

Quantum Measurement of Space-Time Events

Dorje C. Brody^{1,2} and Lane P. Hughston³

¹*Department of Mathematics, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH, UK*

²*St Petersburg National Research University of Information Technologies, Mechanics and Optics, St Petersburg 197101, Russia*

³*Department of Computing, Goldsmiths University of London, New Cross, London SE14 6NW, UK*

The phase space of a relativistic system can be identified with the future tube of complexified Minkowski space. As well as a complex structure and a symplectic structure, the future tube, seen as an eight-dimensional real manifold, is endowed with a natural positive-definite Riemannian metric that accommodates the underlying geometry of the indefinite Minkowski space metric, together with its symmetry group. These structures are enough to allow one to construct a quantum theory of phase-space events. In particular, a theory of quantum measurement can be formulated in a relativistic setting, based on the use of positive operator valued measures, for the detection of phase-space events, hence allowing one to assign probabilities to the outcomes of joint space-time and four-momentum measurements in a manifestly covariant framework. This leads to a localization theorem for phase-space events in relativistic quantum theory, determined by the associated Compton wavelength.

I. INTRODUCTION

Starting with the pioneering work of Dirac [1], investigations of the Hamiltonian formulation of space-time physics have been pursued by numerous authors. One of the motivations behind such analysis has been that the mathematical structures of phase-space formalisms are highly amenable to a quantum-mechanical description. The naive formulation of a relativistic phase space as a kind of doubled-up Minkowski space with four position coordinates and four momentum coordinates, while feasible in the classical theory, is not satisfactory as the basis for a relativistic quantum theory. Here we propose an alternative approach in which the future tube of complexified Minkowski space is taken to be the phase space of a relativistic system. Remarkably, this phase space comes naturally equipped with both the symplectic structure and the compatible Riemannian structure needed for the development of a fully covariant relativistic quantum theory.

Let us write \mathbb{M} for Minkowski space, by which we mean \mathbb{R}^4 equipped with the usual flat space-time metric g_{ab} with signature $(+, -, -, -)$. For the positions of points $x, y \in \mathbb{M}$ relative to an origin in \mathbb{M} we write x^a and y^a where $a, b = 0, 1, 2, 3$. We say that x and y are time-like, space-like, or null separated according to whether $g_{ab}(x^a - y^a)(x^b - y^b)$ is positive, negative, or zero. In the time-like and null cases, the separation vector $v^a = x^a - y^a$ is said to be future-pointing or past-pointing according to whether v^0 is positive or negative. Then by complex Minkowski space \mathbb{CM} we mean \mathbb{C}^4 equipped with the same metric tensor. The so-called future tube Γ is the open submanifold of \mathbb{CM} consisting of points that are of the form $z^a = x^a - ir^a$ where r^a is time-like and future pointing. Thus for all $z^a \in \Gamma$ it holds that $g_{ab}r^a r^b > 0$ with $r^0 > 0$. The term “future tube” is a misnomer that we stick with since it is standard; but the fact that r^a must be future-pointing when the minus sign appears in the definition of z^a is crucial.

The future tube plays an important role in rigorous treatments of quantum field theory. In particular, the Wightman functions are analytic in Γ , and one can reconstruct the field theory from the data of these expectation values. The future

tube contains no real space-time points; however, the so-called extended future tube, consisting of points attainable by the actions of the complex Lorentz group on Γ , contains real points, called Jost points. One can then recover the field theory from the values of the Wightman functions at the Jost points [2]. Complexified Minkowski space also plays an important role in the Penrose twistor program [3], as does the future tube. In twistor theory, the complex projective space \mathbb{CP}^3 is divided into two parts, called the upper and lower half of \mathbb{CP}^3 , separated by a five real dimensional hypersurface N of null twistors. The points of \mathbb{CM} correspond to complex projective lines in \mathbb{CP}^3 . The points of Γ correspond to complex projective lines that lie entirely in the top half of \mathbb{CP}^3 .

In both twistor theory and quantum field theory, the complexification of Minkowski space, natural as it may be, is introduced primarily to enable one to exploit the tools of complex analysis in relation to the positive frequency condition on fields; and there is no direct physical significance attached to the imaginary components of complex space-time points. Some form of reality condition has to be brought into play to make the link to the physical “real” spacetime.

From the viewpoint of the complex formulation of classical mechanics [4], however, it is natural to ask whether the imaginary part of a point in Γ can be interpreted as being related to the four momentum of a relativistic system. In what follows we offer an affirmative answer to this question. We construct a Hilbert space of quantum states over the space-time phase space, in terms of which we are able to formulate a quantum measurement theory for the detection of the phase-space location of a relativistic event.

