

Thermal Spacetime, Part I: Free Relativistic Bohmian Mechanics

Gerald Kaiser
kaiser@wavelets.com

April 18, 2023

Abstract

By complexifying Minkowski space \mathbb{R}^{1+d} , the proper distance $\sigma(x)$ and proper time $\tau(x)$ extend to the real and imaginary parts $\sigma(z)$ and $\tau(z)$ of the *complex length* $\zeta(z) \equiv \sqrt{-z^2}$ of $z = x - iy$ (Fig. 1). For holomorphic solutions of the Klein-Gordon equation to exist, y must belong to the future cone V_+ , thus forming a *local arrow of time* without the need to invoke statistical physics.

The *future tube* $\mathcal{T}_+ = \mathbb{R}^{1+d} - iV_+$ acts as an extended phase space for the *classical* particle, the two extra variables being the time x^0 and $\lambda = \sqrt{y^2} > 0$, acting as a “squeezing” parameter. The evaluation maps $e_z: \psi \mapsto \psi(z)$ on the space \mathcal{K} of holomorphic Klein-Gordon solutions define a family of *fundamental states* (e_z is the “quantization” of $z \in \mathcal{T}_+$) whose nonrelativistic limits are Gaussian coherent states at time $x^0 = 0$ evolving relativistically to $x^0 \neq 0$; see Fig. 3. A norm is defined in \mathcal{K} by $\|\psi\|^2 = \int_{\Gamma} d\gamma(z) |\psi(z)|^2$, with $d\gamma(z)$ and Γ as covariant forms of Liouville measure and classical phase space, respectively (127). We prove that $\|\psi\|^2$ is the total conserved “charge” of a *microlocal probability current* $j_{\mu}(z)$, which implies that $\|\psi\|$ is identical to the momentum space norm and $|\psi(z)|^2$ is a probability density on *all* phase spaces Γ . This solves a long-standing problem in Klein-Gordon theory, at least for free particles. The fundamental states e_z give resolutions of unity for every Γ (143), generalizing those for the non-relativistic coherent states.

A direct connection with thermal physics is established in Theorem 1, where it is shown that the average of an operator A in a relativistic canonical ensemble at the reciprocal temperature β in a reference frame with its time axis along the unit vector $u \in V_+$ is an integral of $\tilde{A}(z - i\vartheta)$ over $z \in \Gamma$, where $\tilde{A}(z)$ is the expectation of A in e_z , $\vartheta \equiv \frac{1}{2}\hbar\beta u$ is a *thermal vector* specifying a quantum equilibrium frame and its temperature, and Γ is any covariant phase space. This reveals the *ensemble* of the thermal approach to be the family of all “hidden” phase-space trajectories of the associated classical particle.

Lastly, we suggest how interactions may be included through *holomorphic gauge theory*, which will be the subject of Part II.

*For Angela,
With Love & Gratitude*

Contents

1	A Problem with Minkowski space	3
2	Thermal Spacetime and its Complex Length	6
3	The Quantization of \mathcal{T}_+	12
3.1	Review of Nonrelativistic (Gaussian) Coherent States	19
3.2	The Fundamental Relativistic States e_z	21
3.3	The Thermodynamics of a Single Quantum Particle	29
4	Interactions through Holomorphic Gauge Theory	31

1 A Problem with Minkowski space

An *affine spacetime* in $D = 1 + d$ dimensions is a set A of D -tuples

$$a = \{a^0, a^1, \dots, a^d\} \in \mathbb{R}^D \tag{1}$$

representing *events* at time $a^0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and position $\{a^1, \dots, a^d\} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It is “affine” because there is no privileged point playing the role of origin, so A is not a vector space even though it can be identified with \mathbb{R}^D as a set of *points*. However, any two events $a, b \in A$ can be connected by the vector

$$x = b - a \tag{2}$$

called the *spacetime interval* from a to b , which we write as a *row vector*. The set of all such intervals forms a vector space M called *Minkowski space*. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \left\{ a = \{a^0, a^1, \dots, a^d\} \right\} \stackrel{\text{set}}{=} \mathbb{R}^D \\ M &= \left\{ x = (x^0, x^1, \dots, x^d) \right\} \stackrel{\text{vec}}{=} \mathbb{R}^D \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\stackrel{\text{set}}{=}$ and $\stackrel{\text{vec}}{=}$ denote isomorphisms as a *point set* and a *vector space*, respectively. The coordinates of x are x^μ ($0 \leq \mu \leq d$), and its space-time decomposition is

$$x = (t, \mathbf{x}) \text{ where } t = x^0 \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^d) \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{4}$$

The *Minkowski scalar product* of two intervals $x, y \in M$ is given by

$$x \cdot y = x^0 y^0 - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = \sum_{\mu, \nu=0}^d x^\mu \eta_{\mu\nu} y^\nu \equiv x^\mu \eta_{\mu\nu} y^\nu, \quad (5)$$

where units have been chosen so that the universal speed of light $c = 1$ and

$$\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, \dots, -1) \quad (6)$$

is the *Minkowski pseudo-metric* on M . (We reinsert c in select formulas when it helps with physical interpretation.) The last identity in (5) illustrates *Einstein's summation convention*, where identical superscripts and subscripts in each term are automatically summed over their range.

The *Lorentz group* \mathcal{G} is the set of all linear maps

$$\Lambda: M \rightarrow M, \quad x \mapsto x\Lambda \quad (7)$$

which preserve the scalar product (5), i.e.,

$$(x\Lambda) \cdot (y\Lambda) = x \cdot y \quad \forall x, y \in M. \quad (8)$$

Remark 1 The $D \times D$ matrix Λ must act *to the left* on the row vector x . If a second Lorentz transformation Λ' is applied, the combined action is

$$(x\Lambda)\Lambda' = x(\Lambda\Lambda'), \quad (9)$$

so the order of mappings is from left to right, the same as mathematical writing. The convention (7) could thus be called *chronological*. Had we taken x to be a *column vector*, the order of mappings would be *anti-chronological*:

$$\Lambda'(\Lambda x) = (\Lambda'\Lambda)x. \quad (10)$$

This explains our unconventional preference for row vectors and left-acting operators. The same will apply to quantum wave functions and operators. ♣

However, \mathcal{G} includes *space and time inversions*. In this first part of the *Thermal spacetime* series we confine ourselves to the *restricted Lorentz group*, which excludes all inversions:

$$\mathcal{G}_0 = \{\Lambda \in \mathcal{G}: \det \Lambda = 1 \text{ and } \text{sgn}(x\Lambda)^0 = \text{sgn } x^0 \quad \forall x \in M\}. \quad (11)$$

The condition $\det \Lambda = 1$ ensures that the overall orientation of M remains unchanged, while the invariance of $\text{sgn } x^0$ ensures that the order of time is preserved, hence so is the orientation of space since $\det \Lambda = 1$.

The *Minkowski quadratic form* is the mapping $\mathcal{M}: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{M}(x) = x \cdot x \equiv x^2 = t^2 - r^2, \quad \text{where} \quad r = \sqrt{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x}} = \sqrt{x^2} \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

Since \mathcal{M} is indefinite, M breaks into the three Lorentz-invariant sectors

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Timelike intervals: } V &= \{x \in M: x^2 > 0\} \\ \text{Lightlike intervals: } L &= \{x \in M: x^2 = 0\} \\ \text{Spacelike intervals: } S &= \{x \in M: x^2 < 0\} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and M is their disjoint union

$$M = V \cup L \cup S. \quad (14)$$

V and L further break into the disjoint unions

$$\begin{aligned} V &= V_+ \cup V_-, & V_{\pm} &= \{(t, \mathbf{r}): \pm t > r\} \\ L &= L_+ \cup L_-, & L_{\pm} &= \{(t, \mathbf{r}): \pm t = r\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where

$$V_+ \text{ is the } \textit{future cone} \qquad V_- \text{ is the } \textit{past cone} \quad (16)$$

$$L_+ \text{ is the } \textit{future light cone} \qquad L_- \text{ is the } \textit{past light cone}. \quad (17)$$

The physical significance of the decomposition (14) is as follows.

1. Two distinct events $\{a, b\}$ can be made *simultaneous* by a Lorentz transformation if and only if their interval $x = b - a$ is spacelike, i.e.,

$$\{x^2 < 0\} \iff x\Lambda = (0, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \text{ for some } \Lambda \in \mathcal{G}_0, \quad \mathbf{0} \neq \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (18)$$

and (8) then gives $x^2 = -\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2$. While $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is not Lorentz invariant, its length is:

$$|\boldsymbol{\sigma}| = \sqrt{-x^2} \equiv \sigma(x) > 0, \quad x \in S. \quad (19)$$

$\sigma(x)$ is then the *proper distance* between the events.

