

Singular spacetime and quantum probe

Włodzimierz Piechocki*
Sołtan Institute for Nuclear Studies,
Hoża 69, 00-681 Warszawa, Poland

Abstract

We examine the dependence of quantization on global properties of a classical system. Quantization based on local properties may lead to ambiguities and inconsistency between local and global symmetries of a quantum system. Our quantization method based on global characteristics has sound foundation. Presented results give insight into the nature of removable type singularity of spacetime at the quantum level.

PACS: 04.60.Ds, 04.20.Gz, 02.20.-a

Keywords: Singular spacetime; Group quantization

1 Introduction

Finding a theory of quantum gravity is not only an intellectual adventure but also the present day need, since the number of cosmological data on the very early Universe increases and they call for theoretical description. It seems that understanding of the nature of spacetime singularities in quantum context is the core of the problem. The insight can be achieved by studying some suitable ‘toy models’ which include both singular spacetimes and quantum rules.

*E-mail address: piech@fuw.edu.pl

The toy model considered here concerns a spacetime with removable type singularities. We analyze classical and quantum dynamics of a test particle in singular and corresponding regular spacetimes. To quantize classical dynamics of the systems we apply the group quantization method [1]. We show that quantization of the system with regular spacetime can be carried out without problems. In the singular case not all classical observables are well defined globally since spacetime includes incomplete geodesics. Therefore, smaller number of classical observables can be mapped into quantum observables. As the result, the classical dynamics of a test particle in a spacetime with removable type singularities can be quantized, but the local symmetry of the quantum singular system cannot be as rich as in the corresponding regular case.

2 Classical dynamics

We present dynamics of a test particle in two de Sitter's type spacetimes. For simplicity we restrict ourselves to two dimensional spacetimes. In conclusions we make comments concerning the four dimensional cases.

The considered spacetimes are defined to be

$$V_p = (R^1 \times R^1, \hat{g}), \quad V_h = (R^1 \times S^1, \hat{g}). \quad (1)$$

In both cases the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu} := (\hat{g})_{\mu\nu}$ ($\mu, \nu = 0, 1$) is defined by the line-element

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - \exp(2t/r) dx^2, \quad (2)$$

where r is a positive real constant.

Eq.(1) presents all possible topologies of the de Sitter spacetime in two dimensions. V_p is a plane with global $(t, x) \in R^2$ coordinates. V_h is defined to be a one-sheet hyperboloid embedded in 3d Minkowski space. There exists [3] an isometric immersion map f of V_p into V_h defined by

$$V_p \ni (t, x) \longrightarrow f(t, x) := (y^0, y^1, y^2) \in V_h, \quad (3)$$

where

$$y^0 = r \sinh(t/r) + \frac{x^2}{2r} \exp(t/r),$$

$$y^1 = -r \cosh(t/r) + \frac{x^2}{2r} \exp(t/r), \quad y^2 = -x \exp(t/r),$$

and where

$$(y^2)^2 + (y^1)^2 - (y^0)^2 = r^2. \quad (4)$$

One can check that f maps V_p onto a non-compact half of V_h and that the induced metric on V_h is identical to the metric defined by (2).

Let us emphasize that f cannot be extended to an isometry $F : V_p \rightarrow V_h$ such that $F(V_p) = V_h - \{x(R^1)\} =: V_x$, where $x : R^1 \rightarrow V_h$ is defined to be a complete smooth curve on V_h , and such that V_x is simply connected [4]. In other words, V_p and V_h are not almost globally isometric spacetimes having only different boundary conditions.

It is known [5] that V_p is geodesically incomplete. But all incomplete geodesics in V_p can be extended to complete ones in V_h , which means that V_p has removable type singularities. The singularity type of V_p is not as severe as in the case of spacetimes with essential type singularities [6]. The latter includes both incomplete geodesics and blowing up curvature scalars. In our case both V_p and V_h have constant curvatures $R = -2r^{-2}$.

The action integral, S , describing a relativistic test particle of mass m in gravitational field $g_{\mu\nu}$ ($\mu, \nu = 0, 1$) is proportional to the length of a particle world-line

$$S = \int L(\tau) d\tau, \quad L(\tau) := -m\sqrt{g_{\mu\nu}(x^0(\tau), x^1(\tau)) \dot{x}^\mu(\tau)\dot{x}^\nu(\tau)}, \quad (5)$$

where τ is an evolution parameter, x^μ are spacetime coordinates and $\dot{x}^\mu := dx^\mu/d\tau$. It is assumed that $\dot{x}^0 > 0$, i.e. x^0 has interpretation of time monotonically increasing with τ .