II. RELATIVISTIC MECHANICS

We begin by reviewing the cotangent bundle approach to relativistic mechanics [5–8]. The phase space is taken to be the cotangent bundle of Minkowski space, where the cotangent vectors in the fibre over a point in Minkowski space are identified with the momentum four-vectors that the particle might possess. The bundle is an eight-dimensional manifold $T^*\mathbb{M}$,

with base coordinates x^a and fibre coordinates p_a . We form the canonical one-form $\theta = p_a dx^a$ on $T^*\mathbb{M}$ along with its exterior derivative, the associated symplectic form $\omega = dp_a \wedge dx^a$. Given a smooth function $H : T^*\mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we then write Hamilton's equations for a dynamical trajectory

$$s \in \mathbb{R}^+ \mapsto \{x^a(s), p_a(s)\} \in T^*\mathbb{M} \quad (1)$$

in the form

$$\frac{dx^a}{ds} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_a} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dp_a}{ds} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x^a}, \quad (2)$$

and we call $H(x^a, p_a)$ the Hamiltonian function. As before, we let $g_{ab} = \text{diag}(+1, -1, -1, -1)$ be the metric on the base space \mathbb{M} , which we can use to raise and lower indices on the fibre elements as well. Then we can write $(x^a, p^a) = (x^a, g^{ab} p_b)$ and put Hamilton's equations in the more symmetrical form

$$\frac{dx^a}{ds} = g^{ab} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p^b} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dp^a}{ds} = -g^{ab} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x^b}. \quad (3)$$

The cotangent-bundle approach works well for characterizing the dynamics of typical mechanical systems in space-time. To convince oneself it suffices to explore a few examples.

Example 1. *Free particle.* The Hamiltonian is taken to be

$$H = [g_{ab} p^a p^b]^{1/2}. \quad (4)$$

Then H will be a constant of the motion which we identify as the mass m . The phase space is foliated by surfaces of constant H , and as an initial condition we choose $\{x^a(0), p_a(0)\}$ to lie on the surface $H = m$. Hamilton's equations (3) imply

$$m\dot{x}^a = p^a, \quad \dot{p}^a = 0. \quad (5)$$

The phase-space trajectory is then given by

$$x^a(s) = x^a(0) + s m^{-1} p_a(0), \quad p_a(s) = p_a(0), \quad (6)$$

corresponding to a geodesic motion in Minkowski space subject to the specified initial conditions.

Example 2. *Charged particle in an electromagnetic field.* Let the charge be q and write $A^a(x)$ for the electromagnetic four-potential. With the familiar minimal coupling, we extend the previous example by taking the Hamiltonian to be of the form

$$H = [g_{ab}(p^a - qA^a)(p^b - qA^b)]^{1/2}. \quad (7)$$

We foliate the phase space with surfaces of constant H , identifying the value of H with the mass of the particle. Hamilton's equations give

$$m\dot{x}^a = (p^a - qA^a), \quad \dot{p}^a = q\dot{x}_c \nabla^a A^c, \quad (8)$$

where $\nabla_a = \partial/\partial x^a$. Further differentiation leads to the Lorentz force law

$$m\ddot{x}^a = qF^{ab} \dot{x}_b, \quad F^{ab} = \nabla^a A^b - \nabla^b A^a. \quad (9)$$

Example 3. *Relativistic two-body problem with a force of mutual attraction.* Let us write x^a, y^a, X^a, Y^a for the space-time positions and momenta of the two particles, setting

$$q^a = \frac{1}{2}(x^a - y^a), \quad (10)$$

along with

$$P^a = X^a + Y^a, \quad Q^a = X^a - Y^a. \quad (11)$$

To model a central force we project q^a onto the space-like hypersurface orthogonal to the total momentum P^a to measure the separation of the two particles. Since P^a is time-like, the resulting "internal" coordinate ξ^a defined by

$$\xi^a = q^a - \frac{q_c P^c}{P_c P^c} P^a \quad (12)$$

is space-like. Thus $\xi_a \xi^a \leq 0$ and for the potential we set

$$V(\xi^a) = \Phi(-\xi_a \xi^a), \quad (13)$$

for some function $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in $C^1(0, \infty)$. For example, for a harmonic oscillator we set $\Phi(u) = ku$ where $k \in \mathbb{R}^+$. For a Coulomb potential set $\Phi(u) = -e_1 e_2 u^{-1/2}$, where e_1, e_2 are the charges of the particles. For a gravitational potential, set $\Phi(u) = Gm_1 m_2 u^{-1/2}$, and so on. Consider now a pair of particles interacting via the potential V . We write

$$X^2 = m_1^2 + V, \quad Y^2 = m_2^2 + V, \quad (14)$$

where $X^2 = X_a X^a$ and $Y^2 = Y_a Y^a$, and m_1, m_2 are the rest masses. These conditions imply

$$\frac{1}{2}(P^2 + Q^2) - 2V = m_1^2 + m_2^2, \quad P_c Q^c = m_1^2 - m_2^2. \quad (15)$$

