

What Is a Field?

IDE-021 · Fundamental Ideas

Concept essays for *The Universe and Its Observers*

Author: Juan Segurolo

Version: v0.8 EN · 17 September 2026

Status: Publication version

Article form: Concept essay

Scale / context: Relativistic quantum theory, from laboratory tests to the Standard Model

Boundary: The quantum field: what it is, what its excitations are, and what its ground state contains. The general organizing idea of a field belongs to IDE-009, and the particle concept to IDE-020

Related works: IDE-022, IDE-009, IDE-020

Epistemic profile: Established knowledge with interpretive boundaries

Licence at publication: All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

In current fundamental physics the basic objects are not particles but fields, and the fields are not classical quantities spread through space. A quantum field assigns operators rather than numbers to regions of spacetime, and what a detector calls a particle is an excitation of one.[1,2] That inversion explains things the particle picture cannot: why all electrons are exactly alike, why particle number changes in interactions, and why the ground state is not empty in the ordinary sense. The theory is also strictly local in a specific technical sense that coexists with the correlations Bell identified.[3] This article sets out the structure, the evidence, and the point at which the question of what a quantum field is stops having a settled answer.[5]

In 60 Seconds

A classical field puts a number at each point. A quantum field puts an operator there, so field values are not simultaneously possessed quantities; what exists is a state, and the field is what acts on it.[1] Particles are excitations of these fields, and every electron carries exactly the same mass and charge labels: they are not manufactured copies but excitations of one underlying structure, differing in the states they occupy rather than in what makes them electrons.[1,6] It also explains why particle number changes, since the operators that create and destroy excitations are the natural objects of the theory. The ground state is not nothing either: it has structure with measurable consequences, of which the attraction between two uncharged conducting plates is the cleanest example.[4] Locality survives all of this in a precise form, since measurements in spacelike-separated regions commute, so no controllable signal outruns light even though the correlations Bell analysed exceed anything a local classical model allows.[2,3]

Why This Question Matters

Almost every popular account of fundamental physics is built on particles, and almost every difficulty with those accounts dissolves when the order is reversed. Why are electrons identical, how can energy

become matter, what is the vacuum made of, how can entanglement be nonlocal without allowing signals: these look like paradoxes from the particle side and like consequences from the field side. Getting the order right also disciplines the language, because it makes clear which statements are results of a well-tested theory and which are interpretations of it.

1. From Numbers to Operators

A classical field is an assignment of values to points, evolving under local equations. Quantizing it replaces those values with operators: mathematical objects that act on states rather than possessing definite magnitudes of their own.[1] Asking for the value of a quantum field at a point is therefore the wrong question in the same way as asking for the position of an electron between measurements.

What the theory provides instead is a state, together with operators associated with regions of spacetime whose expectation values and correlations are what experiments measure. In the algebraic formulation this is made primary: the physical content is a family of observable algebras attached to regions, and everything else is derived from how those algebras fit together.[2]

The construction is not optional decoration. Relativistic symmetry, causality and spectral positivity requirements place strong constraints on the form a quantum field can take, once the additional assumptions of the chosen construction are specified, and Weinberg's development derives the field formalism from those requirements rather than postulating it.[1] The result is a constraint and not a uniqueness theorem: it is why field theory is the working framework, not a proof that no relativistic quantum theory could be built on other assumptions.

Where That Leaves Us

Quantizing a field replaces values at points with operators acting on states, so a quantum field does not have simultaneously possessed values, and the physical content sits in states and in observables attached to regions. Relativistic symmetry, causality and spectral positivity requirements place strong constraints on that form, once the additional assumptions of the chosen construction are specified. The first thing it explains is what particles are.

2. Particles as Excitations

Each species of particle corresponds to a field, and a particle is a quantized excitation of that field, in the same sense that a normal mode of a vibrating system carries discrete quanta of energy.[1] The operators that appear in the theory add and remove these excitations, which is the formal expression of creation and annihilation.

