

COSMOLOGY FROM A NON-PHYSICAL STANDPOINT: AN ALGEBRAIC ANALYSIS

FRED GREENSITE

ABSTRACT. We present a non-physical interpretation of the Cosmological Constant based on a particular algebraic analysis. This also introduces some novel algebraic structures, such as an “anti-wedge” product.

1. INTRODUCTION

Based on independent astronomical observations from the 1990s, it is generally believed that the expansion of the universe is accelerating [1, 2]. Within the formalism of general relativity, this is accommodated by addition of the term $\Lambda g_{\mu\nu}$ to the left-hand-side of the original Einstein equations, where $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the metric tensor of the pseudo-Riemannian spacetime manifold, and the Cosmological Constant Λ has a small positive value with respect to usually applied systems of physical units. The resulting Einstein equations are,

$$(1.1) \quad R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}Rg_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \left(\frac{8\pi G}{c^4}\right) T_{\mu\nu},$$

where $R_{\mu\nu}$ and R are respectively the Ricci curvature tensor and scalar curvature, G is Newton’s gravitational constant, c is the speed of light, and $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the stress-energy tensor. Examining (1.1) in the context of the usual spacetime 4-vector $x^\mu = (ct, x^1, x^2, x^3)$, whose components have physical units of length (so that the metric tensor is devoid of physical units), the curvature expressions on the left-hand-side of (1.1) indicate that Λ has units of length^{-2} (in the preceding, t is the time variable, so that $x^0 \equiv ct$ has physical units of length, as do all other components of x^μ). To emphasize its role as a source of dynamics, $\Lambda g_{\mu\nu}$ is sometimes instead subtracted from the right-hand-side of the original Einstein equations. But a third equivalent presentation is removal of Λ as a coefficient in the new additional term and instead subsuming it within the curvature expressions, initiated by simply dividing both sides of (1.1) by Λ . For example, it can then be incorporated into the default coordinate vector field $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}$ underlying the curvature expressions, so that coordinate vector field becomes $\frac{\partial}{\partial(\sqrt{\Lambda}x^\mu)}$. This third format highlights the fact that a non-vanishing Cosmological Constant renders the Einstein equations unitless.

In other words, for the Einstein equations augmented by the Cosmological Constant, the unitless metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ as an entity varying on the unitless domain with points $\sqrt{\Lambda}x^\mu$, is dependent on the unitless source $\left(\frac{8\pi G}{c^4\Lambda}\right) T_{\mu\nu}$. Of course, the point is that not only do no physical units appear in the equations, but $g_{\mu\nu}$, $\sqrt{\Lambda}x^\mu$, and $\left(\frac{8\pi G}{c^4\Lambda}\right) T_{\mu\nu}$, are not functions of the choice of a system of physical units.

This elimination of all physical units might be viewed as an exoneration of the Pythagorean conception of a purely mathematical essence comprising nature (at

least insofar as gravitation theory is concerned). There seems to be an inexorable historical progression in that direction.

- The experimental analyses of *Galileo* made it possible to talk scientifically about three physical units: those of mass, length, and time.
- With subsequent recognition of the Lorentz covariance of *Maxwell's* equations, those three basic units reduce to two via the universal constant c , e.g., only mass (i.e., energy) and length units remain.
- In the context of the universal constant G first introduced in *Newton's* law of gravitation, those two basic units reduce to one, e.g., only the length unit remains (characterizing the geometric unit system of general relativity).
- Introduction of the (presumably) universal constant Λ , arising from *Einstein's* recognition of an augmented equation set satisfying the general covariance principle, then reduces the number of physical units from one to none.

Together, c, G, Λ scrub the Einstein equations clean of physical units. So, the question arises:

If physical units need not appear in the basic equations of general relativity, why should they appear in the equations of special relativity?

To add perspective, imagine that we instead make the *prior* assumption that physical units are ultimately not fundamental in physics (perhaps something Plato might have liked). Once the Einstein equations are derived in the usual physical way (where the means of satisfying Einstein's general covariance principle is by equating the stress-energy tensor to an expression that is required to be linear in the Riemann tensor and dependent solely on the Riemann tensor and metric tensor), the *prediction* will be that Λ is nonzero, so that physical units are eliminated. Given that general relativity is already based on the (equivalence) principle indicating that gravitational effects are geometrical, the only thing missing from such a non-physical program would be a derivation of the Lorentzian geometry of the spacetime manifold tangent spaces in a manner in which physical units play no part.

To add credence to the prediction that the Einstein equations should be devoid of physical units, it is of interest to present a program wherein physical units *cannot* have a fundamental role in special relativity. This would be effected by deriving the tangent space at each point of the spacetime manifold as a self-contained algebra (mathematically, a tangent space at a point of the spacetime manifold is intrinsically indistinguishable from the space of events in special relativity with respect to a particular origin). Physically, the members of the tangent space must carry the same physical unit(s). But the product of two algebra members would then be attached to the square of the physical unit(s), and so could not map back into the tangent space. Thus, if a spacetime manifold tangent space is a self-contained algebra, physical units must ultimately disappear.

So, suppose we actually take this line of thought seriously. Can we derive the Minkowski spacetime metric in this manner from only the structural components of an inertial observer's physical space as given to us by Euclid, and can anything be learned from that? We intend to answer those questions in the positive, by presenting such a derivation that provides a broader context for considering the emergence/significance of spacetime geometry. More fancifully, the results could

also be considered in the context of currently speculative notions such as “histories exist, rather than time”, or “we are living in a simulation”.

