

On solving Schrödinger's equation with integrals over classical paths

Winfried Lohmiller and Jean-Jacques Slotine

Nonlinear Systems Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02139, USA
{wslohmil, jjs}@mit.edu

Abstract

We show that the Schrödinger equation of quantum physics can be solved using the classical Hamilton-Jacobi action dynamics, extending a key result of Feynman applicable only to quadratic Lagrangians. This is made possible by two developments. The first is incorporating geometric constraints directly in the classical least action problem, in effect replacing in part the probabilistic setting by the non-uniqueness of solutions of the constrained problem. For instance, in the double slit experiment or for a particle in a box, spatial inequality constraints create Dirac constraint forces, which lead to multiple path solutions. The second development is a spatial rescaling of clocks, specifically designed to achieve a general equivalence between Schrödinger and Hamilton-Jacobi representations. These developments leave the results of associated Feynman path integrals unchanged, but they can greatly simplify their computation as only classical paths need to be included in the integrals, and time-slicing is avoided altogether. They also suggest a smooth transition between physics across scales.

1 Introduction

Attempts to bridge the conceptual gap between classical and quantum physics have a long and very distinguished history. Central among those is the path-integral formulation of quantum mechanics, starting with Wiener's work on stochastic processes, Dirac's discussion of the relation of classical least action to quantum mechanics, Feynman's fundamental paper [4, 5] on path integral computation, and more recent important extensions such as Duru and Kleinert's time reparametrization [2, 7, 14, 15].

The current paper stems from the same general motivation. It starts by deriving simple results on classical action optimization of Lagrangian dynamics subject to spatial inequality constraints. Such constraints typically imply multiple local least action solutions of the optimization problem. It then shows that quantum kernels, computed with the usual Feynman integral along all possible zig-zag paths [5] and its many extensions [7], can be computed instead along the multiple classical least action paths with inequality constraints, without requiring the Lagrangian to be quadratic in velocity. In the double slit or n -slit experiments, for instance, the spatial inequality constraints simply represent the geometry of the slits and the multiple action solutions correspond to diffraction behind the slits. The paper then derives more generally an equivalence between Schrödinger and Hamilton-Jacobi representations, based on a state transformation and a rescaling of time. Besides its computational implications, this equivalence also suggests a smooth transition between physics models across scales.

Recall that the classical motion is a local extremum of the action

$$\phi(\mathbf{q}, t) = \int_0^t L dt + \phi(\mathbf{q}, 0) \quad L = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\mathbf{q}}^T \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q}) \dot{\mathbf{q}} - V(\mathbf{q}, t) \quad (1)$$

with $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (see e.g. [5, 12]). Note that the Lagrangian L can in principle be extended with a linear term in $\dot{\mathbf{q}}$, e.g. to describe electromagnetic effects, without changing the main results of this paper. The action $\phi(\mathbf{q}, t)$ can be computed from the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + h = 0 \quad h = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \phi^T}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mathbf{q}) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}} + V(\mathbf{q}, t) \quad (2)$$

For Lipschitz continuous $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q})$, $V(\mathbf{q}, t)$, and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the Hamilton-Jacobi equation has a unique solution [3] for a given initial $\phi(\mathbf{q}, 0)$. However, this deterministic unique solution can change to multiple solutions if spatial constraints are introduced.

Section 2 first extends the standard Euler-Lagrange or Hamiltonian dynamics with $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to the case of constrained positions $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{G}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with \mathbb{G}^n defined by $k = 1, \dots, K$ *inequality* constraints

$$g_k(\mathbf{q}, t) \leq 0 \quad (3)$$

At the border $\partial \mathbb{G}^n$ of \mathbb{G}^n , a Dirac constraint force ensures that the constraint is not violated. This non-Lipschitz activation of the constraint force can lead to multiple, but deterministic, action and path solutions.

