

Geometrical interpretation of the quantum Klein-Gordon equation

Benjamin Koch

*Institut für Theoretische Physik,
Johann Wolfgang Goethe - Universität,
D-60438 Frankfurt am Main, Germany*

(Dated: March 21, 2019)

We study the question whether the laws of quantum mechanics can be derived from a purely classical setting with one additional time dimension. It is shown that an equivalent to the quantum Klein-Gordon equation can be obtained from the higher dimensional Einstein equations coupled to a conserved energy momentum tensor. In an explicit toy model we give matching conditions for what corresponds to the phase, the amplitude, and the mass of the quantum wave function.

PACS numbers: 04.50.Cd, 04.62.+v, 03.65.Ta

The purpose of this paper is to make a connection between quantum mechanics and a classical theory with two time dimensions. On the one hand there are alternative approaches to quantum mechanics. Early such attempts have been discussed within the so called Bohmian mechanics [1, 2]. Similarities between a higher dimensional wave equation and the non-relativistic quantum theory have been pointed out in [3]. It was also suggested that quantum field theory might emerge from a chaotic classical theory with friction [4, 5]. For an overview see [6]. On the other hand there is the idea of an additional time dimension. The phenomenological consequences of more than one time dimensions were studied in [7, 8]. Further, an additional time dimension was used to interpret geodesics in four dimensions as null paths in the higher dimensions [9]. There is also an intersection of both ideas. Some papers relate a quantum field theory on the horizon of a black hole to a corresponding classical theory in the higher dimensional spacetime [10, 11]. Similar effects are found in the context of supergravity and string theory involving a holographic principle and extra time dimensions [12, 13, 14]. In a purely conceptual discussion an extra time dimension is suggested as an alternative to quantization [15]. In a stochastic approach [16], the classical Langevin equation for an auxiliary time coordinate \tilde{t} is used in order to obtain Euclidian quantum field theory in the limit $\tilde{t} \rightarrow \infty$. All those ideas can be seen as motivation for this paper, where the quantum Klein-Gordon equation is derived from classical differential geometry with one additional time dimension.

The conceptual starting point of our approach is the movement of a classical particle with respect to an additional but unobservable time dimension \bar{t} . An observer who is not able to measure \bar{t} and the velocity with respect to \bar{t} would therefore have to confine himself to some kind of statistical description of the particle's position in the four dimensional spacetime. We will show that this statistical description can be identified with quantum mechanics. As first application of this idea we will derive the relativistic quantum Klein-Gordon equation from a classical theory with one additional time dimension.

I. THE QUANTUM KLEIN-GORDON EQUATION IN CURVED SPACETIME

Before starting with the alternative interpretation of quantum mechanics, we will rewrite the relativistic Klein-Gordon equation in curved spacetime [17]

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{-\hat{g}}} \partial_\mu \left(\sqrt{-\hat{g}} \hat{g}^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \Phi(x, t) \right) = -\frac{m^2}{\hbar^2} \Phi(x, t) \quad , \quad (1)$$

where \hat{g} stands for the determinant of the metric $\hat{g}_{\mu\nu}$. This equation for the complex wave function Φ can be expressed in terms of the real function $S_Q(x, t)$ and the real function $\rho(x, t)$ by defining $\Phi(x, t) = \sqrt{\rho} \exp(iS_Q/\hbar)$. This gives two coupled differential equations

$$\square \sqrt{\rho} = \frac{\sqrt{\rho}}{\hbar^2} \left((\partial^\mu S_Q)(\partial_\mu S_Q) - m^2 \right) \quad , \quad (2)$$

$$0 = \partial_\mu \left(\sqrt{-\hat{g}} \hat{g}^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\nu S_Q) \right) \quad . \quad (3)$$

In the first equation we used the abbreviation $\square \sqrt{\rho} \equiv \partial_\mu \left(\sqrt{-\hat{g}} \hat{g}^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \sqrt{\rho} \right) / \sqrt{-\hat{g}}$ for the covariant d'Alembert operator.

The redefinition of the complex wave function in terms of the real functions S_Q and ρ does not change the meaning or the interpretation of Eq. (1). The function S_Q is usually understood as the phase of the quantum wave function.

