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#### Abstract

We analyse a possible connection between different quantisation schemes and the Bargman-Segal realisation of the Heisenberg algebra H. We show that only a oneparameter subfamily of the family of Heisenberg algebras $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{Q}}$ subduced from $\mathrm{H} \oplus \mathrm{H}$ can be rewritten in the Bargman-Segal form.


## 1. Introduction

One of the most interesting approaches to the quantisation problem is that which formulates itself on the phase space of the physical system under consideration. Such a formulation is based on the observation made by several authors [1-7] who have suggested a quantisation mapping adhering to the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{f}=\mathrm{i} X_{f}+f-p \partial f / \partial p-q \partial f / \partial q \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $X_{f}$ is a tangent vector field on phase space associated with the function $f$ for some vector field $X[8,9]$.

Specific realisations of quantisation mapping resulting from the general prescription given by (1.1) are the following.
(i) Van Hove's [1, 7] mapping

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{Q}=q+\mathrm{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p}  \tag{1.2a}\\
& \hat{P}=-\mathrm{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial q} \tag{1.2b}
\end{align*}
$$

or its improved form [10]

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{Q}=\frac{1}{2} q+\mathrm{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p}  \tag{1.3a}\\
& \hat{P}=-2 \mathrm{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial q} . \tag{1.3b}
\end{align*}
$$

(ii) The symmetric quantisation mapping [4-6, 10]

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{Q}=\mathrm{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p}+\frac{1}{2} q  \tag{1.4a}\\
& \hat{P}=-\mathrm{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial q}+\frac{1}{2} p \tag{1.4b}
\end{align*}
$$

There are various reasons why the above prescriptions might be advantageous with respect to the conventional quantisation mapping (see [1-10] and also Chernoff [11]).

The aim of the present paper is to find a specific relation between possible quantisation schemes and the Bargmann-Segal [12,13] realisation (hereafter referred to as Bs ) of the Heisenberg algebra. As is well known the last is closely connected to the coherent states [14, 15].

Our paper is organised as follows. In $\S 2$ we investigate the Heisenberg subalgebras $\mathrm{H}_{Q}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{q}$ rotated by a symplectic transformation. We relate our findings to the irreducible subspaces connected with the eigenvalues of $N_{q}$. In $\S 3$ we connect the realisation of $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{Q}}$ with the bs one.

## 2. Embeddings of $\mathbf{H}$ in $\mathbf{H} \oplus \mathbf{H}$ and the representation problem

Let $\mathscr{H}$ denote the Hilbert space of square-integrable functions $\Psi(q, p)$ of $q$ and $p$ with measure $\mathrm{d} \mu_{0}=\mathrm{d} q \mathrm{~d} p$ which are defined on the phase space $\mathbb{R}^{2}$. Following the famous von Neumann theorem [16] the space $\mathscr{H}$ is the underlying space for irreducible representation of the Heisenberg algebra H generated by the multiplication operations by $q$ and $p$ by differentiation $-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial q$ and $-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial p$ and by identity. In H we can distinguish two subalgebras generated by $(q,-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial q, I)$ and ( $p,-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial p, I$ ), respectively, with a common one-dimensional subspace spanned by the identity $I$. It is obvious that the above decomposition of the algebra H is not unique: we can go to another set of generators by a symplectic transformation $\Omega \in \operatorname{Sp}(2 ; R)$

$$
\left(\begin{array}{l}
\hat{Q}  \tag{2.1}\\
\hat{p} \\
\hat{q} \\
\hat{p}
\end{array}\right)=\Omega\left(\begin{array}{c}
q \\
-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial q \\
p \\
-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial p
\end{array}\right)
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Omega^{\mathrm{T}} J \Omega=J  \tag{2.2a}\\
& \Omega^{*}=\Omega \tag{2.2b}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
J=\left(\begin{array}{rr|rr}
0 & -1 & 0 & 0  \tag{2.3}\\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

is the symplectic matrix.

