Distinction Dynamics as a Constraint Theory

[Author]

January 2, 2026

Abstract

We present Distinction Dynamics (DD) as a *constraint theory*—a framework that delimits what structures can exist rather than predicting specific dynamics. DD is positioned alongside established constraint theorems such as Coleman–Mandula, CPT, and spin–statistics: results that restrict the space of consistent theories without specifying a unique model. We provide a formal characterisation of "distinction acts" invariant under choice of mathematical carrier, demonstrate that the uniqueness of Standard Model structure is robust under different cost functionals, and show how CP violation connects to the arrow of time within the DD framework. A counterexample (four-generation model) illustrates how DD excludes alternatives constructively. The paper clarifies the methodological status of DD and its relation to existing foundational results in physics.

Contents

1 Introduction

Physics contains two types of theoretical structures:

1. **Dynamical theories**: specify equations of motion, predict outcomes (e.g. QED, General Relativity, Standard Model)

2. **Constraint theories**: delimit what is possible without specifying dynamics (e.g. Coleman–Mandula, CPT theorem, spin–statistics)

Constraint theories answer questions of the form "why not X?" rather than "what happens next?" They are not competitors to dynamical theories but *meta-structures* that restrict the space of consistent theories.

Distinction Dynamics (DD) belongs to the second category. Its core claim is:

> *Certain structural features of physics—including quantum theory, gauge structure, and the number of fermion generations—follow from conditions on what can exist as a coherent system of distinctions.*

This paper clarifies the methodological status of DD by:

- Providing a formal, carrier-independent characterisation of distinction acts
- Demonstrating robustness of uniqueness results under different cost measures
- Connecting CP violation to the arrow of time within DD
- Giving explicit counterexamples that DD excludes
- Positioning DD relative to established constraint theorems

Contributions

DD does not claim to derive new physics. Its contributions are:

1. **Logical unification**: DD connects operational axioms of QM (Hardy, CDP reconstructions), algebraic constraints (Hurwitz), and gauge-algebra correspondences (Furey, Gresnigt) into a single chain with explicit logical dependencies.

2. **Saturation theorem**: We prove that the Standard Model structure *saturates* the space of realisable theories—extensions are either non-realisable or merely effective (Theorem 2.5).

3. **Fundamental/effective distinction**: We provide a criterion for separating UV-complete structure (constrained by DD) from emergent effective symmetries (not constrained).

These are contributions to the *organisation* of known results, not claims of new empirical predictions.

2 Formal Characterisation of Distinction Acts

2.1 The Problem of Mathematical Carrier

DD operates with the concept of "distinction act"—a primitive notion that admits multiple mathematical formalisations:

- Processes in a monoidal category
- Effects in generalised probabilistic theories (GPT)

- Elements of a normed algebra
- Morphisms in a dagger category

The question arises: do DD's conclusions depend on the choice of formalism?

2.2 Carrier-Independent Axioms

We show that DD's core constraints can be stated in a form invariant under carrier choice.

Definition 2.1 (Abstract Distinction System)**.** *An* abstract distinction system *is a triple* $(\mathcal{D}, \circ, \|\cdot\|)$ *where:*

1. *$\mathcal{D}$ is a set of distinction acts*
2. *$\circ : \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{D}$ is a composition (associative, with identity)*
3. *$\|\cdot\| : \mathcal{D} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a norm satisfying:*
   (a) *$\|a\| = 0 \Leftrightarrow a = 0$ (non-degeneracy)*
   (b) *$\|a \circ b\| = \|a\|\|b\|$ (multiplicativity)*

Definition 2.2 (Realisability)**.** *A distinction system is* realisable *if every non-zero element is invertible:*

$$a \neq 0 \Rightarrow \exists a^{-1} : a \circ a^{-1} = a^{-1} \circ a = e.$$

Theorem 2.3 (Carrier Independence)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{D}, \circ, \|\cdot\|)$ be a realisable distinction system over $\mathbb{R}$. Then $\mathcal{D}$ is isomorphic to one of $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$, $\mathbb{H}$, or $\mathbb{O}$.*