II. GENERAL RELATIVITY WITH ONE ADDITIONAL TIME DIMENSION

In this section we will consider the geometric structure of Einsteins equations with one additional coordinate \bar{t} . A simple ansatz for the metric in 2 + 3 dimensions will be made. We then show that it is possible to choose the energy-momentum tensor T_{AB} in such a way that the classical equations of motion in the higher dimensional theory (after the additional coordinate \bar{t} is integrated out) correspond to the relativistic quantum equation for a spinless particle. We use the coordinate notation $x_A = (\bar{t}, x_\mu) = (\bar{t}, t, \vec{x})$, where capital Latin indices A run from 0 to 4 and Greek indices run from 1 to 4. As starting point we take the \bar{t} integrated Einstein equations in (2+3) dimensions

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d\bar{t} \left(R_{AB} - \frac{1}{2} g_{AB} R \right) \\ &= \int d\bar{t} \left(G_D T_{AB} - \frac{1}{2} g_{AB} \Lambda \right) \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where R_{AB} is the higher dimensional Ricci tensor, R is it's contraction, and G_D is the higher dimensional gravitational coupling constant. The term Λ is directly connected to the cosmological constant Λ_4 . Our ansatz for the higher dimensional metric is

$$g_{AB} dx^A dx^B = \bar{\alpha}^2(\bar{t}) \rho(t, \vec{x}) d\bar{t}^2 + g_{\mu\nu}(\bar{t}, x_\alpha) dx^\mu dx^\nu. \quad (5)$$

Later, the function $\bar{\alpha}$ will be separated into a constant plus a small \bar{t} dependent part

$$\bar{\alpha}(\bar{t}) = \alpha_0 + \epsilon_0 \bar{\omega}(\bar{t}) \quad . \quad (6)$$

Note that this metric is similar to the Kaluza-Klein metric for a vanishing electromagnetic field $A_\mu = 0$ [3, 18, 19, 20]. However, in contrast to the Kaluza-Klein approach the energy momentum Tensor T_{AB} and Λ are not assumed to be identically zero and all the functions have real values only. An other difference is that the functions in the metric ($\bar{\alpha}^2 \rho$ and $g_{\mu\nu}$) and the energy momentum tensor T_{AB} are allowed to have a explicit \bar{t} dependence. With the metric (5) the twenty-five coupled differential equations (4) read

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d\bar{t} \left(-\bar{\alpha}^2 \sqrt{\rho} \square \sqrt{\rho} - \frac{(g^{\lambda\beta} \dot{g}_{\lambda\beta})_{,0}}{2} + \frac{\dot{\bar{\alpha}} g^{\lambda\beta} \dot{g}_{\lambda\beta}}{4\bar{\alpha}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{g^{\mu\beta} g^{\lambda\sigma} \dot{g}_{\lambda\beta} \dot{g}_{\mu\sigma}}{2} \right) \\ &= \int d\bar{t} \left[G_D \left(T_{00} - \frac{\bar{\alpha}^2 \rho}{3} T_A^A \right) + \frac{\bar{\alpha}^2 \rho}{3} \Lambda \right] \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d\bar{t} \left(\frac{g^{\lambda\beta}}{4\rho} (\dot{g}_{\lambda\beta} \rho_{,\delta} - \rho_{,\beta} \dot{g}_{\delta\lambda}) + \frac{\partial_\lambda (g^{\lambda\mu} \dot{g}_{\mu\delta})}{2} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{\partial_\delta (g^{\lambda\mu} \dot{g}_{\lambda\mu})}{2} + \frac{g^{\lambda\sigma} g^{\mu\beta} \dot{g}_{\sigma\delta} g_{\mu\beta,\lambda}}{4} + \frac{\dot{g}^{\mu\beta} g_{\mu\beta,\delta}}{4} \right) \\ &= \int d\bar{t} G_D T_{0\delta} \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d\bar{t} \left[\hat{R}_{\delta\beta} - \frac{(\sqrt{\rho})_{;\delta;\beta}}{\sqrt{\rho}} + \frac{1}{2\bar{\alpha}^2 \rho} \left(\frac{\dot{\bar{\alpha}} \dot{g}_{\delta\beta}}{\bar{\alpha}} - \dot{g}_{\delta\beta} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + g^{\lambda\mu} \dot{g}_{\delta\lambda} \dot{g}_{\beta\mu} - \frac{g^{\mu\nu} \dot{g}_{\mu\nu} \dot{g}_{\delta\beta}}{2} \right) \right] \\ &= \int d\bar{t} \left[G_D \left(T_{\delta\beta} - \frac{g_{\delta\beta}}{3} T_A^A \right) + \frac{g_{\delta\beta}}{3} \Lambda \right] \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here, we denoted a derivative with respect to \bar{t} as $\partial_0 X \equiv \dot{X}$, the covariant derivative in the four dimensional subspace as $\nabla_\mu X \equiv X_{;\mu}$, and $\square \sqrt{\rho} = (\sqrt{\rho})_{;\mu}^{\mu}$. $\hat{R}_{\delta\beta}$ is the normal four dimensional form of the Ricci tensor which only contains

