

A Mathematical Definition of Path Integrals on Symplectic Manifolds

Joshua Lackman*

Abstract

We give a mathematical definition of some path integrals, emphasizing those relevant to the quantization of symplectic manifolds (and more generally, Poisson manifolds) — in particular, the coherent state path integral. We show that Kähler manifolds provide many computable examples.

Contents

0	Introduction	2
1	The Simplest Case	3
1.1	Definition of the Path Integral	3
1.2	The Hilbert space and Path Integral – Operator Correspondence	5
1.3	Example: Conventional Quantum Mechanics	7
1.4	Relation to Deformation Quantization and Special Observables	7
1.4.1	Special Observables	7
1.4.2	Deformation Quantization	8
1.5	Non-Uniqueness of Primitives	8
1.6	The Derivative of the Measure on Paths	8
1.7	Extending the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus to Path Measures	8
2	The General Case: The Propagator of Symplectic Manifolds	9
2.1	Relation to Kontsevich’s Work, the Poisson Sigma Model and Weinstein’s Program	12
3	A New Look at the Riemann Integral	12
3.1	The One-Dimensional Case	12
3.2	Integration Over Non-Differentiable Paths	13
3.3	Differentiating Path Measures to Differential Forms	14
4	More Examples From Kähler Manifolds	15
4.1	Surfaces of Constant Curvature	15
5	Relation to Geometric Quantization	17
Appendix		18
.1	The van Est map and Riemann Sums on Manifolds	18
References		19

*josh@pku.edu.cn

0 Introduction

We discuss a mathematical definition of some path integrals, particularly those relevant to the quantization of symplectic manifolds (M, ω) , such as

$$\langle m_1 | m_0 \rangle = \int_{\gamma(0)=m_0}^{\gamma(1)=m_1} \mathcal{D}\gamma e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^1 \gamma^* \nabla}, \quad (0.0.1)$$

$$(f \star g)(m) = \int_{X(\infty)=m} \mathcal{D}X e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{D^2} X^* \omega} f(X(1))g(X(0)), \quad (0.0.2)$$

for $m_0, m_1, m \in M$. In eq. (0.0.1), ∇ is the connection on the prequantum line bundle and the integrand should be interpreted as parallel transport from the vector space over m_0 to the vector space over m_1 .¹ Computing this path integral *immediately* produces a quantization, ie. a good Hilbert space and quantization map defined on all classical observables, as explained in section 1, section 2. We suggest that computing it is equivalent to finding a propagator satisfying definition 2.0.1. In eq. (0.0.2), the integral is over maps from the disk into M , where $0, 1, \infty$ are points on the boundary of the disk. Equation (0.0.2) naturally generalizes to Poisson manifolds. Kähler manifolds produce many computable examples, and as such this is related to Toeplitz quantization [3], as discussed in [5].

Equation (0.0.1) is sometimes called the coherent state path integral (or phase space path integral) and Daubechies, Klauder in [6], [12] computed it on surfaces of constant curvature using Brownian motion — see section 4.1, where we also discuss the issue of uniqueness.² In some sense it is the most natural and mathematically well-behaved form of quantization, and as we will discuss, it is closely related to the different geometric and deformation quantization programs, [25], [26], [15], [8]. In particular, eq. (0.0.2) is closely related to the Poisson sigma model, see [4] remark 3, and [2] equation (3.39). Also see [10].

The idea is that we can compute eq. (0.0.1) by finding a function on $M \times M$ with the right derivative. We will not prove any very general existence theorems, but we do obtain well-defined existence and uniqueness questions. This paper is largely a continuation of [18], where we formalized the procedure of putting a path integral on a lattice, in a wide class of cases (eg. for path integrals over spaces of maps between manifolds). That paper describes a path integral construction analogous to the construction of the Riemann integral via Riemann sums, eg. Feynman’s construction of the path integral. This paper, on the other hand, focuses on the path integral analogue of the fundamental theorem of calculus.

Idea:

The definition we give is simple, and to understand it we will begin with an analogy with the definition of antiderivatives, which will lead us into eq. (1.1.2), 1.1.3:

Let $f dx$ be a 1-form on \mathbb{R} . An antiderivative is normally said to be a function F such that $dF = f dx$. However, an antiderivative can be equivalently defined as a function

$$F : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad (0.0.3)$$

which satisfies the following two conditions:

$$F(x, z) + F(z, y) = F(x, y), \quad (0.0.4)$$

$$\partial_y F(x, y)|_{y=x} = f(x). \quad (0.0.5)$$

¹Implicit in this notation is a choice of orthonormal bases of the vector spaces over m_0, m_1 . We have written it this way to be consistent with the physics literature, eg. equation (2.7) of [9]. See section 2 for the definition.

²It was more generally computed on Kähler manifolds in [5] — when we say it was computed, we mean a reasonable value was assigned to it. A general definition isn’t given.

The fundamental theorem of calculus says that $F(x, y) = \int_x^y df$.

Suppose that we want to find such an antiderivative. In order to compute it, we can first choose *any* function F satisfying eq. (0.0.5), ignoring eq. (0.0.4). We can then triangulate the interval $[x, y]$ with vertices $x = x_0 < \dots < x_n = y$ and consider the sum

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} F(x_i, x_{i+1}). \quad (0.0.6)$$

This gives an approximation to $\int_x^y df$, whose limit over subdivisions converges to $\int_x^y df$. The traditional choices for F are the ones giving the left-point and right-point Riemann sums:

$$F(x, y) = f(x)(y - x), \quad (0.0.7)$$

$$F(x, y) = f(y)(y - x). \quad (0.0.8)$$

However, any choice of smooth F satisfying eq. (0.0.5) will do, see proposition 3.1.1. This gives a notion of Riemann sum which behaves well with respect to pullbacks, which is needed for the path integral. We can think of a path integral as an antiderivative of a differential form in a different category — a category of complex measures. Feynman’s way of computing them is the analogue of taking a limit of Riemann sums.

Note that, we can replace the additive structure used in eq. (0.0.4) with a multiplicative structure:

$$F(x, z)F(z, y) = F(x, y), \quad (0.0.9)$$

$$\partial_y \log F(x, y)|_{y=x} = f(x), \quad (0.0.10)$$

$$F(x, x) = 1. \quad (0.0.11)$$

However, this doesn’t really give anything different, but we do get something different if we only ask that eq. (0.0.9) holds “on average”. This leads us to the path integral.

Remark 0.0.1. *Stated differently, an antiderivative of $f dx$ is a 1-cocycle F on the pair groupoid*

$$\text{Pair } \mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R} \quad (0.0.12)$$

such that $VE_0(F) = f dx$, where VE_0 is the van Est map. See appendix .1.

1 The Simplest Case

1.1 Definition of the Path Integral

Let $(M, d\mu)$ be a manifold with a measure $d\mu$ and consider a purely imaginary 1-form $i\omega$. Let

$$\Omega : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad (1.1.1)$$

be a smooth function, considered as an integral kernel with respect to $d\mu$. Suppose that Ω satisfies the following four conditions (compare with eq. (0.0.4), 0.0.5): for all $(x, y) \in M \times M$,

$$\int_M \Omega(x, z)\Omega(z, y) d\mu(z) = \Omega(x, y), \quad (1.1.2)$$

$$d_y \log \Omega(x, y)|_{y=x} = i\omega|_x, \quad (1.1.3)$$

$$\Omega(x, x) = 1, \quad (1.1.4)$$

$$\overline{\Omega(x, y)} = \Omega(y, x). \quad (1.1.5)$$

The first condition says that the convolution $\Omega * \Omega = \Omega$, and this is one of the defining properties of a (time-independent) propagator;³ d_y is the exterior derivative in the second factor; the additional third and fourth conditions are normalization and reversal of orientation properties.⁴ Together with eq. (1.1.2), they imply that

$$\int_M |\Omega(x, y)|^2 d\mu(y) = 1. \quad (1.1.6)$$

The first property can be thought of as a cocycle condition on the pair groupoid $\text{Pair } M$, and the second condition says that $VE_0(\log \Omega) = i\omega$, where VE_0 is the van Est map, see appendix .1 (note that, Ω is non-zero on a neighborhood of the identity bisection).