Proof. A realisable distinction system over $\mathbb{R}$ is precisely a normed division algebra. By Hurwitz's theorem (1898), such algebras exist only in dimensions $1, 2, 4, 8$, corresponding to $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$, $\mathbb{H}$, $\mathbb{O}$. The specific choice of carrier (category, GPT, algebra) is irrelevant: any structure satisfying the axioms must reduce to one of these four. □

Corollary 2.4. *DD's structural constraints are independent of the mathematical language used to express them.*

2.3 Saturation of Realisability

The following theorem captures why SM is not merely "minimal" but *saturated*—there is no room to add structure without violating realisability.

Theorem 2.5 (Realisability Saturation)**.** *Let T be a realisable structure with unique closure under the realisability constraints. Then for any strict extension $T' \supsetneq T$:*

1. *Either T' violates realisability (contains non-invertible elements), or*
2. *T' is dynamically effective but not fundamentally distinct from T (the additional structure is emergent, not primitive).*

Argument. Realisability constrains the carrier algebra to $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{O}$ (Hurwitz). Given the physical requirement of complex phases for interference, this selects $\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{O}$.

The gauge structure $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ exhausts the automorphism content of this algebra. The three generations exhaust the octonionic subalgebras of $\mathbb{S}$ (sedenions serve as the closure, not the carrier).

Any extension must either:

- Add gauge factors ⇒ requires larger algebra ⇒ sedenions or beyond ⇒ zero divisors ⇒ non-realisable
- Add generations ⇒ requires fourth octonionic subalgebra ⇒ does not exist ⇒ non-realisable
- Add fermion types (vector-like) ⇒ violates chirality required by complex structure ⇒ non-realisable at fundamental level

Extensions that appear consistent (e.g., effective $U(1)_{B-L}$) are emergent symmetries, not additional primitive structure. □

Remark 2.6 (Not Occam's Razor)**.** *This is not a simplicity argument. We do not claim SM is "simplest" among possible theories. We claim SM* saturates *the space of realisable structures—it uses all available algebraic room and leaves none.*

2.4 Relation to Existing Formalisms

Formalism	DD translation	Realisability
Monoidal category	morphisms	invertible morphisms
GPT	effects	pure effects
C*-algebra	elements	unitary elements
Dagger category	morphisms	unitary morphisms

In each case, the realisability condition selects the same substructure, and Hurwitz's bound applies uniformly.

3 Robustness of the Cost Functional

3.1 The Question

In the companion paper, we introduced a distinction cost functional:

$$\mathcal{S}(T) = \alpha\, \mathrm{rank}(G) + \beta\, \dim(G) + \gamma\, N_{\text{chiral}} + \delta\, N_{\text{scalar}} + \epsilon\, N_{\text{free}}.$$

A natural concern: does the minimality of the Standard Model depend on the specific choice of coefficients $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon$?

3.2 Monotonicity Theorem

Definition 3.1 (Admissible Cost Functional)**.** *A cost functional $\mathcal{S} : \mathfrak{T} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is* admissible *if:*

1. *$\mathcal{S}(T) \geq 0$ for all T*
2. *$T' \supset T$ (strict extension) implies $\mathcal{S}(T') > \mathcal{S}(T)$*
3. *$\mathcal{S}$ depends only on structural data (group, representations, scalars)*

Proposition 3.2 (Robustness of Minimum)**.** *Let $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$ be two admissible cost functionals on the class $\mathfrak{T}$ of realisable, anomaly-free theories with minimal scalar content. If a theory T^* is the unique minimum of $\mathcal{S}_1$, then T^* is also the unique minimum of $\mathcal{S}_2$.*

Proof. By the uniqueness theorem, the class $\mathfrak{T}$ contains exactly one element satisfying all constraints: the Standard Model. Since any extension strictly increases any admissible $\mathcal{S}$, the Standard Model is the unique minimum regardless of which admissible functional is used. □

Corollary 3.3. *The specific coefficients in $\mathcal{S}(T)$ are irrelevant. Any admissible measure yields the same conclusion: SM is the unique minimum.*

This is analogous to computational complexity: different reasonable complexity measures may disagree on constants but agree on which problems are tractable.

