

# On the kinematics of the last Wigner particle

J. M. Gracia-Bondía<sup>1,2</sup> and J. C. Várilly<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Escuela de Física, Universidad de Costa Rica, San José 11501, Costa Rica

<sup>2</sup> Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad de Zaragoza, Zaragoza 50009, Spain

<sup>3</sup> Escuela de Matemática, Universidad de Costa Rica, San José 11501, Costa Rica

August 14, 2019

## Abstract

Wigner’s particle classification provides for “continuous spin” representations of the Poincaré group, corresponding to a class of (as yet unobserved) massless particles. Rather than building their induced realizations by use of “Wigner rotations” in the textbooks’ way, here we exhibit a scalar-like first-quantized form of those (bosonic) Wigner particles directly, by combining wave equations proposed by Wigner long ago with a recent prequantized treatment employing Poisson structures.

## 1 Introduction

By the last Wigner particle (WP) here is meant the last case in Wigner’s classification of unirreps of the Poincaré group [1]: massless particles whose second Casimir has a nonzero value. More often, they are referred to as continuous spin particles (CSP) – somewhat of a misnomer. Though routinely dismissed as “unobserved” in standard textbook treatments, the possible existence and properties of such particles are of continued interest [2]; after pioneering work by Schuster and Toro [3–5], several recent studies [6–10] have appeared. Closer to the spirit of this paper is the construction by Rehren [11] stemming from his own work with Mund and Schroer – see [12] and references therein – of a string-local quantum field for such a particle, as a “Pauli–Lubański limit” of massive, string-local fields. At an opposite end, mathematically speaking, our own construction [13] of a “classical elementary system” for the WP foreshadows its quantum kinematics.

Our goal here is to review the first-quantized description of the (bosonic) WP: this is the relevant approach for certain applications that do not require a full-blown quantum field formalism. In principle, such a description is already available, by means of little-group techniques [14, 15]. However, one can attain a simpler-looking scalar-like version by starting directly from the wave equations. Among our purposes here is to delineate this version, less cumbersome than the standard approach.

The plan of the article is as follows. In Section 2 we recall the theory of the second Casimir associated to the Poincaré group, borrowing a method and notation going back to work by Schwinger [16]. We also bring in a quite instrumental result on the Wigner rotation for massless particles [17]. Section 3 is the core of the paper. There we introduce an appropriate set of states for the WP, and we show the invariant nature of their associated wavefunctions, their equations of motion, and the existence of an invariant scalar product. In Section 4 we exhibit the causal propagator for the boson WP. Section 5 deals briefly with the relation between the invariant and the conventional formalisms.

In the appendices we state and develop our Poincaré-group conventions, and then expound a relevant aspect of little-group theory that we have not found in the standard presentations.

## 2 The Schwinger decomposition of the Pauli–Lubański operator

Before coming to the (one-particle) Hilbert space for the WP, let us recall the standard basis of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{p}$  of the Poincaré group  $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$  whose 10 generators  $\{P^0, P^a, L^a, K^a : a = 1, 2, 3\}$  correspond respectively to time translation, space translations, rotations and boosts – consult Appendix A for our notation and conventions. The commutation relations for the Lorentz subgroup are as follows:

$$[L^a, L^b] = \varepsilon^{ab}{}_c L^c, \quad [L^a, K^b] = \varepsilon^{ab}{}_c K^c, \quad [K^a, K^b] = -\varepsilon^{ab}{}_c L^c.$$

The pseudovector operator (in the enveloping algebra of  $\mathfrak{p}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} W^\rho &:= J^{*\rho\mu} P_\mu = P_\mu J^{*\rho\mu} = (\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{L}, P^0 \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P}) \equiv (W^0, \mathbf{W}) \\ &= (P^1 J^{23} + P^2 J^{31} + P^3 J^{12}, P^0 J^{23} + P^2 J^{30} + P^3 J^{02}, \\ &\quad P^0 J^{31} + P^1 J^{03} + P^3 J^{10}, P^0 J^{12} + P^2 J^{10} + P^1 J^{02}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

is referred to as the *Pauli–Lubański vector*. It clearly satisfies

$$(WP) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad [P^\nu, W^\mu] = 0,$$

and is a vector under the action of the Lorentz group generators:

$$[J^{\mu\nu}, W^\tau] = g^{\tau\nu} W^\mu - g^{\tau\mu} W^\nu.$$

As a corollary, one obtains the identities:

$$[W^\mu, W^\nu] = \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}{}_{\tau\rho} W^\tau P^\rho; \quad \text{and} \quad [J^{\mu\nu}, (WW)] = 0; \quad (2.2)$$

the second one indicating that  $(WW)$  is a Casimir operator for  $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ . One finds also that

$$(WW) = \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon^{\rho\mu\nu\tau} P_\mu J_{\nu\tau} \varepsilon_{\rho\kappa\sigma\eta} P^\kappa J^{\sigma\eta} = -\frac{1}{2} J_{\nu\tau} J^{\nu\tau} P^2 + J_{\kappa\sigma} J^{\mu\sigma} P^\kappa P_\mu. \quad (2.3)$$

We assume in what follows that  $P^0 > 0$ . By invoking expression (2.1) in the rest frame, it becomes clear that the Casimir  $(WW)$  for a massive particle equals  $-m^2 \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{S}$ , where  $\mathbf{S}$  is the

spin generator. This tells us that  $(WW)$  captures *internal* angular momentum. In general  $W$  is spacelike,<sup>1</sup> except that in the massless case it can be parallel to  $P$ : this leads to the known fixed-helicity particles, like the photon and graviton, for which relations (2.2) are trivial.

Here we put that case aside: the Wigner particle *by definition* obeys

$$(WW) = -\kappa^2 < 0.$$

We have seen in (2.1) that the temporal component of  $W$  is directly related to helicity, which deserves a symbol:

$$H := (\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{L})/P^0. \quad \text{Therefore} \quad W^0 = HP^0. \quad (2.4)$$

The relation  $(WP) = 0$  implies that the relevant part of  $\mathbf{W}$  is that which is transverse to  $\mathbf{P}$ :

$$\mathbf{T} := \mathbf{W} - W^0 \mathbf{P}/P^0 = \mathbf{W} - (\mathbf{W} \cdot \mathbf{P})\mathbf{P}/(P^0)^2, \quad \text{so that} \quad \mathbf{W} = H\mathbf{P} + \mathbf{T}. \quad (2.5)$$