2. Two distinct events $\{a, b\}$ can be Lorentz-transformed to the same *spatial* location if and only if their interval x is timelike, i.e.,

$$x^2 > 0 \iff x\Lambda = (\tau(x), \mathbf{0}) \text{ for some } \Lambda \in \mathcal{G}_0, \quad \tau(x) \neq 0,$$

and (8) then gives $x^2 = \tau(x)^2$ or

$$\tau(x) = \pm\sqrt{x^2}, \quad x \in V. \quad (20)$$

While $|\tau(x)|$ is the usual proper time interval between the events, its sign identifies their *chronological order* if we set $\text{sgn } \tau(x) = \text{sgn } t$. This leads to the following definition of *chronological proper time interval* between a and b:

$$\tau(x) = \hat{t}\sqrt{x^2}, \quad x = b - a \in V \quad (21)$$

where¹

$$\hat{t} \equiv \frac{t}{|t|} = \text{sgn } t, \quad (t^2 > r^2 \geq 0) \quad (22)$$

is invariant under all $\Lambda \in \mathcal{G}_0$. $\tau(x)$ is the chronologically oriented time interval between the events as measured by a clock whose (straight) worldline passes through both in the *future* direction. Since x^2 does not determine \hat{t} , neither does it determine $\tau(x)$.

3. Any two events $\{a, b\}$ can be connected by a *light ray* if and only if their interval x is lightlike, i.e.,

$$\{x^2 = 0\} \iff x\Lambda = (\pm|\boldsymbol{\sigma}|, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \text{ for some } \Lambda \in \mathcal{G}_0, \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (23)$$

2 Thermal Spacetime and its Complex Length

Does a single function exist that is defined on all of M and so unifies the proper distance $\sigma(x)$ and proper time $\tau(x)$? We shall see that it does — but only if we are willing to give up *time reversal invariance* and allow our spacetime to include *arrows of time*. The plural *arrows* is required by Relativity since all future-pointing arrows are equivalent under \mathcal{G}_0 , as are all past-pointing arrows.

An obvious starting point is the observation that

$$\sqrt{-x^2} = \begin{cases} \sigma(x) > 0, & x^2 < 0 \\ \pm i\tau(x), & x^2 > 0 \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

where the sign in the timelike case is indeterminate since x^2 does not distinguish between past and future. We shall make sense of (24) by *complexifying* x to

$$z = x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D. \quad (25)$$

¹The notation $\hat{t} = t/|t|$ is just a one-dimensional version of the vector notation $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{r}/|\mathbf{r}|$.

Definition 1 Let $\Theta \subset \mathbb{C}^D$ be the domain of the principal branch of the square root. The **complex length** of $z \in \Theta$ is the analytic continuation of $\sigma(x) = \sqrt{-x^2}$ (19) from $S \subset M$ to $\Theta \subset \mathbb{C}^D$ given by

$$\boxed{\zeta(z) = \sqrt{-z^2} = \sqrt{y^2 - x^2 + 2iy \cdot x}.} \quad (26)$$

The extended proper distance and extended chronological proper time are

$$\sigma(z) = \operatorname{Re} \zeta(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau(z) = \operatorname{Im} \zeta(z). \quad (27)$$

Remark 2 The most important role of $\zeta(z)$ is in quantum theory, where it is a measure of the distance between fundamental quantum states; see Eq. (113).

Remark 3 \mathcal{T}_+ as *Thermal Spacetime*. In Theorem 1, where $y \in V_+$ (necessary to describe analytic wave functions), we relate the new variable y to the **thermal vector**

$$\vartheta = \frac{1}{2} \hbar \beta u \quad (28)$$

where $\beta = \sqrt{y^2}/\hbar$ is an *analogue* of the reciprocal equilibrium temperature in a quantum canonical ensemble and u is the D -velocity of the ‘equilibrium’ frame. This is the basis of the name *thermal spacetime*.² ♣

We now compute Θ . The branch cut of the principal branch of ζ is along the negative axis

$$N = \{\sigma + i\tau \in \mathbb{C} : \sigma < 0, \tau = 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}. \quad (29)$$

For $z \in \Theta$, ζ belongs to the right half-plane $\sigma \geq 0$ and ζ^2 belongs to the cut plane

$$\mathbb{C}_* = \mathbb{C} \setminus N \equiv \{w \in \mathbb{C} : w \notin N\} = \{\sigma + i\tau \in \mathbb{C} : \tau = 0 \Rightarrow \sigma \geq 0\}. \quad (30)$$

It follows that

$$\Theta = \{x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D : y \cdot x = 0 \Rightarrow x^2 \leq y^2\}. \quad (31)$$

²This quantum-mechanical notion of “equilibrium” is based on the fact that thermal expectations of operators can be represented as ensemble averages, where the ensemble is simply the set of all *classical relativistic phase-space trajectories* of the particle, which are ‘hidden variables’ according to the Copenhagen interpretation; see Remark 16. It may be related to *quantum equilibrium* as used in Bohmian Mechanics in connection with Born’s rule [1]; see Remark 12.

Proposition 1 *The domain Θ of the principal branch $\zeta(z)$ is the disjoint union*

$$\Theta = \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{L} \quad (32)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &= \{x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D : x \in M, y \in V\} = M - iV && \text{Timelike Sector} \\ \mathcal{S} &= \{x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D : x^2 \leq y^2, y \in S\} && \text{Spacelike Sector} \\ \mathcal{H} &= \{x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D : x \in S, y \in L\} = S - iL && \text{Hybrid Sector} \\ \mathcal{L} &= \{z = \kappa y : \kappa \in \mathbb{C}, y \in L\} = \mathbb{C} \otimes L && \text{Complex Light Cone} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

with (real) dimensions

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{T} &= 2D && \dim \mathcal{S} = 2D \\ \dim \mathcal{H} &= 2D - 1 && \dim \mathcal{L} = 2D - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof: Whereas the partition (14) of M is based on the sign of x^2 , we now examine a similar partition of \mathbb{C}^D based on the sign of y^2 .

1. If $y^2 > 0$, choose a ‘rest frame’ with $y = (s, \mathbf{0}), s \neq 0$. Then

$$y \cdot x = st = 0 \Rightarrow x = (0, \mathbf{x}) \Rightarrow x^2 = -\mathbf{x}^2 \leq 0 < y^2, \quad (34)$$

hence $x - iy \in \Theta$ by (31). This gives the timelike sector \mathcal{T} .

2. If $y^2 < 0$, choose a frame where $y = (0, \mathbf{y})$ with $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Then

$$y \cdot x = -\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{x} = 0 \quad (35)$$

does not determine whether or not $x^2 \leq y^2$ as in (31), so this condition must be imposed directly. This gives the spacelike sector \mathcal{S} .

3. If $y^2 = 0$, choose a frame where

$$y = (\varepsilon|\mathbf{y}|, \mathbf{y}) \text{ with } \varepsilon = \pm 1. \quad (36)$$

If $y \neq 0$, then $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and

$$y \cdot x = 0 \iff \varepsilon|\mathbf{y}|t = \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{x} \iff t = \varepsilon\hat{\mathbf{y}} \cdot \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow x^2 \leq 0 = y^2, \quad (37)$$

hence

$$\{x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D : y \neq 0, y^2 = 0, y \cdot x = 0 \Rightarrow x^2 \leq 0\} \subset \Theta. \quad (38)$$

This breaks into the two subsets

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}' &\equiv \{x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D : y \neq 0, y^2 = 0, y \cdot x = 0 \Rightarrow x^2 < 0\} \\ \mathcal{L}' &\equiv \{x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D : y \neq 0, y^2 = 0, y \cdot x = 0 \Rightarrow x^2 = 0\}.\end{aligned}\tag{39}$$

But in \mathcal{L}' ,

$$y \cdot x = 0 \iff t = \varepsilon \hat{\mathbf{y}} \cdot \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow x^2 = (\hat{\mathbf{y}} \cdot \mathbf{x})^2 - \mathbf{x}^2,$$

so x^2 can vanish only if $\mathbf{x} = k\mathbf{y}$. Then

$$x = (\varepsilon \hat{\mathbf{y}} \cdot \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = k(\varepsilon|\mathbf{y}|, \mathbf{y}) = ky$$

hence

$$\mathcal{L}' = \{x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D : y \neq 0, y^2 = 0, x = ky\}.\tag{40}$$

To (39) we must add the case of Eq. (38) with $y = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}'' &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^D : x^2 < 0\} = S \\ \mathcal{L}'' &= \{x \in M : x^2 = 0\} = L.\end{aligned}\tag{41}$$

Combining (39) and (41) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} &\equiv \mathcal{H}' \cup \mathcal{H}'' = \{x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D : x \in S, y \in L\} = S - iL \\ \mathcal{L} &\equiv \mathcal{L}' \cup \mathcal{L}'' = \{(k - i)y \in \mathbb{C}^D : k \in \mathbb{R}, y \in L\}.\end{aligned}\tag{42}$$

Since L is invariant under $y \mapsto by$ for any nonzero $b \in \mathbb{R}$, we may replace $(k - i)y$ by κy with $\kappa \in \mathbb{C}$, so \mathcal{L} is simply the complex light cone

$$\mathcal{L} = \{\kappa y : \kappa \in \mathbb{C}, y \in L\} \equiv \mathbb{C} \otimes L. \blacksquare\tag{43}$$

Remark 4 The timelike sector splits into the disjoint union

$$\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_+ \cup \mathcal{T}_-\tag{44}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_+ &= \{x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D : x \in M, y \in V_+\} \text{ is the } \textit{Future Tube} \\ \mathcal{T}_- &= \{x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D : x \in M, y \in V_-\} \text{ is the } \textit{Past Tube}.\end{aligned}\tag{45}$$

\mathcal{T}_+ and \mathcal{T}_- (45) play a central role in axiomatic quantum field theory [6], where they are called the *forward and backward tube*. However, no attempt is made there to interpret \mathcal{T}_\pm physically. ♣

Proposition 2 *The boundary value of ζ as $y \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{T}_\pm is the distribution*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \zeta(x - iy) = \sigma(x)H(-x^2) \pm i\tau(x)H(x^2) \quad (46)$$

where H is the Heaviside step function. This resolves the sign ambiguity in (24).

