

Multi-Time Schrödinger Equations Cannot Contain Interaction Potentials

Sören Petrat* and Roderich Tumulka†

January 24, 2014

Abstract

Multi-time wave functions are wave functions that have a time variable for every particle, such as $\phi(t_1, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, t_N, \mathbf{x}_N)$. They arise as a relativistic analog of the wave functions of quantum mechanics but can be applied also in quantum field theory. The evolution of a wave function with N time variables is governed by N Schrödinger equations, one for each time variable. These Schrödinger equations can be inconsistent with each other, i.e., they can fail to possess a joint solution for every initial condition; in fact, the N Hamiltonians need to satisfy a certain commutator condition in order to be consistent. While this condition is automatically satisfied for non-interacting particles, it is a challenge to set up consistent multi-time equations with interaction. We prove for a wide class of multi-time Schrödinger equations that the presence of interaction potentials (given by multiplication operators) leads to inconsistency. We conclude that interaction has to be implemented instead by creation and annihilation of particles, which, in fact, can be done consistently, as we show elsewhere [17]. We also prove the following result: When a cut-off length $\delta > 0$ is introduced (in the sense that the multi-time wave function is defined only on a certain set of spacelike configurations, thereby breaking Lorentz invariance), then the multi-time Schrödinger equations with interaction potentials of range δ are consistent; however, in the desired limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ of removing the cut-off, the resulting multi-time equations are interaction-free, which supports the conclusion expressed in the title.

Key words: multi-time wave function; many-time formalism; commutator condition for consistency of multi-time equations; short-range potentials in quantum mechanics; Dirac equation; covariant formulation of Schrödinger equation for many particles.

*Mathematisches Institut, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Theresienstr. 39, 80333 München, Germany. E-mail: petrat@math.lmu.de

†Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019, USA. E-mail: tumulka@math.rutgers.edu

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 2 |
| 1.1 | Multi-Time Evolution | 4 |
| 1.2 | Consistency Condition | 5 |
| 1.3 | Perspective | 5 |
| 1.4 | Example of Inconsistent Multi-Time Equations | 7 |
| 1.5 | Brief Overview of Results | 8 |
| 1.5.1 | Results on Consistency Condition | 8 |
| 1.5.2 | Inconsistency Results | 8 |
| 1.5.3 | Consistency with Cut-Off Length δ | 8 |
| 1.5.4 | On the Limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ | 10 |
| 2 | The Consistency Condition | 10 |
| 2.1 | Heuristic Derivation | 11 |
| 2.2 | Exact Formulations | 11 |
| 2.3 | Path Independence | 12 |
| 2.4 | Comparison with the Frobenius Theorem | 14 |
| 3 | Results on Inconsistency of Potentials | 16 |
| 4 | Result on Consistency of Potentials with Cut-Off Length δ | 19 |
| 5 | Proofs of Results on Consistency Condition | 20 |
| 6 | Proofs of Inconsistency Theorems | 29 |
| 7 | Proof of Cut-Off Consistency Theorem | 36 |
| 7.1 | Domain of Dependence | 37 |
| 7.2 | Proof of the Theorem | 41 |

1 Introduction

This paper belongs to a series of papers [17, 18, 19, 20] exploring multi-time wave functions, i.e., wave functions of the form

$$\phi(t_1, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, t_N, \mathbf{x}_N) \tag{1}$$

that have a separate time variable for each particle and thus $4N$ variables in total ($\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbb{R}^3$). In other words, these are wave functions on configurations of N points in space-time. Such wave functions arise naturally as a relativistic generalization of the usual (single-time) wave function of non-relativistic quantum mechanics,

$$\psi(t, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) \tag{2}$$

with $3N + 1$ variables. Multi-time wave functions can also be defined in the context of quantum field theories (QFTs) that permit a particle–position representation of a quantum state (in Fock space), when we regard also N as variable [17, 19, 20].

This paper is mainly about the *consistency condition* for multi-time Schrödinger equations, formulated as (8) in Section 1.2 below. Apart from a careful derivation of this condition, our main result is that it excludes interaction by means of a potential (i.e., multiplication operator); we conclude that interaction must be formulated, in the multi-time approach, by means of particle creation and annihilation, as we do in [17, 19]. We also describe here a result about the consistency of potentials of limited range $\delta > 0$ on multi-time wave functions with a certain kind of length cut-off at the length δ .

Multi-time wave functions deserve study for several reasons. First, while it was unclear until recently whether any consistent set of multi-time Schrödinger equations could involve interaction (and thus, whether multi-time wave functions could be of any physical relevance), we now know [17, 19] that relevant interacting QFTs can be consistently reformulated in terms of multi-time wave functions. Thus, multi-time wave functions are not a mere mathematical speculation but rather a new representation of familiar QFTs. This representation, actually a very natural one, can be regarded as the covariant Schrödinger-picture particle-position representation; it is related to the Tomonaga–Schwinger representation but conceptually simpler because the latter is defined on the *infinite*-dimensional space of all spacelike hypersurfaces, whereas the domain of the relevant multi-time wave functions has locally *finite* dimension. The multi-time approach emphasizes the similarity of QFT with quantum mechanics, particularly so by expressing the quantum state in terms of a wave function. Another reason why multi-time wave functions deserve study is that they are such a natural concept, the immediate analog of the wave function of quantum mechanics in a relativistic setting, and manifestly covariant objects. Since the multi-time approach is unfamiliar, we take the time here to develop the theory of the consistency condition in some detail. It may seem that the consistency condition is a novel obstacle, even a drawback, that the multi-time approach brings with it. However, we think of the consistency condition as providing us guidance about how the equations of a relativistic QFTs should be set up. For example, the main result of the present paper, that interaction potentials conflict with the consistency condition, tells us that interaction should be incorporated by means of particle creation and annihilation. Likewise, the consistency condition for the multi-time equations considered in [19] tells us that a fermion cannot decay into two fermions.

Multi-time wave functions were considered early on in the history of quantum theory (particularly by Dirac [7], Dirac, Fock, and Podolsky [8], and Bloch [2]), but have, as far as we know, never been studied comprehensively. We discuss their application to QFT in [17, 19]. Connections with QFT were made also by Günther [13] and Schweber [23, p. 171]. Horwitz and Rohrlich [15] suggested considering a wave function of $5N$ variables, which does not seem to yield a viable reformulation of quantum physics. While we consider one Schrödinger equation for each time variable, Salpeter and Bethe [22] (as well as Marx [16]) considered a single higher-order equation for a two-time

wave function. Several authors [11, 9, 10, 25, 14] have proposed Lorentz-invariant sets of equations for two-time wave functions containing interaction terms that neither are potentials (i.e., multiplication operators) nor involve particle creation, but instead are nonlocal in time (see also Section 1.3). We compare the status and significance of multi-time formulations in classical and quantum physics in [18].

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In the remainder of Section 1, we introduce multi-time Schrödinger equations for the time evolution of multi-time wave functions, formulate the consistency condition (8), and outline our results. In Section 2 we provide precise formulations of the statement that condition (8) is necessary and sufficient for the consistency of the multi-time equations. In Section 3 we provide precise formulations of our results about the inconsistency of interaction potentials. In Section 4, we provide a precise formulation of our result about the consistency of potentials with range δ . In Sections 5, 6, and 7, we provide the proofs of the statements made in Sections 2, 3, and 4, respectively.

1.1 Multi-Time Evolution

For the multi-time wave function ϕ to be determined by initial data

$$\phi(0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, 0, \mathbf{x}_N) \quad (3)$$

we need N Schrödinger equations, one for each time variable (we set $\hbar = 1$):

$$i \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t_j} = H_j \phi \quad (4)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, N$.¹ We call equations of the form (4) *multi-time Schrödinger equations*² or simply *multi-time equations*, and the operators H_j *partial Hamiltonians*. The connection between the multi-time wave function ϕ and the single-time wave function ψ is that on configurations of N space-time points that are simultaneous with respect to the Lorentz frame L to which ψ refers, ϕ coincides with ψ ; i.e.,

$$\phi(t, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, t, \mathbf{x}_N) = \psi(t, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N). \quad (5)$$

It follows from (5) that, at every configuration that is simultaneous with respect to the Lorentz frame L ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N H_j = H, \quad (6)$$

¹Since we have written the equations (4) in a Hamiltonian form, we have used a particular Lorentz frame in order to refer to a time variable t_j . This is convenient for us at this point but not necessary; H_j will contain derivatives with respect to the spacelike components \mathbf{x}_j , and those could be moved to the left-hand side to write (4) in a manifestly covariant form, just like the one-particle Dirac equation can be written either in the Hamiltonian form $i\partial\psi/\partial t = H\psi$ with (setting $c = 1$) $H = -i\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \nabla + \beta m$ or in the manifestly covariant form $i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \psi = m\psi$.

²The expression *Schrödinger equation* is not meant to imply that H_j involves the Laplace operator, but is understood as including, e.g., the Dirac equation.

where H is the Hamiltonian governing ψ ,

$$i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = H\psi. \quad (7)$$

1.2 Consistency Condition

A novel feature of multi-time equations such as (4), absent from the single-time Schrödinger equation (7), is that the multi-time equations can be *inconsistent*; being inconsistent means that they possess no non-zero joint solutions ϕ , or possess non-zero joint solutions only for special initial conditions. The condition for consistency (or integrability), which Bloch [2] was already aware of, reads

$$\left[i\frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} - H_j, i\frac{\partial}{\partial t_k} - H_k \right] = 0 \quad \forall j \neq k. \quad (8)$$

To begin to understand where (8) comes from, consider the multi-time equations (4) for $N = 2$ particles and the simple case where H_1 and H_2 are time-independent and bounded operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , e.g., $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$. We can regard ϕ as an \mathcal{H} -valued function of t_1 and t_2 . Then, for arbitrary initial conditions $\phi(0, 0)$ we can obtain a solution of the multi-time equations (4) in two different ways,

$$\phi(t_1, t_2) = e^{-iH_2 t_2} \phi(t_1, 0) = e^{-iH_2 t_2} e^{-iH_1 t_1} \phi(0, 0) \quad (9)$$

and

$$\phi(t_1, t_2) = e^{-iH_1 t_1} \phi(0, t_2) = e^{-iH_1 t_1} e^{-iH_2 t_2} \phi(0, 0). \quad (10)$$

Both expressions agree (and thus yield a joint solution ϕ) for all initial $\phi(0, 0) \in \mathcal{H}$ if and only if

$$[H_1, H_2] = 0. \quad (11)$$

Since the Hamiltonians do not depend on t_1 or t_2 , they commute with $\partial/\partial t_j$, and the consistency condition (8) amounts to (11). A more general and detailed derivation and discussion of condition (8) is given in Section 2.

1.3 Perspective

The time evolution of non-interacting particles trivially satisfies (8). The central claim of this paper is that every interaction potential violates the consistency condition (8).

Before explaining the details of the claim, let us put it into perspective. The claim might be surprising from the point of view of non-relativistic quantum mechanics because there, potentials are the only method of implementing interaction between the particles. A different method, however, is available in quantum field theory, where the particle number is not fixed: there, particles can interact by emitting and absorbing other particles. And indeed, as we show in [17, 19, 20], this kind of interaction can be implemented with consistent multi-time equations; the analysis of the consistency of these equations is more delicate because, as the number of particles is not fixed, also

the number of time variables is not fixed; yet, the analysis can be done and confirms the consistency of natural choices of multi-time equations with particle creation and annihilation.

From a different perspective, our claim, that interaction potentials make multi-time equations inconsistent, may be *unsurprising*: Multi-time wave functions were introduced for the purpose of a *covariant* description of the quantum state, and interaction potentials may seem incompatible with relativity. After all, interaction potentials involve a function $V(x, y)$ with x, y different space-time points, and this suggests that interaction potentials represent a direct (and possibly faster-than-light) action-at-a-distance, in conflict with principles of relativity and presumably implying, in particular, the possibility of superluminal signaling.

On the other hand, it is not uncommon to use, in (relativistic) quantum electrodynamics, the Coulomb gauge of the quantized fields, which leads to an explicit Coulomb potential term in the Hamiltonian besides the quantized degrees of freedom of the electromagnetic field; see, e.g., [5]. So it is perhaps not so clear that interaction potentials have no place in relativistic theories.

Moreover, while the use of multi-time wave functions is motivated by relativity, they can be considered also independently of relativity. In particular, one can consider multi-time equations of the form (4) that are not covariant but make use of a special Lorentz frame and will have a different H_j after transformation to a different frame. So it may again be surprising that even if we do not require Lorentz invariance but only consistency of the multi-time equations, interaction potentials are excluded. As a consequence, in view of our results in this paper and in [17, 19, 20], the mere introduction of multi-time wave functions, with space-time configurations as arguments, naturally leads us to considering particle creation and annihilation.

On the other hand, further possibilities are known to exist, at least mathematically, and at least if we are willing to consider H_j that are nonlocal in time: Several authors [11, 9, 10, 25, 14] have given examples of Lorentz-invariant equations of the form (4) for $N = 2$ particles that are, at least in some sense, consistent. In these examples, the interaction terms neither are multiplication operators (like potentials) nor involve particle creation; instead, $H_j\phi$ involves integrating ϕ over some time interval (partly in the future), so that these equations may not determine ϕ from initial data as in a Cauchy problem.

As a last remark, our result may seem unsurprising in view of the result of Currie, Jordan, and Sudarshan [6], who showed for $N = 2$ particles that classical mechanics, in a particular Hamiltonian formulation, cannot be made relativistic except in the absence of interaction. Then again, it is not clear whether and why that particular Hamiltonian formulation should be regarded as the appropriate classical analog of the framework of multi-time Schrödinger equations; see [18] for further discussion.

1.4 Example of Inconsistent Multi-Time Equations

Let us now look at an explicit example of multi-time equations with potentials. Consider the two-particle Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^d)$ and the Hamiltonian

$$H = H^{\text{free}} + V = H_1^{\text{free}} + H_2^{\text{free}} + \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|} \quad (12)$$

in the usual single-time picture, where the H_j^{free} are the free Schrödinger ($d = 1$) or free Dirac ($d = 16$) Hamiltonians. To begin with, in view of (6), how should the potential be distributed on the two partial Hamiltonians? If $V(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$ were of the form $V_1(\mathbf{x}_1) + V_2(\mathbf{x}_2)$ then it would be natural to define $H_j = H_j^{\text{free}} + V_j$, but such a potential V would represent an external field and not interaction between the two particles. One obvious (though perhaps unnatural) possibility for the Coulomb potential is to attribute half of the potential to each of the partial Hamiltonians, i.e., to set

$$H_j = H_j^{\text{free}} + \frac{1}{2\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|}. \quad (13)$$

But then the consistency condition (8) is violated. Indeed, if the H_j^{free} are the free Schrödinger Hamiltonians,

$$H_j^{\text{free}} = -\frac{1}{2m}\Delta_j, \quad (14)$$

then

$$[H_1, H_2] = \frac{\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2}{2m\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|^3} \cdot (\nabla_1 + \nabla_2) \neq 0, \quad (15)$$

and if the H_j^{free} are the free Dirac Hamiltonians (we set $c = 1$),

$$H_j^{\text{free}} = -i\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j \cdot \nabla_j + \beta_j m, \quad (16)$$

then

$$[H_1, H_2] = \frac{i(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)}{2\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|^3} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 + \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2) \neq 0. \quad (17)$$

(Here, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j$ means the 3-vector consisting of the three Dirac alpha matrices, acting on the spin index of particle j .) As above, for time-independent Hamiltonians the consistency condition (8) amounts to $[H_1, H_2] = 0$. Thus, the most obvious choice of multi-time equations for two particles with a Coulomb potential is inconsistent.

(Furthermore, the only joint solution $\phi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ of (4) is zero. Indeed, an initial wave function which is mapped to zero by the operator in (15) must be constant along the line $\{(\mathbf{a} + (1+s)\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a} + s\mathbf{b}) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and thus cannot be square-integrable unless it vanishes almost everywhere. The kernel of the operator in (17) consists of those wave functions $\psi : \mathbb{R}^6 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{16}$ such that, at almost every $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$, $\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$ is an eigenvector of $(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1$ with eigenvalue $\pm\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|$ and simultaneously an eigenvector of $(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2$ with eigenvalue $\mp\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|$; non-zero elements of the kernel will not remain in the kernel under $\exp(-iH_1 t)$ or $\exp(-iH_2 t)$.)

Several previous authors, starting from Bloch [2], were aware of this kind of difficulties with potentials; some [11, 16] mentioned it explicitly.

1.5 Brief Overview of Results

1.5.1 Results on Consistency Condition

The first type of results that we present (Theorems 1 and 2) are precise formulations and proofs of the statement that the condition (8) is necessary and sufficient for the consistency of the system of multi-time equations (4). In this context we also elucidate (Section 2.3) a perspective from which (8) expresses the vanishing of the curvature of a gauge connection on a vector bundle with fibers \mathcal{H} over the space \mathbb{R}^N spanned by the time axes, such that time evolution corresponds to parallel transport in this bundle.