Definition 1.1.1. *If Ω satisfies the previous four conditions, then we say that Ω integrates $i\omega$ (as a propagator), or that Ω differentiates to $i\omega$.*

$\Omega(x, y)$ should be thought of as the amplitude of a particle beginning at x to end at y .⁵ To understand in what sense Ω is a path integral, suppose that

$$\Omega(x, y) = e^{S(x, y)}. \quad (1.1.7)$$

Using eq. (1.1.2), we have that

$$\Omega(x, y) = \underbrace{(\Omega * \dots * \Omega)}_{n \text{ times}}(x, y), \quad (1.1.8)$$

hence

$$e^{S(x, y)} = \int_{M^{n-1}} e^{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} S(x_k, x_{k+1})} d\mu(x_1) \dots d\mu(x_{n-1}). \quad (1.1.9)$$

Now pick a smooth path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ and pick a triangulation $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_n = 1$ of $[0, 1]$. Due to eq. (1.1.3) (see proposition 3.1.1), we have that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} S(\gamma(t_k), \gamma(t_{k+1})) \xrightarrow{\Delta t_k \rightarrow 0} i \int_0^1 \gamma^* \omega. \quad (1.1.10)$$

Hence, taking $n \rightarrow \infty$ in eq. (1.1.9), we can formally say that

$$\Omega(x, y) = \int_{\gamma(0)=x}^{\gamma(1)=y} e^{i \int_0^1 \gamma^* \omega} \mathcal{D}\gamma. \quad (1.1.11)$$

Now, if we ignore condition eq. (1.1.2), then the limit of the right side of eq. (1.1.9) is essentially Feynman's method of defining eq. (1.1.11), which is made precise by the lattice construction given in [18]. Formally then, the right side of eq. (1.1.9) is a Riemann sum with the algebraic property of eq. (0.0.4) replaced by eq. (1.1.2) (of course, we have to understand Riemann sums more generally to make this statement, see section 3).

By the complex version of Komolgorov's extension theorem (A.2 of [21]), such an Ω defines a complex measure on the space of paths $[0, 1] \rightarrow M$, though a priori this measure is concentrated on all paths (including discontinuous ones).⁶ We can denote this measure by

$$e^{i \int_0^1 \gamma^* \omega} \mathcal{D}\gamma. \quad (1.1.12)$$

³See remark 1.1.2 for a comment on the time-dependent case.

⁴These condition is automatically satisfied by iF , where F satisfies eq. (0.0.4) and with the multiplicative structure replaced by the additive structure.

⁵With a zero Hamiltonian.

⁶One should be able to modify the measurable space so that this measure is concentrated on a smaller set of discontinuous paths. A relevant discussion is in Berezin [1].

Most of the observables in quantum theory are given by correlation functions and are of the form

$$\int_{\gamma(0)=x}^{\gamma(1)=y} f_1(\gamma(t_1)) \cdots f_n(\gamma(t_n)) e^{i \int_0^1 \gamma^* \omega} \mathcal{D}\gamma, \quad (1.1.13)$$

for some functions $f_1, \dots, f_n : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n \in (0, 1)$. This is equal to

$$\int_{M^n} f_1(x_1) \cdots f_n(x_n) \Omega(x, x_1) \cdots \Omega(x_n, y) d\mu(x_1) \dots d\mu(x_n).^7 \quad (1.1.14)$$

Remark 1.1.2. *In the time-dependent case, eg. for Brownian motion or a non-zero Hamiltonian, eq. (1.1.2) is replaced by*

$$\int_M \Omega_{t_0, t_1}(x, z) \Omega_{t_1, t_2}(z, y) \omega_z^n = \Omega_{t_0, t_2}(x, y). \quad (1.1.15)$$

1.2 The Hilbert space and Path Integral – Operator Correspondence

This section puts the work of [12] into general context. We can use a non-trivial line bundle with Hermitian form rather than the trivial one, and we will do this in the next section.

From Ω we get the following sesquilinear form⁸ on $L^2(M, d\mu)$:

$$\langle \Psi_1 | \Psi_2 \rangle := \int_{M \times M} \overline{\Psi_1(y)} \Psi_2(x) \Omega(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y), \quad (1.2.1)$$

which we assume is bounded (this is automatic if $\mu(M) < \infty$). The Riesz representation theorem gives an equivalence between bounded sesquilinear forms and bounded linear operators on Hilbert spaces, and the corresponding operator is given by

$$\hat{\Omega} \Psi(x) = \int_M \Psi(y) \Omega(y, x) d\mu(y). \quad (1.2.2)$$

That is, given a sesquilinear form $A(\cdot, \cdot)$ on a Hilbert space $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$, there is a unique linear operator Q such that

$$A(\Psi_1, \Psi_2) = \langle \Psi_1, Q \Psi_2 \rangle. \quad (1.2.3)$$

The conditions assumed on Ω imply that $\hat{\Omega}$ is an orthogonal projection, ie. $\hat{\Omega}^2 = \hat{\Omega}$ and $\hat{\Omega}^* = \hat{\Omega}$, from which it follows that

$$\langle \Psi_1 | \Psi_2 \rangle \geq 0. \quad (1.2.4)$$

Definition 1.2.1. *The space of physical states (or quantum states), denoted $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, is the $\lambda = 1$ eigenspace of $\hat{\Omega}$.*

On $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, eq. (1.2.1) agrees with the $L^2(M, d\mu)$ -inner product. This eigenspace is analogous to a space of complex polarized sections of a prequantum line bundle, and we can identify it with $L^2(M, d\mu) / \sim$, where $\Psi_1 \sim \Psi_2$ if $\hat{\Omega}(\Psi_1) = \hat{\Omega}(\Psi_2)$.

⁷Presently, we are only considering time-independent propagators (or equal-time propagators) hence the values of t_1, \dots, t_n don't affect the result.

⁸We assume linearity in the second component.

Such an Ω is sometimes called a reproducing kernel.⁹ $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ has the special property that point-wise evaluation is a bounded linear functional, since by the definition of $\hat{\Omega}$, for $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$

$$|\Psi(x)| \leq \|\Omega\| \|\Psi\|_{L^2} \quad (1.2.5)$$

for all $x \in M$. Therefore, by the Riesz representation theorem, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ has “delta functions” for each point $x \in M$, denoted $|x\rangle$. That is, if $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, then there are genuine states $|x\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ such that

$$\langle x|\Psi\rangle = \Psi(x) . \quad (1.2.6)$$

Definition 1.2.2. *The states $\{|x\rangle\}_{x \in M}$ are the coherent states*

Coherent states form an overcomplete basis of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, in the sense that they are linearly dependent.