The Lagrangian (5) is invariant under the reparametrization $\tau \rightarrow f(\tau)$. This gauge symmetry leads to the constraint

$$G := g^{\mu\nu} p_\mu p_\nu - m^2 = 0, \quad (6)$$

where $g^{\mu\nu}$ is an inverse of $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $p_\mu := \partial L / \partial \dot{x}^\mu$ are canonical momenta.

Since a test particle does not modify the geometry of spacetime, the local symmetry of the system is defined by the set of all Killing vectors of spacetime. Each Killing vector field X^μ ($\mu = 0, 1$) has corresponding dynamical integral [7]

$$D = p_\mu X^\mu. \quad (7)$$

The dynamical integrals restricted to the constraint surface (6) and specifying particle trajectories admissible by the dynamics define the physical phase-space Γ .

Since the hyperboloid (4) is invariant under the proper Lorentz transformations, the symmetry group of V_h is $SO^\uparrow(1, 2)$. In the standard parametrization [2] the infinitesimal transformations of $SO^\uparrow(1, 2)$ group read

$$\begin{aligned}(\rho, \theta) &\longrightarrow (\rho, \theta + a_0 r), \\(\rho, \theta) &\longrightarrow (\rho - a_1 r \sin \rho/r \sin \theta/r, \theta + a_1 r \cos \rho/r \cos \theta/r), \\(\rho, \theta) &\longrightarrow (\rho + a_2 r \sin \rho/r \cos \theta/r, \theta + a_2 r \cos \rho/r \sin \theta/r),\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

where $(a_0, a_1, a_2) \in R^3$ are parameters.

The corresponding dynamical integrals (7)

$$\begin{aligned}J_0 &= p_\theta r, & J_1 &= -p_\rho r \sin \rho/r \sin \theta/r + p_\theta r \cos \rho/r \cos \theta/r, \\J_2 &= p_\rho r \sin \rho/r \cos \theta/r + p_\theta r \cos \rho/r \sin \theta/r,\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

(where $p_\theta := \partial L/\partial \dot{\theta}$, $p_\rho := \partial L/\partial \dot{\rho}$ are canonical momenta) satisfy the commutation relations of $sl(2, R)$ algebra

$$\{J_a, J_b\} = \varepsilon_{abc} \eta^{cd} J_d,\tag{10}$$

where ε_{abc} is the anti-symmetric tensor with $\varepsilon_{012} = 1$ and η^{cd} is the Minkowski metric tensor.

The constraint (6) in terms of (9) reads

$$J_0^2 - J_1^2 - J_2^2 = -\kappa^2, \quad \kappa = mr.\tag{11}$$

The particle trajectories are found [2] to be defined by

$$J_a y^a = 0, \quad J_2 y^1 - J_1 y^2 = r^2 p_\rho.\tag{12}$$

Each point (J_0, J_1, J_2) of the one-sheet hyperboloid (11) defines a particle trajectory (12) available for dynamics. Therefore (11) defines the physical phase-space Γ_h with $SO^\uparrow(1, 2)$ as the symmetry group. The spacetime and phase-space of V_h system have the same symmetry group.

The infinitesimal symmetry transformations of V_p system read [2]

$$(t, x) \longrightarrow (t, x + b_0), \quad (t, x) \longrightarrow (t - r b_1, x + x b_1),\tag{13}$$

$$(t, x) \longrightarrow (t - 2r x b_2, x + (x^2 + r^2 e^{-2t/r}) b_2),\tag{14}$$

where $(b_0, b_1, b_2) \in R^3$ are parameters.

The corresponding dynamical integrals (7) are

$$P = p_x, \quad K = -rp_t + xp_x, \quad M = -2rxp_t + (x^2 + r^2e^{-2t/r})p_x, \quad (15)$$

where $p_x = \partial L/\partial \dot{x}$, $p_t = \partial L/\partial \dot{t}$.

One can check that the integrals (15) satisfy the commutation relations of $sl(2, R)$ algebra in the form

$$\{P, K\} = P, \quad (16)$$

$$\{K, M\} = M, \quad \{P, M\} = 2K. \quad (17)$$

The constraint (6) leads to

$$K^2 - PM = \kappa^2. \quad (18)$$

In case of V_p system, contrary to the case of V_h system, some points (P, K, M) of (18) cannot describe the trajectories available for a particle:

For $P = 0$ there are two lines $K = \pm\kappa$ on the hyperboloid (18). Since by assumption $\dot{t} > 0$, we have that $p_t = \partial L/\partial \dot{t} = -m\dot{t}(t - \dot{x} \exp(2t/r))^{-1/2} < 0$. According to (15) $K - xP = -rp_t$, thus $K - xP > 0$, i.e. $K > 0$ for $P = 0$. Therefore, the line $(P = 0, K = -\kappa)$ is not available for the dynamics. The hyperboloid (18) without this line defines the physical phase-space Γ_p . The particle trajectories are [2]

$$x = M/2K, \quad \text{for } P = 0 \quad (19)$$

and

$$xP = K - \sqrt{\kappa^2 + (rP)^2 \exp(-2t/r)}, \quad \text{for } P \neq 0. \quad (20)$$

Since Γ_p is topologically equivalent to a plane R^2 we can parametrize Γ_p as follows [2]

$$P = p, \quad K = pq - \kappa, \quad M = pq^2 - 2\kappa q, \quad (21)$$

where $(q, p) \in R^2$.

The local symmetry of both V_p and V_h systems is defined by $sl(2, R)$ algebra. However, the symmetry groups are different. The Lie group $SO^\uparrow(1, 2)$ cannot be the global symmetry of V_p system, since V_p is only a subspace of V_h due to (3). Since the Killing vector field generated by (14) is not complete (see, App.A of [2]), the symmetry group of V_p is the Lie group with the Lie algebra defined by (16) only. Therefore, in case of V_p system the Lie algebra

corresponding to the symmetry group is different from $sl(2, R)$ algebra of all the Killing vector fields.

The classical observables are defined to have the following properties:

(i) they specify particle trajectories available for dynamics (V_h and V_p are integrable systems), (ii) they are gauge invariant (have vanishing Poisson's brackets with the constraint G , Eq.(6)), (iii) they satisfy the algebra corresponding to the symmetry group of V_h or V_p system **or** (\widetilde{iii}) they satisfy the algebra corresponding to the local symmetry of V_h or V_p system.

3 Quantum dynamics

In case of V_h system the classical observables are J_0, J_1 and J_2 . We choose the following parametrization [2]

$$J_0 = J, \quad J_1 = J \cos \beta - \kappa \sin \beta, \quad J_2 = -J \sin \beta - \kappa \cos \beta, \quad (22)$$

where $J \in R^1$ and $\beta \in S^1$ are the canonical coordinates.

The observables satisfy both sets of conditions $A := \{(i), (ii), (iii)\}$ and $\tilde{A} := \{(i), (ii), (\widetilde{iii})\}$, since $sl(2, R)$ is the algebra of $SO^\uparrow(1, 2)$ group.

The quantum observables corresponding to (22) read [2]

$$\hat{J}_0 = \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{d}{d\beta}, \quad \hat{J}_1 = \cos \beta \hat{J}_0 - \left(\kappa - \frac{i\hbar}{2}\right) \sin \beta, \quad \hat{J}_2 = -\sin \beta \hat{J}_0 - \left(\kappa - \frac{i\hbar}{2}\right) \cos \beta. \quad (23)$$

Since they are unbounded, they are defined [2] on a dense subspace Ω of the Hilbert space $L^2[0, 2\pi]$

$$\Omega := \{\psi \in L^2[0, 2\pi] \mid \psi \in C^\infty[0, 2\pi], \psi^{(n)}(0) = \psi^{(n)}(2\pi), n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}. \quad (24)$$

Eqs. (23) and (24) define an essentially self-adjoint representation of $sl(2, R)$ algebra (see, App.C of [2]). It can be further examined for its integrability to the unitary representation of $SO^\uparrow(1, 2)$ group.

In case of V_p system the two sets of conditions A and \tilde{A} lead to different sets of observables, because $SO^\uparrow(1, 2)$ is no longer the symmetry group of the system. We examine the consequences of each choice separately.

With the choice \tilde{A} the classical observables are P, K and M . The symplectic transformation $(q, p) \rightarrow (I, \sigma)$ defined by

$$q := -\cot \frac{\sigma}{2}, \quad p := (1 - \cos \sigma)(I + \kappa \cot \frac{\sigma}{2}) \quad (25)$$

leads to

$$I_0 := \frac{1}{2}(M + P) = I,$$

$$I_1 := \frac{1}{2}(M - P) = I \cos \sigma - \kappa \sin \sigma, \quad I_2 := K = -I \sin \sigma - \kappa \cos \sigma. \quad (26)$$

where $I \in R^1$ and $0 < \sigma < 2\pi$ are the canonical coordinates.

One can easily check that the line ($P = 0, K = -\kappa$) of the hyperboloid (18) turns into the generatrix ($I_0 = I_1, I_2 = -\kappa$) of the hyperboloid (11) (with J_a replaced by I_a).