1.5.2 Inconsistency Results

The main goal of this paper is to prove in great generality that interaction potentials in multi-time equations lead to violations of the consistency condition (8). Our results (Theorems 3–7) cover arbitrary smooth potential functions, also time-dependent ones, such as $V_j(t_1, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, t_N, \mathbf{x}_N)$; they cover the free Dirac Hamiltonian and the Laplace operator, and in fact all self-adjoint differential operators up to second order, as free Hamiltonians.

Furthermore, writing $x = (x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3) = (x^0, \mathbf{x}) = (t, \mathbf{x})$ for a space-time point, it is reasonable to demand of ϕ only that it be defined on the set of *spacelike configurations* of N particles,

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in (\mathbb{R}^4)^N : \forall j \neq k : x_j \sim x_k \text{ or } x_j = x_k \right\} \quad (18)$$

(where $x \sim y$ means that x is spacelike to y),³ and not on all of $(\mathbb{R}^4)^N$.⁴ In that case, also the partial Hamiltonians need to be defined only on \mathcal{S} (e.g., as differential operators), and also the consistency condition can only be expected to hold on \mathcal{S} . Among our inconsistency results, we also prove that even if the consistency condition holds only on \mathcal{S} , all consistent potentials are interaction-free.

1.5.3 Consistency with Cut-Off Length δ

Another result we prove (Theorem 8) concerns a scenario with a cut-off length $\delta > 0$. Although a cut-off length is usually not considered for potentials but only for particle creation, we consider it here for potentials because that allows for a consistent kind of multi-time equations. In an arbitrary but fixed Lorentz frame L , we consider instead of \mathcal{S} the set of *δ -spacelike configurations*,

$$\mathcal{S}_\delta = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in (\mathbb{R}^4)^N : \forall j \neq k : x_j^0 = x_k^0 \text{ or } \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_k\| > |x_j^0 - x_k^0| + \delta \right\}. \quad (19)$$

³We say that x is spacelike to y if and only if $(x^0 - y^0)^2 - \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 < 0$. For a *spacelike configuration*, we allow repeated entries, $x_j = x_k$.

⁴Bloch [2] has argued first that multi-time wave functions ϕ should be defined only on \mathcal{S} , a view that we share. As we show in [17], it is actually the case that interaction implemented by the creation and annihilation of particles is consistent on spacelike configurations, but not on all space-time configurations (i.e., consistent on the analog of \mathcal{S} for a variable number of particles, but not on that of $(\mathbb{R}^4)^N$).

This is the set of those spacelike configurations in which additionally for each pair of particles either the times are equal or the spatial distance from one particle's light cone to the other particle is bigger than δ . Figure 1 shows an example of such a configuration.




Figure 1: A space-time configuration belonging to \mathcal{S}_δ

Our result, Theorem 8, asserts that for a pair potential of range δ or less, the obvious multi-time equations on \mathcal{S}_δ (with Dirac operators as H_j^{free}) are consistent.⁵

In more detail, for any δ -spacelike configuration the N particles can be grouped together in families that have equal time coordinate. The obvious multi-time equations say that particles belonging to different families do not interact (as they have distances greater than δ anyway), while each family, having only one joint time coordinate, satisfies one Schrödinger equation that contains interaction potentials. It is therefore not surprising that the multi-time equations, one equation per family, are consistent. Yet, the proof requires some work, as the grouping into families is not fixed but varies over \mathcal{S}_δ . (Note also that two particles at a distance $> \delta$ can interact by interacting with a third particle, travelling from one to the other if necessary.)

This model breaks Lorentz invariance in two ways: the set \mathcal{S}_δ is not Lorentz invariant, and the time evolution involves L -instantaneous interaction within each family (over distances up to δ), and thus superluminal signaling. This leads to the question, which we address now, whether a fully relativistic version of the example could be obtained by letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

⁵As a consequence, the statement made in the title of this paper is not true on \mathcal{S}_δ , and the title should be understood as meaning that multi-time Schrödinger equations without cut-off length cannot contain interaction potentials.

1.5.4 On the Limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$

The answer is negative: There is no consistent set of multi-time equations with interaction of range 0 based on the Dirac equation. Indeed, such a multi-time evolution would involve a wave function ϕ defined on the set of spacelike configurations of N particles, which at each spacelike configuration (x_1, \dots, x_N) (away from the set where $x_j = x_k$) would satisfy the free multi-time Dirac equations,

$$i \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t_j} = (-i \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j \cdot \nabla_j + \beta_j m) \phi \quad (20)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, N$. While these equations look like the free equations, they alone may not completely determine the time evolution, as the set \mathcal{S} of spacelike configurations has a non-empty boundary $\partial \mathcal{S}$; to determine the time evolution it might be necessary to specify boundary conditions on $\partial \mathcal{S}$, and one might hope that a suitable choice of boundary condition will define a consistent interacting multi-time evolution. However, consider (in any one Lorentz frame L) the 1-time wave function ψ obtained from the multi-time wave function ϕ as in (5). As a consequence of (20), ψ would satisfy the free N -particle 1-time Dirac equation

$$i \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \sum_{j=1}^N (-i \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j \cdot \nabla_j + \beta_j m_j) \psi \quad (21)$$

on the set

$$\mathbb{R}_{\neq}^{3,N} = \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) \in (\mathbb{R}^3)^N : \forall j \neq k : \mathbf{x}_j \neq \mathbf{x}_k \right\} = (\mathbb{R}^3)^N \setminus D \quad (22)$$

of configurations without collisions. It is known [24] that the Dirac equation does not allow for point interactions if the dimension of physical space is 3; that is, if (21) holds away from the diagonal D then it also holds on the diagonal D ; put yet differently, the free Dirac Hamiltonian as in (21) is essentially self-adjoint on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3N} \setminus D, (\mathbb{C}^4)^{\otimes N})$, and its unique self-adjoint extension is again a free Dirac operator. Thus, the theory in the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ is free of interaction.

2 The Consistency Condition

Since the time derivatives $\partial/\partial t_j$ and $\partial/\partial t_k$ commute, (8) is just a more compact way of writing

$$[H_j, H_k] - i \frac{\partial H_k}{\partial t_j} + i \frac{\partial H_j}{\partial t_k} = 0 \quad \forall j \neq k. \quad (23)$$

We now want to convey why this condition is necessary and sufficient for the multi-time equations (4) to possess a joint solution for every initial condition. We will approach this point from several angles.

2.1 Heuristic Derivation

First, regard the multi-time equations (4) as N equations about a function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{4N} \rightarrow S$ (with S the spin-space, e.g., $S = \mathbb{C}$ for spinless particles, or $S = (\mathbb{C}^4)^{\otimes N}$ for Dirac particles). If ϕ is a joint solution then

$$\left[i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} - H_j, i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_k} - H_k \right] \phi = 0 \quad \forall j \neq k. \quad (24)$$

Now suppose that arbitrary times τ_1, \dots, τ_N can be chosen as initial times, at which arbitrary initial data $\phi|_{t_1=\tau_1, \dots, t_N=\tau_N}$ can be specified. Then the left-hand side of (24) has to vanish at $t_1 = \tau_1, \dots, t_N = \tau_N$ for arbitrary $\phi|_{t_1=\tau_1, \dots, t_N=\tau_N}$, and therefore the commutator has to vanish at $t_1 = \tau_1, \dots, t_N = \tau_N$. Since the τ_j were arbitrary, the commutator has to vanish everywhere, which is what we wanted to derive.

It is sometimes important to note that, for the condition (8) to characterize consistency, the commutator has to vanish not only on all *joint solutions* ϕ of (4), but on *all possible initial conditions*, or, equivalently (since, as visible from (23), the left-hand side of (24) does not involve the time derivative of ϕ), on *all functions* $\mathbb{R}^{4N} \rightarrow S$.

In many relevant cases, the commutator can also be considered locally (i.e., at a single point in \mathbb{R}^{4N}), e.g., when the H_j are differential operators; then the commutator may vanish on some subset U of \mathbb{R}^{4N} but not on its complement. This case is relevant in connection with the fact that the Dirac equation has a finite propagation speed (given by the speed of light, which we have set to 1), so that a solution $\psi(t, \mathbf{x})$ of the (1-particle) Dirac equation depends on the initial data $\psi(0, \cdot)$ only through the initial data in the closed ball $\overline{B}_{|t|}(\mathbf{x})$ around \mathbf{x} with radius $|t|$ (called the domain of dependence). If every H_j has propagation speed 1, then $\phi(\tau_1 + \varepsilon, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \tau_N + \varepsilon, \mathbf{x}_N)$ depends on initial data at times τ_1, \dots, τ_N only on $\overline{B}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_1) \times \dots \times \overline{B}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_N)$, and for solving (4) on the Cartesian product of the cones between $(\tau_j + \varepsilon, \mathbf{x}_j)$ and $(\tau_j, \overline{B}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_j))$ we only need that this product set is contained in U . In particular, for solving (4) on \mathcal{S} we only need that (8) holds on \mathcal{S} .

2.2 Exact Formulations

Another way of thinking about the consistency condition is from a Hilbert space perspective. Regard ϕ as a function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ on the space \mathbb{R}^N spanned by the N time axes, with values in a Hilbert space, e.g., $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N}, S)$. The partial Hamiltonians are N operator-valued functions $H_1(t_1, \dots, t_N), \dots, H_N(t_1, \dots, t_N)$.

A simple case is that in which the H_j are time-independent:

Theorem 1. *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and let H_1, \dots, H_N be (time-independent) self-adjoint operators in \mathcal{H} . Then the system of equations (4) possesses a strong solution for every initial condition $\phi(0, \dots, 0) \in \mathcal{H}$ if and only if the consistency condition $[H_j, H_k] = 0$ holds (in the spectral sense) for all $j \neq k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.*

The proof is given in Section 5. Here, a *strong solution* means a function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$\phi(t_1, \dots, t_N) = e^{-iH_j t_j} \phi(t_1, \dots, t_{j-1}, 0, t_{j+1}, \dots, t_N) \quad (25)$$

for every $j = 1, \dots, N$, in analogy to the usual terminology that a strong solution of the single-time Schrödinger equation $i\partial_t\psi = H\psi$ is a function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that $\psi(t) = e^{-iHt}\psi(0)$. Furthermore, to say that $[H_1, H_2] = 0$ “in the spectral sense” means that, for all measurable sets $A_1, A_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, the corresponding spectral projections $P_1 = 1_{A_1}(H_1)$ and $P_2 = 1_{A_2}(H_2)$ commute. In case H_1 and H_2 are bounded operators (and thus defined on all of \mathcal{H}), this statement is equivalent to $H_1H_2 = H_2H_1$. (For unbounded operators, the expression $H_1H_2 - H_2H_1$ may not be defined on a dense domain because the range of H_1 may not be contained in, or even may not overlap non-trivially with, the domain of H_2 and vice versa.)

Let us return to the general case $H_j = H_j(t_1, \dots, t_N)$.

Theorem 2. *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and let H_1, \dots, H_N be smooth functions on \mathbb{R}^N with values in the bounded operators on \mathcal{H} . Then the system of equations (4) possesses a solution $\phi : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ for every initial condition $\phi(0, \dots, 0) \in \mathcal{H}$ if and only if the consistency condition (8) holds.*

The derivative $\partial/\partial t_j$ in (4) is understood here as the limit in the Hilbert space topology of the appropriate difference quotient. The proof of Theorem 2 is also given in Section 5. The restriction to *bounded* $H_j(t_1, \dots, t_N)$ in Theorem 2 can presumably be relaxed if a more refined proof is used. For finite-dimensional \mathcal{H} , Theorem 2 was already known [12].

2.3 Path Independence

Let us explore further the view of ϕ as an \mathcal{H} -valued function on \mathbb{R}^N . Already the simplified derivation of the consistency condition in Section 1.2 has made clear that consistency is related to a certain type of path independence: It was relevant to consistency that we could either first increase the t_1 variable from its initial to its final value, and then the t_2 variable, or vice versa. The first way of obtaining $\phi(t_1, t_2)$ from $\phi(0, 0)$ proceeds along a path that is the polygonal chain from $(0, 0)$ to $(t_1, 0)$ to (t_1, t_2) ; the second along the path from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, t_2)$ to (t_1, t_2) ; see Figure 2.

As further alternatives, we could first increase t_1 a bit, then t_2 , then t_1 some more, then t_2 , etc.. More generally, also for N time variables, with every path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ from the initial point $\gamma(0) = \vec{t}^i = (t_1^i, \dots, t_N^i)$ to the final point $\gamma(1) = \vec{t}^f = (t_1^f, \dots, t_N^f)$, there is associated an evolution operator

$$U_\gamma = \mathcal{T}e^{-i \int_\gamma \sum_j H_j dt_j}, \quad (26)$$

which means the path-ordered exponential integral, i.e., the value $U(1)$ of the solution of the differential equation

$$\frac{dU(s)}{ds} = -i \sum_j H_j(\gamma(s)) \frac{d\gamma_j(s)}{ds} U(s) \quad (27)$$

with initial condition $U(0) = I$, the identity operator; for bounded H_j , it is given by the Dyson series (see Section 5 for more detail).




Figure 2: Two paths in the $t_1 t_2$ -plane from $(0,0)$ to (t_1, t_2) associated with two ways of computing $\phi(t_1, t_2)$ from $\phi(0,0)$: either first increase the t_1 variable and then t_2 , or first increase t_2 and then t_1 . Dashed: another path from $(0,0)$ to (t_1, t_2) associated with another way, first increase the t_1 variable a bit but not to the desired final value, then increase the t_2 variable a bit, then t_1 again etc..

The consistency of (4) is then equivalent to saying that every path γ from \vec{t}^i to \vec{t}^f yields the same operator U_γ ; or, put differently, since any point in \mathbb{R}^N could serve as \vec{t}^i or \vec{t}^f , that U_γ depends only on the endpoints of γ .

We note that, as discussed in more detail in [17], a similar situation occurs for the Tomonaga–Schwinger equation, which defines the evolution of a wave function in Hilbert space along any path in the set of spacelike hypersurfaces; if the consistency condition of the Tomonaga–Schwinger equation is satisfied, then the evolution is path-independent, and thus depends only on the initial and the final hypersurface but not on the foliation used to interpolate between the two.

Returning to the consistency of (4), the evolution operator U_γ and its path-independence can be naturally expressed in terms of a gauge connection of a vector bundle. Consider as the base manifold the space \mathbb{R}^N spanned by the N time axes, take as the fiber spaces copies of \mathcal{H} (so it is a trivial vector bundle), and regard ϕ as a cross-section of this vector bundle. Define a gauge connection (or “covariant derivative”) on this bundle by⁶

$$\nabla_j = \partial_j - iA_j \tag{28}$$

with $\partial_j = \partial/\partial t_j$ and connection coefficients $A_j = -H_j$.⁷ Then U_γ coincides with the

⁶We use the symbol ∇_j in this paper in two different meanings: here, it means the covariant derivative in the t_j -direction, whereas in some other places including (15), (20), and (21), it means the gradient $(\partial/\partial x_{j,1}, \partial/\partial x_{j,2}, \partial/\partial x_{j,3})$ with respect to spatial variables. It should always be clear from the context which meaning is intended.

⁷Put differently, a gauge connection can be described, relative to some other gauge connection, by a one-form with values in the Lie algebra of the gauge group; here, the reference connection [∂ in (28)] is the one along which the Hilbert spaces in the bundle are identified with \mathcal{H} (and thus with each other), the Lie algebra of the gauge group consists of operators on \mathcal{H} , and a one-form on \mathbb{R}^N can be specified by specifying its N components $A_j = -H_j$.

parallel transport operator along γ associated with the gauge connection, a joint solution ϕ is a cross-section for which all covariant derivatives vanish, and path-independence is equivalent to saying that all closed curves γ have trivial holonomy (i.e., $U_\gamma = I$). By the non-Abelian Stokes theorem (see the proof of Theorem 2 in Section 5), the holonomy of a closed curve γ equals the ordered exponential integral of the curvature over any oriented 2-surface Σ whose oriented boundary is γ . As a consequence, a gauge connection has only trivial holonomies if and only if its curvature F vanishes. Here, F is an operator-valued 2-form; by the standard formula for computing curvature from the connection coefficients, the components of F are

$$F_{jk} = -\frac{\partial H_k}{\partial t_j} + \frac{\partial H_j}{\partial t_k} - i[H_j, H_k]. \quad (29)$$

Thus, path-independence (and thus consistency) is equivalent to

$$F_{jk} = 0 \quad \forall j \neq k, \quad (30)$$

which coincides with condition (8) in the form (23). We have thus obtained another derivation of the equivalence between (8) and consistency; a precise version of this derivation is formulated in Section 5.

