

Spacetime might not be doomed after all

Olivier Minazzoli*

Artemis, Université Côte d'Azur, CNRS, Observatoire Côte d'Azur, BP4229, 06304, Nice Cedex 4, France

Popular wisdom amongst theoretical physicists says that spacetime is probably not a fundamental entity of nature, but rather an emergent one. While most arguments to support that view arise from very speculative ideas (usually related to attempts to understand gravity at the quantum level), the argument can also be made by only invoking standard physics. In this manuscript, I shall argue that a novel theory of relativity—which simply follows the three basic principles that Einstein invoked as the building blocks of his theory of general relativity—might change the deal.

Essay written for the Gravity Research Foundation 2021 Awards for Essays on Gravitation.

January 5, 2022

There is a growing rumor amongst theoretical physicists that spacetime cannot be fundamental after all, and that it probably actually emerges from more elementary constituents that are yet to be theorized. Some even say, with striking confidence, that spacetime is *doomed*. Indeed, although most arguments against the fundamental nature of spacetime seem to arise from very speculative areas of theoretical physics, it is possible to get to that same conclusion—or, at least, to argue in that direction—from well-established physics: either from pure general relativity, with Penrose's celebrated theorem on black hole singularities; or from Heisenberg's principle in conjunction with general relativity.

Penrose's theorem basically implies that within our current paradigm of elementary physics (general relativity and the standard model of particle physics, sometimes referred to as the *core theory*), a black hole must contain a singularity [1], that is, a kind of *hole* within the very fabric of spacetime. Indeed, if spacetime itself breaks down when following the rules of general relativity, it is tempting to argue that there must be something more elementary than spacetime, hidden underneath its apparent smoothness. Some may even argue that the existence—or absence of existence—of spacetime singularities ought to be related to quantum effects associated to gravity at high curvature. Of course, this may not be the case, but Penrose's theorem can clearly be taken as circumstantial evidence against the fundamental spatio-temporal description of *events* in our universe—provided one considers that our universe indeed extends beyond the event horizon of a black hole.

Another, arguably even stronger, piece of circumstantial evidence for the non-elementary nature of spacetime comes from the minimal assumption that Heisenberg's principle and general relativity are both always correct [2]. Indeed, assuming that general relativity is correct, and that Heisenberg's principle applies in all circumstances, there seems to be no operational way for the

notion of spacetime to make sense beyond the Planck scale. Indeed, Heisenberg's principle implies that the amount of energy required to probe scales beyond the Planck scale would necessarily lead to the formation of a black hole—whose internal volume cannot by definition be probed. As Freeman Dyson puts it: “It appears that Nature conspires to forbid any measurement of distance with error smaller than the Planck length” [2].

Now, I shall argue that both (strong) circumstantial pieces of evidence might simply go away when one considers that general relativity is only a limiting case of the recently proposed theory of entangled relativity [3–5]. Unlike many alternatives to general relativity, entangled relativity does not assume any new ingredient with respect to general relativity: for instance, spacetime is described by a four-dimensional manifold, the metric tensor encodes the mechanical properties of space as well as the inertia of bodies and gravitation, and its curvature is generated by matter fields. However, unlike general relativity, entangled relativity cannot be defined without defining matter fields at the same time (both force and substance). Therefore, unlike general relativity, entangled relativity satisfies the last of Einstein's three original demands for an acceptable theory of relativity, which he named *Mach's Principle* [6]—in the sense that, unlike in general relativity, inertia cannot be defined *ex nihilo* in entangled relativity. This can be achieved if one does not assume a simple additive coupling at the level of the action between spacetime curvature and matter fields, but rather a pure multiplicative coupling instead: $R + 2\kappa\mathcal{L}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_m^2/R$. What is remarkable with the action of entangled relativity, for our purpose, is that it does not assume any coupling constant between matter and curvature. In other words, Newton's constant G , which appears in κ in general relativity has no equivalent in entangled relativity. But the very existence of this constant (and the related Planck constant) and its specific sign is a necessary condition for the previously mentioned arguments against the fundamental nature of spacetime. Indeed, Penrose's theorem for the formation of singularities inside black holes notably requires that gravity is attractive ($G > 0$) [7], whereas the argument

* ominazzoli@gmail.com

based on Heisenberg’s principle requires that the size of a back-hole is always proportional to the product of the energy within its volume times a constant (G). But in entangled relativity, the dynamical coupling that replaces G in the metric field equation is neither constant nor necessarily positive everywhere. Meaning that entangled relativity stands right in the middle of a loophole for both arguments against the elementary nature of spacetime.