The pair $(\hat{Q}, \hat{P}, I)$ and ( $\hat{q}, \hat{p}, I$ ) now generate two Heisenberg algebras $\mathrm{H}_{Q}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{q}$, respectively. Each symplectic transformation $\Omega \in \mathrm{Sp}(2 ; R)$ can be decomposed into two parts; one part which leaves invariant the subalgebras spaces (it changes the basis within subalgebras only) and the other part which non-trivially mixes these subspaces. The former one forms the stability group of a given subalgebra and is given by the evident condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
(I-\Pi) \Omega_{0} \Pi=0 \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Omega_{0} \in \mathrm{G}_{0}$, the stability subgroup $\left(\mathrm{G}_{0} \subset \mathrm{Sp}(2 ; R)\right), I$ is the identity matrix,

$$
\Pi=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
I_{2} & 0  \tag{2.5}\\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

projects on the upper subspace corresponding to $\mathrm{H}_{Q}$ and $I_{2}$ is the $2 \times 2$ unit matrix. The condition (2.4) can be solved immediately and we obtain as a result

$$
\Omega_{0}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\Omega_{+} & 0  \tag{2.6}\\
0 & \Omega_{-}
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $\Omega_{ \pm}$are $2 \times 2$ real matrices with $\operatorname{det} \Omega_{ \pm}=1$, i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Omega_{0} \in \operatorname{Sp}(1 ; R) \times \mathrm{Sp}(1 ; R)=\mathrm{SL}(2 ; R) \times \mathrm{SL}(2 ; R)=\mathrm{G}_{0} . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now the essentially different choices of the subalgebra, say $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{Q}}$, are parametrised by points of the quotient space $[17,18] \operatorname{Sp}(2 ; R) / \operatorname{Sp}(1 ; R) \times \operatorname{Sp}(1 ; R)$. In order to obtain an explicit parametrisation of the above coset space, let us note that the elements outside the Lie algebra of the stability subgroup take the form

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & -\sigma_{2} \omega^{\mathrm{\top}} \sigma_{2}  \tag{2.8}\\
\omega & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

where

$$
\sigma_{2}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & -\mathrm{i}  \tag{2.8a}\\
\mathrm{i} & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

is the Pauli matrix and $\omega$ is an arbitrary $2 \times 2$ real matrix. Consequently the corresponding group elements are

$$
W=\left(\begin{array}{rr|rr}
\alpha & 0 & \beta & \gamma  \tag{2.9}\\
0 & \alpha & \delta & -\varepsilon \\
\hline \varepsilon & \gamma & \alpha & 0 \\
\delta & -\beta & 0 & \alpha
\end{array}\right)
$$

where the real parameters $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon$ satisfy the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha^{2}-(\beta \varepsilon+\gamma \delta)=1 . \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that the elements $W$ and $-W$ belong to the same coset because $\pm I \in \mathrm{G}_{0}$. Therefore, to get a global homeomorphy between the coset space $\operatorname{Sp}(2 ; R) / \operatorname{Sp}(1 ; R) \times$ $\mathrm{Sp}(1 ; R)$ and the set $\{W\}$ we must demand $\alpha \geqslant 0$. Geometrically the considered quotient
space is the one-sheet hyperboloid $H_{3,2}\left(\operatorname{dim} H_{3,2}=4\right)$; this yields readily if we pass to coordinates $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{5}$ defined as

$$
\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}  \tag{2.11}\\
x_{2} \\
x_{3} \\
x_{4} \\
x_{5}
\end{array}\right]=\frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{rrrrr}
2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right]\left(\begin{array}{l}
\alpha \\
\beta \\
\gamma \\
\delta \\
\varepsilon
\end{array}\right)
$$