2.4 Comparison with the Frobenius Theorem

The statement that (8) is necessary and sufficient for the consistency of a system of multi-time equations bears some similarity with the Frobenius theorem of differential topology, which concerns the following. Suppose that with every point $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is associated a subspace $S_q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of dimension $N < d$; the family of the subspaces S_q is called *integrable* if and only if there exists an N -dimensional foliation of \mathbb{R}^d such that S_q is the tangent space of the foliation at q . The Frobenius theorem provides a necessary and sufficient condition for integrability. Equivalently, the situation can be expressed in terms of a system of N partial differential equations for a function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-N}$, $\phi(q) = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N)$, of the form

$$\sum_{n=1}^d f_{kn}(q) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial q_n} = 0 \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, N \quad (31)$$

with real-valued coefficients f_{kn} .

Here, the leaves of the foliation are supposed to be the surfaces of constant $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N)$; they do form a foliation if the matrix $D(q) = (D_{in}) = (\partial \phi_i / \partial q_n)$ has full rank $d - N$ at every $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$. At every q , the N vectors (written as directional derivative operators)

$$L_k = \sum_{n=1}^d f_{kn}(q) \frac{\partial}{\partial q_n} \quad (32)$$

span the subspace S_q ; Eq. (31) expresses that the foliation is tangent to S_q . The family S_q is integrable if and only if there is a solution ϕ of (31) such that $D(q)$ has full rank

at every q ; in this case, Eq. (31) is said to be integrable. The Frobenius theorem states that (31) is integrable in a neighborhood of $q_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ if and only if the operators L_k satisfy the commutator condition

$$[L_i, L_j] = \sum_{k=1}^N c_{ijk}(q) L_k \quad (33)$$

in a neighborhood of q_0 for suitable functions c_{ijk} .

To compare the Frobenius theorem to Theorem 2, we consider $d = 4N$, $q = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$, and

$$L_k = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k^0} + iH_k. \quad (34)$$

The similarities are that both theorems concern the possibility of a joint solution ϕ of several PDEs; that this possibility occurs if and only if the PDEs satisfy a certain integrability condition; and that this condition can be expressed in terms of the commutator $[L_i, L_j]$. The differences are that ϕ in Theorem 2 can have any number of components, not just $d - N$; that Theorem 2 does not guarantee that $D(q)$ has full rank at every q ; relatedly, that a joint solution ϕ of (4) does not, in general, define an N -dimensional foliation of \mathbb{R}^d ; that the operators H_k in Theorem 2 can have matrix-valued coefficients, do not have to be of first order, and do not have to be differential operators;⁸ and that the commutator in (8) has to vanish, rather than being a linear combination of the L_k . Thus, neither theorem is a special case of the other.

A statement of the following type can be regarded as a generalized Frobenius theorem that covers both the original Frobenius theorem and the consistency of multi-time Schrödinger equations as special cases:

- Let \mathcal{H} be a vector space. The system of partial differential equations for $\phi : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$,

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t_j} = f_j(t_1, \dots, t_N, \phi(t_1, \dots, t_N)), \quad (35)$$

possesses a solution ϕ on \mathbb{R}^N for every initial condition $\phi(0, \dots, 0) = \phi_0$ if and only if the functions $f_j : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, everywhere satisfy the consistency condition

$$\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial t_k} + f_k \cdot \nabla_\phi f_j = \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t_j} + f_j \cdot \nabla_\phi f_k \quad (36)$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, N$. In this case, the solution is unique.

For finite-dimensional \mathcal{H} (and under certain technical assumptions on the f_j), this statement can be found as Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 in [12]. On the other hand, for

⁸Strictly speaking, Theorem 2 does not apply to differential operators because they are unbounded; but an appropriate version of Theorem 2 will be true of differential operators.

$f_j(t_1, \dots, t_N, \phi) = -iH_j(t_1, \dots, t_N)\phi$, (35) reduces to (4) and (36) to (8), and Theorems 1 and 2 above provide precise versions of the statement. The original Frobenius theorem (or at least a variant thereof) is a special case of the statement for $(q_1, \dots, q_d) = (t_1, \dots, t_N, x_1, \dots, x_{d-N})$, $L_k = \partial/\partial t_k + \sum_{n=1}^{d-N} f_{kn}(q) \partial/\partial x_n$, \mathcal{H} a suitable space of functions of (x_1, \dots, x_{d-N}) , and $f_j(t_1, \dots, t_N, \phi) = -\sum_{n=1}^{d-N} f_{jn}(q) \partial\phi/\partial x_n$.

3 Results on Inconsistency of Potentials

We now state our results about the inconsistency of interaction potentials. The proofs are postponed to Section 6. The results cover, as the free Hamiltonians, both the free Schrödinger Hamiltonian⁹

$$H_i^{\text{free}} = -\frac{1}{2m}\Delta_i, \quad (37)$$

and the free Dirac Hamiltonian

$$H_i^{\text{free}} = -i\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \cdot \nabla_i + \beta_i m. \quad (38)$$

Since we are more interested in the Dirac case, we formulate our results first for first-order operators (Theorems 3–6), and present the corresponding results for second-order operators afterwards in Theorem 7.

So consider $\phi_{s_1, \dots, s_N}(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ with $s_j = 1, \dots, 4$ the spin index of the j -th particle; that is, $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{4N} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^4)^{\otimes N}$. In the following Theorem 3 we consider real scalar interaction potentials.

Theorem 3. *Suppose $H_i = H_i^{\text{free}} + V_i(x_1, \dots, x_N)$, where H_i^{free} is the free Dirac Hamiltonian (38) acting on \boldsymbol{x}_i (and the i -th spin index), and $V_i : \mathbb{R}^{4N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth. The consistency condition (8) is satisfied on \mathbb{R}^{4N} only if the evolution (4) is gauge-equivalent to a non-interacting one, i.e., there are smooth real-valued functions $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\tilde{V}_i(x_i)$ such that*

$$\tilde{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_N) := e^{i\theta(x_1, \dots, x_N)} \phi(x_1, \dots, x_N) \quad (39)$$

satisfies the equations

$$i \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}}{\partial t_i} = \left(H_i^{\text{free}} + \tilde{V}_i(x_i) \right) \tilde{\phi} \quad (40)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$.

Theorem 3 can easily be generalized to more arbitrary first-order differential operators.

⁹There should be no difficulty with distinguishing when the symbol i denotes the unit imaginary number from when it denotes a particle label.

Theorem 4. *Theorem 3 is still true if the free Dirac operator is replaced by any first-order differential operator*

$$H_i^{\text{free}} = -i \sum_{a=1}^3 A_{i,a} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i,a}} + B_i \quad (41)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, N$, where the coefficients $A_{i,a}$ and B_i are self-adjoint $k_i \times k_i$ matrices acting on the index $s_i = 1, \dots, k_i$ of the wave function (referring to the spin space \mathbb{C}^{k_i} of the i -th particle), and for each i the four matrices $A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}, A_{i,3}, I$ (with I the identity matrix) are linearly independent.¹⁰ That is, let, for every i ,

$$H_i = H_i^{\text{free}} + V_i(x_1, \dots, x_N) \quad (42)$$

with arbitrary real-valued, smooth potential functions V_i . The consistency condition (8) is satisfied only if the multi-time evolution (4) defined by H_1, \dots, H_N is gauge-equivalent to a non-interacting one, i.e., (as before) there are smooth real-valued functions $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ and $\tilde{V}_i(x_i)$ such that $\tilde{\phi}$ given by (39) satisfies (40).

The assumption that $A_{i,a}$ and B_i be self-adjoint can actually be dropped; it is not used in the proof, nor in that of Theorem 5. However, as far as we are aware, it is satisfied in all examples of physical interest. The assumption that $A_{i,a}$ be self-adjoint is needed in Theorem 6.

In the following theorem, we consider spacelike configurations. As remarked in the introduction, it is reasonable to expect that multi-time wave functions are defined only on \mathcal{S} . It is useful to also have a notation for the set of spacelike configurations *without collisions* (i.e., demanding $x_j \neq x_k$),

$$\mathcal{S}_{\neq} = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in (\mathbb{R}^4)^N : \forall j \neq k : x_j \sim x_k \right\}, \quad (43)$$

where $x \sim y$ means that x is spacelike to y .

Theorem 5. *Theorem 4 is still true if the consistency condition holds only on the set \mathcal{S}_{\neq} of collision-free spacelike configurations and the multi-time wave function is defined only on \mathcal{S}_{\neq} .*

Theorem 5 yields that (40) holds on \mathcal{S}_{\neq} . In order to see that this actually implies the absence of interaction, note that it implies the corresponding 1-time equation

$$i \frac{\partial \tilde{\psi}}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^N (H_i^{\text{free}} + \tilde{V}_i(t, \mathbf{x}_i)) \tilde{\psi} \quad (44)$$

on $\mathbb{R}^{3N} \setminus D$, where D is the set of collision configurations (“the diagonal”). Since the Dirac equation does not allow for point interactions [24] if the dimension of physical

¹⁰This is the case for the free Dirac Hamiltonian with $k_i = 4$, $A_{i,a} = \alpha_a$ acting on s_i and $B_i = \beta m$ acting on s_i ; indeed, the three α matrices and I are linearly independent in the space of self-adjoint 4×4 matrices.

space is 3, (44) holds also on D . (More precisely, the only self-adjoint Hamiltonian in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N}, (\mathbb{C}^4)^{\otimes N})$ that agrees with (44) on smooth functions with compact support away from D is the obvious, non-interacting one.) And a multi-time evolution law can hardly be called interacting if it is non-interacting on the equal-time configurations.¹¹

The most general one of our inconsistency theorems is

Theorem 6. *Theorems 4 and 5 are still true if the matrices $A_{i,a}$ and B_i are allowed to depend smoothly on x_i (such that still, for each x_i , the four matrices $A_{i,1}(x_i)$, $A_{i,2}(x_i)$, $A_{i,3}(x_i)$, I are linearly independent), and if $V_i(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ is, rather than a real scalar, a self-adjoint $k_i \times k_i$ matrix acting on the index s_i ; it is understood that also $\tilde{V}_i(x_i)$ is a self-adjoint $k_i \times k_i$ matrix acting on the index s_i , while $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ is still real.*

The remark after Theorem 5 applies also to Theorem 6.

Theorem 6 should be regarded as the main result of this paper, and we take it to rule out interaction potentials for covariant multi-time equations. The case of x_i -dependent coefficients occurs, for example, when H_i^{free} is the free Dirac operator on a curved space-time.

For the proofs of Theorems 5 and 6 we need some auxiliary lemmas about the connectedness of \mathcal{S}_\neq and certain subsets thereof, in particular that $\mathcal{S}_\neq \subset \mathbb{R}^{4N}$ is simply connected. These lemmas are stated and proven in Section 6, along with the proofs of the theorems from this section.

Finally, the same kind of results can be obtained for Schrödinger operators instead of Dirac operators:

Theorem 7. *Theorems 3, 4, and 6 are also true when H_i^{free} is the free Schrödinger Hamiltonian (37) acting on \mathbf{x}_i , or in fact any second-order differential operator,*

$$H_i^{\text{free}} = \sum_{a,b=1}^3 A_{i,ab}(x_i) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{i,a} \partial x_{i,b}} + \sum_{a=1}^3 B_{i,a}(x_i) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i,a}} + C_i(x_i), \quad (45)$$

where each of the coefficients $A_{i,ab}(x_i)$, $B_{i,a}(x_i)$, $C_i(x_i)$ is a complex $k_i \times k_i$ matrix acting on the index s_i and depending smoothly on x_i , and the $3k_i \times 3k_i$ matrix $(A_{i,ab}(x_i))_{ab}$ has full rank.

That is, for such H_i^{free} , for wave functions $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{4N} \rightarrow \otimes_i \mathbb{C}^{k_i}$, and for smooth $V_i(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ with values in the self-adjoint $k_i \times k_i$ matrices acting on s_i , the consistency condition (8) holds on \mathbb{R}^{4N} only if the multi-time evolution (4) defined by H_1, \dots, H_N with $H_i = H_i^{\text{free}} + V_i$ is gauge-equivalent to a non-interacting one, i.e., there are smooth functions $\theta : \mathbb{R}^{4N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{V}_i : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{k_i \times k_i}$ such that $\tilde{\phi}$ given by (39) satisfies (40) on \mathbb{R}^{4N} .

Here, $\mathbb{C}^{k \times k}$ denotes the space of complex $k \times k$ matrices.

¹¹Even more, one can argue as follows that the only reasonable multi-time evolution obeying (40) on \mathcal{S}_\neq is the one obeying (40) on \mathbb{R}^{4N} . Grouping the particles into families with equal time coordinate as in the proof of Theorem 8 in Section 7, consider the evolution first on the set of configurations with $L = 1$ families, then with $L = 2$, etc.. As just pointed out, for $L = 1$ the only acceptable evolution (i.e., with a self-adjoint Hamiltonian) is non-interacting. Likewise, when considering $L > 1$ families, we require the partial Hamiltonian for each family to be self-adjoint, which implies (by the impossibility of point interactions) that it is non-interacting. It then follows that (40) holds on all of \mathbb{R}^{4N} .

4 Result on Consistency of Potentials with Cut-Off Length δ

In this section we describe a consistent multi-time theory on the set \mathcal{S}_δ of δ -spacelike configurations as in (19) with an interaction pair potential with range δ . We use the notation $q = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ with each $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and similarly $q^4 = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{4N}$ with $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^4$.

Let us first turn to the way in which the particles are grouped into families. Any configuration $q^4 \in \mathcal{S}_\delta$ defines a partition P_{q^4} of the set $\{1, \dots, N\}$ of all particles by the equivalence classes of the relation that holds between j and k if and only if $t_j = t_k$. A *partition* P of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ is a set $P = \{S_1, \dots, S_L\}$ of non-empty subsets S_α of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ with $\cup_{\alpha=1}^L S_\alpha = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $S_\alpha \cap S_\beta = \emptyset$ for $\alpha \neq \beta$. For every partition P we define

$$\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P} = \left\{ q^4 \in \mathbb{R}^{4N} : \begin{aligned} (1) & \forall \alpha = 1, \dots, L \forall i, j \in S_\alpha : t_i = t_j \\ (2) & \forall \alpha \neq \beta \forall i \in S_\alpha, j \in S_\beta : \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\| > |t_i - t_j| + \delta \end{aligned} \right\}. \quad (46)$$

Figure 1 shows a configuration in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \{S_1, S_2\}}$ with $S_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $S_2 = \{4, 5\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{P}_N = \left\{ \text{partitions } P \text{ of } \{1 \dots N\} \right\} \quad (47)$$

and note that¹²

$$\mathcal{S}_\delta = \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_N} \mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}. \quad (48)$$

If $q^4 \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$ then we also write t_α for the joint time variable of all particles in S_α , and q_α for the list of space coordinates of all particles belonging to S_α ; using that notation, we also write $q^4 = (t_1, q_1; \dots; t_L, q_L)$, so that $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$ can also be regarded as an open subset of \mathbb{R}^{3N+L} (while we still sometimes find the notation $q^4 = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ convenient). (The ambiguity as to whether the symbol t_1 refers to the family $\alpha = 1$ or to the particle $j = 1$ should not cause any practical difficulty.) We say that a function ϕ is *smooth on* $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$ if it is smooth as a function of the variables $t_1, q_1, \dots, t_L, q_L$; we say that ϕ is *smooth on* \mathcal{S}_δ if it is smooth on each $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$.

A potential V is a pair potential if it can be written as

$$V = \sum_{\substack{i, j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^N W(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j). \quad (49)$$

¹²For most $q^4 \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$, $P_{q^4} = P$, but for some $q^4 \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$, P_{q^4} is coarser than P ; viz., for those q^4 for which particles from S_α happen to have the same time coordinate as particles from S_β , $\beta \neq \alpha$. As a consequence, $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P'}$ need not be disjoint from $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$ for $P' \neq P$. In fact, P_{q^4} is the coarsest partition P such that $q^4 \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$. For any $q^4 \in \mathcal{S}_\delta$, let FP_{q^4} be the partition of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ formed by the equivalence classes of the transitive hull of the relation that holds between j and k if and only if $\|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_k\| \leq |t_j - t_k| + \delta$. Then FP_{q^4} is the finest partition P such that $q^4 \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$. Moreover, $q^4 \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$ for exactly those partitions P that are coarser than (or equal to) FP_{q^4} and finer than (or equal to) P_{q^4} .

