

Curved spacetimes from quantum mechanics

László B. Szabados*

February 12, 2025

Abstract

The ultimate extension of Penrose's Spin Geometry Theorem is given. It is shown how the *local* geometry of any *curved* Lorentzian 4-manifold (with C^2 metric) can be derived in the classical limit using only the observables in the algebraic formulation of abstract Poincaré-invariant elementary quantum mechanical systems. In particular, for any point q of the classical spacetime manifold and curvature tensor there, there exists a composite system built from finitely many Poincaré-invariant elementary quantum mechanical systems and a sequence of its states, defining the classical limit, such that, in this limit, the value of the distance observables in these states tends with asymptotically vanishing uncertainty to lengths of spacelike geodesic segments in a convex normal neighbourhood U of q that determine the components of the curvature tensor at q . Since the curvature at q determines the metric on U up to third order corrections, the metric structure of curved C^2 Lorentzian 4-manifolds is recovered from (or, alternatively, can be *defined* by the observables of) abstract Poincaré-invariant quantum mechanical systems.

Keywords: curved Lorentzian geometries, sectional curvature, empirical distance, classical limit

1 Introduction

As is well known, the notion of spacetime of special and general relativity, as introduced *operationally* in the framework of *classical physics* e.g. in [1], turned out to be surprisingly useful even in *quantum physics*. But Marzke and Wheeler [2], quoting Bohr and Rosenfeld, stress that '*... every proper theory should provide in and by itself its own means for defining the quantities with which it deals*'. Hence, in particular, the basic notions in quantum physics should not be based on classical physical concepts, and the laws of classical physics should be derivable from the notions and laws of micro-physics. The latter may not be based on concepts of classical physics. Extending this principle to the spacetime of classical general relativity as a background for the quantum physical calculations, it should also be re-defined by purely quantum concepts. In the contribution [2], Marzke and Wheeler raise the idea that the spacetime geometry, and perhaps the spacetime points themselves too, should be introduced using the distance *as the primary concept*. Two years later, Penrose initiated the project to derive the various geometric structures of spacetime from more fundamental quantum concepts. (The essay with his original ideas became available for the public much later, only in [3].)

As an illustration of his strategy, using combinatorial techniques, Penrose showed how the *conformal structure* (i.e. the geometry of *directions*) of the Euclidean 3-space can be recovered

*Budapest, European Union; e-mail: lsodabazs(at)gmail.com

from the quantum mechanics of spins [4]. However, apart from the dissertation [5], this project was not continued and has not been completed.

Using standard techniques of quantum mechanics, in our previous papers, we re-derived the conformal structure of the Euclidean 3-space [6], and derived the *metric* structure of the Euclidean 3-space [7] and of the Minkowski spacetime [8] from $SU(2)$, Euclidean and Poincaré invariant quantum mechanical systems, respectively. In the present paper, we complete the first stage of the (then) ‘radically new’ project of Penrose in the spirit of Wheeler’s ‘radical conservatism’ [9], by determining *formal* conditions under which the (local) geometry of general curved spacetimes with C^2 Lorentzian metrics can be recovered in the classical limit from abstract Poincaré-invariant quantum *mechanics*. In particular, we use *only* ideas and techniques of standard general relativity, differential geometry and Poincaré-invariant quantum mechanics. (Following the classical paper [1], by spacetime we mean only a four dimensional Lorentzian geometry, but still no field equation is used. Like in the foundation of the classical theory in [1] [see also [10, 11, 12]], *mechanical* concepts appear to be enough to introduce the spacetime geometry. *Field theoretical* concepts and ideas are expected to be needed only in the introduction of the field equations.)

The present investigations are based in an essential way on our previous results [8], in which the metric structure of the Minkowski spacetime has been recovered in the classical limit from an expression called ‘empirical distance’. The latter is built from the basic quantum observables of Poincaré-invariant elementary quantum mechanical systems in an abstract, algebraic formulation of quantum mechanics (see e.g. [13, 14, 15]) *without assuming anything about space or spacetime*. (At this point it should be stressed that the Poincaré symmetry is the symmetry of the *algebra of the basic observables* of the quantum mechanical systems, rather than that of the spacetime.)

The key idea that we adopt here is the ‘localization’ of the concepts of [8], just as how the flat pseudo-Euclidean spaces are ‘localized’ and became the geometry of tangent spaces of general curved pseudo-Riemannian geometries. We have no a priori assumption on the ‘micro-structure’ of the spacetime. We take general relativity as it is as the correct *classical* theory of spacetime and gravity; and also the abstract, algebraic formulation of (Poincaré-invariant) quantum mechanics (without referring to any notion of spacetime) as the most successful theory of quantum *particles*. (In the context of quantum mechanics, by Poincaré group $E(1,3)$ we mean the semidirect product of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ and the group of the four dimensional translation group, rather than the isometry group of the Minkowski space.) In the present paper, we search only for the quantum states of the Poincaré-invariant elementary quantum mechanical systems by means of which the known *local* geometric structures (in particular, the metric) of the classical spacetime can *formally* be recovered from the observables of the quantum systems *in their classical limit*. Here, by ‘local structures’ we mean those in convex normal neighbourhoods (in particular the curvature tensor and all the structures, e.g. the metric, that it determines locally), and by ‘formal’ that still we do not intend to identify the source where the resulting quantum states may come from. The search for the roots of the origin of these states in the quantum systems themselves is the subject of a separate project.

The general strategy of these investigations, which at some point deviates from that of [3], has been discussed and summarized in the introduction of [8]. Thus we do not repeat it here, and we concentrate only on the new aspects of the strategy. In particular, the present localization program rests on two new elements:

First, as is well known in differential geometry (see e.g. [16, 17, 18, 19, 20]), the curvature tensor at a given point is completely determined by the sectional curvatures there, and the latter are linked directly to lengths of triplets of certain curves, forming a ‘triangle’ on 2-surfaces generated by geodesics emanated from the given point. (The differential geometric background of Regge’s non-smooth formulation of the spacetime geometry [21], and also of the strategy how to synthesize the ‘empirical geometry’ from distances between *points* [2], is provided by these ideas.) Thus, to be able to recover the curvature from the quantum observables, first

we should reformulate these geometric ideas and results in terms of *distances* (i.e. by length of *geodesics*, rather than only by length of certain non-geodesic curves like in the standard differential geometric texts above) between spacetime *points*.

Second, in Minkowski space the empirical distance, introduced in [8], is a distance between *timelike straight lines* (and are realized as the length of certain *spacelike straight line segments*), rather than between points. However, to be able to recover e.g. the curvature at some *point* of the classical spacetime manifold using the same notion of distance, the notion of points should also be reformulated in the form that could be implemented in quantum theory. A point of the classical spacetime manifold can be characterized by the set of the timelike geodesics that intersect one another at that point, and the characteristic property of these geodesics is that the (spatial) empirical distance between any two of them is zero. (The idea how to represent spacetime points in this way is borrowed from twistor theory [22, 23, 24], where a point of the Minkowski space is represented by the *null* straight lines that intersect one another at that point.) It is this equivalent property that can be imported into quantum theory to *define* ‘points’ of the resulting ‘empirical, physical spacetime’, obtained in the classical limit: points will emerge as *pairs of timelike geodesics with vanishing empirical distance between them*.

Technically, the localization is based on the use of convex normal neighbourhoods, and that all the geometric structures there can be mapped diffeomorphically into the tangent space of a point of these neighbourhoods. (As we will see, the ambiguity in such a diffeomorphism can be controlled by a pair (Λ^a_b, ξ^a) of a Lorentz transformation and a ‘translation’, just like in the Cartesian coordinate systems in Minkowski spacetime, though the set of these pairs do not have any obvious group structure). Hence, by this diffeomorphism the *curved* spacetime metric emerges as an extra structure on the *flat*, Minkowskian tangent space, and this makes it possible to link it to observables of abstract Poincaré-invariant quantum mechanical systems.

In the present paper, we show that for any ‘geodesic triangle’ above we can always find Poincaré-invariant quantum mechanical systems and a sequence of their states, defining the classical limit, such that the empirical distance, evaluated in the tensor product of these states, reproduces the lengths of the geodesics of the geodesic triangle in the classical limit. Therefore, *the local metric structure of any (as we will see, C^2) Lorentzian geometry can be recovered from Poincaré-invariant quantum mechanics*. In the given context, the role of the curvature tensor is to shift the location of the image of the spacetime points in the tangent space. A different interpretation and role of the curvature in quantum theory will be given elsewhere.

In Section 2, we review the geometry of convex normal neighbourhoods and derive the form of the result on the geodesic triangles that we need. In the first half of Section 3, we recall the idea behind the empirical distance and the key result in Minkowski spacetime, and we show how the spacetime points can be represented by pairs of timelike straight lines. In the second half of this section the previous concepts are generalized to curved spacetimes. Section 4 is devoted to the quantum mechanical considerations, where the key result, Theorem 4.2.1, is presented. The paper concludes with Section 5 with a few remarks and an Appendix where a technical question is clarified.

Our sign conventions are those of [23, 24]. In particular, the signature of the spacetime metric is $(+, -, -, -)$, and the curvature is defined according to $-R^\alpha_{\beta\gamma\delta} X^\beta Z^\gamma W^\delta := \nabla_Z(\nabla_W X^\alpha) - \nabla_W(\nabla_Z X^\alpha) - \nabla_{[Z, W]} X^\alpha$, where $[Z, W]^\alpha$ is the Lie bracket of the vectors. We use the units in which $c = 1$, but we keep \hbar .

2 The geometry of convex normal neighbourhoods

After summarizing the necessary differential geometric background (mostly to fix the notations and the differential geometric notions) in subsection 2.1, we show in subsection 2.2 how the curvature tensor at an arbitrary point is related to the lengths of certain *spacelike geodesics* between pairs of spacelike separated points.

2.1 Convex normal neighbourhoods

Let M be the base manifold of a Lorentzian 4-geometry, $q \in M$ and $U \subset M$ a convex normal neighbourhood of q ; i.e. for some open neighbourhood V of the zero vector in the tangent space T_qM the exponential map $\exp_q : V \rightarrow U$ is a diffeomorphism, and any two points of U can be joined by a unique geodesic segment which lays entirely in U (see e.g. [16, 17, 18, 19]). We parameterize the points of the geodesic defined by the exponential map according to $\alpha(t) := \exp_q(tX)$ with fixed $X^\alpha \in T_qM$, and if X^α is a unit vector, then the natural (affine) parameter t is the arc length parameter along α .

The Riemannian normal coordinate system, based on the point $q \in M$ and, say, an *orthonormal* basis $\{E_a^\alpha\}$ in T_qM , $a = 0, \dots, 3$, with timelike E_0^α , is defined by the exponential map: the coordinates of the point $r \in U$ are defined to be $x^a = (x^0, \dots, x^3) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ if $r = \exp_q(x^a E_a)$. Here, the Greek indices are referring to a general coordinate system on U (which can also be considered to be abstract tensor indices), and the small Latin indices are concrete name indices referring to the orthonormal basis $\{E_a^\alpha\}$ at q . Hence, the Riemannian normal coordinates are not only coordinates in the sense of differential topology, but (actually) they are adapted to the metric structure of the spacetime geometry, analogously to the Cartesian coordinates in (pseudo-) Euclidean spaces. In the coordinates $\{x^a\}$, the geodesics through q in U are straight lines in V through the origin of T_qM : $x^a = tX^a$ for some vector $X^\alpha = X^a E_a^\alpha$ with the components X^a in the basis $\{E_a^\alpha\}$; and the origin of this coordinate system corresponds to q . If the components of the curvature tensor in this basis at q are R_{abcd} , then, as is well known,

$$g_{ab}(x) = \eta_{ab} - \frac{t^2}{3} R_{acdb} X^c X^d + O(t^3), \quad (2.1)$$

$$\Gamma_{bc}^a(x) = \frac{t}{3} (R^a{}_{bcd} + R^a{}_{cbd}) X^d + O(t^2), \quad (2.2)$$

$$R^a{}_{bcd}(x) = R^a{}_{bcd} + O(t) \quad (2.3)$$

hold, where $\eta_{ab} := \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$. Note that, by (2.1)-(2.3), the curvature at q provides a control on the derivatives of the metric on the whole U only up to second order. To have control on the first $(r+2)$ derivatives, $r \geq 0$, the derivatives of the curvature up to r th order would have to be specified at q . This more accurate (but technically considerably more complicated) case will not be considered in the present paper. By (2.1) the metric on U can also be considered to be a perturbed flat metric, where the perturbation grows quadratically in the leading order with the coordinates $x^a = tX^a$, and the factor of proportionality is just the curvature. The significance of the presence of the *generic* curvature in (2.1) is that it provides a guarantee that a *generic*, rather than only some special spacetime geometry is considered.

