gr-qc/9508037

Quantization of Nonstandard Hamiltonian Systems

Alejandro Corichi* and Michael P. Ryan Jr.† ‡
Center for Gravitational Physics and Geometry
Department of Physics, The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

Abstract

The quantization of classical theories that admit more than one Hamiltonian description is considered. This is done from a geometrical viewpoint, both at the quantization level (geometric quantization) and at the level of the dynamics of the quantum theory. A spin-1/2 system is taken as an example in which all the steps can be completed. It is shown that the geometry of the quantum theory imposes restrictions on the physically allowed nonstandard quantum theories.

PACS number(s): 03.65.Bz, 03.65.Ca, 02.40.-k

Typeset using REVTEX

*Electronic address: corichi@phys.psu.edu

†Electronic address: ryan@phys.psu.edu

‡Permanent Address: Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, UNAM, A. Postal 70-543, México 04510 D.F., MEXICO.

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of quantization of a classical theory is at least seventy years old, but the term 'quantization' always has had a somewhat loose meaning. There is no such thing a *the* quantization recipe that takes a classical theory and produces for us the 'correct' quantum theory.

There are three main approaches to canonical quantization: algebraic [1], geometric [2], and group theoretic quantization [3]. They differ, roughly speaking, in the basic structures on phase space they regard as fundamental in order to construct a quantum theory. In each of these approaches one is led to make several choices along the way that might yield inequivalent quantum theories. Well known examples of these ambiguities are the factor ordering problem and different representations of the CCR in QFT, for example.

The quantization schemes mentioned above have, however, a common feature. They assume that the classical system to be quantized is unique, that is, that there is a preferred classical description for the system. From the classical viewpoint, on the other hand, there might be more than one perfectly valid way of representing a given system. These alternative descriptions are called *nonstandard* Hamiltonian systems. The aim of this paper is to explore the possibility of quantization starting from different classical theories.

The program of quantization of nonstandard Hamiltonian dynamics has its roots in work of Feynman reported by Dyson [4] and its extension by Hojman and Shepley [5]. Feynman's original work showed that Poisson-bracket relations place strong constraints on the types of forces allowed in physical systems. Hojman and Shepley generalized Feynman's work and were able to show that a consistent quantization with a set of commuting coordinates led to a second order Lagrangian in those coordinates. Hojman then constructed a consistent Poisson-bracket Hamiltonian theory for first-order equations of motion of the form $\dot{x}^i = f^i(x^j)$ [6]. We will discuss this formalism in more detail below. The question was open, however, about the possibility of quantizing those systems that admit no Lagrangian.

This program could be seen as yet another ambiguity in the quantization process or, if viewed from a different perspective, as a new avenue for finding possibly valid quantum theories. This would be the case, for instance, if the given system has more than one classical description without any a priori criteria for choosing the 'correct' one.

We will proceed as follows. In the introduction we will recall the basic steps of geometric quantization, pointing out the choices one makes in the process and discussing the possible implications in the final quantum theory. Section II reviews the possibility of different classical descriptions or 'non-standard Hamiltonian systems'. We consider as an example the classical spinning particle. Section III recalls the geometry of quantum mechanics as proposed by Ashtekar and Schilling, focusing in the spin 1/2 particle. The basic program is discussed in Sec. IV for the spinning particle. The obstructions to quantizing the nonstandard description are isolated. Section V discusses the results and suggests some directions for further research. Throughout the paper, the 'abstract index notation' is employed. For a discussion of the notation see [7].

a. Geometric Quantization. By quantization we will mean the process of finding a quantum theory from some known classical theory. The starting point for all canonical quantization schemes is a classical system described in terms of symplectic geometry. Let us recall the basic notions in order to set the notation [8,9].

The *phase space* of the system consists of a manifold Γ of dimension $dim(\Gamma) = 2n$ (real). Physical states are represented by the points on the manifold. *Observables* are smooth functions on Γ. There is a non-degenerate, closed two-form Ω defined on it. That is, the form Ω_{ab} satisfies $\nabla_{[c}\Omega_{ab]} = 0$, and if $\Omega_{ab}V^b = 0$ then $V^b = 0$. Therefore, there exists an inverse Ω^{ab} which defines an isomorphism between the cotangent and the tangent space at each point of Γ. The existance of the *symplectic two-form* Ω endows (Γ, Ω) with a *symplectic structure*.

A vector field V^a generates infinitesimal canonical transformations if it Lie drags the symplectic form, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_V \Omega = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

This condition is equivalent to saying that locally it is of the form: $V^b = \Omega^{ba}\nabla_a f := X_f^b$ and it is called the *Hamiltonian vector field of f (w.r.t. Ω)*. Note that the symplectic structure gives us a mapping between functions on Γ and Hamiltonian vector fields. Thus, functions on phase space (i.e. observables) are generators of infinitesimal canonical transformations.

The Lie algebra of vector fields induces a Lie algebra structure on the space of functions.

$$\{f, g\} := \Omega_{ab} X_g^a X_f^b = \Omega^{ab}\nabla_a f \nabla_b g, \tag{1.2}$$

such that $X^a_{\{f,g\}} = -[X_f, X_g]^a$.

Since the symplectic form is closed, it can be obtained locally from a *symplectic potential*, ω_a,

$$\Omega_{ab} = 2\nabla_{[a}\omega_{b]}. \tag{1.3}$$

Time evolution is given by a vector field f^a whose integral curves are the dynamical trajectories of the system. On phase space there is a *preferred* function, the *Hamiltonian* H whose Hamiltonian vector field corresponds directly to f^a, i.e.,

$$f^a = \Omega^{ab}\nabla_b H. \tag{1.4}$$

Adopting the viewpoint that all observables generate canonical transformations we see that the motion generated by the Hamiltonian corresponds to 'time evolution'. The 'change' in time of the observables will be simply given by the Poisson bracket of the observable with H ($\dot{g} = f^a\nabla_a g = \Omega^{ab}\nabla_a g \nabla_b H = \{g, H\}$).

So far, not very much has been assumed about the phase space Γ. It can be any (even dimensional) manifold with complicated topology, compact, open, etc. The symplectic structure Ω and the function H are assumed to be given a priori. Note that they might not be unique. From the classical viewpoint the only 'observable' entities are the dynamical trajectories f^a of the system (the equations of motion). They could have come from more than one pair (Ω, H)[1].

---

[1] There is another, even more drastic, possibility. There could be another f'^a that could have the same integral curves as f^a. Such systems are called S-equivalent [10]. We will not consider them here.

However, if the system has a configuration space C, then the phase space is automatically 'chosen' to be the cotangent bundle of the configuration space T^*C. There is also a preferred 1-form on C that can be lifted to T^*C and taken to be the symplectic potential which determines uniquely the symplectic structure. Therefore, the fact that there exists a configuration space picks out for us the phase space and the symplectic two-form.

The program of quantization can be divided in two parts: kinematical and dynamical. The kinematical part deals with the problem of defining a good prescription for going 'from Poisson brackets to commutators' in a consistent way. That is, it should start with the classical system and produce a Hilbert space of states. The dynamical part deals with the Hamiltonian, i.e. the generator of dynamical evolution.

We will concentrate on geometric quantization whose starting point is a symplectic manifold (Γ, Ω). There is no *a priori* assumption about the structure of the phase space Γ. It can be completely general. In particular it can include the case in which Γ is compact, i.e., it is *not* a cotangent bundle.

There are two steps in geometric quantization. The first one involves defining a Hilbert space on the full phase space. Wave functions are, roughly speaking, functions on Γ. Any observable can be 'quantized'. The second step involves introducing an additional structure on Γ, a *polarization* that will select those wave functions that depend only on 'half of the coordinates'. Physical observables are those that respect, in a way to be defined below, the polarization.

We start with a Hamiltonian system as defined above. We define what are called *prequantum wave functions.* They are cross sections Ψ of a complex line bundle over Γ. The corresponding $U(1)$ connection is the symplectic potential ω_a whose curvature is the symplectic two form Ω_{ab}. For each trivialization ω_a there corresponds a function Ψ_ω. If we change ω by a gauge transformation $\omega_a \to \omega_a + \nabla_a g$ then

$$\Psi_{\omega'} = e^{ig/\hbar}\Psi_\omega. \tag{1.5}$$

There is a Hermitian inner product in this complex vector space given by the Liouville measure on Γ. The pre-Hilbert space would be the completion with respect to this inner product.