2. A FOUR-DIMENSIONAL SPACETIME ALGEBRA

We will base the derived geometry of spacetime on the given algebra of real numbers \mathbb{R} and imposition of the property of linearity whenever the opportunity arises (\mathbb{R} itself is the very embodiment of linearity through its product and sum operations). An “observer” notes that locally his surrounding “space” seems well modeled by \mathbb{R}^3 (taken to be a linear space, i.e., a vector space), and the fact that the product and sum of \mathbb{R} with \mathbb{R}^3 also seem to have descriptive power. That is, the tensor product $\mathbb{R} \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$, a linear space, models the feature of “scale” through the component-wise product of scalars with points of \mathbb{R}^3 . The direct sum $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^3$, a linear space, allows indexing of serial configurations (trajectories) in his physical space. He also notices that as a linear space, $\mathbb{R}^3 \approx \mathbb{R} \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$ seems to conform to Euclidean geometry (so it is an inner product space). In what follows, we will take $\mathbb{R}^{m,n}$ to be the vector space \mathbb{R}^{m+n} associated with a symmetric bilinear form having signature (m, n) . Thus, the observer finds his physical space to be $\mathbb{R}^{3,0}$. Given the known geometry of his physical space, the observer is interested in geometry of the augmented space $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ arising from the need to describe trajectories.

Since our program can be placed within the context of Geometric (Clifford) Algebras, we will initially generalize the notation by writing the observer’s physical space $\mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ as $\mathbb{R}^{m,n}$. Following the variant nomenclature commonly used with the latter algebras, we refer to the bilinear form associated with $\mathbb{R}^{m,n}$ as an “inner product”, and thereby consider $\mathbb{R}^{m,n}$ to be an “Inner Product Space”.

We first note that there are three bilinear products underlying the linear space $\mathbb{R}^{m,n}$, these being the field product $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, component-wise multiplication by a scalar, $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$, and the inner product $\mathbb{R}^{m+n} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Linear extrapolation implies a bilinear product “ \bullet ” making $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ an algebra such that for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha + \mathbf{a}) \bullet (\beta + \mathbf{b}) &= \alpha \bullet \beta + \alpha \bullet \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{a} \bullet \beta + \mathbf{a} \bullet \mathbf{b} \\ (2.1) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= [\alpha\beta + \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}] + [\beta\mathbf{a} + \alpha\mathbf{b}] \in \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{m+n}, \end{aligned}$$

where “ \cdot ” is the inner product on $\mathbb{R}^{m,n}$. That is, the three products inherent in $\mathbb{R}^{m,n}$ imply a groupoid structure on $\mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ with a product \bullet such that $\alpha \bullet \beta \equiv \alpha\beta$, $\alpha \bullet \mathbf{b} \equiv \alpha\mathbf{b}$, and $\mathbf{a} \bullet \mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}$. Linear extrapolation of the inherent groupoid product (invocation of the distributive law) makes the vector space $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ a unital algebra with the multiplicative identity $\mathbf{1}$ as simply 1 (this is an abuse of notation, since $\mathbf{1}$ is an algebra element while 1 is a field element; to be precise, in (2.1) the term $(\alpha + \mathbf{a})$ could be instead written as $\mathbf{a} = (\alpha\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{a})$, so that algebra elements are distinguished by the boldface font, and similar comments apply to (3.10) below). When $n = 0$ and $m \geq 2$, the latter is known as a Spin Factor Jordan Algebra [3].

Having derived an algebra associated with spacetime $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ via the product (2.1), we must find the associated inner product to advance our program. There is a compelling way to do this for real finite-dimensional unital algebras with unique element inverses [4], so we have to first show that a Spin Factor Jordan Algebra is such an algebra. It is obviously a real algebra (the associated field is \mathbb{R}), and unital, as noted above. As for having unique element inverses, that is something that has to be established since Spin Factor Jordan algebras are neither associative

or alternative (algebras which always have unique element inverses), being instead power associative.

Despite that, establishing uniqueness of element inverses for a Spin Factor Jordan Algebra is easy. For element $(\alpha + \mathbf{a})$, suppose it has an inverse $(\beta + \mathbf{b})$. Then the expression on the right-hand-side of (2.1) is equal to 1. Thus, $\alpha\beta + \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} = 1$ and $\beta\mathbf{a} + \alpha\mathbf{b} = 0$. Solving these two equations yields the unique inverse $\beta + \mathbf{b} = \frac{\alpha - \mathbf{a}}{\alpha^2 - \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{a}}$. We define the conjugate operation $*$ via $(\alpha + \mathbf{a})^* \equiv (\alpha - \mathbf{a})$. Thus, we have the unique inverse of a unit (i.e., invertible element) in a Spin Factor Jordan Algebra as,

$$(\alpha + \mathbf{a})^{-1} = \frac{(\alpha + \mathbf{a})^*}{\alpha^2 - \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{a}}.$$

So now we proceed to derive the geometry of a Spin Factor Jordan Algebra.

3. THE SPACETIME INNER PRODUCT

Assuming it is even a reasonable task, how does one introduce geometry to an algebra? A more basic task is to identify a “norm” that assigns a real number to each element, from which one can conveniently draw conclusions regarding relative features of the members of the space. Thus, for a real finite-dimensional associative algebras, one can examine how an element acts through its multiplication with all members of the algebra’s vector space of elements. Accordingly, an element x can be viewed as associated with a linear transformation from the algebra to itself. The components of a first element define a parallelepiped which accordingly has a volume as a product of the component absolute values. Multiplication of x with that first element yields a second element whose components define a different volume than that of the first element - and this latter volume is the product of the absolute value of the determinant of the above linear transformation defined by x with the volume of the first element. The (signed) factor by which x augments the volume of a first element, given by the above determinant, is the well-recognized “non-reduced norm” of x . However, the argument in favor of this norm is considerably weakened for the case of not associative algebras, since the collection of linear transformations defined by the algebra elements as above is an associative algebra, while the algebra comprised of the elements themselves is not associative (so there is no algebra homomorphism linking them). Thus, a determinant does not seem to be an appropriate structure to associate with an element of a not associative algebra. There is a way to salvage the situation for power associative algebras, by taking the norm to be the constant term of the minimal polynomial (which remains well defined if the algebra is at least power associative), by analogy with the constant term of the characteristic polynomial in the associative algebra case, which is the determinant [5]. However, we will pursue a different route, which gets to essentially the same place in this application, but in general is a “richer” concept [4].