Proof: If $y \in V_\pm$ and $x^2 < 0$, then

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \zeta(x - iy) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{y^2 - x^2 + 2iy \cdot x} = \sqrt{-x^2} = \sigma(x).$$

If $x^2 > 0$, let $\lambda = \sqrt{y^2}$ and use the invariance of ζ under \mathcal{G}_0 to transform to a rest frame, where

$$y = (\pm\lambda, \mathbf{0}) \in V_\pm \quad \text{and} \quad y \cdot x = \pm\lambda t \quad (47)$$

thus

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \zeta(x - iy) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\lambda^2 - x^2 \pm 2i\lambda t} = \pm i\hat{t}\sqrt{x^2} = \pm i\tau(x). \quad \blacksquare \quad (48)$$

Figure 1 shows plots of σ , τ , and $|\zeta|$ with $D = 2$, $y = (1, 0)$ and $x = (t, r)$, so that

$$\zeta(t, r) = \sqrt{1 + r^2 - t^2 + 2it} = \sqrt{(1 + it)^2 + r^2} \equiv \sigma(t, r) + i\tau(t, r). \quad (49)$$

The level surfaces of $\sigma(x)$ in S and $\tau(x)$ in V are

$$\begin{aligned} B_\sigma &= \{x \in S: r^2 - t^2 = \sigma^2\}, \quad \sigma > 0 \\ W_\tau &= \{x \in V: t^2 - r^2 = \tau^2\}, \quad \tau \neq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Proposition 3 *The level surfaces of $\sigma(z)$ and $\tau(z)$ in the ‘rest frame’ $y = (\lambda, \mathbf{0})$ are the following hyperboloids in M :*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_\sigma &= \left\{ x \in M: \frac{r^2}{\sigma^2 - \lambda^2} - \frac{t^2}{\sigma^2} = 1 \right\}, \quad \sigma > 0 \\ \mathcal{W}_\tau &= \left\{ x \in M: \frac{t^2}{\tau^2} - \frac{r^2}{\tau^2 + \lambda^2} = 1, \quad \hat{t} = \hat{\tau} \right\}, \quad \tau \neq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where the condition $\hat{t} = \hat{\tau}$ eliminates the chronologically dissonant half $\hat{t} = -\hat{\tau}$ of the two-sheeted hyperboloid. Note that

$$\lambda \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{B}_\sigma \rightarrow B_\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{W}_\tau \rightarrow V_\tau. \quad (52)$$




Figure 1: Plots of $\sigma(z)$ and $\tau(z)$ in the ‘rest frame’ $y = (1, \mathbf{0})$: (a) $\sigma(t, r)$, (b) $\tau(t, r)$, (c) $|\zeta(t, r)|$. Figure (d) is a closeup of $|\zeta(t, r)|$ showing the smooth minimum $\zeta(0, 0) = 1$.

Proof: For $z \in \mathcal{T}_+$, we can choose $y = (\lambda, \mathbf{0})$. Then

$$\zeta = \sqrt{\lambda^2 - t^2 + r^2 + 2i\lambda t} = \sigma + i\tau,$$

from which

$$\lambda^2 - t^2 + r^2 = \sigma^2 - \tau^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda t = \sigma\tau$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 r^2 &= \lambda^2(t^2 + \sigma^2 - \tau^2 - \lambda^2) \\ &= \sigma^2 \tau^2 + \lambda^2 \sigma^2 - \lambda^2 \tau^2 - \lambda^4. \end{aligned}$$

The right side factorizes, giving

$$\lambda^2 r^2 = (\sigma^2 - \lambda^2)(\tau^2 + \lambda^2) \quad \lambda t = \sigma\tau. \quad (53)$$

This proves that (σ, τ) carries information equivalent to (t, r) in \mathcal{T}_+ . Hence

$$\frac{r^2}{\sigma^2 - \lambda^2} = \frac{\tau^2}{\lambda^2} + 1 \quad \frac{r^2}{\tau^2 + \lambda^2} = \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda^2} - 1,$$

and (51) follows from $\lambda t = \sigma\tau$. ■

Equations (51) and (53) are not Lorentz-invariant because we chose $y = (\lambda, \mathbf{0})$ from the outset. This is easily remedied.

Definition 2 Given $y \in V$, let

$$\lambda = |y| \equiv \sqrt{y^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{y} = y/\lambda. \quad (54)$$

The invariant local time and radial coordinates relative to y are

$$t_y(x) = \hat{y} \cdot x \quad \text{and} \quad r_y(x) = \sqrt{t_y^2 - x^2}. \quad (55)$$

Note that

$$t_y^2 - r_y^2 = x^2 = t^2 - r^2$$

and

$$y \rightarrow (\pm\lambda, \mathbf{0}) \in V_{\pm} \Rightarrow \{t_y(x) \rightarrow \pm t, \quad r_y(x) \rightarrow r\}.$$

By choosing any $y \in V_+$ and substituting t_y for t and r_y for r , Equations (53) take the invariant form

$$\lambda^2 r_y^2 = (\sigma^2 - \lambda^2)(\tau^2 + \lambda^2) \quad \lambda t_y = \sigma\tau \quad (56)$$

relating the *local* invariants $(t_y(x), r_y(x))$ and the *global* invariants $(\sigma(z), \tau(z))$.

Remark 5 A different route to complex spacetime was developed in [5]. ♣

3 The Quantization of \mathcal{T}_+

We conclude that the Klein-Gordon equation does not have a consistent single-particle interpretation and the naive transcription of the trajectory interpretation of nonrelativistic Schrödinger quantum mechanics into this context does not work. – Peter Holland in [2].

Here we resolve this ancient and well-known problem by quantizing a Klein-Gordon particle in the *complexification* \mathcal{T}_+ of M . In the process we discover that the quantum randomness in this case is due to averaging “observables” over a *hidden*³ canonical ensemble consisting of all classical phase-space particle trajectories. This amounts to a phase-space formulation of *relativistic Bohmian Mechanics* (RBM).

³The ensemble is “hidden” because classical trajectories are not an admissible quantum concept.

Remark 6 *Simplified Dirac Notation.*

Let \mathfrak{H} be a complex Hilbert space with inner product $\langle g|f \rangle$ linear in g and antilinear in f .⁴ Then every $f \in \mathfrak{H}$ trivially defines a linear map

$$F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}, \quad kF = fk \quad (57)$$

where fk denotes the scalar multiple of f by k . Since $0F = 0$ and $1F = f$, we may think of the restriction of F to $[0, 1] \subset \mathbb{C}$ as a *pictorial representation* of the vector $f \in \mathfrak{H}$. We may thus *identify* F with f without confusion.

Since \mathbb{C} is a Hilbert space with inner product

$$\langle k'|k \rangle_{\mathbb{C}} = k'\bar{k} \quad \forall k', k \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (58)$$

we can use (57) to define the Hermitian adjoint

$$F^\dagger \equiv f^\dagger: \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad \langle gf^\dagger|k \rangle_{\mathbb{C}} \equiv \langle g|kf \rangle = \langle g|fk \rangle = \langle g|f \rangle \bar{k}, \quad (59)$$

hence by (58) we have

$$\boxed{gf^\dagger = \langle g|f \rangle}. \quad (60)$$

We adapt gf^\dagger as a simplified form of Dirac notation. Note that (60) is closely related to the *Riesz Representation Theorem*, which states that every bounded linear functional $B: \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ can be uniquely represented as $gB = gf^\dagger$ for some $f \in \mathfrak{H}$ (clearly, $f = B^\dagger$). ♣

A *massive scalar* is a single free spinless relativistic particle of mass $m > 0$. A *plane wave* with energy-momentum $p = (E, \mathbf{p})$ is given by

$$\phi_p(x) = e^{-ix \cdot p/\hbar} = e^{(itE - i\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{p})/\hbar}, \quad E = \sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2}. \quad (61)$$

This is the beginning of quantum mechanics. It associates with a particle of energy-momentum p a wave of frequency k^0 and wave vector \mathbf{k} given by the *Planck–Einstein–de Broglie relations*

$$k^0 = E/\hbar, \quad \mathbf{k} = \mathbf{p}/\hbar, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad k \equiv (k^0, \mathbf{k}) = p/\hbar. \quad (62)$$

⁴This convention is standard in mathematics and works well with the left action of operators (Remark 1). Physicists use the opposite convention, antilinear in g and linear in f . Consequently, the representation of \mathcal{G}_0 must be defined in terms of right action as

$$(U(\Lambda)\psi)(z) = \psi(\Lambda^{-1}z)$$

instead of the left action $\psi U(\Lambda)(z) = \psi(z\Lambda)$ as in (77).