Any observable f ($f : \Gamma \to R$) has a corresponding symmetric operator O_f defined by:

$$O_f\Psi = \frac{\hbar}{i}X_f^a\nabla_a\Psi + f\,\Psi := \frac{\hbar}{i}X_f^a\left(\partial_a - \frac{i}{\hbar}\omega_a\right)\Psi + f\,\Psi. \tag{1.6}$$

These operators are: i)linear; ii) gauge-covariant, iii) symmetric (formally self-adjoint).

The assignment $f \to O_f$ is one to one and preserves the natural Lie algebra structure,

$$[O_f, O_g] = -i\hbar O_{\{f,g\}}, \tag{1.7}$$

that is, one can assign a consistent operator to all observables.

It is known that 'actual' quantum wave functions depend only on 'half' of the variables. We have to 'split' Γ into two parts. This is done by choosing a *polarization* P. It assigns at each point γ a maximal subspace $P|_\gamma$ of the complexified tangent space such that:

i) V^a and $W^a \in P|_\gamma$ then $[V, W]^a \in P|_\gamma$ for all γ

ii) for all $V^a, W^a \in P$ then $\Omega_{ab}V^aW^b = 0$ for all γ.

If P is real we have a 'real polarization'. The first condition implies that through each point of Γ there passes an n-dimensional submanifold, which is tangent to the subspace $P|_\gamma$. The phase space is then foliated by n-dimensional submanifolds. The second condition implies that the Poisson bracket of any two coordinates of this submanifold vanishes.

Given a polarization, a *quantum wave function* is a cross section Ψ satisfying

$$V^a \nabla_a \Psi = 0. \tag{1.8}$$

For all $V^a \in P$. This is called the *polarization condition.*

This condition tells us that the wave function depends only on n coordinates q^i 'in involution'(For instance, if we have a configuration space C with coordinates q^i, the standard polarization is the 'vertical polarization' spanned by $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}\}$. We have then that $\{q^i, q^j\} = 0$.)

Classical observables whose pre-quantum operators become well defined operators are *good observables.* The condition is,

$$[O_f, V^a \nabla_a]\Psi = 0. \tag{1.9}$$

For all $V^a \in P$. This can be written classically as $[X_f, V]^a \in P$ for all V^a ($\mathcal{L}_V X_f \in P$). We say then that X_f^a *preserves the polarization* P. In particular, the operators corresponding to the coordinates q^i preserve the vertical polarization and therefore are good observables.

A special kind of complex polarization is called Kähler. An almost complex structure is a tensor field $J_a{}^b$ such that $J_a{}^b J_b{}^c = -\delta_a{}^c$, and it is a canonical transformation: $J_a{}^b J_c{}^d \Omega_{bd} = \Omega_{ac}$. Then,

$$g_{ab} := \Omega_{ac} J^c{}_b \tag{1.10}$$

is symmetric, non-degenerate, positive definite metric. The triplet (Ω, J, g) equips Γ with an almost Kähler structure. We can construct on the phase space a Hermitian (complex) inner product whose real part is given by g and the imaginary part by Ω, i.e $(,) = \frac{1}{2}g(,) - \frac{i}{2}\Omega(,)$.

The tensor field J has eigenvectors in the complexified tangent space. Let us decompose any (complexified) V^a into two parts,

$$V^a_\pm := \frac{1}{2}(V^a \mp iJ^a{}_b V^b) \tag{1.11}$$

where V^a_+ is an eigenvector of J with eigenvalue i. Let's choose the vector space spanned by those eigenvectors. It is a n-dimensional (complex) vector space, and $\Omega_{ab}V^a_+ V^b_+ = 0$. If the distribution is integrable (the manifold can be given complex charts), the polarization is called Kähler.

In this case the polarization condition, on the section of the Hermitian line bundle, involves considering *holomorphic* sections. When the phase space Γ is compact it is necessary to have holomorphic sections. This is relevant, for instance, for the quantization of spin systems.

Note that prequantization is a purely kinematical step. It produces a (nonphysical) Hilbert space on Γ and every observable is pre-quantizable. There is no external input [other that the original (Ω, H) pair].

The choice of polarization, on the other hand, has both kinematical and dynamical content. It is kinematical because it singles out the physically relevant quantum states from the pre-quantum Hilbert space and defines what the physically admissible observables are, namely those that preserve the polarization. This choice has also dynamical implications since the Hamiltonian might *not* be compatible with P. It is the choice of polarization that might lead to inequivalent quantum theories.

II. NONSTANDARD CLASSICAL THEORY

As we mentioned in the introduction, we are interested in considering systems that might have a nonstandard classical description. By this we mean systems that admit more than one Hamiltonian formulation or systems that obey certain equations of motion that do *not* come from a variational principle.

This section has two parts. In the first we review the nonstandard Hamiltonian systems mentioned above, considering a generalization of the symplectic formalism, namely that of Poisson structures on a manifold. The second part takes a spinning classical particle as a particular example of a system that admits nonstandard descriptions.

A. Poisson Structures and Non-standard Dynamics

In the introduction we gave an overview of the standard Hamiltonian dynamics in terms of a symplectic structure Ω_{ab}. It is possible to define dynamics by introducing a more general structure known as a *Poisson (bracket) structure* [8,9]. It consists of a bivector $\Pi^{ab} = \Pi^{[ab]}$ on Γ satisfying the Jacobi identity:

$$\Pi^{c[d}\nabla_c\Pi^{ab]} = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

It defines naturally a 'generalized' Poisson bracket between functions on Γ.

$$\{f,g\}_\Pi := \Pi^{ab}\nabla_b f\nabla_a g. \tag{2.2}$$

It also defines a mapping from functions to vector fields

$$\overset{\pi}{X}{}^a_f := \Pi^{ab}\nabla_b f. \tag{2.3}$$

Note that Π^{ab} might be degenerate, in which case there will be *Casimir functions*. For instance, if $\nabla_a C$ is a degenerate 'direction' of Π^{ab} ($\Pi^{ab}\nabla_b C = 0$), then $\{f,C\}_\Pi \equiv 0, \quad \forall f$. That is, C 'commutes' with all functions on Γ.

In the case of a nondegenerate symplectic structure, its inverse Ω^{ab} defines (locally) an 'almost' one to one mapping between functions and Hamiltonian vector field, that is, two functions will define the same vector field if they differ by, at most, a constant function. On the other hand, for a degenerate Poisson structure, given a Casimir function C, then two functions f and g will define the same vector field $X^a_f = \Pi^{ab}\nabla_b f$ if $f = g + h(C)$ where $h(C)$ is *any* (differentiable) function of C.

Given a phase space Γ, the dynamical evolution of a system is given by the integral curves of a vector field V^a. The vector field gives at each point of Γ a set of equations of motion for the system. If we choose some local coordinates x^μ, $\mu = 1, \ldots 2n$, then the rate of change of each coordinate x^μ is given by the Lie derivative of x^μ along V^a,

$$\dot{x}^\mu := \mathcal{L}_V x^i = V^a \nabla_a (x^\mu) = V^\mu(x) \tag{2.4}$$

Recall that in the x^μ coordinate system, $V^a = V^\mu(x) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\right)^a$.

A natural question is whether the given system of first order differential equations can be put in a Hamiltonian form. That is, does there exist a Poisson structure Π^{ab} and a function h such that $V^a = \Pi^{ab} \nabla_b h$? If the set of equation came from a (second order) variational principle, then the Poisson structure is the inverse of the (naturally defined) symplectic structure $\Omega^{(0)}_{ab}$ on $\Gamma = T^*C$ and the Hamiltonian h is the Legendre transform of the Lagrangian (for non-singular systems).

There might be, however, *another* Poisson structure that makes the equations Hamiltonian, with another Hamiltonian. Those systems are known as *bi*-Hamiltonian [11].

In the case when the set of equations does not come from a variational principle, there is in principle no natural way of putting then in Hamiltonian form. A program for doing this has been proposed in the past years by S. Hojman [6]. The underlying idea is that one should use the symmetries of the equations of motion in order to construct a Poisson structure. Let us summarize the Hojman construction for systems with $N = 2n$ constants of motion C_i, $(N-1)$ of which do not depend explicitly on time. That is, one knows them as explicit functions of the coordinates (a fairly strong requirement, equivalent to knowing the full classical solution). The preceding requirement is sufficient to be able to reduce the equations to Hamiltonian form. It is, of course, not necessary for constructing the Hamiltonian theory.