We begin by deriving inspiration from a means of identifying a norm on a vector space which has not been given the structure of an algebra. For the case of \mathbb{R}^n , this entails identifying a function $\ell : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that encodes features we wish to graft onto \mathbb{R}^n , such as that which attends the (degree-1 positive) homogeneity expressed by $\ell(\alpha s) = \alpha \ell(s)$ for $\alpha > 0$, and the concept of a unit sphere $\{s \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ell(s) = 1\}$ with respect to which, e.g., isotropy can be defined. We might also insist that ℓ be continuously differentiable on relevant domains and have an exterior derivative as

$\nabla\ell(s) \cdot ds$, where $\nabla\ell(s)$ is defined as the ordered n -tuple of coordinate-wise one-dimensional derivatives. Evidently, s and $\nabla\ell(s)$ are both members of \mathbb{R}^n . However, the latter behave very differently if s is replaced by αs . By the Euler Homogeneous Function Theorem, degree-1 positive homogeneity of ℓ implies $s \cdot \nabla\ell(s) = \ell(s)$. For $\alpha > 0$, replacing s by αs then leads to $\alpha s \cdot \nabla\ell(\alpha s) = \ell(\alpha s) = \alpha\ell(s) = \alpha s \cdot \nabla\ell(s)$, implying $\nabla\ell(\alpha s) = \nabla\ell(s)$ (where $\nabla\ell(\alpha s)$ means that $\nabla\ell$ is evaluated at αs). On the other hand, for degree-1 positive homogeneous ℓ , the expressions s and $\ell(s)\nabla\ell(s)$ *do* behave the same way when s is replaced by αs (each expression simply being multiplied by α). So a “simplest” candidate for ℓ presents itself as the solution to,

$$(3.1) \quad s = \ell(s)\nabla\ell(s),$$

under the constraint,

$$(3.2) \quad \ell(\nabla\ell(s)) = 1,$$

since satisfaction of (3.2) is a necessary condition for a nonnegative solution of (3.1) to be degree-1 positive homogenous (e.g., apply ℓ to both sides of (3.1)). It is easily shown that $\ell(s)$ is then the Euclidean norm.

But without unduly compromising the simplicity of the rationale, we could alternatively propose

$$(3.3) \quad Ls = \ell(s)\nabla\ell(s),$$

for a linear transformation $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, since we would still have Ls and $\ell(s)\nabla\ell(s)$ behaving the same when s is replaced by αs , $\alpha > 0$. L must be self-adjoint since Ls is a gradient (i.e., the right-hand-side of (3.3) is equal to $\frac{1}{2}\nabla\ell^2(s)$). Applying the dot product with s to both sides of (3.3), the Euler Homogeneous Function Theorem then implies

$$(3.4) \quad s'Ls = s \cdot Ls = \ell^2(s).$$

Hence, L must be positive semi-definite. From the Polarization Identity, it is seen that the above leads to arbitrary inner product spaces on \mathbb{R}^n .

So now we consider the case where vector space \mathbb{R}^n is endowed with the additional structure of a unital associative algebra. In this setting there is already a compelling rationale for the traditional non-reduced norm as the determinant of an element's image under the left regular representation (which is what was being referred to in the first paragraph of this section). Nevertheless, one can alternatively speculate how the “vector space norm treatment” of the prior paragraphs can incorporate the new opportunity for an element's inverse to influence construction of a “norm-like” real function $\mathcal{U}(s)$ on the units of the algebra (something not explicitly addressed by the non-reduced norm). Proceeding as before, one recognizes that s^{-1} and $\nabla\mathcal{U}(s)$ are members of \mathbb{R}^n , and for $\alpha > 0$ we have $\nabla\mathcal{U}(\alpha s) = \nabla\mathcal{U}(s)$ if degree-1 positive homogeneity is again mandated. While the expressions s^{-1} and $\nabla\mathcal{U}(s)$ thereby behave differently when αs replaces s , this time it is s^{-1} and $\frac{\nabla\mathcal{U}(s)}{\mathcal{U}(s)}$ that behave the same under that replacement, in that both expressions are simply multiplied by $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ - analogous to the situation in the prior paragraph. So now, based on the treatment applied in the paragraph before last, we might be tempted to equate s^{-1} and $\frac{\nabla\mathcal{U}(s)}{\mathcal{U}(s)}$ - except that the latter is the gradient of $\log\mathcal{U}(s)$, while s^{-1} is in general not a gradient. That problem resolves if we can find a linear transformation L such that Ls^{-1} is a gradient, i.e., satisfies the exterior derivative condition,

$$(3.5) \quad d([Ls^{-1}] \cdot ds) = d((ds)'Ls^{-1}) = 0.$$

But there is also the Euler Homogeneous Function Theorem to deal with, wherein $\frac{s \cdot \nabla \mathcal{U}(s)}{\mathcal{U}(s)} = 1$. Denoting the multiplicative identity of the algebra as $\mathbf{1}$, we can define $\|\mathbf{1}\|^2$ to be the number of independent entries on the main diagonal of the matrices comprising the left regular representation of the algebra. We are free to constrain L by the requirement that $\mathbf{1} \cdot (L\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}'L\mathbf{1} = \|\mathbf{1}\|^2$. It follows that we can now propose,

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{\nabla \mathcal{U}(s)}{\mathcal{U}(s)} = \frac{Ls^{-1}}{\|\mathbf{1}\|^2},$$

if L satisfies both (3.5) and

$$(3.7) \quad s \cdot Ls^{-1} = s'Ls^{-1} = \|\mathbf{1}\|^2,$$

since constraint (3.7) is a necessary condition for a solution of (3.6) to be degree-1 positive homogeneous (e.g., take the dot product of both sides of (3.6) with s). Since (3.7) must hold if s is replaced by s^{-1} as both are units, we expect L to be self-adjoint.