If Z^α is any vector at q , then it can be extended to the whole U in a unique way by parallelly propagating it along the ('radial') geodesics α : using (2.2), for its components $Z^a(t)$ at the point $\alpha(t)$ in the coordinate basis $\{(\partial/\partial x^a)^\alpha\}$ we obtain

$$Z^a(t) = \left(\delta_b^a + \frac{t^2}{6} R^a{}_{cdb} X^c X^d + O(t^3) \right) Z^b, \quad (2.4)$$

where Z^a and X^a are the components of Z^α and X^α , respectively, at $q = \alpha(0)$ in the basis $\{E_a^\alpha\} = \{(\partial/\partial x^a)^\alpha|_q\}$. In particular, the basis $\{E_a^\alpha\}$ can be extended in a unique way from q to the whole U by parallel transport via (2.4). (N.B.: In general, by (2.1), the coordinate basis $\{(\partial/\partial x^a)^\alpha\}$ is *not* orthonormal on $U - \{q\}$, and hence, in particular, not parallelly propagated along the radial geodesics.) The above formula can be inverted for Z^a :

$$Z^a = \left(\delta_b^a - \frac{t^2}{6} R^a{}_{cdb} X^c X^d + O(t^3) \right) Z^b(t), \quad (2.5)$$

by means of which a vector at any point of U can be transported into T_qM . Since parallel transport preserves the metric, the norm of $Z^\alpha(t)$ at r , i.e. at $x^a = tX^a$, with respect to the

physical metric $g_{\alpha\beta}(x)$ there, is equal to the norm of Z^a , obtained from (2.5) at q , with respect to the flat metric (as one can check it explicitly using (2.1) and (2.5), too).

The Riemannian normal coordinates x^a on U are uniquely determined by the origin point q and the orthonormal basis $\{E_a^\alpha\}$ at q . Hence all the ambiguities in these coordinates are manifested in the Lorentz transformations taking one orthonormal basis to another one in T_qM ; and in the choice of another origin point $\tilde{q} \in U$. Since the new origin point can always be written in a unique way as $\tilde{q} = \exp_q(\xi)$ for some vector $\xi^\alpha \in T_qM$, the ambiguities in the Riemannian normal coordinates on U can be controlled by pairs (Λ^a_b, ξ^a) of Lorentz transformations and vectors, which might be called ‘translations’. (Nevertheless, the set of these pairs does not seem to have any obvious group structure.) The action of the former is obvious: if the Lorentz transformation takes E_a^α into $\tilde{E}_a^\alpha := E_b^\alpha \Lambda^b_a$, then by $r = \exp_q(x^a E_a) = \exp_q(\tilde{x}^a \tilde{E}_a)$ it maps x^a into $\tilde{x}^a = (\Lambda^{-1})^a_b x^b$, and Λ^a_b is unrestricted. However, the action of the ‘translation’ ξ^α is less trivial, and ξ^α must be ‘small enough’. To see this, let $\{\tilde{E}_a^\alpha\}$ denote the basis at $\tilde{q} := \exp_q(\xi)$ obtained from $\{E_a^\alpha\}$ by parallel transport via (2.4), and denote the coordinates of the point $r = \exp_q(x^a E_a)$ in the Riemannian normal coordinate system based on $(\tilde{q}, \{\tilde{E}_a^\alpha\})$ by \tilde{x}^a ; i.e. (by definition) $r = \exp_{\tilde{q}}(\tilde{x}^a \tilde{E}_a)$ also holds. Then for the components of the position vectors $x^b E_b^\alpha, \xi^\alpha \in T_qM$ and $\tilde{x}^b \tilde{E}_b^\alpha \in T_{\tilde{q}}M$ in the coordinate basis $\{(\partial/\partial x^a)^\alpha\}$ we have that $x^b E_b^\alpha + O(|x|^2) = \xi^\alpha + \tilde{x}^b \tilde{E}_b^\alpha$, and hence by (2.4) that

$$\tilde{x}^a = \left(\delta^a_b - \frac{1}{6} R^a_{\ cdb} \xi^c \xi^d + O(|\xi|^3) \right) x^b - \xi^a + O(|x|^2). \quad (2.6)$$

In Minkowski space the position vector of r with respect to \tilde{q} is just -1 times the position vector of \tilde{q} with respect to r . By equation (2.6) the curvature destroys this anti-symmetry of the translation and the position vectors, ξ^α and $x^a E_a^\alpha$. In fact, for the sum of (2.6) and of the equation obtained from (2.6) by interchanging the role of ξ^α and $x^a E_a^\alpha$ we obtain that, in the leading order, $\tilde{x}^a + \xi^a = \frac{1}{6} R^a_{\ bcd} (x^b - \xi^b) \xi^c x^d$. In the presence of curvature, the concept of the position vector and of the translation splits even in convex normal neighbourhoods.

Thus, to summarize, the curved geometry of U is mapped diffeomorphically into the flat T_qM . The vector tX^a in the parameterization of the point $r = \exp_q(tX)$ may be considered to be the ‘position vector’ of the point r with respect to q , all the tensors at r can be transported into q via (2.5), and the resulting tensor can be interpreted as a tensor at tX^a in T_qM . On the other hand, due to the curvature, the concept of translations deviates from that of the position vectors. The curvature emerges as an extra structure on T_qM .

2.2 Curvature from spatial geodesic lengths

Let $X^\alpha, Y^\alpha \in T_qM$ be two unit spacelike vectors that are orthogonal to each other, let $X^\alpha(w) := \cos w X^\alpha + \sin w Y^\alpha$, and let us form the 2-surface S in U through q whose points are of the form $\exp_q(tX(w))$. Thus, S is formed by the 1-parameter family α_w of geodesics through q , defined by $\alpha_w(t) := \exp_q(tX(w))$ with w as the family parameter. These geodesics are orthogonal to the 1-parameter family of curves λ_t , defined by $\lambda_t(w) := \exp_q(tX(w))$ with t as the family parameter (‘Gauss lemma’ [16, 17, 18, 19]). In Riemann’s normal coordinates, these curves are given by the arcs $\lambda_t^a(w) = tX^a(w)$. If the 2-surface S were intrinsically flat, then the length of α_w between $q = \alpha_w(0)$ and $\alpha_w(t)$ would be t for any w , and the length of the arc λ_t between $\alpha_0(t)$ and $\alpha_w(t)$ would be wt . In general, although the length of α_w is still t , but, as it is noted in an informal remark in [18], page 101, the length of λ_t is affected by $t^2/6$ -times the component $R_{abcd} X^a Y^b X^c Y^d$ of the curvature tensor at q . The significance of this result is that, in Riemannian geometry, the given component of the curvature can be determined *directly* from the length of α_w and λ_t . Since all the components of the curvature tensor is determined by its components of the form $R_{abcd} X^a Y^b X^c Y^d$, called the sectional curvature determined by X^α and Y^α , the whole curvature at q can be determined in this way by considering various 2-planes

spanned by vectors like X^α and Y^α in T_qM . (For a more detailed discussion of these and related ideas in Riemannian geometry, see e.g. [16, 17, 18, 19], and in semi-Riemannian geometries [20].)

Our aim is to find the relation between the curvature tensor of Lorentzian 4-geometries in terms of lengths of *spacelike geodesics*. However, the curves λ_t are *not* geodesics, and the question is whether or not an analogous result, involving the radial geodesics α_0 and α_w and the uniquely determined *geodesic* χ between the points $\alpha_0(t) = \lambda_t(0)$ and $\alpha_w(t) = \lambda_t(w)$, can be derived. Moreover, one should check that it is enough to use only *spacelike* 2-planes to determine the whole curvature, even though the geometry is Lorentzian. The answer to the first question is given by the lemma below, and the second question is clarified in the Appendix.

If the 2-surface S were intrinsically flat, then the geodesic from $\alpha_0(t)$ to $\alpha_w(t)$ would be the uniquely determined straight line segment in S , i.e. the position vector pointing from $\alpha_0(t)$ to $\alpha_w(t)$. This position vector is $t(X^a(w) - X^a) = 2t \sin(w/2)V^a$, where, as elementary calculation shows, its *unit* tangent V^a is the linear combination $V^a = -\sin(w/2)X^a + \cos(w/2)Y^a$. For sufficiently small w the length of this position vector is $tw(1 - w^2/4! + O(w^4))$. The effect of the curvature on this length is given by the next lemma, motivated by the remark in [18], page 101, quoted above.

Lemma 2.2.1. *Let $X^\alpha, Y^\alpha \in T_qM$ be unit spacelike vectors orthogonal to each other, and, for $t > 0$ and $w \geq 0$, let us form the geodesics α_0 , α_w and the curve λ_t . Let χ be the geodesic segment between the points $\alpha_0(t) = \lambda_t(0)$ and $\alpha_w(t) = \lambda_t(w)$. Then, for sufficiently small t and w , the length of χ is*

$$L[\chi] = tw \left(1 - \frac{t^2}{6} R_{abcd} X^a Y^b X^c Y^d + O(t^3) + O(w) \right). \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. Since U is a convex normal neighbourhood of q , for sufficiently small t and w the geodesic χ exists, unique and lays in U . Let the curve λ_t and the geodesic χ be given in the Riemannian normal coordinates by the functions $\lambda_t^a(\bar{w})$ and $\chi^a(\bar{w})$, respectively, where $0 \leq \bar{w} \leq w$. Since the order of differentiability of the two terms in the geodesic equation, $(d^2 y^a / dv^2) + \Gamma_{bc}^a(y(v))(dy^b/dv)(dy^c/dv) = 0$, must be the same, for a C^k connection the differentiability class of the solution $y^a(v)$ must be C^{k+2} . Since by (2.2) Γ_{bc}^a is C^1 in the coordinates x^a , $\lambda_t^a(\bar{w})$ and $\chi^a(\bar{w})$ are C^3 . Clearly, $\chi^a(0) = \lambda_t^a(0)$, and if $t \rightarrow 0$, then $\chi^a(\bar{w}) - \lambda_t^a(\bar{w}) \rightarrow 0$. Hence there are C^2 functions w^a of \bar{w} and t such that $\chi^a(\bar{w}) - \lambda_t^a(\bar{w}) = \bar{w} t w^a(\bar{w}, t)$ holds. Moreover, since in the $w \rightarrow 0$ limit the tangent of χ at its starting point $\lambda_t(0)$ tends to the tangent of λ_t there, there exist C^2 functions W^a of \bar{w} and t such that

$$\frac{d\chi^a(\bar{w})}{d\bar{w}} - \frac{d\lambda_t^a(\bar{w})}{d\bar{w}} = w t W^a(\bar{w}, t).$$