This Π^{ab} may be constructed by summing elements of the form

$$\Pi^{ab} = \mu(x) \varepsilon^{ab\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{N-2}} \nabla_{\lambda_1} C_1 \cdots \nabla_{\lambda_{N-2}} C_{N-2}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\varepsilon^{ab\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{N-2}}$ is the N-index Levi-Civita symbol, and $\mu(x)$ is a function of the coordinates to be explained below. This Π^{ab} satisfies the Jacobi identity. The $C_1, \cdots, C_{N-2}$ are time-independent constants of motion. The Hamiltonian is defined by $H = C_{N-1}$, along with $C_N = t + d_N$, where d_N is time-independent. This can always be achieved by a change of coordinates. Hojman has another construction that uses a symmetry of the equations of motion, without needing to know some constants of the motion in explicit form. For more details see [6].

Suppose that for a given set of equations that come from a Lagrangian, we have been able to construct a non-degenerate Π by means of the Hojman procedure. Let us denote by Ω'_{ab} the corresponding two-form ($\Omega'_{ab}\Pi^{bc} = \delta^c_a$). If the Poisson structure Π is compatible with Ω^{ab} [2], then there will be a tensor field K^a_b such that

$$\Omega'_{ab} = K^c_a \Omega_{cb}. \tag{2.6}$$

---

[2] Two Poisson structures are said to be *compatible* if their sum is also a Poisson structure [11].

Note that since Ω is invertible, we have then $K_a^d = \Omega'_{ab}\Omega^{bd}$. We will call this mapping a *Hojman transformation.*

B. Classical Description of a Spin-1/2 particle

As we mentioned in the Introduction, the example we would like to use to illustrate the difficulties of changing Poisson structures in quantum mechanics is the simplest quantum system, that of a spin-1/2 particle. In order to investigate the relationship between the classical and quantum theories we would like to study the classical problem equivalent to that of a quantum spin-1/2 particle. The main difficulty with this idea is that, strictly speaking, there is no classical limit to this problem. There are a number of 'classical' limits that have been proposed [12], but we will use a limit in terms of Grassman variables. We would like to find a limit of the quantum theory based on the three spin operators $\hat{S}_i = \hbar\sigma_i$, the σ_i the Pauli matrices with Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = A\hat{S}_3$, $A = \text{const.}$ Notice that $\hat{S}_i^2 = \hbar^2$, and $[\hat{S}_i, \hat{S}_j] = \hbar\varepsilon_{ijk}\hat{S}_k$, and $\{\hat{S}_i, \hat{S}_j\}_+ = 0$, $i \neq j$. As $\hbar \to 0$, we get $\hat{S}_i^2 = 0$, $[\hat{S}_i, \hat{S}_j] = 0$ and $\{\hat{S}_i, \hat{S}_j\}_+ = 0$, and there is no set of classical numbers that can obey these relations. If we write the classical variables as $S_i = \varepsilon s_i(t)$, where the s_i are commuting functions of t and ε is a constant Grassman number, then $S_i^2 = 0$ ($\varepsilon^2 = 0$), $[S_i, S_j] = 0 = \{S_i, S_j\}_+$.

Assume we have a Hamiltonian H, in principle a function of some coordinates q_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, and $S_i = \beta_{ik}p_k$, where the p_i are the momenta conjugate to the q_i, and $\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ij}(q)$ (the angular velocities are $\omega_i = \alpha_{ij}(q)\dot{q}_j$, where $\alpha_{ij}\beta_{jk} = \delta_{ik}$), then

$$\dot{S}_j + \gamma_{jk\ell}\frac{\partial H}{\partial S_k}S_\ell = 0 \tag{2.7}$$

if H does not depend explicitly on the q_i, *i.e.*, $H = H(S_i)$. For a rigid body $\gamma_{jk\ell} = \alpha_{\ell m}\left(\frac{\partial\beta_{mk}}{\partial q_n}\beta_{nj} - \frac{\partial\beta_{mj}}{\partial q_n}\beta_{nk}\right) = -\varepsilon_{jk\ell}$. If we take $H = AS_3$ then

$$\dot{S}_i = \varepsilon_{i3k}AS_k, \tag{2.8}$$

or,

$$\varepsilon\dot{s}_i = \varepsilon_{i3k}A\varepsilon s_k, \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\dot{s}_i = \varepsilon_{i3k}As_k. \tag{2.10}$$

These imply that $s_3 = \text{const.} = K_1$ and

$$\dot{s}_1 = -As_2, \tag{2.11}$$
$$\dot{s}_2 = As_1, \tag{2.12}$$

so $s_1^2 + s_2^2 = \text{const.}$ These mean that $s_1^2 + s_2^2 + s_3^2 = \mathcal{S}^2 = \text{const.}$ which implies that the classical state space is a two-sphere. The system orbits lie on the two-sphere of radius $\mathcal{S}$

and since s_3 is a constant they are parallels of 'latitude'. If we look at the equations for s_i, $\dot{s}_3 = 0$ and (2.11,2.12), they can be written as

$$\dot{s}_i = \Pi_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial s_j}, \tag{2.13}$$

with $H = As_3$ and $\Pi_{ij} = \varepsilon_{ijk} s_k$.

This is precisely an example of a very well studied system with a Poisson structure. Systems that have rotational degrees of freedom (a rigid body for example), have a common description coming from the fact that the rotation group SO(3) acts on the system, as we now recall [8,9]. The phase space is given by a 3-dimensional vector space (that we can identify with R^3) with coordinates s_i (it is the dual of the Lie algebra so(3)). The Poisson structure is given by

$$\Pi_{ij} = C^k{}_{ij} s_k \tag{2.14}$$

where $C^k{}_{ij} = \delta^{kn} \varepsilon_{nij}$ are the structure constants of so(3). It is clearly degenerate (any antisymmetric tensor field in an odd dimensional space is). Note however, that Π_{ij} induces a nondegenerate symplectic structure on each sphere of radius $\mathcal{S}$. R^3 is then foliated by *leaves* of symplectic manifolds. Furthermore, the 'natural' Casimir function is $K_0 = \frac{1}{2} \delta^{ij} s_i s_j$ which is clearly constant on each sphere. All Hamiltonian vector fields generated by Π are tangent to the spheres and therefore leave the Casimir unchanged.

Note that Π can be written as

$$\Pi_{ij} = \varepsilon_{nij} \frac{\partial K_0}{\partial s_n} \tag{2.15}$$

which is precisely of the form (2.5).

A remark is in order. With our formalism we could recover the Euler equations for a rigid body if we chose the Hamiltonian to be the kinetic energy $T = I^{ij} s_i s_j$, where I^{ij} is the inverse of the inertia tensor. The Hamiltonian we have chosen for our system $H = As_3$ is therefore not the 'kinetic' energy of a rigid body, but resembles more that of a 'point-like' object that might interact with an external potential (a constant magnetic field, for example).