Note that (3.6) is analogous to (3.3), and (3.7) is analogous to (3.4). Indeed, L is akin to an inner product matrix, but *an important feature in this algebra setting compared to the earlier "naked" vector space setting is that L need not be positive semi-definite*. And, if L satisfying (3.5) and (3.7) can be found, then one can provide degree-1 positive homogeneous $\mathcal{U}(s)$ by integrating (3.6), at least in some simply connected neighborhood of $\mathbf{1}$. That is, mandating $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{1}) = 1$, we have $\mathcal{U}(s) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{1}\|^2} \int_{\mathbf{1}}^s [Lt^{-1}] \cdot dt\right)$, where the integral is path-independent due to (3.5), and self-adjoint L must satisfy (3.7) due to the homogeneity requirement.

$\mathcal{U}(s)$ is called an (incomplete) Unital Norm. Self-adjoint L satisfying (3.5), but not necessarily (3.7), is called a Proto-norm. Since L can be considered an inner product matrix, (3.7) can be viewed as a condition mandating that the multiplicative inverses s, s^{-1} in their role as vector space members also act inversely with respect to the metric L .

Lest it be thought that there is something eccentric about this particular identification of a norm with an algebra, we can first note that for real finite-dimensional unital associative algebras a non-empty family of Unital Norms always exists and always contains a member essentially equivalent to the non-reduced norm (apart from some exponents). For the not associative higher-dimensional Cayley-Dixon Algebras and all of the Spin-factor Jordan Algebras, there is only one Unital Norm associated with each algebra, and for these two classes the Unital Norm is given by the Euclidean norm and Minkowski norm, respectively. For the case of associative algebras, the characterizations provided by Proto-norms and Unital Norms is formalized by a particular functor linking the category of such algebras and a category of Proto-norms. This program is explored in detail in [4].

For the Spin Factor Jordan Algebra on the spacetime vector space $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ introduced in Section 2, the multiplicative identity is 1, so we can take $\|\mathbf{1}\|^2 = 1$. It is easy to show that the only L satisfying (3.5) and (3.7) for this algebra is the conjugate operation, i.e. for $s = \sigma + \mathbf{s}$, this is $s^* = (\sigma + \mathbf{s})^* \equiv \sigma - \mathbf{s}$. Integrating (3.6) then produces the (incomplete) Unital Norm,

$$(3.8) \quad \mathcal{U}(\sigma + \mathbf{s}) = \sqrt{\sigma^2 - \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{s}} = \sqrt{(\sigma + \mathbf{s}) \bullet (\sigma + \mathbf{s})^*},$$

valid in a some simply connected neighborhood of $\mathbf{1}$ (and this is easily extended to the whole space as in [4]). A norm defines an invariant on the space, and so does its square. The square of the right-hand-side of (3.8) is a quadratic form, which then supplies another invariant on the space by the Polarization Identity, yielding the inner product,

$$(3.9) \quad \langle \alpha + \mathbf{a}, \beta + \mathbf{b} \rangle = \frac{(\alpha + \mathbf{a}) \bullet (\beta + \mathbf{b})^* + (\beta + \mathbf{b}) \bullet (\alpha + \mathbf{a})^*}{2} = \alpha\beta - \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}.$$

Thus, the Lorentzian geometry of spacetime is derived.

It is worthwhile comparing the above with other algebraic formulations of Relativity. We begin with the observation that an additional algebra on $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ can be generated that is closely allied with the Spin Factor Jordan Algebra, but for which the algebra product is the sum of a symmetric bilinear form (given by (3.9)) and an antisymmetric bilinear product. This is accomplished by defining a new algebra product “ \circ ” as,

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} (\alpha + \mathbf{a}) \circ (\beta + \mathbf{b}) &\equiv (\alpha + \mathbf{a}) \bullet (\beta + \mathbf{b})^* \\ &= [\alpha\beta - \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}] + [\beta\mathbf{a} - \alpha\mathbf{b}] \in \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^3. \end{aligned}$$

As demonstrated later, the algebra defined by (3.10) can be shown to arise in the context of the Geometric Algebra generated by $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$. Also, it is easily appreciated that this is not a unital algebra. The only candidate for the multiplicative identity would be $\mathbf{1}$ (i.e., $\alpha = 1, \mathbf{a} = 0$). This is indeed a right identity, but is not a left identity. This algebra is further explored in Section 4. [N.B. Similar to comments immediately following (2.1), there is significant abuse of notation here. To be precise, $(\alpha + \mathbf{a})$ in (3.10) could be replaced by $\mathbf{a} = (\alpha\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{a})$, etc., where $\mathbf{1}$ is an algebra element that is also the multiplicative identity on the subalgebra isomorphic to \mathbb{R} . It is $\mathbf{1}$ that is a right identity and not a left identity on this non-unital algebra.]

Having now brought up the subject of Geometric Algebras, it is notable that for the spacetime case the relevant Geometric Algebra is generated by $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, which is known as the Spacetime Algebra (STA) [6]. The Geometric Algebra generated by $\mathbb{R}^{3,0}$, which is the even subalgebra of STA, is also of interest, and known as the Algebra of Physical Space [7]. APS and STA each provide an environment suitable for framing relativistic physics. Although STA assumes Lorentzian 4-space geometry, APS does not, so APS can also be thought of as containing an implicit mathematical derivation of the Minkowski inner product on the subspace of paravectors $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ (which is the vector space of elements of the relevant Spin Factor Jordan Algebra). But for that implicit derivation to be possible in the APS context, it must be assumed *a priori* that physical units attached to \mathbb{R} (time) and \mathbb{R}^3 (physical space) be the same - for otherwise application of an “isometry” will in general cause the time components of paravectors to acquire mixed “time + space” units without evident physical meaning (thereby precluding isometries). However, a single remaining spacetime physical unit can still pertain, because of the existence of multivectors.