It follows from the definition of $|x\rangle$, eq. (1.2.1) and the fact that for each $y \in M$, $\Omega(x, y) \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, that

$$\langle y|x\rangle = \Omega(x, y) , \quad (1.2.7)$$

where $\langle y|$ is the dual linear functional of $|y\rangle$.

Definition 1.2.3. *There is a quantization map*

$$L^\infty(M, d\mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(L^2(M, d\mu)) , \quad f \mapsto \hat{f} \quad (1.2.8)$$

given by associating to each f the following sesquilinear form:

$$(\Psi_1, \Psi_2) \mapsto \int_{M^3} \overline{\Psi_1(z)} \Psi_2(x) f(y) \Omega(x, y) \Omega(y, z) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) d\mu(z) . \quad (1.2.9)$$

This is the “matrix element” of the observable $\gamma \mapsto f(\gamma(t))$ determined by the path integral (for any $t \in (0, 1)$) and is given by

$$\int_{M \times M} \left[\int_{\gamma(0)=x}^{\gamma(1)=y} f(\gamma(t)) e^{i \int_0^1 \gamma^* \omega} \mathcal{D}\gamma \right] \overline{\Psi_1(y)} \Psi_2(x) d\mu(y) d\mu(x) . \quad (1.2.10)$$

Explicitly,

$$\hat{f}\Psi(x) = \int_{M^2} \Psi(z) f(y) \Omega(z, y) \Omega(y, x) d\mu(z) d\mu(y) . \quad (1.2.11)$$

To be clear, the correspondence between the path integral and the operator formulations is an instance of the correspondence determined by the Riesz representation theorem between sesquilinear forms and operators.¹⁰

These quantum operators have the property that $\hat{f}\hat{\Omega} = \hat{\Omega}\hat{f} = \hat{f}$, hence

$$\langle \Psi_1, \hat{f}\Psi_2 \rangle = \langle \Psi_1 | \hat{f}\Psi_2 \rangle , \quad (1.2.12)$$

where on the left is the inner product of $L^2(M, d\mu)$. On $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, we can write \hat{f} diagonally in the coherent state basis, ie.

Lemma 1.2.4.

$$\hat{f}|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}} = \int_M f(x) |x\rangle \langle x| d\mu(x) . \quad (1.2.13)$$

From this, it follows that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ forms an irreducible representation of the quantum operators, so indeed $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ is a good Hilbert space.

⁹Though this Hilbert space is not quite a reproducing kernel Hilbert space since it doesn't contain all functions on M .

¹⁰However, there is a sense in which the path integral formulation logically precedes the operator formalism. This is also one reason why the coherent space path integral (or phase space path integral, [14]) is nice, as this correspondence is obfuscated when a polarization is used.

1.3 Example: Conventional Quantum Mechanics

Consider the symplectic manifold $T^*\mathbb{R}$ with coordinates (p, q) and symplectic form $\frac{dp \wedge dq}{2\pi\hbar}$. Let

$$\Omega(p, q, p', q') = \exp \left[-\frac{(p' - p)^2 + (q' - q)^2}{4\hbar} + i\frac{pq' - qp'}{2\hbar} \right]. \quad (1.3.1)$$

Ω is a propagator integrating $i\omega = \frac{i}{\hbar} \frac{p dq - q dp}{2}$, according to definition 1.1.1. This is equal to

$$\langle p', q' | p, q \rangle. \quad (1.3.2)$$

The state $|p, q\rangle$ is identified with the corresponding quantum mechanical coherent state, ie. the eigenvector of the lowering operator¹¹ for which the expectation values of the momentum and position operators are p, q , respectively. The physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ is the Segal-Bargmann representation (sometimes called the holomorphic representation), [13].

Many other examples come from Kähler manifolds, as we will discuss in section 4.

1.4 Relation to Deformation Quantization and Special Observables

1.4.1 Special Observables

There is a special class of functions for which

$$f(x) = \langle x | \hat{f} | x \rangle, \quad (1.4.1)$$

where the latter is equal to

$$\int_M f(y) |\Omega(x, y)|^2 d\mu(y). \quad (1.4.2)$$

Such functions generalize the harmonic functions on phase space (in particular, the coordinate functions p, q). There is a sense in which these observables are the most canonically quantizable ones — their classical and quantum expectation values agree on all states, in the sense of C^* -algebras ([28]). That is, given a normalized radon measure dm on M (ie. a mixed classical state), we get a mixed quantum state given by

$$T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}) \mapsto \int_M \langle x | T | x \rangle dm(x), \quad (1.4.3)$$

and if f satisfies eq. (1.4.1) then

$$\int_M \langle x | \hat{f} | x \rangle dm(x) = \int_M f(x) dm(x). \quad (1.4.4)$$

On the left is a quantum expectation value and on the right is a classical expectation value.¹² In [6], the dual quantization scheme is used, ie. a function f quantizes to an operator \hat{f} such that $f(x) = \langle x | \hat{f} | x \rangle$. However, such a quantization map doesn't need to exist.

In special cases our quantization map

$$L^\infty(M, d\mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}) \quad (1.4.5)$$

is an isomorphism of vector spaces, and in this case we get a noncommutative product on $L^\infty(M, d\mu)$. In some other case, there may be a special subspace of functions for which the quantization map is injective and algebraically closed, in which case one gets a noncommutative product on this special subspace.

¹¹These are usually defined in the context of the harmonic oscillator.

¹²These describe states with classical statistical uncertainty.

1.4.2 Deformation Quantization

We can get a quantization of a symplectic manifold (M, ω) by choosing a propagator integrating the connection on the prequantum line bundle, as discussed in section 2. One can often show that the quantization map is *perturbatively* an isomorphism. Here, we should consider propagators integrating

$$\frac{i}{\hbar} \nabla, \frac{1}{\hbar} \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.4.6)$$

In this case we obtain a formal deformation quantization, see equation (2.10) of [9]. We claim that this is what occurs in Toeplitz quantization [3]. We will explore this in forthcoming work, also see section 2.1 for more on this relation.

1.5 Non-Uniqueness of Primitives

It is important to note that, while primitives in the sense of eq. (0.0.4) are unique (this uses connectivity of \mathbb{R}), primitives in the sense of eq. (1.1.2) are not. Therefore, we are abusing notation by writing eq. (1.1.11) — we should really consider the right side to be the set of all functions satisfying the four aforementioned conditions and write

$$\Omega(x, y) \in \int_{\gamma(0)=x}^{\gamma(1)=y} e^{i \int_0^1 \gamma^* \omega} \mathcal{D}\gamma. \quad (1.5.1)$$

This is a similar abuse of notation one commits when stating that f is *the* antiderivative of df .

We address the non-uniqueness more in the example of section 4.1, where we show that the different propagators are distinguished by their second order Taylor expansions, rather than the expected first order.

1.6 The Derivative of the Measure on Paths

Consider a complex measure $d\gamma$ on the space of (discontinuous) paths $[0, 1] \rightarrow (M, d\mu)$. The condition corresponding to eq. (1.1.3) says that the derivative of the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the 2-dimensional distributions of $d\gamma$ equals $i\omega$ — its 2-dimensional distribution being the complex measure on $M \times M$ given by

$$\gamma_2(A) := \int_{(\gamma(0), \gamma(1)) \in A} d\gamma. \quad (1.6.1)$$

That is, the integral above is over all paths such that $(\gamma(0), \gamma(1)) \in A$.