Notice that  $\mathbf{T}^2 = \kappa^2$ . We call  $\mathbf{W} = H\mathbf{P} + \mathbf{T}$  the Schwinger decomposition of (the spatial part of) the PL vector; the notation  $\mathbf{T}$  for the part of  $\mathbf{W}$  transverse to  $\mathbf{P}$  follows Ref. [16]. Not only do the components of  $\mathbf{T}$  commute with the momentum; they commute with each other. This is worth a proof:

$$\begin{aligned} [T^a, T^b] &= [W^a, W^b] - [W^0, W^b]P^a/P^0 - [W^a, W^0]P^b/P^0 \\ &= \varepsilon^{ab}_c T^c P^0 - \varepsilon^b_{de} T^d P^e P^a/P^0 + \varepsilon^a_{rs} T^r P^s P^b/P^0 \\ &= \varepsilon^{ab}_c T^c P^0 - (\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{P})^b P^a/P^0 + (\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{P})^a P^b/P^0 \\ &= \varepsilon^{ab}_c (T^c P^0 + ((\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{P}) \times \mathbf{P})^c/P^0) = \varepsilon^{ab}_c (T^c P^0 - T^c (P^0)^2/P^0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Schwinger writes for this:  $\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{0}$ . Note also that

$$[H, K^a] = T^a/P^0; \quad [K^a, T^b] = T^a P^b/P^0.$$

Let us introduce another spatial 3-vector, also transverse to  $\mathbf{P}$ :

$$\mathbf{Y} := (\mathbf{P}/P^0) \times \mathbf{T}.$$

There is a 4-vector naturally associated with  $\mathbf{Y}$  like  $W$  with  $\mathbf{T}$ . But we do not go into that. Note the commutator relation

$$[H, T^a] = [W^0, T^a]/P^0 = \varepsilon^a_{bc} T^b P^c/P^0 = \mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{P}^a/P^0 = -Y^a,$$

which is at once accompanied by

$$\begin{aligned} [H, Y^a] &= \varepsilon^a_{bc} [H, P^b T^c/P^0] = -\varepsilon^a_{bc} P^b Y^c/P^0 \\ &= -(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Y})^a/P^0 = (\mathbf{P} \times (\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{P}))^a (P^0)^{-2} = T^a. \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Since  $(WP) = 0$  and  $(PP) \geq 0$  together imply that  $(WW) \leq 0$ .

At this point, following Schwinger anew, and also inspired by [18], we may introduce a position vector commuting with  $H$ :

$$\mathbf{R} = -\frac{1}{2}[\mathbf{K}, (P^0)^{-1}]_+ - (\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{P})(P^0)^{-3}.$$

Notice that

$$[W^0, \mathbf{R}] = -\frac{W_{\parallel}}{P^0}, \quad \text{so} \quad [H, \mathbf{R}] = [W^0/P^0, \mathbf{R}] = -\frac{W_{\parallel}}{(P^0)^2} + \frac{W^0 \mathbf{P}/P^0}{(P^0)^2} = 0.$$

We remark that  $[P^j, R^k] = -\delta^{jk}$ . Also,  $[R^j, P^0] = P^j/P^0$  and  $[R^j, (P^0)^{-1}] = -P^j/(P^0)^3$ .

We list here some commutators involving  $\mathbf{R}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} [R^j, P^k] &= \delta^{jk}, & [R^j, P^0] &= P^j(P^0)^{-1}, & [W^0, R^j] &= (T^j - W^j)(P^0)^{-1}, \\ [R^j, H] &= 0, & [R^j, T^k] &= -T^j P^k (P^0)^{-2}, & [R^j, R^k] &= -\varepsilon_l^{jk} H P^l (P^0)^{-3}, \\ [R^j, (\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{P})^k (P^0)^{-2}] &+ [(\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{P})^j (P^0)^{-2}, R^k] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

The sixth relation in (2.6) shows the WP to be intrinsically non-localizable. The proofs of the above are routine; and anyway, the Poisson brackets and general results of the thorough study of the kinematics of the WP in Kirillov's prequantized formalism [13] can be largely transposed here. In particular: the commuting orthogonal trihedron  $(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{Y})$  rotates gyroscopically under boosts, this being *ipso facto* true for all (restricted) Lorentz transformations. While the length of  $\mathbf{P}$  can vary, the lengths of  $\mathbf{T}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  are fixed at  $\kappa$ . The next subsection helps to understand why.

## 2.1 The Wigner rotation, tamed

In the massive case there is a canonical definition for a Lorentz transformation taking the reference momentum  $(m, \mathbf{0})$  to  $p$ , as a boost  $L_{\zeta \mathbf{n}}$  with direction  $\mathbf{n}$  (a unit vector) and boost parameter  $\zeta$ . The corresponding Wigner rotation acting<sup>2</sup> on a 3-vector  $\mathbf{v}$  is found in [13, 17]:

$$R(L_{\zeta \mathbf{n}}, p)\mathbf{v} = R_{\mathbf{m}, \delta}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} \cos \delta + \mathbf{m} \times \mathbf{v} \sin \delta + (\mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{m}(1 - \cos \delta),$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m} &= \frac{\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{n}}{|\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{n}|}; & \cos \delta &= 1 - \frac{|\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{n}|^2 (\cosh \zeta - 1)}{(m + p^0)(m + p'^0)}, \\ \sin \delta &= \frac{(m + p^0) \sinh \zeta + \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{p} (\cosh \zeta - 1)}{(m + p^0)(m + p'^0)} |\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{n}|, \end{aligned}$$

with the action  $p \mapsto p'$  on 4-momenta given by:

$$\begin{aligned} p'^0 &= p^0 \cosh \zeta + \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{p} \sinh \zeta, \\ \mathbf{p}' &= \mathbf{p} + p^0 \mathbf{n} \sinh \zeta + (\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{p})\mathbf{n}(\cosh \zeta - 1). \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>2</sup>In the "active transformation" view [19, Sect. 3.3].

As remarked in [17], the massless limit of  $\sin \delta$  is perfectly smooth:

$$\sin \delta = \left( \frac{\sinh \zeta}{p^0} + \frac{\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{p}(\cosh \zeta - 1)}{p^0 p'^0} \right) |\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{n}|, \quad (2.7)$$

whereas

$$\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{p}' = [p^0 \sinh \zeta + \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{p}(\cosh \zeta - 1)] \mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{n};$$

therefore the component of  $\mathbf{p}'$  not along  $\mathbf{p}$  stays in the plane perpendicular to  $\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{n}$ . The sine of the angle of rotation is given by

$$\frac{|\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{p}'|}{|\mathbf{p}||\mathbf{p}'|} = \frac{p^0 \sinh \zeta + \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{p}(\cosh \zeta - 1)}{|\mathbf{p}||\mathbf{p}'|} |\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{n}|. \quad (2.8)$$

In the massive case (where  $p^0 p'^0 > |\mathbf{p}||\mathbf{p}'|$ ), this angle is generally greater than the Wigner rotation angle  $\delta$ . The key point is that this formula makes perfect sense for  $m = 0$ , even though some of the factors in its definition do not. Namely, keeping in mind that in the massless case  $p^0 = |\mathbf{p}|$  and  $p'^0 = |\mathbf{p}'|$ , the formula (2.8) exactly matches formula (2.7). Which means that momentum and “spin” turn in solidarity. Wigner graphically describes why in the massless case they must do so: “for a particle with zero rest-mass [. . .] if we connect any internal motion with the spin, this is perpendicular to the velocity” [20].