Particles of a given species are excitations of the corresponding field, and they share the species-defining mass, charge and spin labels while the states they occupy can differ. There is one electron field, and the labels its excitations carry are properties of that field, which the Standard Model treats as parameters characterizing it.[1,6] No manufacturing process has to be invoked to account for the identity of the labels, and where two electrons differ they differ in the state each occupies rather than in what makes them electrons.

It also fixes the status of the vacuum-to-particle transitions that sound paradoxical in popular accounts. Energy is not converted into a substance called matter; a state with excitations of one

field becomes a state with excitations of others, subject to the conservation laws. The bookkeeping is in the quantum numbers, and it is exact.

Where That Leaves Us

A particle is a quantized excitation of a field. All electrons carry the same species-defining mass, charge and spin labels, while the states they occupy can differ, and creation and annihilation are the natural operations of the theory. Excitations presuppose a ground state, and that ground state turns out not to be empty.

3. The Ground State Is Not Nothing

The vacuum of a quantum field theory is the state of lowest energy, and it is a state rather than an absence. It has correlations between regions, fluctuates in the sense that field observables have nonzero variance in it, and is not invariant under all the transformations one might naively expect. [1,2,5]

The clearest evidence is mechanical. Casimir predicted that two parallel uncharged conducting plates in vacuum attract, because the boundary conditions they impose change the structure of the field between them relative to outside.[4] The force depends on the separation and on nothing about the material charge, and it has been measured.

Care is needed about what this licenses. That the ground state has structure with measurable consequences is well established, and the vacuum is the ground state of the field Hamiltonian rather than nothingness or empty space; formulations built from different classical Lagrangians can turn out to be the same theory described in different ways.[5] Those are the claims this section makes, and they are narrower than the popular image of a seething broth of particles appearing and disappearing. What is measured and what is pictured should not be assigned the same status.

Where That Leaves Us

The vacuum is the lowest-energy state rather than an absence, with correlations and nonzero variance in field observables, and the Casimir attraction between uncharged plates is measurable evidence that boundary conditions change it. What the ground state is like beyond what those measurements reach is not settled by them. What has still to be reconciled is locality with the correlations quantum states allow.

4. Locality, and What Bell Showed

Relativistic quantum field theory is local in a precise sense: observables associated with regions that cannot be connected by a light signal commute, which entails that a measurement in one region cannot change the statistics of any measurement in the other.[2] No controllable influence outruns light, and that is a theorem of the framework rather than a hope.

Bell showed something different and equally firm. Correlations between measurements on entangled systems can exceed what any model attributing pre-existing local values to the systems allows, and the bound he derived makes this experimentally decidable.[3] Quantum theory predicts violations of that bound, and experiments find them.

The two results sit together without tension because they concern different things. Bell's analysis rules out a class of explanation, namely local hidden-variable models; commutation at spacelike separation rules out a class of use, namely signalling. Correlations stronger than any local classical model permits do not by themselves transmit anything, because neither party can steer the other's marginal statistics.[2,3]

Where That Leaves Us

Observables in spacelike-separated regions commute, so no controllable signal outruns light, while Bell's bound shows the correlations exceed what local pre-existing values allow. The two constrain different things, explanation and use, which is why they coexist. What remains is the question the formalism does not settle: what kind of thing a quantum field is.

5. What Kind of Thing Is a Quantum Field

The predictive success of the framework is not in question. The anomalous magnetic moment of the electron is measured to about one part in ten billion.[6] That measurement is compared with a quantum electrodynamic calculation, and how closely the two agree depends on the uncertainty of the calculation as much as on the uncertainty of the measurement, so an agreement figure is not read off the experimental error bar alone. Even so, it is one observable of quantum electrodynamics rather than the framework as a whole, since predictions in the strongly interacting sector are tested to nothing like that precision.