Hence for the Hamiltonian we set

$$H = \left(\frac{1}{2}(P^2 + Q^2) - 2V\right)^{1/2}. \quad (16)$$

Since H will be a constant of the motion, we choose the initial conditions so that $\{r^a(0), q^a(0)\}$ lies on the surface

$$H = [m_1^2 + m_2^2]^{1/2}. \quad (17)$$

Hamilton's equations show that $P_c Q^c$ is also a constant of the motion, so we set $P_c Q^c = m_1^2 - m_2^2$, thus fixing the two masses. A calculation then shows that

$$\frac{d^2 \xi^a}{ds^2} = -\frac{1}{m_1^2 + m_2^2} \Phi'(-\xi_c \xi^c) \xi^a, \quad (18)$$

where $\Phi'(u) = d\Phi(u)/du$. Since the right side is a function of ξ^a , we can solve for $\xi^a(s)$, which in turn allows us to determine the phase-space trajectory. For example, in the case of an oscillator, we have $\Phi' = k$, so we obtain

$$\xi^a(s) = \alpha^a \cos(\omega s) + \beta^a \sin(\omega s), \quad (19)$$

where α^a, β^a are constant spacelike vectors such that $\alpha^a = \xi^a(0)$ and $\omega\beta^a = \dot{\xi}^a(0)$, with $\omega^2 = k/(m_1^2 + m_2^2)$.

Despite the merits of these examples, there are limitations to the effectiveness of the cotangent bundle approach as a foundation for the theory of relativistic dynamics. For a start, there is no intrinsic mechanism to prevent the momentum from becoming space-like or past-pointing. This problem can be avoided in specific examples, such as the ones above, but it is undesirable that one should have to manage the situation on an *ad hoc* basis. The cotangent bundle approach also poses problems when we look at field theories, since the cotangent bundle does not admit a natural complex structure. In particular, there is no general recipe for combining position and momentum in a linear way, allowing one to write complex expressions of the form $x^a + ip^a$. Such variables arise in the quantization of oscillators, but in that case there is a dimensional constant that allows one to modify the expressions to produce terms of the same dimensionality. If the constants of nature at ones disposal are the speed of light and Planck's constant, then one cannot convert a quantity with units of momentum to one with units of length. Further, the interpretation of the parameter s as a proper time in the cotangent bundle approach is ambiguous when many particles are involved.

What is the optimal way forward? Many authors have considered the problems arising with the formulation of relativistic phase spaces, both for classical theories and quantum theories [9–13]. Our approach incorporates ideas drawn from all of these, and from geometric quantum mechanics as well [14–17], but we also look closely at the role of probability in what follows as we develop a relativistic theory of quantum measurement based on the geometry of the future tube.

III. BACK TO THE FUTURE TUBE

That there is an appropriate map from the cotangent bundle to the future tube is not immediately apparent, but a dimensional argument will lead the way. In order for us to be able to regard $x^a - ir^a$ as a complex phase-space variable in a relativistic context we shall require r^a to have units of inverse momentum. Then if we multiply r^a by Planck's constant we obtain a vector with units of position that can be combined with x^a . Specifically, we consider the Kelvin inversion

$$r^a = \hbar p^a / (p_c p^c), \quad p^a = \hbar r^a / (r^a r_a). \quad (20)$$

This transformation maps the cone of time-like future-pointing Minkowski space vectors into itself. Thus we have

$$\hbar g^{ab} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^b} = r_c r^c \left(g^{ab} - \frac{2 r^a r^b}{r_c r^c} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial r^b} \quad (21)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\hbar} g_{ab} \frac{dp^a}{ds} = \frac{1}{r_c r^c} \left(g_{ab} - \frac{2 r_a r_b}{r_c r^c} \right) \frac{dr^a}{ds}. \quad (22)$$

Now define a symmetric tensor h_{ab} with inverse k^{ab} by setting

$$h_{ab} = -\frac{1}{r_c r^c} \left(g_{ab} - \frac{2 r_a r_b}{r_c r^c} \right), \quad k^{ab} = -r_c r^c \left(g^{ab} - \frac{2 r^a r^b}{r_c r^c} \right). \quad (23)$$

Then $k^{ab} h_{bc} = \delta_c^a$, and a straightforward calculation shows that Hamilton's equations on the future tube take the form

$$\hbar \frac{dx^a}{ds} = -k^{ab} \frac{\partial H}{\partial r^b} \quad \text{and} \quad \hbar \frac{dr^a}{ds} = k^{ab} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x^b}. \quad (24)$$