derivatives of $g_{\mu\nu}$ with respect to x_μ . The Hamilton-Jakobi definition of the energy momentum tensor of a free particle in curved spacetime is

$$\begin{aligned} T^A_B &= (\partial^A S_H)(\partial_B S_H), \quad \text{with} \\ T^A_A &= ((\partial^0 S_H)(\partial_0 S_H) + (\partial^\mu S_H)(\partial_\mu S_H)) \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where S_H is the density of Hamilton's principal function [21, 22]. A priori, the \bar{t} dependence of S_H is not known. Therefore, we make a separation ansatz where S_H can be decomposed into a classical part \tilde{S} which only depends on the observable coordinates t, \vec{x} and a part $B(\bar{t})\sqrt{\rho}$ which depends on all coordinates \bar{t}, t, \vec{x} :

$$S_H(\bar{t}, t, \vec{x}) = \epsilon_1 \sqrt{\rho} B(\bar{t}) + \tilde{S}(t, \vec{x}) \quad , \quad (11)$$

with $\partial_0 B(\bar{t}) \equiv \beta(\bar{t})$. Instead of making the heroic but vain attempt to solve all those coupled equations simultaneously we restrain ourselves to a simpler scenario. First, we take the trace of the higher dimensional Einstein equations and integrate over the resulting scalar equation

$$\int d\bar{t} R = \frac{-1}{3} \int d\bar{t} (2G_D T^A_A - 5\Lambda) \quad . \quad (12)$$

Using the definitions (5, 10), and after a multiplication with $-\sqrt{\rho}/2$ the scalar equation (12) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \square \sqrt{\rho} \int d\bar{t} &= \sqrt{\rho} \left[\frac{G_D}{3} \int d\bar{t} (\partial^\mu S_H)(\partial_\mu S_H) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left(\frac{5}{6} \Lambda \int d\bar{t} - \frac{\int d\bar{t} \hat{R}_\alpha^\alpha}{2} - \frac{G_D \epsilon_1^2}{3} \int d\bar{t} \frac{\beta^2}{\bar{\alpha}^2} \right) \right] \\ &\quad - \int d\bar{t} \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}} \partial_0 \frac{g^{\alpha\beta} \dot{g}_{\alpha\beta}}{\sqrt{\rho \bar{\alpha}}} + \frac{\int d\bar{t}}{2\sqrt{\rho}} \left(\frac{P^{\alpha\beta} P_{\alpha\beta}}{\bar{\alpha}^2} - \frac{(P_\alpha^\alpha)^2}{9\bar{\alpha}^2} \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The source term on the right hand side contains the tensor $P_{\mu\nu} = (\dot{g}_{\mu\nu} - g_{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} \dot{g}_{\alpha\beta})/2$. Apart from the last two terms this equation has always the same ρ dependence as Eq. (2), which justifies the ansatz (11). Those last terms have the form of a source, which indicates that a \bar{t} dependence of $g_{\mu\nu}$ can lead to particle production. This result is not too surprising because it is known that already a normal time dependence of the metric can lead to particle production [23]. However, we are primarily interested in problems with a seemingly constant (with respect to \bar{t}) four dimensional spacetime. Therefore, we decompose the four dimensional submetric $g_{\mu\nu}$ into a \bar{t} independent part $\hat{g}_{\mu\nu}$ and a traceless \bar{t} -variable part $\gamma_{\mu\nu}(\bar{t}, x^\alpha)$

$$g_{\mu\nu}(\bar{t}, x^\alpha) = \hat{g}_{\mu\nu} + \epsilon_2^2 \gamma_{\mu\nu}(\bar{t}, x^\alpha) \quad . \quad (14)$$