Since the geodesic χ depends on w , the functions w^a and W^a depend on w , too. Using these formulae for $\chi^a(\bar{w})$ and its \bar{w} -derivative and the fact that $\lambda_t^a(\bar{w}) = tX^a(\bar{w}) = t(\cos \bar{w}X^a + \sin \bar{w}Y^a)$, by (2.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ab}(\chi) \frac{d\chi^a}{d\bar{w}} \frac{d\chi^b}{d\bar{w}} &= \eta_{ab} \left(\frac{d\lambda_t^a}{d\bar{w}} + w t W^a \right) \left(\frac{d\lambda_t^b}{d\bar{w}} + w t W^b \right) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{3} R_{abcd} \left(\frac{d\lambda_t^a}{d\bar{w}} + w t W^a \right) \left(\lambda_t^b + \bar{w} t w^b \right) \left(\frac{d\lambda_t^c}{d\bar{w}} + w t W^c \right) \left(\lambda_t^d + \bar{w} t w^d \right) + O\left(\left| \frac{d\chi^e}{d\bar{w}} \right|^2 \right) O(t^3) = \\ &= t^2 \left\{ -1 + \frac{t^2}{3} R_{abcd} X^a Y^b X^c Y^d + w F_1 + w^2 F_2 + \right. \\ &\left. + t^2 \left(w G_1 + \bar{w} G_2 + w^2 G_3 + w \bar{w} G_4 + \bar{w}^2 G_5 + w \bar{w}^2 G_6 + w^2 \bar{w} G_7 + w^2 \bar{w}^2 G_8 \right) + O(t^3) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $F_1, F_2, G_1, \dots, G_8$ are C^2 functions of w, \bar{w} and t . The Taylor expansion of the square root of its absolute value with respect to t, w and \bar{w} around $t = w = \bar{w} = 0$ up to second order is

$$\sqrt{|g_{ab}(\chi) \frac{d\chi^a}{d\bar{w}} \frac{d\chi^b}{d\bar{w}}|} = t \left(1 - \frac{t^2}{6} R_{abcd} X^a Y^b X^c Y^d + O(w) + O(\bar{w}^2) + O(t^3) \right),$$

and hence its integral with respect to \bar{w} from 0 to w gives (2.7). \square

Thus, the component $R_{abcd}X^aY^bX^cY^d$ of the curvature tensor at q is determined by the length of χ in the triplet $(\alpha_0, \alpha_w, \chi)$ of *spacelike geodesics*; and, by (2.7), it is given by the derivatives

$$R_{abcd}X^aY^bX^cY^d = -\left(\frac{\partial^4}{\partial t^3 \partial w} L[\chi]\right)_{t=w=0} = -\frac{1}{16} \left(\frac{\partial^6}{\partial t^4 \partial w^2} (L[\chi])^2\right)_{t=w=0}. \quad (2.8)$$

In the appendix we show that *all* the components of the curvature tensor are determined by the contractions of the form $R_{abcd}X^aY^bX^cY^d$ for 21 (in fact, only 20 independent) appropriately chosen *purely spacelike* pairs (X^α, Y^α) .

3 Lorentzian 4-geometries from classical empirical distances

In subsection 3.1 we summarize the key ideas behind the empirical distance, and it will be shown how the concept of spacetime points can be characterized, or rather to be defined operationally, using this distance. In subsection 3.2, we consider distances between *points* of convex normal neighbourhoods in a *curved* spacetime, and then we reinterpret these distances as distances between certain *timelike geodesics*. This reinterpretation of distances yields that the spacetime points can be introduced *operationally* as pairs of timelike geodesics with zero distance between them; and it is this form of the distance between points that can be carried over into quantum theory.

3.1 The distance between timelike straight lines in Minkowski space

3.1.1 The empirical distance

In Minkowski space the distance between any two non-parallel timelike straight lines is well defined. In fact, if the two straight lines are (e.g.) future directed, then, in *Cartesian coordinates* $x^a = (x^0, \dots, x^3)$, they can be given by $\gamma_1^a(u) = \Lambda_{1b}^a \gamma_0^b(u) + \xi_1^a$ and $\gamma_2^a(u) = \Lambda_{2b}^a \gamma_0^b(u) + \xi_2^a$, respectively, for some Lorentz boosts Λ_{1b}^a and Λ_{2b}^a and translations ξ_1^a and ξ_2^a , where $\gamma_0^a(u) := u\delta_0^a$ and u is the proper time parameter. Then the (square of the) distance $D(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, or simply D_{12} , between these two straight lines is

$$(D_{12})^2 := -\Pi_{ab}(\xi_1^a - \xi_2^a)(\xi_1^b - \xi_2^b), \quad (3.1)$$

where (considering these straight lines to be the world lines of classical freely moving point particles with positive rest mass μ_1 and μ_2 , respectively, and hence their energy-momentum 4-vectors are $p_1^a = \mu_1 \Lambda_{10}^a$ and $p_2^a = \mu_2 \Lambda_{20}^a$) Π_b^a is the projection to the spacelike 2-plane orthogonal to p_1^a and p_2^a given explicitly by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_b^a &:= \delta_b^a + \frac{1}{P_{12}^4 - \mu_1^2 \mu_2^2} \left(\mu_2^2 p_1^a p_{1b} + \mu_1^2 p_2^a p_{2b} - P_{12}^2 (p_1^a p_{2b} + p_2^a p_{1b}) \right) = \\ &= -\frac{1}{P_{12}^4 - \mu_1^2 \mu_2^2} (\varepsilon^a{}_{ecd} p_1^c p_2^d) (\varepsilon^e{}_{bgh} p_1^g p_2^h) = \frac{1}{((\Lambda_1^{-1} \Lambda_2)_{00})^2 - 1} (\varepsilon^a{}_{cde} \Lambda_{10}^c \Lambda_{20}^d) (\varepsilon_{bgh}{}^e \Lambda_{10}^g \Lambda_{20}^h). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Here ε_{abcd} is the volume 4-form (which, actually, is the totally skew Levi-Civita symbol), and $P_{12}^2 := \eta_{ab} p_1^a p_2^b$. This D_{12} is just the well defined Lorentzian length of the straight line segment in this spacelike 2-plane between a uniquely determined point ν_1 of γ_1 and a uniquely determined

point ν_2 of γ_2 . (If the straight lines γ_1 and γ_2 were parallel, then the denominator in (3.2) would be zero. However, by taking limits, the distance D_{12} could be extended in a unique [and obvious] way to pairs of parallel timelike straight lines, too. In this case, the points ν_1 and ν_2 would not be uniquely determined.) Here $\Pi_b^a(\xi_2^b - \xi_1^b)$ can be interpreted as the relative position vector pointing from ν_1 to ν_2 , or the translation taking ν_1 into ν_2 . The significance of this distance D_{12} is twofold.

The first is that (the square of) this distance can be re-expressed in terms of the basic observables of Poincaré-invariant elementary classical mechanical systems, viz. the 4-momenta p_1^a and p_2^a and the angular momenta J_1^{ab} and J_2^{ab} , and the structure of this alternative expression, denoted by d_{12}^2 , showed how to construct the analogous expression *in quantum theory*. In the classical theory, the construction of d_{12}^2 is as follows.

If the rest mass μ of such a system is positive, then one can always find a 1-parameter family of translations, viz. $\xi^a = -M^a/\mu^2 + up^a/\mu$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$, by means of which the centre-of-mass vector, $M^a := J^{ab}p_b$, can be taken to be vanishing. (Recall that under the translation with ξ^a the basic observables transform as $(p^a, J^{ab}) \mapsto (p^a, J^{ab} + \xi^a p^b - \xi^b p^a)$; and hence, under such a translation, $M_a \mapsto \tilde{M}_a := M_a + (\mu^2 \eta_{ab} - p_a p_b) \xi^b$. N.B.: This translation is -1 times the translation in the parameterization of the timelike straight lines given in the beginning of this subsection, and hence the latter is M^a/μ^2 up to the addition of an arbitrary term of the form up^a/μ .) These translations point to the points of a timelike straight line in Minkowski space, the so-called centre-of-mass world line of the elementary mechanical system. Then, considering the straight lines γ_1 and γ_2 to be the centre-of-mass world lines of two Poincaré-invariant elementary classical mechanical systems, (3.1) with these special translations yields an alternative form of this distance in terms of the 4-momentum and the angular momentum of the elementary systems: this is the square $(d_{12})^2 := -\eta_{ab} d_{12}^a d_{12}^b$ of the relative position vector

$$d_{12}^a := \Pi_b^a \left(\frac{M_1^b}{\mu_1^2} - \frac{M_2^b}{\mu_2^2} \right) = -\frac{1}{P_{12}^4 - \mu_1^2 \mu_2^2} \varepsilon^a{}_{bcd} p_1^b p_2^c \left(S_{12}^d - P_{12}^2 \left(\frac{S_1^d}{\mu_1^2} - \frac{S_2^d}{\mu_2^2} \right) \right), \quad (3.3)$$

where $S^a := \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^a{}_{bcd} J^{bc} p^d$ is the Pauli–Lubanski spin vector and $S_{12}^a := \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^a{}_{bcd} (J_1^{bc} p_2^d + J_2^{bc} p_1^d)$. (For the details, see [8].) Thus, the distance between any two timelike straight lines has been re-expressed by *observables of classical mechanical systems*.

As we noted above, the significance of d_{12} (that we call the ‘empirical distance’) is that its structure showed how to construct an analogous empirical distance from the *basic quantum mechanical observables* by means of which the metric structure of the Minkowski space could be recovered in the classical limit. In fact, denoting this quantum mechanical expression (which is evaluated in the quantum state of the systems) also by d_{12} , the following theorem [8] could be proven:

Theorem 3.1.1. *Let γ_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, be timelike straight lines in Minkowski space such that no two of them are parallel. Then there are N Poincaré-invariant quantum mechanical systems and a sequence ϕ_{ik} , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, of pure quantum states of them such that, in the $k \rightarrow \infty$ limit, the empirical distances d_{ij} , calculated in the pure tensor product states $\phi_{1k} \otimes \dots \otimes \phi_{Nk}$, tend with asymptotically vanishing uncertainty to the classical Lorentzian distances D_{ij} between γ_i and γ_j for any $i, j = 1, \dots, N$.*

(A more detailed discussion of the concepts here will be given in subsection 4.1.) The primary aim of the present paper is to find an analogous result on how the C^2 Lorentzian metric on a neighbourhood of a point of the classical spacetime can be recovered.

3.1.2 Points of Minkowski spacetime as derived concepts

The other significance of D_{12} (and hence of d_{12}) is that this makes it possible *to determine the spacetime points* in an *operational way*. (This issue was not considered in [8].) Theorem 3.1.1

is about how the distance between (timelike) *straight lines*, rather than between points, can be recovered from quantum mechanics. Thus, if we want to recover distances between *points*, the notion of point must also be reformulated in a way to be able to implement it in the quantum theory.

Clearly, any point q of Minkowski space is specified completely by the set $[q]$ of (e.g. the future directed) timelike straight lines through q . Physically, this means that the event represented by the point q is identified to be just the meeting of the freely moving massive particles with the timelike straight lines as their world lines. But $D_{12} = 0$ holds precisely when γ_1 and γ_2 intersect each other at some (uniquely determined) point. Hence the points of the Minkowski spacetime are in a one-to-one correspondence with the pairs of timelike straight lines with linearly independent tangents and vanishing distance between them. Moreover, the distance D provides a criterion when a timelike straight line γ passes through the intersection point of γ_1 and γ_2 , and hence when two spacetime points, defined by pairs of timelike straight lines, coincide.

Defining the set $[\gamma] := \{\gamma' \mid D(\gamma, \gamma') = 0\}$, i.e. the set of the timelike straight lines γ' that intersect γ somewhere, this criterion is given by the following proposition and its corollary.

Proposition 3.1.1. *Let γ_1 , γ_2 and γ_3 be timelike straight lines with linearly independent tangents. Then γ_1 , γ_2 and γ_3 intersect one another at a single point, say q , precisely when $D(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = D(\gamma_2, \gamma_3) = D(\gamma_3, \gamma_1) = 0$ holds. The set $[q]$ of the timelike straight lines through this common intersection point is $[\gamma_1] \cap [\gamma_2] \cap [\gamma_3]$.*

Proof. Clearly, if γ_1 , γ_2 and γ_3 intersect one another at a single point, then $D(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = D(\gamma_2, \gamma_3) = D(\gamma_3, \gamma_1) = 0$ holds. Conversely, let us suppose that $D(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = 0$. Then there is a uniquely determined point $q := \gamma_1 \cap \gamma_2$, and the two straight lines γ_1 and γ_2 lay in a timelike 2-plane. Since the tangent of γ_3 is linearly independent of that of γ_1 and of γ_2 , the straight line γ_3 cannot lay in the same 2-plane. Hence, γ_3 can intersect this timelike 2-plane in a single point. But by $D(\gamma_1, \gamma_3) = D(\gamma_2, \gamma_3) = 0$ the straight line γ_3 must intersect both γ_1 and γ_2 , which can happen only if its intersection point with the timelike 2-plane is just the intersection point q of γ_1 and γ_2 . Thus $q = \gamma_1 \cap \gamma_2 \cap \gamma_3$.