The Radon-Nikodym derivative is taken with respect to the product measure $d\mu \times d\mu$. This defines a function

$$\Omega : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad (1.6.2)$$

and we require that

$$d_y \log \Omega(x, y)|_{y=x} = i\omega|_x. \quad (1.6.3)$$

Of course, we are making some differentiability assumptions on the complex measure to do this. We generalize this to path integrals from higher dimensional simplices in section 3.3.

1.7 Extending the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus to Path Measures

The ultimate goal is to extend the fundamental theorem of calculus in this setting. The main issues to understand are:

1. non-uniqueness of the propagators differentiating to $i\omega$ (see section 4.1 for a discussion),

2. the problem of determining convergence on the right side of eq. (1.1.9) for Ω which don't satisfy eq. (1.1.2).

The non-uniqueness is due to the fact that, under path integrals, we can't really integrate differential forms. This is because to uniquely specify Riemann-type integrals under path integrals we need to specify higher order information, eg. classically we integrate objects such as $f dx$, but under path integrals we integrate objects such as

$$f dx + g dx^2 . \quad (1.7.1)$$

Here, $dx^2 = (dx)^2$ can be considered as a symmetric tensor, or as a homogenous polynomial of degree 2. We could integrate such objects classically as well, but we don't bother to make it explicit because the higher order terms don't contribute to the integral. However, in path integrals they do contribute. Picking good higher order terms often seems necessary to get convergence. To be a bit more precise, for a partition x_0, \dots, x_n of the interval $[0, 1]$, classically

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Delta x_i^2 \xrightarrow{\Delta x_i \rightarrow 0} 0 . \quad (1.7.2)$$

This is why the usual definition of the Riemann integral doesn't depend on the choice of Riemann sum, ie. why the choice of g in eq. (1.7.1) is never specified. However, eq. (1.7.2) isn't quite true under path integrals and therefore we need to be more precise than just specifying a 1-form. We discuss this in detail in section 3.

2 The General Case: The Propagator of Symplectic Manifolds

More generally, we can replace $L^2(M, d\mu)$ with square-integrable sections of a complex line bundle with Hermitian connection, and essentially everything still works. Of course, the most natural setting for this is a prequantizable symplectic manifold (M, ω) , which comes with a natural measure. Even better are Kähler manifolds, since the path integral can be computed more canonically in this case due to it coming with a Hermitian form, as discussed in section 4.1.

In this setting, consider a prequantum line bundle with Hermitian connection

$$(\mathcal{L}, \nabla, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) \rightarrow (M, \omega) , \quad (2.0.1)$$

where we assume $\dim M = 2n$. In this case, the path integral we want to compute is

$$\int_{\gamma(0)=x}^{\gamma(1)=y} \mathcal{D}\gamma e^{i \int_0^1 \gamma^* \nabla} , \quad (2.0.2)$$

where $e^{i \int_0^1 \gamma^* \nabla}$ denotes parallel transport between the vector spaces over x and y .¹³ That is, eq. (2.0.2) must define a linear map between any two vector spaces of the line bundle. The kernel Ω we need to consider then is a section of

$$\pi_1^* \mathcal{L}^* \otimes \pi_2^* \mathcal{L} \rightarrow M \times M , \quad (2.0.3)$$

where $\pi_1, \pi_2 : M \times M \rightarrow M$ are the projections onto the first and second factor, respectively. Equation (2.0.3) defines a line bundle over $M \times M$, and points in this line bundle are naturally identified with linear maps between the corresponding vector spaces of \mathcal{L} .

¹³We have suppressed the \hbar dependence, but it divides i .

The conditions of definition 1.1.1 are replaced by: for all $(x, y) \in M \times M$,¹⁴

$$\int_M \Omega(x, z) \circ \Omega(z, y) \omega_z^n = \Omega(x, y), \quad (2.0.4)$$

$$d_y \Omega(x, y)|_{y=x} = i\nabla|_x, \quad (2.0.5)$$

$$\Omega(x, y)^* = \Omega(y, x), \quad (2.0.6)$$

$$\Omega(x, x) = \text{Identity}. \quad (2.0.7)$$

To explain eq. (2.0.5), we note that each $l_x \in \mathcal{L}$ defines a section of \mathcal{L} , given by

$$y \mapsto l_x \Omega(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}_y, \quad (2.0.8)$$

where the subscript is used to denote the corresponding vector space. Equation (2.0.5) means that the pushforward of this map agrees with $i\nabla$ as maps $T_x M \rightarrow T_{l_x} \mathcal{L}$, for all l_x .

Definition 2.0.1. *If Ω satisfies the previous conditions and the corresponding sesquilinear form eq. (2.0.9) is bounded, we say that it integrates $i\nabla$ (as a propagator).*¹⁵

We discuss uniqueness of such a propagator in section 4.1.

The rest goes as in section 1, with the sesquilinear form eq. (1.2.1) replaced by

$$\langle \Psi_1 | \Psi_2 \rangle = \int_{M \times M} \langle \Psi_1(y), \Psi_2(x) \Omega(x, y) \rangle \omega_x^n \omega_y^n. \quad (2.0.9)$$

The only difference is that, due to nontriviality of the line bundle, the states $|x\rangle$ are only defined up to a scalar. To define a coherent state, choose a normalized vector l_x over x . We get a bounded linear functional on the physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, which is given by square-integrable sections of the line bundle satisfying

$$\hat{\Omega} \Psi = \Psi, \quad (2.0.10)$$

where $\hat{\Omega}$ is the operator corresponding to the sesquilinear form eq. (2.0.9). Given such a section Ψ ,

$$\Psi(x) = \lambda_\Psi l_x \quad (2.0.11)$$

for some $\lambda_\Psi = \mathbb{C}$. The map

$$\Psi \mapsto \lambda_\Psi \quad (2.0.12)$$

defines a bounded linear functional, by eq. (2.0.10). The Riesz representation theorem then defines the coherent states.

Definition 2.0.2. *The coherent state $|l_x\rangle$ is defined to be the vector in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ corresponding to the linear functional eq. (2.0.12).*

If $l_x = e^{i\theta} l'_x$, then

$$|l_x\rangle \langle l_x| = |l'_x\rangle \langle l'_x|. \quad (2.0.13)$$

Therefore, associated to x there is a canonical projection operator, which we denote by $|x\rangle \langle x|$. It follows that

$$l_x \Omega(x, y) = |y\rangle \langle y | l_x, \quad (2.0.14)$$

¹⁴In this notation, we are assuming $\Omega(x, y)$ acts on the left, but we may not be consistent. Furthermore, for the first condition it is acceptable to scale ω_z^n by a finite constant.

¹⁵We may relax eq. (2.0.4), see section 5.

Note that, it is only as a vector state that the coherent state $|x\rangle$ isn't well-defined, as the linear functional on operators (ie. a C^* -algebra state)

$$T \mapsto \langle x|T|x\rangle \quad (2.0.15)$$

it is well-defined. Of course, the associated projection operator is also well-defined as discussed above.

Interestingly, if we can find a subspace of sections of the prequantum line bundle for which pointwise evaluation is continuous, then we can try to flip this construction to determine a propagator via eq. (2.0.14). This leads us to our next example.

Example 2.0.3. *Let (M, ω, I) be a prequantizable Kähler manifold, with prequantum line bundle*

$$(\mathcal{L}, \nabla, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) \rightarrow (M, \omega) . \quad (2.0.16)$$

Then pointwise evaluation of complex-polarized sections is a continuous map, and we can define Ω by

$$l_x \Omega(x, y) = |y\rangle \langle y|l_x\rangle ,^{16} \quad (2.0.17)$$

where $|l_x\rangle$ is defined via the Riesz representation theorem, as above. Ω is a propagator integrating $i\nabla$, and the $\lambda = 1$ eigenspace of the corresponding operator $\hat{\Omega}$ consists of complex-polarized sections. See [5] for more.