Since the particle is free, p belongs to the *mass shell*

$$\Omega_m = \{(E, \mathbf{p}): E = \sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2}, \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^d\}. \quad (63)$$

As all $p \in \Omega_m$ must have equal weight by Einstein's Relativity Principle and \mathbf{p} varies over \mathbb{R}^d , each p has weight zero. This means that Ω_m must be treated as a measure space, where the 'weight' of a measurable subset $A \subset \Omega_m$ is its measure

$$\mu(A) = \int_A d\mu(p). \quad (64)$$

For $\mu(A)$ to be frame-independent, $d\mu$ must be Lorentz-invariant. To find it, note that for general $p = (p_0, \mathbf{p}) \in V_+$ we have $p^2 - m^2 = p_0^2 - E^2$, hence

$$\delta(p^2 - m^2)dp = \delta((p_0 - E)(p_0 + E))dp_0 d\mathbf{p} = \delta(p_0 - E) dp_0 \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{2E},$$

proving that $d\mu$ is given uniquely, up to a constant factor, by

$$d\mu(p) = \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{2E} \quad (p \in \Omega_m). \quad (65)$$

The numerator $d\mathbf{p}$ is the Galilean-invariant Lebesgue measure on the nonrelativistic momentum space \mathbb{R}^d , and the denominator $2E$ accounts for the *curvature* of the hyperboloid Ω_m . Momenta \mathbf{p} with large energies $E(\mathbf{p})$ count for less in $d\mu$ than they would in $d\mathbf{p}$, thus making the space of integrable functions larger:

$$L^1(d\mu) \supset L^1(d\mathbf{p}). \quad (66)$$

Remark 7 The curvature factor $(2E)^{-1}$ in $d\mu(p)$ breaks the symmetry between the position- and momentum representations of nonrelativistic quantum mechanics, on which the canonical commutation relations and the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle are based. That complicates many aspects of the theory, including the inner product in the position representation (as compared with the momentum representation (73), which is straightforward), the spatial probability interpretation, and even the existence of position operators. This results in the well-known non-existence of a covariant probability interpretation for massive scalar particles in *real* spacetime, which will be resolved in thermal spacetime; see also [4, Chapter 4]. ♣

The plane wave $\phi_p(x)$ extends to the entire function

$$\phi_p(z) = e^{-iz \cdot p/\hbar} = \phi_p(x)e^{-y \cdot p/\hbar}, \quad z = x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D \quad (67)$$

satisfying the holomorphic Klein-Gordon equation

$$-\square_z \phi_p(z) \equiv -\frac{\partial^2 \phi_p(z)}{\partial z^\mu \partial z_\mu} = (mc/\hbar)^2 \phi_p(z). \quad (68)$$

But what happens to a general superposition of such plane waves? The question about the compatibility of the complexification $M \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_+$ with quantum theory thus comes down to studying the behavior of the function

$$R_y: \Omega_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad R_y(p) = e^{-y \cdot p/\hbar}, \quad \text{where } y \in \mathbb{R}^D \text{ and } p \in \Omega_m. \quad (69)$$

A general holomorphic solution of (68) with positive energy is a continuous superposition of holomorphic plane waves $\phi_p(z)$ with all possible $p \in \Omega_m$,

$$\psi(z) = \int_{\Omega_m} d\mu(p) a(p) \phi_p(z). \quad (70)$$

We call $\psi(z)$ and $a(p)$ the z -representation and p -representation of the quantum state, respectively. The Hilbert space of the p -representation is

$$\mathcal{H} \equiv L^2(d\mu) = \{a: \Omega_m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \|a\| < \infty\} \quad (71)$$

where the norm $\|a\| \geq 0$ is given by

$$\|a\|^2 \equiv \int_{\Omega_m} d\mu(p) |a(p)|^2 \quad (72)$$

with inner product (60)

$$a_1 a_2^\dagger \equiv \int_{\Omega_m} d\mu(p) a_1(p) a_2(p)^*. \quad (73)$$

The Hilbert space of the z -representation is

$$\mathcal{K} = \{\psi(z) = \int_{\Omega_m} d\mu(p) a(p) e^{-iz \cdot p/\hbar}: a \in \mathcal{H}\} \quad (74)$$

with inner product imported, initially, from \mathcal{H} :

$$\psi_1 \psi_2^\dagger \equiv a_1 a_2^\dagger. \quad (75)$$

We shall express $\psi_1 \psi_2^\dagger$ as an integral over any relativistic classical phase space $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{T}_+$ of dimension $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} G = 2d$. This gives a Lorentz-covariant probability interpretation of $\psi(z)$. As noted before, such an interpretation is missing in M .

To see how $\psi(z)$ and $a(p)$ transform under the restricted Lorentz group \mathcal{G}_0 ,⁵ we must first explain how z transforms. The action of \mathcal{G} on M extends to \mathbb{C}^D by *complex linearity*, i.e.,

$$z\Lambda \equiv x\Lambda - iy\Lambda, \quad z = x - iy \in \mathbb{C}^D, \quad \Lambda \in \mathcal{G}. \quad (76)$$

⁵Here we must confine ourselves to the *reduced* Lorentz group \mathcal{G}_0 in order to leave \mathcal{T}_\pm invariant, as is necessary by Proposition 5.

Since \mathcal{T}_+ is not invariant under $z \mapsto -z$, we must confine our analysis to the restricted Lorentz group \mathcal{G}_0 , whose actions on $a(p)$ and $\psi(z)$ are given by

$$aU(\Lambda)(p) = a(p\Lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi U(\Lambda)(z) = \psi(z\Lambda) \quad (77)$$

which imply

$$U(\Lambda_1\Lambda_2) = U(\Lambda_1)U(\Lambda_2) \quad (78)$$

as required of a representation. From the invariance of Ω_m and $d\mu$ it follows that the p -representation is unitary, hence so is the z -representation by (75).

Proposition 4 *Reverse Triangle Inequality* (Figure (2)).

If y and p are any vectors in V_+ , then

$$y \cdot p \geq |y||p| \quad \text{where} \quad |y| = \sqrt{y^2}, \quad |p| = \sqrt{p^2}, \quad (79)$$

with equality if and only if y and p are parallel, i.e.,

$$y \cdot p = |y||p| \iff \hat{p} = \hat{y} \quad (80)$$

where $\hat{p} = p/|p|$ and $\hat{y} = y/|y|$.

Proof: Choose a ‘rest frame’ with $y = (|y|, \mathbf{0})$. Then

$$y \cdot p = |y|\sqrt{|p|^2 + \mathbf{p}^2} \geq |y||p| \quad (81)$$

with equality if and only if $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}$, in which case

$$p = (|p|, \mathbf{0}) = |p|\hat{y} \Rightarrow \hat{y} = \hat{p}.$$

By the \mathcal{G}_0 -invariance of $y \cdot p$, this is true in any inertial frame. ■




Figure 2: The ray filter (83) in $d = 1$ space dimensions with $m = \hbar = 1$, $y = (\lambda, 0)$, and $p = (\sqrt{1 + q^2}, q)$, thus $S_\lambda(q) = e^{-\lambda\sqrt{1+q^2}}$ in (83). The upper and lower plots show $S_1(q)$ and $S_4(q)$, demonstrating the increasing directivity of R_y with λ .

Proposition 5 *For a free massive scalar, the following are true:*

1. $\psi(z)$ is holomorphic for all $a \in \mathcal{H}$ if and only if z is restricted to \mathcal{T}_+ .
2. $R_y(p)$ is a **guiding filter** for the wave $\psi(x - iy)$, steering it along $\hat{y} \in V_+$.
3. $R_y(p)$ filters $a(p)$ down to a **ray bundle** centered around the direction $\hat{p} = \hat{y}$.
4. $R_y(p)$ is a ‘bump function’ on Ω_m peaking at

$$p_y = m\hat{y}. \tag{82}$$

5. $\lambda \equiv \sqrt{y^2}$ is a measure of the **directivity** of R_y : the greater λ , the more narrowly the filter is focused around its maximizing direction \hat{y} . Thus, all D components of y are physically significant.

Proof: Set $\hbar = 1$ for convenience and consider the cases $y \in V_{\pm}$, $y \in L_{\pm}$, $y \in S$.

- If $y \in V_{\pm}$, choose a ‘rest frame’ where $y = (\pm\lambda, \mathbf{0})$. Then

$$R_y(p) = e^{\mp\lambda\sqrt{m^2+p^2}} \equiv S_{\pm\lambda}(\mathbf{p}). \quad (83)$$

$S_{-\lambda}(\mathbf{p})$ grows as $e^{\lambda|\mathbf{p}|}$, ruling out $y \in V_-$. For $y \in V_+$, S_{λ} decays as $e^{-\lambda|\mathbf{p}|}$ and the integral (70) converges absolutely for all $a \in \mathcal{H}$, defining the function $\psi(z)$. It remains absolutely convergent when differentiated with respect to z^{μ} under the integral sign, so ψ is holomorphic in \mathcal{T}_+ .

- If $y \in L_{\pm}$, choose a frame where $y = (\pm|\mathbf{y}|, \mathbf{y})$. Then

$$-y \cdot p = \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{p} \mp |\mathbf{y}|\sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2}$$

and

$$|\mathbf{p}| \gg m \Rightarrow R_y(p) \approx e^{\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{p} \mp |\mathbf{y}||\mathbf{p}|}.$$

The case $y \in L_-$ is ruled out since $R_y(p)$ grows exponentially with $|\mathbf{p}|$ except when $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = -\hat{\mathbf{y}}$. For $y \in L_+$ and $\mathbf{p} = \kappa\mathbf{y}$ with $\kappa > 0$, we have

$$|\mathbf{p}| \gg m \Rightarrow R_y(p) \approx e^{\kappa|\mathbf{y}|^2 - \kappa|\mathbf{y}|^2} = 1,$$

hence (70) fails to converge *absolutely*, eliminating the case $y \in L_+$ as well.