That the signs in (24) are reversed in comparison with (3) is an artefact of the convention that defines the future tube by points of the form $x^a - ir^a$ with r^a time-like and future-pointing. But what is not so obvious, and comes perhaps as a surprise, is that the quadratic form h_{ab} is *positive definite*, thus defining a Riemannian metric on the future tube. As a consequence we see that the arc-length along a smooth curve can be taken as a canonical parametrization of the phase-space trajectory. In particular, in situations where two or more particles are interacting, the phase space of the system as a whole can be taken to be the product of the phase spaces of the individual systems, with an overall positive definite metric, thus leading to a natural way of synchronizing the dynamics of the constituents.

IV. RELATIVISTIC PHASE-SPACE GEOMETRY

As a number of authors have pointed out, here are several distinct but ultimately equivalent ways of arriving at the geometrical structure of the future tube [18–24]. Building on these works, we pursue here an alternative approach to the geometry of Γ that ties in naturally with quantum measurement theory. We begin with the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of square-integrable holomorphic functions on the future tube. If we let f, g be elements of $L^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{O})$, then for their inner product we write

$$\langle \bar{g} | f \rangle = \int_{\Gamma} f(z) \bar{g}(\bar{z}) d\mu_z, \quad (25)$$

where

$$d\mu_z = \frac{1}{16} d^4 z d^4 \bar{z} \quad (26)$$

denotes the Lebesgue measure on Γ . The fact that such functions constitute a Hilbert space is nontrivial, for it is not immediately obvious that any Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{O})$ converges to an element of $L^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{O})$. That such convergence holds follows as a consequence of a well-known bound [25], which states that for any compact subset $Q \subset \Gamma$ there exists a constant C_Q such that for all $\phi \in L^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{O})$ we have

$$\sup_{z \in Q} |\phi(z)| \leq C_Q \|\phi\|, \quad (27)$$

where

$$\|\phi\| = \left(\int_{\Gamma} \phi(z) \bar{\phi}(\bar{z}) d\mu_z \right)^{1/2}. \quad (28)$$

Now let $\{\phi^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an orthonormal basis for \mathcal{H} so that

$$\int_{\Gamma} \phi^n(z) \bar{\phi}_m(\bar{z}) d\mu_z = \delta_m^n. \quad (29)$$

We introduce the so-called Bergman kernel on Γ by setting

$$K(z, \bar{w}) = \sum_n \bar{\phi}_n(\bar{w}) \phi^n(z), \quad (30)$$

which is independent of the choice of orthonormal basis. Thus $K(z, \bar{w})$ is holomorphic in z and antiholomorphic in w , and for any holomorphic function $f \in \mathcal{H}$ we evidently have

$$\int_{\Gamma} K(z, \bar{w}) f(w) d\mu_w = f(z). \quad (31)$$

We see therefore that $K(z, \bar{w})$ acts as a Kronecker delta or reproducing kernel on \mathcal{H} . Now consider a smooth curve

$$\gamma : \sigma \in [0, 1] \mapsto w_{\sigma} \in \Gamma. \quad (32)$$

For each value of the parameter σ the function $\psi_{\sigma}(z) = K(z, \bar{w}_{\sigma})$ is holomorphic and square integrable. It follows that ψ_{σ} describes a curve in \mathcal{H} as σ varies, so we can work out the length along γ by use of the Fubini-Study metric:

$$ds^2 = \frac{\int_{\Gamma} d\psi_{\sigma}(z) d\bar{\psi}_{\sigma}(\bar{z}) d\mu_z}{\int_{\Gamma} \psi_{\sigma}(z) \bar{\psi}_{\sigma}(\bar{z}) d\mu_z} - \frac{\left| \int_{\Gamma} d\psi_{\sigma}(z) \bar{\psi}_{\sigma}(\bar{z}) d\mu_z \right|^2}{\left(\int_{\Gamma} \psi_{\sigma}(z) \bar{\psi}_{\sigma}(\bar{z}) d\mu_z \right)^2}. \quad (33)$$

A calculation then shows that

$$ds^2 = \frac{\partial^2 \log K(w, \bar{w})}{\partial w^a \partial \bar{w}^b} dw^a d\bar{w}^b. \quad (34)$$

Thus, the Fubini-Study metric on \mathcal{H} induces a Kähler metric on the Γ . This is the so-called Bergman metric [26]. In the case of the future tube, the Bergman kernel can be worked out explicitly, and hence so can the Bergman metric. We have

$$K(z, \bar{w}) = \left(\frac{2^8 \cdot 3}{\pi^4} \right) \frac{1}{[g_{ab}(z^a - \bar{w}^a)(z^b - \bar{w}^b)]^4}. \quad (35)$$

Substitution of (35) into (34) then gives

$$\frac{\partial^2 \log K(z, \bar{z})}{\partial z^a \partial \bar{z}^b} = h_{ab}, \quad (36)$$

where h_{ab} turns out to be none other than the metric (23) that we introduced earlier using the Kelvin transformation. Since a Bergman metric is fully determined by the complex analytic structure of the underlying domain, it follows that h_{ab} admits the symmetry group of Γ , which is the 15-parameter conformal group of Minkowski space. These phase-space symmetries are generated by Hamiltonian flows on Γ .