### 3 The invariant formalism for the WP

To construct a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  carrying a unitary irreducible representation (or “unirrep”)  $U$  of the Poincaré group  $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$  corresponding to a Wigner particle with Casimir  $\kappa^2$ , we proceed by taking a basic set of kets, labelled as  $|\mathbf{p}|, \mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|, \mathbf{t}\rangle$ ; where<sup>3</sup>

$$\mathbb{P}^\mu |\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{t}\rangle = \mathbb{P}^\mu |\mathbf{p}|, \mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|, \mathbf{t}\rangle = p^\mu |\mathbf{p}|, \mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|, \mathbf{t}\rangle; \quad \mathbb{T} |\mathbf{p}|, \mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|, \mathbf{t}\rangle = \mathbf{t} |\mathbf{p}|, \mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|, \mathbf{t}\rangle.$$

Here  $\mathbb{P}^\mu$  is the selfadjoint operator corresponding to the generator  $P^\mu$ ;  $\mathbb{T}$  is the 3-component selfadjoint operator corresponding to Schwinger’s geometric generator  $\mathbf{T}$ ; and  $\mathbf{t}$  is the 3-vector of its eigenvalues. These polarization states lie on a circle of radius  $\kappa$  in the plane perpendicular to  $\mathbf{p}$ . Thus, with some abuse of notation, we can rewrite  $|\mathbf{p}, \theta\rangle$  or  $|\kappa; \mathbf{p}, \theta\rangle$  for those kets, with  $\theta$  denoting their angular degree of freedom. Note that different positive values of  $\kappa$  correspond to inequivalent representations of  $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$ .

The gyroscopic property is the key to the strange simplicity of the WP structure, as it indicates that the corresponding wave-functions for the WP may transform similarly to spin-zero particles. Indeed, for *any* Lorentz transformation  $\Lambda$  the gyroscopic property implies that the rotation  $R_\Lambda: \mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}| \mapsto \mathbf{p}'/|\mathbf{p}'|$  applies equally to  $\mathbf{t}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{t} \mapsto \mathbf{t}' = R_\Lambda \mathbf{t}$ . This is clear if  $\Lambda$  is a rotation, and has been shown in [13] when  $\Lambda$  is a boost; and so it is true of any  $\Lambda$ .

---

<sup>3</sup>We use open-faced type for the operators on Hilbert space corresponding to geometrical generators.

**Remark 1.** The little-group techniques demand the choice of a Lorentz transformation at each point of (the mantle of) the lightcone. Now, it is not possible, for rather obvious topological reasons [21], to construct a global continuous section of the  $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ -principal bundle. Since one works mostly in the category of Hilbert spaces, and there *exist* Borel sections, this is usually deemed not too serious a problem. However, it does produce some pathologies, which, according to the analysis in [22], for ordinary massless particles of nonzero helicity at least, partially invalidate the concept of sharp momentum states that people have been using all along. It would be good to know whether related troubles manifest themselves for WPs in the invariant formulation. On the other hand, the very fact that the description of one of their states requires three angles instead of two makes for more singular eigenstates than for scalar particles.

It pertains to declare the normalization of our kets. We decide for the Lorentz-invariant expression:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{p}, t \mid \mathbf{p}', t' \rangle &= |\mathbf{p}| \delta(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}') \delta(t - t'), \quad \text{or} \\ \langle \mathbf{p}, \theta \mid \mathbf{p}', \theta' \rangle &= |\mathbf{p}| \delta(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}') \delta(\theta - \theta').\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\Phi(\mathbf{p}, \theta) := \langle \mathbf{p}, \theta \mid \Phi \rangle$ . An inner product for these wavefunctions is thus given by

$$\langle \Phi \mid \Phi \rangle \propto \int \frac{d^3 p}{|\mathbf{p}|} d\theta |\Phi(\mathbf{p}, \theta)|^2. \quad (3.1)$$

The definition does not depend on the Lorentz frame [23]. We give an explicitly invariant form of  $\langle \Phi \mid \Phi \rangle$  in momentum space at the end of this section; and also a formula in configuration space. In order to see them, and to better grasp the kinematics of the WP, we introduce, following Wigner, its manifestly invariant formalism.

### 3.1 Equations of motion

As advertised, the gyroscopic property implies that equations of motion for the WP may be of scalar-like form. In fact, Wigner returned many times [23–25] to the question of equations of motion for a WP. In those papers Wigner considers scalar wave functions depending on configuration or momentum-space variables and an extra spacelike 4-vector variable,<sup>4</sup> transforming covariantly under the Lorentz group, and satisfying the equations:

$$\square_x \Phi(x, w) = 0; \quad \text{or} \quad p^2 \Phi(p, w) = 0, \quad (3.2a)$$

$$(w^2 + \kappa^2) \Phi(x, w) = 0; \quad \text{or} \quad (w^2 + \kappa^2) \Phi(p, w) = 0, \quad (3.2b)$$

$$(w \partial_x) \Phi(x, w) = 0; \quad \text{or} \quad (pw) \Phi(p, w) = 0, \quad (3.2c)$$

$$((\partial_x \partial_w) + 1) \Phi(x, w) = 0; \quad \text{or} \quad ((p \partial_w) + i) \Phi(p, w) = 0. \quad (3.2d)$$

The first three equations have a ready interpretation, corresponding respectively to the Klein–Gordon equation for a massless particle, the value of the second Casimir associated to a given WP, and mutual perpendicularity of the momentum and PL vectors.

---

<sup>4</sup>Here called  $w$ , since it will be seen to be an avatar of the PL vector.

For the fourth equation, just note that identifying the equations of motion with the action of the Casimir operators is a matter of principle. So let us formally take  $P$  and  $W$  as independent variables at the same title, in a representation in which  $P$  is diagonal, and compute from equation (2.3) with  $P^2 = 0$  the second Casimir:

$$\begin{aligned}
C_2 \equiv (WW) &= (w_\nu \partial_\rho^w - w_\rho \partial_\nu^w)(w^\nu \partial_w^\sigma - w^\sigma \partial_w^\nu) \partial_\sigma^x \partial_x^\rho \\
&= -\kappa^2 (\partial_x \partial_w)^2 + (w \partial_x)(\partial_x \partial_w) - (w \partial_x)(w \partial_w)(\partial_x \partial_w) - (w \partial_w) \square_x \\
&\quad - (w \partial_x)(w \partial_w)(\partial_x \partial_w) - 4(w \partial_x)(\partial_x \partial_w) + (w \partial_x)^2 \square_w + (w \partial_x)(\partial_w \partial_x) \\
&= -\kappa^2 (\partial_x \partial_w)^2 + (w \partial_x)^2 \square_w - 2(w \partial_x)(\partial_x \partial_w)(w \partial_w) - (w \partial_w) \square_x \\
&= \kappa^2 (p \partial_w)^2 - (pw)^2 \square_w + 2(pw)(p \partial_w)(w \partial_w) = -\kappa^2. \tag{3.3}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, since here  $(pw) = 0$ , we are left with  $(\partial_x \partial_w) = \mp 1$ , which arguably completes the Wigner equations (3.2) above.<sup>5</sup>

The weak point of the argument appears to be that the components of  $W$  do not commute in general. But the equations defend themselves very well: the last one is immediately integrated,

$$\Phi(\mathbf{p}, w - \gamma p) = e^{\pm i\gamma} \Phi(\mathbf{p}, w), \tag{3.4}$$

and may be interpreted as an infinitesimal gauge transformation, which, in view of the Schwinger decomposition (2.4) and (2.5), identifies  $\gamma$  as the placeholder for helicity. One recognizes that the argument  $w$  in (3.2) stands for both “spin” and “gauge” degrees of freedom.