Now we assume that perturbations due to \bar{t} are small and expand Eq. (13) to lowest order in $\epsilon_i \ll 1$ ($i = 0, 1, 2$). With Eq. (11) one finds up to order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon_i)$

$$\begin{aligned} \square \sqrt{\rho} &= \frac{\sqrt{\rho}}{\hbar^2} \left[\frac{\hbar^2 G_D}{3} (\partial^\mu \tilde{S})(\partial_\mu \tilde{S}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\hbar^2}{6} (5\Lambda - 3\hat{R}_\alpha^\alpha) \right] \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The second to last term of Eq. (13) vanished, since it is proportional to the trace of $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$, and the last term vanished because it is of higher order in ϵ_i . A comparison of Eq. (15) with the quantum Klein-Gordon equation (2) shows that both equations are the same if two identifications are made. The first identification relates the Hamilton principal function \tilde{S} to the quantum phase S_Q by

$$S_Q \equiv \hbar \sqrt{\frac{G_D}{3}} \tilde{S} \quad . \quad (16)$$

The second identification relates the mass m to the functions \hat{R}_μ^μ and Λ by

$$m^2 \equiv \frac{\hbar^2}{6} (5\Lambda - 3\hat{R}_\alpha^\alpha) \quad . \quad (17)$$

One can already see that such an identification makes only sense if the scalar curvature in the four dimensional subspace \hat{R}_μ^μ does not depend on x_μ [34]. One also has to check that a solution of Eq. (15) allows to solve all the twenty-five equations (7-9) in the ϵ_i expansion. The first check is to compare Eq. (15) with Eq. (7). It turns out that both equations are only consistent if

$$\hat{R}_\mu^\mu = \Lambda \quad . \quad (18)$$

Consequently, the mass identification (17) simplifies to

$$m^2 \equiv \frac{\hbar^2}{3}\Lambda \quad . \quad (19)$$

The remaining twenty-four checks will be postponed to the subtopic ‘‘Is this theory consistent with all Einstein- and conservation equations?’’ in the discussion. One also sees that for matching several different masses (m_j) one has to impose several constants (Λ_j).

Since Eq. (2) was found, the next step is to derive the second quantum Klein-Gordon equation (3). For this we consider the covariant conservation law for the energy-momentum tensor T_{AB}

$$0 = \nabla_B (T_A^B) = \partial_B T_A^B - \Gamma_{AB}^D T_D^B + \Gamma_{BD}^B T_A^D \quad . \quad (20)$$

Now we take the 0 component of this equation and apply the definitions (11, 14)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \left[\frac{\epsilon_1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \partial_\mu \left(\rho \partial^\mu (\tilde{S} + \epsilon_1 \rho \beta) \right) \beta \right. \\ & - \frac{\epsilon_2^2}{2} \hat{g}^{\mu\alpha} \dot{\gamma}_{\nu\alpha} (\partial_\mu S_H) (\partial^\nu S_H) \\ & + \frac{\epsilon_2^2 \epsilon_1^2}{2} \hat{g}^{\alpha\beta} \dot{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta} \frac{\beta^2}{\alpha_0^2} + \epsilon_0^2 \partial_0 \left(\frac{\beta^2}{\alpha_0^2} \right) \\ & \left. + \frac{\epsilon_1}{2} \hat{g}^{\alpha\beta} \gamma_{\alpha\beta, \nu} \sqrt{\rho} (\partial^\nu S_H) \beta + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_i^3) \right] \quad . \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

Only the first and the last term survive in a first order ϵ_i expansion and the continuity equation simplifies to

$$0 = \partial_\mu \left(\sqrt{-\hat{g}} \rho (\hat{g}^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \tilde{S}) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_i) \quad . \quad (22)$$

With the identification (16) this is exactly the second Klein-Gordon equation (3). Up to now we have used the classical but \bar{t} dependent higher dimensional Einstein equations (4) and the covariant continuity equation (20) and expanded them for small perturbations around the \bar{t} -independent solution. From this we have found two matching rules (16, 19) such that the quantum Klein-Gordon equations in a curved spacetime (2, 3) can be exactly identified with the classical equations (15, 22).