V. QUANTUM STATES

Going forward, now let u, v, w, x, y, z denote points of Γ . Having introduced the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of holomorphic functions on Γ we are in a position to build a quantum theory. A general state will be a density matrix $\rho(y, \bar{z}) \in L^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{O}) \times L^2(\Gamma, \bar{\mathcal{O}})$. For such a state, require the following: (a) that $\rho(y, \bar{z}) = \bar{\rho}(\bar{z}, y)$, (b) that $\rho(y, \bar{z})$ should be positive, that is to say

$$\int \bar{\alpha}(\bar{y}) \rho(y, \bar{z}) \alpha(z) d\mu_y d\mu_z \geq 0, \quad (37)$$

for $\alpha(z) \in L^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{O}) \setminus \{0\}$, and (c) that it should have unit trace,

$$\int K(z, \bar{y}) \rho(y, \bar{z}) d\mu_y d\mu_z = \int \rho(z, \bar{z}) d\mu_z = 1. \quad (38)$$

We note, in particular, that $\rho(z, \bar{z})$ takes the form of a normalized density function on the phase space Γ . A state will then be said to be pure if $\rho(y, \bar{z}) = \xi(y) \bar{\xi}(\bar{z})$ for some holomorphic function $\xi \in L^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{O})$ with unit norm.

The interpretation of a density matrix is that it represents *the quantum state of a relativistic event*. Such an event is accompanied by position and momentum data. The fact that wave functions are holomorphic then prohibits the possibility that they can be concentrated with arbitrarily high precision in a given region of phase space. This follows from the fundamental inequality (27). Many aspects of the theory can be understood as being analogous to the Bargmann-Segal construction in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics [27, 28].

VI. QUANTUM MEASUREMENTS

To make sense of the notion of quantum detection in a relativistic setting we need positive operator-valued measures [29–31]. In the present context a POVM can be formed by taking a collection Φ of positive operators $\{\phi_A(y, \bar{z})\}_{A \in \mathcal{B}}$ on phase space labelled by elements of the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma)$ generated by the open subsets of Γ . We require Φ to have the following properties: (a) $\phi_A(y, \bar{z})$ is positive for each $A \in \mathcal{B}$, (b) $\phi_{\Gamma}(y, \bar{z}) = K(y, \bar{z})$, and (c) for any countable collection of disjoint sets $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathcal{B} with union $A = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$ it holds that

$$\phi_A(x, \bar{z}) = \sum_n \phi_{A_n}(x, \bar{z}). \quad (39)$$

We consider now a measurement operation appropriate for determining the location of an event in phase space. The POVM is defined by

$$\phi_A(x, \bar{z}) = \int_{y \in A} K(x, \bar{y}) K(y, \bar{z}) d\mu_y, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}. \quad (40)$$

The recorded outcome of such a measurement will be a measurable set A in phase space: for instance, the detection of a particle in a certain space-time region, accompanied by a four-momentum taking values in a certain range. One can have in mind, for example, the detection of a cosmic ray. By (31) and (40), the probability that the outcome lies in $A \in \mathcal{B}$ is

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \int \phi_A(y, \bar{z}) \rho(z, \bar{y}) d\mu_y d\mu_z = \int_{z \in A} \rho(z, \bar{z}) d\mu_z. \quad (41)$$

We see, in particular, that $\rho(z, \bar{z})$ is the probability density for the outcome, and hence that the expectation value of any measurable function $F : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by the integral

$$\mathbb{E}[F] = \int F(z, \bar{z}) \rho(z, \bar{z}) d\mu_z, \quad (42)$$

which is well-defined providing that $|F|$ is similarly integrable.