The Wigner system of equations is consistent; indeed, compatibility between the third and fourth equations is guaranteed precisely by the wave equation (3.2a), and compatibility between the second and fourth by the third equation (3.2c). That is to say: the differential operators in the left column of (3.2) form a closed system, since  $\square_x$  commutes with the other three, which have the nontrivial commutation relations:

$$[(\partial_x \partial_w) + 1, w^2 + \kappa^2] = 2(w \partial_x), \quad [(w \partial_x), (\partial_x \partial_w) + 1] = \square_x.$$

This would not hold were  $m > 0$ , requiring  $\square_x + m^2$  in (3.2a). Moreover, were  $\kappa = 0$ , then (3.2d) would not follow from (3.3). What is more: in the light of the display above, the two key equations are (3.2d) and (3.2b), since we may regard the other two – whose physical meaning is obvious – as their compatibility conditions. In summary: the system (3.2) is associated specifically to the WP.

Let us consider the transformation  $\partial_w \mapsto i\nu$ ,  $w \mapsto -i\partial_\nu$  in the Wigner system of equations [26, 27]. There ensues the relation

$$\begin{aligned}
(WW) &= 2(pw)(p \partial_w)(w \partial_w) - w^2 (p \partial_w)^2 - (pw)^2 \square_w \\
&= 2(p\nu)(p \partial_\nu)(\nu \partial_\nu) - \nu^2 (p \partial_\nu)^2 - (p\nu)^2 \square_\nu.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $(WW)$  is Fourier-invariant in this sense.

---

<sup>5</sup>For definiteness, we opted for the upper sign in (3.2d); taking the lower one amounts to changing the sign of  $\kappa$  only.

In terms of this Fourier-conjugate to  $w$ , we now obtain the “smooth solutions” by Schuster and Toro [3]:

$$(p \partial_v) \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{p}, v) = 0.$$

Also, the equations in [11] coincide essentially with those of [3].<sup>6</sup> The associated action functionals [5, 28, 29] look quite complicated.

### 3.2 Invariant wavefunctions

The Wigner equation (3.2a) tells us that we are on-shell in momentum. We express this by

$$\Phi(x, w) \propto \int d^4 p \theta(p^0) \delta(p^2) e^{-i(p \cdot x)} \Phi(\mathbf{p}, w) \propto \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{p}}{|\mathbf{p}|} e^{-i(p \cdot x)} \Phi(\mathbf{p}, w),$$

and equivalently

$$\Phi(\mathbf{p}, w) \propto \int d^4 x e^{i(p \cdot x)} \Phi(x, w) \Big|_{p^0=|\mathbf{p}|},$$

with our choice of sign for  $p^0$ . Now we may relate the above  $\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{t} | \Phi \rangle$  with  $\Phi(x, w)$ . Consider again equation (3.2d), or formula (3.4), and let the gauge  $\gamma := w^0/p^0 = w^0/|\mathbf{p}|$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\mathbf{p}, w) &\equiv \Phi(\mathbf{p}, w^0, \mathbf{w}_{\parallel}, \mathbf{t}) = \exp(-i w^0/|\mathbf{p}|) \Phi(\mathbf{p}, 0, \mathbf{t}) \\ &=: \exp(-i w^0/|\mathbf{p}|) \langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{t} | \Phi \rangle = \exp(-i \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{w}/|\mathbf{p}|^2) \langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{t} | \Phi \rangle \\ &=: \exp(-i(\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{w})/|\mathbf{p}|^2) \langle \mathbf{p}, \theta | \Phi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For any  $(\mathbf{p}, \theta)$  there holds  $|\Phi(\mathbf{p}, \gamma, \theta)| = |\Phi(\mathbf{p}, 0, \theta)|$ . Notice that for the definition (3.1) of the scalar product one should not integrate on the real gauge variable  $\gamma$ , which would yield a divergent expression.

The corresponding representation  $U$  of  $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow$  satisfies

$$U(a, \Lambda) \Phi(x, w) = \Phi(\Lambda^{-1}(x - a), \Lambda^{-1}w)$$

on the space of solutions of the equations (3.2). We have found the simple theory of an invariant object for the WP – with the help of the Wigner equations themselves.

The internal parts of Lorentz group generators in this formalism commute with the orbital parts. They are of the form [23]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{K}_{\text{int, cov}}^c &= i(w^0 \partial_{w^c} + w^c \partial_{w^0}) =: \mathbb{K}_w^c; \\ \mathbb{L}_{\text{int, cov}}^c &= -i \varepsilon^c{}_{ab} w^a \partial_{w^b} =: \mathbb{L}_w^c \equiv \mathbb{S}^c. \end{aligned}$$

Note the commutation relations  $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S} = i\mathbb{S}$ , in Schwinger’s notation; and that the total angular momentum generators can be written as  $\mathbb{L} = -i\mathbf{p} \times \partial_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbb{S}$ , just like for massive particles.

---

<sup>6</sup> “. . . alle diese Gleichungssysteme, sofern sie widerspruchsfrei sind, äquivalent sind” [24].

**Remark 2.** Given  $p$  such that  $p^2 = 0$  and  $p^0 > 0$ , its three-dimensional little group  $G_p$  of rotations around  $\mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|$  and *null rotations* preserving  $\mathbf{p}$  is well known. Any proper, orthochronous Lorentz transformation of the sphere must have (properly counted) two fixed points [30]. One possibility is that both null directions *coincide*; these are precisely the parabolic Lorentz transformations, called in context “null rotations”; they are discussed further in App. B.<sup>7</sup>

Given a pair  $(p, w)$  satisfying  $p^0 > 0$ ,  $p^2 = (pw) = w^2 + \kappa^2 = 0$  and another pair  $(p', w')$  of the same kind, there is a *unique* restricted Lorentz transformation  $\Lambda$  such  $\Lambda p = p'$  and  $\Lambda w = w'$ .

