# GEOMETRIC QUANTIZATION II: PREQUANTIZATION AND THE HEISENBERG GROUP

## 1. Prospectus

- 1.1. **Representation.** In the first lecture we defined a Lie algebra structure on  $C^{\infty}(M)$ , where M is any symplectic manifold. The general aim is to define a representation of this Lie algebra on some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  associated to M. It's not always clear what the rules are, but here are some pointers:
  - (a) For each  $f \in C^{\infty}(M)$ , the corresponding operator on  $\mathcal{H}$  should be skew-Hermitian.
  - (b) Any constant function f should act by multiplication-by-if.
  - (c) We may only be able to represent some subalgebra of  $C^{\infty}(M)$ .
  - (d) H should not be 'too big'; in particular, it should be an irreducible representation.

There is some kind of tradeoff between the size of  $\mathcal{H}$  and the size of the subalgebra that we can represent. In the end, what we do will be judged by how well we can handle important examples.

1.2. **Hermiticity.** Given a Lie group G, it is usual to consider unitary representations of G. This corresponds to Lie-algebra representations in which Lie(G) acts by skew-Hermitian operators. For various reasons, physicists prefer to work with Hermitian operators. If X is Hermitian, iX is anti-Hermitian. So from this point of view, we want for each  $f \in C^{\infty}(M)$ , a Hermitian operator  $\hat{f}$ , such that

$$[\hat{f}, \hat{g}] = -i\widehat{[f, g]}.$$

On the right, [,] is the Poisson bracket. The passage between Hermitian and skew-Hermitian operators is the source of most factors of i throughout.

## 2. Prequantization

2.1. **Hilbert Space.** Suppose we have a manifold M with a measure  $\mu$ . Then we can form the Hilbert space  $L^2(M,\mu)$  of complex-valued  $L^2$  functions on M.

We need a more general construction. Suppose given a complex line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  on M with a Hermitian form  $\eta \colon \overline{\mathcal{L}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{L} \to \mathbb{C}_{M}$ . (Here  $\mathbb{C}_{M}$  is the trivial complex line bundle on M.) Then the space of sections  $C^{\infty}(M,\mathcal{L})$  has a natural Hermitian pairing

$$(f,g) = \int_{M} \eta(f,g) \, \mu$$

and we again obtain a Hilbert space  $L^2(M, \mathcal{L}, \mu)$ . Here  $\eta(f, g)$  is a function on M, so  $\eta(f, g) \mu$  is a measure.

Remark 2.1. A slightly more canonical construction is to forget about the measure  $\mu$ , and assume given a Hermitian pairing  $\eta \colon \overline{\mathcal{L}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{L} \to \Delta_1(M)$ , where now  $\Delta_1(M)$  is the complex line bundle whose sections are smooth (complex) measures on M. Then  $\eta(f,g)$  is a measure, and can be integrated, so we get a Hilbert space  $L^2(M,\mathcal{L})$ . In this context, I talked a bit about spaces of densities and forms; we ended up not needing this yet, so I will come back to this subject later in the notes.

If M is a symplectic manifold then there is already a canonical (up to scale) measure  $\mu$  on M, corresponding to the volume form  $\omega \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega$ . We will use this canonical measure in what follows.

2.2. **Operators.** Recall that for each  $f \in C^{\infty}(M)$  we have a 'globally Hamiltonian' vector field  $X_f$ . This vector field  $X_f$  acts on  $L^2(M,\mu)$  by derivations. More generally, we must assume that our line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  has a connection, which allows us differentiate sections of  $\mathcal{L}$ , and in particular gives us an operator  $\nabla_{X_f}$  on  $L^2(M,\mathcal{L},\mu)$ . If we define

$$\hat{f}(s) = -i\nabla_{X_f} s + f s$$

then  $\hat{f}$  is a Hermitian operator, and if f is constant then  $\hat{f}$  is multiplication-by-f. However, to fulfill our mission, we must also require (1).

**Theorem 2.3.** (a) Equation (1) holds if and only if

$$\omega(\xi_1, \xi_2)s = \frac{i}{2}([\nabla_{\xi_1}, \nabla_{\xi_2}] - \nabla_{[\xi_1, \xi_2]})s$$

for all sections s of  $\mathcal{L}$  (i.e.  $\omega$  is the curvature of  $\nabla$ ).

- (b) There exists a triple  $(\mathcal{L}, \eta, \nabla)$  with curvature  $\omega$  if and only if  $\omega$  is integral.
- (c) If  $\omega$  is integral, then the triples  $(\mathcal{L}, \eta, \nabla)$  with curvature  $\omega$  are parameterised by  $H^1(M, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ .

The condition in (b) that  $\omega$  is integral means that its class in  $H^2(M,\mathbb{R})$  comes from  $H^2(M,2\pi\mathbb{Z})$ , or, more geometrically, that the integral of  $\omega$  over every closed, oriented 2-surface in M is an integer times  $2\pi$ . Suppose that there exists some  $(\mathcal{L}, \eta, \nabla)$  such that  $\nabla$  has curvature  $\omega$ . Then  $\eta$  is determined uniquely by  $(\mathcal{L}, \nabla)$ ; but given  $(\mathcal{L}, \eta)$ , the choices of  $\nabla$  are parameterized by  $H^1(M, \mathbb{R})/H^1(M, \mathbb{Z})$ .

The representation  $f \mapsto \hat{f}$  of  $C^{\infty}(M)$  on  $\mathcal{H} = L^2(M, \mathcal{L}, \mu)$  is called a *prequantization*.