The idea now, in order to find different descriptions for the system, is to use the Hojman prescription for different constants of the motion. We have the functions $K_1 = s_3$ and $K_2 = s_1^2 + s_2^2$. Following Hojman [13] we can now take $C = C(K_1, K_2)$, any arbitrary function of (K_1, K_2), and a new 'Hamiltonian' $H = H(K_1, K_2)$, also any function of K_1 and K_2, and define

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{ij} = \mu(s_\ell) \varepsilon_{ijk} \frac{\partial C}{\partial s_k}, \tag{2.16}$$

We would like to have then the equations of motion for s_i as

$$\dot{s}_i = \tilde{\Pi}_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial s_j}. \tag{2.17}$$

We can have the same equations as before if we choose μ properly and C and H satisfy one condition. If we look at the s_3 equation we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{s}_3 = \mu &\left[\frac{\partial C}{\partial K_1}\frac{\partial K_1}{\partial s_2} + \frac{\partial C}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial K_2}{\partial s_2}\right]\left[\frac{\partial H}{\partial K_1}\frac{\partial K_1}{\partial s_1} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial K_2}{\partial s_1}\right] - \\ - \mu &\left[\frac{\partial C}{\partial K_1}\frac{\partial K_1}{\partial s_1} + \frac{\partial C}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial K_2}{\partial s_1}\right]\left[\frac{\partial H}{\partial K_1}\frac{\partial K_1}{\partial s_2} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial K_2}{\partial s_2}\right],\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

and since K_1 does not depend on s_1 or s_2,

$$\dot{s}_3 = -2\mu s_1 s_2\left[\frac{\partial C}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial H}{\partial K_2} - \frac{\partial C}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial H}{\partial K_2}\right] = 0. \tag{2.19}$$

For s_1

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{s}_1 &= \mu\left[\frac{\partial C}{\partial K_1}\frac{\partial K_1}{\partial s_3} + \frac{\partial C}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial K_2}{\partial s_3}\right]\left[\frac{\partial H}{\partial K_1}\frac{\partial K_1}{\partial s_2} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial K_2}{\partial s_2}\right] - \\ &- \mu\left[\frac{\partial C}{\partial K_1}\frac{\partial K_1}{\partial s_2} + \frac{\partial C}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial K_2}{\partial s_2}\right]\left[\frac{\partial H}{\partial K_1}\frac{\partial K_1}{\partial s_3} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial K_2}{\partial s_3}\right], \\ &= 2\mu s_2\left[\frac{\partial C}{\partial K_1}\frac{\partial H}{\partial K_2} - \frac{\partial C}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial H}{\partial K_1}\right].\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

We can achieve $\dot{s}_1 = -As_2$ if $\Delta \equiv \frac{\partial C}{\partial K_1}\frac{\partial H}{\partial K_2} - \frac{\partial C}{\partial K_2}\frac{\partial H}{\partial K_1} \neq 0$ and we take $\mu = -\frac{A}{2\Delta}$. It is easy to show that his choice of μ also gives $\dot{s}_2 = As_1$, so we recover the original equations of motion.

As an example of this procedure, take the normal Hamiltonian $H = As_3$ and $C = s_1^2 + s_2^2$. If we look at the plane $s_1 = 0$, the orbits intersect the circle $s_3^2 + s_2^2 = 1$. The lines of constant $s_3 = H/A$ and C are perpendicular straight lines that form a coordinate grid over the half plane given by the $s_2 s_3$-plane with $s_2 > 0$. The sphere $s_1^2 + s_2^2 + s_3^2 = \mathcal{S}^2$ intersects this half plane in a semi-circle, and any point on this semi-circle represents the initial point of a possible orbit, and if we rotate the semi-circle around the s_3-axis then a point on it traces out a parallel of 'latitude'. In the rectangular grid of C and H/A we can always specify this point by particular values of C and H/A.

Now, the equation for s_i is

$$\frac{ds_i}{dt} = \mu(s_\ell)\varepsilon_{ijk}\frac{\partial C}{\partial s_k}\frac{\partial H}{\partial s_j}. \tag{2.21}$$

Note that this has the form

$$\frac{d\mathbf{s}}{dt} = \mu(\mathbf{s})(\nabla H) \times (\nabla C), \tag{2.22}$$

where ∇C and ∇H are the two-dimensional gradients of C and H which are the the normals to the coordinate curves. We have $\nabla H \times \nabla C = |\nabla H \times \nabla C|\mathbf{e}_1$, where $\mathbf{e}_1$ is the unit vector in the s_1 direction. Since in the $s_1 = 0$ plane

$$\frac{ds_1}{dt} = -As_2, \tag{2.23}$$

we see that (15) gives this if we take $\mu = -As_2/|\nabla H \times \nabla C|$. From Ref. [13] we see that this μ works for all s_1, s_2.

As long as they form a complete coordinate grid in the $s_2 s_3$-plane, any functions C and H can be used in the formulation. Note that if ∇H is parallel to ∇C at any point (or the norm of one of the vectors is zero), μ blows up. This is the condition in Ref. [13] for the nonexistence of μ. Notice also that H is no longer the energy.

Let us now try to understand what we are doing from a geometrical viewpoint. The fact that we are using a preferred function (the Casimir) to define the Poisson structure means that one-forms w_a 'transverse' to the C = constant surfaces are precisely the degenerate directions of Π. Hamiltonian vector fields are always tangent to the surfaces and therefore the motion they generate lies within them. In the standard case of the rigid body, for example, the surfaces on which the Casimir is constant are spheres precisely because they are the orbits of the rotation group (coadjoint action on the dual of the Lie algebra) on R^3. The symplectic structure induced on the spheres from the Poisson structure on R^3 is precisely ($1/\mathcal{S}$ times) the area element (Recall that any nondegenerate two-form on a surface is proportional, by means of a conformal factor, to the area element).

Suppose that we now define a new Poisson structure via a function whose surfaces of constant value are not spheres but some 'ellipsoids' (with rotational symmetry around the s_3 axis). Now, the surfaces will not be the orbits of the rotation group in 3 dimensions (see [13] for a particular choice in which the resulting deformed algebra is $SU(2)_q$). The change in the induced symplectic structure, the 'Hojman transformation', will be a simple conformal transformation. We can conclude then that by a rescaling of the symplectic structure and a corresponding change in the Hamiltonian, we have an infinite number of classical descriptions for the system.

As we mentioned above, we would now like to apply the idea of changing the symplectic structure to quantum mechanics. In the next section we will discuss this formulation and its extension to 'Kähler quantum mechanics' in the context of the spin-1/2 example outlined above. We will see that two obstructions exist to doing this in the most simple-minded way. These are both related to the fact that we need to define a probability structure on the quantum-mechanical phase space. Probability structures are often given in terms of linear operators on a Hilbert space. We will see that both the definition of probabilities in 'Kähler quantum mechanics' and the realization of dynamical quantities as linear operators place strong constraints on the possible symplectic structures that are allowed.

III. QUANTUM MECHANICS

The question we want to address in this paper is the possible quantization of systems that admit non-standard descriptions. If the system admits more that one classical description, we are led to ask whether the quantum theories are equivalent. If not, what are the criteria to choose the 'correct' classical description?

As we mentioned in the introduction, there are, roughly speaking, two different sets of issues about the quantum mechanics one has to address: kinematical and dynamical. The kinematical conditions, so to speak, that the constructed quantum theory should satisfy, are mainly related to the Heisenberg uncertainty relations. Commuting quantum observables

can, in principle, be simultaneously measured. Such quantum observables correspond to classical observables that have vanishing Poisson brackets among them. Therefore, there is in principle a way of distinguishing between, for instance, two different Poisson structures. If the Poisson structure in the classical theory is degenerate, there will be Casimir functions and, therefore, corresponding quantum Casimir operators. This will lead to 'super-selected' sectors that should be detected experimentally.

There are another set of issues one has to consider when analyzing the dynamical content of the theory. Quantum mechanics is a theory of measurement. If the theory is to pass the test of 'validity', it should provide probabilities for measuring eigenvalues of various operators as functions in time, that should be compatible with measurements. This is a condition to be satisfied by the dynamical evolution of the quantum system. This condition is analogous to the corresponding classical condition that the dynamical evolution should be the integral curves of a preferred vector field. This 'dynamical condition' has a very clean geometrical formulation when quantum mechanics is cast in geometric language.

A. Geometry of Quantum Mechanics

Quantum mechanics, with all its postulates, can be put into geometric language. In this subsection we will recall the geometry of quantum mechanics. For details see [14,15].

The description we will give is for systems with a finite dimensional Hilbert space but the generalization to the infinite dimensional case is straightforward [15]. Denote by $\mathcal{P}$ the space of rays in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. In this case $\mathcal{P}$ will be the complex projective space CP^n, since $\mathcal{H}$ can be identified with C^n.

It is convenient to view $\mathcal{H}$ as a *real* vector space equipped with a complex structure (recall that a complex structure J is a linear mapping $J : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ such that $J^2 = -1$). Let us decompose the Hermitian inner product into real and imaginary parts,

$$\langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle = \frac{1}{2} G(\Psi, \Phi) - \frac{i}{2} \Omega(\Psi, \Phi), \tag{3.1}$$

where G is a Riemannian inner product on $\mathcal{H}$ and Ω is a symplectic form.