III. CRITICAL POINTS

We will now try to point out some checks, criticism, and limitations of the idea and the derivation presented here.

Why is the second time not visible?

The easiest way to explain this, is with a compactification of the hidden time such that $\bar{t} = \bar{t} + \bar{T}$. As long the ‘‘radius’’ is just short enough, this would only lead to violations of Lorentz invariance on the small scale \bar{T} . A similar construction for an extra but compact time variable (imaginary or not) can be found in [16, 24]. Thus there are several viable theoretical models that allow and have extra time dimensions.

Isn't this interpretation of \bar{t} already excluded?

The additional time \bar{t} plays the role of a hidden variable. No go theorems like Bell's inequality [25] exclude most interpretations in terms of hidden variables. However, they do not apply to cases where locality or causality are violated [6]. In the theory of Bohm this violation comes through the instantaneous formation of the so called quantum potential [1, 2]. In our approach such a violation happens on the four dimensional spacetime due to a movement with respect to \bar{t} . Also causality arguments can not rule out an additional time. Instead of an rigorous exclusion there exist only experimental bounds on the size of the additional time dimension \bar{T} [7, 8].

What is the interpretation of the higher dimensional metric?

The strongest assumption (5) for the higher dimensional metric g_{AB} is that $g_{00} \sim \rho$. This can be justified by a

classical probability argument: The idea of this new approach becomes most clear for a system that does not change in the observable time direction t . In a deterministic system, the position \vec{x} and velocity $\vec{v} = d\vec{x}/d\tau$ of the particle are known as soon as the initial position \vec{x}_0 , the initial velocity \vec{v}_0 , and the propagation time τ are known. Not knowing the initial conditions one has to deal with a probability density $f(\vec{x}_0, \vec{v}_0, \tau)$. Without loss of generality we choose some fixed starting point which leaves a probability density $g(\vec{v}_0, \tau)$. In a deterministic system the initial velocity can be calculated as a function of the actual velocity and the time $\vec{v}_0 = \vec{v}_0(v_{\vec{x}}(\tau), \tau)$. Therefore, the whole system can also be described by a statistical probability density $h(\vec{v}_{\vec{x}}(\tau))$. The probability $\rho(\vec{x})$ of finding the particle at a point \vec{x} will then be obtained by an integration over the proper time variable

$$\rho(\vec{x}) = \int d\tau h(\vec{v}_{\vec{x}}(\tau), \tau) \quad . \quad (23)$$

The key observation, which relates a probability to the extra time variable, is: The faster a particle moves at a certain point \vec{x} the smaller is the probability of finding the particle at this point $h(\vec{v}_{\vec{x}}(\tau), \tau) \sim 1/\vec{v}_{\vec{x}}(\tau)$ and hence

$$\rho(x) \sim \int d\tau \frac{1}{v_x(\tau)} = \int d\tau \frac{1}{\frac{dx}{d\tau}} \quad . \quad (24)$$

This probability is directly related to the 00 component of the metric g_{AB} . We already assumed that the particle moves mostly in parallel to the additional time coordinate ($d\bar{t}/d\tau \gg dx/d\tau > dt/d\tau$). In this limit the differential of the proper time τ can be approximated by the differential of the additional time variable $d\tau \approx d\bar{t} \sqrt{g_{00}}$. Under the assumption that some part of From the integral in Eq. (24) one finds

$$\rho(x) \sim \int d\bar{t} \frac{1}{\frac{dx}{d\bar{t}}} g_{00} \quad . \quad (25)$$

This shows that a statistical interpretation of an unobservable additional time leads naturally to the metric ansatz (5).

Is this quantum mechanics?

Or: “Does deriving the quantum Klein-Gordon equation already mean that quantum mechanics is derived?” The line of argument follows closely the philosophy of Bohm [1, 2]. He explains that a statistical interpretation together with a classical equation of motion which reproduces the quantum equation (the quantum potential in Bohm’s case and Eqs. (12,20) in our case) is equivalent to the quantum theory.

What about non-relativistic quantum mechanics?

Non-relativistic quantum mechanics can be described in the Schrödinger picture. The Schrödinger picture is a special case of our derivation, since the Schrödinger equation can be derived from the Klein-Gordon equation in the limit of small momenta [26]. However, the non-relativistic potential of the Schrödinger equation has to be taken into account by adding it explicitly to the right hand side of Eq. (4).