Section 3 then shows that the wave function $\Psi(\mathbf{q}, t)$ of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation [1, 8]

$$0 = \left[-i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \Delta_M + V(\mathbf{q}, t) \right] \Psi(\mathbf{q}, t) \quad (4)$$

with the Laplacian (Laplace-Beltrami operator) [12] in a metric $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q})$

$$\Delta_M = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \mathbf{M}}} \frac{\partial^T}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \left(\sqrt{\det \mathbf{M}} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \right) \quad (5)$$

can be solved with the Feynman path integral [5] evaluated *only along the multiple classical paths* of the constrained Hamiltonian of section 2. To handle more general applications, the spatial scaling of the metric $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q})$ is extended by a temporal scaling $T(\mathbf{q})$, inspired by [2, 7], which is used to cancel a specific term in the associated Schrödinger equation. In addition, the Hamilton-Jacobi equation, the Schrödinger equation and the mapping between both, which we will introduce, are all coordinate-invariant tensor results.

Let us recall on an example how Feynman [5] solves the Schrödinger equation (4) using the classical motion (2), assuming a quadratic Lagrangian and without any constraint.

Example 1.1: Consider the n -dimensional harmonic oscillator

$$h = \frac{1}{2M} \frac{\partial \phi^T}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}} + \frac{M\omega^2}{2} \mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{q}$$

with angular frequency ω and constant mass M . The classical action (2) connecting an initial point $\mathbf{q}_o, 0$ to a final point \mathbf{q}, t is

$$\phi = \frac{M\omega}{2 \sin \omega t} ((\mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}_o^T \mathbf{q}_o) \cos \omega t - 2\mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{q}_o) \quad (6)$$

starting as a Dirac impulse at $t = 0$. The exponential of this action solves the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (4) as [5]

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &= e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \phi - \int \frac{\Delta_M \mathbf{I} \phi}{2} dt} = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \phi - \int \frac{M\omega}{2} \cot \omega t dt} = \sqrt{\frac{M\omega}{2\pi i \hbar \sin \omega t}}^n e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \phi} \\ &= \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} E_j t} \psi_{j_1, \dots, j_4}(\mathbf{q}) \psi_{j_1, \dots, j_4}(\mathbf{q}_o) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the second equation, [2, 5] algebraically expands the wave function Ψ in powers $e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} E_j t}$ of the eigenvalues $E_j = \hbar\omega(j + \frac{1}{2})$, $j = j_1 + \dots + j_4$ using Euler's formula. The corresponding eigenfunctions are

$$\psi_{j_1, \dots, j_4} = \sqrt{\frac{M\omega}{\pi \hbar}}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{(j_1 + \dots + j_4)} j_1! \dots j_4!}} H_{j_1} \dots H_{j_n} e^{-\frac{M\omega}{2\hbar} \mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{q}} \quad (8)$$

with the Hermite polynomials $H_j(q_j \sqrt{\frac{M\omega}{\hbar}})$ [2, 5]. \square

The goal of this paper is to extend this conversion, from classical action to the Schrödinger wave function, to constrained positions $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{G}^n$ and non-quadratic Lagrangians.

2 Constrained Hamilton-Jacobi Dynamics

In this section, we extend the standard Euler-Lagrange or Hamilton-Jacobi dynamic formulations to the case of spatial inequality constraints. First, let us denote whether spatial inequality constraints (3) are active or not.

Definition 1 *The constrained space \mathbb{G}^n is defined by the $k = 1, \dots, K$ inequality constraints*

$$g_k(\mathbf{q}, t) \leq 0$$

The set of active constraints $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{q}, t) \subset \{1, \dots, K\}$ is the set of indices j on the boundary $\partial\mathbb{G}^n$ of \mathbb{G}^n , i.e., such that

$$g_k(\mathbf{q}, t) = 0$$

The action ϕ (1) has a local extremum if the variation of the action (1)

$$\delta\phi = \int_0^t \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}} \delta \dot{\mathbf{q}} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \delta \mathbf{q} dt = \left[\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}} \delta \mathbf{q} \right]_0^t - \int_0^t \left[\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \right] \delta \mathbf{q} dt = \int_0^t \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda_k \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \delta \mathbf{q} dt$$

is only non-zero orthogonal to an active constraint, where the Lagrange parameter λ_j defines the magnitude of the cost gradient at the active constraint.