Note that, the previous example somewhat contradicts the discussion in section 2.3 of [9]. This is due to the fact that this path integral isn't invariant under all symplectomorphisms, as is assumed.

Lemma 2.0.4. ¹⁷ *If $\Omega(x, y)$ is a propagator integrating $i\nabla$, then*

$$VE_0(\log(\Omega(x, y) \circ \Omega(y, z) \circ \Omega(z, x))) = i\omega , \quad (2.0.18)$$

where $\Omega(x, y) \circ \Omega(y, z) \circ \Omega(z, x)$ is interpreted as a function $M \times M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and ω is now the symplectic form.

In the previous lemma, $\Omega(x, y) \circ \Omega(y, z) \circ \Omega(z, x)$ should be interpreted as

$$\int_{\gamma: S^1 \rightarrow M} \mathcal{D}\gamma e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^1 \gamma^* \nabla} , \quad (2.0.19)$$

where the domain of integration is all maps $\gamma : S^1 \rightarrow M$ with three marked points on S^1 mapping to x, y, z (compare with equations (2.9), (2.11) of [9]).

Remark 2.0.5. *Usually, a quantization is said to be something like an operator assignment $f \mapsto \hat{f}$ on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{\hbar} , such that*

$$[\hat{f}, \hat{g}] = i\hbar\{f, g\} + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^2) \quad (2.0.20)$$

(eg. [24]). However, it's not clear that any such a structure should count as a quantization, since it appears to completely ignore any classical-quantum state correspondence. It is important that for any classical state ρ ¹⁸ one can choose quantum states ρ_{\hbar} such that $\rho_{\hbar} \rightarrow \rho$ as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. More precisely, we should have that

$$\rho_{\hbar}(\hat{f}) \xrightarrow{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \rho(f) . \quad (2.0.21)$$

Otherwise, one can't recover classical dynamics, as Heisenberg's equations only limit to Hamilton's equations on such sequences of states. The coherent state path integral approach comes with such states.

¹⁶As pointed out to me by Francis Bischoff, the map $y \mapsto |y\rangle \langle y|$ is a version of the Kodaira embedding.

¹⁷See appendix .1 for details about the van Est map, VE_0 .

¹⁸In the sense of C^* -algebras, ie. ρ is a continuous, positive linear functional on the C^* -algebra.

2.1 Relation to Kontsevich's Work, the Poisson Sigma Model and Weinstein's Program

The propagator Ω of the previous subsection defines a section of the prequantum line bundle over the symplectic groupoid, and it is an idempotent with respect to the twisted convolution algebra ([11]). Equation (2.0.5) implies that $VE_0(\log \delta^* \Omega) = i\Pi$, where Π is the Poisson tensor and δ^* is the groupoid pullback (this makes sense because δ^* of this prequantum line bundle is canonically trivial). Therefore, on a Poisson manifold this construction gives a C^* -algebra and quantization map, as in Weinstein's program [26], and Ω can be used to compute

$$(f \star g)(m) = \int_{X(\infty)=m} f(X(1))g(X(0))e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}S[X]} \mathcal{D}X . \quad (2.1.1)$$

Here,

$$S[X] = \int_D X^* \Pi \quad (2.1.2)$$

and the path integral is over all Lie algebroid morphisms $X : TD \rightarrow T^*M$, where $0, 1, \infty$ are marked points on ∂D . This is formally equivalent to the Poisson sigma model approach to Kontsevich's star product [15], see [2]. In the symplectic case, it is the same as eq. (0.0.2). We will explore this more in forthcoming work.

3 A New Look at the Riemann Integral

3.1 The One-Dimensional Case

To make sense of our definition of the path integral, we need to consider a more mathematically natural version of the Riemann integral. In particular, we need a version which behaves well with respect to pullbacks, since the path integral involves pulling back forms over paths. To motivate the definition, consider the following:

Proposition 3.1.1. ([17], [18]) *Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function and let $F : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function which vanishes on the diagonal,¹⁹ such that*

$$\partial_y F(x, y)|_{y=x} = f(x) . \quad (3.1.1)$$

Then

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} F(x_i, x_{i+1}) \xrightarrow{\Delta x_i \rightarrow 0} \int_0^1 f dx . \quad (3.1.2)$$

Stated more geometrically, eq. (3.1.1) says that the exterior derivative of F in the second factor, evaluated at the diagonal, is equal to $f dx$.

The usual choices of F are $F(x, y) = f(x)(y - x)$, $f(y)(y - x)$. These result in the left-point and right-point Riemann sums, respectively. The left side of eq. (3.1.2) can be considered to be a generalized Riemann sum. In particular, if $dF = f dx$ then

$$(x, y) \mapsto F(y) - F(x) \quad (3.1.3)$$

also satisfies the conditions, so this definition makes the fundamental theorem of calculus almost tautological. This notion of integration easily to give a notion of Riemann sums of differential forms on manifolds. This gives a notion of integration on manifolds which mirrors the notion of integration on coordinate space, ie. it involves triangulations and not partitions of unity or coordinates.

¹⁹That is, $F(x, x) = 0$ for all x .

3.2 Integration Over Non-Differentiable Paths

Importantly, consider a smooth map $\gamma : [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$. This induces a map

$$\gamma \times \gamma : [0,1] \times [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1] \times [0,1], \quad (3.2.1)$$

and if F satisfies the conditions of proposition 3.1.1 with respect to $f dx$, then $(\gamma \times \gamma)^* F$ satisfies the conditions of proposition 3.1.1 with respect to $\gamma^*(f dx)$. Therefore, if F can be used to approximate

$$\int_0^1 f dx, \quad (3.2.2)$$

then $(\gamma \times \gamma)^* F$ can be used to approximate

$$\int_0^1 \gamma^*(f dx). \quad (3.2.3)$$

As stated in section 1.5, while the integral of $f dx$ makes sense classically, it isn't well-defined under path integrals because proposition 3.1.1 doesn't hold there. This is related to the non-differentiable nature of paths in the path integral. The problem is that, different functions F chosen in eq. (3.1.1) lead to different results under the path integral. Therefore, we need to specify more data. In the 1-dimensional Lagrangian formulation of the path integral (or better, its Euclidean version with respect to the Wiener measure), it is enough to specify

$$\partial_y^2 F(x, y)|_{y=x} = g(x). \quad (3.2.4)$$

That is, we need to specify the second derivative of F as well. This means that

$$\int_0^1 \gamma^*(f dx + g dx^2) \quad (3.2.5)$$

is well-defined in Wiener space $L^2(C[0,1], \mu_W)$, if for a path $\gamma : [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we take it to mean

$$\lim_{\Delta t_i \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} F(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_{i+1})), \quad (3.2.6)$$

where F vanishes on the diagonal and

$$\partial_y F(x, y)|_{y=x} = f(x), \quad \partial_y^2 F(x, y)|_{y=x} = g(x). \quad (3.2.7)$$

To state a precise result, we have the following well-known result:

Proposition 3.2.1. ²⁰ *With respect to the Wiener measure on continuous paths $\gamma \in C([0,1], \mathbb{R})$, and for a smooth function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f\left(\frac{\gamma(t_i) + \gamma(t_{i+1})}{2}\right) (\gamma(t_{i+1}) - \gamma(t_i)) - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(\gamma(t_i)) (\gamma(t_{i+1}) - \gamma(t_i)) \xrightarrow{\Delta t_i \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{df}{dx}(\gamma(t)) dt$$

in $L^2(C[0,1])$.