Can such a theory explain the superposition of states?

The superposition of time independent states with different energies results in a total state, which is time dependent, and should therefore correctly be described in this picture.

What about antiparticles?

One peculiarity of the quantum Klein-Gordon equation is that it has antiparticle solutions. Antiparticles are interpreted as particles traveling backwards in time t . Such a traveling backwards in only one of the time coordinates (t) can certainly be allowed in the two time picture as long as some relation like $(\Delta\bar{t})^2 - (\Delta t)^2 > 0$ holds. An other peculiarity of the quantum Klein-Gordon equation is that the non-relativistic probability density $\rho(\vec{x})$ can in principal change in time. In the two time picture this fact has formally been accounted for by allowing $\rho = \rho(t, \vec{x})$. One could even go further and use this theory to interpret many particle, many antiparticle, or many particle-antiparticle states as a single particle in a higher dimensional (two time) spacetime with a nontrivial mapping to the lower dimensional Minkowski spacetime [27].

Is this theory consistent with all Einstein- and conservation equations?

Since we only worked with a subset of the Einstein equations we have to check whether this can lead to inconsistencies with the full set. From comparing Eq. (15) with Eq. (7) we already found that $\hat{R}_\mu^\mu = \hat{\Lambda}$. The same condition is found when comparing Eq. (15) with the trace of Eq. (9). Because of this condition one can always decompose the four dimensional Ricci tensor as

$$\hat{R}_{\mu\nu} = n_1 \hat{g}_{\mu\nu} + G_{DP\mu} p_\nu \quad , \quad (26)$$

where the four vector p_μ and the number n_1 do not depend on x_μ . Please note that we do not know the solution to Eq. (26) but we assume that it exists. In the ϵ_i expansion the eight equations (8) do not create any new conditions, since the LHS is of order ϵ_i^2 and the RHS is composed of a vanishing \bar{t} boundary term plus a term which is also of

higher order in ϵ_i . In the same scheme and after using Eqs. (18, 26) the remaining nine independent equations in (9) read

$$\int d\bar{t} \frac{(\sqrt{\rho})_{;\delta;\beta}}{\sqrt{\rho}} = - \int d\bar{t} \left[G_D \left((\partial_\delta \tilde{S})(\partial_\beta \tilde{S}) - p_\delta p_\beta \right) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{g^{\delta\beta}}{3} (G_D (\partial^\mu \tilde{S})(\partial_\mu \tilde{S}) - \Lambda) + \frac{g^{\delta\beta}}{4} (G_D p^\mu p_\mu - \Lambda) \right] . \quad (27)$$

It is hard to prove in general that those equations and the Klein-Gordon equations can always be consistently solved. However, we can show that this is the case for the most simple solution of the Klein-Gordon equation. The most simple solution of the first Klein-Gordon equation (15) is: $\rho = \text{const}$, $\tilde{S}_{,\mu} \equiv p_\mu$, and $p^\mu p_\mu = \Lambda/G_D$. For this solution the nine independent equations (27) are obviously fulfilled since both sides of the equation vanish. A comparison with Eq. (18) further shows that $n_1 = 0$. Thus, we have shown that, at least in the discussed special case, all twenty-five Einstein equations can be fulfilled consistently in our theory. As last consistency check we have to study the four remaining continuity equations from Eq. (20)

$$\nabla_B (T_\mu^B) = \partial_\delta \left(g^{\delta\nu} \tilde{S}_{,\mu} \tilde{S}_{,\nu} \right) - \hat{\Gamma}_{\mu\nu}^\delta \left(g^{\gamma\nu} \tilde{S}_{,\gamma} \tilde{S}_{,\delta} \right) \\ + \hat{\Gamma}_{\delta\nu}^\nu \left(g^{\gamma\delta} \tilde{S}_{,\mu} \tilde{S}_{,\gamma} \right) + \frac{\rho_{,\nu}}{2\rho} \left(g^{\gamma\nu} \tilde{S}_{,\gamma} \tilde{S}_{,\mu} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_i) . \quad (28)$$

For the above solution of the Klein-Gordon equation this is the conservation law for the four momentum $p_\mu \sim \tilde{S}_{,\mu}$. Therefore, we have checked the consistency of an exemplary solution of our theory with all its thirty equations (7-9,20). Because of the condition (26) the Klein-Gordon equation on a flat Minkowski background can only result from our theory in an asymptotic region of spacetime. Since energy always curves spacetime, this what one would expect also from the standard interpretation of quantum mechanics and general relativity.