If γ is any straight line through q , then by the definition of q the line γ intersects all of γ_1 , γ_2 and γ_3 , i.e. $\gamma \in [\gamma_1] \cap [\gamma_2] \cap [\gamma_3]$, and hence $[q] \subset [\gamma_1] \cap [\gamma_2] \cap [\gamma_3]$. Conversely, let $\gamma \in [\gamma_1] \cap [\gamma_2] \cap [\gamma_3]$. Then since γ_1 , γ_2 and γ_3 do not lay in the same 2-plane, γ can intersect all of γ_1 , γ_2 and γ_3 only if it intersects them at q , i.e. $[\gamma_1] \cap [\gamma_2] \cap [\gamma_3] \subset [q]$. \square

Corollary 3.1.2. *Let γ_1 , γ_2 be timelike straight lines that cross each other at q , let γ'_1 , γ'_2 be timelike straight lines that cross each other at q' , and suppose that at least three of the tangent of these straight lines are linearly independent. Then $q = q'$ if and only if $D(\gamma_1, \gamma'_1) = D(\gamma_1, \gamma'_2) = D(\gamma_2, \gamma'_1) = D(\gamma_2, \gamma'_2) = 0$.*

Proof. If $q = q'$, then the distance between any two of the timelike straight lines is clearly zero.

Conversely, suppose that $D(\gamma_1, \gamma'_1) = D(\gamma_1, \gamma'_2) = D(\gamma_2, \gamma'_1) = D(\gamma_2, \gamma'_2) = 0$ holds, and that e.g. the tangent of γ_1 , γ_2 and γ'_1 are linearly independent. Then by Proposition 3.1.1 the straight line γ'_1 intersects γ_1 and γ_2 precisely at q . But γ'_1 does not lay in the 2-plane of γ_1 and γ_2 , and hence γ'_2 can intersect the other three straight lines only at q . Hence $q = q'$. \square

By this corollary $D(\gamma_1, \gamma'_1) = D(\gamma_1, \gamma'_2) = D(\gamma_2, \gamma'_1) = D(\gamma_2, \gamma'_2) = 0$ and $q \neq q'$ can happen only in rather exceptional cases, viz. when all these straight lines lay in a single timelike 2-plane, and hence it gives a criterion when two points, specified by two pairs of timelike straight lines, coincide. Therefore, it provides an *operational definition* of the spacetime points in terms of the distance D and the 4-momenta. This representation of points is analogous to the representation of points by null geodesics and the orthogonality of their null twistor representatives in twistor theory [22, 23].

Using this representation of the points of the Minkowski space, the distance between any three *spacelike* separated points, say q , r_1 and r_2 , can be rewritten as the empirical distance between certain timelike straight lines through these points as follows. Let the points q , r_1 and r_2 be represented by the position vectors ξ_{01}^a , ξ_{11}^a and ξ_{21}^a , respectively, and hence $\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a$, $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{01}^a$ and $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{11}^a$ are spacelike. Let γ_{01}^a and γ_{02}^a be different timelike straight lines through q , given in the Cartesian coordinate system, and, analogously, γ_{11}^a and γ_{12}^a through r_1 , and γ_{21}^a and γ_{22}^a through r_2 . Thus the points q , r_1 and r_2 are represented by the pairs $(\gamma_{01}^a, \gamma_{02}^a)$, $(\gamma_{11}^a, \gamma_{12}^a)$ and $(\gamma_{21}^a, \gamma_{22}^a)$, respectively. Clearly, these straight lines can be obtained from the single timelike straight line $\gamma_0^a(u) = u \delta_0^a$ by an appropriate Poincaré transformation. In particular, $\gamma_{01}^a(u) = \Lambda_{01b}^a \gamma_0^b(u) + \xi_{01}^a$ and $\gamma_{02}^a(u) = \Lambda_{02b}^a \gamma_0^b(u) + \xi_{01}^a$ hold for some Lorentz boosts Λ_{01b}^a and Λ_{02b}^a ; and we have analogous expressions for $\gamma_{11}^a(u)$, $\gamma_{12}^a(u)$, $\gamma_{21}^a(u)$ and $\gamma_{22}^a(u)$, too.

To recover the distance between e.g. the points q and r_1 as the empirical distance between e.g. γ_{01}^a and γ_{11}^a according to subsection 3.1.1, these two straight lines should not be parallel and both must be orthogonal to $\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a$. Moreover, if this distance is expected to be the same between any of the two straight lines chosen one from the pair $(\gamma_{01}^a, \gamma_{02}^a)$ and the other from $(\gamma_{11}^a, \gamma_{12}^a)$, then no two of them may be parallel and any of them must be orthogonal to $\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a$. In terms of the Lorentz boosts and the relative position vector $\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a$ the latter conditions take the form

$$(\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a) \eta_{ab} \Lambda_{010}^b = (\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a) \eta_{ab} \Lambda_{020}^b = (\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a) \eta_{ab} \Lambda_{110}^b = (\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a) \eta_{ab} \Lambda_{120}^b = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

To recover the distance between q and r_2 , and also between r_1 and r_2 , we obtain analogous conditions for $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{01}^a$ and the boosts Λ_{010}^a , Λ_{020}^a , Λ_{210}^a , Λ_{220}^a ; and for $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{11}^a$ and the boosts Λ_{110}^a , Λ_{120}^a , Λ_{210}^a , Λ_{220}^a . Since actually (because of the absolute parallelism in Minkowski space) the spacelike 2-plane spanned by $\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a$ and $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{01}^a$ at q , by $\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a$ and $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{11}^a$ at r_1 , and by $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{01}^a$ and $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{11}^a$ at r_2 coincide, these orthogonality conditions are just the requirement that the boosts Λ_{010}^a , Λ_{020}^a , Λ_{110}^a , Λ_{120}^a , Λ_{210}^a and Λ_{220}^a , as vectors, be orthogonal to this spacelike 2-plane. Since the dimension of the spacetime is four, and hence the orthogonal complement of this 2-plane is a timelike 2-plane, all these boosts can be chosen to be different, and hence all the algebraic conditions can be imposed. It is this geometric picture that we carry over into the general, curved spacetime, and then also into the quantum theory.

3.2 The distance between timelike geodesics in curved spacetimes

3.2.1 Distances as Lorentzian norms

Although in Lorentzian geometries the notion of distance between spacelike separated points is not well defined in general, the distance between spatially separated points *in convex normal neighbourhoods* can be introduced as the length of the *uniquely determined* spacelike geodesic segment between them. In particular, with the notations and the result of Lemma 2.2.1, the square of the distance between the points q , $r_1 := \exp_q(tX)$ and $r_2 := \exp_q(tX(w))$ is given by

$$(D_{q,r_1})^2 = t^2 = -\eta_{ab} (tX^a) (tX^b), \quad (3.5)$$

$$(D_{q,r_2})^2 = t^2 = -\eta_{ab} (tX^a(w)) (tX^b(w)), \quad (3.6)$$

$$(D_{r_1,r_2})^2 = t^2 w^2 \left(1 - \frac{t^2}{3} R_{abcd} X^a Y^b X^c Y^d + O(t^3) + O(w) \right). \quad (3.7)$$

Thus, the distances D_{q,r_1} and D_{q,r_2} are just the norms of the ‘position vectors’ tX^a and $tX^a(w)$, respectively, with respect to the *flat* Minkowski metric η_{ab} . We show that, apart from higher order corrections, all these distances can be written in the same form.

As we saw in subsection 2.2, in Minkowski space the position vector of r_2 with respect to r_1 is $t(X^a(w) - X^a)$, where $X^a(w) := \cos w X^a + \sin w Y^a$. Considering this vector to be $Z^a(t)$ in

(2.5), its parallel transport from r_1 to q along the geodesic $\exp_q(tX)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Z^a &= t \left((\cos w - 1)X^a + \sin w(Y^a - \frac{t^2}{6}R^a{}_{bcd}X^bX^cY^d) + O(w)O(t^3) \right) = \\ &= tw \left(Y^a - \frac{t^2}{6}R^a{}_{bcd}X^bX^cY^d - \frac{w}{2}X^a + O(t^3) + O(w^2) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

This motivates to consider the position vectors of the form

$$\xi_1^a := tX^d \left(-\frac{w}{2} \right) \left(\delta_d^a - \frac{t^2}{6}R^a{}_{bcd}X^bX^c \right) = t \left(\cos \frac{w}{2}X^a - \sin \frac{w}{2} \left(Y^a - \frac{t^2}{6}R^a{}_{bcd}X^bX^cY^d \right) \right), \quad (3.9)$$

$$\xi_2^a := tX^d \left(\frac{w}{2} \right) \left(\delta_d^a - \frac{t^2}{6}R^a{}_{bcd}X^bX^c \right) = t \left(\cos \frac{w}{2}X^a + \sin \frac{w}{2} \left(Y^a - \frac{t^2}{6}R^a{}_{bcd}X^bX^cY^d \right) \right). \quad (3.10)$$

These vectors are obtained from the position vectors tX^a and $tX^a(w)$ in two steps: first the zero of the angle parameter w was shifted, and then they were modified by the curvature terms. Clearly, the first is only a change of parameterization, and we could have parameterized the points r_1 and r_2 in this way even in Section 2. The advantage of this re-parameterization is that ξ_1^a and ξ_2^a evidently have the same structure. However, the second step is essential here: it is this point where the effect of curvature is taken into account, viz. that the position vectors of the points r_1 and r_2 , given in the flat geometry of the tangent space by $X^a(\pm w/2)$, are shifted by the curvature both with respect to q and relative to each other.

The norm of these vectors with respect to the *flat* Minkowski metric η_{ab} is

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{ab}\xi_1^a\xi_1^b &= \eta_{ab}\xi_2^a\xi_2^b = -t^2 \left(1 - \sin^2 \frac{w}{2} \frac{t^2}{3} R_{abcd}X^aY^bX^cY^d + O(w^2)O(t^4) \right) = -t^2 + \\ &+ O(w^2)O(t^4) = -(D_{q,r_1})^2 + O(w^2)O(t^4) = -(D_{q,r_2})^2 + O(w^2)O(t^4), \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{ab}(\xi_2^a - \xi_1^a)(\xi_2^b - \xi_1^b) &= -4 \sin^2 \frac{w}{2} t^2 \left(1 - \frac{t^2}{3} R_{abcd}X^aY^bX^cY^d + O(t^4) \right) = \\ &= - (D_{r_1,r_2})^2 + O(t^2)O(w^3) + O(t^5)O(w^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Hence, apart from higher order terms, the distances D_{q,r_1} , D_{q,r_2} and D_{r_1,r_2} given by (3.5)-(3.7) can in fact be rewritten as the Minkowski norm of the vectors ξ_1^a , ξ_2^a and $\xi_2^a - \xi_1^a$, respectively. Taking the derivatives of these norms we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} (\eta_{ab}\xi_1^a\xi_1^b) \right)_{t=w=0} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} (\eta_{ab}\xi_2^a\xi_2^b) \right)_{t=w=0} = -1, \quad (3.13)$$

$$\frac{1}{16} \left(\frac{\partial^6}{\partial t^4 \partial w^2} (\eta_{ab}(\xi_2^a - \xi_1^a)(\xi_2^b - \xi_1^b)) \right)_{t=w=0} = R_{abcd}X^aY^bX^cY^d. \quad (3.14)$$

Thus, in the $t, w \rightarrow 0$ limit, the above norm of both ξ_1^a and ξ_2^a provides the *physical distance* t in the leading order along the radial geodesics α ; and the norm of $\xi_2^a - \xi_1^a$, also with respect to the *flat* Minkowski metric η_{ab} , reproduces the component $R_{abcd}X^aY^bX^cY^d$ of the curvature tensor at q (see Lemma 2.2.1 and equation (2.8)). The significance of this form of the distances will be clear in subsection 4.2.