Once a measurement has been performed and the outcome recorded, the state of the system changes. To model this we require a state transformation operator of the Krauss type:

$$T_A(u, v, \bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \int_{w \in A} \frac{K(u, \bar{w}) K(v, \bar{w}) K(w, \bar{x}) K(w, \bar{y})}{K(w, \bar{w})} d\mu_w. \quad (43)$$

It can be verified directly that the partial trace of the transformation operator generates the POVM. That is, we have

$$\int T_A(x, y, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) d\mu_y = \phi_A(x, \bar{z}) \quad (44)$$

for each $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Now suppose that the system is initially in the state $\rho_{\text{in}}(y, \bar{v})$. Then after the measurement we find that

$$\rho_{\text{out}}(u, \bar{x}) = \frac{\int T_A(u, v, \bar{x}, \bar{y}) \rho_{\text{in}}(y, \bar{v}) d\mu_v d\mu_y}{\int T_A(z, v, \bar{z}, \bar{y}) \rho_{\text{in}}(y, \bar{v}) d\mu_v d\mu_y d\mu_z}, \quad (45)$$

which represents the transformed state that results when the measurement outcome determines that the phase-space event lies in the set $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Substituting (43) in (45), and making use of the reproducing property (31), we deduce that

$$\rho_{\text{out}}(u, \bar{x}) = \frac{\int_{z \in A} \Psi_z(u, \bar{x}) \rho_{\text{in}}(z, \bar{z}) d\mu_z}{\int_{z \in A} \rho_{\text{in}}(z, \bar{z}) d\mu_z}, \quad (46)$$

where

$$\Psi_z(u, \bar{x}) = \frac{K(u, \bar{z}) K(z, \bar{x})}{K(z, \bar{z})} \quad (47)$$

is the pure state associated with the normalized wave function

$$\psi_z(u) = \frac{K(u, \bar{z})}{[K(z, \bar{z})]^{1/2}}. \quad (48)$$

Then in the limit that the recorded outcome shrinks to a phase-space point, we find that

$$\rho_{\text{out}}(u, \bar{x}) = \Psi_z(u, \bar{x}). \quad (49)$$

In what follows we shall refer to a pure density matrix of the form (47) as an *elementary state* with focus z . When there is no danger of confusion, the same term can be used for a state vector of the form (48). We observe, in particular, that

$$\psi_z(u) = \frac{8\sqrt{3}}{\pi^2} \frac{[g_{ab}(z^a - \bar{z}^a)(z^b - \bar{z}^b)]^2}{[g_{ab}(u^a - \bar{z}^a)(u^b - \bar{z}^b)]^4}. \quad (50)$$

The completeness relation

$$\int_z K(u, \bar{z}) K(z, \bar{x}) d\mu_z = K(u, \bar{x}) \quad (51)$$

then shows that the elementary states are coherent. The term ‘‘elementary state’’ that we have used here comes from an analogous construction in twistor theory that arises quite naturally in connection with the theory of zero rest mass fields [32].

The foregoing analysis shows that when the measurement apparatus detects that an event has taken place in a region A of phase space, the output state will in general be a mixed state, given by the weighted average of the elementary state $\Psi_z(u, \bar{x})$ over $z \in A$ with respect to the renormalized density

$$\rho_A(z, \bar{z}) = \frac{\rho_{\text{in}}(z, \bar{z})}{\int_{y \in A} \rho_{\text{in}}(y, \bar{y}) d\mu_y}. \quad (52)$$

If, however, the record shows a specific phase-space point z as the result, then the output will be the elementary state $|\psi_z\rangle = \psi_z(u)$ parameterized by z . At the other extreme, if the measurement is performed but the outcome is not recorded, then the focus of the elementary state is smeared over the phase space, representing a decoherence effect, and we obtain

$$\rho_{\text{out}}(u, \bar{x}) = \int \Psi_z(u, \bar{x}) \rho_{\text{in}}(z, \bar{z}) d\mu_z, \quad (53)$$

On the matter of the interpretation of the elementary states, it is worth remarking that $\psi_z(u)$ can be thought of as the Fourier transform a positive frequency ‘‘plane wave’’ in real Minkowski space that has been analytically extended into the future tube, but damped in the low-mass regions of phase space. If the Fourier transform of an element $\psi \in L^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{O})$ is defined by

$$\Phi(p^a) = \int_{\Gamma} \exp(ip_a \bar{u}^a) \psi(u^a) d\mu_u, \quad (54)$$

then one can prove that the inverse Fourier map is given by

$$\psi(u^a) = \frac{1}{8\pi^5} \int_{V^+} \exp(-ip_a u^a) [g_{bc} p^b p^c]^2 \Phi(p^a) d^4 p, \quad (55)$$

where the integration is over the interior of the forward cone

$$V^+ = \{p^a : p_a p^a > 0, p^0 > 0\}. \quad (56)$$

A calculation then shows that the Fourier transform of the elementary state $\psi_z(u)$ with focus $z \in \Gamma$ is given by

$$\Phi_z(p^a) = \frac{8\sqrt{3}}{\pi^2} [g_{ab}(z^a - \bar{z}^a)(z^b - \bar{z}^b)]^2 \exp(i\bar{z}_a p^a). \quad (57)$$