In contrast, the above derivation of geometry on $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ using the Spin Factor Jordan Algebra makes the even more radical assumption that the relevant physical units can be replaced by the mathematical unit 1. This program proceeds from the notion that \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^3 should be multiplied together (as a tensor product) and added together (as a direct sum) to provide the environment for linearly scaling space and linearly indexing trajectories. The means of identifying geometry on the direct sum

is entirely based on generating a self-contained algebra on it - accomplished by linear extrapolation of the groupoid inherent in $\mathbb{R}^{3,0}$. But the three constituent product operations that are part of the definition of $\mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ could not produce a groupoid if the members of $\mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ are attached to physical units. This is because the field of scalars \mathbb{R} must be inherently devoid of physical units (its members only scale), while the product of a member of $\mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ attached to a physical unit with another member of $\mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ attached to a physical unit must map to something attached to the square of the physical unit - and thus cannot map into the field of scalars. Thus, the groupoid could not exist. It follows that physical interpretation and associated physical implications of this program require that the relevant physical unit be replaceable with the mathematical unit 1.

However, this prior assertion that the physical units of time and space can be replaced by the mathematical unit is a very sound assumption. Equivalently, this assumption first predicts a factor equating physical units of time and space - which of course turns out to be the speed of light c - and secondly posits that the remaining physical unit, e.g., meters, ultimately disappears. And indeed, the exchange of the physical unit of length for the mathematical unit does in fact occur in the gravitational equations (with $\Lambda \neq 0$), as noted in the Introduction.

In summary, inclusion of a nonzero Cosmological Constant leads to a presentation of the Einstein equations in which physical units can be interpreted as being superfluous. This motivates the task of finding a non-physical derivation of Lorentzian geometry, as accomplished in the present section. A bias against non-physical derivations of physical principles is natural, but in our program one is at least left with some novel mathematical notions, particularly new characterizations of real finite-dimensional unital algebras via a certain functor [4]. Furthermore, it is our view that examination of abstract implications of the elimination of physical units is worthwhile in this case, as these include the “prediction” of vacuum curvature.

4. ANTI-GEOMETRIC ALGEBRAS AND SPACETIME

4.1. The anti-wedge product. As intimated in the last section, there is a relationship between the Geometric Algebra generated by $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ (known as the Spacetime Algebra (STA) [6]) and a particular algebra derived from the algebra with product (2.1) - this derived *non-unital* algebra being defined by the product (3.10). Consideration of these algebras in tandem forwards the concepts of an “anti-Geometric Algebra”, an “anti-wedge product”, and the structure of the system defined by “the observer and the observed”. That is the subject of this section.

In dealing with STA, one chooses grade-1 elements γ_μ with $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ (i.e., members of $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$) such that $\gamma_\mu\gamma_\nu = -\gamma_\nu\gamma_\mu$ for $\mu \neq \nu$, where $\gamma_0^2 = 1$ and $\gamma_i^2 = -1$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. These conditions specify that $\{\gamma_\mu\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, due to the Geometric Algebra feature that the symmetric component of the (geometric) product of grade-1 elements is their inner product in $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ - so that the inner product of any two of the particular grade-1 elements above is $\frac{\gamma_\mu\gamma_\nu + \gamma_\nu\gamma_\mu}{2} = \pm\delta_{\mu\nu}$. A grade-1 element of STA is notated as, e.g., $a = a^\mu\gamma_\mu$, and we will use the boldface font to represent elements spanned by $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$, i.e., $\mathbf{a} = a^i\gamma_i$, where the repeated index summation convention is understood in both cases.

In the nomenclature of [6], the STA element γ_0 is the “observer”, and one then has the “spacetime split” determined by the members of $P \equiv \{p\gamma_0 : p \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3}\}$. P is

isomorphic to the inner product space on $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ as derived from the Spin Factor Jordan Algebra via (2.1) and (3.8), since $\{\gamma_i \gamma_0\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{R}^{3,0}$. That is, using $\gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu = -\gamma_\nu \gamma_\mu$ for $\mu \neq \nu$, and associativity of the geometric product, we obtain

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{(\gamma_i \gamma_0)(\gamma_j \gamma_0) + (\gamma_j \gamma_0)(\gamma_i \gamma_0)}{2} = - \left(\frac{\gamma_i \gamma_j + \gamma_j \gamma_i}{2} \right),$$

where the parenthetical expression on the right-hand-side is the given inner product of basis elements on $\mathbb{R}^{0,3} \subset \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$. Indeed, $\{\gamma_i \gamma_0\}$ generates the even subalgebra of STA, whose space of grade-1 elements is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ - due to the negative sign attached to the parenthetical (ultimately, inner product) expression on the right-hand-side of (4.1).

As a sum of grade-0 and grade-2 elements of STA, the members of P are subject to the STA product (notated by element juxtaposition). But there are two other interesting products on the vector space of members of P . The first comes from an important observation in STA, which is that for any grade-1 element a , associativity of this Geometric Algebra implies $(a\gamma_0)(\gamma_0 a) = a^2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Since the latter product is a scalar independent of whichever algebra element with unit square is selected as observer γ_0 , it defines the isometries of P . Accordingly, the ‘‘spatial reverse’’ involution, $(a\gamma_0)^* \equiv \gamma_0 a$, is analogous to the conjugate operation in the Spin Factor Jordan Algebra. For a, b grade-1 elements of STA, we have this first interesting product as

$$(4.2) \quad (a\gamma_0) \star (b\gamma_0) \equiv (a\gamma_0)(b\gamma_0)^* = ab = \langle a, b \rangle + a \wedge b,$$

where the right-hand-side is expression of the (geometric) product of STA grade-1 elements as the sum of the $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ -inner product and the wedge product. The second interesting product on P comes from the orthogonal projection of the above geometric product to P ,

$$(4.3) \quad (a\gamma_0) \circ (b\gamma_0) \equiv ab - \mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{b} = \langle a, b \rangle + a \wedge b - \mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{b}.$$