In terms of these coordinates, the constraint (2.10) takes the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{1}^{2}+x_{2}^{2}+x_{3}^{2}-x_{4}^{2}-x_{5}^{2}=1 \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

determining $H_{3,2}$.
We are led to the conclusion that $\Omega \in \operatorname{Sp}(2 ; R)$ can be represented as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Omega=\Omega_{0} W \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\Omega_{0}$ and $W$ given by (2.6) and (2.9), respectively. Therefore, the explicit form of (2.1) is

$$
\begin{align*}
& \binom{\hat{Q}}{\hat{P}}=\Omega_{+}\left[\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\alpha & 0 \\
0 & \alpha
\end{array}\right)\binom{q}{-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial q}+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\beta & \gamma \\
\delta & -\varepsilon
\end{array}\right)\binom{p}{-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial p}\right]  \tag{2.14a}\\
& \binom{\hat{q}}{\hat{p}}=\Omega_{-}\left[\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\alpha & 0 \\
0 & \alpha
\end{array}\right)\binom{p}{-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial p}+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\varepsilon & \gamma \\
\delta & -\beta
\end{array}\right)\binom{q}{-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial q}\right] . \tag{2.14b}
\end{align*}
$$

Because we are interested in quantisation of a one-dimensional system we must subduce the representation of H acting on $\mathscr{H}$ to, say, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{Q}}$. However the subduced representation of $H_{Q}$ is in $\mathscr{H}$ highly reducible; irreducible subspaces are marked by eigenvalues of the occupation number operator for $\mathrm{H}_{q}$, namely by

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{q}=\frac{1}{2}(\hat{q}-\mathrm{i} \hat{p})(\hat{q}+\mathrm{i} \hat{p}) \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the following we restrict ourselves to the irreducible subspace connected with the eigenvalue zero of $N_{q}$. To do this, we note first that the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{q} \Psi(q, p)=0 \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

implies, via positive definiteness of the norm in $\mathscr{H}$, that

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\hat{q}+\mathrm{i} \hat{p}) \Psi(q, p)=0 \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore the explicit form of the projection equation (2.17), using (2.14a,b), is

$$
\begin{gather*}
0=\{\alpha[(a+\mathrm{i} c) p+(d-\mathrm{i} b) \partial / \partial p]+[\varepsilon(a+\mathrm{i} c)+\delta(b+\mathrm{i} d)] q \\
-\mathrm{i}[\gamma(a+\mathrm{i} c)-\beta(b+\mathrm{i} d)] \partial / \partial q\} \Psi(q, p) \tag{2.17a}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $a, b, c, d$ parametrise $\Omega_{-}$:

$$
\Omega_{-}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a & b  \tag{2.18}\\
c & d
\end{array}\right)
$$

with the constraint

$$
\begin{equation*}
a d-b c=1 \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

The general case will be considered in the next section.

## 3. Connection with the bs representation

Now let us try to connect the realisation of $\mathrm{H}_{Q}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon)$ with the bs one. We remember first that in the bs representation case we have to deal with the Hilbert space of entire functions $\phi\left(z^{*}\right)$ of $z^{*}, z \in \mathbb{C}$, with the measure

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d} \mu=\mathrm{d}^{2} z \exp \left(-\frac{1}{4}|z|^{2}\right) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and with action of the annihilation and creation operators corresponding to the differentiation $\partial / \partial z^{*}$ and multiplication by $z^{*}$ respectively. Therefore we should redefine $\Psi$ and $\mathrm{d} \mu_{0}$ as well as connect $z$ with $q$ and $p$ as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Psi(q, p)=\exp \left(-\frac{1}{2}|z|^{2}\right) \phi\left(z^{*}\right)  \tag{3.2a}\\
& \mathrm{d} \mu_{0}=\mathrm{d} \mu \exp \left(\frac{1}{4}|z|^{2}\right)  \tag{3.2b}\\
& z=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(q^{\prime}+\mathrm{i} p^{\prime}\right) \tag{3.2c}
\end{align*}
$$

where $q^{\prime}$ and $p^{\prime}$ are appropriate linear combinations of $q$ and $p$. Moreover, in the action on $\phi\left(z^{*}\right)$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{Q}+\mathrm{i} \hat{P})=\frac{\partial}{\partial z^{*}}  \tag{3.2d}\\
& \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{Q}-\mathrm{i} \hat{P})=z^{*} \tag{3.2e}
\end{align*}
$$