The first term on the right-hand side is zero since $\delta \mathbf{q}$ is zero at the start and end points. Between the end points $\delta \mathbf{q}$ can take on any arbitrary value. Thus a least action solution satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{q}} = \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{q}} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda_k \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \quad (9)$$

This extends the usual Euler-Lagrange or Hamiltonian dynamics (see e.g. [12]) with Lagrangian collision forces activated by inequality constraints. While constrained dynamics with *equality* constraints [13] would simply correspond to Lagrange's method of the first kind, *inequality* constraints (3) are fundamentally different since they lead to Dirac constraint forces at the collision with the border $\partial\mathbb{G}^n$. At the border $\mathbf{q} \in \partial\mathbb{G}^n$ multiple solutions $\frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial \mathbf{q}}$ can occur, which are continuous in ϕ_j due to (1). By contrast, for Lipschitz continuous $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q}), V(\mathbf{q}, t)$ and for $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{G}^n \setminus \partial\mathbb{G}^n$ equation (9) has the unique integrable solution $\frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial \mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{q}, t)$ of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (2) [3].

The constraint forces can be computed by assuring that each active constraint $g_j(\mathbf{q}, t) = 0$, $\dot{g}_j = \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial \mathbf{q}}^T \dot{\mathbf{q}} + \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial t} > 0$ is not violated at $t + dt$, i.e. for an instantaneous collision

$$\ddot{g}_j = \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda_k \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \right)^T \leq \delta(g_j) \dot{g}_j \quad (10)$$

where $\delta(g_j)$ is the Dirac delta function. The equation above represents a partial elastic collision and can e.g. be solved with linear programming.

Let us make the formulation more general by introducing temporal scaling. Earlier work [10, 11] shows that the Hamilton equation (2) is contracting [9] with a rate $\Delta_M \phi$, whereas the Schrödinger equation is indifferent. Since $\Delta_M \phi$ is a tensor [12], it cannot be changed by any spatial coordinate transformation, i.e., $\Delta_M \phi(\mathbf{q}) = \Delta_M \phi(\mathbf{q}')$ at any $\mathbf{q}'(\mathbf{q})$. Motivated by [2], let us now consider changing $\Delta_M \phi$ to $\frac{\Delta_M \phi}{T}$ with a path-dependent temporal scaling

$$\tau = \int_0^t T(\mathbf{q}) dt \iff t = \int_0^\tau \frac{1}{T(\mathbf{q})} d\tau \quad (11)$$

with the integral taken along the curve $\mathbf{q}(t)$. Note the above is invertible for bounded $T > 0$. The temporal scaling (11) can be used in some cases to find an analytic action solution as e.g. the Coulomb action computed by d'Alembert [7] in Example 3.4. The time-scaled Laplacian can also be used to shape the contraction rate $\frac{\Delta_M \phi}{T}$ [10, 11] of classical Hamilton dynamics (13). For instance, for a strictly negative $\frac{\Delta_M \phi}{T}$ the Hamilton dynamics with $V(\mathbf{q})$ exponentially converges to its steady state solution. This can be exploited in optimal observer design [10, 11] or in the numerical solution of the equivalent Schrödinger equation.

Let us summarize the above using this more general form.

Theorem 1 *The action (1) constrained by Definition 1 and the scaled time (11) is locally extremized by the momentum dynamics*

$$\begin{aligned} T \frac{d}{d\tau} \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial \mathbf{q}} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{q}} &= \sum_{\text{all } k \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \lambda_k \\ \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q}) T \frac{d\mathbf{q}}{d\tau} &= \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the partially elastic collision force λ_j fulfills (10). A fully elastic collision force would in addition leave h constant at the collision instance.