We say that a pair potential has *range* δ if and only if, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$W(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \|\mathbf{x}\| \geq \delta. \quad (50)$$

Theorem 8. *Consider N particles and a smooth pair potential with range $\delta > 0$. Then the multi-time Dirac equation is consistent on the set (19) of δ -spacelike configurations.*

In more detail, let $W \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^{4 \times 4})$ be a pair potential with range δ . Then for all initial conditions $\phi_0 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3N}, (\mathbb{C}^4)^{\otimes N})$ there is a unique wave function $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathcal{S}_\delta, (\mathbb{C}^4)^{\otimes N})$ with $\phi|_{t_1=\dots=t_N=0} = \phi_0$ which satisfies on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta,P}$ for every partition $P = \{S_1, \dots, S_L\}$ the equations

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_\alpha} \phi(t_1, q_1; \dots; t_L, q_L) = \left(\sum_{j \in S_\alpha} H_j^{\text{free}} + \sum_{\substack{i, j \in S_\alpha \\ i \neq j}} W(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) \right) \phi(t_1, q_1; \dots; t_L, q_L) \quad (51)$$

for all $\alpha = 1, \dots, L$ and with $t_\alpha = x_i^0$ for all $i \in S_\alpha$; here, H_j^{free} is the free Dirac operator $-i\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j \cdot \nabla_j + \beta_j m$.

The proof is given in Section 7. Because of the shape of \mathcal{S}_δ , Theorems 1 and 2 cannot be applied directly, and the check of consistency requires some care.

5 Proofs of Results on Consistency Condition

Proof of Theorem 1. For ease of notation let us set $N = 2$ first. Let H_1, H_2 be given as self-adjoint operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} that do not depend on t_1, t_2 . By the definition (25) of “strong solution,” any strong solution ϕ of the multi-time equations (4) must satisfy (cf. also Figure 2)

$$e^{-iH_2 t_2} e^{-iH_1 t_1} \phi(0, 0) = \phi(t_1, t_2) = e^{-iH_1 t_1} e^{-iH_2 t_2} \phi(0, 0), \quad (52)$$

and if a solution exists for every $\phi(0, 0) \in \mathcal{H}$ then $e^{-iH_1 t_1}$ must commute with $e^{-iH_2 t_2}$, which requires that $[H_1, H_2] = 0$ in the spectral sense. Conversely, $[H_1, H_2] = 0$ in the spectral sense implies that $e^{-iH_1 t_1}$ commutes with $e^{-iH_2 t_2}$ for all t_1 and t_2 , and then

$$\phi(t_1, t_2) := e^{-iH_1 t_1} e^{-iH_2 t_2} \phi(0, 0) \quad (53)$$

satisfies (25). For $N > 2$ variables, one sees in the same way that it is necessary and sufficient for the existence of a strong solution that all H_1, \dots, H_N commute with each other, which proves Theorem 1. \square

Before proving Theorem 2, we recall the Dyson expansion for the time evolution in the one-time case. We want to solve the Schrödinger equation

$$i \frac{d\psi(t)}{dt} = H(t)\psi(t) \quad (54)$$

for arbitrary initial condition $\psi(s) \in \mathcal{H}$. It is known [21, Theorem X.69] that for a strongly continuous function $t \mapsto H(t)$ into the bounded operators on \mathcal{H} there is a unique operator $U(t, s)$ for every $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $U(s, s) = I$ and, for any $\psi(s) \in \mathcal{H}$, $t \mapsto \psi(t) = U(t, s)\psi(s)$ satisfies (54) with the derivative d/dt understood as the limit in the Hilbert space topology of the difference quotient; $U(t, s)$ is given by a time-ordered exponential, the Dyson series

$$\begin{aligned} U(t, s) &= \mathcal{T} e^{-i \int_s^t H(T) dT} \\ &= I + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-i)^n \int_s^t dT_1 \int_s^{T_1} dT_2 \cdots \int_s^{T_{n-1}} dT_n H(T_1) H(T_2) \cdots H(T_n), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

which converges in operator norm (because it actually follows that $H(\cdot)$ is uniformly bounded on $[s, t]$), and satisfies, by the triangle inequality,

$$\|U(t, s) - I\| \leq \exp\left(|t - s| \sup_{r \in [s, t]} \|H(r)\|\right) - 1 \quad (56)$$

and

$$\|U(t, s)\| \leq \exp\left(|t - s| \sup_{r \in [s, t]} \|H(r)\|\right). \quad (57)$$

We note further that always

$$U(t, s)U(s, r) = U(t, r), \quad (58)$$

in particular

$$U(s, t)U(t, s) = I, \quad (59)$$

so $U(t, s)$ is invertible. For self-adjoint $H(t)$ the operator $U(t, s)$ is unitary. It is perhaps useful to mention that the intuitive, or heuristic, meaning of the time-ordered exponential is a continuous product

$$\mathcal{T} e^{-i \int_s^t H(T) dT} \stackrel{“=”}{=} \prod_{T=s}^t \left(I - iH(T) dT \right) \quad (60)$$

in which the factors (which do not necessarily commute) are ordered so that T increases from right to left.

We offer two proofs for Theorem 2 because we find both of them instructive.

First proof of Theorem 2. For ease of notation we formulate the proof for $N = 2$, although the arguments apply to any N . For the multi-time equations (4) for $\phi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, relevant time evolution operators are given by time-ordered exponentials. As a consequence of (4) for $j = 1$, the time evolution in the first time variable is given by

$$\phi(t_1, t_2) = U(t_1, s_1; t_2) \phi(s_1, t_2) \quad (61)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
U(t_1, s_1; t_2) &= \mathcal{T}_1 e^{-i \int_{s_1}^{t_1} H_1(T, t_2) dT} \\
&= I + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-i)^n \int_{s_1}^{t_1} dT_1 \int_{s_1}^{T_1} dT_2 \cdots \int_{s_1}^{T_{n-1}} dT_n H_1(T_1, t_2) H_1(T_2, t_2) \cdots H_1(T_n, t_2). \quad (62)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(t_1, t_2) \mapsto H(t_1, t_2)$ is assumed to be smooth (with respect to the operator norm), it is in particular norm-continuous and thus uniformly bounded on $[s_1, t_1] \times \{t_2\}$ (or any other compact set in \mathbb{R}^2), so that the Dyson series converges (in operator norm). Similarly, if we keep the first time variable fixed, we find

$$\phi(t_1, t_2) = U(t_1; t_2, s_2) \phi(t_1, s_2) = \mathcal{T}_2 e^{-i \int_{s_2}^{t_2} H_2(t_1, T) dT} \phi(t_1, s_2). \quad (63)$$

We have thus obtained the time evolution for vertical and horizontal line segments in \mathbb{R}^2 . For any path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ that is a concatenation of such segments, it follows further that

$$\phi(\gamma(1)) = U_\gamma \phi(\gamma(0)) \quad (64)$$

with U_γ the product of the time evolution operators for each segment, ordered from right to left as the segments are run through by γ .

As a consequence of (61) and (63), every solution $\phi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ of (4) satisfies (in analogy to (52), cf. also Figure 2)

$$U(t_1, s_1; t_2) U(s_1; t_2, s_2) \phi(s_1, s_2) = \phi(t_1, t_2) = U(t_1; t_2, s_2) U(t_1, s_1; s_2) \phi(s_1, s_2) \quad (65)$$

for all $t_1, t_2, s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Now fix $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Consistency, i.e., the existence of a solution for every $\phi(0, 0) \in \mathcal{H}$, is equivalent to the existence of a solution for every $\phi(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{H}$. Indeed, assuming consistency, then for any given $\tilde{\phi}(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists a solution with $\phi(0, 0) = U(0, s_1; 0) U(s_1; 0, s_2) \tilde{\phi}(s_1, s_2)$, and by (65) and (59) it will have

$$\phi(s_1, s_2) = U(s_1; s_2, 0) U(s_1, 0; 0) \phi(0, 0) \quad (66)$$

$$= U(s_1; s_2, 0) U(s_1, 0; 0) U(0, s_1; 0) U(s_1; 0, s_2) \tilde{\phi}(s_1, s_2) \quad (67)$$

$$= \tilde{\phi}(s_1, s_2). \quad (68)$$

Conversely, if there exists a solution for any choice of $\phi(s_1, s_2)$, then choose $\phi(s_1, s_2) = U(s_1; s_2, 0) U(s_1, 0; 0) \tilde{\phi}(0, 0)$, and by (65) and (59) the solution will have

$$\phi(0, 0) = U(0, s_1; 0) U(s_1; 0, s_2) \phi(s_1, s_2) \quad (69)$$

$$= U(0, s_1; 0) U(s_1; 0, s_2) U(s_1; s_2, 0) U(s_1, 0; 0) \tilde{\phi}(0, 0) \quad (70)$$

$$= \tilde{\phi}(0, 0), \quad (71)$$

so consistency follows.

As a consequence, consistency is equivalent to

$$U(t_1, s_1; t_2) U(s_1; t_2, s_2) = U(t_1; t_2, s_2) U(t_1, s_1; s_2) \quad \forall t_1, t_2, s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (72)$$

Put differently, the condition is that $U_\gamma = I$ for any path γ around an axiparallel rectangle.

We now show that (72) implies (8). Rename $s_j \rightarrow t_j$, $t_j \rightarrow t_j + \Delta t$ with $\Delta t > 0$. (Our arguments will also go through for negative Δt , but the presentation is simplified by assuming it is positive.) We write $O(\Delta t^n)$ for any operator R (that may depend on Δt and other things) such that there is a constant $0 < M < \infty$ (independent of Δt or other things) with $\|R\| \leq M\Delta t^n$ whenever Δt is sufficiently small. We write $o(\Delta t^n)$ for any operator R such that $\|R\| \leq f(\Delta t)$ for some function f with $\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \Delta t^{-n} f(\Delta t) = 0$. Clearly, any $O(\Delta t^{n+1})$ is an $o(\Delta t^n)$. For any $(s_1, s_2) \in [t_1, t_1 + \Delta t] \times [t_2, t_2 + \Delta t]$, we can write

$$H_j(s_1, s_2) = H_j(t_1, t_2) + \sum_{k=1}^2 (s_k - t_k) \frac{\partial H_j}{\partial t_k}(t_1, t_2) + o(\Delta t) \quad (73)$$

because H_j was assumed to be a differentiable function of (t_1, t_2) . We can write the Dyson series (62) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} U(t_1 + \Delta t, t_1; t_2) &= I - i \int_{t_1}^{t_1 + \Delta t} dT_1 H_1(T_1, t_2) \\ &\quad - \int_{t_1}^{t_1 + \Delta t} dT_1 \int_{t_1}^{T_1} dT_2 H_1(T_1, t_2) H_1(T_2, t_2) + O(\Delta t^3). \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Indeed, the remainder R comprising all terms of order $n \geq 3$ in the Dyson series satisfies, in analogy to (56), $\|R\| \leq f(M\Delta t)$ with $f(x) = e^x - 1 - x - \frac{1}{2}x^2$, $\Delta t \leq 1$, and

$$M = \sup \left\{ \|H_j(s_1, s_2)\| : j = 1, 2, s_1 \in [t_1, t_1 + 1], s_2 \in [t_2, t_2 + 1] \right\} < \infty. \quad (75)$$

Since $f(x) \leq x^3$ for sufficiently small positive x , R is an $O(\Delta t^3)$ and an $o(\Delta t^2)$.

Plugging (73) into (74), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} U(t_1 + \Delta t, t_1; t_2) &= I - iH_1(t_1, t_2)\Delta t - \frac{i}{2} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial t_1}(t_1, t_2) \Delta t^2 + o(\Delta t^2) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} H_1(t_1, t_2)^2 \Delta t^2 + o(\Delta t^2). \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Likewise, abbreviating $H_j(t_1, t_2)$ by H_j and $\frac{\partial H_j}{\partial t_k}(t_1, t_2)$ by $\frac{\partial H_j}{\partial t_k}$,

$$U(t_1 + \Delta t, t_1; t_2 + \Delta t) = I - iH_1\Delta t - i \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial t_2} \Delta t^2 - \frac{i}{2} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial t_1} \Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{2} H_1^2 \Delta t^2 + o(\Delta t^2) \quad (77)$$

$$U(t_1; t_2 + \Delta t, t_2) = I - iH_2\Delta t - \frac{i}{2} \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial t_2} \Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{2} H_2^2 \Delta t^2 + o(\Delta t^2) \quad (78)$$

$$U(t_1 + \Delta t; t_2 + \Delta t, t_2) = I - iH_2\Delta t - i \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial t_1} \Delta t^2 - \frac{i}{2} \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial t_2} \Delta t^2 - \frac{1}{2} H_2^2 \Delta t^2 + o(\Delta t^2). \quad (79)$$

A simple calculation shows that the difference between the left and the right-hand side of (72) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= U(t_1 + \Delta t, t_1; t_2 + \Delta t)U(t_1; t_2 + \Delta t, t_2) - U(t_1 + \Delta t; t_2 + \Delta t, t_2)U(t_1 + \Delta t, t_1; t_2) \\ &= \left(-[H_1, H_2] - i\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial t_2} + i\frac{\partial H_2}{\partial t_1} \right) \Delta t^2 + o(\Delta t^2). \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Therefore, the bracket in front of Δt^2 must vanish. (After all, the equation is true for every sufficiently small Δt ; if the bracket did not vanish, then for small enough Δt the $o(\Delta t^2)$ would be too small to cancel it.) This proves (23) or, equivalently, (8).

Conversely, suppose that the bracket vanishes at all points in an axiparallel rectangle, which we can take to be $[0, t_1] \times [0, t_2]$. Subdivide the rectangle into small squares of side length Δt , and for each square, consider the paths shown in Figure 3; call them γ and γ' , and let the square be $[s_1, s_1 + \Delta t] \times [s_2, s_2 + \Delta t]$.




Figure 3: Two paths from $(0,0)$ to (t_1, t_2) that pass along different sides of a small square. The paths actually lie *on* dashed lines and are drawn next to them only for better visibility.

We know from the equality of the two right-hand sides in (80) that, when the bracket vanishes, the southeast and the westnorth way around a square differ by $o(\Delta t^2)$; thus, $U_{\gamma'} - U_{\gamma}$ is of the form $U(t_1, s_1 + \Delta t; t_2)U(s_1 + \Delta t; t_2, s_2 + \Delta t)o(\Delta t^2)U(s_1; s_2, 0)U(s_1, 0; 0)$; by (57), this operator has norm no greater than $e^{(t_1+t_2)M}\|o(\Delta t^2)\|$ with

$$M = \sup \left\{ \|H_j(s_1, s_2)\| : j = 1, 2, s_1 \in [0, t_1], s_2 \in [0, t_2] \right\} < \infty, \quad (81)$$

and thus is itself an $o(\Delta t^2)$. Now sum $U_{\gamma'} - U_{\gamma}$ over all squares; due to cancellations (sum in the order depicted in the right diagram of Figure 4), the result R is the difference of the U of the two paths shown in Figure 2,

$$R = U(t_1, 0; t_2)U(0; t_2, 0) - U(t_1; t_2, 0)U(t_1, 0; 0). \quad (82)$$

Since the number of small squares is proportional to Δt^{-2} , R is an $o(1)$; letting $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we see that $R = 0$. Thus, we have shown (72) (our simplifying assumption $s_1 = s_2 = 0$ can be dropped), and thus consistency. \square

Second proof of Theorem 2. The theme of this proof is the path independence described in Section 2.3. We begin by showing that also for other paths γ , not just horizontal and vertical line segments, there exist time evolution operators given by suitable ordered exponentials.

So consider an arbitrary smooth path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N, t \mapsto (\gamma_1(t), \dots, \gamma_N(t))$. Our first claim is that, for any solution ϕ of (4), the function $t \mapsto \phi(\gamma(t))$ is differentiable, and its derivative is, as expected from the chain rule,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\phi(\gamma(t)) = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t_j} \dot{\gamma}_j \quad (83)$$

$$= \left(-i \sum_{j=1}^N H_j(\gamma(t)) \dot{\gamma}_j \right) \phi(\gamma(t)). \quad (84)$$

with $\dot{\gamma}(t) = d\gamma(t)/dt$. Note that the chain rule applies only if ϕ is a differentiable function of $\vec{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_N)$, and we have not yet shown this to be the case.¹³ So we now prove differentiability or, what amounts to the same, the chain rule (83).