**Remark 3.** The scalar product (3.1) is Lorentz-invariant, though not obviously so. A manifestly invariant form of the scalar product appears in Wigner [24]: given two solutions  $\Phi(p, w)$ ,  $\Psi(p, w)$  of (3.2), define  $\langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle$  by:

$$2 \int d^4 p d^4 w \Psi^*(p, w) \Phi(p, w) \delta(p^2) \delta(w^2 + \kappa^2) \delta((pw)) (pu) \delta((uw) - a), \quad (3.5)$$

where  $u$  is *any* timelike 4-vector such that  $u^2 = 1$  and  $a$  an arbitrary parameter. For the convenience of the reader we follow Wigner in verifying that the integral is independent of such  $u$  and  $a$ . Differentiating first with respect to  $a$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{da} \langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle &= -2 \int d^4 p d^4 w \Psi^*(p, w) \Phi(p, w) \delta(p^2) \delta(w^2 + \kappa^2) \delta((pw)) (p \partial_w) \delta((uw) - a) \\ &= 2 \int d^4 p d^4 w \Psi^*(p, w) \Phi(p, w) p^2 \delta(p^2) \delta(w^2 + \kappa^2) \delta'((pw)) \delta((uw) - a) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus one can as well drop  $a$  in the expression (3.5). Next, by application of the differential operators  $u_\alpha \partial / \partial u_\beta \mp u_\beta \partial / \partial u_\alpha$ , one easily checks that the same expression is independent of the direction of  $u$ . So we can as well choose  $u = (1, \mathbf{0})$ , leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle &= 2 \int d^4 p d^3 \mathbf{w} \Psi^*(p, w) \Phi(p, w) p^0 \delta(p^2) \delta(|\mathbf{w}|^2 - \kappa^2) \delta(\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \\ &= \int d^3 \mathbf{p} d^3 \mathbf{w} \Psi^*(p, w) \Phi(p, w) \delta(|\mathbf{w}|^2 - \kappa^2) \delta(\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{w}), \end{aligned}$$

which, with  $p^0 = |\mathbf{p}|$  and  $w^0 = 0$  in the arguments of the wavefunctions understood, coincides with (3.1).

Wigner [24] discusses as well in great detail the passage to  $x$ -space, yielding several equivalent forms, among which an attractive one is given by:

$$\langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle = \int d^3 \mathbf{x} d^3 \mathbf{w} \partial_t \Psi^*(x, w) \partial_t \Phi(x, w) \delta(|\mathbf{w}|^2 - \kappa^2) \delta(\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{w}).$$

---

<sup>7</sup>The most general transformation fixing a null direction decomposes into a null rotation (belonging to a two-parameter set), a rotation and a boost. The four of them together constitute a *Borel subgroup* of the Lorentz group; the last two have as invariant directions those of  $\mathbf{k}$  and the antipodal  $-\mathbf{k}$ ; the boost does not leave  $k$  itself invariant.

## 4 The propagator

In our notation, and with slightly different conventions, the following formula is found in [31, Eq. (3.15)]:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}(x, x'; w^0, \mathbf{w}, w'^0, \mathbf{w}') &= -\tilde{D}(x', x; w^0, \mathbf{w}, w'^0, \mathbf{w}') = \delta(w^2 + \kappa^2) \\ &\times \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3 \mathbf{p} \frac{\sin |\mathbf{p}|(t - t')}{|\mathbf{p}|} e^{i\mathbf{p} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')} \delta(pw) \delta^3(|\mathbf{p}|(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}') - (w^0 - w'^0)\mathbf{p}) e^{i(w^0 - w'^0)/|\mathbf{p}|}. \end{aligned}$$

The above  $\tilde{D}$  is a Lorentz invariant distribution, which satisfies the Wigner equations.

Consider the skewsymmetric form  $s$  given by

$$s(\Psi, \Phi) := \int d^3 x' [\Psi(x') \partial_{t'} \Phi(x') - \Phi(x') \partial_{t'} \Psi(x')]_{t'=\text{const}}.$$

If  $D$  denotes the ordinary Jordan–Pauli propagator for massless fields, the solution of the wave equation with Cauchy data  $\Phi(t', \mathbf{x}')|_{t'=\text{const}}$  is given by  $s(D(x, -), \Phi(-))$ .

Now it should be clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^4 w' s(\tilde{D}(x, -; w, w'), \Phi(-; w')) &= \frac{\delta(w^2 + \kappa^2)}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3 \mathbf{w}' \delta^3(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}') \Phi(x; \mathbf{w}', w_0) \delta(pw) \\ &= \Phi(x; w), \end{aligned}$$

if  $\Phi$  already satisfies the Wigner equations; and this expression *becomes* a solution in the general case – since  $\tilde{D}$  itself satisfies them. Therefore this  $\tilde{D}$  behaves like a reproducing kernel, exactly as the ordinary Jordan–Pauli propagator, which reproduces any solution of the KG equation, and produces one such from an arbitrary spacetime function.

Notice moreover that  $\tilde{D}$  is *causal*:  $D = 0$  when  $(x - x')^2 < 0$ . This does not contradict Yngvason’s theorem [32] on the nonlocality of quantum fields associated to WPs, for, among other reasons, the wavefunctions depend on an extra variable.

## 5 Connecting with the standard formalism

The *point de départ* of the standard formalism for the Wigner modules is the choice of a reference 4-momentum  $k = (|\mathbf{k}|, \mathbf{k})$ , which for massless particles can only be arbitrary. Its “length”  $|\mathbf{k}|$  is irrelevant, so here it is assumed equal to one. The time-honoured choice for the reference momentum is  $k := (1, 0, 0, 1)$ . The representation space of its corresponding little group for a boson WP is spanned by vectors lying on the circle  $|\xi|^2 := (\xi^1)^2 + (\xi^2)^2 = \kappa^2$ : either

$$|\xi^1, \xi^2\rangle \equiv |\kappa; \tau\rangle, \quad \text{where } \tau := \arctan(\xi^2/\xi^1),$$

or  $|\kappa; h\rangle$ , with  $h$  denoting the helicity, computed with respect to the reference momentum. For these kets:

$$\mathbb{T}_{1,2} |\xi^1, \xi^2\rangle \equiv \mathbb{W}^{1,2} |\xi^1, \xi^2\rangle = \xi^{1,2} |\xi^1, \xi^2\rangle;$$

and also:

$$\exp(i\beta\mathbb{W}^0) |\kappa; \tau\rangle = |\kappa; \tau - \beta\rangle, \quad \text{or} \quad \exp(i\beta\mathbb{W}^0) |\kappa; h\rangle = e^{i\beta h} |\kappa; h\rangle.$$

Then one can employ the *standard* wave functions:

$$\psi_{\text{st}}(\mathbf{p}, \xi^1, \xi^2) := \langle \mathbf{p}, \xi^1, \xi^2 | \psi \rangle$$

defined on the lightcone and the internal circle by the customary lifting to a unirrep space of the Poincaré group.