What is the classical limit?

The construction with its higher dimensional energy-momentum tensor T_{AB} and the higher dimensional metric g_{AB} should (in the limit of large distancescales and large timescales) be consistent with the usual four dimensional classical general relativity. In this limit the ρ dependence and the terms proportional to ϵ_i can be omitted. However, a different normalization in the metric expansion (14) is useful such that $\hat{g}_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow 3g_{\mu\nu}^0/2$. Now Eq. (9) simplifies to

$$\hat{R}_{\mu\nu} = G_D \left(\tilde{S}_{,\mu} \tilde{S}_{,\nu} - \frac{g_{\mu\nu}^0}{2} \tilde{S}_{,\alpha} \tilde{S}_{,\alpha} \right) + \frac{g_{\mu\nu}^0 \Lambda}{2} . \quad (29)$$

For an infinitely small normalizing volume at the position of the particle trajectory we denote the density of the energy momentum tensor as $\tilde{S}_{,\mu} \tilde{S}_{,\nu} \rightarrow \tilde{p}_\mu \tilde{p}_\nu \delta^3(\vec{x} - \vec{x}_n)/E$. Thus, we found the four dimensional Einstein field equations for a free particle [28]

$$\hat{R}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{G_D}{E} \left(\tilde{p}_\mu \tilde{p}_\nu + \frac{g_{\mu\nu}^0}{2} \tilde{p}^2 \right) \delta^3(\vec{x} - \vec{x}_n) + \frac{g_{\mu\nu}^0 \Lambda}{2} . \quad (30)$$

Please note that in contrast to [29, 30] the gravitating matter is free to propagate into all space and time dimensions and therefore the higher dimensional gravitational coupling G_D is equal to the Newton constant G_N . This shows that classical general relativity can be obtained from the ansatz (4) after integrating out \bar{t} and taking the limit of large time and distance scales.

Isn't the cosmological constant very small?

The higher dimensional cosmological term Λ is on the one hand related to the mass in the quantum equation and on the other hand to the four dimensional cosmological constant Λ_4 . The observed cosmological constant Λ_4 is a very small number [31] and therefore inconsistent with a typically much bigger particle mass in Eq. (19). A possible way out of the mass-cosmological constant problem might be found by considering higher orders in the ϵ_i expansion or by taking a possible \bar{t} dependence of Λ into account. Even if the issue remains in our toy model, this might be a good sign because also most of the conventional quantum theories have a problem in getting the cosmological constant right [32].

Which parameters had to be engineered?

The presented mechanism only worked after demanding Eqs. (16, 19) to be true. The first equation (16) relates the classical principal functional \tilde{S} to the phase of the quantum wave function S_Q . The second equation (19) relates the constant Λ to the mass of the quantum particle.

What about spinors?

One of the great successes of quantum mechanics was the prediction and explanation of a particle with a Landé factor ($g = 2$) due to the Dirac equation. It will be a challenging task to find the analog of the Dirac equation in our picture. However, it has been shown by [33] that the $g = 2$ factor is also present in a Reissner-Nordström spacetime. Later, [24] found out how to relate the electro magnetic field of a Dirac electron to the surrounding field of the Reissner-Nordström solution. Those progresses indicate that there is a way to explain spin 1/2 with the help of classical general relativity.

Quantum field theory?

Questions concerning the formulation of the second quantization in quantum field theory, interacting field theory, or Yang Mills theories in this picture are hopefully subject to future studies.

IV. SUMMARY

In this paper we address the question whether the apparent uncertainty of quantum physics might be understood from a classical theory with one hidden time dimension.