3.2.2 Distances between timelike geodesics

In the present subsection, we make the analogy with the Minkowski case even closer by reinterpreting the distances (3.5)-(3.7) between the points q , r_1 and r_2 to be distances between certain *timelike geodesics* through these points.

If $r, r' \in U$ are any two spacelike separated points, and γ and γ' are arbitrary timelike geodesics through r and r' , respectively, such that they are *orthogonal* to the uniquely determined spacelike geodesic segment between r and r' , then their distance $D(\gamma, \gamma')$ is *defined* to be just

$D_{r,r'}$. γ and γ' can always be chosen such that the tangent of γ , parallelly propagated from r into r' along the spacelike geodesic segment, is not parallel with that of γ' . (We emphasize that, in contrast to the Minkowski case, the distance D is *not* defined between *any* two timelike geodesics, not even in a convex normal neighbourhood.) If $r = r'$, i.e. when these geodesics intersect each other, the distance between them is clearly zero. On the other hand, even if r and r' are different and spacelike separated, and hence the distance between the geodesics γ and γ' defined in this way is non-zero, then these geodesics may still intersect each other somewhere in the common part of the chronological future or past of the two points, $I^+(r) \cap I^+(r')$ or $I^-(r) \cap I^-(r')$ (for the notation see e.g. [25, 26]). This phenomenon is due to geodesic focusing. However, this intersection should be *outside* U . Hence, the intersection of two timelike geodesics, i.e. the points of the neighbourhood U , can be characterized *locally* by the vanishing of their distance, yielding locally an *operational definition* of spacetime points using only the notion of their distance¹. If two timelike geodesics do not intersect each other in U , then either their distance is not defined, or, if it is defined, then it is not zero. Thus the restriction of the notion of D to certain pairs of timelike geodesics in a small enough U made it possible to characterize the points of U by D .

The above considerations, together with the construction made at the end of the previous subsection, motivate the following geometric setup. Let p_{01}^α and p_{02}^α be different future pointing timelike vectors at q which are orthogonal to X^α and Y^α . By parallel transport along α_0 these vectors can be propagated from q into r_1 , and by parallel transport along α_w into r_2 . Then let us choose two different future pointing timelike vectors p_{11}^α and p_{12}^α at r_1 which are orthogonal to the spacelike geodesics α_0 and χ there. Moreover, since $4 = \dim M > 3$, p_{11}^α and p_{12}^α can always be chosen not to be parallel with any of p_{01}^α and p_{02}^α propagated here. By parallel transport, we propagate p_{11}^α and p_{12}^α along χ from r_1 into r_2 . In a similar way, we choose p_{21}^α and p_{22}^α to be different future pointing timelike vectors at r_2 which are orthogonal to α_w and χ , and which are not parallel with any of p_{01}^α , p_{01}^α , p_{21}^α and p_{22}^α propagated there. Again, since $\dim M = 4$, p_{21}^α and p_{22}^α can be chosen in this manner.

Then there are future directed timelike geodesics γ_{01} and γ_{02} through q with tangents p_{01}^α and p_{02}^α , timelike geodesics γ_{11} and γ_{12} through r_1 with tangents p_{11}^α and p_{12}^α , and timelike geodesics γ_{21} and γ_{22} through r_2 with tangents p_{21}^α and p_{22}^α , respectively. The distance between them are *defined* simply to be

$$D(\gamma_{01}, \gamma_{02}) = D(\gamma_{11}, \gamma_{12}) = D(\gamma_{21}, \gamma_{22}) = 0, \quad (3.15)$$

$$D(\gamma_{01}, \gamma_{11}) = D(\gamma_{01}, \gamma_{12}) = D(\gamma_{02}, \gamma_{11}) = D(\gamma_{02}, \gamma_{12}) = D_{q,r_1}, \quad (3.16)$$

$$D(\gamma_{01}, \gamma_{21}) = D(\gamma_{01}, \gamma_{22}) = D(\gamma_{02}, \gamma_{21}) = D(\gamma_{02}, \gamma_{22}) = D_{q,r_2}, \quad (3.17)$$

$$D(\gamma_{11}, \gamma_{21}) = D(\gamma_{11}, \gamma_{22}) = D(\gamma_{12}, \gamma_{21}) = D(\gamma_{12}, \gamma_{22}) = D_{r_1,r_2}. \quad (3.18)$$

With these definitions we reinterpret the above geometric setup in the following way:

Let us consider the above six timelike geodesics as world lines of massive classical point particles with the given 4-momenta as tangents and let us consider the distances (3.15)-(3.18) between them to be *primarily given*. Then we may say that, by (3.15), they *define* three points, and let us call them q , r_1 and r_2 . The distance between these points is *defined* by the primarily given distances (3.16)-(3.18) between the world lines. Then equation (2.7) in Lemma 2.2.1 tells us how the component $R_{abcd}X^aY^bX^cY^d$ of the curvature tensor at the point q can be recovered, or, alternatively, be *defined*, by the distances between these timelike geodesics. Then by (2.1) and (2.2) the C^2 metric tensor can be recovered on U . The genericness of the curvature at q ensures the genericness of the metric on U . It is this classical picture that will be behind the quantum mechanical setup that we use to get our main results in Section 4.

¹Without restricting our considerations to convex normal neighbourhoods, to have an analogous characterization of the spacetime points by the set of the future/past directed timelike curves through them the future/past distinguishing condition, a rather weak global causality condition, must also be satisfied [25, 26].

4 Lorentzian 4-geometries from quantum mechanical empirical distances

4.1 The empirical distance

The composite quantum mechanical system considered in Theorem 3.1.1 is the formal union of any large N number of independent $E(1, 3)$ -invariant elementary quantum mechanical systems. (Recall that a quantum system in its algebraic formulation is thought to be specified completely if the algebra of its observables and the representation of this algebra on a complex separable Hilbert space are fixed. Such a system is called an $E(1, 3)$ -invariant *elementary* quantum mechanical system if the algebra is the universal enveloping algebra of the Lie algebra $e(1, 3)$ of $E(1, 3)$ and the representation is a unitary irreducible representation. See e.g. [27, 28].) The Hilbert space of its vector states is the tensor product $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$ of the Hilbert spaces of the elementary subsystems, and the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, are carrier spaces of unitary irreducible representations of $E(1, 3)$. The states in Theorem 3.1.1 are the tensor products of the states of the elementary systems with the form ϕ_i , or in the bra-ket notation $|\phi_i\rangle$, given by

$$|\phi_i\rangle = \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar} p_{i\epsilon} \xi_i^\epsilon\right) \mathbf{U}_i |\psi_i\rangle. \quad (4.1)$$

Here $|\psi_i\rangle = |\psi_{s_i, s_i}\rangle$ are special, co-moving centre-of-mass states in the unitary, irreducible representation of the quantum mechanical Poincaré group $E(1, 3)$ with positive rest mass μ_i and spin s_i , p_i^ϵ is the 4-momentum (as multiplication operators) in this representation, \mathbf{U}_i is the unitary operator that implements the Lorentz boost $\Lambda_{i\ b}^a$ appearing in the classical expression $\gamma_i^a(u) = \Lambda_{i\ b}^a \gamma_0^b(u) + \xi_i^a$ of the timelike straight line γ_i^a , and ξ_i^a is this translation (for the details see [8], and, for the representation, its Appendix A.2). The states $|\psi_i\rangle$ play the role analogous to that of the (reference) world line $\gamma^a(u) = u \delta_0^a$ given in the Cartesian coordinates in Minkowski space. (Recall that a state $|\psi\rangle$ is called a special, co-moving centre-of-mass state if, in this state, the expectation value of the centre-of-mass vector operator is vanishing, the expectation value of the energy-momentum 4-vector has only the time component and the expectation value of the Pauli–Lubanski spin has only a single spacelike component. Such states were constructed *explicitly* in [8].) In the classical limit, which is defined by a sequence of states ϕ_{ik} , $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (and denoted by Clim), the two Casimir invariants μ_i and s_i are linked via $\mu_i = O(s_i)$ and the limit itself is defined by $s_i \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, it is essentially the smallest of the spins s_1, \dots, s_N that plays the role of the index k in Theorem 3.1.1. (For the details, see [8]).

The (square of the) empirical distance d_{ij} between the i th and j th elementary subsystems of the composite system in the state $\phi := \phi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \phi_N$ was defined by

$$d_{ij}^2 := \frac{\langle \phi | (\Sigma_{ij}^a \varepsilon_{acde} p_i^c p_j^d) (\varepsilon^e{}_{ghb} p_i^g p_j^h \Sigma_{ij}^b) | \phi \rangle}{\langle \phi | (\mathbf{P}_{ij}^4 - \mu_i^2 \mu_j^2 \mathbf{I}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{I}_N) | \phi \rangle}, \quad (4.2)$$

where \mathbf{I}_i is the identity operator on \mathcal{H}_i , and, for $i < j$,

$$\Sigma_{ij}^a := \frac{1}{\mu_i^2} \mathbf{I}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{C}_i^a \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{I}_N - \frac{1}{\mu_j^2} \mathbf{I}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{C}_j^a \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{I}_N, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{ij}^2 := \eta_{ab} \mathbf{I}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{p}_i^a \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{p}_j^b \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{I}_N. \quad (4.4)$$

Here \mathbf{C}_i^a , the (self-adjoint) centre-of-mass operators, are built from the 4-momentum and angular momentum tensor operators of the elementary systems according to the general definition $\mathbf{C}^a := \mathbf{J}^{ab} \mathbf{p}_b - \frac{3}{2} i \hbar \mathbf{p}^a$. The structure of (4.2) was motivated by the structure of the classical expression (3.3). The role of the denominator in (4.2) is simply the normalization of the projection $(\varepsilon^a{}_{cde} p_i^c p_j^d) (\varepsilon^e{}_{ghb} p_i^g p_j^h)$. (See the classical expression (3.2), and also [6] and [7] in the $SU(2)$ and

$E(3)$ -invariant cases, respectively, where the ‘empirical’ quantum physical quantities considered there have the similar structure).

The structure (4.3) of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{ij}}^a$ and (4.4) of $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{ij}}^2$ implies that, by the *pure tensor product* nature of the state ϕ , $d_{\mathbf{ij}}^2$ depends *only* on the states $\phi_{\mathbf{i}}$ and $\phi_{\mathbf{j}}$ of the respective elementary systems, and it is independent of the state of the other subsystems. In particular, in the states of the form (4.1), $d_{\mathbf{ij}}^2$ gives $-\Pi_{ab}(\xi_{\mathbf{i}}^a - \xi_{\mathbf{j}}^a)(\xi_{\mathbf{i}}^b - \xi_{\mathbf{j}}^b)$ in the classical limit with asymptotically vanishing uncertainty², moreover, if the vectors $\xi_{\mathbf{i}}^a$ and $\xi_{\mathbf{j}}^a$ are chosen to be the translations in the parameterization of the straight lines $\gamma_{\mathbf{i}}^a$ and $\gamma_{\mathbf{j}}^a$ in Minkowski space, then this limit is just the square of the correct Lorentzian distance $D_{\mathbf{ij}}$ between $\gamma_{\mathbf{i}}^a$ and $\gamma_{\mathbf{j}}^a$: $\text{Clim } d_{\mathbf{ij}}^2 = D_{\mathbf{ij}}^2$ (see (3.1) and Theorem 3.1.1 above). This is the way how the metric structure of Minkowski space could be recovered from $d_{\mathbf{ij}}^2$.