For a general unit vector  $\mathbf{k}$ , the generators of rotations take the form

$$\mathbb{L}_{\mathbf{k}} = -i\mathbf{p} \times \partial_{\mathbf{p}} + \frac{\mathbf{p} \times (\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{p})}{|\mathbf{p}|(|\mathbf{p}| + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p})} \mathbb{S} \cdot \mathbf{k} + \frac{\mathbf{p}}{|\mathbf{p}|} \mathbb{S}_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{k} = -i\mathbf{p} \times \partial_{\mathbf{p}} + \frac{\mathbf{p} + |\mathbf{p}|\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{p}| + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}} \mathbb{S}_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{k} \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\xi$  is taken transversal to  $\mathbf{k}$  of norm  $\kappa$ , and  $\mathbb{S}_{\xi} := -i\xi \times \partial_{\xi}$ . For the boost generators, one finds:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{k}} &= i|\mathbf{p}| \partial_{\mathbf{p}} - \frac{\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{p}}{|\mathbf{p}| + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}} \mathbb{S}_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{k} + \frac{\mathbf{p} \cdot \xi}{|\mathbf{p}|^2} \frac{\mathbf{p} + |\mathbf{p}|\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{p}| + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}} - \frac{\xi}{|\mathbf{p}|} \\ &= i|\mathbf{p}| \partial_{\mathbf{p}} - \frac{\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{p}}{|\mathbf{p}| + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}} \mathbb{S}_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{k} + \frac{\mathbf{p}}{|\mathbf{p}|^2} \times \left( \frac{\mathbf{p} + |\mathbf{p}|\mathbf{k}}{|\mathbf{p}| + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}} \times \xi \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

The generators are defined on a (dense) subspace of the Hilbert space consisting of twice-differentiable functions vanishing on a cylinder centered on the negative  $\mathbf{k}$ -axis, including the origin – keep in mind the analysis in [22]. When  $\mathbf{k} = (0, 0, 1)$ , one recovers from Eqs. (5.1) and (5.2) the familiar expressions found by Lomont and Moses [33] long ago.

It stands to reason that wavefunctions pertaining to the standard routine must be related to the invariant wavefunctions of Sect. 3.2 by unitary transformations. Let

$$\alpha := \arccos(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|) = \arctan \frac{|\mathbf{p} - (\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{k})\mathbf{k}|}{\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{k}}.$$

In [31] one finds the assertion that such unitary transformations essentially consist of a rotation representative:

$$\delta(|\xi|^2 - \kappa^2) \delta(\xi \cdot \mathbf{k}) \psi_0(\mathbf{p}, \xi) := e^{iw^0/|\mathbf{p}|} \exp\left(i\alpha \frac{\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{p}}{|\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{p}|} \cdot \mathbb{S}\right) \Phi(\mathbf{p}, w) \Big|_{w=\xi+w^0\mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|}.$$

Reciprocally, given  $\mathbf{k}$ :

$$\Phi(\mathbf{p}, w) = e^{-iw^0/|\mathbf{p}|} \exp\left(-i\alpha \frac{\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{p}}{|\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{p}|} \cdot \mathbb{S}_{\xi}\right) \delta(|\xi|^2 - \kappa^2) \delta(\xi \cdot \mathbf{k}) \psi_0(\mathbf{p}, \xi) \Big|_{\xi=w-w^0\mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|}.$$

Let us simply denote

$$V := \exp\left(i\alpha \frac{\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{p}}{|\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{p}|} \cdot \mathbb{S}\right).$$

It is perfectly true that  $V$  “diagonalizes” the helicity operator:

$$V(\mathbb{S} \cdot \mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|)V^{\dagger} = \mathbb{S} \cdot \mathbf{k}.$$

Straightforward albeit tedious calculations show that the correct internal angular momentum components transversal to  $\mathbf{k}$  in (5.1) are recovered by this unitary transformation. (See also [34, 35].) Unfortunately, we cannot go into this matter here.

## A Poincaré group conventions

Our metric on the Minkowski space  $\mathbb{M}$  is mostly-negative. The inner product of two vectors  $x \equiv x^\mu$ ,  $p \equiv p^\nu$  of spacetime is denoted with parentheses:  $(xp) = x^\mu p_\mu$ . When (we hope) it does not cause confusion, we often write  $p^2 = (pp)$ , say.

The Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  has a basis of ten elements  $\{P^0, P^a, L^a, K^a : a = 1, 2, 3\}$ , corresponding respectively to time translations, space translations, rotations and boosts. The commutation relations for the Lorentz subgroup are as follows:

$$[L^a, L^b] = \varepsilon^{ab}{}_c L^c, \quad [L^a, K^b] = \varepsilon^{ab}{}_c K^c, \quad [K^a, K^b] = -\varepsilon^{ab}{}_c L^c.$$

The commutation relations are realized<sup>8</sup> by  $K^a = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^a$  and  $L^a = -\frac{i}{2}\sigma^a$ .

In the real four-dimensional representation:

$$J^{01} \equiv K^1 = \begin{pmatrix} & 1 & & \\ 1 & & & \\ & & 0 & \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad J^{02} \equiv K^2 = \begin{pmatrix} & & 1 & \\ & 0 & & \\ 1 & & & \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad J^{03} \equiv K^3 = \begin{pmatrix} & & & 1 \\ & & 0 & \\ & 0 & & \\ 1 & & & \end{pmatrix};$$

$$J^{23} \equiv L^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & & -1 \\ & & 1 & \end{pmatrix}; \quad J^{31} \equiv L^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & & & 1 \\ & & 0 & \\ -1 & & & \end{pmatrix}; \quad J^{12} \equiv L^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & & -1 & \\ & 1 & & \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with the same commutation relations. Remark that

$$(L^1 + K^2)^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & -1 \\ & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & \\ 1 & & & -1 \end{pmatrix} = (L^2 - K^1)^2$$

and  $(L^1 + K^2)^3 = (L^2 - K^1)^3 = 0$ .

It is advisable to pull these generators together in matrix form:

$$J^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} & K^1 & K^2 & K^3 \\ -K^1 & & L^3 & -L^2 \\ -K^2 & -L^3 & & L^1 \\ -K^3 & L^2 & -L^1 & \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad J_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} & -K^1 & -K^2 & -K^3 \\ K^1 & & L^3 & -L^2 \\ K^2 & -L^3 & & L^1 \\ K^3 & L^2 & -L^1 & \end{pmatrix}.$$

The general expression is  $(J_{\rho\sigma})^\alpha{}_\beta = \delta_\rho^\alpha g_{\sigma\beta} - \delta_\sigma^\alpha g_{\rho\beta}$ , and the commutation relations are summarized as:

$$[J_{\rho\sigma}, J_{\mu\nu}] = -g_{\rho\mu}J_{\sigma\nu} - g_{\sigma\nu}J_{\rho\mu} + g_{\sigma\mu}J_{\rho\nu} + g_{\rho\nu}J_{\sigma\mu}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

---

<sup>8</sup>Or by  $K^a = -\frac{1}{2}\sigma^a$  and  $L^a = -\frac{i}{2}\sigma^a$ . In the usual terminology,  $K^a = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^a$  and  $L^a = -\frac{i}{2}\sigma^a$  correspond to the  $D(0, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $D(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$  spinor representations respectively, according to [19, Chap. 8].