- At the border $\mathbf{q} \in \partial\mathbb{G}^n$, multiple momentum solutions $\frac{\partial\phi_j}{\partial\mathbf{q}}$ can occur.
- Outside the border $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{G}^n \setminus \partial\mathbb{G}^n$ and for Lipschitz continuous $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q}), \frac{V}{T}(\mathbf{q}, t)$ the individual momentum solutions $\frac{\partial\phi_j}{\partial\mathbf{q}}$ stay unique with a unique action solution $\phi_j(\mathbf{q}, t)$ of the time scaled Hamilton equation

$$T \frac{\partial\phi_j}{\partial\tau} + h = 0 \quad (13)$$

The original formulation by Hamilton, Lagrange and Jacobi was derived in \mathbb{R}^n , but not in \mathbb{G}^n , and thus cannot be used to predict multiple solutions at a constraint. The computation of elastic collision forces is well established [13], but to the authors' knowledge has not been used in the context of constrained momentum (12) and Hamiltonian dynamics (13).

3 Constrained Hamiltonian Solution of the Schrödinger equation

We now build on the above result to show the equivalence of the Hamilton-Jacobi and Schrödinger formulations, using the Schrödinger equation (4) at a scaled time τ (11) [2]

$$0 = \left[-i\hbar T \frac{\partial}{\partial\tau} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \Delta_M + V(\mathbf{q}, t) \right] \Psi_j(\mathbf{q}, t) \quad (14)$$

The Hamilton equation, as used at the times of Schrödinger and Feynman, only had a single deterministic solution ϕ without diffraction at a constraint $\partial\mathbb{G}^n$. Hence the Feynman path integral [5] had to consider all possible stochastic zig-zag trajectories with a time slicing approach, rather than just those extremizing (1). This stochastic complexity can be avoided if one uses the multiple local extremal action solutions of Theorem 1. The Schrödinger equation (14) can be solved with the exponential function

$$\Psi_j(\mathbf{q}, t) = e^{i\hbar\phi_j(\mathbf{q}, t) - \int \frac{\Delta_M\phi_j}{2T} d\tau} \quad (15)$$

where the integration constant is chosen to normalize the wave function, $\int_{\mathbb{G}^n} \Psi_j = 1$. We have used in the above the Hamilton-Jacobi (13)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left[-i\hbar T \frac{\partial}{\partial\tau} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \mathbf{M}}} \frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{q}}^T \left(\sqrt{\det \mathbf{M}} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{q}} \right) + V \right] \Psi_j \\ &= \left[T \frac{\partial\phi_j}{\partial\tau} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial\phi_j^T}{\partial\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{M}^{-1} \frac{\partial\phi_j}{\partial\mathbf{q}} + V \right] \Psi_j \end{aligned}$$

where the temporal scaling $T(\mathbf{q})$ was selected to assure that $\frac{\Delta_M \phi_j}{2T}$ is independent of \mathbf{q} . Note the first equation is an operator equation, which becomes a product in the second equation thanks to the exponential form of (15). Let us summarize the above results.

Theorem 2 *Using the mapping (15) and selecting a temporal scaling (11) such that $\frac{\Delta_M \phi_j(\mathbf{q}, t)}{T(\mathbf{q})}$ is independent of \mathbf{q} , the wave functions Ψ_j of the Schrödinger equation (14) are equivalent to the actions ϕ_j (13) of momentum dynamics of Theorem 1.*

The overall wave function solution of is the equally weighted, normalized superposition

$$\Psi(\mathbf{q}, \tau) = \langle \Psi(\mathbf{q}, \tau) | \Psi(\mathbf{q}_o, 0) \rangle = \frac{\Psi'}{\int_{\mathbb{G}^n} \sqrt{\Psi' \Psi'^*} d\mathbf{q}} \quad \Psi' = \sum_j \Psi_j \quad (16)$$