- If $y \in S$, choose a frame where $y = (0, \mathbf{y})$. Then

$$R_y(p) = e^{\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{p}},$$

which grows exponentially with $|\mathbf{p}|$ in the half-space $\{\mathbf{p}: \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{p} > 0\}$.

Thus (70) gives a holomorphic function $\psi(z)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{H}$ only when $y \in V_+$, proving the first point above. To prove the other points, choose $y = (\lambda, \mathbf{0}) \in V_+$. Then (83) becomes

$$R_y(p) = e^{-\lambda\sqrt{m^2+p^2}} \equiv S_{\lambda}(\mathbf{p}),$$

which guides the wave function along a ray bundle centered about $\hat{p} = \hat{y}$. The filter $S_{\lambda}(\mathbf{p})$ becomes exponentially sharper with increasing λ , as seen in Figure (2). Again, the above proofs are independent of the choice $y = (\lambda, \mathbf{0})$ due to \mathcal{G}_0 -invariance. ■

Remark 8 Proposition 5 suggests a connection to the de Broglie–Bohm pilot wave theory, [1, 2], with a fundamental difference:

The ‘pilot’ is now built into the underlying geometry through $y \in V_+$, and its guiding property follows from the holomorphy of $\psi(x - iy)$.

Although our theory so far is restricted to a single free relativistic particle, it should not be too difficult to extend to N independent and identical free particles. A further extension to $N = \infty$ should yield the Fock space of a free quantum field theory using Wightman’s holomorphic n -point functions of the free field on permuted extended tube domains (see [6] and [4], Chapter 5). Adding relativistic interactions is a more difficult problem, but it is not hopeless. While the complex structure makes it difficult to introduce regular potentials, it opens a new opportunity for creating a gauge theory taking into account the complex structure at hand, as explained in Section 4. ♣

Remark 9 While $\psi(z)$ is a solution of the Klein-Gordon equation (68), this is not the whole story because it does not explicitly state that it is a positive-energy solution.⁶ That fact can be included by requiring that $\psi(z)$ be a solution of the psuedo-differential equation

$$\sqrt{-\square_z} \psi(z) = (m/\hbar)\psi(z), \quad (84)$$

which is *non-local*. This explains the non-locality in the real Minkowski space M of relativistic quantum theories requiring positive-energy solutions, where the convergence of the integral over $p \in \Omega_m$ requires that $z \in \mathcal{T}_+$. However, locality can be restored in the *complexified* spacetime \mathcal{T}_+ if we express the required holomorphy through the *Cauchy-Riemann equations*

$$\bar{\partial}_\mu \psi(z) \equiv \frac{\partial \psi(z)}{\partial \bar{z}^\mu} = 0, \quad (85)$$

so $\psi(z)$ is simultaneously a solution of the local equations (68) and (85) in \mathcal{T}_+ . ♣

3.1 Review of Nonrelativistic (Gaussian) Coherent States

We shall see that the z -representation is closely related to nonrelativistic coherent-states representations, which will now be reviewed.

⁶Given $\psi, \phi \in \mathcal{K}$, the function $\psi'(z) = \psi(z) + \phi(z)^*$ also solves (68) because $\partial_\mu \phi(z)^* = 0$. But $\psi'(z)$ is neither holomorphic (unless $\phi(z)$ is constant) nor positive-energy.

Consider a nonrelativistic particle in \mathbb{R}^d , whose position and momentum operators \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P} satisfy the canonical commutation relations

$$[X_j, X_k] = [P_j, P_k] = 0, \quad [X_j, P_k] = i\hbar\delta_{jk}, \quad 1 \leq j, k \leq d \quad (86)$$

and act on a wave function $f(\mathbf{x}) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and its Fourier transform $\hat{f}(\mathbf{p})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} fX_k(\mathbf{x}) &= x_k f(\mathbf{x}) & fP_k(\mathbf{x}) &= -i\hbar \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x})}{\partial p_k} \\ \hat{f}X_k(\mathbf{p}) &= i\hbar \frac{\partial \hat{f}(\mathbf{p})}{\partial p_k} & \hat{f}P_k(\mathbf{p}) &= p_k \hat{f}(\mathbf{p}). \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

To construct coherent states, choose any real number κ and let

$$A_k = X_k + i\kappa P_k. \quad (88)$$

Given a normalized state f , define $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$ by

$$\bar{z}_k \equiv fA_k f^\dagger = \langle A_k \rangle = \langle X_k \rangle + i\kappa \langle P_k \rangle \equiv \tilde{x}_k + i\kappa \tilde{p}_k. \quad (89)$$

Using the notation

$$\delta A_k = A_k - \langle A_k \rangle = A_k - \bar{z}_k = \delta X_k + i\kappa \delta P_k \quad (90)$$

we have $\langle \delta A_k \rangle = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \|f\delta A_k\|^2 &= f\delta A_k \delta A_k^\dagger f^\dagger = \langle A_k A_k^\dagger \rangle - |z_k|^2 \\ &= \langle X_k^2 + \kappa^2 P_k^2 - i\kappa[X_k, P_k] \rangle - \tilde{x}_k^2 - \kappa^2 \tilde{p}_k^2 \\ &= [\langle X_k^2 \rangle - \tilde{x}_k^2] + \kappa^2 [\langle P_k^2 \rangle - \tilde{p}_k^2] + \hbar\kappa \\ &= \Delta_{X_k}^2 + \kappa^2 \Delta_{P_k}^2 + \hbar\kappa \end{aligned}$$

where Δ_{X_k} and Δ_{P_k} are the usual uncertainties of X_k and P_k in f . Since the quadratic form on the right side must be nonnegative for all real κ , its discriminant must be nonpositive, i.e.,

$$\hbar^2 \leq 4\Delta_{X_k}^2 \Delta_{P_k}^2 \quad (91)$$

which is the *Heisenberg uncertainty principle*. Furthermore, equality holds if and only if $f\delta A_k = 0$, so f is an eigenvector χ_z of A_k with eigenvalue \bar{z}_k ,

$$\chi_z A_k = \bar{z}_k \chi_z. \quad (92)$$

The \mathbf{x} -representation (87) of X_k and P_k thus gives

$$x_k \chi_z(\mathbf{x}) + \hbar\kappa \frac{\partial \chi_z(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_k} = \bar{z}_k \chi_z(\mathbf{x}) \quad (93)$$

with a unique normalized solution (up to a constant phase factor)

$$\chi_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x}) = N' \exp[(\bar{\mathbf{z}} \cdot \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^2/2)/\hbar\kappa] \quad (94)$$

which requires $\kappa > 0$ for convergence. Inserting $\bar{\mathbf{z}} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + i\kappa\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$, (89) gives

$$\chi_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x}) = N \exp[i\tilde{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \mathbf{x}/\hbar - (\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})^2/2\hbar\kappa] \quad (95)$$

with $N = N' \exp(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2/2\hbar\kappa)$. These are the Gaussian coherent states in the \mathbf{x} -representation.

Similarly, in the \mathbf{p} -representation the Fourier transform $\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{p})$ satisfies

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{p})}{\partial p_k} + i\kappa p_k \hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{p}) = \bar{z}_k \hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{p}) \quad (96)$$

giving

$$\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{p}) = C' \exp[-i\bar{\mathbf{z}} \cdot \mathbf{p}/\hbar - \kappa \mathbf{p}^2/2\hbar] = C \exp[-i\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{p}/\hbar - \kappa(\mathbf{p} - \tilde{\mathbf{p}})^2/2\hbar] \quad (97)$$

with $C = C' \exp(\kappa\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^2/2\hbar)$. The physical significance of $\mathbf{z} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}} - i\kappa\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ is that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \langle \chi_{\mathbf{z}} | \mathbf{X} | \chi_{\mathbf{z}} \rangle \quad \tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \langle \chi_{\mathbf{z}} | \mathbf{P} | \chi_{\mathbf{z}} \rangle, \quad (98)$$

as required by (89). The uncertainties can be read off from the probability densities:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\mathbf{x}) &\equiv |\chi_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x})|^2 = N^2 \exp[-(\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})^2/\hbar\kappa] \Rightarrow \Delta_{X_k} = \sqrt{\hbar\kappa/2} \\ \tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{p}) &\equiv |\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{p})|^2 = K^2 \exp[-\kappa(\mathbf{p} - \tilde{\mathbf{p}})^2/\hbar] \Rightarrow \Delta_{P_k} = \sqrt{\hbar/2\kappa} \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

confirming the minimum-uncertainty property

$$\Delta_{X_k} \Delta_{P_k} = \hbar/2. \quad (100)$$

3.2 The Fundamental Relativistic States e_z

The key to understanding the role of z in quantization is to note that in (70), $\psi(z)$ can be expressed as an inner product

$$\psi(z) = a e_z^\dagger \quad \text{where} \quad e_z(p) = \phi_p(z)^* = e^{i\bar{z} \cdot p/\hbar}. \quad (101)$$