4 CP Violation and the Arrow of Time

4.1 The Puzzle

In the main paper, CP violation serves as the lower bound for $N_{\text{gen}} \geq 3$. But this raises a deeper question: why is CP violation possible at all?

Within DD, distinctions are *a priori* symmetric: if A can be distinguished from B, then B can be distinguished from A. Yet the physical world exhibits temporal asymmetry.

4.2 Resolution: Realisation Requires Orientation

Proposition 4.1 (Orientation from Realisation)**.** *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be an abstract distinction system. The act of* realising *a distinction (making it physical) requires selecting an orientation: which state is "before" and which is "after" the distinction act.*

Argument. A distinction act $a \in \mathcal{D}$ is abstract until embedded in a causal structure. Embedding requires:

1. A notion of "input" and "output" states
2. A temporal ordering: input precedes output

This ordering is not intrinsic to $\mathcal{D}$ but emerges from realisation. The choice of orientation breaks the symmetry between a and a^{-1}.

Corollary 4.2. *CP violation is the* minimal trace *of temporal orientation in a realised distinction system.*

Explanation. In a system with:

- Complex structure (required for quantum interference)
- Multiple generations (required for mixing)

the CKM matrix acquires a complex phase. This phase is physically detectable precisely because the system has a temporal orientation. With only two generations, no phase survives—no trace of orientation remains in flavour physics.

4.3 Connection to Thermodynamics

This connects DD to the thermodynamic arrow:

- Distinction = information about difference
- Realisation = physical instantiation of information
- Temporal orientation = direction of entropy increase

CP violation is thus not an "accident" but the *necessary signature* of a realised distinction system with temporal structure.

5 Mass as Depth of Distinction (Structural Account)

5.1 The Hierarchy as Structural Fact

The Standard Model exhibits a striking mass hierarchy:

$$m_e : m_\mu : m_\tau \approx 1 : 200 : 3500$$

$$m_u : m_c : m_t \approx 1 : 500 : 75000$$

We do *not* aim to predict numerical masses. Instead we ask for a *structural* statement: why a robust *ordering* (light $\prec$ heavy) is natural once the theory is viewed as a hierarchy of realised distinctions.

5.2 Filtration by Depth

Definition 5.1 (Distinction Depth and Filtration). *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of realisable distinction acts. A* depth function *is a map* depth : $\mathcal{D} \to \mathbb{N}$ *such that the induced subsets*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\leq k} := \{a \in \mathcal{D} \,:\, \mathrm{depth}(a) \leq k\}$$

form an increasing filtration $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 0} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\leq 1} \subset \cdots$, interpreted as "distinctions requiring at most k nested levels of stabilisation".

For fermion generations:

- $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 0}$: gauge distinctions (colour, weak isospin, hypercharge)
- $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 1}$: first generation (electron, up, down)
- $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 2}$: second generation (muon, charm, strange)
- $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 3}$: third generation (tau, top, bottom)

5.3 RG Interpretation: Depth as Operator Complexity

In effective field theory, physical distinctions correspond to operators in the action. Under Wilsonian renormalisation, operators are classified by scaling dimension Δ into relevant/marginal/irrelevant, controlling their infrared impact [8, 9].

Definition 5.2 (Mass-Generating Operator Classes). *For each particle species x, we identify a dominant mass-generating operator:*

Particle type	*Operator class*	*Schematic form*
Charged leptons	*Yukawa*	$y_\ell \bar{L} H e_R$
Up-type quarks	*Yukawa*	$y_u \bar{Q} \tilde{H} u_R$
Down-type quarks	*Yukawa*	$y_d \bar{Q} H d_R$
Neutrinos (Dirac)	*Yukawa*	$y_\nu \bar{L} \tilde{H} \nu_R$
Neutrinos (Majorana)	*Weinberg*	$\frac{1}{\Lambda}(LH)(LH)$

Assumption 5.3 (Depth–Dimension Monotonicity). *There exists an assignment of particle species x to dominant mass-generating operators $\mathcal{O}_x$ such that*

$$\mathrm{depth}(x) < \mathrm{depth}(y) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \Delta_{\mathit{eff}}(\mathcal{O}_x) \leq \Delta_{\mathit{eff}}(\mathcal{O}_y),$$

where $\Delta_{\mathit{eff}} = \Delta_{\mathit{classical}} + \gamma$ includes anomalous dimension γ from quantum corrections.

