

## Reply to Comment on 'Dirac theory in spacetime algebra'

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2002 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 35 4797

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/35/22/402>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 171.66.16.107

The article was downloaded on 02/06/2010 at 10:11

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

## COMMENT

## Reply to Comment on ‘Dirac theory in spacetime algebra’

**William P Joyce**

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Canterbury, Private Bag 4800,  
Christchurch, New Zealand

Received 14 February 2002, in final form 15 April 2002

Published 24 May 2002

Online at [stacks.iop.org/JPhysA/35/4797](http://stacks.iop.org/JPhysA/35/4797)

### Abstract

The Dirac theory formulated by Joyce (Joyce W P 2001 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34** 1991–2005) is equivalent to two copies of the usual Dirac formulation. The comment of Baylis (Baylis W E 2002 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **35** 4791) concerns the extension of the Joyce formulation to the entire Dirac algebra  $\mathbb{C} \otimes C\ell(3, 1)$ . We demonstrate how this extended version is equivalent to four copies of the usual Dirac formulation.

PACS numbers: 03.50.Dy, 03.30.+p

This reply discusses a comment by Baylis [1] on a paper of Joyce [2]. We adopt the notation and conventions used by Baylis. Baylis argues that the embedded Dirac theory formulation of Joyce [2], given the embedding  $\mathbb{C} \otimes C\ell^+(3, 1) \subset \mathbb{C} \otimes C\ell(3, 1)$ , decomposes into a usual Dirac equation and a Dirac equation with the mass reversed. The Joyce formulation is over the subalgebra  $\mathbb{C} \otimes C\ell^+(3, 1)$ , where the decomposition of Baylis is inapplicable.

The Joyce formulation decomposes into two copies of the usual Dirac equation (as formulated in Lounesto [3]), as we now demonstrate. We may decompose the Joyce spinor as  $\psi_J = \psi_J P_{+12} + \psi_J P_{-12}$ . Thus the maps  $\psi \mapsto \psi P_{\pm 12}$  project onto the summands  $\mathbb{C} \otimes C\ell^+(3, 1) P_{\pm 12}$ . The two component Joyce formulations over  $\mathbb{C} \otimes C\ell^+(3, 1) P_{+12}$  and  $\mathbb{C} \otimes C\ell^+(3, 1) P_{-12}$  are equivalent. The equivalence is given by the anti-involutive map  $\psi \mapsto \psi \gamma_{23}$ . Each copy is equivalent to the usual Dirac equation. The invertible map for the first copy is  $\psi \mapsto \psi P_{+0}$ , and for the second copy  $\psi \mapsto \psi P_{+0} \gamma_{23}$ .

The Joyce equation over  $\mathbb{C} \otimes C\ell(3, 1)$  may also be identified with four copies of the usual Dirac equation. An equivalence is valid provided it commutes with all Lorentz transformations, observables for spin and four-momentum and preserves the Dirac current. This admits the equivalence map  $\psi \mapsto \gamma_{0123} \psi$ . This map changes the sign of the mass on the usual, Joyce and Hestenes versions of the Dirac equation. These observations are part of a general analysis on the equivalence of Dirac formulations by Joyce and Martin [4]. In particular the usual Dirac equation over  $\mathbb{C} \otimes C\ell(3, 1) P_{+0}$  is equivalent to the usual Dirac equation with the sign of the mass reversed over  $\mathbb{C} \otimes C\ell(3, 1) P_{-0}$ . Their equivalence is demonstrated by the map  $\psi \mapsto \gamma_{0123} \psi \gamma_{01}$ .

One should note that the left action of the pseudo-scalar anti-commutes with the parity ( $P$ ) and time-reversal ( $T$ ) operations, and these operations are transformed to  $-\gamma_{0123}P\gamma_{0123}$  and  $-\gamma_{0123}T\gamma_{0123}$  respectively.

Finally we remark that if two Dirac formulations are equivalent, such as among the usual Dirac, Joyce restricted to  $\mathbb{C} \otimes C\ell^+(1, 3)P_{\pm 12}$  and Hestenes formulations, then the same physical content is realized. However, alternative mathematical procedures may be required to extract the physical information. The choice of equation is largely a matter of taste, unless one invokes extra criteria. For example, Hestenes [5] argues that the unit imaginary in the complexified spacetime algebra has no geometrical meaning and should be avoided by remaining in the real component  $C\ell(1, 3)$ .

### Acknowledgment

The author acknowledges the New Zealand Foundation for Research, Science and Technology. Contract number UOCX0102.

### References

- [1] Baylis W E 2002 Comments on Dirac theory in spacetime algebra *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **35** 4791 (preceding comment)
- [2] Joyce W P 2001 Dirac theory in spacetime algebra: I. The generalized bivector Dirac equation *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34** 1991–2005
- [3] Lounesto P 1997 *Clifford Algebras and Spinors (London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol 239)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- [4] Joyce W P and Martin J G 2002 Equivalence of Dirac formulations *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **35** 4729 (in this issue)
- [5] Hestenes D 1996 Real Dirac theory *The Theory of the Electron* ed J Keller and Z Oziewicz (Facultad de Estudios Superiores, Mexico) pp 1–50