Let us restrict our attention to the sphere S of normalized states. The true space of states is given by the quotient of S by the $U(1)$ action of states the differ by a 'phase', i.e. the projective space $\mathcal{P}$. The complex structure J is the generator of the $U(1)$ action (J plays the role of the imaginary unit i when the Hilbert space is taken to be real). Since the phase rotations preserve the norm of the states, both the real and imaginary parts of the inner product can be projected down to $\mathcal{P}$.

Therefore, the structure on $\mathcal{P}$ which is induced by the Hermitian inner product is given by a Riemannian metric g and a symplectic two-form $\mathbf{\Omega}$. The pair $(g, \mathbf{\Omega})$ defines a Kähler structure on $\mathcal{P}$ (Recall that a Kähler structure is a triplet $(M, g, \mathbf{\Omega})$ where M is a complex manifold (with complex structure J), g is a Riemannian metric and $\mathbf{\Omega}$ is a symplectic two-form, such that they are compatible).

The space $\mathcal{P}$ of quantum states has then the structure of a Kähler manifold, so, in particular, it is a symplectic manifold and can be regarded as a 'phase space' by itself. It turns out that the quantum dynamics can be described by a 'classical dynamics', that is,

with the same symplectic description that is used for classical mechanics. Let us see how it works. In quantum mechanics, Hermitian operators on $\mathcal{H}$ are generators of unitary transformations (through exponentiation) whereas in classical mechanics, generators of canonical transformations are real valued functions $f : \mathcal{P} \to R$. We would like then to associate with each operator F on $\mathcal{H}$ a function f on $\mathcal{P}$. There is a natural candidate for such function: $f := \langle F \rangle|_S$ (denote it by $f = \langle F \rangle$). The Hamiltonian vector field X_f of such a function is a Killing field of the Riemannian metric g. The converse also holds, so there is a one to one correspondence between self-adjoint operators on $\mathcal{H}$ and real valued functions ('quantum observables') on $\mathcal{P}$ whose Hamiltonian vector fields are symmetries of the Kähler structure.

There is also a simple relation between a natural vector field on $\mathcal{H}$ generated by F and the Hamiltonian vector field associated to f on $\mathcal{P}$. Consider on S a 'point' ψ and an operator F on $\mathcal{H}$. Define the vector $X_F|_\psi := \frac{d}{dt} \exp[-JFt]\psi|_{t=0} = -JF\psi$. This is the generator of a one parameter family (labeled by t) of unitary transformation on $\mathcal{H}$. Therefore, it preserves the Hermitian inner-product. The key result is that X_F projects down to $\mathcal{P}$ and the projection is precisely the Hamiltonian vector field X_f of f on the symplectic manifold $(\mathcal{P}, \mathbf{\Omega})$.

Dynamical evolution is generated by the Hamiltonian vector field X_h when we choose as our observable the Hamiltonian $h = \langle H \rangle$. Thus, Schrödinger evolution is described by Hamiltonian dynamics, exactly as in classical mechanics.

One can define the Poisson bracket between a pair of observables (f, g) from the inverse of the symplectic two form $\mathbf{\Omega}^{ab}$,

$$\{f, g\} := \mathbf{\Omega}(X_g, X_f) = \mathbf{\Omega}^{ab}(\partial_a f)(\partial_b g). \tag{3.2}$$

The Poisson bracket is well defined for arbitrary functions on $\mathcal{P}$, but when restricted to observables, we have,

$$\langle -i[F, G] \rangle = \{f, g\}. \tag{3.3}$$

This is in fact a slight generalization of Ehrenfest theorem, since when we consider the 'time evolution' of the observable f we have the Poisson bracket $\{f, h\} = \dot{f}$,

$$\dot{f} = \langle -i[F, H] \rangle. \tag{3.4}$$

We have seen that the symplectic aspect of the quantum state space is completely analogous to classical mechanics. Notice that, since only those functions whose Hamiltonian vector fields preserve the metric are regarded as 'quantum observables' on $\mathcal{P}$, they represent a very small subset of the set of functions on $\mathcal{P}$.

There is another facet of the quantum state space $\mathcal{P}$ that is absent in classical mechanics: Riemannian geometry. Roughly speaking, the information contained in the metric g has to do with those features which are unique to the quantum description, namely, those related to measurement and 'probabilities'. We can define a Riemannian product (f, g) between two observables as

$$(f, g) := g(X_f, X_g) = g^{ab}(\partial_a f)(\partial_b g). \tag{3.5}$$

This product has a very direct physical interpretation in terms of the dispersion of the operator in the given state:

$$(f,f) = 2(\Delta F)^2. \tag{3.6}$$

Therefore, the length of X_f is the uncertainty of the observable F.

The metric g has also an important role in those issues related to measurements. Note that eigenvectors of the Hermitian operator F associated to the quantum observable f correspond to points ϕ_i in $\mathcal{P}$ at which f has local extrema. These points correspond to zeros of the Hamiltonian vector field X_f, and the eigenvalues f_i are the values of the observable $f_i = f(\phi_i)$ at these points.

If the system is in the state Ψ, what are the probabilities of measuring the eigenvalues f_i? The answer is strikingly simple: measure the geodesic distance given by g from the point Ψ to the point ϕ_i (denote it by $d(\Psi,\phi_i)$). The probability of measuring f_i is then,

$$P_i(\Psi) = \cos^2\left[\frac{d(\Psi,\phi_i)}{\sqrt{2}}\right]. \tag{3.7}$$

Therefore, a state Ψ is more likely to 'collapse' to a nearby state than to a distant one when a measurement is performed. We will now turn our attention to spin systems and in particular the quantum theory of a spin-1/2 particle.

B. The Spin-1/2 System

In this part we will find the quantum theory of a spin-1/2 particle starting from the classical description of Sec. II. We will then discuss the quantum theory in the geometric language just described.

1. Geometric Quantization of Spin Systems

In Sec. II, we arrived at a kinematical description for systems with 'rotational degrees of freedom', that includes spin systems. We saw that the physically relevant space is R^3 that is foliated by spheres of radius $\mathcal{S}$. That is, for each value of $\mathcal{S}$ we have a sphere which corresponds to the reduced phase space of a particle with classical 'intrinsic angular momentum' equal to $\mathcal{S}$. Since each sphere is a symplectic manifold with a perfectly defined symplectic structure on it, we can employ the machinery of geometric quantization that was outlined in the introduction.

We have then, $\Gamma = S^2$, $\Omega_{ab} = \mathcal{S}\sin\theta\nabla_{[a}\phi\nabla_{b]}\theta$, where we have chosen spherical coordinates (θ,ϕ) for the sphere. Note that the symplectic two form is $1/\mathcal{S}$ times the area element of a sphere of radius $\mathcal{S}$.

The first step in geometric quantization is to construct the pre-quantum line bundle. There are, however, some integrality conditions that must be satisfied so that the pre-quantum line bundle exists. These conditions are the generalization of the Bohr-Sommerfeld quantum conditions:

$$\frac{1}{2\pi\hbar}\int_{S^2}\Omega = k, \tag{3.8}$$

where k is an integer. Since $\int_{S^2} \Omega = 4\pi\,\mathcal{S}$, the condition reads $\mathcal{S} = \frac{\hbar}{2}k$. This is precisely the quantization of spin! What this condition is telling us is that the only symplectic manifolds that can be quantized are those that correspond to classical systems whose angular momentum is an integer multiple of $\frac{\hbar}{2}$.

The next step is to find a polarization in the phase space Γ. Note that the sphere S^2 is a compact manifold and therefore does not correspond to a cotangent bundle. Luckily the sphere is a complex manifold and therefore admits a Kähler structure. We can coordinatize it by z (recall that the Riemman sphere is the complex plane with the point at infinity). the symplectic two form reads then,

$$\Omega = i\,k\hbar\,\frac{dz \wedge d\bar{z}}{(1+z\bar{z})^2}. \tag{3.9}$$

The Hilbert space of states will correspond then to holomorphic sections of a complex line bundle over the sphere. A standard theorem in complex analysis shows that the space of such sections is *finite* dimensional. Furthermore, holomorphic functions on the coordinate z can be represented by,

$$\Psi(z) = \sum_{l=0}^{k} \begin{pmatrix} k \\ l \end{pmatrix} \psi_l z^l, \tag{3.10}$$

where ψ_l are constants. In this way, one gets all the finite-dimensional, unitary, irreducible representations of SU(2).