In entangled relativity, the effective value of κ at a given location in spacetime is proportional to an effective scalar degree of freedom of the theory such that $\kappa = -R/\mathcal{L}_m$ [4], where \mathcal{L}_m is the *on-shell* value of material Lagrangian—that is, the value that it takes when one considers the actual solutions of all the field equations. But the sign of \mathcal{L}_m may differ in low versus high energy contexts. Indeed, assuming that the Lagrangian for matter fields is still equal to the kinetic energy minus the potential energy at a fundamental level, one can expect that the sign that \mathcal{L}_m takes on-shell should be the opposite in either situation, since in one case kinetic energy should dominate (high energy), whereas potential energy should dominate in the other (low energy). This gives at least one way for the sign of κ to flip at high enough energy, potentially reverting the inexorable contraction of matter inside black holes, or backward in time during the big bang. More broadly, the effective value of κ at a given location in spacetime—which pegs the size of a black hole to its energy content in general relativity—depends on the field equations. Therefore, it is far from obvious, to say the least, that probing scales beyond the Planck scale would necessarily lead to the formation of a black hole, or that one can expect a priori that singularities arise within the context of entangled relativity. In any case, unlike in general relativity, it seems that investigating these questions in entangled relativity requires an accurate description of the on-shell matter Lagrangian at (potentially unlimited) high energy, since the effective coupling constant G depends upon its value.

Should entangled relativity invalidate both arguments against the elementary nature of spacetime, could it also reconcile gravity and quantum field theory? At least one (very preliminary) piece of evidence suggests that it

might. Indeed, for dimensional reasons, the action of entangled relativity must be proportional to a new constant (ξ) that does not appear in the classical field equations. It means that entangled relativity involves a new, purely quantum, (dimensionfull [8]) fundamental constant of nature [4]. In the path integral formulation of quantum field theory for instance, this constant has an impact on the weighting of the quantum phase of the various paths.

All these nice features would not matter, however, if the theory was unable to explain observations in our universe. The thing with entangled relativity is that its extra degree of freedom with respect to general relativity [9] nicely freezes in very generic situations [4]: roughly speaking, this happens whenever the on-shell matter Lagrangian is (or is close to being) equal to the trace of the stress-energy tensor—such as in the solar system for instance, where pressure is at best six orders of magnitude smaller than the energy density, or in a dark matter dominated universe. When the degree of freedom freezes, the theory becomes indistinguishable from general relativity without a cosmological constant: all equations become literally the same as in general relativity [4]. In other words, general relativity (without a cosmological constant) is a limiting case of entangled relativity. But even for the most relativistic known objects in the universe apart from black holes—that is, neutron stars—the predictions from entangled relativity are very close to the ones of general relativity, with, for instance, a mere 8% maximal difference of the mass of neutron stars [5]. The theory, therefore, seems very capable of depicting our universe.

Nevertheless, perhaps the most challenging part with this theory would be to find a new fundamental description of matter that both *naturally fits* into this framework and also overlaps with the standard model of particles, when entangled relativity becomes indistinguishable from general relativity.

Of course, at this stage, entangled relativity could very well fail miserably to depict our universe—as so many alternatives to general relativity before it. Interestingly enough, however, this somewhat simple modification of the general theory of relativity opens new avenues for both the gravitational and matter fields sectors.

-
- [1] Roger Penrose, “Gravitational Collapse and Space-Time Singularities,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **14**, 57–59 (1965).
- [2] Freeman Dyson, “Is a Graviton Detectable?” *International Journal of Modern Physics A* **28**, 1330041 (2013).
- [3] Hendrik Ludwig, Olivier Minazzoli, and Salvatore Capozziello, “Merging matter and geometry in the same Lagrangian,” *Physics Letters B* **751**, 576–578 (2015), [arXiv:1506.03278 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.03278).
- [4] Olivier Minazzoli, “Rethinking the link between matter and geometry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 124020 (2018), [arXiv:1811.05845 \[gr-qc\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.05845).
- [5] Denis Arruga, Olivier Rousselle, and Olivier Minazzoli, “Compact objects in entangled relativity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 024034 (2021).
- [6] A. Einstein, “Prinzipielles zur allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie,” *Annalen der Physik* **360**, 241–244 (1918), translation available at <https://einsteinpapers.press.princeton.edu/vol17-tr>
- [7] This requirement is usually formulated as the non-negativeness of local energy, which leads (assuming general relativity) to the actual necessary condition of Penrose’s theorem, that is $E_{\alpha\beta}t^\alpha t^\beta \leq 0$, where $E_{\alpha\beta}$ is the left hand side of the Einstein’s equation, and t^μ is any timelike vector [1].

[8] $\xi/(c\hbar)$ is the inverse of an energy squared.

[9] Like in more common $f(R)$ theories of gravity, the extra

degree of freedom is manifest in the trace of the metric field equation.