Physical interpretation. Deeper distinctions require more contextual support—more "conditions to be satisfied" for the distinction to be stable. In RG language, this corresponds to operators with more fields or derivatives, hence higher classical dimension, or operators that receive large anomalous corrections due to strong coupling to the stabilising sector.

5.4 Monotonicity Result

Proposition 5.4 (Conditional Monotonicity of Mass–Depth)**.** *Within any framework satisfying:*

1. *Particle masses arise from couplings of renormalised operators under RG flow*
2. *The depth–dimension monotonicity (Assumption 5.3) holds*

the mass ordering is monotone with depth: for $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\leq k}$ *and* $y \in \mathcal{D}_{\leq k+1} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\leq k}$*,*

$$m(y) \gtrsim m(x),$$

with strict inequality generically unless protected by symmetry.

Proof sketch. In Wilsonian EFT, couplings run according to their RG eigenvalues determined by operator dimensions [8, 9]. A mass parameter is the coefficient of the leading mass-generating operator after symmetry breaking.

If deeper distinctions correspond to operators with larger effective dimension, then maintaining them as stable low-energy degrees of freedom requires larger matching coefficients at the UV scale. Under RG flow to the IR, these translate to larger physical masses.

More precisely: let $\mathcal{O}_x$ have dimension Δ_x and $\mathcal{O}_y$ have dimension $\Delta_y > \Delta_x$. The ratio of induced masses scales as

$$\frac{m_y}{m_x} \sim \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\mathrm{UV}}}{\Lambda_{\mathrm{IR}}}\right)^{\Delta_y - \Delta_x} \gg 1$$

for $\Delta_y > \Delta_x$ and hierarchically separated scales. □

5.5 Symmetry Protection and Exceptions

The monotonicity is *generic but not absolute.* Known mechanisms that can modify or violate the naive ordering:

Mechanism	Effect	Example
Chiral symmetry	Suppresses mass	Light quarks (u, d, s)
Approximate flavour symmetry	Near-degeneracy	$m_u \approx m_d$
See-saw mechanism	Inverts hierarchy	Neutrino masses
Technical naturalness	Protects lightness	Electron vs. QCD scale

These exceptions do not violate the theorem; they correspond to additional symmetry structure that modifies the effective dimension or protects certain operators from receiving large corrections.

Remark 5.5 (Neutrinos)**.** *Neutrino masses appear to violate the generation ordering (m_{ν_3} largest but still $\ll m_e$). This is explained by the see-saw mechanism: the Weinberg operator has dimension 5, not 4, introducing an additional suppression factor v^2/Λ where $\Lambda \gg v$ is the heavy right-handed neutrino scale. The* intra-neutrino *ordering still respects depth monotonicity.*

5.6 What This Does and Does Not Claim

DD claims	DD does not claim
Mass hierarchy is structurally natural	Numerical mass values
Ordering is RG-robust	Precise ratios m_τ/m_μ
Deeper $\Rightarrow$ heavier (generically)	Yukawa coupling values
Exceptions require symmetry protection	Origin of flavour symmetries

The mass hierarchy becomes readable as an emergent grading: deeper realised distinctions require more stabilisation under renormalisation. This answers the objection "you do not explain the hierarchy" honestly: we explain *why hierarchy is structurally natural* and why its ordering is RG-robust, while acknowledging that numerical values require dynamics.

6 Counterexamples: What DD Excludes

A constraint theory gains credibility by exhibiting what it *excludes*. We construct explicit models that DD forbids.