Now writing $z^a = x^a - ir^a$ we have $z^a - \bar{z}^a = -2ir^a$, so

$$\Phi_z(p^a) = \frac{2^7 \sqrt{3}}{\pi^2} (g_{ab} r^a r^b)^2 e^{-r_a p^a} e^{ix_a p^a}, \quad (58)$$

showing that as z^a varies the Fourier component $\Phi_z(p^a)$ behaves like a plane wave in Minkowski space that has been extended into the future tube, but is damped exponentially for large r^a . We notice, in particular, that when r^a is large, corresponding to the case where focal point lies in a low-mass region of the relativistic phase space, the damping of the high-energy Fourier components is significant.

VII. PHASE-SPACE LOCALIZATION

With a view to getting a better understanding of the degree of localization in phase space that might be achievable in such a detection problem, let us consider properties of the elementary states in more detail. For each choice of the focal point $z \in \Gamma$, the associated elementary state is represented by the normalized wave function $\psi_z(u)$. Now, if $|\phi\rangle \in L^2(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{O})$ is any other normalized state, we have the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$\langle \psi_z | \phi \rangle \langle \phi | \psi_z \rangle \leq 1. \quad (59)$$

It then follows immediately from (31), (48) and (59) that

$$\phi(z) \bar{\phi}(\bar{z}) \leq K(z, \bar{z}) \quad (60)$$

for all $z \in \Gamma$, which shows that the amplitude of any pure state at a phase-space point z is bounded by the amplitude at z of the elementary state with focus z . One sees that the elementary states are the most sharply peaked states, and that the peak of an elementary state occurs at its focus. It thus makes sense that if the measurement outcome takes the form of a specific point in phase space, then the transformed state should be peaked as much as possible at that point, and hence an elementary state with that peak, as we obtained in (49).

An interesting physical interpretation of the inequality (60) can be deduced if we write $\text{Im}(z^a) = -r^a$ and make use of the phase-space correspondence (20). It follows from (35) that

$$K(z, \bar{z}) = \frac{3}{\pi^4 \hbar^8} (g_{ab} p^a p^b)^4. \quad (61)$$

Then if we let

$$M_z = (g_{ab} p^a p^b)^{1/2} \quad (62)$$

denote the mass associated with the phase-space point z^a , we can write (60) in the form of a localization bound on the probability density. In particular, we obtain

$$\rho(z, \bar{z}) \leq \frac{3}{\pi^4 \hbar^8} M_z^8, \quad (63)$$

which shows that states cannot be localized very sharply in regions of phase space with low mass, but that for higher mass a much greater degree of localization can be achieved.

We can thus think of (63) as a kind of localization theorem for relativistic quantum theory. Suppose that a phase-space event of a relativistic system is characterized by a pure state $\phi(z)$. Then the probability of detecting the event is determined by the normalized density function $\rho(z, \bar{z}) = \phi(z) \bar{\phi}(\bar{z})$. The inequality (63) shows that the maximum value that the density function can take, on the eight-dimensional phase space, is given by $3\pi^{-4} \lambda_z^{-8}$, where λ_z denotes the reduced Compton wavelength associated with the phase-space point z . Now, if an event is detected to have occurred at a specific phase-space point z , then the resulting output wave function will be given by the corresponding elementary state, for which the bound in (63) is saturated. Since the density function $\rho(z, \bar{z})$ has to

integrate to unity over the phase space, one is thus able to conclude that for a system of short Compton wavelength the event will be highly localized in phase space. It follows that we can view the elementary state, which can be regarded as an example of a generalized coherent state in the sense of [33], as representing in some sense the most ‘‘classical’’ type of wave function over the relativistic phase space.

VIII. DISCUSSION

In summary, we have shown that the future tube possesses a phase-space geometry appropriate both for (a) formulation of a consistent Hamiltonian mechanics for relativistic systems, and (b) construction of a quantum theory of space-time events. In particular, the Hilbert space of holomorphic square-integrable functions on the future tube can be interpreted as the pure state space of relativistic quantum mechanics. The resulting structure is rich enough to allow for the development of a manifestly covariant theory of measurement for the detection of phase-space events, including the transformation rule for a quantum state after the measurement, a concept that has hitherto been lacking in relativistic quantum theory. We are also able to gain some understanding of the extent to which relativistic events can be localized.

Acknowledgements. DCB acknowledges support from the Russian Science Foundation, grant 20-11-20226. We thank M. Hoban for helpful discussions.