Equations (15, 16) assume an initial Dirac distribution $\psi(\mathbf{q}_o, 0) = \delta(\mathbf{q}_o)$. Since (14) is linear, it extends immediately to any arbitrary initial normalized distribution $\Psi(\mathbf{q}_o, 0)$

$$\Psi(\mathbf{q}, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle \Psi(\mathbf{q}, t) | \Psi(\mathbf{q}_o, 0) \rangle \Psi(\mathbf{q}_o, 0) dq_1, \dots, dq_n \quad (17)$$

Equations (15) and (17) extend the non zig-zag Feynman path integral [5], taken along the classical extremal action solution for a quadratic Lagrangian, to

- a constrained space \mathbb{G}^n rather than \mathbb{R}^n , as the constrained extremal action ϕ of Theorem 1 already includes diffraction in \mathbf{q} .
- a Laplacian $\frac{\Delta_M \phi_j}{T}(\tau)$ which only has to be independent of \mathbf{q} , rather than being required to be quadratic.

The general Feynman path integral with zig-zag paths and time-slicing [2, 5, 7] is of course applicable to constrained space and non-quadratic Lagrangian. However, the same results are obtained here still using only classical paths (12), which are much fewer and are differentiable almost everywhere. The above results are now illustrated for the double slit, single slit, particle in a box, and Coulomb potential examples, where we compute the wave function from the action. In principle all examples could also be reverted to compute the action from the wave function. Also in all examples the Lagrangian collision force (10) simply corresponds to the momentum change at the collision.

Example 3.1: Consider the double slit experiment in Figure 1, with Hamiltonian $h = \frac{1}{2M} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}}^T \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}}$, temporal scaling $T = 1$ and constant mass M . We define the real action on $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{G}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{E}^2$ rather than on \mathbb{R}^2 , thus excluding the red double slit wall obstacle \mathbb{E}^2 in Figure 1. As in [5], we assume the two slots are infinitesimally thin, and consider the two cases of a given initial position \mathbf{q}_o and a given momentum \mathbf{p}_o – these cases are mutually exclusive from the Heisenberg uncertainty principle.

1. Consider first the case on the left side of Figure 1 where \mathbf{q}_o is given at $t = 0$ and where the particle passes through the slit at t_j . Based on Theorem 1, the local extremized continuous actions $j = 1, 2$ from \mathbf{q}_o to \mathbf{q} are given by

$$\phi_j(q, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{M}{2t} (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_o)^T (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_o) & \text{for } q_1 < 0 \\ \frac{M}{2(t-t_j)} (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_j)^T (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_j) + \frac{M}{2t_j} (\mathbf{q}_j - \mathbf{q}_o)^T (\mathbf{q}_j - \mathbf{q}_o) & \text{for } q_1 \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

with one corner in the slit, marked as star in Figure 1. Note each ϕ_j is smooth even at $t = 0$ and $t = t_j$. The trajectory can bend due to the constraint Dirac collision force in any direction at the corner, which has normals in all directions.

The quantum wave functions can be computed from Theorem 2 and the two action solutions

$$\Psi_j = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \phi_j(\mathbf{q}, t) - \int \frac{\Delta_M \phi_j}{2} dt} = \begin{cases} \frac{M}{2\pi i \hbar t} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \phi_j} & \text{for } q_1 < 0 \\ \frac{M}{2\pi i \hbar (t-t_j)} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \phi_j} & \text{for } q_1 \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

which are Dirac impulses at $t = 0$ and $t = t_j$. At t_j the energy can change due to the partial elastic collision force (10). Finally, both solutions $j = 1, 2$ are equally weighted and superposed according to (16).