Unlike the plane wave $\phi_p(x)$ in M , e_z is square-integrable, with

$$\|e_z\|^2 = (\pi mc/\lambda)^\nu K_\nu(2\lambda mc/\hbar). \quad (102)$$

Remark 10 By (102), all wavefunctions $\psi \in \mathcal{K}$ obey the bound

$$\rho(z) \equiv |\psi(z)|^2 = |ae_z^\dagger|^2 \leq \|a\|^2 \|e_z\|^2, \quad (103)$$

decreasing monotonically with λ . ♣

The expectations of the *Newton-Wigner position operators* X_k in e_z at $x^0 = 0$ are found in [4] to be

$$t \equiv \text{Re } z^0 = 0 \Rightarrow \langle X_k \rangle_{e_z} \equiv \frac{e_z X_k e_z^\dagger}{e_z e_z^\dagger} = x_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq d. \quad (104)$$

The expectations of the energy-momentum operators P_μ in e_z are

$$z \in \mathcal{T}_+ \Rightarrow \langle P_\mu \rangle_{e_z} \equiv \frac{e_z P_\mu e_z^\dagger}{e_z e_z^\dagger} = m_\lambda c \hat{y}_\mu \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq d \quad (105)$$

where

$$m_\lambda = m \frac{K_{\nu+1}(2\lambda mc/\hbar)}{K_\nu(2\lambda mc/\hbar)}. \quad (106)$$

Remark 11 From the definition

$$K_\nu(z) = \int_0^\infty e^{-z \cosh s} \cosh(\nu s) ds \quad (107)$$

it follows that

$$z > 0 \Rightarrow \partial_\nu K_\nu(z) = \int_0^\infty e^{-z \cosh s} \sinh(\nu s) s ds > 0 \quad \forall \nu \geq 0 \quad (108)$$

hence by (106),

$$m_\lambda > m \quad \forall \lambda \geq 0, \quad (109)$$

and the *effective mass* m_λ of the particle in the $(2d+1)$ -dimensional *state space*

$$\mathcal{T}_+^\lambda = \{x - iy \in \mathcal{T}_+ : y^2 = \lambda^2\} \quad (110)$$

is greater than its ‘bare’ mass m . This is a *mass renormalization* effect due to the convexity of Ω_m and the fluctuations of the ray filter $R_y(p)$ (69) around its maximum value at p_y (82). ♣

Proposition 6 *The nonrelativistic limit of e_z at $t = 0$ is a Gaussian coherent state.*

Proof: Setting $c = \hbar = 1$, let

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \hat{y} = (\sqrt{1 + \mathbf{u}^2}, \mathbf{u}), & \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{y}/\lambda \\ v &= \hat{p} = (\sqrt{1 + \mathbf{v}^2}, \mathbf{v}), & \mathbf{v} &= \mathbf{p}/m \end{aligned}$$

and assume that y is nonrelativistic, i.e., $\mathbf{u}^2 \ll 1$. By Proposition 5, $e_z(p)$ is negligible unless p is also nonrelativistic, i.e., $\mathbf{v}^2 \ll 1$. Then

$$u \approx (1 + \mathbf{u}^2/2, \mathbf{u}) \quad v \approx (1 + \mathbf{v}^2/2, \mathbf{v})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} u \cdot v &\approx (1 + \mathbf{u}^2/2)(1 + \mathbf{v}^2/2) - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} \approx 1 + (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})^2/2 \\ x \cdot v &= t\sqrt{1 + \mathbf{v}^2} - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v} \approx t(1 + \mathbf{v}^2/2) - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v} \end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} e_z(p) &= e^{-\lambda m u \cdot v} \approx e^{-\lambda m} e^{i\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{p}} e^{-\lambda m (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})^2/2} \\ &\approx e^{-\lambda m} \exp \{it(m + \mathbf{p}^2/2m) - i\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{p} - (m\mathbf{y} - \lambda\mathbf{p})^2/2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

At $t = 0$, this is a coherent state with expected position and momentum

$$\langle \mathbf{X} \rangle_z = \mathbf{x}, \quad \langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_z = m\hat{\mathbf{y}}. \quad (112)$$

The nonrelativistic free-particle Hamiltonian $H = m + \mathbf{p}^2/2m$ propagates (111) to time t , where it no longer has a minimum uncertainty products. This is not surprising since the uncertainty products $\Delta_{X_k} \Delta_{P_k}$ is not a Lorentz scalar. ■

The states e_z are thus a relativistic generalization of the Gaussian coherent states. We call them *fundamental relativistic quantum states* or just *fundamental states* because e_z will be seen as a natural *quantization* of z (Remark 15). To see how close they are to being mutually orthogonal, we need the following property [4, Section 4.4], changed to agree with the present conventions:

$$\boxed{e_z e_{z'}^\dagger = (2\pi mc/\zeta)^\nu K_\nu(mc\zeta/\hbar), \quad \nu = \frac{d-1}{2}} \quad (113)$$

where K_ν is a modified Bessel function of the second kind and

$$\zeta \equiv \sqrt{-w^2} \quad (114)$$




Figure 3: *Left*: Plot of $(\operatorname{Re} K(w))^2$ with $d = 3$ and $w = z' - \bar{z} = (t - i\lambda, x^1, 0, 0)$. *Right*: Plot of $|K(z)|^2$ with the same parameters. The quadrature complement $(\operatorname{Im} K(z))^2$ has similar oscillations with offset phases, making the sum on the right smooth. Compare with the level surfaces \mathcal{B}_σ and \mathcal{W}_τ in (51). As illustrated in Figure 4, the parameter λm controls the *directivity* of the beam. Here we chose $\lambda m = 1$, making the beam sufficiently wide to show the wave fronts (left).

is the complex length (26) of the interval

$$w = z' - \bar{z} = (x' - x) - i(y' + y) \in \mathcal{T}_+. \quad (115)$$

Thus \mathcal{T}_+ can be interpreted as an *extended classical phase space* for the particle. Since $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{T}_+ = 2D$ and the classical phase space of a single particle in d space dimensions has dimension $2d = 2D - 2$, what are the two extra dimensions in \mathcal{T}_+ ? Clearly, one is the *time* $t = x^0$. The other is λ , which may be called the *directivity* (Proposition 5) or *squeezing parameter* (Figure 4) of the fundamental states e_z .

Classical phase spaces are thus submanifolds of \mathcal{T}_+ given by specifying t and λ . More generally, choose a *spacelike* submanifold of M of codimension one, say

$$\Sigma = \{x \in M : s(x) = 0\}, \quad (116)$$




Figure 4: The variable $\lambda = \sqrt{y^2}$ acts as a *relativistic squeezing parameter* for the states e_z since it controls the *directivity* of $K(w)$. On the left is a plot of $|K(w)|^2$ with $\lambda m = 0.1\hbar$. On the right, a plot of the same function with $\lambda m = 20\hbar$.

whose normal vector $n_\mu(x) = \partial_\mu s(x)$ is timelike:⁷

$$n_\mu(x)n^\mu(x) > 0. \quad (117)$$

In general, what we shall call a *covariant classical phase space* then has the form

$$\Gamma \equiv \Gamma_{s,\lambda} = \{x - iy \in \mathcal{T}_+ : s(x) = 0, y^2 = \lambda^2\} = \Sigma - i\Omega_\lambda \quad (118)$$

where Σ is a covariant configuration space (117) and

$$\Omega_\lambda = \{y \in V_+ : y^2 = \lambda^2\} \quad (119)$$

is a relativistic ‘momentum space’ within \mathcal{T}_+ . To complete the picture, we need a *symplectic form* on Γ which must be Lorentz-invariant in order to give invariant inner products in \mathcal{K} . The cleanest way to do this is to begin with the invariant 2-form [4]

$$\omega = dx_\mu \wedge dy^\mu. \quad (120)$$

⁷A more careful analysis [4] shows that n need only be *nowhere spacelike*, i.e., $n_\mu(x)n^\mu(x) \geq 0$.

A Lorentz-invariant measure on Γ is obtained from the $(2d)$ -form

$$\omega^d \equiv \omega \wedge \omega \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega = d! \widehat{dx}^\mu \wedge \widehat{dy}_\mu \quad (121)$$

where $\widehat{dx}^\mu \sim dx/dx_\mu$ is a d -form in M with dx_μ missing and $\widehat{dy}_\mu \sim dy/dy^\mu$ is a d -form in V_+ with dy^μ missing; see [4].

Note that when $s(x) = x^0 \equiv t$, then $dx_0 = 0$ and $\omega^d/d!$ reduces to the differential form associated with the usual *Liouville measure* on the classical phase space:

$$s(x) = t \Rightarrow \omega^d/d! \mapsto d^d \mathbf{x} \wedge d^d \mathbf{y}. \quad (122)$$

Hence we define the *relativistic Liouville measure* as the $(2d)$ -form on \mathcal{T}_+ given by

$$\boxed{d\gamma(z) \equiv N\omega^d/d!} \quad (123)$$

where the normalization constant N is explained in Proposition 7. Liouville measures covariant with individual phase spaces Γ will be obtained by *restricting* $d\gamma(z)$.