Let $\vec{t} = \gamma(t)$, $\Delta t_j = \gamma_j(t + \Delta t) - \gamma_j(t)$, $\Delta t > 0$, and $c = \sup\{|\dot{\gamma}_j(s)| : j \in \{1 \dots N\}, s \in [0, 1]\} < \infty$; note that $|\Delta t_j| \leq c\Delta t$. We consider the piecewise axiparallel path from $\gamma(t)$ to $\gamma(t + \Delta t)$ that first changes the first variable, then the second, etc.; by (61), we have that

$$\phi(\gamma(t + \Delta t)) = U_N \cdots U_1 \phi(\gamma(t)) \quad (85)$$

with $U_j = U(t_N; \dots; t_{j+1}; t_j + \Delta t_j, t_j; t_{j-1} + \Delta t_{j-1}; \dots; t_1 + \Delta t_1)$ given by a Dyson series as in (62). Using expansions as in (76)–(79), based on truncating the Dyson series as in (74), but this time expanding only to first order, we obtain that

$$U_N \cdots U_1 = I - i \sum_j H_j \Delta t_j + o(\Delta t), \quad (86)$$

using that every $o(|\Delta t_j|)$ is an $o(\Delta t)$ because $|\Delta t_j| \leq c\Delta t$. Applying (86) to $\phi(\gamma(t))$, we obtain from (85) that

$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\phi(\gamma(t + \Delta t)) - \phi(\gamma(t))}{\Delta t} = -i \sum_j H_j(\gamma(t)) \dot{\gamma}_j(t) \phi(\gamma(t)), \quad (87)$$

or (84).

¹³A well-known theorem asserts that a real-valued function of \vec{t} is differentiable as soon as it possesses continuous partial derivatives. However, while our ϕ possesses partial derivatives according to (4), which can be shown with a little effort to be continuous, this theorem yields only that, for every fixed vector $\chi \in \mathcal{H}$, $\vec{t} \mapsto \langle \chi | \phi(\vec{t}) \rangle$ is continuous, and not that $\vec{t} \mapsto \phi(\vec{t})$ is continuous in the norm topology, as needed.

Now that we have (84), this can be expressed by saying that $\phi \circ \gamma$ satisfies a Schrödinger equation with t -dependent Hamiltonian

$$H(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N H_j(\gamma(t)) \dot{\gamma}_j(t). \quad (88)$$

Therefore, the solution is given by the appropriate t -ordered exponential,

$$\phi(\gamma(1)) = U_\gamma \phi(\gamma(0)) \quad (89)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} U_\gamma &= \mathcal{T} e^{-i \int_\gamma \sum_j H_j dt_j} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-i)^n \int_0^1 dT_1 \int_0^{T_1} dT_2 \cdots \int_0^{T_{n-1}} dT_n \times \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum_j H_j(\gamma(T_1)) \dot{\gamma}_j(T_1) \right) \cdots \left(\sum_j H_j(\gamma(T_n)) \dot{\gamma}_j(T_n) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

The conclusion (89) is also true for paths that are *piecewise* smooth because if γ, γ' are smooth paths with $\gamma'(0) = \gamma(1)$ then (89) implies that $\phi(\gamma'(1)) = U_{\gamma'} U_\gamma \phi(\gamma(0))$, while the property (58) implies that $U_{\gamma'} U_\gamma$ equals the Dyson series associated with the concatenation of γ and γ' .

As a corollary of the results so far, we obtain a certain kind of path independence: that for any two paths γ, γ' connecting two points $\vec{t}, \vec{t}' \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and any solution ϕ of (4), $U_\gamma \phi(\vec{t}) = U_{\gamma'} \phi(\vec{t}')$. As a corollary of *that*, we obtain that if the multi-time equations (4) are consistent (i.e., possess a solution for every $\phi(0, \dots, 0)$), then the path independence discussed in Section 2.3 holds, i.e., $U_\gamma = U_{\gamma'}$ for any two paths from $(0, \dots, 0)$ to \vec{t} (and thus also for any two paths between two given points). (Conversely, if path independence holds, we know already that the system (4) is consistent.) It remains to show that path independence is equivalent to (8).

We now assume the point of view described in Section 2.3, regarding ϕ as a cross section of a vector bundle with base space \mathbb{R}^N , fibers \mathcal{H} , connection given by the H_j , and parallel transport operator U_γ . We now show that the parallel transport is path-independent if and only if the connection is *flat*, i.e., its curvature vanishes. The curvature is a two-form F with values in the Lie algebra of the gauge group (here, with values in the bounded operators on \mathcal{H}); we have given the formula for F in (29).

The non-Abelian Stokes theorem [1, 3] for parallel transport in a vector bundle expresses the holonomy (i.e., parallel transport along a closed path γ) in terms of the curvature of the connection integrated over a 2-dimensional surface Σ whose boundary is γ . It asserts that, for any 2-surface Σ parameterized by a C^1 function $f : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$\mathcal{T} \exp \left(-i \int_{\partial \Sigma} \sum_j H_j dt_j \right) = \mathcal{P}_f \exp \left(i \int_{\Sigma} \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{F}_{ij} dt_i \wedge dt_j \right). \quad (91)$$

Before we apply this formula to the case at hand, we elucidate it. The left-hand side, a path-ordered integral over the connection coefficients, is, in fact, equal to the holonomy along the boundary curve of Σ . For a heuristic understanding of this fact, think of parallel transport from $\gamma(t)$ to $\gamma(t + dt)$ (relative to the reference connection that identifies the fibers with \mathcal{H}) as the application of the operator $I - i \sum_j H_j \dot{\gamma}_j dt = I - i \sum_j H_j dt_j$. Thus, parallel transport along the whole path γ is the application of the “continuous product”

$$\prod_{t=0}^1 \left(I - i H(t) dt \right) \quad \text{with } H(t) = \sum_j H_j(\gamma(t)) \dot{\gamma}_j(t), \quad (92)$$

with the (non-commuting) factors ordered so that t increases from right to left. By (60), this is the same as the path-ordered exponential integral of the connection coefficients, i.e., the left-hand side of (91).

The right-hand side of (91) is a suitably ordered exponential surface integral of an operator-valued 2-form $\mathcal{F} = \sum_{ij} \mathcal{F}_{ij} dt_i \wedge dt_j$ obtained from the curvature 2-form F by suitable parallel transport to the reference point $\gamma(0)$ at which the boundary curve begins. The right-hand side of (91) can be regarded heuristically as the two-parameter continuous product

$$\prod_{s=0}^1 \prod_{t=0}^1 \left(I + i \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{F}_{ij} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial s} \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial t} ds dt \right) \quad (93)$$

with the terms ordered from right to left according to the right diagram of Figure 4, and with the operator $\mathcal{F}_{ij}(s, t)$ obtained from $F_{ij}(f(s, t))$ by parallel transport along the image under f of the path $(s, t) \rightarrow (s, 0) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ in the st -plane.




Figure 4: Heuristic derivation of the non-Abelian Stokes theorem, based on subdividing the 2-surface Σ (parameterized by s, t) into tiny rectangles. Left: For each rectangle, consider this path surrounding it. Right: Ordering of rectangles that corresponds to order of contributions in the surface integral.

To understand heuristically why (91) is true, one may first convince oneself that for every *infinitesimal* rectangle R , the holonomy around ∂R (counterclockwise in the

st -plane) equals

$$I + i \int_R \sum_{ij} F_{ij} dt_i \wedge dt_j = I + i \sum_{ij} F_{ij} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial s} \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial t} ds dt + o(ds dt). \quad (94)$$

For a finite-sized surface Σ , subdivide it into tiny rectangles R , let γ_R be the image under f of the path shown in the left diagram of Figure 4, let U_{γ_R} be the holonomy of that path as given in (94), and let γ be the concatenation of the γ_R for all R in the order shown in the right diagram of Figure 4. Note that in U_γ all inner segments cancel out, so that $U_\gamma = U_{\gamma'}$ with γ' the path that surrounds the big square $[0, 1]^2$ once counterclockwise. Now (91) follows.¹⁴

For the sake of completeness, we also express the definition of the right-hand side of (91) in a formula (following the notation of [1]):¹⁵

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{P}_f \exp \left(i \int_\Sigma \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{F}_{ij} dt_i \wedge dt_j \right) = \\ & I + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} i^n \int_0^1 dS_1 \int_0^1 dT_1 \int_0^{S_1} dS_2 \int_0^1 dT_2 \cdots \int_0^{S_{n-1}} dS_n \int_0^1 dT_n \times \\ & \times (\mathcal{F}f'f)(S_n, T_n) \cdots (\mathcal{F}f'f)(S_1, T_1), \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

with $(\mathcal{F}f'f)(s, t) = \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{F}_{ij}(s, t) f'_i(s, t) \dot{f}_j(s, t)$, where $f'_i(s, t) = \partial f_i(s, t)/\partial s$ and $\dot{f}_j(s, t) = \partial f_j(s, t)/\partial t$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij}(s, t) = h^{-1}(s, 0) g^{-1}(s, t) F_{ij}(f(s, t)) g(s, t) h(s, 0), \quad (96)$$

$$h(s, t) = \mathcal{T} \exp \left(-i \int_0^s \sum_i H_i(f(s', t)) f'_i(s', t) ds' \right), \quad (97)$$

$$g(s, t) = \mathcal{T} \exp \left(-i \int_0^t \sum_i H_i(f(s, t')) \dot{f}_i(s, t') dt' \right). \quad (98)$$

¹⁴It may seem surprising that, in (91), F_{ij} must be parallel-transported to the reference point $f(0, 0)$ but H_j need not. That is because H_j actually expresses the difference between two gauge connections, the one $[\nabla$ in (28)] representing the time evolution and the trivial one $[\partial$ in (28)] corresponding to the identification of all fibers with \mathcal{H} ; as a consequence, the trivial connection must be used to transport H_j to $f(0, 0)$. On the other hand, the inner segments in $U_\gamma = \prod_R U_{\gamma_R}$ cancel only if the same connection ∇ is used along all pieces of γ , so the non-trivial connection ∇ must be used to transport F_{ij} to $f(0, 0)$. By the way, the reference connection need not be mentioned in (91) if we understand the left-hand side as the holonomy of ∇ over $\partial\Sigma$.

¹⁵It may seem surprising that the T_m ($m = 1, \dots, n$) are not ordered decreasingly. Take note that the factors involving (S_m, T_m) must be ordered according to the right diagram in Figure 4, i.e., terms with bigger S_m must be further to the right; only when $S_m = S_{m+1}$ then terms must be ordered by T , but this demand can be ignored because $S_m = S_{m+1}$ occurs only on a set of measure zero.

The proof of the non-Abelian Stokes formula (91) in [1] is formulated for finite-dimensional fiber spaces but remains valid if H_1, \dots, H_N are, as in our case, bounded operators on \mathcal{H} .

We now apply (91) to our connection with coefficients $A_j = -H_j$. Since \mathbb{R}^N is simply connected, every closed path γ actually is the boundary curve of a 2-surface Σ . Now we see immediately from (91) that vanishing F_{ij} for all i, j implies that for every closed path γ the left-hand side of (91) is I , which is equivalent to path independence. Conversely, if $F_{ij} \neq 0$ for some i, j at some point (s_1, \dots, s_N) , then, due to the smoothness of H_1, \dots, H_N , there is a whole neighborhood of (s_1, \dots, s_N) where $F_{ij} \neq 0$. Then there is also a closed path $\gamma = \partial\Sigma$ such that (91) does not vanish, and so path independence fails. We have already seen around (72) that path independence (already merely for boundaries of axiparallel rectangles) is also sufficient for consistency. \square

6 Proofs of Inconsistency Theorems

Proof of Theorems 3 and 4. We directly prove Theorem 4, since Theorem 3 follows for a special choice of $A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}, A_{i,3}, B_i$. Since the H_i^{free} commute with each other, and the V_i do, the consistency condition (8) is

$$0 = -i \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial t_i} + i \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial t_j} + [H_i, H_j] \quad (99)$$

$$= -i \left(\frac{\partial V_j}{\partial t_i} - \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial t_j} \right) + [H_i^{\text{free}}, V_j] - [H_j^{\text{free}}, V_i] \quad (100)$$

$$= -i \left(\frac{\partial V_j}{\partial t_i} - \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial t_j} \right) - i \sum_{a=1}^3 \left(A_{i,a} \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial x_{i,a}} - A_{j,a} \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial x_{j,a}} \right). \quad (101)$$

Since $A_{i,a}$ and $A_{j,a}$ act on different indices (viz., s_i and s_j), the seven matrices

$$I, A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}, A_{i,3}, A_{j,1}, A_{j,2}, A_{j,3} \quad (102)$$

are linearly independent when regarded as $k \times k$ matrices ($k = \prod_{\ell=1}^N k_\ell$) acting on all spin indices s_1, \dots, s_N . Thus,

$$\frac{\partial V_j}{\partial t_i} - \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial t_j} = 0 \quad (103)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial V_j}{\partial x_{i,a}} = 0, \quad (104)$$

so V_j does not depend on \mathbf{x}_i ; since the same argument applies to any $i \neq j$, we have that $V_j = V_j(\mathbf{x}_j, t_1, \dots, t_N)$. Set

$$\tilde{V}_j(\mathbf{x}_j, t_j) := V_j(\mathbf{x}_j, t_1 = 0, \dots, t_{j-1} = 0, t_j, t_{j+1} = 0, \dots, t_N = 0) \quad (105)$$

for every j . By (103), for $i \neq j$ and any $a = 1, 2, 3$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j,a}} (V_j - \tilde{V}_j) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j,a}} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} (V_j - \tilde{V}_j) \quad (106)$$

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j,a}} \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial t_i} \quad (107)$$

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j,a}} \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial t_j} \quad (108)$$

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial x_{j,a}} \quad (109)$$

$$= 0. \quad (110)$$

Thus, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j,a}} (V_j - \tilde{V}_j)$ does not depend on t_i for any $i \neq j$, and since it vanishes when $t_i = 0$ for all $i \neq j$, we have that $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j,a}} (V_j - \tilde{V}_j) = 0$ for all \mathbf{x} 's and t 's. Thus,

$$V_j(\mathbf{x}_j, t_1, \dots, t_N) = \tilde{V}_j(\mathbf{x}_j, t_j) + W_j(t_1, \dots, t_N) \quad (111)$$

for some real-valued, smooth function W_j . Since for $i \neq j$,

$$\frac{\partial V_j}{\partial t_i} = \frac{\partial \tilde{V}_j}{\partial t_i} + \frac{\partial W_j}{\partial t_i} = \frac{\partial W_j}{\partial t_i}, \quad (112)$$

we obtain from (103) that

$$\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial t_i} - \frac{\partial W_i}{\partial t_j} = 0, \quad (113)$$

so $W_j = \partial\theta/\partial t_j$ for some real-valued, smooth function $\theta(t_1, \dots, t_N)$. From this, (40) follows. \square

In order to prove Theorem 5 we need the following auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 9. *For any $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and $t_1, \dots, t_N \in \mathbb{R}$, the set*

$$\mathcal{S}_{j,\mathbf{x},t_1,\dots,t_N} = \left\{ (t_1, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, t_N, \mathbf{x}_N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\neq} : \mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{x} \right\} \quad (114)$$

is path-connected.

Proof of Lemma 9. First, note that $\mathcal{S}_{j,\mathbf{x},t_1,\dots,t_N} \subset \mathbb{R}^{4N}$ can be identified in an obvious way with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{j,\mathbf{x},t_1,\dots,t_N} = \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{j-1}, \mathbf{x}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N-3} : \right. \\ \left. \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_k\| > |t_i - t_k| \ \forall i, k \in 1, \dots, N, i \neq k \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

Now choose two arbitrary elements

$$x = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{j-1}, \mathbf{x}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) \text{ and } y = (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{j-1}, \mathbf{y}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_N) \quad (116)$$

in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$. Each element is given by $N - 1$ points in \mathbb{R}^3 that each have a fixed minimum distance to each other and to a fixed point \mathbf{x}_j . One can connect x and y by the following path. First, choose a large number λ and move the $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{j-1}, \mathbf{x}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$ away from \mathbf{x}_j so that their distances grow continuously by the factor λ . That is, for the path parameter $0 \leq s \leq \lambda - 1$, set $\mathbf{x}_i(s) = \mathbf{x}_j + (1 + s)(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)$ for $i \neq j$. That path stays in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$. Call the final configuration $x' = (\mathbf{x}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}'_{j-1}, \mathbf{x}'_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}'_N)$. One does the same procedure with the element y to obtain y' . To find a path in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ from x' to y' , it is useful to look at x' and y' zoomed out by the factor λ ; the net effect of going from x to x' and then zooming out is that the minimum distances have shrunk by a factor λ . It is clear that the space ${}^N\mathbb{R}^3$ of N -element subsets of \mathbb{R}^3 is connected, and that there is a path in ${}^N\mathbb{R}^3$ from $\lambda^{-1}\{\mathbf{x}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}'_{j-1}, \mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}'_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}'_N\}$ to $\lambda^{-1}\{\mathbf{y}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_{j-1}, \mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}'_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_N\}$ that keeps $\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{x}_j$ fixed. Choose such a path. It has a nonzero minimal distance δ that any two points ever reach, so if λ is so large that $\max_{i,k=1,\dots,N} \lambda^{-1}|t_i - t_k| < \delta$ then the corresponding path from x' to y' stays in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$. In this way we have constructed a path that connects two arbitrary elements x and y from $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 5. As shown in the proof of Theorem 4, the consistency condition is equivalent to the conjunction of

$$\frac{\partial V_j}{\partial t_i} - \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial t_j} = 0 \quad (117)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial V_j}{\partial x_{i,a}} = 0 \quad (118)$$

on \mathcal{S}_{\neq} for all i, j ($i \neq j$). For fixed j , equation (118) holds for all $i \neq j$ and $a = 1, 2, 3$, i.e., V_j is a function with vanishing gradient on the set $\mathcal{S}_{j, \mathbf{x}_j, t_1, \dots, t_N}$, which is pathwise connected according to Lemma 9. Therefore we can conclude from (118) that V_j is constant on $\mathcal{S}_{j, \mathbf{x}_j, t_1, \dots, t_N}$; put differently, V_j does not depend on $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{j-1}, \mathbf{x}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$. Since for every $\mathbf{x}_j, t_1, \dots, t_N$, the set $\mathcal{S}_{j, \mathbf{x}_j, t_1, \dots, t_N}$ is non-empty, $V_j(\mathbf{x}_j, t_1, \dots, t_N)$ is indeed a function on all of \mathbb{R}^{3+N} . Thus all steps in the proof of Theorem 4 from Equation (105) onwards remain valid, and we obtain that (40) holds on \mathcal{S}_{\neq} . \square

In order to prove Theorem 6 we need two more auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 10. *The set $\mathcal{S}_{\neq} \subset \mathbb{R}^{4N}$ as in (43) of ordered spacelike configurations without collisions in 3 + 1 dimensions is simply connected.*

(It is interesting to note that this does not hold in 2 + 1 or 1 + 1 dimensions.)

