

Functorial Interpretations of Symmetry and Coherence in Modern Physics

Matthew Long
Magnetron Labs

January 10, 2025

Abstract

Symmetry principles play a central role in contemporary physics, shaping fundamental laws and guiding the classification of particles and interactions. Meanwhile, the conceptual underpinnings of quantum mechanics and quantum field theory—ranging from the observer’s role to gauge redundancies—remain subject to interpretational debate. In this paper, we present a *functorial physics* framework that unifies these two perspectives. By treating symmetries, gauge transformations, and interpretational viewpoints as morphisms in a suitable (possibly higher) category, we argue that *interpretational coherence* emerges from structural consistency conditions (e.g. natural transformations). We illustrate how group actions, boundary anomalies, and observer re-labellings fit naturally into a functorial environment, clarifying why apparent paradoxes—like conflicting frames of measurement or the gauge observer’s “choice”—can be viewed as structural transformations in a single, higher-level theory. The paper presents foundational equations, examples, and a discussion of how this approach dissolves some long-standing puzzles in quantum and gauge-theoretic interpretations.

1 Introduction

Symmetry has guided physics from the earliest days of classical mechanics up to the modern Standard Model of particle physics. Gauge invariance, Lorentz symmetry, global vs. local transformations—all these reflect deep structural invariances in the laws of nature. Simultaneously, quantum mechanics (QM) introduces interpretational puzzles about *who* is measuring *what*, the role of wavefunction collapse or branching, and how observer-related frames might or might not reflect a global reality.

Historically, interpretational questions were treated separately from symmetry principles, leading to a patchwork of partial solutions. For instance:

- *Gauge Symmetry vs. Physical Equivalence*: Are gauge-related states truly the same physical configuration, or do they differ by unphysical degrees of freedom?

- *Observer Dependence*: The measurement problem raises issues of perspective: is wave-function collapse an absolute process, or is it relative to an observer’s vantage (a la Wigner’s Friend)?
- *Global vs. Local Symmetries*: While global transformations are well-understood (e.g. rotating all spins simultaneously), local transformations complicate interpretational questions by introducing position-dependent phases or field re-labellings.

Functorial physics offers a structural approach:

- (i) Physical systems become *objects* in a category,
- (ii) Symmetries, observer changes, or gauge transformations become *morphisms*,
- (iii) Consistency conditions (e.g. commutation of diagrams, natural isomorphisms) unify interpretational and symmetry-based viewpoints.

In this paper, we outline how functorial methods shed light on interpretational coherence by embedding symmetries at the categorical level. Section 2 reviews the role of symmetry in quantum theory. Section 3 details the functorial recasting of interpretational puzzles. Section 4 provides illustrative equations. We conclude with outlooks in Section 6.

2 Symmetry and Interpretational Issues

2.1 Gauge Theories and Redundancies

Gauge theories (e.g. electromagnetism, Yang–Mills) are built on the principle that certain internal transformations of fields leave physics invariant. Naively, one might interpret these as mere redundancies of description (e.g. rewriting potentials A_μ in new gauges). However, anomalies or topological effects (like θ -terms) show that *some* gauge transformations may fail to be symmetries at the quantum level. Interpreting gauge copies (physically identical or not) can spawn confusion: do gauge equivalences reflect “the same physical state,” or can they differ in boundary data or global topological sectors?

2.2 Observer Changes

Wigner’s Friend-like scenarios illustrate how different observers might ascribe different states or measurement outcomes to the same physical process. From a symmetry standpoint, one might see an observer change as a transformation in the Hilbert space basis (e.g. unitary change of frame). Yet interpretational tension arises if each observer’s perspective leads to irreconcilable accounts of wavefunction collapse or branching.

2.3 Global vs. Local Symmetries and the Emergence of Boundaries

Even seemingly global symmetries (e.g. total particle number, total spin rotation) become subtle when subregions or boundaries are introduced. Local constraints can break or extend

global symmetries, leading to edge excitations, zero modes, and anomalies. Interpretationally, deciding what is an “inside” vs. “outside” observer often hinges on these boundary choices.

3 A Functorial Physics Framework

3.1 Objects, Morphisms, Natural Transformations

In category theory, a *functor*

$$\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$$

maps objects $X \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ to objects $\mathcal{F}(X) \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{D})$, and morphisms $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to $\mathcal{F}(f) : \mathcal{F}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$ in a structure-preserving way. In *functorial physics*, we typically let:

- \mathcal{C} be a “physical” category (e.g. a category of fields, boundary conditions, or gauge transformations),
- \mathcal{D} be a category of “state spaces” (Hilbert spaces, logical algebras, or classical data).

Symmetries (global or local) then appear as certain *automorphisms* or *group actions* within \mathcal{C} . A *natural transformation* between two such functors might represent a re-labelling of gauge fields or a shift in observer vantage.

3.2 Interpretational Coherence via Natural Transformations

Suppose we have two functors:

$$\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D},$$

which might correspond to two “interpretations” of the same physical situation (e.g. one observer’s measurement perspective vs. another). A *natural transformation* $\eta : \mathcal{F}_1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{F}_2$ is a family of morphisms

$$\eta_X : \mathcal{F}_1(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_2(X)$$

for each object X in \mathcal{C} , commuting with morphisms. Natural transformations thus unify both perspectives into a single coherent structure, revealing precisely where (if anywhere) they disagree.