It is easily shown that ‘‘ \circ ’’ makes vector space P an algebra. We can also observe that this algebra is isomorphic to the algebra on $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ defined by (3.10). That is, the symmetric component of the product \circ is a symmetric bilinear form, which we can denote by

$$(4.4) \quad \langle a\gamma_0, b\gamma_0 \rangle \equiv \langle a, b \rangle,$$

where (in this abuse of notation) it is obvious from the context that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on the left-hand-side refers to the symmetric bilinear form on P (comparable to (3.9)), and on the right-hand-side it refers to the inner product on $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$. According to (4.3), the antisymmetric component of \circ is,

$$(4.5) \quad (a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0) \equiv a \wedge b - \mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{b} = a^0 \gamma_0 \wedge \mathbf{b} - b^0 \gamma_0 \wedge \mathbf{a} = b^0 \mathbf{a} \gamma_0 - a^0 \mathbf{b} \gamma_0.$$

Thus,

$$(a\gamma_0) \circ (b\gamma_0) = \langle a\gamma_0, b\gamma_0 \rangle + b^0 \mathbf{a} \gamma_0 - a^0 \mathbf{b} \gamma_0,$$

from which the isomorphism between the algebra on vector space P with product \circ and the algebra defined by (3.10) is evident.

Putting all this together, we have the geometric product of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ versus the algebra product \circ of paravectors in $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$, as given by the respective

$$(4.6) \quad ab = \langle a, b \rangle + a \wedge b,$$

$$(4.7) \quad (a\gamma_0) \circ (b\gamma_0) = \langle a\gamma_0, b\gamma_0 \rangle + (a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0).$$

The above equations on the respective spaces $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ and $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ are tightly linked via (4.4) and (4.5). Referring to the algebra on P with product \circ as an “anti-Geometric Algebra” is then justified by the following:

- A Geometric Algebra product of vectors is the sum of a symmetric bilinear form and an antisymmetric bilinear product (4.6), as is an anti-Geometric Algebra product of paravectors (4.7).
- Subject to their respective product operations,
 - a Geometric Algebra is “maximally free” in that the product of a vector (grade-1 element) with itself is given by the inner product, but products are otherwise entirely unconstrained in a tensor algebra sense,
 - an anti-Geometric Algebra is “maximally constrained” in that the product of *any* two vectors is their inner product, so that the product of paravectors remains in the space of paravectors.
- The antisymmetric component of a Geometric Algebra product of vectors (\wedge) has an interpretation as an integral, while the antisymmetric component of an anti-Geometric Algebra product of paravectors (\vee) has an interpretation as a differential (“the boundary of $a \wedge b$ as seen by observer γ_0 ”).

Consistent with the above, we will refer to \vee as the “anti-wedge product”.

It is relevant to observe that $P \approx \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ is the subspace of paravectors arising in the Algebra of Physical Space (APS) [7], APS being the Geometric Algebra arising from $\mathbb{R}^{3,0}$. APS is not concerned with making the set of paravectors a self-contained algebra, which (as stated earlier) is an important part of the objective of Section 3 regarding exclusion of a fundamental role for physical units.

Note that according to (4.4), (4.6), (4.7), the inner product relevant to $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ (or its generalization to $\mathbb{R}^{n+1,m}$) can be expressed as either the difference of the anti-Geometric Algebra product and the anti-wedge product, or the difference of the geometric product and wedge product. Since an inner product is the defining geometric invariant, the anti-Geometric Algebra product of paravectors is “like” the Geometric Algebra product of vectors in that they both sequester their noninvariant components in the output of the antisymmetric portion of their products - the nonreal component of their output.

Thus, in $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ there is a Lorentz-invariant geometric product of vectors when the wedge product is zero, and in $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$ there is a Lorentz-invariant product of paravectors when the anti-wedge product is zero. In $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, the 4-volume element $[a \wedge b] \wedge [c \wedge d] = a \wedge b \wedge c \wedge d$ is invariant under proper Lorentz transformations, since it is a pseudoscalar. There are no pseudoscalars in the anti-Geometric Algebra, but $[(a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0)] \vee [(c\gamma_0) \vee (d\gamma_0)]$ is Lorentz-invariant because it is zero (“the boundary of two boundaries is zero”).

While the inner product defines Lorentz invariance, the anti-wedge product is associated with entirely different symmetries. As indicated in the next section, these relate to the conjoined system of the “observer” and the “observed”, as arising in special relativity.

4.2. Symmetries of the system of observer and observed. The notion of an observer is central in special relativity, but so is the idea of the “observed”. The latter is a second inertial frame having some non-zero velocity with respect to the observer. If (as in [6]) we consider the observer to be a particular γ_0 , the observed implies a particular γ_1 multiplied by a scalar speed - representing a boost with respect to the observer. We now consider symmetries of the system defined by choices of γ_0, γ_1 .

First, we examine the boost equations of special relativity with all coordinates expressed in terms of the natural unit resulting from $c = 1$ (the latter equality also pertains when one proceeds from the program of Section 2 or APS). They are,

$$(4.8) \quad w'_0 = \frac{w_0 - v w_1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2}},$$

$$(4.9) \quad w'_1 = \frac{w_1 - v w_0}{\sqrt{1 - v^2}},$$

$$(4.10) \quad w'_2 = w_2,$$

$$(4.11) \quad w'_3 = w_3.$$

The phenomena of time dilation and boost direction length contraction are immediately recognized, but the features that are of particular interest for our present purposes are instead phrased in terms of the symmetries expressed by the equations:

- (1) The time direction and boost direction coordinates are evidently w_0 and w_1 , but one can't tell which is which. We term this the “time-boost direction symmetry”.
- (2) The existence of a boost direction uniquely splits 4-space into orthogonal planes (the $w_0 \times w_1$ -plane and the $w_2 \times w_3$ -plane), whose respective area scaling factors (these factors being the signed areas of the parallelograms given by wedge products of the orthogonal projections of two 4-vectors to each plane) are insensitive to the magnitude of the boost. We term this the “boost magnitude symmetry”.