The interpretive question is separate and open. Whether the fundamental entities are fields, or particles, or the local algebras of the algebraic formulation, or none of these, remains argued; different formulations of the same physics support different readings, and the mathematics does not settle it.[2,5] Wallace's defence of taking the working Lagrangian formulation seriously as a description, rather than as a calculational device awaiting replacement, is one position in a live debate rather than a consensus.[5]

So the article stops where the evidence does. Fields, in the sense of the operator-valued structures of the Standard Model, organize everything that has been measured about elementary matter, and particles are their excitations. What those structures ultimately are is not answered by that success, and the honest version of this subject says so.

Where That Leaves Us

One quantum electrodynamic observable, the electron's anomalous magnetic moment, is measured to about one part in ten billion, while what a quantum field ultimately is remains an open interpretive question the mathematics does not settle. Predictive success of that kind constrains descriptions without selecting one. IDE-022 takes up a property these excitations carry and that is routinely misdescribed: mass.

What We Know, and How

- Quantization replaces field values at points with operators acting on states, and relativistic symmetry, causality and spectral positivity requirements place strong constraints on the form those fields can take, once the additional assumptions of the chosen construction are specified.
[1]

- Particles are quantized excitations of fields, all excitations of a given field carry identical mass, charge and spin labels while the states they occupy can differ, and particle number changes in interactions.[1,6]
- The vacuum is the lowest-energy state rather than an absence and has structure with measurable consequences, of which the Casimir attraction between uncharged conducting plates is the clearest.[1,4,5]
- Observables in spacelike-separated regions commute, so no controllable signal outruns light, while Bell's bound shows correlations exceeding what local pre-existing values permit.[2,3]

What We Still Don't Know

- What the fundamental entities of the theory are, with fields, particles and local algebras all defended and the formalism underdetermining the choice.[2,5]
- How to formulate interacting quantum field theories in four spacetime dimensions with full mathematical rigour, which remains open despite the framework's predictive success.
- How the field description is to be combined with gravitation, which is where the framework is expected to require replacement rather than extension.

What Could Change Our Minds

- A reproducible demonstration of controllable signalling between spacelike-separated regions would contradict the commutation structure on which relativistic quantum field theory is built. [2]
- A measured Casimir force differing from the prediction for well-characterized geometry and conductivity, beyond the known corrections for finite conductivity, roughness and temperature, would undermine the structural account of the vacuum.[4]
- A confirmed discrepancy between the calculated and measured anomalous magnetic moment of the electron larger than the combined theoretical and experimental uncertainties would indicate that the framework is incomplete at accessible energies.[6]

If You Remember Only One Thing

A quantum field is an operator-valued structure whose excitations are particles, all electrons carry the same species-defining labels, and the vacuum is a state rather than an absence.

Related Articles

- IDE-022 — What Does Mass Mean?
- IDE-009 — Field
- IDE-020 — What Is a Particle?

References

- [1] Steven Weinberg. The Quantum Theory of Fields, Volume I: Foundations. Cambridge University Press (1995).
- [2] Rudolf Haag. Local Quantum Physics: Fields, Particles, Algebras, 2nd edition. Springer (1996).
- [3] John S. Bell. On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox. Physics Physique Fizika 1(3), 195-200 (1964). DOI 10.1103/PhysicsPhysiqueFizika.1.195.

- [4] H. B. G. Casimir. On the Attraction Between Two Perfectly Conducting Plates. Proceedings of the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen 51, 793-795 (1948).
- [5] David Wallace. In Defence of Naiveté: The Conceptual Status of Lagrangian Quantum Field Theory. Synthese 151(1), 33-80 (2006). DOI 10.1007/s11229-004-6248-9.
- [6] F. Takahashi et al. (Particle Data Group). Review of Particle Physics. International Journal of Modern Physics A 41, 2630011 (2026). DOI 10.1142/S0217751X26300115.