As we already noted in (the first footnote in subsection 1.2 of) [8], the root of the boost-rotation and the translation symmetries in the Minkowski *affine* space, introduced as the dual to the momentum space, is different. The boost-rotation symmetries are rooted in the intrinsic Minkowski *vector space* structure of the momentum space, while the translations come from the *assumption* that changing the wave function not only by a constant, but even by a special momentum-dependent phase factor, $\exp(ip_e \xi^e / \hbar)$, as a symmetry of the quantum mechanical system, came from a metric symmetry of the Minkowski space, too. It is this assumption that makes the Minkowski *vector space* to be Minkowski *affine space*. Moreover, in subsection 2.1 we saw that the Lorentzian symmetry of the Minkowski vector space survives in curved spacetimes as an exact symmetry in the tangent spaces, and hence as a symmetry that takes Riemannian normal coordinate systems into such coordinate systems. On the other hand, due to the curvature, the naive translation of the Riemannian normal coordinates, $x^a \mapsto x^a + \xi^a$, does *not* yield Riemannian normal coordinates. Thus the Lorentz and translation symmetries of the Minkowski affine space separate even further in the presence of curvature. Therefore, it seems natural to search for the appropriate states in (4.2) among those in which only the translations, or rather the position vectors, deviate from the states yielding the flat spacetime distances.

In the next subsection we show that the local metric structure of *curved* spacetimes can also be recovered from, or rather *defined* by, *tensor product states* simply by modifying the position vectors in (3.1) appropriately.

4.2 Recovering the Riemann tensor from pure tensor product states

We can apply the general ideas above to the composite system consisting of six elementary subsystems indexed by $\mathbf{i} = 01, 02, 11, 12, 21, 22$ and whose state is the tensor product state

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi\rangle &:= \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar}(p_{01e} + p_{02e})\xi_{01}^e\right) \left(\mathbf{U}_{01}|\psi_{01}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{U}_{02}|\psi_{02}\rangle\right) \\ &\otimes \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar}(p_{11e} + p_{12e})\xi_{11}^e\right) \left(\mathbf{U}_{11}|\psi_{11}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{U}_{12}|\psi_{12}\rangle\right) \\ &\otimes \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar}(p_{21e} + p_{22e})\xi_{21}^e\right) \left(\mathbf{U}_{21}|\psi_{21}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{U}_{22}|\psi_{22}\rangle\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Note that the position vectors in the subsystems 01 and 02, in 11 and 12, and in 21 and 22 are the same. If the Lorentz transformations that are represented by the unitary operators in (4.5) are all different, then by the discussion in subsection 3.2.1 the classical limit, $\text{Clim } d_{\mathbf{ij}}^2$, is well defined for any \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} . Moreover, $\text{Clim } d_{01,02} = \text{Clim } d_{11,12} = \text{Clim } d_{21,22} = 0$ (see (3.1)). Thus, the role of the pairs (01, 02), (11, 12) and (21, 22) of the subsystems with the given structure of

²Since by (3.2) $d_{\mathbf{ij}}^2$ is the quotient of two expectation values rather than the expectation value of a single self-adjoint operator, its uncertainty is *not* the standard deviation of an operator in the given state. Essentially, this uncertainty is the sum of the standard deviation of the operator in the numerator and of the operator in the denominator in (3.2). For the details, see [8].

their states is to *define* three points in the classical limit, and we call these points q , r_1 and r_2 , respectively.

However, in general the classical limit of the empirical distances $d_{01,11}$, $d_{01,12}$, $d_{02,11}$ and $d_{02,12}$ are all different unless the Lorentz boosts Λ_{010}^a , Λ_{020}^a , Λ_{110}^a and Λ_{120}^a are all orthogonal to $\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a$ (see equation (3.4)). In fact, although the classical limit of the square of these empirical distances has the form $-\Pi_{ab}(\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a)(\xi_{11}^b - \xi_{01}^b)$ (see equation (3.1)), but the projection Π_{ab} in these four cases are *different* (see equation (3.2)): it is the projection to the spacelike 2-space orthogonal to Λ_{010}^a and Λ_{110}^a , to Λ_{010}^a and Λ_{120}^a , to Λ_{020}^a and Λ_{110}^a , and to Λ_{020}^a and Λ_{120}^a , respectively. These spacelike 2-spaces coincide, and hence $\text{Clim } d_{01,11} = \text{Clim } d_{01,12} = \text{Clim } d_{02,11} = \text{Clim } d_{02,12}$ holds, if the orthogonality conditions in (3.4) are satisfied. In this case the common classical limit of their square is

$$\text{Clim } d_{01,11}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{01,12}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{02,11}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{02,12}^2 = -\eta_{ab}(\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a)(\xi_{11}^b - \xi_{01}^b) \quad (4.6)$$

(see the structure (3.8) of the projection Π_{ab}), which is just the square of the Minkowski norm of $\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a$. We have analogous conditions on the equality of the classical limit of $d_{01,21}$, $d_{01,22}$, $d_{02,21}$ and $d_{02,22}$ in terms of $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{01}^a$ and the Lorentz boosts Λ_{010}^a , Λ_{020}^a , Λ_{210}^a and Λ_{220}^a ; and also on the equality of the classical limit of $d_{11,21}$, $d_{11,22}$, $d_{12,21}$ and $d_{12,22}$ in terms of $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{11}^a$ and Λ_{110}^a , Λ_{120}^a , Λ_{210}^a and Λ_{220}^a . Therefore, if (3.4) and the analogous two conditions are satisfied, i.e. all the six boosts Λ_{010}^a , Λ_{020}^a , Λ_{110}^a , Λ_{120}^a , Λ_{210}^a , Λ_{220}^a are orthogonal to the spacelike 2-plane spanned by $\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a$ and $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{01}^a$, then the resulting three distances in the classical limit can be interpreted as the distances between the points q , r_1 and r_2 above like in (3.16)-(3.18), and the distances themselves are given by the norm of $\xi_{11}^a - \xi_{01}^a$, $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{01}^a$ and $\xi_{21}^a - \xi_{11}^a$ with respect to the *flat* metric η_{ab} . Note that, so far, the position vectors ξ_{01}^a , ξ_{11}^a and ξ_{21}^a have not been specified.

If the position vectors ξ_{01}^a , ξ_{11}^a and ξ_{21}^a were chosen to be those in the parametrization of the timelike straight lines in Minkowski spacetime, then these distances would be the *flat* spacetime distances. In the rest of the present subsection, we show that, choosing these position vectors according to the results of subsection 3.2.1, we can recover the local metric structure of any *curved* Lorentzian spacetime as well.

Choosing the vectors ξ_{11}^a and ξ_{12}^a in (4.5) to be

$$\xi_{11}^a := \xi_{01}^a + \xi_1^a, \quad \xi_{21}^a := \xi_{01}^a + \xi_2^a, \quad (4.7)$$

where the vectors ξ_1^a and ξ_2^a are the *shifted relative position vectors* given by (3.9) and (3.10), respectively, we obtain a two-parameter family of tensor product states, viz.

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(t, w)\rangle = \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar}(p_{01e} + p_{02e})\xi_{01}^e + \right. \\ \left. + \frac{i}{\hbar}(p_{11e} + p_{12e})(\xi_{01}^e + tX^e(-\frac{w}{2}) + \sin\frac{w}{2}\frac{t^3}{6}R^e{}_{bcd}X^bX^cY^d) + \right. \\ \left. + \frac{i}{\hbar}(p_{21e} + p_{22e})(\xi_{01}^e + tX^e(\frac{w}{2}) - \sin\frac{w}{2}\frac{t^3}{6}R^e{}_{cdb}X^cX^dY^b) \right) |\chi\rangle, \quad (4.8) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$|\chi\rangle := \mathbf{U}_{01}|\psi_{01}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{U}_{02}|\psi_{02}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{U}_{11}|\psi_{11}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{U}_{12}|\psi_{12}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{U}_{21}|\psi_{21}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{U}_{22}|\psi_{22}\rangle. \quad (4.9)$$

As in (4.5), here the states $|\psi_{\mathbf{i}}\rangle$, $\mathbf{i} = 01, 02, 11, 12, 21, 22$, are the special co-moving centre-of-mass states in the unitary irreducible representation of $E(1,3)$ labeled by the Casimir invariants $\mu_{\mathbf{i}}$ and $s_{\mathbf{i}}$. The Lorentz boosts, represented by the unitary operators in (4.9), are chosen to satisfy the orthogonality conditions discussed at the end of the second paragraph above. If the states $|\psi_{\mathbf{i}}\rangle$ are chosen from a sequence $|\psi_{\mathbf{i}k}\rangle$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, of special co-moving centre-of-mass states that define the classical limit, then $d_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}}^2$ can be evaluated in these states and one can take the classical

limit $k := \min\{s_{01}, \dots, s_{22}\} \rightarrow \infty$. Then, repeating the argumentation behind Theorem 3.1.1 and using (3.11)-(3.12), we obtain

$$\text{Clim } d_{01,02}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{11,12}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{21,22}^2 = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\text{Clim } d_{01,11}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{01,12}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{02,11}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{02,12}^2 = (D_{q,r_1})^2 + O(t^4)O(w^2), \quad (4.11)$$

$$\text{Clim } d_{01,21}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{01,22}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{02,21}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{02,22}^2 = (D_{q,r_2})^2 + O(t^4)O(w^2), \quad (4.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Clim } d_{11,21}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{11,22}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{12,21}^2 = \text{Clim } d_{12,22}^2 = (D_{r_1,r_2})^2 + \\ + O(t^2)O(w^3) + O(t^5)O(w^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Hence, up to higher order corrections, the classical distances (3.15)-(3.18) have been recovered from the quantum mechanical empirical distance $d_{\mathbf{i}}^2$ in the classical limit. With this result and as a consequence of Theorem 3.1.1, we have proven the next statement.

Theorem 4.2.1. *Let $(M, g_{\alpha\beta})$ be a spacetime manifold, $q \in M$, and let $X^\alpha, Y^\alpha \in T_q M$ be any two spacelike unit vectors that are orthogonal to each other. Let $r_1 := \exp_q(tX)$ and $r_2 := \exp_q(tX(w))$, where $X^\alpha(w) := \cos w X^\alpha + \sin w Y^\alpha$, and let D_{q,r_1} , D_{q,r_2} and D_{r_1,r_2} be the distances between these points. Then there exist six Poincaré-invariant quantum mechanical systems \mathcal{S}_i , $i = 01, 02, 11, 12, 21, 22$, and a sequence $\phi_{ik}(t, w)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, of two-parameter families of their vector states, $0 \leq t, w < \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, such that in the $k \rightarrow \infty$ limit the square of the empirical distances, $d_{\mathbf{i}}^2$, calculated in the tensor product states $\phi_{01k}(t, w) \otimes \dots \otimes \phi_{22k}(t, w)$, tend with asymptotically vanishing uncertainty to the values given by (4.10)-(4.13).*

Thus, as a consequence of (3.13)-(3.14), the component $R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} X^\alpha Y^\beta X^\gamma Y^\delta$ of the curvature tensor at q has been recovered. In the Appendix, we show that there are 20 *spacelike* 2-planes in $T_q M$ such that the corresponding sectional curvatures determine all the independent components of the curvature tensor. Therefore, choosing the vectors $X^\alpha, Y^\alpha \in T_q M$ to span these twenty spacelike 2-planes, all the components of the curvature tensor can be determined, or rather *defined*, in the classical limit from the empirical distances between the constituents of sextets of Poincaré-invariant quantum mechanical systems via Theorem 4.2.1. Since by equations (2.1)-(2.2) the whole C^2 metric on U is determined by the curvature and the curvature is arbitrary, *the local geometry of any curved C^2 Lorentzian spacetime can be determined, or rather defined, in the classical limit by observables of abstract, Poincaré-invariant quantum mechanical systems.*

5 Final remarks

The strategies to resolve the well known conflicts between general relativity and quantum theory are usually based on one of the two paradigms: first, gravity is ‘fundamental’ (like electromagnetism), and hence it must be the subject of some (more or less standard) active quantization procedure; and the other is that gravity is ‘emergent’ (like thermo- or hydrodynamics), in which case gravity should be derivable from (probably some modified, or rather ‘improved’) quantum theory. In both cases one must have some extra, still not justified *a priori* assumption on the existing theories. Nevertheless, according to Wheeler’s ‘radical conservatism’ [9], before introducing a new paradigm to explain some phenomenon or to resolve some difficulty, we should exhaust all the possibilities that our existing, known theories provide. It could be the ultimate failure of all these attempts that could indicate what kind of new paradigm (if any) should be adopted.