The left sum is the midpoint rule and the right sum is the left-point rule. The summands differ by a term of order $d\gamma^2$. Classically, this term doesn't contribute to the integral because for smooth paths $d\gamma^2 \sim dt^2$. However, paths in Wiener space are generically Hölder continuous of exponent less than

²⁰The Riemann sum on the left defines the Stratonovich integral and the Riemann sum on the right defines the Itô integral, [23]. The former satisfies the fundamental theorem of calculus.

$1/2$, and $d\gamma^2 \sim dt$. Since the paths are generically Hölder continuous with exponent greater than $1/3$ ([7], [22]) it follows that all terms of order $d\gamma^3$ and higher are negligible.

Note that, even on a smooth path these left and right sums are not Riemann sums in the traditional sense. In order to be a Riemann sum, the summand would need to be multiplied by Δt_i , not $\Delta\gamma(t_i)$. However, in the more general sense of proposition 3.1.1, they are Riemann sums. The same issue arises in Feynman's construction of the path integral. The sums involved in the approximations are not traditional Riemann sums, they are Riemann sums in our more general sense.

We will come back to this discussion in section 4.1.

Remark 3.2.2. *It would be interesting to know if there are forms which are integrable in this sense but which aren't Lebesgue integrable. For example, consider a differentiable function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that df isn't Lebesgue integrable. It is still the case that*

$$(x, y) \mapsto f(y) - f(x) \tag{3.2.8}$$

satisfies the conditions required to be used for a generalized Riemann sum of df , and that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(x_{i+1}) - f(x_i) \tag{3.2.9}$$

converges in the limit (of course, to $f(1) - f(0)$). If we choose another function F satisfying the conditions to be used for a Riemann sum of df and such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} F(x_i, x_{i+1}) \tag{3.2.10}$$

converges, must it converge to $f(1) - f(0)$?

3.3 Differentiating Path Measures to Differential Forms

Label the vertices of the (topological) standard n -simplex $|\Delta^n|$ by $0, \dots, n$. Suppose we have a complex measure dX on the space of maps $X : |\Delta|^n \rightarrow M$, with respect to some sigma algebra for which maps of the form

$$X \mapsto f(X(i)) \tag{3.3.1}$$

are measurable, for $i = 0, \dots, n$ and for any $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Then we can consider the finite dimensional distributions given by

$$A \subset M^{n+1} \mapsto \int_{(X(0), X(1), \dots, X(n)) \in A} dX. \tag{3.3.2}$$

We can take the Radon-Nikodym derivative of these finite dimensional distributions with respect to $d\mu^{\times n+1}$, and this gives us a function

$$\Omega : M^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}. \tag{3.3.3}$$

Definition 3.3.1. *The derivative of dX is the n -form on M given by*

$$VE_0(\log \Omega). \tag{3.3.4}$$

If we write $\Omega = \Omega(m_0, \dots, m_n)$, then VE_0 takes the exterior derivative of $\log \Omega$ in each of the components m_1, \dots, m_n at $m_1 = \dots = m_n = m_0$. See definition .1.1.

Of course, in the previous definition we are assuming that the finite dimensional distributions are absolutely continuous with respect to $d\mu^{\times n+1}$ and that it is n -times differentiable at the diagonal.

We suggest that any complex measure dX on the space of maps $X : |\Delta^n| \rightarrow M$ which formally equals

$$\mathcal{D}X e^{i \int_{|\Delta^n|} X^* \omega} \quad (3.3.5)$$

should have a derivative which is equal to $i\omega$.

4 More Examples From Kähler Manifolds

Example 4.0.1. *Let (M, ω, I) be a prequantizable Kähler manifold, with prequantum line bundle*

$$(\mathcal{L}, \nabla, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) \rightarrow (M, \omega) . \quad (4.0.1)$$

Then as in example 2.0.3, pointwise evaluation of complex-polarized sections is a continuous map. Given a normalized vector $l_x \in \mathcal{L}$ over $x \in M$, we get a continuous linear functional on complex-polarized sections given by

$$\Psi \mapsto \lambda_\Psi , \quad (4.0.2)$$

where λ_Ψ is defined by $\Psi(x) = \lambda_\Psi l_x$. The Riesz representation theorem determines a complex-polarized section $|l_x\rangle$ corresponding to this linear functional. We can define Ω by

$$\Omega(x, y, z) = \langle l_x | l_y \rangle \langle l_y | l_z \rangle \langle l_z | l_x \rangle , \quad (4.0.3)$$

as in lemma 2.0.4. This is well-defined, ie. it is independent of the choices of l_x, l_y, l_z , and

$$VE_0(\log \Omega) = i\omega . \quad (4.0.4)$$

If M is simply connected, then $\Omega(m, m_0, m_1)$ should be interpreted as

$$\int_{m, m_0, m_1} \mathcal{D}X e^{i \int_{D^2} X^* \omega} , \quad (4.0.5)$$

where the path integral is over all maps $X : D^2 \rightarrow M$ such that $X(\infty) = m$, $X(0) = m_0$, $X(1) = m_1$, where $0, 1, \infty$ are three marked points on the boundary of the disk. See eq. (0.0.2).

4.1 Surfaces of Constant Curvature

Now we will recall some examples of eq. (0.0.1) computed by Daubechies, Klauder, on Kähler manifolds in [6], [12] (see [5] for the general Kähler case). We will show that they satisfy definition 2.0.1. To arrive at these expressions, the aforementioned authors (essentially) introduce Brownian motion into eq. (0.0.1) via a massive term M , and send $M \rightarrow 0$.

Example 4.1.1. *The following locally describe some 2-dimensional Kähler manifolds and their propagators eq. (0.0.1), for which the connection on the prequantum line bundle (\mathcal{L}, ∇) is pdq and g is the Riemannian metric (which has constant curvature).*

1. *Flat space:*

$$g = dp^2 + dq^2 , \quad (4.1.1)$$

$$\Omega(p, q, p', q') = \exp \left[-\frac{(p' - p)^2 + (q' - q)^2}{4\hbar} + i \frac{(p' + p)(q' - q)}{2\hbar} \right] . \quad (4.1.2)$$

2. *Sphere:*

$$g = \frac{dp^2}{1 - p^2/\hbar} + (1 - p^2/\hbar)dq^2, \quad (4.1.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(p, q, p', q') &= \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{p'}{\sqrt{\hbar}} \right)^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{p}{\sqrt{\hbar}} \right)^{1/2} e^{i \frac{q'-q}{2\sqrt{\hbar}}} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{p'}{\sqrt{\hbar}} \right)^{1/2} \left(1 - \frac{p}{\sqrt{\hbar}} \right)^{1/2} e^{i \frac{q'-q}{2\sqrt{\hbar}}} \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1.4)$$

3. *Hyperbolic plane:* ²¹

$$g = \hbar \frac{dp^2}{p^2} + \frac{p^2}{\hbar} dq^2, \quad (4.1.5)$$

$$\Omega(p, q, p', q') = \left(\frac{\hbar}{p'p} \right) \left[\frac{\sqrt{\hbar}}{2p'} + \frac{\sqrt{\hbar}}{2p} - \frac{i(q'-q)}{2\sqrt{\hbar}} \right]^{-2}. \quad (4.1.6)$$

A simple computation shows that, indeed,

$$d \log \Omega(p, q, p', q')|_{(p', q')=(p, q)} = \frac{i}{\hbar} p dq \quad (4.1.7)$$

(where the exterior derivative is taken in (p', q')). Therefore, Ω integrates $\frac{i}{\hbar} \nabla$ in the sense of definition 2.0.1. This illustrates the non-uniqueness of the value of eq. (0.0.1).