6.1 Four Fermion Generations

Consider a hypothetical Standard Model with four fermion generations:

- Gauge group: $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ (unchanged)
- Fermions: four copies of $(Q_L, u_R, d_R, L_L, e_R)$
- Anomaly cancellation: satisfied (each generation is anomaly-free)

This model is:

- Perturbatively consistent
- Anomaly-free
- Not experimentally excluded (except by precision data)

6.2 DD Exclusion

Theorem 6.1 (Four Generations Excluded)**.** *A Standard Model with four fermion generations violates realisability.*

Proof. By the sedenion structure theorem (Proposition 6.4 of the main paper), the algebra $\mathbb{S}$ contains exactly three maximal division-preserving subalgebras. A fourth generation would require a fourth such subalgebra.

Explicitly: the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{S}) = G_2 \times S_3$ acts on octonionic subalgebras. The S_3 factor permutes exactly three subalgebras; there is no S_4 action. A fourth generation has no algebraic home in the realisability structure. □

Corollary 6.2. *The four-generation model is anomaly-free but* non-realisable*. Anomaly cancellation is necessary but not sufficient for physical existence.*

6.3 Significance

This counterexample demonstrates that DD is not merely a restatement of known constraints. It provides an *independent* exclusion mechanism:

Constraint	Four generations	Status
Anomaly cancellation	Satisfied	—
Perturbative consistency	Satisfied	—
Electroweak precision	Violated	Empirical
DD realisability	**Violated**	**Structural**

DD excludes four generations *a priori*, without reference to experiment.

6.4 Second Counterexample: SM + Extra $U(1)'$

Consider extending the Standard Model by an additional abelian factor:

$$SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)'$$

with fermions charged under $U(1)'$ in a generation-dependent pattern (e.g., $B - L$ or family-specific charges).

Status by standard criteria:

- Anomaly cancellation: can be satisfied with appropriate charge assignments
- Perturbative consistency: satisfied
- Phenomenologically viable: constrained but not excluded

Theorem 6.3 (Extra $U(1)$ Excluded by Realisability)**.** *Any extension $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1) \times U(1)'$ with fermions charged under $U(1)'$ violates the minimality implied by realisability.*

Argument. The gauge structure $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ emerges uniquely from $\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{O}$ (Furey 2018). This algebraic derivation produces *exactly one* $U(1)$ factor—the hypercharge.

An additional $U(1)'$ would require either:

1. A second independent phase rotation in the algebra, or
2. An extension beyond $\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{O}$

Option (1) is impossible: the single $U(1)$ saturates the abelian content of the octonionic automorphism structure.

Option (2) requires moving to sedenions or higher Cayley–Dickson algebras, which contain zero divisors and violate realisability (non-invertibility).

Therefore, no realisable extension admits an extra $U(1)$ factor. □

Remark 6.4. *This does* not *exclude $U(1)_{B-L}$ as an* emergent *symmetry at low energies. DD constrains the* fundamental *gauge structure, not effective symmetries arising from dynamics.*

6.5 Summary of Exclusions

Model	Anomaly-free	Perturbative	DD-realisable
SM (3 generations)	✓	✓	✓
SM (4 generations)	✓	✓	×
SM + $U(1)'$	✓*	✓	×
SM + vector-like fermions	✓	✓	×†

*With appropriate charge assignment. †Violates chiral structure required by realisability.

DD is not fitted to SM. It *derives* SM as the unique realisable structure and *excludes* natural-looking extensions.

7 DD Among Constraint Theorems

7.1 Classification of Constraint Theorems

Theorem	What it constrains	Key assumption
Coleman–Mandula	Symmetry mixing	Lorentz + S-matrix
CPT	Discrete symmetries	QFT + Lorentz
Spin–statistics	Spin ↔ statistics	QFT + locality
Weinberg–Witten	Massless higher spin	Lorentz + conserved currents
DD	**Gauge group, generations**	**Realisability**

7.2 Common Structure

All constraint theorems share a logical form:

$$(\text{General assumptions}) \Rightarrow (\text{Restricted class of theories})$$

DD fits this pattern:

$$(\text{Realisability}) \Rightarrow (\text{SM-like structure})$$

The assumptions (unitarity, invertibility, norm conservation) are no stronger than those of other constraint theorems.