3.3 Gauge Symmetry vs. Physical Symmetry

Not all automorphisms in \mathcal{C} correspond to physically distinct states. A purely *gauge* redundancy may appear as *id* in \mathcal{D} . Hence, a *physically relevant symmetry* is one that induces a nontrivial automorphism in \mathcal{D} . This clarifies the conceptual puzzle: gauge transformations that map to *id* in \mathcal{D} are genuinely “redundant,” while global or nontrivial local symmetries map to real transformations of states or amplitudes.

4 Illustrative Equations and Model

4.1 Group Actions as Morphisms

Consider a simple quantum system with a symmetry group G . In standard quantum mechanics, we represent $g \in G$ by a unitary U_g acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Categorically, let X be the object representing \mathcal{H} . Then each g is a morphism

$$g : X \longrightarrow X,$$

which we interpret as $U_g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. The condition $U_{g_1 g_2} = U_{g_1} \cdot U_{g_2}$ ensures a functor from the group (as a category with one object) to the category of Hilbert spaces. Gauge transformations or observer changes can be similarly represented once we specify domain categories.

4.2 Gauge Redundancy vs. Physical Symmetry

Formally, if $\mathcal{F} : G \rightarrow \text{End}(\mathcal{H})$ is trivial, meaning $\mathcal{F}(g) = \text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for all $g \in G$, then g is *gauge-like* in that it does not produce a new physical state. Conversely, a nontrivial representation indicates physically realizable transformations.

4.3 Anomaly Condition

Anomalies occur if an attempted extension of \mathcal{F} to a larger group or bigger category fails to produce a commutative diagram. Symbolically, if $h : X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism capturing certain boundary conditions or gauge transformations, and g is a symmetry, then for an anomaly-free theory we want:

$$\mathcal{F}(g \circ h) = \mathcal{F}(g) \circ \mathcal{F}(h),$$

for all composable pairs (g, h) . Anomalies appear if no consistent assignment can be made.

5 Interpretational Gains: Why It Clarifies the Physical Process

Dissolving Observer Discrepancies. In a functorial setting, two different “frames” or interpretations become different functors, \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 . A measurement or wavefunction assignment that appears contradictory from a local perspective (like Wigner’s and Wigner’s Friend) may unify at the level of a higher *natural transformation* η bridging $\mathcal{F}_1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{F}_2$. The question “who collapses the wavefunction first?” becomes an inquiry about whether η can be made to commute with all relevant morphisms in \mathcal{C} .

Physical vs. Redundant Symmetries. By seeing gauge equivalences as morphisms that map to the identity in the target category, the difference between *genuine symmetries* and *mere redundancies* emerges automatically. We no longer have to guess which transformations “count” as physical; the functor picks out exactly those that act nontrivially on states.

6 Conclusion and Outlook

We have argued that *interpretational coherence* in quantum theory—particularly involving the role of symmetries, gauge redundancies, and observer-centric frames—is resolved or greatly clarified by adopting a *functorial physics* perspective. Symmetry transformations, gauge mappings, and changes of vantage become morphisms in a single category or higher category, while the question of “physical distinctness” vs. “redundancy” is captured by how these morphisms map under a (mono)morphic or faithful functor into a category of states or classical data.

This approach not only dissolves traditional puzzles about wavefunction collapse in different frames, but it also recasts gauge anomalies as the obstructions to extending or factorizing functors. The deeper ramifications include:

- **Unifying Local vs. Global Symmetries:** Both appear as functorial mappings that can be either identity-like or physically relevant, depending on the target category.
- **Potential for ∞ -Categories:** Many real-world gauge theories (with corners, boundary excitations, or topological sectors) require 2-categories or higher, where interpretational puzzles often lurk at the boundary or defect lines.
- **Observer Neutrality:** By embedding all vantage points in a single category or a family of functors, one can show how no single observer has absolute priority; coherence emerges from consistent transformations among them.

Overall, *functorial physics* suggests that interpretational clarity arises not from introducing new ad hoc rules, but from recognizing that symmetries, gauge freedoms, and observer frames are part of the same compositional structure.

Acknowledgments

Matthew Long acknowledges insightful discussions at Magnetron Labs on gauge theories, quantum interpretations, and the synergy between category theory and physics. Work by Baez, Coecke, Freed, Segal, and others on categorical quantum mechanics and TQFT has influenced this approach.

References

- [1] E. P. Wigner, *Remarks on the mind-body question*, in *Symmetries and Reflections*, Bloomington (1967).
- [2] C. N. Yang, R. L. Mills, *Conservation of Isotopic Spin and Isotopic Gauge Invariance*, Phys. Rev. **96**, 191–195 (1954).
- [3] J. C. Baez, “Higher-Dimensional Algebra and Topological Quantum Field Theory,” *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, 4(2): 243–265 (1995).

- [4] D. S. Freed, “Gauge Theory and Topology,” in *Handbook of Mathematical Physics*, Elsevier, 2006.