Since we are interested in the spin 1/2 representation, we have to consider the $k = 1$ case, that is, the 'smallest' quantizable sphere. The Hilbert space in this case is given by elements of the form,

$$\Psi = \psi_0 + \psi_1 z. \tag{3.11}$$

Each element of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ will be then characterized by two complex numbers. We have recovered the standard SU(2) two-component spinors. The inner product is then,

$$\langle \Phi | \Psi \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{\phi}_0\psi_0 + \bar{\phi}_1\psi_1). \tag{3.12}$$

For details see [2].

2. Geometry of a Quantum Spin-1/2 System

The spin degrees of freedom of a spin 1/2 particle provide a very clear example of the geometric structures described in Sec. II A. In this case the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is formed by vectors on C^2: $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}$ where α and β are complex numbers. As we saw above, it is convenient then to consider $\mathcal{H}$ as a real vector space. Instead of a column vector in C^2 we will have column vectors on R^4:

$$\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \\ c \\ e \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.13}$$

where a, b, c, e are real numbers.

The Hermitian inner product $\langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle$ between $\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}$ and $\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma \\ \delta \end{pmatrix}$ given by

$$\langle \Psi | \Phi \rangle = \bar{\alpha}\,\gamma + \bar{\beta}\,\delta \tag{3.14}$$

induces a metric G and a symplectic two form Ω on R^4:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{ij} &= 2\left[\nabla_i(a)\nabla_j(a) + \nabla_i(b)\nabla_j(b) + \nabla_i(c)\nabla_j(c) + \nabla_i(e)\nabla_j(e)\right], \\ \Omega_{ij} &= 4\left(\nabla_{[i}a\nabla_{j]}b + \nabla_{[i}c\nabla_{j]}e\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Normalized states satisfy then,

$$\langle \Phi | \Phi \rangle = a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + e^2 = 1. \tag{3.16}$$

Thus, the space S corresponds to the 3-sphere S^3.

We know that the quantum space of states $\mathcal{P}$ will be the projection of S^3 under the action of the $U(1)$ action. That is, S has the structure of a principal fiber bundle with fiber S^1 and base space $\mathcal{P} = S^2$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S^1 & \longrightarrow & S^3 \\ & & \pi \downarrow \\ & & S^2 \end{array} \tag{3.17}$$

This corresponds precisely to one of the Hopf bundles over the two sphere S^2.

In order to show the projection π explicitly and recover common coordinates on the sphere S^2 we introduce the coordinates (α, β, δ) on S^3 as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \cos(\tfrac{\beta}{2})\cos(\delta + \alpha), \\ b &= \cos(\tfrac{\beta}{2})\sin(\delta + \alpha), \\ c &= \sin(\tfrac{\beta}{2})\cos(\delta - \alpha), \\ e &= \sin(\tfrac{\beta}{2})\sin(\delta - \alpha). \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

It is straightforward to compute the induced simplectic structure on S:

$$\bar{\Omega}_{ij} = 4\sin\beta\nabla_{[i}\alpha\nabla_{j]}\beta. \tag{3.19}$$

It is clear that the degenerate direction of $\bar{\Omega}$ is $\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta}\right)^j$, which is precisely the direction of the 'phase change' generated by J.

The induced metric on S is

$$\bar{G}_{ij} = \nabla_i(\alpha)\nabla_j(\alpha) + \frac{1}{4}\nabla_i(\beta)\nabla_j(\beta) + \nabla_i(\delta)\nabla_j(\delta) - 2\cos\beta\nabla_{(i}(\alpha)\nabla_{j)}(\delta). \tag{3.20}$$

It is clear that $\bar{\Omega}$ correspond to the pullback of $\mathbf{\Omega}$ under π ($\bar{\Omega} = \pi^*\mathbf{\Omega}$). We can find the metric defined in the orbits of the degenerate direction, and define $(g, \mathbf{\Omega})$ on $\mathcal{P} = S^2$ with ordinary spherical coordinates $(\theta = \beta, \phi = 2\alpha)$ to be

$$\mathbf{\Omega}_{ab} = 2\sin\theta\nabla_{[a}\phi\nabla_{b]}\theta, \tag{3.21}$$

$$g_{ab} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\sin^2(\theta)\,\nabla_a(\phi)\nabla_b(\phi) + \nabla_a(\theta)\nabla_b(\theta)\right]. \tag{3.22}$$

Quantum observables correspond on $\mathcal{H}$ to Hermitian 2×2 matrices. A basis for those matrices is given by the Pauli matrices. They are associated with the generators of rotations in 3 dimensions and are the 'angular momentum' operators $\hat{S}_x$, $\hat{S}_y$ and $\hat{S}_z$, satisfying ordinary commutation relations: $[\hat{S}_i, \hat{S}_j] = \hbar\varepsilon_{ijk}\hat{S}_k$. We know that there are three functions on $\mathcal{P}$ which correspond to the 'observables' in the 'quantum phase space';

$$\begin{aligned} x &:= \langle\hat{S}_x\rangle = \hbar(a\,c + b\,e) = \tfrac{\hbar}{2}\sin\theta\,\cos\phi, \\ y &:= \langle\hat{S}_y\rangle = \hbar(a\,e - c\,b) = \tfrac{\hbar}{2}\sin\theta\,\sin\phi, \\ z &:= \langle\hat{S}_z\rangle = \tfrac{\hbar}{2}\left[(a^2 + b^2) - (c^2 + e^2)\right] = \tfrac{\hbar}{2}\cos\theta. \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

It is a curious fact that they are also the coordinates of a sphere of radius $\hbar/2$.

Let us now consider dynamical evolution. Without loss of generality we can take the Hamiltonian to be $H = A\hat{S}_z$. The corresponding observable on $\mathcal{P}$ is $h = \langle\hat{H}\rangle = A\,\frac{\hbar}{2}\cos\theta$. Given h and $\mathbf{\Omega}$ we can compute the equations of motion for the coordinates (θ, ϕ):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\theta} &= \mathbf{\Omega}^{ab}\,\partial_a\theta\,\partial_b h = 0, \\ \dot{\phi} &= \mathbf{\Omega}^{ab}\,\partial_a\phi\,\partial_b h = -A\tfrac{\hbar}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

That is, the quantum evolution is given by a 'point' traveling on S^2 at constant 'latitude' θ and with constant angular velocity $\dot{\phi} = -A\frac{\hbar}{2}$.

Note that the quantum description in terms of 'Kähler geometry' for the spin-1/2 particle coincides exactly with the classical description given in Sec. II. for the chosen Hamiltonian. The spheres in both cases have, however, very different origin. In one case it is the smallest quantizable *reduced phase space*. In the quantum case is the *projective* 'quantum phase space' coming from the Hilbert space of states.

IV. NONSTANDARD QUANTUM HAMILTONIAN SYSTEMS

Notice that our previous discussion means that it is possible to describe the quantization of a system in two stages. In order to see this, it is simpler to think of these stages in reverse, that is, as one method of constructing a classical theory from a known quantum theory. In this 'classicalization' one would begin with a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and a set of observables given as linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. We could now project to the space of rays $\mathcal{P}$, which, since it is a phase space itself and observables are now represented by real valued functions, the system

is represented by a 'classical theory' with at least a large part (if not all) of the content of the quantum theory defined on the Hilbert space. The main addition to this 'classical' theory is the probability structure given by (3.7) based on the Riemannian metric g_{ab}. If one were able to ignore the probability structure of this symplectic manifold, one could think of quantum mechanics on $\mathcal{P}$ as nothing more than another classical theory. Our program of 'classicalization' would then be simply a map from $\mathcal{P}$ to another symplectic manifold Γ, the phase space of the usual classical theory. We can represent the process by the following diagram,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{H} & & \\ \downarrow & & \\ \mathcal{P} & \rightarrow & \Gamma \end{array} \tag{4.1}$$

The usual process of 'quantization' is to leap from Γ directly to $\mathcal{H}$, but one might just try to reverse the direction of the arrows in (4.1), first constructing the 'Kähler quantum theory' on $\mathcal{P}$, then 'raising' the observables on $\mathcal{P}$ to Hermitian operators on $\mathcal{H}$. Notice that it could be possible to stop this procedure at $\mathcal{P}$ if one could be certain that *all* the properties of quantum mechanics (such as the superposition of states) could be realized in terms of observables on $\mathcal{P}$ and the probability structure generated by g_{ab}.