The observables I_a ($a = 0, 1, 2$) satisfy $sl(2, R)$ algebra, have the same functional form as J_a ($a = 0, 1, 2$) observables, but are defined on different domains. Therefore, the functional form of corresponding quantum observables \hat{I}_a is again defined by (23) (with \hat{J}_a replaced by \hat{I}_a and β replaced by σ). However, the carrier space of \hat{I}_a is different. Now, it is defined to be [2]

$$\Omega_\alpha := \{ \psi \in L^2[0, 2\pi] \mid \psi \in C^\infty[0, 2\pi], \psi^{(n)}(0) = e^{i\alpha} \psi^{(n)}(2\pi), n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \}, \quad (27)$$

where $0 \leq \alpha < 2\pi$.

It can be easily proved (see, App.C of [2]) that Eq. (23), with \hat{J}_a replaced by \hat{I}_a and β replaced by σ , and Eq. (27) define essentially self-adjoint representations of $sl(2, R)$ algebra. However, the choice \hat{A} leads to ambiguities. Since the end points of the range of σ in (26) do not coincide, there is no reason to choose any specific value for α . Thus, there are infinitely many unitarily nonequivalent quantum systems corresponding to a single classical V_p system. Such a quantum theory has no predictability. It can be useful as a phenomenological model, but we are interested in finding a fundamental description. Obviously, these representations cannot be lifted to the unitary representation of the symmetry group, because the symmetry group has the algebra defined by Eq.(16) which is only a subalgebra of $sl(2, R)$ algebra.

Now, we consider the choice A. The set of observables consists of P and K which satisfy the algebra (16). The corresponding quantum observables read [2]

$$\hat{P} = \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{d}{dq}, \quad \hat{K} = q\hat{P} + \frac{\hbar}{2i} - \kappa. \quad (28)$$

The common invariant dense domain Λ for \hat{P} and \hat{K} is defined to be [2]

$$\Lambda := \{ \psi \in L^2(R) \mid \psi \in C_0^\infty(R) \}. \quad (29)$$

The representation defined by (28) and (29) is essentially self-adjoint (see, App.D of [2]). Next step would be lifting this representation to the unitary representation of the symmetry group of V_p system.

4 Conclusions

It is interesting that at the phase-space level one has $\Gamma_h = \Gamma_p \cup \{\text{generatrix}\}$, which is quite different from the correspondence between V_h and V_p systems at the spacetime level. This subtle phase-space difference between V_p and V_h systems leads to quite different quantum systems. The problem of incomplete geodesics of V_p spacetime translates into the boundary condition problem at the quantum level. The latter leads to ambiguities. Uniqueness of the quantization procedure can be achieved by favouring the global symmetries of the singular V_p system. No quantization problem occurs in case of the regular spacetime V_h . We can see that quantization is very sensitive to the choice of spacetime topology.

Generalization of our results to the four dimensional de Sitter spacetimes is straightforward. The quantum dynamics of a particle on hyperboloid is presented in [8]. The de Sitter spacetime with the topology $R^1 \times R^3$, the four dimensional analog of V_p , is geodesically incomplete and it can be embedded isometrically [3] into the four dimensional analog of V_h by generalization of the map (3). This is why a direct application of our method should lead, after tedious calculations, to the results similar in its essence to the results presented here.

We believe that one can generalize our results further to any spacetime with topology admitting removable type singularities. Quantization of dynamics of a test particle in such singular spacetime should be feasible, unless the system has no globally well defined observables.

Further analyses of the quantum dynamics can be carried out at the level of the unitary representations of the symmetry groups. The results will be published elsewhere [9].

Our paper concerns *removable* type singularities. It is possible that analyses for spacetimes with *essential* type singularities [6] may bring unexpected results.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to G. Jorjadze, A. Trautman and S. L. Woronowicz

for helpful discussions, and to the anonymous referee for the criticism which helped me to clarify the paper.

References

- [1] A. A. Kirillov, Elements of the Theory of Representations, Berlin, Springer, 1976.
- [2] W. Piechocki, gr-qc/0105005.
- [3] E. Schrödinger, Expanding Universe, Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- [4] M. Lachiéze-Rey and J-P. Luminet, Phys. Reports 254 (1995) 135.
- [5] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis, The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time, Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- [6] J. M. M. Senovilla, Gen. Relativ. Gravit. 30 (1998) 701.
- [7] H. Stephani, General Relativity, Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- [8] G. Jorjadze and W. Piechocki, Phys. Lett. B476 (2000) 134.
- [9] J-P. Gazeau and W. Piechocki, in preparation.