Our present investigations (and, in fact, the previous ones in [6, 7, 8], too) were done in this spirit. We took general relativity and quantum mechanics as they are, and we found that the metric structure of the Euclidean 3-space and of the flat and curved spacetimes can be derived from quantum mechanics *strictly in the framework provided by these two theories*. A by-product of these investigations is that, in contrast to general expectations, these metric structures could

be derived from *pure tensor product states* of the quantum mechanical subsystems, i.e. without any entanglement of them. It is the observables that are entangled.

While the preparation of the present paper was in its final stage, the paper [29] appeared with the idea similar to that we are proposing here, viz. that the quantum theory should live in the flat geometry of the tangent spaces of curved spacetimes, and the quantum physical phenomena on a neighbourhood of a spacetime point, rather than only on the whole spacetime, should also be investigated in this way. However, the mathematical/technical realization of this idea appears to be rather different in [29] and in the present paper.

No funds, grants or support was received.

A Appendix: Curvature from purely spatial 2-surfaces

In this appendix, we show that although the spacetime metric is Lorentzian, all the components of the curvature tensor can be recovered from the sectional curvatures determined by *purely spacelike* 2-surfaces.

If $X^\alpha, Y^\alpha \in T_q M$ are any two linearly independent vectors, then let $[X.Y]$ denote the 2-plane in $T_q M$ spanned by X^α and Y^α (which should not be confused with the Lie bracket of them), and form $A(X, Y) := (g_{\alpha\beta} X^\alpha X^\beta)(g_{\gamma\delta} Y^\gamma Y^\delta) - (g_{\alpha\beta} X^\alpha Y^\beta)^2$. If the 2-plane $[X, Y]$ is non-degenerate (in the sense that $A(X, Y) \neq 0$), then the sectional curvature corresponding to the 2-plane $[X, Y]$ is defined by

$$K(X, Y) := \frac{R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} X^\alpha Y^\beta X^\gamma Y^\delta}{A(X, Y)}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

(In Lorentzian geometries, $[X.Y]$ is degenerate if e.g. X^α is null and Y^α is a spacelike vector orthogonal to X^α .) Clearly, $K(X, Y) = K(Y, X)$, and it depends only on the (non-degenerate) 2-plane $[X, Y]$, but it is independent of the actual vectors X^α and Y^α that span $[X, Y]$. In particular, $K(X, aX + bY) = K(X, Y)$ holds for any real a and non-zero real b . The significance of the sectional curvatures is that, as it is proven e.g. in [18, 19], they determine the curvature tensor at q completely.

However, we need more than the general proof above: we want the *explicit expression* of the components of the curvature tensor in terms of the sectional curvatures. As one can check e.g. by direct calculations, this is given by

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} X^\alpha Y^\beta Z^\gamma W^\delta = & \quad (\text{A.2}) \\ = \frac{1}{6} \{ & A(X + Z, Y + W)K(X + Z, Y + W) - A(Y + Z, X + W)K(Y + Z, X + W) + \\ & + A(Y + Z, W)K(Y + Z, W) + A(Y + Z, X)K(Y + Z, X) - \\ & - A(X + Z, W)K(X + Z, W) - A(X + Z, Y)K(X + Z, Y) + \\ & + A(X + W, Z)K(X + W, Z) + A(X + W, Y)K(X + W, Y) - \\ & - A(Y + W, Z)K(Y + W, Z) - A(Y + W, X)K(Y + W, X) + \\ & + A(Y, Z)K(Y, Z) + A(W, X)K(W, X) - A(X, Z)K(X, Z) - A(W, Y)K(W, Y) \}. \end{aligned}$$

This formula is valid even in any pseudo-Riemannian geometries, but here all the 2-planes must be non-degenerate.

Since our aim is to link the independent components of the curvature tensor to *purely spatial distances* via Lemma 2.2.1, in (A.2) we should use only *spacelike* 2-planes and the corresponding sectional curvatures. However, if we used the vectors of the orthonormal basis $\{E_a^\alpha\}$ as the vectors $X^\alpha, Y^\alpha, Z^\alpha$ and W^α in (A.2), then some of the 2-planes would necessarily be timelike. Thus we choose a new basis in $T_q M$ consisting of purely spacelike vectors.

Let us introduce the basis $\{E_{\underline{a}}^\alpha\} = \{E_1^\alpha, E_2^\alpha, E_3^\alpha, E_4^\alpha\}$, $\underline{a} = 1, \dots, 4$, where $E_4^\alpha := \alpha E_0^\alpha + \beta E_1^\alpha + \gamma E_2^\alpha + \delta E_3^\alpha$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$ for which $\alpha > 0$ and $1 + \alpha^2 = \beta^2 + \gamma^2 + \delta^2$ hold. Thus, the *underlined* small Latin indices are referring to this basis. Clearly, E_4^α is a spacelike unit vector, but this is not orthogonal to the other vectors of the basis. We show that for appropriately chosen coefficients β, γ, δ all the 2-planes that appear in the expression (A.2) of the components of the curvature tensor in the basis $\{E_{\underline{a}}^\alpha\}$ are spacelike.

If $W^\alpha = Y^\alpha$, then equation (A.2) reduces to

$$R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} X^\alpha Y^\beta Z^\gamma Y^\delta = \frac{1}{2} \left(A(X+Z, Y)K(X+Z, Y) - A(Z, Y)K(Z, Y) - A(X, Y)K(X, Y) \right). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

18 of the 20 algebraically independent components of the curvature tensor are given by (A.3). Explicitly, since the vectors E_i^α , $i = 1, 2, 3$, form an orthonormal basis in a spacelike 3 dimensional subspace in $T_q M$, any two of these vectors span a spacelike 2-plane $[E_i, E_j]$, where $i \neq j$. Hence, for $i \neq j \neq k \neq i$, from (A.3) we have that

$$R_{ijij} = K(E_i, E_j), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$R_{ijkj} = \frac{1}{2} \left(2K(E_i + E_k, E_j) - K(E_i, E_j) - K(E_k, E_j) \right). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The number of these components is six, which are in a one-to-one correspondence with (appropriate linear combinations of) the six sectional curvatures $K(E_i, E_j)$, $K(E_i + E_k, E_j)$. There are no components R_{ijkl} in which all the indices, taking the values 1, 2 or 3, would be different.

There are six algebraically independent components of the form R_{4iji} , $i \neq j$. Explicitly, these are

$$2R_{4121} = (2 + 2\gamma - \beta^2)K(E_4 + E_2, E_1) - K(E_2, E_1) - (1 - \beta^2)K(E_4, E_1), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$2R_{4131} = (2 + 2\delta - \beta^2)K(E_4 + E_3, E_1) - K(E_3, E_1) - (1 - \beta^2)K(E_4, E_1), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$2R_{4212} = (2 + 2\beta - \gamma^2)K(E_4 + E_1, E_2) - K(E_1, E_2) - (1 - \gamma^2)K(E_4, E_2), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$2R_{4232} = (2 + 2\delta - \gamma^2)K(E_4 + E_3, E_2) - K(E_3, E_2) - (1 - \gamma^2)K(E_4, E_2), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$2R_{4313} = (2 + 2\beta - \delta^2)K(E_4 + E_1, E_3) - K(E_1, E_3) - (1 - \delta^2)K(E_4, E_3), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$2R_{4323} = (2 + 2\gamma - \delta^2)K(E_4 + E_2, E_3) - K(E_2, E_3) - (1 - \delta^2)K(E_4, E_3). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Although E_4^α and E_i^α are spacelike, the 2-planes that they span, $[E_4, E_i]$, are not necessarily spacelike. E.g. $[E_4, E_1]$ is spacelike precisely when there exists a spacelike vector X^α in this 2-plane which is orthogonal to E_1^α . Thus, let $X^\alpha = aE_1^\alpha + bE_4^\alpha$, and suppose that $0 = g(X, E_1) = -a - b\beta$. Then $a = -b\beta$, and hence $g(X, X) = -b^2(1 - \beta^2)$. Therefore, $[E_4, E_1]$ is spacelike precisely when $\beta^2 < 1$. In a similar way, $[E_4, E_2]$ is spacelike precisely when $\gamma^2 < 1$; and $[E_4, E_3]$ is spacelike precisely when $\delta^2 < 1$. As one can check easily, these conditions ensure that the vectors $E_4^\alpha \pm E_i^\alpha$ are all spacelike. A completely similar analysis shows that the 2-planes $[E_4 + E_1, E_2]$, $[E_4 + E_2, E_1]$, $[E_4 + E_1, E_3]$, $[E_4 + E_3, E_1]$, $[E_4 + E_2, E_3]$ and $[E_4 + E_3, E_2]$ are spacelike if $\gamma^2 < 2(1 + \beta)$, $\beta^2 < 2(1 + \gamma)$, $\delta^2 < 2(1 + \beta)$, $\beta^2 < 2(1 + \delta)$, $\delta^2 < 2(1 + \gamma)$ and $\gamma^2 < 2(1 + \delta)$, respectively.

From (A.3) we have six components of the form R_{4i4j} . Explicitly:

$$R_{4141} = (1 - \beta^2)K(E_1, E_4), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$R_{4242} = (1 - \gamma^2)K(E_2, E_4), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$R_{4343} = (1 - \delta^2)K(E_3, E_4), \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$2R_{4142} = (2 - (\beta + \gamma)^2)K(E_1 + E_2, E_4) - (1 - \beta^2)K(E_1, E_4) - (1 - \gamma^2)K(E_2, E_4), \quad (\text{A.15})$$

$$2R_{4143} = (2 - (\beta + \delta)^2)K(E_1 + E_3, E_4) - (1 - \beta^2)K(E_1, E_4) - (1 - \delta^2)K(E_3, E_4), \quad (\text{A.16})$$

$$2R_{4243} = (2 - (\gamma + \delta)^2)K(E_2 + E_3, E_4) - (1 - \gamma^2)K(E_2, E_4) - (1 - \delta^2)K(E_3, E_4). \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Here, three more 2-planes emerged: $[E_1 + E_2, E_4]$, $[E_1 + E_3, E_4]$ and $[E_2 + E_3, E_4]$. These are spacelike precisely when $(\beta + \gamma)^2 < 2$, $(\gamma + \delta)^2 < 2$ and $(\beta + \delta)^2 < 2$, respectively.

To express the remaining components of the curvature tensor we should use the general formula (A.2). They are of the form R_{4ijk} , where i, j and k are all different. However, only two of these three, say R_{4123} and R_{4231} , are independent, because $R_{4123} + R_{4231} + R_{4312} = 0$ holds by the 1st Bianchi identity (which was in fact discovered by Ricci [19]). Explicitly, by (A.2) they are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
6R_{4123} = & (4(1 + \gamma) - (\beta + \delta)^2)K(E_2 + E_4, E_1 + E_3) - \\
& - (4(1 + \delta) - (\beta + \gamma)^2)K(E_1 + E_2, E_3 + E_4) + \\
& + 2K(E_1 + E_2, E_3) - 2K(E_1 + E_3, E_2) + K(E_1, E_2) - K(E_1, E_3) + \\
& + (2 - (\beta + \gamma)^2)K(E_1 + E_2, E_4) - (2 - (\beta + \delta)^2)K(E_1 + E_3, E_4) - \\
& - (2(1 + \gamma) - \delta^2)K(E_2 + E_4, E_3) - (2(1 + \gamma) - \beta^2)K(E_2 + E_4, E_1) + \\
& + (2(1 + \delta) - \gamma^2)K(E_3 + E_4, E_2) + (2(1 + \delta) - \beta^2)K(E_3 + E_4, E_1) + \\
& + (1 - \delta^2)K(E_3, E_4) - (1 - \gamma^2)K(E_2, E_4), \tag{A.18}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
6R_{4231} = & (4(1 + \delta) - (\beta + \gamma)^2)K(E_2 + E_4, E_1 + E_3) - \\
& - (4(1 + \beta) - (\gamma + \delta)^2)K(E_2 + E_3, E_1 + E_4) + \\
& + 2K(E_2 + E_3, E_1) - 2K(E_1 + E_2, E_3) + K(E_2, E_3) - K(E_1, E_2) + \\
& + (2 - (\gamma + \delta)^2)K(E_2 + E_3, E_4) - (2 - (\beta + \gamma)^2)K(E_1 + E_2, E_4) + \\
& + (2(1 + \beta) - \gamma^2)K(E_1 + E_4, E_2) + (2(1 + \beta) - \delta^2)K(E_1 + E_4, E_3) - \\
& - (2(1 + \delta) - \beta^2)K(E_3 + E_4, E_1) - (2(1 + \delta) - \gamma^2)K(E_3 + E_4, E_2) - \\
& - (1 - \beta^2)K(E_1, E_4) - (1 - \delta^2)K(E_3, E_4). \tag{A.19}
\end{aligned}$$

In these expressions, three more 2-planes appeared: $[E_4 + E_1, E_2 + E_3]$, $[E_4 + E_2, E_1 + E_3]$ and $[E_4 + E_3, E_1 + E_2]$. These are spacelike precisely when $(\gamma + \delta)^2 < 4(1 + \beta)$, $(\beta + \delta)^2 < 4(1 + \gamma)$ and $(\beta + \gamma)^2 < 4(1 + \delta)$, respectively.