We will show that these two symmetries, which refer specifically to the observer-observed system $\{\gamma_0, \gamma_1\}$ and are *not* an expression of Lorentz invariance, are precisely mirrored by anti-wedge product symmetries. Note that with respect to the area scaling factor pertinent to w_0 and w_1 , an interchange of the time and boost component values leads to an antisymmetry (i.e., a change in sign of the area scaling factor).

The time-boost direction symmetry refers to the special interest of a transformation defined by exchange of the coordinate values of the time direction and boost direction components.

Definition 4.1. For a spacetime vector a , its *time-boost reflection* \hat{a} is the vector resulting from interchange of the time direction and boost direction component values.

The boost magnitude symmetry, relating to the boost-generated splitting of 4-space, inspires

Definition 4.2. For a spatial vector $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^{3,0}$, the component parallel to the boost direction is \mathbf{s}_{\parallel} and the component normal to the boost direction is \mathbf{s}_{\perp} . The expression $\mathbf{s}_{\parallel} + \mathbf{s}_{\perp}$ is the *boost decomposition* of \mathbf{s} .

The above two definitions are used to describe the invariance structure of the anti-wedge product as an expression of the time-boost direction and boost magnitude symmetries.

The anti-wedge product of spacetime vectors yields a spatial vector, so this product has a boost decomposition. The fact that boost equations (4.8) through (4.11) are unchanged under a time-boost reflection motivates us to examine the two boost decompositions,

$$\begin{aligned}(a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0) &= [(a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0)]_{\parallel} + [(a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0)]_{\perp}, \\ (\hat{a}\gamma_0) \vee (\hat{b}\gamma_0) &= [(\hat{a}\gamma_0) \vee (\hat{b}\gamma_0)]_{\parallel} + [(\hat{a}\gamma_0) \vee (\hat{b}\gamma_0)]_{\perp}.\end{aligned}$$

It turns out that the first summand on the right-hand-side of each of the two equations above, and the wedge product of the second summands with each other, are each antisymmetric under application of the time-boost reflection, and have magnitudes that are invariant under the boost.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\{\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3\}$ be grade-1 elements of STA as defined in the second paragraph of Section 8.1, but with γ_1 identified as the boost direction. Denote $\mathcal{A}_{0,1}(a, b)$ as the area-scaling factor of the $(\gamma_0 \times \gamma_1)$ -plane and $\mathcal{A}_{2,3}(a, b)$ as the area-scaling factor of the $(\gamma_2 \times \gamma_3)$ -plane, i.e., the latter factors are the respective signed areas of the parallelograms determined by the wedge products of orthogonal projections of $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ to those planes. Then,*

$$[(a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0)]_{\parallel} = -[(\hat{a}\gamma_0) \vee (\hat{b}\gamma_0)]_{\parallel} = \mathcal{A}_{0,1}(a, b) \gamma_1,$$

where the equated expressions are antisymmetric under application of the time-boost reflection and their magnitudes are invariant under the boost, and

$$[(a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0)]_{\perp} \wedge [(\hat{a}\gamma_0) \vee (\hat{b}\gamma_0)]_{\perp} = [\mathcal{A}_{0,1}(a, b)\mathcal{A}_{2,3}(a, b)] \gamma_2 \wedge \gamma_3,$$

where the equated expressions are antisymmetric under application of the time-boost reflection and invariant under the boost.

Proof. With respect to the given basis, we can write $a = a_{\tau}\gamma_0 + a_x\gamma_1 + a_y\gamma_2 + a_z\gamma_3$ and $b = b_{\tau}\gamma_0 + b_x\gamma_1 + b_y\gamma_2 + b_z\gamma_3$. Using the basis elements, the wedge product $a \wedge b$ has six components, each being a determinant attached to a bivector,

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned}-a \wedge b &= \begin{vmatrix} b_{\tau} & b_x \\ a_{\tau} & a_x \end{vmatrix} \gamma_0 \wedge \gamma_1 + \begin{vmatrix} b_{\tau} & b_y \\ a_{\tau} & a_y \end{vmatrix} \gamma_0 \wedge \gamma_2 + \begin{vmatrix} b_{\tau} & b_z \\ a_{\tau} & a_z \end{vmatrix} \gamma_0 \wedge \gamma_3 \\ &+ \begin{vmatrix} b_x & b_y \\ a_x & a_y \end{vmatrix} \gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_2 + \begin{vmatrix} b_x & b_z \\ a_x & a_z \end{vmatrix} \gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_3 + \begin{vmatrix} b_y & b_z \\ a_y & a_z \end{vmatrix} \gamma_2 \wedge \gamma_3.\end{aligned}$$

From the antisymmetry and associativity of a wedge product of vectors, we have $(a \wedge b) \wedge (a \wedge b) = 0$. Using the distributive property to formally expand $(a \wedge b) \wedge (a \wedge b)$ with respect to the above basis, we obtain a linear combination of thirty-six terms of the form $\gamma_i \wedge \gamma_j \wedge \gamma_k \wedge \gamma_{\ell}$, but any term for which two of the indices i, j, k, ℓ are the same is a zero term. Rearranging the individually nonzero remaining terms

(there would be no such terms if instead $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^3$), we obtain

$$(4.13) \quad (a \wedge b) \wedge (a \wedge b) = 2 \left(\begin{array}{c} \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_\tau & b_x \\ a_\tau & a_x \end{array} \right| \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_y & b_z \\ a_y & a_z \end{array} \right| - \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_\tau & b_y \\ a_\tau & a_y \end{array} \right| \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_x & b_z \\ a_x & a_z \end{array} \right| \\ + \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_\tau & b_z \\ a_\tau & a_z \end{array} \right| \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_x & b_y \\ a_x & a_y \end{array} \right| \end{array} \right) \gamma_0 \wedge \gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_2 \wedge \gamma_3$$

$$(4.14) \quad = 0.$$

Of course, one can also verify (4.14) by simply multiplying out the terms in the parenthesis on the right-hand-side of (4.13).