Proof of Lemma 10. We first show that \mathcal{S}_{\neq} is path-connected. Choose two arbitrary points $x^{4N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\neq}$ and $y^{4N} = (y_1, \dots, y_N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\neq}$. We now construct a path from x^{4N} to y^{4N} within \mathcal{S}_{\neq} . First, move the time variables x_1^0, \dots, x_N^0 to the common time $x_1^0, \dots, x_N^0 = 0$ along the path

$$\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{4N}, \gamma(s) = \left(((1-s)x_1^0, \mathbf{x}_1), \dots, ((1-s)x_N^0, \mathbf{x}_N) \right). \quad (119)$$

This path stays in \mathcal{S}_\neq since $\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_j\| > |x_i^0 - x_j^0| \geq (1-s)|x_i^0 - x_j^0|$ for $s \in [0, 1]$ and all $i \neq j$. We have thus obtained a path from x^{4N} to $x_0^{4N} = ((0, \mathbf{x}), \dots, (0, \mathbf{x}_N))$ that stays in \mathcal{S}_\neq . Do the same with y^{4N} to obtain y_0^{4N} . Now one can easily move \mathbf{x}_1 to \mathbf{y}_1 by any path that avoids the points $\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$. For example, one could choose a straight line $(1-s')\mathbf{x}_1 + s'\mathbf{y}_1$, $s' \in [0, 1]$, and in case some of the $\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$ are on this line, one modifies the path by going around these points in a semicircle. After that, move \mathbf{x}_2 to \mathbf{y}_2 along some path that avoids $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{x}_3, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$ and repeat this procedure for $\mathbf{x}_3, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$. This shows that \mathcal{S}_\neq is path connected.

Now we show that any closed path $(x_1(t), \dots, x_N(t))$ (with $(x_i(0) = x_i(1))$) in \mathcal{S}_\neq can be deformed to a point. As we did for single points in \mathcal{S}_\neq above, we now move the whole path to the $x_1^0, \dots, x_N^0 = 0$ plane. Note that the path thus obtained in \mathbb{R}^{3N} corresponds to N paths in \mathbb{R}^3 with the property that for any fixed t the diagonals $\mathbf{x}_i(t) = \mathbf{x}_j(t)$ are avoided for all $i \neq j$. Now one can indeed deform each of the paths in \mathbb{R}^3 to a point by an arbitrary deformation. Should it occur that for some path parameter t , some $i \neq j$ and some deformation parameter s , $\mathbf{x}_i^{(s)}(t) = \mathbf{x}_j^{(s)}(t)$, then just change the deformation such that the i -th path is deformed faster, so the diagonals are avoided during the deformation. This procedure shows that any path can be contracted within \mathcal{S}_\neq . \square

Lemma 11. *For any $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^4$, the set $\mathcal{S}_{j,x} := \{(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{S}_\neq : x_j = x\}$ is path-connected.*

Proof of Lemma 11. Choose two arbitrary points $x^{4N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{S}_{j,x}$ and $y^{4N} = (y_1, \dots, y_N) \in \mathcal{S}_{j,x}$ (in this notation $x_j = x$, $y_j = x$). We construct a path from x^{4N} to y^{4N} by a similar procedure that was used in the proof of Lemma 10. First, move the time variables x_1^0, \dots, x_N^0 to the common time $x_1^0, \dots, x_N^0 = x^0$ along the path

$$\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{4N}, \gamma(s) = \left(((1-s)x_1^0 + sx^0, \mathbf{x}_1), \dots, ((1-s)x_N^0 + sx^0, \mathbf{x}_N) \right), \quad (120)$$

which stays in $\mathcal{S}_{j,x}$. Do the same with y_1^0, \dots, y_N^0 . Now one can easily move \mathbf{x}_1 to \mathbf{y}_1 by any path that avoids the points $\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$ as in the proof of Lemma 10. Repeating that for $\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$, one obtains a path connecting x^{4N} and y^{4N} . \square

Proof of Theorem 6. We first prove the generalization of Theorem 4 and later that of Theorem 5. That is, we first assume that the consistency condition holds everywhere, and later show that it suffices to assume the consistency condition on the collision-free spacelike configurations.

We use the notation $x^{4N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ and $A_{i,0} = I$. Since the H_i^{free} commute with each other, and the V_i do, and the $A_{i,1}$, $A_{i,2}$, $A_{i,3}$ and B_i are functions only of x_i , the

consistency condition (8) is

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left[-i \sum_{\mu=0}^3 A_{i,\mu}(x_i) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} + B_i(x_i) + V_i(x^{4N}), -i \sum_{\mu=0}^3 A_{j,\mu}(x_j) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j,\mu}} + B_j(x_j) + V_j(x^{4N}) \right] \\
&= \left[-i \sum_{\mu=0}^3 A_{i,\mu}(x_i) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i,\mu}}, V_j(x^{4N}) \right] - \left[-i \sum_{\mu=0}^3 A_{j,\mu}(x_j) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j,\mu}}, V_i(x^{4N}) \right] \\
&= -i \sum_{\mu=0}^3 A_{i,\mu}(x_i) \frac{\partial V_j(x^{4N})}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} + i \sum_{\mu=0}^3 A_{j,\mu}(x_j) \frac{\partial V_i(x^{4N})}{\partial x_{j,\mu}}. \tag{121}
\end{aligned}$$

We define $k_i \times k_i$ matrices $A_{i,\alpha}(x_i)$ (depending smoothly on x_i) for $\alpha = 4, \dots, k_i^2 - 1$ such that $\{A_{i,\alpha}(x_i)\}_{\alpha=0, \dots, k_i^2-1}$ is a basis (over the field \mathbb{R}) in the space of self-adjoint $k_i \times k_i$ matrices. Then, by expanding V_i in this basis, i.e.,

$$V_i(x^{4N}) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k_i^2-1} A_{i,\alpha}(x_i) d_{i,\alpha}(x^{4N}) \tag{122}$$

with real-valued smooth functions $d_{i,\alpha}$, the consistency condition (121) is

$$-i \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k_j^2-1} A_{i,\mu}(x_i) A_{j,\alpha}(x_j) \frac{\partial d_{j,\alpha}(x^{4N})}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} + i \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k_i^2-1} A_{j,\mu}(x_j) A_{i,\alpha}(x_i) \frac{\partial d_{i,\alpha}(x^{4N})}{\partial x_{j,\mu}} = 0. \tag{123}$$

Since, for $i \neq j$, $A_{i,\alpha}$ and $A_{j,\alpha}$ act on different indices (viz., s_i and s_j), we have that, for every x_i and x_j , the matrices

$$\left\{ I, A_{i,\alpha}(x_i), A_{j,\beta}(x_j), A_{i,\alpha}(x_i) A_{j,\beta}(x_j) : \alpha = 1 \dots k_i^2 - 1, \beta = 1 \dots k_j^2 - 1 \right\} \tag{124}$$

are linearly independent (over the field \mathbb{R}) when regarded as $k \times k$ matrices ($k = \prod_{\ell=1}^N k_\ell$) acting on all spin indices s_1, \dots, s_N . Thus,

$$\frac{\partial d_{j,\alpha}}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} = 0 \quad \forall i \neq j, \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \alpha = 4, \dots, k_j^2 - 1 \tag{125}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial d_{j,\mu}}{\partial x_{i,\nu}} - \frac{\partial d_{i,\nu}}{\partial x_{j,\mu}} = 0 \quad \forall i \neq j, \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3. \tag{126}$$

Equation (125) implies that

$$d_{j,\alpha}(x_1, \dots, x_N) = d_{j,\alpha}(x_j) \quad \forall \alpha = 4, \dots, k_j^2 - 1. \tag{127}$$

Now we draw inferences from (126). For

$$g_{i,\mu\nu} := \frac{\partial d_{i,\mu}}{\partial x_{i,\nu}} - \frac{\partial d_{i,\nu}}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} \tag{128}$$

we find, using (126) twice, that for all $j \neq i$ and $\lambda = 0, 1, 2, 3$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j,\lambda}} g_{i,\mu\nu} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j,\lambda}} \left(\frac{\partial d_{i,\mu}}{\partial x_{i,\nu}} - \frac{\partial d_{i,\nu}}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} \right) \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i,\nu}} \frac{\partial d_{i,\mu}}{\partial x_{j,\lambda}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} \frac{\partial d_{i,\nu}}{\partial x_{j,\lambda}} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i,\nu}} \frac{\partial d_{j,\lambda}}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} \frac{\partial d_{j,\lambda}}{\partial x_{i,\nu}} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{129}$$

This implies that $g_{i,\mu\nu}(x_1, \dots, x_N) = g_{i,\mu\nu}(x_i)$ is a function of x_i only. By choosing some fixed values $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_N$ we define the function

$$\tilde{d}_{i,\mu}(x_i) := d_{i,\mu}(\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_{i-1}, x_i, \tilde{x}_{i+1}, \dots, \tilde{x}_N). \tag{130}$$

It has the property that

$$g_{i,\mu\nu}(x_i) = \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{d}_{i,\mu}}{\partial x_{i,\nu}} - \frac{\partial \tilde{d}_{i,\nu}}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} \right) (x_i). \tag{131}$$

Now define $h_{i,\mu} := d_{i,\mu}(x_1, \dots, x_N) - \tilde{d}_{i,\mu}(x_i)$. Using (131) we find

$$\frac{\partial h_{i,\mu}}{\partial x_{i,\nu}} - \frac{\partial h_{i,\nu}}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} = 0 \tag{132}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, N$ and all $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Since from (126) we also have that

$$\frac{\partial h_{i,\mu}}{\partial x_{j,\nu}} - \frac{\partial h_{j,\nu}}{\partial x_{i,\mu}} = 0 \tag{133}$$

for all $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ ($i \neq j$) and all $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$, it follows that $h_{i,\mu}$ is a gradient of a real-valued function θ , i.e., $h_{i,\mu} = \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{i,\mu}}$. Therefore

$$d_{j,\mu}(x^{4N}) = \frac{\partial \theta(x^{4N})}{\partial x_{j,\mu}} + \tilde{d}_{j,\mu}(x_j). \tag{134}$$

By (127),

$$V_j(x^{4N}) = \sum_{\mu=0}^3 A_{j,\mu}(x_j) \frac{\partial \theta(x^{4N})}{\partial x_{j,\mu}} + \underbrace{\sum_{\mu=0}^3 A_{j,\mu}(x_j) \tilde{d}_{j,\mu}(x_j) + \sum_{\alpha=4}^{k_j^2-1} A_{j,\alpha}(x_j) d_{j,\alpha}(x_j)}_{\tilde{V}_j(x_j)}, \tag{135}$$

and (40) follows.

Now we discuss how this proof needs to be changed when the consistency condition is granted only on \mathcal{S}_{\neq} . In this case (125) and (126) hold only on \mathcal{S}_{\neq} . From (125) on \mathcal{S}_{\neq}

we can still conclude (127) because $d_{j,\alpha}$ has vanishing gradient on the set \mathcal{S}_{j,x_j} , which is path-connected according to Lemma 11. For the same reason also (129), valid on \mathcal{S}_{\neq} , implies that $g_{i,\mu\nu}$ is a function of x_i only. Since every $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^4$ occurs in some spacelike configuration, we obtain that $g_{i,\mu\nu}(x_i)$ is, in fact, consistently (and smoothly) defined on all \mathbb{R}^4 ; that is, for any fixed i , writing x for x_i and $g_{\mu\nu}(x)$ for $g_{i,\mu\nu}(x_i)$, we have a 2-form g on \mathbb{R}^4 that is closed by virtue of (128). By the Poincaré lemma, it is exact, i.e., g is the exterior derivative of a 1-form \tilde{d} on \mathbb{R}^4 ; now write $\tilde{d}_{i,\mu}(x_i)$ instead of $\tilde{d}_\mu(x)$ and take this, rather than (130), as the definition of \tilde{d} . Then (131) is still true, both when regarded as a relation between functions on \mathbb{R}^4 or between functions on \mathcal{S}_{\neq} . It now follows that (132) and (133) are still true on \mathcal{S}_{\neq} . By the Poincaré lemma again, a closed 1-form on a simply connected set is exact,¹⁶ and since, according to Lemma 10, \mathcal{S}_{\neq} is simply connected, it follows that $h_{i\mu}$ is the gradient of a scalar function $\theta : \mathcal{S}_{\neq} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Thus (135) is still true and (40) follows on \mathcal{S}_{\neq} . \square

Proof of Theorem 7. We use the convention $A_{i,ab}(x_i) = A_{i,ba}(x_i)$ for all i . Then the consistency condition is that, for an arbitrary initial wave function ψ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left[i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} - H_i, i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} - H_j \right] \psi \\
&= \sum_{a,b=1}^3 \left(A_{i,ab}(x_i) \frac{\partial^2 V_j}{\partial x_{i,a} \partial x_{i,b}} - A_{j,ab}(x_j) \frac{\partial^2 V_i}{\partial x_{j,a} \partial x_{j,b}} \right) \psi \\
&\quad + \sum_{a=1}^3 \left(B_{i,a}(x_i) \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial x_{i,a}} - B_{j,a}(x_j) \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial x_{j,a}} \right) \psi + i \left(\frac{\partial V_i}{\partial t_j} - \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial t_i} \right) \psi \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{a,b=1}^3 A_{i,ab}(x_i) \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial x_{i,a}} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_{i,b}} - 2 \sum_{a,b=1}^3 A_{j,ab}(x_j) \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial x_{j,a}} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_{j,b}}. \tag{136}
\end{aligned}$$

Since ψ is arbitrary, the terms involving $\partial\psi/\partial x_{i,b}$, $\partial\psi/\partial x_{j,b}$, and ψ must vanish separately; that is,

$$0 = \sum_{a=1}^3 A_{i,ab}(x_i) \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial x_{i,a}} \tag{137}$$

$$0 = \sum_{a=1}^3 A_{j,ab}(x_j) \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial x_{j,a}} \tag{138}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \sum_{a,b=1}^3 \left(A_{i,ab}(x_i) \frac{\partial^2 V_j}{\partial x_{i,a} \partial x_{i,b}} - A_{j,ab}(x_j) \frac{\partial^2 V_i}{\partial x_{j,a} \partial x_{j,b}} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{a=1}^3 \left(B_{i,a}(x_i) \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial x_{i,a}} - B_{j,a}(x_j) \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial x_{j,a}} \right) + i \left(\frac{\partial V_i}{\partial t_j} - \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial t_i} \right). \tag{139}
\end{aligned}$$

¹⁶Note that the Poincaré lemma for 1-forms indeed holds on simply connected sets. For p -forms with $p \geq 2$ one needs stronger assumptions, e.g., that the p -form is closed on a contractible set (such as a star shaped set), in order to conclude that it is exact.