We study the higher dimensional Einstein equations (4) and the higher dimensional continuity equation (20) with one additional time dimension \bar{t} . For the higher dimensional metric we make the ansatz (5), and for the higher dimensional principal function we make the ansatz (11). Then we make an expansion in the parameter ϵ_i to ensure a small \bar{t} dependence. After defining the quantum phase

$$(16) : \quad S_Q \equiv \hbar \sqrt{\frac{G_D}{3}} \tilde{S}$$

and the quantum mass

$$(19) : \quad m^2 \equiv \frac{\hbar^2}{3} \Lambda \quad ,$$

we find the standard quantum Klein-Gordon equations in curved spacetime

$$(15) : \quad \square \sqrt{\rho} = \frac{\sqrt{\rho}}{\hbar^2} [(\partial^\mu S_Q)(\partial_\mu S_Q) - m^2] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_i) \quad ,$$

$$(22) : \quad 0 = \partial_\mu \left(\sqrt{-\hat{g}} \hat{g}^{\mu\nu} \rho (\partial_\nu S_Q) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_i) \quad .$$

Our results suggest that the uncertainty of quantum physics can be understood in terms of a classical theory with one hidden time dimension. Before concluding, we address possible criticism, discuss several open questions, and point out limitations of our model.

The idea and its toy model realization which were presented here is one of several (very different) theories [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 24] that make a connection between the quantum structure of nature and a formal introduction of an additional time dimension. Our conclusion is that this connection could be more than a pure mathematical peculiarity, it might actually reflect the structure of spacetime.

Many thanks to Jorge Noronha, Silke Weinfurter, Goigrio Torrieri, Sabine Hossenfelder, Martin Kober, Nan Su, and Basil Sad for their comments and remarks.

-
- [1] D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. **85**, 166 (1951).
 - [2] D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. **85**, 180 (1951).
 - [3] O. Klein, Z. f. Physik **37**, 895 (1926).
 - [4] G. 't Hooft, Class. Quant. Grav. **16**, 3263 (1999), gr-qc/9903084.
 - [5] T. S. Biro, S. G. Matinyan, and B. Muller, Found. Phys. Lett. **14**, 471 (2001), hep-th/0105279.
 - [6] H. Nikolic, Found. Phys. **37**, 1563 (2007), quant-ph/0609163.
 - [7] G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze, and G. Senjanovic, (1999), hep-ph/9910207.
 - [8] I. Bars, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 085019 (2006), hep-th/0606045.
 - [9] S. S. Seahra and P. S. Wesson, Gen. Rel. Grav. **33**, 1731 (2001), gr-qc/0105041.
 - [10] G. 't Hooft, (1993), gr-qc/9310026.
 - [11] L. Susskind, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 6377 (1995), hep-th/9409089.

- [12] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231 (1998), hep-th/9711200.
- [13] E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 253 (1998), hep-th/9802150.
- [14] C. M. Hull, (1999), hep-th/9911080.
- [15] S. Weinstein, Physicsworld **Sept.**, 18 (2007).
- [16] P. H. Damgaard and H. Huffel, Phys. Rept. **152**, 227 (1987).
- [17] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, Cambridge University Press; ISBN: 0 521 27858 9 , 43+ (1982).
- [18] T. Kaluza, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Phys. math. **Klasse**, 996 (1921).
- [19] O. Klein, Nature **118**, 516 (1926).
- [20] S. Wesson, Paul, *Space - Time - Matter* (World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.; ISBN 981-02-3588-7, New York 07661, 2000).
- [21] W. Hamilton, Dublin University Review pp. , 795 (1833).
- [22] L. Landau and L. Lifshitz, Elsevier, Amsterdam; ISBN 0750628960 (1975).
- [23] C. W. Bernard and A. Duncan, Ann. Phys. **107**, 201 (1977).
- [24] A. Burinskii, (2007), arXiv:0712.0577 [hep-th].
- [25] J. S. Bell, Physics **1**, 195 (1964).
- [26] G. Baym, *Lectures on quantum mechanics* (Perseus Books Publishing, New York, 1990).
- [27] P. S. Wesson, (2002), gr-qc/0205117.
- [28] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology* (ISBN 0-471-92567-5, 1972).
- [29] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. **B429**, 263 (1998), hep-ph/9803315.
- [30] I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. **B436**, 257 (1998), hep-ph/9804398.
- [31] W.-M. e. a. Yao, Journal of Physics G **33**, 1+ (2006).
- [32] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1 (1989).
- [33] B. Carter, Commun. Math. Phys. **10**, 280 (1968).
- [34] This is for instance the case in de-Sitter spacetimes.