Definition 3 *The inner product in \mathcal{K} with Γ as phase space is*

$$(\psi_1 \psi_2^\dagger)_\Gamma = \int_\Gamma d\gamma(z) \psi_1(z) \psi_2(z)^*. \quad (124)$$

By the polarization identity, it suffices to deal with the norm

$$\|\psi\|_\Gamma^2 = \int_\Gamma d\gamma(z) \rho(z) \quad \text{where} \quad \rho(z) = |\psi(z)|^2. \quad (125)$$

Proposition 7 *Let Γ be a covariant classical phase space of the form (118). Then for an appropriate choice of N (see [K94]), we have the ‘Plancherel theorem’*

$$\|\psi\|_\Gamma^2 = \|a\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (126)$$

In particular, $\|\psi\|_\Gamma^2$ is independent of Γ and we may write

$$\|\psi\|^2 = \int_\Gamma d\gamma(z) |\psi(z)|^2 \quad \forall \Gamma. \quad (127)$$

This is proved in [4], first when Σ is a flat time-slice as in (122), i.e.,

$$\|\psi\|_\Gamma^2 = N \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} d^d \mathbf{x} d^d \mathbf{y} \rho(z). \quad (128)$$

The integral on the right is of the Liouville type, given the linear relationship (82) between \hat{y} and the momentum p_y . For general Γ , we use the fact that the ‘momentum space’ Ω_λ is a *boundary*:

$$\Omega_\lambda = -\partial B_\lambda \quad \text{where} \quad B_\lambda = \{y \in V_+ : y^2 > \lambda^2\} \quad (129)$$

where the minus sign indicates the orientation of Ω_λ toward the convex side of the paraboloid. The contribution from $\lambda = \infty$ vanishes due to the factor $e^{-y \cdot p/\hbar}$ in the integrand. Stokes’ theorem then gives

$$\int_{\Omega_\lambda} \widehat{dy}_\mu \rho(z) = - \int_{B_\lambda} dy \frac{\partial \rho(z)}{\partial y^\mu} \quad (130)$$

and so

$$\|\psi\|_\Gamma^2 = -N \int_\Sigma \widehat{dx}^\mu \int_{B_\lambda} dy \frac{\partial \rho(z)}{\partial y^\mu}. \quad (131)$$

Choose a volume $W \subset M$ bounded by two configuration spaces Σ_1, Σ_2 so that

$$\partial W = \Sigma_2 - \Sigma_1 \quad (132)$$

and the corresponding phase spaces are

$$\Gamma_1 = \Sigma_1 - i\Omega_\lambda \quad \Gamma_2 = \Sigma_2 - i\Omega_\lambda. \quad (133)$$

Then a second application of Stokes’ theorem gives

$$\|\psi\|_{\Gamma_2}^2 - \|\psi\|_{\Gamma_1}^2 = -N \int_W dx \int_{B_\lambda} dy \frac{\partial^2 \rho(z)}{\partial x_\mu \partial y^\mu}. \quad (134)$$

Since $\square_z \rho(z) = (\square_z \psi) \bar{\psi} = -(m/\hbar)^2 \rho(z)$, it follows that

$$\frac{\partial^2 \rho(z)}{\partial x_\mu \partial y^\mu} = i(\bar{\partial}^\mu + \partial^\mu)(\bar{\partial}_\mu - \partial_\mu) \rho(z) = i(\bar{\square}_z - \square_z) \rho = 0, \quad (135)$$

proving that $\|\psi\|_\Gamma^2$ is independent of Γ as claimed in (126). ■

The above proof is not rigorous because it disregards ‘leaks’ that may occur in the integrals (134) at spatial infinity. For a rigorous proof, see [4].

Definition 4 *The microlocal current $j_\mu(z)$ in \mathcal{T}_+ and the local current $J_\mu(x)$ in M generated by $\rho(z) = |\psi(z)|^2$ are given by*

$$\boxed{j_\mu(z) = -N \frac{\partial \rho(z)}{\partial y^\mu} \quad J_\mu(x) \equiv \int_{B_\lambda} dy j_\mu(x - iy).} \quad (136)$$

They can be expressed in terms of $\psi(z)$ as

$$j_\mu(z) = -2N \operatorname{Im} (\partial_\mu \psi(z) \cdot \psi(z)^*) = iN \psi(z) \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_\mu \psi(z)^* \quad (137)$$

where

$$\psi_1 \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_\mu \psi_2^* \equiv (\partial_\mu \psi_1) \psi_2^* - \psi_1 \partial_\mu \psi_2^*. \quad (138)$$

By (135), both currents are conserved in M , i.e., with respect to variations of Σ :

$$\frac{\partial j_\mu(x-iy)}{\partial x_\mu} = \frac{\partial J_\mu(x)}{\partial x_\mu} = 0. \quad (139)$$

This makes

$$\|\psi\|^2 = \int_\Sigma \widehat{dx}^\mu J_\mu(x) = \int_\Sigma \widehat{dx}^\mu \int_{B_\lambda} dy j_\mu(x-iy) \quad (140)$$

the total “charge” of the conserved current $J_\mu(x)$ over Σ , as well as that of $j_\mu(z)$ over $\Sigma \times B_\lambda$. Being conserved, this “charge” is independent of Σ and B_λ , which enables us to drop the subscript on $\|\psi\|^2$.

Remark 12 Covariant Born Rule: The fact that the norm

$$\|\psi\|^2 = \int_\Gamma d\gamma(z) |\psi(z)|^2 = \|a\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \quad (141)$$

is independent of Γ proves that $|\psi(z)|^2$ acts as the probability density for every covariant phase space. ♣

Remark 13 Resolution of Unity in terms of the fundamental states:

Expressing (141) as

$$\psi \psi^\dagger = \int_\Gamma d\gamma(z) \psi e_z^\dagger e_z \psi^\dagger \quad (142)$$

and peeling away the factors ψ and ψ^\dagger gives the operator equation

$$\int_\Gamma d\gamma(z) e_z^\dagger e_z = I \quad (143)$$

for all Γ of the form (118), where I is the identity operator on \mathcal{H} . This is a relativistic version of the standard resolution of unity in terms of Gaussian coherent states. ♣

Remark 14 By the Resolution of Unity (143),

$$\psi(z') = ae_{z'}^\dagger = \int_{\Gamma} d\gamma(z) ae_z^\dagger e_z e_{z'}^\dagger = \int_{\Gamma} d\gamma(z) \psi(z) K(z' - \bar{z}). \quad (144)$$

If $z' \in \Gamma$, this is a *reproducing property* generalizing that of Gaussian coherent states. If $z' \notin \Gamma$, then z' is either in the future ($z' > \Gamma$) or past ($z' < \Gamma$) of Γ and (144) propagates ψ from Γ to z' . Thus K is a combination of *reproducing kernel* and *propagator* for \mathcal{K} . ♣

Remark 15 *Quantization of \mathcal{T}_+* . The mapping

$$Q: \mathcal{T}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, \quad z \mapsto e_z \quad (145)$$

sends the extended *classical* state z to the *quantum* state e_z , so it may be viewed as a ‘quantization’ of \mathcal{T}_+ . Figures 3 and 4 show the behavior of the reproducing kernel $K(w)$, $w = z' - \bar{z}$, which measures of the *correlation* between $e_{z'}$ and e_z . ♣

3.3 The Thermodynamics of a Single Quantum Particle

The density matrix of a quantum-mechanical canonical ensemble, representing a system in thermal equilibrium with a heat bath at absolute temperature T , is⁸

$$\rho = Z^{-1} e^{-\beta H} \quad \text{where} \quad \beta = T^{-1} \quad (146)$$

where H is the system’s Hamiltonian operator and

$$Z = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H} \quad (147)$$

is the *partition function*. The *thermal expectation value* of an operator A is

$$\langle A \rangle = \text{Tr} (A\rho) = Z^{-1} \text{Tr} (Ae^{-\beta H}). \quad (148)$$

Formally, it is possible to build a statistical thermodynamics of a single relativistic particle. For the massive scalar under consideration, the main thermodynamic potentials of the probability distribution $\rho(z)$ are:

1. The *internal energy* U of the system

$$U \equiv \langle H \rangle = Z^{-1} \langle e^{-\beta H} H \rangle = -Z^{-1} \partial_{\beta} Z = -\partial_{\beta} \ln Z. \quad (149)$$

⁸We take Boltzmann’s constant $k_B = 1$, so that T has units of energy.

2. The *entropy*

$$S \equiv -\langle \ln \rho \rangle = -\text{Tr}(\rho \ln \rho). \quad (150)$$

By (146),

$$-\ln \rho = \Phi + \beta H$$

where

$$\Phi = \ln Z \quad (151)$$

is known as the *Massieu potential* or *Helmholtz free entropy*. Thus

$$S = \Phi + \beta U = \ln Z - \beta \partial_\beta \ln Z. \quad (152)$$

3. The *Helmholtz free energy*

$$F = U - TS = -\beta^{-1} \ln Z. \quad (153)$$

But what is the classical ensemble leading to the above potentials?