In (137), we can replace $A_{i,ab}$ by $A_{i,ba}$; since the $3k_i \times 3k_i$ matrix $A_i = (A_{i,ba})$ has full rank, it possesses an inverse A_i^{-1} ; multiplying (137) from the left by A_i^{-1} , we obtain that

$$\frac{\partial V_j}{\partial x_{i,a}} = 0, \quad (140)$$

as well as the same relation with i and j interchanged. Thus, all spatial derivatives of V in (139) drop out, leaving us with

$$\frac{\partial V_i}{\partial t_j} - \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial t_i} = 0. \quad (141)$$

Since (140) and (141) coincide with (103) and (104), the proof of Theorem 4 goes through from (105) onwards, with the only difference that we have not presented any reason why W_j , or θ , should be real-valued; rather, the arguments in the proof of Theorem 4 yield, in our case, the existence of a self-adjoint matrix-valued θ . However, since V_i was assumed to act only on s_i , it follows that also \tilde{V}_i , W_i , and θ act only on s_i ; since i was arbitrary, θ must be scalar (and thus real-valued).

In order to verify (40), it is relevant to note that θ depends on x_1, \dots, x_N only through t_1, \dots, t_N , while H_i^{free} involves only spatial derivatives; thus, no magnetic terms arise from the gauge transformation, and $\tilde{\phi}$ satisfies (40). \square

7 Proof of Cut-Off Consistency Theorem

In this section we prove Theorem 8 of Section 4. Before we begin the proof, we need a few preparatory considerations. For later reference, let us write out the one-particle Dirac equation with potential for a wave function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^4$,

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \left(-i \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \nabla + \beta m + V(\mathbf{x}) \right) \psi(t, \mathbf{x}) \quad (142)$$

with positive constant m and a self-adjoint 4×4 -matrix-valued function V . The N -particle single-time Dirac equation with potential for a wave function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{3N+1} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^4)^{\otimes N}$ is

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(t, q) = \left(\sum_{k=1}^N (-i \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k \cdot \nabla_k + \beta_k m) + V(q) \right) \psi(t, q) \quad (143)$$

with a self-adjoint matrix-valued function $V : \mathbb{R}^{3N} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{4 \times 4})^{\otimes N}$.

Since Theorem 8 is formulated in terms of *smooth* functions, we need to make use of known results on the regularity of solutions to the Dirac equation; for this purpose we quote in Lemma 12 a basic result from [4]. By a *Dirac-type differential operator* we mean an operator of the form

$$H\psi(q) = -i \sum_{i=1}^d A_i(q) \frac{\partial \psi(q)}{\partial q_i} + B(q)\psi(q), \quad (144)$$

where the coefficients $A_i(q)$ and $B(q)$ are self-adjoint operators on \mathbb{C}^k and smooth functions of $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 12 ([4]). *If H is a Dirac-type differential operator and if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\|\sum_i n_i A_i(q)\| \leq c$ for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all unit vectors (n_1, \dots, n_d) , then the PDE*

$$i \frac{\partial f(t, q)}{\partial t} = H f(t, q), \quad (145)$$

where $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and f is \mathbb{C}^k -valued, possesses, for any smooth initial datum $f_0 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}^k)$, a unique solution $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mathbb{C}^k)$ with $f(0, \cdot) = f_0(\cdot)$.

The constant c can be taken to be 1 in the 1-particle Dirac equation (142) and \sqrt{N} in the many-particle Dirac equation (143).

7.1 Domain of Dependence

It is well known that, in the Dirac equation, perturbations propagate no faster than at the speed of light (here, $c = 1$). Lemma 14 below is the appropriate version of that statement for the N -particle Dirac equation (143) and asserts that the domain of dependence of $\psi(t, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)$ at time 0 in \mathbb{R}^{3N} is the Cartesian product of N 3-balls of radius $|t|$. To make its proof easier to follow, we first give an analogous proof of the corresponding well-known statement for $N = 1$, formulated below as Lemma 13.

We denote the closed ball around \mathbf{x} with radius $r \geq 0$ by

$$\overline{B}_r(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| \leq r\}. \quad (146)$$

The ball around the origin is abbreviated by $\overline{B}_r := \overline{B}_r(\mathbf{0})$. The ball around \mathbf{x} can also be written as $\overline{B}_r(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} + \overline{B}_r$ with the summation defined as $a + B := \{a + b : b \in B\}$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. The next Lemma 13 states that the domain of dependence for $\psi(t, \mathbf{x})$ is given by $\overline{B}_{|t|}(\mathbf{x})$.

Lemma 13. *Let ψ be a solution of the one-particle Dirac equation (142) with initial data $\psi(0, \cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)$ and with a self-adjoint potential matrix $V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^{4 \times 4})$. Then specifying initial conditions on $\overline{B}_{|t|}(\mathbf{x})$ uniquely determines $\psi(t, \mathbf{x})$ (i.e., the domain of dependence is a ball growing at the speed of light).*

Proof. For simplicity, we consider only $t \geq 0$. Let $(T, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ with $T > 0$, and for all $t \in [0, T]$ let

$$\Sigma_t = \{(t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \mathbf{x} \in \overline{B}_{T-t}(\mathbf{y})\}. \quad (147)$$

We first prove that if ψ vanishes on Σ_0 it also vanishes on Σ_t for all $t \in [0, T]$.

For any $t \in [0, T]$, let the light cone between the surfaces Σ_0 and Σ_t be $C_t = \bigcup_{t' \in [0, t]} \Sigma_{t'}$. Let Σ^s denote the sides of the light cone, i.e., $\Sigma^s = \partial C_t \setminus (\Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_t)$ (with ∂C_t the boundary of C_t), as shown in Figure 5. For ease of notation and since we consider a fixed time t we do not write an index t for the t -dependence of Σ^s , and we write $C := C_t$. Let n be the outward-pointing unit vector field on ∂C orthogonal to ∂C in the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R}^4 , i.e., $\|n\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^4 n^i n^i = 1$ and for any tangent vector s




Figure 5: Truncated light cone pertaining to the tip (T, \mathbf{y}) and enclosed by the faces Σ_0, Σ_t , and Σ^s . Σ_0 and Σ_t are 3-balls at constant coordinate time, Σ^s is lightlike.

on ∂C , $n \cdot s = \sum_{i=1}^4 n^i s^i = 0$.¹⁷ Let ψ^\dagger denote the conjugate-transpose of the spinor ψ (so that $|\psi|^2 = \psi^\dagger \psi$). Let $j = (j^0, j^1, j^2, j^3) = (|\psi|^2, \psi^\dagger \alpha^1 \psi, \psi^\dagger \alpha^2 \psi, \psi^\dagger \alpha^3 \psi)$ denote the four-current. Then the continuity equation can be expressed as $\text{div}(j) = 0$.¹⁸ According to the Gauss integral theorem in 4 dimensions,

$$0 = \int_C \text{div}(j) d^4x = \int_{\partial C} j \cdot n d^3x = \int_{\Sigma_0} j \cdot n d^3x + \int_{\Sigma_t} j \cdot n d^3x + \int_{\Sigma^s} j \cdot n d^3x. \quad (148)$$

The differential d^3x denotes the volume on a 3-surface relative to the Euclidean metric and $j \cdot n = \sum_{k=1}^3 j^k n^k$ denotes the Euclidean inner product. Now suppose that $\psi|_{\Sigma_0} = 0$. Since the (outward-pointing) normal vector on Σ_0 is $n = (-1, 0, 0, 0)$ we have $j \cdot n = -j^0 = -|\psi|^2 = 0$ on Σ_0 . On Σ_t the normal vector is $n = (1, 0, 0, 0)$, so $j \cdot n = j^0 = |\psi|^2$ on Σ_t . Therefore,

$$0 = \int_{\Sigma_t} j \cdot n d^3x + \int_{\Sigma^s} j \cdot n d^3x = \int_{\Sigma_t} |\psi|^2 d^3x + \int_{\Sigma^s} \psi^\dagger (n^0 I + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \psi d^3x. \quad (149)$$

Next we prove that the 4×4 matrix $A := (n^0 I + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{n})$ is positive semi-definite on Σ^s , i.e., that all eigenvalues are ≥ 0 . For any unit vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we have that $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{b}$ has eigenvalues -1 and $+1$.¹⁹ Therefore the matrix $\|\mathbf{n}\| \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{n}}{\|\mathbf{n}\|}$ has eigenvalues $+\|\mathbf{n}\|$ and $-\|\mathbf{n}\|$, so the lowest eigenvalue of A is $e = n^0 - \|\mathbf{n}\|$. On Σ^s the normal vector is

¹⁷We use a normal vector in the Euclidean metric here because we have to deal with the lightlike hypersurface Σ^s , so the normal vector in the Minkowski sense would be lightlike, too. Therefore the flux integrals (148) could not be written down in this simple form.

¹⁸Note the difference between the four-divergence $\text{div}(j) = \partial_\mu j^\mu = \frac{\partial j^0}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}$ and the three-divergence $\text{div}(j) = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}$.

¹⁹Indeed, for the Dirac matrices the following relation holds: $\alpha^i \alpha^j + \alpha^j \alpha^i = 2\delta_{ij} I$. Therefore, for any unit vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we have $(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{b})^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^3 b^i b^j \alpha^i \alpha^j = \sum_{i,j=1}^3 b^i b^j (2\delta_{ij} I - \alpha^j \alpha^i) = -(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{b})^2 + 2\|\mathbf{b}\|^2 I$, i.e., $(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{b})^2 = \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 I = I$, so $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{b}$ has eigenvalues -1 and $+1$.

$n = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \mathbf{n})$ with $\|\mathbf{n}\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, so $e = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = 0$. We thus have that

$$0 = \int_{\Sigma_t} |\psi|^2 d^3x + \int_{\Sigma^s} \underbrace{\psi^\dagger (n^0 I + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \psi}_{\geq 0} d^3x. \quad (150)$$

Since each integrand is ≥ 0 , each integral is ≥ 0 , and thus each integral has to vanish. In particular this means that the integrand $|\psi|^2$ has to vanish (almost everywhere) on Σ_t , i.e., $\psi|_{\Sigma_t} = 0$ (almost everywhere). From Lemma 12 we have that $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{C}^4)$, therefore ψ vanishes identically on Σ_t for all $t \in [0, T]$ (in particular also for $t = T$). Thus, if ψ vanishes on Σ_0 , then it also vanishes on Σ_t for all $t \in [0, T]$.

The statement of the lemma follows in this way: Suppose $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{C}^4)$ are solutions of the Dirac equation (142) and are identical on Σ_0 and arbitrary on the rest of the $t = 0$ hypersurface. Then $\psi_1 - \psi_2$ is also a solution of the Dirac equation with $\psi_1 - \psi_2 = 0$ on Σ_0 . Therefore, also $\psi_1 - \psi_2 = 0$ in (T, \mathbf{y}) , i.e., $\psi_1(T, \mathbf{y}) = \psi_2(T, \mathbf{y})$. \square

From Lemma 13 it follows immediately that the wave function on any $M_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ at time t is uniquely determined by specifying initial conditions on $M_{|t|} = M_0 + \overline{B}_{|t|}$ at time zero (with the summation of sets defined as $A + B := \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$; pictorially speaking, one obtains $M_{|t|}$ by putting a ball with radius $|t|$ around each point of M_0). That is, the domain of dependence for M_0 is given by $M_{|t|}$. It also follows that if the initial wave function $\psi(0, \cdot)$ has compact support $M_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, then $\psi(t, \cdot)$ has compact support in $M_0 + \overline{B}_{|t|}$.

We now generalize these considerations to the N -particle Dirac equation. We first generalize the notion of a set growing at the speed of light. Consider a point $q = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ and, around each point, a ball growing at the speed of light. The corresponding set in configuration space is

$$\overline{B}_t^{(N)}(q) := \prod_{i=1}^N \overline{B}_t(\mathbf{x}_i). \quad (151)$$

This set can also be expressed in terms of the $\|\cdot\|_{2,\infty}$ -norm, defined for $q \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ by

$$\|q\|_{2,\infty} := \max_{i=1,\dots,N} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|, \quad (152)$$

according to

$$\overline{B}_t^{(N)}(q) = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^{3N} : \|p - q\|_{2,\infty} \leq t\}. \quad (153)$$

Indeed, using the notation $\tilde{q} = (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_N)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^N \overline{B}_t(\mathbf{x}_i) &= \{\tilde{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N} : \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \in \overline{B}_t(\mathbf{x}_i) \forall i = 1, \dots, N\} \\ &= \{\tilde{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N} : \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{x}_i\| \leq t \forall i = 1, \dots, N\} \\ &= \{\tilde{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N} : \max_{i=1,\dots,N} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{x}_i\| \leq t\} \\ &= \{\tilde{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N} : \|\tilde{q} - q\|_{2,\infty} \leq t\}. \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

For the set around the origin we also write $\overline{B}_t^{(N)}(0) = (\overline{B}_t(0))^N =: \overline{B}_t^{(N)}$. We then have $\overline{B}_t^{(N)}(q) = q + \overline{B}_t^{(N)}$. If an arbitrary subset of configuration space $M_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ grows with the speed of light, then one obtains $M_{|t|} = M_0 + \overline{B}_{|t|}^{(N)}$.

Lemma 14. *Let ψ be a solution of the N -particle Dirac equation (143) with initial data $\psi(0, \cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3N}, (\mathbb{C}^4)^{\otimes N})$ and with a self-adjoint potential matrix $V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3N}, (\mathbb{C}^{4 \times 4})^{\otimes N})$. Then specifying initial conditions on $\overline{B}_{|t|}^{(N)}(q)$ uniquely determines $\psi(t, q)$.*

Proof. The proof proceeds along the same lines as in the one-particle case. Again, we take $t \geq 0$. We first generalize the definition of Σ_t to the N -particle case. Let $Q = (\mathbf{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ and $(T, Q) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N+1}$ with $T > 0$. For $t \in [0, T]$, let

$$\Sigma_t = \left\{ (t, q) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N+1} : q \in \overline{B}_{T-t}^{(N)}(Q) \right\}. \quad (155)$$

We first prove that if ψ vanishes on Σ_0 it also vanishes on Σ_t for all $t \in [0, T]$.

We define $C_t = \bigcup_{t' \in [0, t]} \Sigma_{t'}$ as the ‘‘generalized light cone’’ between the surfaces Σ_0 and Σ_t . Again, Σ^s denotes the sides of the generalized light cone, i.e., $\Sigma^s = \partial C_t \setminus (\Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_t)$. For ease of notation, and since we consider a fixed time t , we do not make explicit the t -dependence of Σ^s and we write C instead of C_t . Σ^s is composed of N faces in the following sense. We call

$$\Sigma^{s,k} = \bigcup_{t' \in (0, t)} \{(t', q) \in \Sigma^s : \|\mathbf{Q}_k - \mathbf{x}_k\| = T - t'\} \quad (156)$$

the k -th face of Σ^s . Then we have that $\Sigma^s = \bigcup_{k=1, \dots, N} \Sigma^{s,k}$. Now let $n = (n^0, \mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N+1}$ be the outward-pointing unit vector field on ∂C orthogonal to ∂C in the Euclidean metric, i.e., $\|n\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{3N+1} n^i n^i = 1$ and for any tangent vector s on ∂C , $n \cdot s = \sum_{i=1}^{3N+1} n^i s^i = 0$. The current j for N particles is $j = (j^0, \mathbf{j}_1, \dots, \mathbf{j}_N) = (|\psi|^2, \psi^\dagger \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 \psi, \dots, \psi^\dagger \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N \psi)$. The well-known continuity equation for N particles reads

$$\operatorname{div}(j) = \frac{\partial |\psi|^2}{\partial t} + \sum_{k=1}^N \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{j}_k) = 0. \quad (157)$$

According to the Gauss integral theorem in $3N + 1$ dimensions,

$$0 = \int_C \operatorname{div}(j) d^{3N+1}x = \int_{\partial C} j \cdot n d^{3N}x = \int_{\Sigma_0} j \cdot n d^{3N}x + \int_{\Sigma_t} j \cdot n d^{3N}x + \int_{\Sigma^s} j \cdot n d^{3N}x. \quad (158)$$

The differential $d^{3N}x$ denotes the $3N$ -dimensional surface area relative to the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R}^{3N+1} , and $j \cdot n = \sum_{k=1}^{3N+1} j^k n^k$ is the Euclidean inner product on \mathbb{R}^{3N+1} . We suppose $\psi|_{\Sigma_0} = 0$. As the normal vector on Σ_0 has components $n^0 = -1$ and $\mathbf{n}_k = \mathbf{0}$ (for all $k = 1, \dots, N$), it follows that $j \cdot n = -j^0 = -|\psi|^2 = 0$ on Σ_0 . On Σ_t we have $n^0 = 1$ and $\mathbf{n}_k = \mathbf{0}$ (for all $k = 1, \dots, N$), so $j \cdot n = j^0 = |\psi|^2$. Therefore,

$$0 = \int_{\Sigma_t} |\psi|^2 d^{3N}x + \int_{\Sigma^s} \psi^\dagger \left(n^0 I + \sum_{k=1}^N \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k \cdot \mathbf{n}_k \right) \psi d^{3N}x. \quad (159)$$