The program we are addressing in this paper involves, however, the ordinary quantization process from Γ to $\mathcal{H}$ and then considering the 'projected' geometrical formulation on $\mathcal{P}$. The classical theory we are starting with, having a modified symplectic geometry defined on it, will yield a different geometry on $\mathcal{P}$. That is, the symplectic structure $\mathbf{\Omega}$ on $\mathcal{P}$ will have some information of the corresponding one on Γ. The question we are led to ask is: Is the 'non-standard' geometry induced on the constructed quantum theory compatible with experiment?

From now on we will restrict our attention to the spin-1/2 system, and show explicitly that there are obstructions at each level to this procedure. Given that the various Hamiltonian descriptions for the classical system differ by only a conformal transformation, the set of issues we will be addressing are the ones we called 'dynamical' in the discussion at the beginning of Sec. III. While we will see that it is quite simple to mirror the change of symplectic structure given by (2.15) and recover the dynamics of the quantum system on $\mathcal{P}$ (in the sense of recovering the integral curves of the original system), but we will find that it is more difficult to maintain the probability structure in terms of g_{ab} that does not exist in the purely classical system. We will also see that realizing the dynamics of the nonstandard Hamiltonian system in terms of a linear Hamiltonian operator is impossible in most cases.

We would like to change the symplectic two-form on $\mathcal{P}$ for the spin-1/2 system and find a new Hamiltonian function $\tilde{h}$ which gives the same set of integral curves that are given in Sec. III. We must also require that the *physical* predictions be the same in terms of measurement. Recall that the probability of measuring the eigenvalue o_i of an operator $\hat{O}$ when the system is in state Ψ is given by the geodesic distance from Ψ to the point Φ_i ($\hat{O}\Phi_i = o_i\Phi_i$): $P(\Psi, o_i) = \cos^2\left[\frac{d(\Psi,\Phi_i)}{\sqrt{2}}\right]$. This implies that in order to recover the same physical predictions, not only the dynamical trajectory must be the same but also the geodesic distance to the eigenstates.

Let us consider a double Stern-Gerlach experiment in which we first measure $\hat{S}_z$ and then look only at the particles that had spin 'up'. In our picture, this corresponds to considering

a quantum state located at the 'north pole' ($\theta = 0$). We put now a second measuring device. The spatial orientation of the apparatus corresponds precisely to the orientation of the eigenstates (which lie on 'antipodal points') on the sphere. The probability of measuring spin 'up' and 'down' will depend only on the angle along maximal circles, from the north pole to the 'podes'. Since the system is rotationally symmetric, we can rotate both detectors while keeping their relative orientation fixed and the probabilities will not change. That operation corresponds to 'fixing the 'up' direction of the detectors' in (x, y, z) space and rotating the sphere. Since the distance along the sphere must be the same, we conclude that the metric on S^2 should be rotational symmetric, which is a property of the metric inherited from the Hermitian inner product. Let us denote by $\overset{o}{g}_{ab}$, the metric defined by Eq. (3.22) $\left(\overset{o}{g}_{ab} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\sin^2(\theta)\,\nabla_a(\phi)\nabla_b(\phi) + \nabla_a(\theta)\nabla_b(\theta)\right]\right)$.

We can conclude then that the metric g should be equal to $\overset{o}{g}$, together with the integral curves. The question that we are led to ask is: can we find a new $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $\tilde{h}$ such that the Hamiltonian vector field of $\tilde{h}$ and g_{ab} are the same? Since any two-form on S^2 is given by a conformal transformation from the 'canonical' two-form $\mathbf{\Omega}$ defined by eq. (3.21), what we are looking for is precisely the conformal factor μ in Sec. II. such that,

$$\tilde{\Omega}^{ab} = \mu \mathbf{\Omega}^{ab}. \tag{4.2}$$

It is easy to see that we can find a $\tilde{h}$ such that the dynamical evolution is the same. The condition, in the (θ, ϕ) coordinates, is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -A\frac{\hbar}{2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\Omega}^{\theta\phi} \\ -\tilde{\Omega}^{\theta\phi} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_\theta \tilde{h} \\ \partial_\phi \tilde{h} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.3}$$

This set implies that $\partial_\phi \tilde{h} = 0$, or, $\tilde{h} = f(\theta)$, so the system reduces to one equation:

$$A\tfrac{\hbar}{2} = \tilde{\Omega}^{\theta\phi} f', \tag{4.4}$$

where $f' = \frac{df}{d\theta}$.

Therefore, $\tilde{\Omega}^{\theta\phi} = A\frac{\hbar}{2}\frac{1}{f'}$. To solve the system, we could fix f and then define $\tilde{\Omega}$ from the previous equation. This would give us the conformal factor to be $\mu = \frac{-\hbar A}{2}\frac{\sin\theta}{f'}$.

However, recall that $\mathcal{P}$ must have a Kähler structure, so g and Ω must be compatible in the sense that $g_{ab} = J^c_a \Omega_{cb}$. Can we change Ω arbitrarily and still have a compatible system for fixed g? The answer to this question is no. A little lemma follows:

Lemma 1 *Let $\overset{o}{g}_{ab}$ be the metric on S^2 given by Eq. (3.21), then $(\mathcal{P}, g, \mathbf{\Omega})$ is a Kähler Manifold iff $f' = K\sin\theta$. That is iff $\mu = C$, where K and C are real constants.*

We have to conclude, that it is impossible to have a nonstandard quantum Hamiltonian dynamics compatible with observation: there is no freedom in changing Ω and h.

The second obstruction (the two obstructions are probably strongly related) to changing the symplectic structure in quantum mechanics is that we would normally like to have the 'Kähler quantum mechanics' on $\mathcal{P}$ come from a system of operators in a Hilbert space whose expectation values on $\mathcal{P}$ would generate the observables. If we attempt to do this for $\tilde{h}$, and

even if we were to ignore the lemma above, we are still restricted by the fact that $\tilde{h}$ must be a function of θ only. Even if we try to let $\tilde{h}$ be any function of θ, in this simple case if $\tilde{h}$ is to be the image of a linear Hermitian operator on the space of vectors in $\mathcal{H}$, the operator $\hat{\tilde{H}}$ must be of the form

$$\hat{\tilde{H}} = \zeta I + \tfrac{\eta}{2}\hat{S}_x + \tfrac{\kappa}{2}\hat{S}_y + \tfrac{\lambda}{2}\hat{S}_z, \tag{4.5}$$

with ζ, η, κ, λ real. This means that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{h} &= \zeta + \tfrac{\eta}{2}\langle\hat{S}_x\rangle + \tfrac{\kappa}{2}\langle\hat{S}_y\rangle + \tfrac{\lambda}{2}\langle\hat{S}_z\rangle \\ &= \zeta + \eta\tfrac{\hbar}{4}\sin\theta\cos\phi + \kappa\tfrac{\hbar}{4}\sin\theta\sin\phi + \lambda\tfrac{\hbar}{4}\cos\theta\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

must be a function of θ. The only way to satisfy this for all ϕ is to take $\eta = \kappa = 0$. This means that the only possible $\tilde{h}$ that come from linear Hermitian operators are

$$\tilde{h} = Kh + D, \tag{4.7}$$

where K and D are real constants. In this case the new μ is $\mu = (1/K)\mu_0$. All other choices of μ must lead to $\hat{\tilde{H}}$ a nonlinear operator.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

We have attempted to transfer to quantum theory an idea originally due to Hojman, that perhaps the usual symplectic structure of classical mechanics is too restrictive, and it might be possible to generalize it. In classical mechanics this is certainly the case, and it may lead to new approaches to solving old problems, and can be used to construct Hamiltonian theories for systems that have no variational principle, and thus no Hamiltonian in the usual sense. We have considered this idea from the viewpoint of changing the symplectic structure and Hamiltonian of a system that does have a Hamiltonian. Classically this can be done with no loss of generality, since we can easily generate the same solution curves for the system for a large class of symplectic structures.