Let us compute (148) using the trace formula

$$\text{Tr} B = \int_\Gamma d\gamma(z) \bar{B}(z) \quad (154)$$

where $\bar{B}(z)$ is the expectation value of B in e_z :

$$\bar{B}(z) = \frac{e_z B e_z^\dagger}{e_z e_z^\dagger}. \quad (155)$$

$$\text{Tr}(Ae^{-\beta H}) = \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H/2} A e^{-\beta H/2}) = \int_\Gamma d\gamma(z) e_z e^{-\beta H/2} A e^{-\beta H/2} e_z^\dagger. \quad (156)$$

To keep this covariant, choose a unit vector $u \in V_+$ representing a possible time axis $\mathbb{R}u$ and let

$$H = u \cdot p, \quad (157)$$

so that $u = (1, \mathbf{0})$ gives the usual energy. By (101),

$$e_z e^{-\beta H/2}(p) = e^{(i\bar{z}-\vartheta) \cdot p/\hbar} = e_{z-i\vartheta} \quad (158)$$

where

$$\vartheta \equiv \frac{1}{2} \hbar \beta u. \quad (159)$$

Since the the magnitude $\frac{1}{2} \hbar \beta$ of ϑ gives the “equilibrium temperature” and its spacetime direction u gives the “equilibrium frame,” we call ϑ the *thermal vector*.

Theorem 1 *The thermal expectation $\langle A \rangle$ can be expressed entirely in terms of integrals over $z \in \Gamma$ for any phase space $\Gamma = \Sigma - i\Omega_\lambda \subset \mathcal{T}_+$:*

$$\boxed{\langle A \rangle(\vartheta) = \tilde{Z}(\vartheta)^{-1} \int_{\Gamma} d\gamma(z) \tilde{A}(z - i\vartheta)} \quad (160)$$

where

$$\tilde{A}(z) = e_z A e_z^\dagger \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{Z}(\vartheta) = \int_{\Gamma} d\gamma(z) \|e_{z-i\vartheta}\|^2. \quad (161)$$

Proof: (160) follows from (156) and (158); $\tilde{Z}(\vartheta)$ is a special case with $A = I$. ■

Note that the *thermal translation*

$$z \mapsto z - i\vartheta = x - i(y + \vartheta) \quad (162)$$

is *internal*: it leaves x invariant while dragging y further away from the origin. For given $\vartheta \neq 0$ (i.e., $T < \infty$), the thermal translation (162) breaks Lorentz symmetry as it selects a preferred equilibrium frame through $u \in V_+$. That symmetry is restored if we allow \mathcal{G}_0 to act on the set thermal expectations in all equilibrium frames by

$$\langle A \rangle U(\Lambda)(\vartheta) = \langle A \rangle(\vartheta\Lambda). \quad (163)$$

Remark 16 *Theorem 1 answers the question posed in (??):*

Every phase-space element $z \in \Gamma$ in (160) represents a unique *classical phase space trajectory* of the particle in \mathcal{T}_+ , and the integral $\int_{\Gamma} d\gamma(z)$ sums over all these trajectories. The ensemble average is independent of the phase space Γ , as it must be since each Γ intersects every classical trajectory exactly once and $d\gamma(z)$ is \mathcal{G}_0 -invariant. This proves that $\langle A \rangle$ depends on the *trajectories* and not their individual points. *These trajectories, then, are the microstates of our ensemble.* ♣

Remark 17 Remark 16 supports the suggestion made in Remark 8 of a fresh approach to *relativistic Bohmian Mechanics* where $\psi(z)$ is a pilot wave guiding classical relativistic particles along phase-space trajectories following the conserved microlocal current $j_\mu(z)$. I hope to elaborate on this elsewhere. ♣

4 Interactions through Holomorphic Gauge Theory

So far we have dealt exclusively with a single, free particle. The requirement that free wave functions be holomorphic would seem to make it difficult to introduce interactions through potentials as done in the nonrelativistic theory. We shall instead introduce them through a method we call *Holomorphic Gauge Theory* [3].

The probability density $\rho(z) = |\psi(z)|^2$ and the microlocal current $j_\mu(z)$ (136) are invariant under *global* gauge transformations $\psi(z) \mapsto \psi(z)\chi$, where χ is constant with $|\chi| \equiv 1$. But they are not invariant under *microlocal* gauge transformations, where χ is a holomorphic function of $z \in \mathcal{T}_+$, because then

$$|\chi(z)| \equiv 1 \Rightarrow \chi(z) = \text{constant}. \quad (164)$$

To correct this, we introduce a *fiber metric*⁹ $g(z) > 0$ into the Hilbert space \mathcal{K} , so that the norm¹⁰ (141) becomes

$$\|\psi\|_{\Gamma}^2 = \int_{\Gamma} d\gamma(z) \rho_g(z) \quad (165)$$

where

$$\rho_g(z) = \psi(z)g(z)\psi(z)^*. \quad (166)$$

This is microlocally gauge invariant if and only if $g(z)$ absorbs the factor $\chi(z)$ and its conjugate:

$$\psi'(z) = \psi(z)\chi(z), \quad g'(z) = \chi(z)^{-1}g(z)(\chi(z)^*)^{-1} \Rightarrow \rho'(z) = \rho(z). \quad (167)$$

The same conservation law (135) making the free norm (141) microlocally gauge invariant makes (166) invariant. Since $\bar{\partial}_\mu \psi(z) = 0$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 \rho_g(z)}{\partial x_\mu \partial y^\mu} &= i(\bar{\partial}^\mu + \partial^\mu)(\bar{\partial}_\mu - \partial_\mu)\rho_g(z) = i(\bar{\square}_z - \square_z)(\psi g \psi^\dagger) \\ &= i\psi \bar{\square}_z (g \psi^\dagger) - i(\square_z \psi g)\psi^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (168)$$

A necessary and sufficient condition for conservation of probability is therefore

$$\square_z(\psi(z)g(z)) = \psi(z)M(z), \quad \text{where } M(z) = M(z)^*. \quad (169)$$

To find the gauge potential and its gauge field, use the exterior derivative

$$d = dx^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} + dy^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} = dz^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial z^\mu} + d\bar{z}^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^\mu} = \partial + \bar{\partial} \quad (170)$$

where ∂ and $\bar{\partial}$ are the holomorphic and antiholomorphic exterior derivatives, with

$$\partial^2 = \bar{\partial}^2 = \partial\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}\partial = 0. \quad (171)$$

⁹Note that unless it is constant, $g(z)$ cannot be holomorphic because it is required to be positive.

¹⁰There is no loss of generality in considering the norm (141) instead of the inner product (124).

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\psi g \psi^*) &= (\partial\psi)g\psi^* + \psi(\partial g + \bar{\partial}g)\psi^* + \psi g \bar{\partial}\psi^* \\
&= [\partial\psi + \psi\partial g \cdot g^{-1}]g\psi^* + \psi g[\partial\psi + \psi\partial g \cdot g^{-1}]^* \\
&= (\mathcal{D}\psi)g\psi^* + \psi g(\mathcal{D}\psi)^*
\end{aligned} \tag{172}$$

where \mathcal{D} is the *covariant exterior derivative*

$$\mathcal{D}\psi(z) = \partial\psi(z) + \psi(z)A(z) \tag{173}$$

with the minimally coupled vector-potential 1-form

$$A(z) = (\partial g)g^{-1} = \partial \ln g. \tag{174}$$

The *gauge field* is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
F(z) &= dA(z) + A(z) \wedge A(z) \\
&= \bar{\partial}A(z) + \partial A(z) + A(z) \wedge A(z).
\end{aligned} \tag{175}$$

The second and third terms vanish since $A = \partial \ln g$ is exact and $A \wedge A = -A \wedge A$ for a scalar 1-form A . Hence the gauge field is *linear* in the potential:

$$F(z) = \bar{\partial}A(z) = \bar{\partial}\partial \ln g. \tag{176}$$

We have thus formulated the electromagnetic field as a holomorphic gauge theory. Note that $\ln g(z)$ is a scalar ‘superpotential’ from which the vector potential A is derived via (174); this would be impossible in the real Minkowski space M .

Remark 18 For particles with internal symmetry, the scalar gauge theory extends to a vector gauge theory where the fiber metric $g(z)$ is a Hermitian $n \times n$ matrix and A is a matrix-valued 1-form. A remarkable fact about holomorphic gauge theory is that the linearity (176) survives the transition from scalar to vector gauge theory due to a integrability condition satisfied by A [3]. ♣

Remark 19 Holomorphic gauge theory suggests a natural synthesis of gauge theory and gravity. The latter uses a metric defined on tangent spaces, while the former uses a metric in the space of quantum states. ♣

In Part II of this series we study fiber metrics $g(z)$ modeling physical systems.

Acknowledgement

I thank Sheldon Goldstein for inspiring conversations about Bohmian Mechanics.

References

- [1] D Dürr, S Goldstein, and N Zanghì, Quantum equilibrium and the origin of absolute uncertainty. *J Stat Phys* **67**, 843–907 (1992).
- [2] P R Holland, *The Quantum Theory of Motion*. Cambridge University Press, 1993. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01049004>
- [3] G Kaiser, Phase-space approach to relativistic quantum mechanics. III. Quantization, relativity, localization and gauge freedom. *J. Math. Phys.* **22**, 705 (1981). <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.524962>
- [4] G Kaiser, *Quantum Physics, Relativity, and Complex Spacetime: Towards a New Synthesis*. North Holland, 1990. <https://arxiv.org/abs/0910.0352>
- [5] G Kaiser, Complex-distance potential theory and hyperbolic equations, in *Clifford Analysis*, J. Ryan and W. Sprössig, eds., Birkhäuser, Boston, 2000. <https://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/9908031>
- [6] R F Streater and A S Wightman, *PCT, Spin and Statistics, and All That*. Princeton University Press, 2001