The dual tensor:

$$J^{*\rho\mu} := -\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{\rho\mu\nu\tau} J_{\nu\tau} = \begin{pmatrix} -L^1 & -L^2 & -L^3 \\ L^1 & K^3 & -K^2 \\ L^2 & -K^3 & K^1 \\ L^3 & K^2 & -K^1 \end{pmatrix}$$

plays a role in the theory of the WP. Notice that  $\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{L} = \frac{1}{2}J_{\rho\mu}J^{*\rho\mu}$  is a relativistic invariant; as is  $\mathbf{K}^2 - \mathbf{L}^2 = \frac{1}{2}J_{\rho\mu}J^{\rho\mu} = -\frac{1}{2}J_{\rho\mu}^*J^{*\rho\mu}$ . These are just the Casimirs of the Lorentz group. A generic infinitesimal Lorentz transformation is of the form

$$\Lambda \simeq 1 + \frac{1}{2}\omega^{\rho\sigma}J_{\rho\sigma}, \quad \text{or} \quad \Lambda^\mu{}_\nu = \delta^\mu{}_\nu + \omega^\mu{}_\nu,$$

where  $\omega^{\rho\sigma}$  must be skewsymmetric.

The  $P^\mu$  mutually commute. The remaining nonvanishing commutation relations for  $\mathcal{P}$  are given by:

$$[L^a, P^b] = \varepsilon^{ab}{}_c P^c, \quad [K^a, P^b] = -\delta^{ab}P^0, \quad [K^a, P^0] = -P^a;$$

that is,  $[J^{K\rho}, P^\mu] = g^{\mu\rho}P^\kappa - g^{\mu\kappa}P^\rho$ .

Let  $U(\Lambda)$  be the unitary operator acting on one-particle states, corresponding to a Lorentz transformation  $\Lambda$ . As discussed for instance in [36, Sect. 2.4], one finds that

$$U^\dagger(\Lambda) \mathbb{P}^\mu U(\Lambda) = \Lambda^\mu{}_\nu \mathbb{P}^\nu; \quad U^\dagger(\Lambda) \mathbb{J}^{\mu\nu} U(\Lambda) = \Lambda^\mu{}_\rho \Lambda^\nu{}_\sigma \mathbb{J}^{\rho\sigma},$$

where by  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{J} = \{\mathbb{K}, \mathbb{L}\}$  we denote *hermitian* generators on Hilbert space, with commutation relations:

$$[\mathbb{L}^a, \mathbb{L}^b] = i\varepsilon^{ab}{}_c \mathbb{L}^c; \quad [\mathbb{L}^a, \mathbb{K}^b] = i\varepsilon^{ab}{}_c \mathbb{K}^c; \quad [\mathbb{K}^a, \mathbb{K}^b] = -i\varepsilon^{ab}{}_c \mathbb{L}^c;$$

that is, equation (A.1) leads to

$$[\mathbb{J}_{\rho\sigma}, \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}] = i(-g_{\rho\mu}\mathbb{J}_{\sigma\nu} - g_{\sigma\nu}\mathbb{J}_{\rho\mu} + g_{\sigma\mu}\mathbb{J}_{\rho\nu} + g_{\rho\nu}\mathbb{J}_{\sigma\mu}).$$

## B The Lorentz decompositions of null rotations

The unique decomposition of an arbitrary (proper orthochronous) Lorentz matrix  $S$  into the product of a rotation and a boost is well known [19, Ch. 1]. It becomes

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \mathbf{a}^t \\ \mathbf{c} & N \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & N - \mathbf{c}\mathbf{a}^t/(1+\alpha) \end{pmatrix} L_{\mathbf{a}/\alpha} =: \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & N - \mathbf{c}\mathbf{a}^t/(1+\alpha) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \mathbf{a}^t \\ \mathbf{a} & 1_3 + \frac{\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^t}{1+\alpha} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\alpha^2 = 1 + \mathbf{a}^2$ . Since  $S$  and  $S^t$  are Lorentz, which implies  $N\mathbf{a} = \alpha\mathbf{c}$ ,  $N^t\mathbf{c} = \alpha\mathbf{a}$  and  $N^tN = 1_3 + \mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^t$ , one checks that  $R := N - \mathbf{c}\mathbf{a}^t/(1+\alpha)$  is a rotation and that  $R\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{c}$ , and thus also  $R + R\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}^t/(1+\alpha) = N$ .

We want to decompose null rotations in  $G_p$ . Note that there is an infinity of spacelike surfaces, of timelike, null or spacelike vectors, which are orbits of  $G_p$  in  $\mathbb{M}$ , each isometric

to the group of motions of a plane [37]. Consider those null rotations which leave invariant the standard momentum  $k = (1, 0, 0, 1)$ . Denoting when convenient  $b_1^2 + b_2^2$  by  $|b|^2$ , a general null rotation fixing  $k$  is given by:

$$S(b_1, b_2) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \frac{1}{2}|b|^2 & -b_2 & b_1 & -\frac{1}{2}|b|^2 \\ -b_2 & 1 & 0 & b_2 \\ b_1 & 0 & 1 & -b_1 \\ \frac{1}{2}|b|^2 & -b_2 & b_1 & 1 - \frac{1}{2}|b|^2 \end{pmatrix} =: \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \mathbf{a}^t \\ \mathbf{c} & N \end{pmatrix}.$$

Simplifying further, we work out first the case  $S(0, -b)$ , with  $b > 0$ .

Here  $\alpha^2 = 1 + b^2 + \frac{1}{4}b^4 = (1 + \frac{1}{2}b^2)^2$  so that  $1 + \alpha = \frac{1}{2}(4 + b^2)$ , and  $S(0, -b)$  factorizes as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 + \frac{1}{2}b^2 & b & 0 & -\frac{1}{2}b^2 \\ b & 1 & 0 & -b \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}b^2 & b & 0 & 1 - \frac{1}{2}b^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{4-b^2}{4+b^2} & 0 & -\frac{4b}{4+b^2} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{4b}{4+b^2} & 0 & \frac{4-b^2}{4+b^2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \frac{1}{2}b^2 & b & 0 & -\frac{1}{2}b^2 \\ b & 1 + \frac{2b^2}{4+b^2} & 0 & -\frac{b^3}{4+b^2} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}b^2 & -\frac{b^3}{4+b^2} & 0 & 1 + \frac{b^4}{2(4+b^2)} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$=: RL = (RLR^{-1})R =: L'R.$$

We see clearly that  $R$  is a rotation around the  $y$ -axis, of positive angle  $\theta$  turning anticlockwise from the positive  $z$ -axis towards the positive  $x$ -axis, with  $\theta = 2 \arctan(b/2)$ . The velocity associated with the boost  $L'$  is:

$$\mathbf{v} = (2b/(2 + b^2), 0, -b^2/(2 + b^2));$$

therefore its rapidity parameter is given by  $\zeta = \operatorname{arcsinh}(\frac{1}{2}b\sqrt{4 + b^2})$ ; the direction of the boost forms an angle  $\arctan(b/2)$  with the  $x$ -axis, tilted towards the negative  $z$ -axis. For small angles, it is intuitive that the boost undoes the turn effected by the rotation. The result reproduces the one indicated without proof in [32].