Thus, to summarize, the conditions under which the 2-planes in the expressions of the independent components of the curvature tensor in the basis $\{E_{\underline{a}}^\alpha\}$ are spacelike are

$$\begin{aligned}
& \beta^2, \gamma^2, \delta^2 < 1; & (\beta + \gamma)^2, (\gamma + \delta)^2, (\delta + \beta)^2 < 2; \\
& \gamma^2, \delta^2 < 2(1 + \beta); & \delta^2, \beta^2 < 2(1 + \gamma), & \beta^2, \gamma^2 < 2(1 + \delta); \\
& (\beta + \gamma)^2 < 4(1 + \delta), & (\gamma + \delta)^2 < 4(1 + \beta), & (\delta + \beta)^2 < 4(1 + \gamma);
\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta^2 + \gamma^2 + \delta^2 = 1 + \alpha^2$ and $\alpha > 0$. Since it does not seem natural to distinguish a priori any spatial direction in the definition of E_4^α , we can try to satisfy these conditions with $\beta = \gamma = \delta > 0$, which would yield $\beta^2 = (1 + \alpha^2)/3$. As it can be checked directly, with this choice all the conditions above can, in fact, be satisfied if $1/3 < \beta^2 < 1/2$, i.e. if $0 < \alpha < 1/\sqrt{2}$. Thus we assume that E_4^α has this structure.

The resulting these 21 spacelike 2-planes can be memorized easily by the following picture. Let us form a tetrahedron whose vertices are labeled by $\underline{a} = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and the midpoint of the edge between the adjacent vertices \underline{a} and \underline{b} by the unordered pair $\underline{a}\underline{b}$. Then six of the spacelike 2-planes are represented by the six edges, twelve of the 2-planes by straight line segments between the midpoints and the not adjacent vertices, and the remaining three 2-planes by straight line segments between the midpoints on the not adjacent edges.

As we have already noted, since in four dimensions the number of the algebraically independent components of the curvature tensor is twenty and the curvature tensor defines the sectional curvatures, only 20 of the 21 sectional curvatures can be considered to be independent. By

(A.4)-(A.17) the 18 algebraically independent components of the curvature tensor can be expressed by the 18 sectional curvatures $K(E_i, E_j)$, $K(E_4, E_i)$, $K(E_i + E_j, E_k)$, $K(E_4 + E_i, E_j)$ and $K(E_4, E_i + E_j)$. Hence these are independent. Thus, only two of the remaining three sectional curvatures, $K(E_4 + E_1, E_2 + E_3)$, $K(E_4 + E_2, E_1 + E_3)$ and $K(E_4 + E_3, E_1 + E_2)$, can be independent. In fact, e.g. a direct calculation shows that their sum is a linear combination of the 18 independent sectional curvatures, viz. that the identity

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 + \beta - \beta^2) & \left(K(E_4 + E_1, E_2 + E_3) + K(E_4 + E_2, E_1 + E_3) + K(E_4 + E_3, E_1 + E_2) \right) = \\
& = -\frac{1}{2} \left(K(E_1, E_2) + K(E_1, E_3) + K(E_2, E_3) \right) + \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \left(K(E_1 + E_2, E_3) + K(E_1 + E_3, E_2) + K(E_2 + E_3, E_1) \right) - \\
& - \frac{1}{2} (1 - \beta^2) \left(K(E_4, E_1) + K(E_4, E_2) + K(E_4, E_3) \right) + \\
& + \frac{1}{2} (1 - 2\beta^2) \left(K(E_4, E_1 + E_2) + K(E_4, E_1 + E_3) + K(E_4, E_2 + E_3) \right) + \\
& + \frac{1}{4} (2 + 2\beta - \beta^2) \left(K(E_4 + E_1, E_2) + K(E_4 + E_1, E_3) + K(E_4 + E_2, E_1) + \right. \\
& \quad \left. + K(E_4 + E_2, E_3) + K(E_4 + E_3, E_1) + K(E_4 + E_3, E_2) \right) \quad (\text{A.20})
\end{aligned}$$

must hold. The sectional curvature corresponding to any other non-degenerate 2-plane at q must be a linear combination of these twenty independent ones. Indeed, if $X^\alpha, Y^\alpha \in T_q M$ are unit spacelike vectors that are orthogonal to each other, then $K(X, Y) = R_{\underline{a}\underline{b}\underline{c}\underline{d}} X^{\underline{a}} Y^{\underline{b}} X^{\underline{c}} Y^{\underline{d}}$, where the components of the curvature tensor are linear combinations of the 20 independent sectional curvatures via (A.2), and hence $K(X, Y)$ will also be a linear combination of the 20 independent sectional curvatures.

If the number of the algebraically independent components of the curvature tensor is less than twenty, e.g. when the Ricci part of the curvature vanishes, then the number of the independent sectional curvatures is also less. The vanishing of the whole curvature at q is, of course, equivalent to the vanishing of all the sectional curvatures.

References

- [1] J. Ehlers, F. A. E. Pirani, A. Schild, The geometry of free fall and light propagation, in *General Relativity*, pp. 63-84, Ed. L. O’Raifeartaigh, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1972, ISBN: 0198511264; Republication in *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **44** 1587-1609 (2012), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10714-012-1353-4>
- [2] R. F. Marzke, J. A. Wheeler, Gravitation as geometry–I: The geometry of space-time and the geometrodynamical standard meter, in *Gravitation and Relativity*, pp. 40-64, Ed.: H. Y. Chiu and W. F. Hoffman, Benjamin, New York 1964, ASIN: B000P6EWPS
- [3] R. Penrose, Combinatorial quantum theory and quantized directions, in *Advances in Twistor Theory*, Eds. L. P. Houghston, R. S. Ward, Pitman Publishing Ltd, London 1979, ISBN: 0-8224-8448-X
- [4] R. Penrose, Theory of quantized directions, in *Collected Works*, vol 1, pp. 769-800, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2010, ISBN-13: 978-0199219445, ISBN-10: 0199219443
R. Penrose, Angular momentum: An approach to combinatorial spacetime, in *Quantum Theory and Beyond*, Ed. T. Bastin, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1971, ISBN 97805211115483

- R. Penrose, On the nature of quantum geometry, in *Magic without Magic*, Ed. J. Klauder, Freeman, San Francisco 1972, ISBN 0-7167-0337-8
- [5] J. P. Moussouris, *Quantum Models of Spacetime Based on Recoupling Theory*, PhD dissertation, Oxford University, 1984
URL: <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:6ad25485-c6cb-4957-b129-5124bb2adc67>
- [6] L. B. Szabados, A note on Penrose’s Spin-Geometry Theorem and the geometry of ‘empirical quantum angles’, *Found. Phys.* **52** 96 (2022), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-022-00616-3>, arXiv: 2112.14538 [gr-qc]
- [7] L. B. Szabados, Three-space from quantum mechanics, *Found. Phys.* **52** 102 (2022), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-022-00617-2>, arXiv: 2203.04827 [quant-ph]
- [8] L. B. Szabados, Minkowski space from quantum mechanics, *Found. Phys.* **54** 25 (2024), DOI: [10.1007/s10701-024-00753-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-024-00753-x), arXiv: 2309.06150 [quant-ph]
- [9] K. S. Thorne, *John A. Wheeler, 1911-2008*, Biographical Memories, National Academy of Sciences 2008, URL: https://www.nasonline.org/publications/biographical-memoirs/memoir-pdfs/wheeler_john.pdf
- [10] N. M. J. Woodhouse, The differentiable and causal structure of spacetime, *J. Math. Phys.* **14** 495-501 (1973), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1666344>
- [11] V. Perlick, Characterization of standard clocks by means of light rays and freely falling particles, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **19** 1059-1073 (1987), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00759142>
- [12] N. Linnemann, J. Read, Constructive axiomatics in spacetime physics, Part I.: Walk-through to the Ehlers–Pirani–Schild axiomatisation, arXiv: 2112.14063 [gr-qc]
- [13] R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1992, ISBN-10: 9783540610496, ISBN-13: 978-3540610496
- [14] C. J. Fewster, K. Rejzner, Algebraic quantum field theory – an introduction, in *Progress and Visions in Quantum Theory in View of Gravity - Bridging Foundations of Physics and Mathematics*, Eds.: F. Finster, D. Giulini, J. Kleiner, J. Tolksdorf, arXiv: 1904.04051 [hep-th]
- [15] D. Buchholz, K. Fredenhagen, Algebraic quantum field theory: objectives, methods and results, arXiv: 2305.12923 [math-ph]
- [16] S. Kobayashi, K. Nomizu, *Foundations of Differential Geometry, Vol. 1*, John Wiley, New York 1963, ISBN-10 0471157333, ISBN-13 978-0471157335
- [17] N. J. Hicks, *Notes on Differential Geometry*, Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York 1965, ISBN-13 978-0442034108
- [18] J. Milnor, *Morse Theory*, Princeton University Press, 1969, ISBN-10 0691080089, ISBN-13 978-0691080086
- [19] M. Spivak, *A Comprehensive Introduction to Differential Geometry*, vol 2, Publish or Perish, Inc, Houghston, 1999, ISBN-10 0914098713, ISBN-13 978-0914098713
- [20] B. O’Neill, *Semi-Riemannian Geometry*, Academic Press, New York 1983, ISBN-10 0125267401, ISBN-13 978-0125267403

- [21] T. Regge, General relativity without coordinates, *Il Nuovo Cimento*, **19** 558-571 (1961), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02733251>
- [22] R. Penrose, M. A. H. MacCallum, Twistor theory: An approach to the quantisation of fields and spacetime, *Phys. Rep.* **6** 241-316 (1972), DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573\(73\)90008-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573(73)90008-2)
- [23] S. A. Hugget, K. P. Tod, *An Introduction to Twistor Theory*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts 4, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1994, ISBN-10: 0521456894, ISBN-13: 9780521456890
- [24] R. Penrose, W. Rindler, *Spinors and Spacetime*, vol 2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1986, ISBN-10: 0521347866, ISBN-13: 978-052134786
- [25] R. Penrose, *Techniques of Differential Topology in Relativity*, SIAM, Philadelphia 1972, ISBN-10 0898710057, ISBN-13 978-0898710052
- [26] S. W. Hawking, G. F. R. Ellis, *The large scale structure of spacetime*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1973, ISBN-10 0521099064, ISBN-13 978-0521099066
- [27] T. D. Newton, E. P. Wigner, Localized states for elementary systems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **21** 400-406 (1949), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.21.400>
- [28] R. F. Streater, A. S. Wightman, *PCT, Spin and Statistics, and All That*, W. A. Benjamin, INC, New York 1964, ISBN-10: 0691070628, ISBN-13: 978-0691070629
- [29] T. Matsuda, Quantum field theory on curved manifolds, arXiv:2501.09919 [hep-th]