-
- [1] Dirac, P. A. M. (1958) The theory of gravitation in Hamiltonian form. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **246**, 333-343.
 - [2] Schweber, S. S. (1962) *An Introduction to Relativistic Quantum Field Theory*. New York: Harper and Row.
 - [3] Penrose, R. (1967) Twistor algebra. *J. Math. Phys.* **8**, 345-366.
 - [4] Mackey, G. W. (1963) *The Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. New York: W. A. Benjamin.
 - [5] Nikolov, P. A. & Todorov, I. T. (1982) Space-time versus phase-space approach to relativistic particle dynamics. In *Twistor Geometry and Non-Linear Systems*, H. D. Doebner & T. D. Palev, eds., Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
 - [6] Marsden, J. E., Montgomery, R., Morrison, P. J. & Thompson, W. B. (1986) Covariant Poisson brackets for classical fields. *Ann. Phys.* **169**, 29-47.
 - [7] Sorge, H., Stöcker, H. & Greiner, W. (1989) Poincaré invariant Hamiltonian dynamics: Modelling multi-hadronic interactions in a phase-space approach. *Ann. Phys.* **192**, 266-306.
 - [8] Woodhouse, N. M. J. (1992) *Geometric Quantization*, second edition. Oxford University Press.
 - [9] Currie, D. G. (1963) Interaction contra classical relativistic Hamiltonian particle mechanics. *J. Math. Phys.* **4**, 1470-1488.
 - [10] Kaiser, G. (1977) Phase-space approach to relativistic quantum mechanics. *J. Math. Phys.* **8**, 952-959.
 - [11] Komar, A. (1978) Constraint formalism of classical mechanics. *Phys. Rev. D* **18**, 1881-1886. Interacting relativistic particles. *Ibid.* 1887-1893.
 - [12] Rohrlich, F. (1979) Relativistic Hamiltonian dynamics. I. Classical mechanics. *Ann. Phys.* **117**, 292-322.

- [13] King, M. J. & Rohrlich, F. (1980) Relativistic Hamiltonian dynamics. II. Momentum-dependent interactions, confinement and quantization. *Ann. Phys.* **130**, 350-394.
- [14] Gibbons, G. W. (1992) Typical states and density matrices. *J. Geom. Phys.* **8**, 147-162.
- [15] Hughston, L. P. (1995) Geometric aspects of quantum mechanics. In *Twistor Theory*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics **169**, S. Huggett, ed., New York: Marcel Dekker.
- [16] Ashtekar, A. & Schilling, T. A. (1998) Geometrical formulation of quantum mechanics. In *On Einstein's Path*, A. Harvey, ed., Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- [17] Brody, D. C. & Hughston, L. P. (2001) Geometric quantum mechanics. *J. Geom. Phys.* **38**, 19-53.
- [18] Uhlmann, A. (1963) Remark on the future tube. *Acta Physica Polonica* **24**, 293.
- [19] Kobayashi, S. and Nomizu, K. (1969) *Foundations of Differential Geometry*, Vol. II. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- [20] Uhlmann, A. (1972) Some properties of the future tube. Karl Marx Universität, HEP-7209, 1-14.
- [21] Rühl, W. (1972) Distributions on Minkowski space and their connection with analytic representations of the conformal group. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **27**, 53-86.
- [22] Odziejewicz, A. (1992) Coherent states and geometric quantization. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **150**, 385-413.
- [23] Segreev, A. G. & Vladimirov, V. S. (1994) Complex analysis in the future tube. In *Several Complex Variables II*, G. M. Khenkin & A. G. Vitushkin, eds., New York: Springer.
- [24] Gibbons, G. W. (2000) Holography and the future tube. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17**, 1071-1079.
- [25] Krantz, S. G. (1982) *Function Theory of Several Complex Variables*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- [26] Bergman, S. (1970) *The Kernel Function and Conformal Mapping*. Providence: American Mathematical Society.
- [27] Bargmann, V. (1961) On a Hilbert space of analytic functions and an associated integral transform. *Commun. Pure and Applied Math.* **14**, 187-214.
- [28] Segal, I. E. (1963) *Mathematical Problems of Relativistic Physics*. Providence: American Mathematical Society.
- [29] Davies, E. B. & Lewis, J. T. (1970) An operational approach to quantum probability. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **17**, 239-260.
- [30] Davies, E. B. (1976) *Quantum Theory of Open Systems*. London: Academic Press.
- [31] Holevo, A. S. (1982) *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- [32] Penrose, R. & MacCallum, M. A. H. (1972) Twistor theory: an approach to the quantization of fields and space-time. *Physics Reports*, **16** (4) 241-316.
- [33] Ali, S. T., Antoine, J. P. & Gazeau, J. P. (2014) *Coherent States, Wavelets, and their Generalizations*. New York: Springer.