However the consistency between (2.17) and (3.2a-e) leads to the relations

$$
\begin{align*}
& \alpha=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \beta=0 \quad \delta=-\frac{1}{2 \gamma} \quad \varepsilon=0  \tag{3.3a}\\
& \Omega_{+}=-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
d / \gamma & 2 \gamma c \\
b / \gamma & 2 \gamma a
\end{array}\right)  \tag{3.3b}\\
& \binom{q^{\prime}}{p^{\prime}}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
-d / \gamma & \sqrt{2} \\
-b / \gamma & \sqrt{2}
\end{array}\right)\binom{q}{p} \tag{3.3c}
\end{align*}
$$

with

$$
\Omega_{-}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a & b  \tag{3.4}\\
c & d
\end{array}\right)
$$

Consequently, the explicit form of the base elements of the distinguished Heisenberg algebra $\mathrm{H}_{Q}$ is

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{Q}=-\frac{d}{2 \gamma} q+\frac{c}{\sqrt{2}} p+\mathrm{i} \frac{d}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial p}+\mathrm{i} \gamma c \frac{\partial}{\partial q}  \tag{3.5a}\\
& \hat{P}=-\frac{b}{2 \gamma} q+\frac{a}{\sqrt{2}} p+\mathrm{i} \frac{b}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial p}+\mathrm{i} \gamma a \frac{\partial}{\partial q} \tag{3.5b}
\end{align*}
$$

while the constraint (2.17a) for $\Psi(q, p)$ takes the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
[(a+\mathrm{i} c)(p-\mathrm{i} \gamma \sqrt{2} \partial / \partial q)-(b+\mathrm{i} d)(1 / \gamma \sqrt{2} q+\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial p)] \Psi(q, p)=0 \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

with (3.2a) as the solution and $z$ given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
z=-\frac{1}{\gamma \sqrt{2}}(d+\mathrm{i} b) q+(c+\mathrm{i} a) p \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the above derivation we see that only the one-parameter subfamily of the Heisenberg algebra family $\mathrm{H}_{Q}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon)$, namely those corresponding to $H_{Q}(1 / \sqrt{2}$, $0, \gamma,-1 / 2 \gamma, 0)$, can be connected with the bs realisation and consequently with the coherent-state description

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi(q, p)=\langle z \mid \Psi\rangle \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\{|z\rangle\}$ is the set of coherent states. Note that for

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma=-\sqrt{2} \quad a=1 / \sqrt{2} \quad b=c=0 \quad d=\sqrt{2} \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

we obtain from (3.5a,b) the symmetric form of $\hat{Q}$ and $\hat{P}$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{Q}_{s}=\frac{1}{2} q+\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial p  \tag{3.10a}\\
& \hat{P}_{s}=\frac{1}{2} p-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial q \tag{3.10b}
\end{align*}
$$

as well as

$$
\begin{equation*}
z=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(q+\mathrm{i} p) \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand it is very surprising that the van Hove and improved van Hove [10] choice of $\hat{P}$ and $\hat{Q}$ does not belong to the above subfamily and consequently cannot be rewritten in the ss form.

Now we investigate the general case, that is when (2.16) takes the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(N_{q}-n\right) \Psi(q, p)=0 \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $n \neq 0$. This equation is the projection equation on a subspace of $\mathscr{H}$ underlying an irreducible representation of $\mathrm{H}_{Q}$. If eventually this representation of the Heisenberg algebra can be rewritten in the bs form, then in the action on $\Psi(q, p)=\Psi^{\prime}\left(z, z^{*}\right)$ the generators

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{Q}+\mathrm{i} \hat{P}) \tag{3.13a}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{Q}-i \hat{P}) \tag{3.13b}
\end{equation*}
$$

should have the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2} z+\partial / \partial z^{*} \quad \text { and } \quad z^{*} \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

respectively.
On the other hand ( $N_{q}-n$ ), from construction, is a differential operator of degree two with respect to $\partial / \partial z$ and $\partial / \partial z^{*}$. Moreover $N_{q}-n$ should commute with $\frac{1}{2} z+\partial / \partial z^{*}$ and $z^{*}$.

However, a direct calculation shows that this holds only for the above-considered case $n=0$. Therefore, for $n>0$ no representation of $\mathrm{H}_{Q}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon)$ in $\mathscr{H}$ related to the bS realisation.
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