The $4^N \times 4^N$ matrix $A := (n^0 I + \sum_{k=1}^N \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k \cdot \mathbf{n}_k)$ is positive semi-definite on Σ^s for the following reason. Since for any unit vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we have that $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{b}$ has eigenvalues -1 and $+1$ (see Footnote 19), each matrix $\|\mathbf{n}_k\| \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k \cdot \frac{\mathbf{n}_k}{\|\mathbf{n}_k\|}$ has eigenvalues $+\|\mathbf{n}_k\|$ and $-\|\mathbf{n}_k\|$. Then the lowest eigenvalue of A is $e = n^0 - \sum_{k=1}^N \|\mathbf{n}_k\|$. On Σ^s the normal-vector has the component $n^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. The spatial components depend on the face of Σ^s . At $\Sigma^{s,k}$ the spatial components have norm $\|\mathbf{n}_j\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \delta_{jk}$ (for all $j = 1, \dots, N$), so $e = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \delta_{jk} = 0$. Thus

$$0 = \int_{\Sigma_t} |\psi|^2 d^{3N}x + \int_{\Sigma^s} \underbrace{\psi^\dagger \left(n^0 I + \sum_{k=1}^N \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k \cdot \mathbf{n}_k \right) \psi}_{\geq 0} d^{3N}x. \quad (160)$$

Since each integrand is ≥ 0 , each integral is ≥ 0 , so each integral has to vanish. This means in particular for the integral over Σ_t , that the integrand $|\psi|^2$ has to vanish (almost everywhere) and therefore $\psi = 0$ on Σ_t (almost everywhere). Since from Lemma 12 we know that $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3N+1}, (\mathbb{C}^4)^{\otimes N})$, ψ has to vanish identically on Σ_t . Thus, if ψ vanishes on Σ_0 , then it also vanishes on Σ_t for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Now Lemma 14 follows: As in the one-particle case, suppose $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3N+1}, (\mathbb{C}^4)^{\otimes N})$ are solutions of the N -particle Dirac equation (143) that are identical on Σ_0 and arbitrary on the rest of the $t = 0$ hypersurface. Then $\psi_1 - \psi_2$ is another solution of (143) with $\psi_1 - \psi_2 = 0$ on Σ_0 . Thus, $\psi_1 - \psi_2 = 0$ in (T, Q) , i.e., $\psi_1(T, Q) = \psi_2(T, Q)$. \square

Lemma 14 implies that the wave function at time t on any $M_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ is uniquely determined by the initial conditions on $M_{|t|} = M_0 + \overline{B}_{|t|}^{(N)}$ at time zero, i.e., the domain of dependence for M_0 is given by $M_{|t|}$. It also implies that if the initial wave function $\psi(0, \cdot)$ has compact support $M_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ then $\psi(t, \cdot)$ has compact support in $M_0 + \overline{B}_{|t|}^{(N)}$.

7.2 Proof of the Theorem

Proof of Theorem 8. We will define a smooth function Φ on \mathcal{S}_δ ; show that any smooth solution ϕ of the evolution equations with initial conditions ϕ_0 must agree with Φ ; and show that such a solution exists by showing that Φ satisfies the multi-time equations (51), which we abbreviate as

$$i \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t_\alpha} = H_{S_\alpha} \Phi \quad (161)$$

with

$$H_{S_\alpha} = \sum_{j \in S_\alpha} H_j^{\text{free}} + \sum_{\substack{i, j \in S_\alpha \\ i \neq j}} W(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j). \quad (162)$$

To this end, let ϕ be any smooth solution of the multi-time equations (161) on \mathcal{S}_δ with initial conditions ϕ_0 on $(\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^3)^N$. We proceed by induction on the number L of families in a partition and treat each $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$ separately.

We start the induction with $L = 1$. The corresponding partition is $P = \{S_1\}$ with $S_1 = \{1, \dots, N\}$. Note that with $P = \{S_1\}$ we have $q^4 = (t_1, q_1)$ with $q_1 = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)$. Let Φ on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \{S_1\}}$ be the solution (which exists, is unique, and is smooth by Lemma 12) of

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \Phi(t_1, q_1) = H_{\{1, \dots, N\}} \Phi(t_1, q_1) \quad (163)$$

with initial conditions given by ϕ_0 . This is just a single-time Dirac-type equation. Any given solution ϕ has to agree with Φ on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \{S_1\}}$ by Lemma 12, since both functions have the same initial conditions ϕ_0 and satisfy the same equation (163). For showing that Φ satisfies (161), the induction start is also provided by (163).

The induction assumption asserts that Φ has been defined on the union of the $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P'}$ for all partitions P' with $L' = L - 1$ or fewer families, that it is smooth on each $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P'}$, that any smooth solution ϕ of (161) with initial condition ϕ_0 agrees with Φ on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P'}$, and that Φ satisfies (161) for all α on all $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P'}$ with $L' < L$.

Now we carry out the induction step from $L - 1$ to L . Consider any P consisting of L families. We now define Φ on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$. That is, we construct $\Phi(Q^4)$ for an arbitrary $Q^4 = (T_1, Q_1; \dots; T_L, Q_L) \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$, numbering the families in $P = \{S_1, \dots, S_L\}$ so that $T_1 \leq T_2 \leq \dots \leq T_L$. According to the induction assumption, Φ is already given on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \tilde{P}}$ for

$$\tilde{P} = \left\{ S_1, \dots, S_{L-2}, S_{L-1} \cup S_L \right\}. \quad (164)$$

In particular, $\Phi(T_1, Q_1; \dots; T_{L-1}, Q_{L-1}; T_{L-1}, q_L)$ is given for every $q_L \in \overline{B}_{T_L - T_{L-1}}^{(|S_L|)}(Q_L)$ because every such $(T_1, Q_1; \dots; T_{L-1}, Q_{L-1}; T_{L-1}, q_L)$ lies in \mathcal{S}_{δ} (using $T_1 \leq \dots \leq T_L$) and thus in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\delta, \tilde{P}}$. Since the domain of dependence of Q_L is $\overline{B}_{T_L - T_{L-1}}^{(|S_L|)}(Q_L)$ by Lemma 14, we can uniquely solve the single-time equation

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_L} \Phi(T_1, Q_1; \dots; T_{L-1}, Q_{L-1}; t_L, q_L) = H_{S_L} \Phi(T_1, Q_1; \dots; T_{L-1}, Q_{L-1}; t_L, q_L) \quad (165)$$

in the variables t_L, q_L with initial condition given by Φ on the set

$$\left\{ (T_1, Q_1; \dots; T_{L-1}, Q_{L-1}; T_{L-1}, q_L) : q_L \in \overline{B}_{T_L - T_{L-1}}^{(|S_L|)}(Q_L) \right\} \quad (166)$$

to obtain $\Phi(T_1, Q_1, \dots, T_L, Q_L)$; see Figure 6.

We need to verify that this Φ is well defined on any overlap $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\delta, P'}$, i.e., that for any Q^4 contained not only in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$ but also in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P'}$ for a partition P' with $L' < L$ families, the value $\Phi(Q^4)$ just defined agrees with the value defined at a previous round of the induction. Such a P' exists if and only if $T_\alpha = T_{\alpha+1}$ for some $1 \leq \alpha < L$. If $T_{L-1} = T_L$ then the solution $\Phi(Q^4)$ of (165) coincides with the initial condition $\Phi(Q^4)$ given on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \tilde{P}}$, which agrees with the value on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P'}$ by the induction assumption. If $T_\alpha = T_{\alpha+1}$ for some $\alpha < L - 1$ then the set (166) is contained not only in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \tilde{P}}$ but already in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \tilde{P}'}$ with \tilde{P}' the partition obtained from \tilde{P} by merging S_α and $S_{\alpha+1}$. By the uniqueness statements of Lemmas 12 and 14, the value of $\Phi(Q^4)$ obtained by solving (165) agrees with the value $\Phi(Q^4)$ already defined using the partition $\{S_1, \dots, S_{\alpha-1}, S_\alpha \cup S_{\alpha+1}, S_{\alpha+2}, \dots, S_L\}$.




Figure 6: A configuration $(T_1, Q_1, \dots, T_L, Q_L) \in \mathcal{S}_\delta$, and the set (166) on which Φ is given before solving (165) to obtain $\Phi(T_1, Q_1, \dots, T_L, Q_L)$. In the case drawn, the L -th family contains only a single particle (so $Q_L \in \mathbb{R}^3$).

We also need to verify that Φ is smooth on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$. Apply Lemma 12 to an open neighborhood of the set (166) in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \bar{P}}$, regarding also $T_1, Q_1, \dots, T_{L-1}, Q_{L-1}$ as variables (while the coefficients $A_i(q)$ in (144) accompanying derivatives relative to these variables vanish); it follows that the solution of (165) is smooth in a neighborhood of Q^4 in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$, provided that $T_L > T_{L-1}$. The case $T_L = T_{L-1}$ needs separate treatment because varying T_L leads to a change in the numbering of the families S_1, \dots, S_L . So let us fix a numbering and drop the condition $T_1 \leq \dots \leq T_L$. Let U be an open neighborhood in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$ of Q^4 ; we focus on a $Q^4 \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$ with $T_L = T_{L-1} \geq \max\{T_1, \dots, T_{L-2}\}$. It is clear that, since the families S_1, \dots, S_L do not interact, the multi-time equations (161) for $\alpha = 1, \dots, L$ possess a smooth joint solution in U , provided U is sufficiently small, from initial data on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \bar{P}}$ as in (164), using that Φ on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \bar{P}}$ satisfies the multi-time equations by induction assumption. This solution agrees with Φ for $T_L \geq T_{L-1}$ by (165), but also for $T_L \leq T_{L-1}$ because in that case we used to renumber $L \leftrightarrow L-1$ before writing down (165). Therefore, Φ must be smooth in a neighborhood of any Q^4 .

To see that ϕ agrees with Φ on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$, note that ϕ and Φ have the same initial conditions on (166) and are solutions to the same equation (165); then apply Lemma 14.

Now we want to show that Φ satisfies the multi-time equations (161) on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$. This can be done by comparing Φ to the unique solution of the multi-time equations from initial data on a sufficiently small open neighborhood U of (166) in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \bar{P}}$; that solution exists because the appropriate cone over U (i.e., the set with domain of dependence within U) lies entirely in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$, so that the families S_1, \dots, S_L do not interact. An alternative route goes as follows.

By the construction based on (165), Φ satisfies (161) for $\alpha = L$ (also for $T_L = T_{L-1}$,

as shown in the discussion of smoothness). Now consider $\alpha < L$. Since, on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$,

$$\left[\frac{i\partial}{\partial t_\alpha} - H_{S_\alpha}, \frac{i\partial}{\partial t_L} - H_{S_L} \right] = 0 \quad (167)$$

because (locally) different families do not interact, we have that

$$\left(\frac{i\partial}{\partial t_L} - H_{S_L} \right) \left(\frac{i\partial}{\partial t_\alpha} - H_{S_\alpha} \right) \Phi = \left(\frac{i\partial}{\partial t_\alpha} - H_{S_\alpha} \right) \left(\frac{i\partial}{\partial t_L} - H_{S_L} \right) \Phi, \quad (168)$$

and since

$$\left(\frac{i\partial}{\partial t_L} - H_{S_L} \right) \Phi = 0, \quad (169)$$

we have that

$$\left(\frac{i\partial}{\partial t_L} - H_{S_L} \right) \left(\frac{i\partial}{\partial t_\alpha} - H_{S_\alpha} \right) \Phi = 0. \quad (170)$$

We will show that the function

$$\Phi'_\alpha := \left(\frac{i\partial}{\partial t_\alpha} - H_{S_\alpha} \right) \Phi \quad (171)$$

vanishes identically on $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, P}$. To this end, we note that, by (170), Φ'_α satisfies (165) with initial datum

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi'_\alpha(T_1, Q_1; \dots; T_{L-1}, Q_{L-1}; T_{L-1}, q_L) = \\ \left(\frac{i\partial}{\partial t_\alpha} - H_{S_\alpha} \right) \Phi(T_1, Q_1; \dots; T_{L-1}, Q_{L-1}; T_{L-1}, q_L). \end{aligned} \quad (172)$$

This initial datum lies in $\mathcal{S}_{\delta, \tilde{P}}$ with \tilde{P} as in (164), and by the induction assumption it vanishes identically. By the linearity of (161) and Lemma 14, also Φ'_α vanishes identically.

This completes the induction step and thus the proof. \square

Acknowledgments. We thank Detlef Dürr, Felix Finster, Sheldon Goldstein, Michael Kiessling, and Matthias Lienert for helpful discussions. S.P. acknowledges support from Cusanuswerk, from the German–American Fulbright Commission, and from the European Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST action MP1006). R.T. acknowledges support from the John Templeton Foundation (grant no. 37433) and from the Trustees Research Fellowship Program at Rutgers.

References

- [1] I. Aref'eva: Non-Abelian Stokes Formula. *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*, 43(1):353–356 (1980)

- [2] F. Bloch: Die physikalische Bedeutung mehrerer Zeiten in der Quantenelektrodynamik. *Physikalische Zeitschrift der Sowjetunion*, 5:301–305 (1934)
- [3] N. E. Bralić: Exact computation of loop averages in two-dimensional Yang–Mills theory. *Physical Review D*, 22(12):3090–3103 (1980)
- [4] P. Chernoff: Essential Self-Adjointness of Powers of Generators of Hyperbolic Equations. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 12:401–414 (1973)
- [5] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc, and G. Grynberg: *Photons & Atoms: Introduction to Quantum Electrodynamics*. New York: Wiley (1989)
- [6] D. G. Currie, T. F. Jordan, and E. C. G. Sudarshan: Relativistic Invariance and Hamiltonian Theories of Interacting Particles. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 35(2):350–375 (1963)
- [7] P. A. M. Dirac: Relativistic Quantum Mechanics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A*, 136:453–464 (1932)
- [8] P. A. M. Dirac, V. A. Fock, and B. Podolsky: On Quantum Electrodynamics. *Physikalische Zeitschrift der Sowjetunion*, 2(6):468–479 (1932). Reprinted in J. Schwinger: *Selected Papers on Quantum Electrodynamics*, New York: Dover (1958)
- [9] Ph. Droz-Vincent: Possibility of Relativistic Quantum Mechanics. *Lettere al Nuovo Cimento*, 1(19):800–802 (1971)
- [10] Ph. Droz-Vincent: Relativistic Wave Equations for a System of Two Particles with Spin $\frac{1}{2}$. *Lettere al Nuovo Cimento*, 30(12):375–378 (1981)
- [11] C. Fronsdal and L. E. Lundberg: Relativistic Quantum Mechanics of Two Interacting Particles. *Physical Review D*, 1(12):3247–3258 (1970)
- [12] C. Ghiu and C. Udriște: Multitime controlled linear PDE systems. Pages 82–109 in A. Adhikari, M. R. Adhikari, and Y. P. Chaubey (ed.s): *Contemporary Topics in Mathematics and Statistics with Applications Vol. 1*, New Delhi: Asian Books (2013) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1201.0256>
- [13] M. Günther: The Relativistic Configuration Space Formulation of the Multi-Electron Problem. *Physical Review*, 88(6): 1411–1421 (1952)
- [14] G. E. Hahne: Quantum dwell-correlation times in the scattering of two nonrelativistic particles. *Physical Review A*, 80:062101 (2009)
- [15] L. P. Horwitz and F. Rohrlich: Constraint relativistic quantum dynamics. *Physical Review D*, 24:1528–1542 (1981)
- [16] E. Marx: Many-Times Formalism and Coulomb Interaction. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 9(3):195–217 (1974)

- [17] S. Petrat and R. Tumulka: Multi-Time Wave Functions for Quantum Field Theory. Preprint (2013) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1309.0802>
- [18] S. Petrat and R. Tumulka: Multi-Time Equations, Classical and Quantum. To appear in *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* (2014) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1309.1103>
- [19] S. Petrat and R. Tumulka: Multi-Time Formulation of Pair Creation. Preprint (2014) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1401.6093>
- [20] S. Petrat and R. Tumulka: Consistency of Evolution Equations for Multi-Time Wave Functions. In preparation (2014)
- [21] M. Reed and B. Simon: *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics II: Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness*. San Diego: Academic Press (1975)
- [22] E. E. Salpeter and H. Bethe: A Relativistic Equation for Bound-State Problems. *Physical Review*, 84(6):1232–1242 (1951)
- [23] S. Schweber: *An Introduction To Relativistic Quantum Field Theory*. Row, Peterson and Company (1961)
- [24] E. C. Svendsen: The Effect of Submanifolds upon Essential Self-Adjointness and Deficiency Indices. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 80:551–565 (1981)
- [25] P. Van Alstine and H. W. Crater: A Tale of Three Equations: Breit, Eddington–Gaunt, and Two-Body Dirac. *Foundations of Physics*, 27(1):67–79 (1997)