Example 2.1. Suppose that  $M=T^*N$  is a cotangent bundle. Then  $\omega$  is exact, so there exists a prequantization. If M is simply connected, then there exists at most one prequantization. In the simplest case, if M=V is a symplectic vector space, then there is a unique prequantization.

2.4. Construction. I sketch how to construct the unique  $(\mathcal{L}, \eta, \nabla)$  when M is simply connected.

First define  $\mathcal{L}_0$  to be the set of triples  $(m, z, \gamma)$  where  $m \in M$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , and  $\gamma$  is a path from some basepoint  $m_0$  to m. Introduce an equivalence relation on  $\mathcal{L}_0$  such that  $(m, z, \gamma) \sim (m', z', \gamma')$  if and only if m = m' and

$$\frac{z}{z'} = \exp(i \int_S \omega)$$

for any oriented 2-surface whose boundary is the concatenation of paths  $\gamma^{-1} * \gamma'$ . Such a surface exists for any  $\gamma, \gamma'$ , because we assumed M simply connected; the right-hand side  $\exp(i \int_S \omega)$  is independent of S by the integrality of  $\omega$ . It is thus easy to see that  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0/\sim$  is a line-bundle on M. We write  $\mathcal{L}_m$  for the fibre at m, and continue to label elements of  $\mathcal{L}_m$  by equivalence classes of pairs  $(z, \gamma)$ .

The Hermitian structure on  $\mathcal{L}$  is given by  $\eta(z, \gamma; z', \gamma) = \bar{z}z'$  where, note, the paths  $\gamma$  are the same. The connection  $\nabla$  is defined by parallel transport as follows. Suppose given a path  $\alpha$  from m to m'. Given  $(z, \gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_m$  there should be a unique way to lift  $\alpha \colon [0, 1] \to M$  to  $\tilde{\alpha} \colon [0, 1] \to \mathcal{L}$  so that  $\nabla_{\alpha'(t)}\tilde{\alpha}(t) = 0$  (i.e. the section  $\tilde{\alpha}$  of  $\mathcal{L}$  over  $\alpha$  is constant). The association  $(z, \gamma) = \tilde{\alpha}(0) \mapsto \tilde{\alpha}(1)$  is 'parallel transport' from m to m', and these parallel transport maps determine  $\nabla$ . The definition is that parallel transport is given by  $(z, \gamma) \mapsto (z, \alpha * \gamma)$ .

### 3. Example

The problem with prequantization is that the Hilbert space is 'too big.' The fundamental example is as follows. Suppose that  $S = \mathbb{R}$  (with coordinate q) and  $M = T^*S = \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$  (with coordinates (q, p)). Quantum mechanics gives the following prescription: let  $\mathcal{H} = L^2(S, dq)$ , and define  $\hat{q}s(q) = qs(q)$  and  $\hat{p}s(q) = -i\partial_q s(q)$ , for every  $s \in L^2(S, dq)$ . These operators satisfy the expected 'canonical' commutation relation (cf. (1))

$$[\hat{p}, \hat{q}] = -i.$$

There are two lessons to be learnt:

- (a) We get a representation of the coordinate functions p and q (and some others), but not all of  $C^{\infty}(M)$ .
- (b) The Hilbert space consists of functions on S, not anything like functions on M (as we would have expected from prequantisation). However, it is an irreducible representation of the Lie algebra generated by p and q.

To preview the general case, the specified quantization depends on the additional datum of the projection  $T^*S \to S$ , which is called a *polarization*. If  $M = T^*N$  is a cotangent bundle, we can always use the projection  $M \to N$ , but in general there may be many possible reasonable choices of polarization.

### 4. The Heisenberg Group

We can abstract the above example in the following way. We take V to be a symplectic vector space. For each  $v \in V$  we have the linear function  $f_v := \omega(v, -) \in C^{\infty}(V)$ . The Poisson bracket is

$$[f_v, f_w] = \omega(v, w).$$

Thus these linear functions generate a Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{h}(V)$  (the Heisenberg Lie algebra):  $\mathfrak{h}(V) = V \times \mathbb{R}$  as a set,  $\mathbb{R}$  is central, and  $[v, w] = (0, \omega(v, w))$  for  $v, w \in V$ .

A quantization of V should yield (at least) a representation of  $\mathfrak{h}(V)$ , in which constants  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  act by ia. There are reasons to require this to be an *irreducible* representation. (The rough reason is that  $\mathfrak{h}(V)$  acts transitively on V, so ought to act 'transitively', i.e. irreducibly, on  $\mathcal{H}$ .)

The Heisenberg Lie group associated to  $\mathfrak{h}(V)$  is  $H(V) = V \times U(1)$  as a set; multiplication is defined so that the circle U(1) is central, and the product of  $(v,0),(w,0) \in V$  is

$$vw = (v + w, \exp(\frac{i}{2}\omega(v, w))).$$

So, to rephrase: a quantization of V is an irreducible unitary representation of H(V) in which U(1) acts by scalar multiplication.

Remark 4.1. Of course there are many different Lie groups with the same Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{h}(V)$ . We choose this one because the representations of  $\mathfrak{h}(V)$  we are interested in correspond to representations of our H(V).

**Theorem 4.1** (Stone-von Neuman). There exists a unique irreducible representation of H(V) such that U(1) acts by scalar multiplication.

'Unique' as usual means unique-up-to-isomorphism. However, the usual construction of the representation depends on a choice of a  $Lagrangian\ subspace$  of V – this is essentially the choice of a polarization mentioned before.

José says that in the infinite dimensional case, the choice of the Lagrangian is a serious matter, resulting in 'different physics' (I think this means: inequivalent representations). But even in our finite-dimensional case, where the representations are isomorphic, there is some subtle structure to the choices, related to the metaplectic group.