As defined by (4.5), we have the anti-wedge products,

$$(4.15) \quad (a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0) = \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_\tau & b_x \\ a_\tau & a_x \end{array} \right| \gamma_1 + \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_\tau & b_y \\ a_\tau & a_y \end{array} \right| \gamma_2 + \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_\tau & b_z \\ a_\tau & a_z \end{array} \right| \gamma_3,$$

$$(4.16) \quad (\hat{a}\gamma_0) \vee (\hat{b}\gamma_0) = \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_x & b_\tau \\ a_x & a_\tau \end{array} \right| \gamma_1 + \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_x & b_y \\ a_x & a_y \end{array} \right| \gamma_2 + \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_x & b_z \\ a_x & a_z \end{array} \right| \gamma_3.$$

The anti-wedge product components parallel to the boost direction, $[(a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0)]_{\parallel}$ and $[(\hat{a}\gamma_0) \vee (\hat{b}\gamma_0)]_{\parallel}$, are respectively equal to the γ_1 -components on the right-hand-sides of (4.15) and (4.16), and are evidently unchanged under a time-boost reflection apart from a change in sign (antisymmetry). Their component values as determined from their 2×2 determinant coefficients are equal to the signed area of the parallelogram defined by the orthogonal projection of the vectors a, b to the $(\gamma_0 \times \gamma_1)$ -plane, i.e., $\pm \mathcal{A}_{0,1}(a, b)$. In the context of a boost, there are four admissible choices for identifying the subscripts 0, 1, 2, 3 of the orthonormal basis elements $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ with the subscripts 0, 1, 2, 3 in equations (4.8) through (4.11) (that indicate component values attached to respective basis elements). That is, the subscripts 0, 1, 2, 3 in (4.8) through (4.11) can correspond to component values respectively attached to the basis elements $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$, or $\gamma_1, \gamma_0, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$, or $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_3, \gamma_2$, or $\gamma_1, \gamma_0, \gamma_3, \gamma_2$. For any of these choices, the (equal) magnitudes of $[(a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0)]_{\parallel}$ and $[(\hat{a}\gamma_0) \vee (\hat{b}\gamma_0)]_{\parallel}$ as given by the absolute values of the relevant 2×2 determinants, are seen to be invariant under application of a boost.

Equations (4.15) and (4.16) combined with the identity embedded in (4.14) imply,

$$(4.17) \quad [(a\gamma_0) \vee (b\gamma_0)]_{\perp} \wedge [(\hat{a}\gamma_0) \vee (\hat{b}\gamma_0)]_{\perp}$$

$$= \left(\begin{array}{c} \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_\tau & b_y \\ a_\tau & a_y \end{array} \right| \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_x & b_z \\ a_x & a_z \end{array} \right| - \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_\tau & b_z \\ a_\tau & a_z \end{array} \right| \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_x & b_y \\ a_x & a_y \end{array} \right| \end{array} \right) \gamma_2 \wedge \gamma_3$$

$$= \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_\tau & b_x \\ a_\tau & a_x \end{array} \right| \left| \begin{array}{cc} b_y & b_z \\ a_y & a_z \end{array} \right| \gamma_2 \wedge \gamma_3,$$

where the determinants on the right-hand-side of (4.17) are the signed areas of the parallelograms determined by orthogonal projections of a, b to the $(\gamma_0 \times \gamma_1)$ -plane and the $(\gamma_2 \times \gamma_3)$ -plane - which are $\mathcal{A}_{0,1}(a, b)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{2,3}(a, b)$, respectively. It is thus evident that the left-hand-side of (4.17) is invariant under a time-boost reflection apart from a change in sign (antisymmetry). Again making admissible choices for the identification of subscripts of $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ with subscripts in equations (4.8)

through (4.11), and applying those boost equations to the right-hand-side of (4.17), it is verified that the left-hand-side of (4.17) is invariant to the boost. \square

Definition 4.2 along with (4.15), (4.16), indicate that $[(a\gamma_0)\vee(b\gamma_0)]_{\perp}$ and $[(\hat{a}\gamma_0)\vee(\hat{b}\gamma_0)]_{\perp}$ each mix up the γ_0 or γ_1 components with the other two components of $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ - but neither of these expressions exhibit either the time-boost direction or boost magnitude symmetries. It is thus remarkable that these mixtures are thoroughly undone via their wedge product (4.17), which in the process creates an entity that *does* exhibit both symmetries.

REFERENCES

- [1] Riess AG, *et al.* (1998) Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a Cosmological Constant. *Astronomical Journal* 116:1009-1038.
- [2] Perlmutter S *et al.* (1999) Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 high-redshift supernovae. *Astrophysical Journal* 517:565-586.
- [3] McCrimmon K (2004) *A taste of Jordan algebras*, Springer, New York.
- [4] Greensite, FS (2022), Novel characterizations of real finite-dimensional unital algebras, arXiv:2207.11358
- [5] Jacobson N (1963) Generic norm of an algebra, *Osaka mathematics Journal*, 15(1):25-50.
- [6] Hestenes D (2003) *Physics with Geometric Algebra*. *American Journal of Physics* 71:691-714.
- [7] Baylis W, Jones G (1989) The Pauli Algebra approach to Special Relativity. *Journal of Physics* A22:1-16.