## Acknowledgements

A report by Alejandro Jenkins of a conversation with Mark Wise set this work in motion. We are grateful to Alejandro, as well as to Fedele Lizzi and Patrizia Vitale, for discussions on the gyroscope property, and to Karl-Henning Rehren for most useful remarks about the equations by Wigner. We thank Daniel Solís for checking App. B and a useful observation.

The project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 690575. JMG-B received funding from Project FPA2015-65745-P of MINECO/Feder, and acknowledges the support of the COST action QSPACE. JCV received support from the Vicerrectoría de Investigación of the Universidad de Costa Rica.

## References

- [1] E. P. Wigner, “On unitary representations of the inhomogeneous Lorentz group”, *Ann. Math.* **40** (1939), 149–204.
- [2] B. Schroer, “Wigner’s infinite spin representations and inert matter”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**:362 (2017).
- [3] Ph. Schuster and N. Toro, “On the theory of continuous spin particles: wavefunctions and soft-factor scattering amplitudes”, *JHEP* **1309** (2013), 104.
- [4] Ph. Schuster and N. Toro, “On the theory of continuous-spin particles: helicity correspondence in radiation and forces”, *JHEP* **1309** (2013), 105.
- [5] Ph. Schuster and N. Toro, “Continuous-spin particle field theory with helicity correspondence”, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015), 025023.
- [6] X. Bekaert, M. Najafizadeh and M. R. Setare, “A gauge field theory of fermionic continuous-spin particles”, *Phys. Lett. B* **760** (2016), 320–323.
- [7] X. Bekaert and E. Skvortsov, “Elementary particles with continuous spin”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **32** (2017), 1730019.
- [8] M. Najafizadeh, “Modified Wigner equations and continuous spin gauge field”, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018), 065009.
- [9] M. V. Khabarov and Yu. M. Zinoviev, “Infinite (continuous) spin fields in the frame-like formalism”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **928** (2018), 182–216.
- [10] I. L. Buchbinder, V. A. Krykhtin and H. Takata, “BRST approach to Lagrangian construction for bosonic continuous spin field”, *Phys. Lett. B* **785** (2018), 315–319.
- [11] K.-H. Rehren, “Pauli–Lubański limit and stress-energy tensor for infinite-spin fields”, *JHEP* **1711** (2017), 130.
- [12] J. Mund, K.-H. Rehren and B. Schroer, “Helicity decoupling in the massless limit of massive tensor fields”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **924** (2017), 699–727.
- [13] J. M. Gracia–Bondía, F. Lizzi, J. C. Várilly and P. Vitale, “The Kirillov picture for the Wigner particle”, *J. Phys. A* **51** (2018), 255203.
- [14] A. McKerrell, “Canonical representations for massless particles and zero-mass limits of the helicity representation”, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London A* **285** (1965), 287–296.
- [15] J. S. Lomont and H. E. Moses, “Reduction of reducible representations of the infinitesimal generators of the proper orthochronous inhomogeneous Lorentz group”, *J. Math. Phys.* **8** (1967), 837–850.
- [16] J. Schwinger, *Particles, Sources and Fields*, vol. 1, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1970.
- [17] J. F. Cariñena, J. M. Gracia–Bondía and J. C. Várilly, “Relativistic quantum kinematics in the Moyal representation”, *J. Phys. A* **23** (1990), 901–933.
- [18] A. P. Balachandran, G. Marmo, A. Simoni, A. Stern and F. Zaccaria, “On a classical description of massless particles”, in *Proceedings of the ISAQTP–Shanxi*, ed. by J. Q. Liang, M. L. Wang, S. N. Qiao and D. C. Su (1993), pp. 396–402.

- [19] R. U. Sexl and H. K. Urbantke, *Relativity, Groups, Particles*, Springer, Vienna, 2001.
- [20] E. P. Wigner, “Relativistic invariance and quantum phenomena”, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **29** (1957), 255–268.
- [21] L. J. Boya, J. F. Cariñena and M. Santander, “On the continuity of the boosts for each orbit”, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **37** (1974), 331–334.
- [22] M. Flato, D. Sternheimer and C. Frønsdal, “Difficulties with massless particles?”, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **90** (1983), 563–573.
- [23] V. Bargmann and E. P. Wigner, “Group theoretical discussion of relativistic wave equations”, *PNAS* **34** (1948), 211–223.
- [24] E. P. Wigner, “Relativistische Wellengleichungen”, *Z. Physik* **124** (1948), 665–684.
- [25] E. P. Wigner, “Invariant quantum mechanical equations of motion”, in *Theoretical Physics Lectures*, ed. by A. Salam, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, 1963; pp. 59–82.
- [26] X. Bekaert and J. Mourad, “The continuous spin limit of higher spin field equations”, *JHEP* **01** (2006) 115.
- [27] K.-H. Rehren, private communication.
- [28] Ph. Schuster and N. Toro, “A gauge field theory of continuous spin particles”, *JHEP* **1310** (2013), 061.
- [29] V. O. Rivelles, “Remarks on a gauge theory for continuous spin particles”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**:433 (2017).
- [30] R. Penrose and W. Rindler, *Spinors and Spacetime*, vol. 1, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984.
- [31] K. Hirata, “Quantization of massless fields with continuous spin”, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **58** (1977) 652–666.
- [32] J. Yngvason, “Zero-mass infinite spin representations of the Poincaré group and quantum field theory”, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **18** (1970), 195–203.
- [33] J. S. Lomont and H. E. Moses, “Simple realizations of the infinitesimal generators of the proper orthochronous inhomogeneous Lorentz group for mass zero”, *J. Math. Phys.* **3** (1962), 405–408.
- [34] U. H. Niederer and L. O’Raifeartaigh, “Realizations of the unitary representations of the inhomogeneous space-time groups I”, *Fortschr. Phys.* **22** (1974), 111–129.
- [35] M. Asorey, L. J. Boya and J. F. Cariñena, “Covariant representations in a fibre bundle framework”, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **21** (1985), 391–404.
- [36] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields I*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [37] J. Mund, “String-localized covariant quantum fields”, in *Rigorous Quantum Field Theory*, ed. by A. Boutet de Monvel, D. Buchholz, D. Iagolnitzer and U. Moschella (Birkhäuser, Boston, 2007), pp. 199–212.