What we have just shown is that, even in the Ashtekar-Schilling formulation [15], where the evolution of the system takes place on a symplectic manifold similar to that of classical mechanics, the extra rigidity a probability structure imposes on the system makes it impossible to use symplectic structures of the type we have been able to use in classical mechanics. In fact, our spin-1/2 example shows that the restrictions on the symplectic structure are quite strong. A probably related obstruction is that only certain Hamiltonians on $\mathcal{P}$ can be represented by linear Hermitian operators on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ that generates the symplectic manifold $\mathcal{P}$.

It seems, then, that the results of the article are essentially negative. However, it may be possible to change some of the structures on the quantum symplectic manifold in order to try to maintain the idea of a more general symplectic structure while still keeping the probability structure necessary for quantum mechanics.

There are two obstructions to the program of generalizing symplectic structures. Perhaps the most important is the fact that changing Ω_{ab} on $\mathcal{P}$ leads to a disastrous change in the

metric g_{ab} on $\mathcal{P}$ that defines the probability. If it were possible to change Ω_{ab} without changing g_{ab}, we would have a simple solution to the problem. The difficulty here is Eq. (1.10),

$$g_{ab} = \Omega_{ac} J^c_b, \tag{5.1}$$

which relates Ω_{ab} to g_{ab} through the complex structure tensor J^a_b. Note that the complex structure is required to obey $J^b_a J^c_b = -\delta^c_a$. If we make a similarity transformation (such as a coordinate transformation) on J, $J^a_b = S^a_c J^c_d (S^{-1})^d_b$, $J^b_a J^c_b = -\delta^c_a$ is preserved. If one makes such a transformation, both Ω_{ab} and g_{ab} change as 'covariant tensors', which is perfectly acceptable. Notice that if we were to make a more complicated transformation, such as a conformal transformation, on Ω_{ab}, $\Omega_{ab} \rightarrow \varphi \Omega_{ab}$, and at the same time insist that g_{ab} remain unchanged in order to preserve the probability structure, we would have to allow $J^a_b \rightarrow (1/\varphi) J^a_b$, and $J^b_a J^c_b = -(1/\varphi)^2 \delta^c_a$, which is negative definite and nonsingular as long as φ is finite and nonzero, but does not obey the defining equation of a complex structure tensor. We have been unable to find in the literature any study of this type of 'pseudocomplex structures' which would allow more drastic changes in J^a_b, and it might be worthwhile to consider such objects to see if a consistent quantum mechanics on $\mathcal{P}$ could be constructed using them. We have taken a conformal transformation as an example because in our spin-1/2 system, with its low-dimensional phase space, the Hojman transformation (2.6) reduces to a simple conformal transformation.

In higher dimensional phase spaces the Hojman transformation $\Omega_{ab} \rightarrow K^c_a \Omega_{cb}$ would imply that to maintain the metric g_{ab} invariant one would have to take $J^a_b \rightarrow J'^c_b = J^a_c (K^{-1})^c_b$, and, in principle, since the Hojman transformation contains the conformal factor μ, we might expect that $J'^a_b J'^b_c$ would not be equal to $-\delta^a_c$, just as for a conformal transformation. In that case, it would be necessary to postulate 'pseudocomplex structures' similar to those just mentioned in order to preserve g_{ab} on changing Ω_{ab}. Note, however, that while the Hojman transformation for a two-dimensional phase space reduces to a pure conformal transformation, the more general transformation allowed in higher dimensional phase spaces may still allow us to write $J'^a_b J'^b_c = -\delta^a_c$, in which case J'^a_b is nothing more than a 'deformed complex structure', and this concept has been studied for some time [16]. It is necessary to investigate whether the Hojman transformation allows $J'^a_b J'^b_c = -\delta^a_c$ or not.

Another possibility that would allow change in the symplectic structure without deforming the complex structure would be to allow the appropriate transformation on g_{ab} that would preserve J^a_b (in the spin-1/2 case a conformal transformation) and define probabilities in some 'conformally invariant' fashion. We will not attempt to consider this idea further.

One remark is in order. The phase space of the system we started with, namely the sphere S^2, is somewhat special. Perhaps the most notorious property is that it is a *compact* manifold. As a consequence, the Hilbert space in the quantum theory is *finite* dimensional. Furthermore, it has recently been shown that the *only* classical observables that can be quantized in a way that the prescription $\{,\} \rightarrow i\hbar[,]$ is satisfied exactly, are the generators of rotations s_i [17]. This is the equivalent, for S^2, of the Groenewold-Van Hove theorem [18]. Our result for the spin-1/2 system is therefore another indication of the 'rigidity' of the structures one can define on the sphere. This has to be contrasted with higher dimensional (non-compact) phase spaces for which the quantum theory is much richer (infinite dimensional Hilbert space). In this case one has in fact an infinite number of possible complex

structures (this freedom is similar to the one that leads to different inequivalent representations of the CCR in QFT). In this case, the nonstandard quantum theory has to satisfy the 'kinematical' requirements related to the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, and possible super-selected sectors, in order to be considered 'valid'. A complete study of the most general case is therefore, still open.

Finally, note that if it were possible to be sure that all of the content of quantum mechanics could be achieved in terms of the evolution and structure of points in $\mathcal{P}$, we would not need to worry about the fact that the time evolution of states, for example, is a reflection of evolution in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ that is generated by a nonlinear Hamiltonian operator. If this is not so, then we would be forced to consider the possibility of nonlinear evolution in quantum mechanics, an idea that has been proposed by several authors [19], but one should be justifiably reluctant to propose such a drastic modification to, at the very least, a one-particle model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank S. Hojman and A. Gomberoff for stimulating discussions. We also thank T. Schilling for discussing his work with us, and J.A. Zapata for helpful comments. One of us (MR) is grateful to the Center for Gravitational Physics and Geometry for the hospitality during 1994-95. Both authors were supported by the National University of México (DGAPA-UNAM). This work was supported in part by the NSF grant PHY93-96246, by the Eberly research fund of Penn State University, and by a CONACYT-CONICET exchange grant (México-Chile).

REFERENCES

[1] A. Ashtekar, Commun. Math. Phys. **71**, 2640 (1980); A. Ashtekar and R.S. Tate, J. Math. Phys. **35**, 6434 (1994).

[2] N.J.M. Woodhouse, *Geometric Quantization*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 1992).

[3] C.J. Isham, in *Relativity Groups and Topology II*, eds. B.S. DeWitt and R. Stora. Elsevier (1984).

[4] F.J. Dyson, Am. J. Phys. **58**, 209 (1990).

[5] S.A. Hojman and L.C. Shepley, J. Math. Phys. **32**, 142 (1991).

[6] S.A. Hojman, "Non-Lagrangian Construction of Hamiltonian Structures", preprint hep-th/9406158.

[7] R.M. Wald, *General Relativity*, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, USA, 1984).

[8] V.I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, (Springer Verlag, New York, USA, 1989).

[9] J.E. Marsden, *Lectures on Mechanics*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1992).

[10] S. Hojman and H. Harleston, J. Math. Phys **22**, 1414 (1981).

[11] R. Brouzet, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, **308**(I), 287 (1989).

[12] See for example: H.C. Corben and P. Stehle, *Classical Mechanics*, (Wiley, New York, USA, 1960); H.C. Corben, *Classical and Quantum Theories of Spinning Particles*, (Holden-Day, San Francisco, USA, 1968).

[13] S.A. Hojman, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **24**, L249 (1991).

[14] T.W.B. Kibble, Commun. Math. Phys. **65**, 189 (1979); A. Heslot, Phys. Rev. D**31**, 1341 (1985); A. Ashtekar and T.A. Schilling, in *Proceedings of the 1st CAM meeting*, World Scientific, (1995).

[15] A. Ashtekar and T.A. Schilling, "Geometry of Quantum Mechanics", Preprint-CGPG (1995).

[16] See for example: K. Kodaira, *Complex Manifolds and Deformation of Complex Structures*, (Springer-Verlag, New York, USA 1986).

[17] M.J. Gotay, H. Grundling and C.A. Hurst, "A Groenewold-Van Hove Theorem for S^2", Preprint dg-ga/9502008. To appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.

[18] See for example: M.J. Gotay, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **19**, 139 (1980).

[19] See for instance (and references therein): T.W.B. Kibble, Commun. Math. Phys. **64**, 73 (1978); B. Mielnik, Commun. Math. Phys. **37**, 221 (1974); I. Bialynicki-Birula and J. Mycielski, Ann. Phys. **100**, 62 (1976).