Let us emphasize the following: there is a unique solution to eq. (0.0.4), 0.0.5, while the corresponding solution to eq. (1.1.2)-1.1.5 (or eq. (2.0.4)-2.0.7) is not unique, and this is for the same reason that the Riemann integral doesn't have a unique value under path integrals, as discussed in section 3.2 — in order to produce a unique value, one needs to specify a second order term, as in eq. (3.2.5).

More interesting then, is the second order Taylor expansion in the variables (p', q') of $\log \Omega(p, q, p', q')$, at $(p', q') = (p, q)$. This does distinguish between the different propagators. To make sense of this, we use the corresponding Riemannian metric to split the short exact sequence associated to the jet bundles

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Sym}^n T^*M \rightarrow J^n(M) \rightarrow J^{n-1}(M) \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.1.8)$$

We do this because, in order to define higher order Taylor expansions on manifolds, we need to split this sequence. Given a Riemannian metric, the result is the usual Taylor expansion formula, with derivatives replaced by symmetrized covariant derivatives, and terms like $(p' - p)^n$ replaced by dp^n .

For the hyperbolic plane, the non-zero Christoffel symbols are given by

$$\Gamma_{00}^0 = -\frac{1}{p}, \quad \Gamma_{11}^0 = -\frac{p^3}{\hbar^2}, \quad \Gamma_{10}^1 = \Gamma_{01}^1 = \frac{1}{p}. \quad (4.1.9)$$

Proposition 4.1.2. *In all three cases, the second order Taylor expansions are given by*

$$\frac{i}{\hbar} p dq - \frac{g}{4\hbar}. \quad (4.1.10)$$

²¹The examples computed by Klauder depend on parameters s, β , which we've set equal to 1.

We might conjecture that this is true for general Kähler manifolds. Geometrically, this is equal to

$$\frac{i}{\hbar} \nabla - \frac{g}{4\hbar} : \pi^* TM \rightarrow T\mathcal{L}, \quad (4.1.11)$$

where we identify $g(X, X) \in \mathbb{C}$ with the corresponding vertical vector induced by the \mathbb{C}^* -action.

Classically (ie. over smooth paths γ), the higher order term $-g/4\hbar$ doesn't contribute to the integral (see section 3), ie.

$$\int_0^1 \gamma^* \left(\frac{i}{\hbar} p dq - \frac{g}{4\hbar} \right) = \int_0^1 \gamma^* \frac{i}{\hbar} p dq. \quad (4.1.12)$$

Therefore, it is more precise to say that these propagators are equal to

$$\int_{\gamma(0)=m_0}^{\gamma(1)=m_1} \mathcal{D}\gamma e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^1 \gamma^* (\nabla + \frac{g}{4})}, \quad (4.1.13)$$

with the understanding that eq. (4.1.12) doesn't hold on non-smooth paths. It would be interesting to know if the second order Taylor expansions (or 2-jets) uniquely determine the propagator — these 2-jets are given by a higher order van Est map ([18]). Similarly, it would be interesting to know if the lattice approach in [18] converges to the propagator. For example, we could cover (M, ω) with small enough neighborhoods such that there is a unique geodesic connecting any two points in such a neighborhood, and approximate the integrand of eq. (4.1.13) using

$$\exp \left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} -\frac{d(p_i, q_i, p_{i+1}, q_{i+1})^2}{4\hbar} + \frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^1 \gamma_i^* \nabla \right], \quad (4.1.14)$$

where $d(p_i, q_i, p_{i+1}, q_{i+1})$ is the distance between the corresponding points, and γ_i is the unique geodesic in the neighborhood connecting (p_i, q_i) , (p_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) . We can then compute the path integral as in Feynman's approach, only integrating in such a way that (p_i, q_i) , (p_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) are in the same neighborhood.

5 Relation to Geometric Quantization

In section 1.3 we discussed the relation of these propagators to geometric quantization, using complex polarizations (also see section 2.1). However, one can ask about real polarizations. In [20] (also see [19]) we discussed a function

$$\Omega : T^*\mathbb{R} \times T^*\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \quad (5.0.1)$$

satisfying all of the conditions to be a propagator integrating $i \frac{p dq - q dp}{2\hbar}$, except that rather than satisfying $\Omega * \Omega = \Omega$, it satisfies the relaxed condition

$$\Omega * \Omega * \Omega = \Omega. \quad (5.0.2)$$

Therefore, it's not a projection, but it still leads to good quantizations. In particular, the corresponding $\lambda = 1$ eigenspace consists of all (complex)-linearly polarized sections (ie. for *all* linear polarizations), and on this subspace Ω does give the correct inner product — the fact that all (complex) linearly-polarized sections are in this eigenspace leads to natural unitary equivalences between all such quantizations. Furthermore, it leads to a non-perturbative deformation quantization, which simultaneously acts on *all* linearly-polarized sections.

It seems that we can view the failure of $\Omega * \Omega = \Omega$ as a failure of Fubini's theorem, since

$$\Omega(p, q, p', q') = e^{i \frac{pq' - qp'}{2\hbar}} \quad (5.0.3)$$

is not in $L^1(T^*\mathbb{R})$ for fixed (p, q) . This Ω can still be considered to be a propagator, just not in the precise sense defined in this paper — though it seems this generalization is useful. It appears that any quantization scheme is (implicitly) attempting to assign a value to eq. (0.0.1), though traditional geometric quantization forgets a lot of information about the quantization map.

Question: When does there exist an Ω integrating $i\nabla$ such that

$$\underbrace{\Omega * \Omega * \cdots * \Omega}_{n \text{ times}} = \Omega \tag{5.0.4}$$

for some $n \geq 2$?

Remark 5.0.1. *With respect to the standard Kähler metric, the Taylor expansion of the logarithm of eq. (5.0.3) in the variables (p', q') , at $(p', q') = (p, q)$, is exactly equal to*

$$i \frac{p dq - q dp}{2\hbar}, \tag{5.0.5}$$

ie. to all orders. In the language of [18], $VE_\infty(\log \Omega) = p dq$.

Appendix

.1 The van Est map and Riemann Sums on Manifolds

The natural setting for the construction of the (generalized) Riemann sums on manifolds we give is the category of Lie groupoids, but it only involves the simplest Lie groupoid that exists, the pair groupoid. The pair groupoid $\text{Pair}(M) \rightrightarrows M$ of a manifold M is the groupoid with a unique arrow between any two points in M . This is discussed more in [17], [18].

Definition .1.1. ²² *Let M be a manifold. Let $\Omega : M^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a smooth function which vanishes on the diagonal and which is invariant under even permutations. The van Est map (in degree 0) applied to Ω gives an n -form $VE_0(\Omega)$ on M . Letting X_1, \dots, X_n be vectors at a point $m \in M$, it is defined by*

$$VE_0(\Omega)(X_1, \dots, X_n) = n! X_n \cdots X_1 \Omega(m, \cdot, \dots, \cdot), \tag{.1.1}$$

where X_i differentiates $\Omega(m, \cdot, \dots, \cdot)$ in the i th component (where m occupies the 0th component).