7.3 What DD Does Not Do

- DD does not predict coupling constants
- DD does not derive the Lagrangian
- DD does not explain numerical mass values
- DD does not replace dynamical theories

DD answers: "Why this structure and not another?"
It does not answer: "What happens in a specific experiment?"
This is the proper scope of a constraint theory.

7.4 Fundamental vs. Effective Structure

A crucial distinction for interpreting DD's claims:

Definition 7.1 (Fundamental vs. Effective).

- *A structure is* fundamental *if it appears in the UV-complete description of the theory*
- *A structure is* effective *if it emerges at some energy scale but is not required by the fundamental formulation*

DD constrains fundamental structure only.

Structure	Fundamental	Effective
$SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$	✓	—
Hypercharge quantisation	✓	—
Three chiral generations	✓	—
$U(1)_{B-L}$	×	✓
Approximate flavour symmetries	×	✓
Custodial $SU(2)$	×	✓

Remark 7.2 (Why This Matters). *Effective symmetries may:*

- *Emerge from dynamics without being realisability-constrained*
- *Be broken at higher energies without contradiction*
- *Appear "additional" to SM without violating DD*

DD does not forbid $U(1)_{B-L}$ as an effective low-energy symmetry. It forbids $U(1)_{B-L}$ as a fundamental gauge factor *in the UV-complete theory.*

This distinction preempts the objection: "But we observe approximate symmetries beyond SM gauge structure!" Such symmetries are dynamical accidents, not structural necessities.

8 Conclusion

Distinction Dynamics is a constraint theory that delimits the space of consistent physical structures. Its core results:

1. **Carrier independence**: DD's conclusions hold regardless of mathematical formalism (categories, GPT, algebras)
2. **Robust uniqueness**: The Standard Model is the unique minimum under any admissible cost functional
3. **Arrow of time**: CP violation is the minimal trace of temporal orientation in a realised distinction system
4. **Mass hierarchy**: Monotonicity theorem explains why deeper generations are heavier; RG provides the mechanism
5. **Constructive exclusion**: Four generations, extra $U(1)$ factors, and vector-like fermions are ruled out structurally

DD does not compete with dynamical theories. It establishes the boundaries within which dynamics must operate—just as Coleman–Mandula establishes boundaries for symmetry, and spin–statistics for particle identity.

The methodological status is clear: DD is not a "theory of everything" but a *theorem about structure*—showing that much of what appears contingent in the Standard Model is in fact necessary.

References

[1] S. Coleman and J. Mandula, "All Possible Symmetries of the S Matrix," Phys. Rev. **159**, 1251 (1967).

[2] A. Hurwitz, "Über die Composition der quadratischen Formen von beliebig vielen Variablen," Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen (1898), 309–316.

[3] R. D. Schafer, "On the algebras formed by the Cayley–Dickson process," Amer. J. Math. **76**, 435 (1954).

[4] C. Q. Geng and R. E. Marshak, "Uniqueness of Quark and Lepton Representations in the Standard Model," Phys. Rev. D **39**, 693 (1989).

[5] C. Furey, "$SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y (\times U(1)_X)$ as a symmetry of division algebraic ladder operators," Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, 375 (2018).

[6] N. G. Gresnigt, "Three generations of colored fermions with S_3 family symmetry from Cayley–Dickson sedenions," Eur. Phys. J. C **83**, 747 (2023).

[7] J. C. Baez, "Division Algebras and Quantum Theory," Found. Phys. **42**, 819 (2012).

[8] K. G. Wilson and J. Kogut, "The renormalization group and the ϵ expansion," Phys. Rep. **12**, 75 (1974).

[9] J. Polchinski, "Renormalization and effective Lagrangians," Nucl. Phys. B **231**, 269 (1984).

[10] C. G. Callan, "Broken scale invariance in scalar field theory," Phys. Rev. D **2**, 1541 (1970); K. Symanzik, "Small distance behaviour in field theory and power counting," Commun. Math. Phys. **18**, 227 (1970).