quanta, and the natural mathematical description uses operators that add and remove them from a state.[2] An electron and a positron can annihilate into photons; a sufficiently energetic collision produces particles that were not present before.

This is where the classical picture becomes untenable rather than merely inaccurate. A small object does not stop existing when it meets another small object, but a quantum excitation does. What is conserved is not the count but a set of quantum numbers, and those constrain which processes are possible.[5]

Composite and unstable entities complicate the accounting further. A proton is a bound state whose internal description is not a fixed list of constituents; a resonance is identified by a bump in a cross-section with a width related to its lifetime, and calling it a particle is a statement about a pole in a scattering amplitude rather than about an object that persists.[5] The word covers a spectrum of cases, and its firmest end is the classification, not the imagery.

Where That Leaves Us

Particle number is not conserved in relativistic quantum theory: interactions create and destroy quanta, and what persists are conserved quantum numbers rather than a count. Unstable resonances are identified by features of scattering amplitudes rather than by persistence. Even the count, though, assumes something the theory does not always provide.

4. Particle Number Is Observer-Dependent

Defining how many particles a state contains requires splitting the field's degrees of freedom into positive and negative frequency parts, and that split depends on the notion of time being used. For inertial observers in flat spacetime everyone agrees, so the question does not arise in ordinary laboratory physics.

Unruh showed that it does arise more generally. A detector accelerating through the state that inertial observers call the vacuum detects particles in it.[4] The two descriptions are not in conflict; they are different and equally valid answers to a question that presupposed a frame.

The consequence for the concept is sharp. Particle number is not an invariant property of a state in the way charge is. It is defined relative to a choice, and in general spacetimes, including cosmological ones, no preferred choice need exist. Algebraic quantum field theory takes nets of local observable algebras as basic and introduces particle concepts asymptotically where applicable.[3]

Where That Leaves Us

How many particles a state contains depends on the splitting of field modes and hence on the observer, and Unruh's result shows an accelerated detector detecting particles in the inertial vacuum. Particle number is therefore not invariant the way charge is. What is left is to say what the concept still does reliably.

5. What Survives

Three things survive intact. Detection events are discrete: a detector clicks or it does not, and once the apparatus is coupled to an environment the record of that click is stable.[6] Quantum numbers are conserved and constrain what can happen. And the Wigner labels remain the identifying properties of a species, which is why a table of particles is a table of masses, spins and charges rather than of shapes and sizes.[1,5]

What is discarded is the picture: the trajectory, the definite position between events, the fixed inventory, and the idea that particles are the fundamental furniture from which fields are built. Algebraic quantum field theory takes nets of local observable algebras as basic and introduces particle concepts asymptotically where applicable.[3]

That inversion is the point at which this article stops. A particle is best described as a discrete, symmetry-classified excitation that a detector can register, and the natural next question is what it is an excitation of, which is the subject of IDE-021.

Where That Leaves Us

What survives is discreteness at detection, conserved quantum numbers, and the invariant labels of mass and spin; what is discarded is the trajectory, the fixed inventory and the idea that particles are the primary structure. IDE-021 takes up what the excitation is an excitation of.

What We Know, and How

- Wigner classifies irreducible Poincaré-group representations by invariant labels.[1,2]
- Particle number is not conserved in relativistic quantum theory; interactions create and destroy quanta while conserved quantum numbers constrain which processes occur.[2,5]
- An accelerated detector detects particles in the state inertial observers call the vacuum, so particle number is defined relative to an observer rather than being an invariant of the state.[4]
- Detection events are discrete, and species are catalogued by mass, spin and charge rather than by shape or size.[1,5]

What We Still Don't Know

- Whether a satisfactory particle concept can be defined in general curved spacetimes, where no preferred splitting of field modes exists.[3,4]
- How to characterize particle-like excitations in strongly interacting regimes where the asymptotic states used to define them are not available.
- Whether the current list of species reflects a deeper organizing structure or is the observed subset of a larger classification.

What Could Change Our Minds

- A reproducible detection of a species whose transformation properties under changes of inertial frame fell outside Wigner's classification would require the relativistic framework itself to be revised.[1,2]
- A direct measurement showing that an accelerated detector does not register particles in the inertial vacuum, with the acceleration and detector coupling controlled, would contradict the observer-dependence of particle number.[4]
- Experimental evidence that particle number is conserved in a regime where the standard framework predicts creation, after all decay channels and detector inefficiencies were accounted for, would overturn the field-theoretic account of interactions.[2,5]

If You Remember Only One Thing

A quantum particle is a discrete, symmetry-classified excitation a detector can register, not a small object with a trajectory, and even its number depends on the observer.

Related Articles

- IDE-021 — What Is a Field?
- IDE-019 — What Is Light? Wave, Quantum and Observer
- IDE-022 — What Does Mass Mean?

References

- [1] Eugene P. Wigner. On Unitary Representations of the Inhomogeneous Lorentz Group. *Annals of Mathematics* 40(1), 149-204 (1939). DOI 10.2307/1968551.
- [2] Steven Weinberg. *The Quantum Theory of Fields, Volume I: Foundations*. Cambridge University Press (1995).
- [3] Rudolf Haag. *Local Quantum Physics: Fields, Particles, Algebras*, 2nd edition. Springer (1996).
- [4] W. G. Unruh. Notes on Black-Hole Evaporation. *Physical Review D* 14(4), 870-892 (1976). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevD.14.870.
- [5] F. Takahashi et al. (Particle Data Group). Review of Particle Physics. *International Journal of Modern Physics A* 41, 2630011 (2026). DOI 10.1142/S0217751X26300115.
- [6] Wojciech H. Zurek. Decoherence, Einselection, and the Quantum Origins of the Classical. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 75(3), 715-775 (2003). DOI 10.1103/RevModPhys.75.715.
- [7] D. Durr; S. Goldstein; N. Zanghi. *Bohmian Mechanics as the Foundation of Quantum Mechanics*. arXiv:quant-ph/9511016 (1995).