Example .1.2. *Let $M = \mathbb{R}^2$ and let $\Omega = \Omega(x_0, y_0, x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)$ be a function on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ which satisfies the conditions of the previous definition. Then*

$$VE_0(\Omega)(\partial_x|_{(x_0, y_0)}, \partial_y|_{(x_0, y_0)}) = 2 \partial_{y_2} \partial_{x_1} \Omega(x_0, y_0, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)|_{(x_1, y_1)=(x_2, y_2)=(x_0, y_0)}. \tag{.1.2}$$

States differently, Ω is a normalized n -cochain on $\text{Pair}(M)$ which is invariant under even permutations.

Now, let M be an oriented, n -dimensional manifold. Given a triangulation Δ_M of M , up to even permutation there is a canonical ordering of the $(n + 1)$ vertices of each n -dimensional simplex. Therefore, we can evaluate $\Omega : M^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on any n -dimensional face $\Delta \in \Delta_M$ by choosing such an ordering of the vertices and plugging them into Ω . This is well-defined because we are assuming that Ω is invariant under even permutations. We denote its value by $\Omega(\Delta)$.

²²This formulation is presented in [18], section 3. Also, [17]. It is equivalent to, but a bit different from, the original formulation of Weinstein-Xu in [27]. It was generalized (to eg. \mathbb{C}^* -valued functions) in [16], which is relevant to path integrals.

Definition .1.3. ([17], [18]) Let M be an oriented n -dimensional manifold, let ω be an n -form on M and let $VE_0(\Omega) = \omega$. Then given a triangulation Δ_M of M , the (generalized) Riemann sum of ω is defined to be

$$\sum_{\Delta \in \Delta_M} \Omega(\Delta), \quad (.1.3)$$

where the sum is over all n -dimensional simplices.

Theorem .1.4. ([17], [18]) Suppose that Ω satisfies the conditions of definition .1.1 and that $VE_0(\Omega) = \omega$. Then

$$\sum_{\Delta \in \Delta_M} \Omega(\Delta) \xrightarrow{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \int_M \omega, \quad (.1.4)$$

where the limit is taken over barycentric subdivisions of any triangulation Δ_M .

The next proposition shows that this notion of Riemann sum is well-behaved with respect to pullbacks, which is important because pullbacks appear in path integrals:

Proposition .1.5. Let Δ_M be a triangulation of an n -dimensional manifold M , let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a smooth function and let ω be an n -form on N with $VE_0(\Omega) = \omega$. Then

$$\sum_{\Delta \in \Delta_M} f^* \Omega(\Delta) \quad (.1.5)$$

is a (generalized) Riemann sum of $f^* \omega$, where $f^* \Omega$ is the pullback via the map $M^{n+1} \rightarrow N^{n+1}$ induced by f .

References

- [1] F. A. Berezin. *Feynman path integrals in a phase space*. Sov. Phys. Usp. 23 763, 1980.
- [2] F. Bonechi, A. S. Cattaneo and M. Zabzine. *Geometric quantization and non-perturbative Poisson sigma model*. Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 10 (2006) 683 [arXiv:math/0507223].
- [3] M. Bordeman, E. Meinrenken and M. Schlichenmaier. *Toeplitz quantization of Kähler manifolds and $gl(n)$, $n \rightarrow \infty$ limits*. Comm. Math. Phys. 165 (1994), 281-296.
- [4] A. S. Cattaneo and G. Felder. *A Path Integral Approach to the Kontsevich Quantization Formula*. Comm Math Phys 212, 591–611 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002200000229>
- [5] L. Charles. *Feynman path integral and Toeplitz quantization*. Helv. Phys. Acta 72, 341-355 (1999).
- [6] Ingrid Daubechies and John R. Klauder. *Quantum-mechanical path integrals with Wiener measure for all polynomial Hamiltonians. II* J. Math. Phys. 26, 2239 (1985); doi: 10.1063/1.526803
- [7] Rick Durrett. *Probability: Theory and Examples* (2019).
- [8] Boris V. Fedosov. *A simple geometrical construction of deformation quantization*. J. Differential Geom. 40(2): 213-238 (1994). DOI: 10.4310/jdg/1214455536
- [9] D. Gaiotto and E. Witten. *Probing Quantization Via Branes*. arXiv:2107.12251 (2021).
- [10] R. E. Grady, Qin Li and Si Li. *Batalin-Vilkovisky Quantization And The Algebraic Index*. Advances in Mathematics Volume 317, 7 September 2017, Pages 575-639. arXiv:1507.01812
- [11] Eli Hawkins. *A Groupoid Approach to Quantization*. J. Symplectic Geom. 6 (2008), no. 1, 61-125.

- [12] John R. Klauder. *Quantization is geometry, after all*. Annals of Physics Volume 188, Issue 1, 15 November 1988, Pages 120-141.
- [13] John R. Klauder. *Is Quantization Geometry*. arXiv:quant-ph/9604032 (1996).
- [14] Hagen Kleinert. *Path Integrals in Quantum Mechanics, Statistics, Polymer Physics, and Financial Markets*. (third edition) 1990. ISBN: 978-9812381071
- [15] M. Kontsevich. *Deformation Quantization of Poisson Manifolds*. Letters in Mathematical Physics 66, 157–216 (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:MATH.0000027508.00421.bf>
- [16] Joshua Lackman. *Cohomology of Lie Groupoid Modules and the Generalized van Est Map*. International Mathematics Research Notices, rnab027, (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1093/imrn/rnab027>
- [17] Joshua Lackman. *A Groupoid Approach to the Riemann Integral*. arXiv.2309.05640 (2023).
- [18] Joshua Lackman. *A Groupoid Construction of Functional Integrals: Brownian Motion and Some TQFTs*. arXiv:2402.05866v2 [math.DG] (2024).
- [19] Joshua Lackman. *Geometric Quantization Without Polarizations*. arXiv:2405.01513v2 (2024).
- [20] Joshua Lackman. *A Derivation of Geometric Quantization via Feynman's Path Integral on Phase Space*. arXiv:2405.17273 (2024).
- [21] Davide Lonigro, Fattah Sakuldee, Łukasz Cywiński, Dariusz Chruściński, Piotr Szańkowski. *Double or nothing: a Kolmogorov extension theorem for multitime (bi)probabilities in quantum mechanics*. arXiv:2402.01218v2. February, 2024.
- [22] Peter Mörters and Yuval Peres. *Brownian Motion*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics, Series Number 30, 2010.
- [23] Bernt Øksendal. *Stochastic Differential Equations: An Introduction with Applications*. Springer, 2003. ISBN: 978-3540047582
- [24] M. Rieffel. *Questions on quantization*. Operator Algebras and Operator Theory (1997, Shanghai), Contemp. Math. 228 (1998), 315–326, quant-ph/9712009.
- [25] D.J. Simms, N.M.J. Woodouse. *Lectures on Geometric Quantization*. 1976, Volume 53 ISBN : 978-3-540-07860-9
- [26] Alan Weinstein. *Symplectic Groupoids, Geometric Quantization, and Irrational Rotation Algebras*. In: Dazord, P., Weinstein, A. (eds) Symplectic Geometry, Groupoids, and Integrable Systems. Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications, vol 20, (1991). Springer, New York, NY.
- [27] Alan Weinstein and Ping Xu. *Extensions of Symplectic Groupoids and Quantization*. Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik. Vol. 417, (1991) pp. 159-190.
- [28] Dana P. Williams. *A (Very) Short Course on C*-Algebras*. (2020).