2. Consider now the case on the right side of figure 1 where \mathbf{p}_o is given at $t = 0$. Based on Theorem 1, the local extremized continuous actions are now given by

$$\phi_j(q, t) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{p}_o^T \mathbf{q} - Et & \text{for } q_1 < 0 \\ \mathbf{p}^T (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_j) + \mathbf{p}_o^T \mathbf{q}_j - Et & \text{for } q_1 \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

for $j = 1, 2$, with constant energy $E = \hbar\omega = \frac{1}{2M} \mathbf{p}_o^T \mathbf{p}_o = \frac{1}{2M} \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{p}$. Note each ϕ_j is continuous even at the slit but in the slit the momentum $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}}$ is discontinuous, i.e. it can change direction (not magnitude) from \mathbf{p}_o to \mathbf{p} with a fully elastic collision force in Theorem 1.

The quantum wave functions can now be computed from Theorem 2 and the two normalized action solutions (18) as

$$\Psi_j = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \phi_j(\mathbf{q}, t) - \int \frac{\Delta_M \phi_j}{2} dt} = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \phi_j(\mathbf{q}, t)} = \begin{cases} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} (\mathbf{p}_o^T \mathbf{q} - Et)} & \text{for } q_1 < 0 \\ e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} (\mathbf{p}^T (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_j) + \mathbf{p}_o^T \mathbf{q}_j - Et)} & \text{for } q_1 \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

Finally both solutions $j = 1, 2$ are equally weighted and superposed according to (16) which leads to the well known two-slit Fraunhofer wave function for $q_1 \geq 0$ with $Et_o = \mathbf{p}_o^T \mathbf{q}_1 = \mathbf{p}_o^T \mathbf{q}_2$

$$\Psi' = \Psi_1 + \Psi_2 = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(\mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{q} + (E(t-t_o)))} (e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{q}_1} + e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{q}_2})$$

While both results match the well-known quantum results in [5], the key difference is that they are now fully consistent with the classical Hamiltonian dynamics of Theorem 1 for $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{G}^2$. \square

Example 3.2: Consider the single slit experiment in Figure 2 with Hamiltonian $h = \frac{M}{2} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}}^T \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}}$, temporal scaling $T = 1$ and constant mass M for a slit of finite width. We define the action on $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{G}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{E}^2$ rather than on \mathbb{R}^2 , thus excluding the red double slit wall obstacle \mathbb{E}^2 in Figure 2.

According to Example 3.4 or [8] a particle corresponds to a wave function decaying as $e^{-\alpha q^2}$. This means that if e.g. a Gaussian electron passes a corner at a geometric distance of q , it still collides with the corner with state magnitude $e^{-\alpha q^2}$. Hence particles which pass through a slit of finite size always collide with the corner, but with a small state magnitude. According to Theorem 1, the least actions $\phi_j, j \in \mathbb{N}^+$ of initial momentum \mathbf{p}_o are given by (18), with corners at the slit marked as star in Figure 2. At the slit, the trajectory can bend in any direction due to the Dirac elastic collision force constraint, which has normals in all directions.

Finally the quantum state can be computed according as the equal weighted and normalised superposition (16) of Theorem 2 from the multiple action solutions of (18). Again, while this result matches the computation in e.g. [5], the key difference is that it is fully consistent with classical physics using the least action (1) of Theorem 1 for $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{G}^2$. \square

Example 3.3: Consider the particle in a box of Figure 3 with Hamiltonian $h = \frac{1}{2M} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial q}^2$, temporal scaling $T = 1$ and constant mass M . We define the action on $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{G}^1 = \mathbb{R}^1 \setminus \mathbb{E}^1$ or $|q| \leq l/2$ rather than on \mathbb{R}^1 , thus excluding the upper and lower wall in Figure 3.

The two periodic actions, down, up, down ... and up, down, up ..., (13) of Theorem 1 in Figure 3 are the two Riemann surfaces

$$\phi_{\pm}(q, t) = \begin{cases} \pm p(q + jl) - Et & \text{for even } j \\ \mp p(q + jl) - Et & \text{for odd } j \end{cases}$$

with constant momentum p and energy $E = \frac{1}{2M} p^2$ and where $j \in \mathbb{N}^+$ is the number of wall reflections. The two equivalent wave functions (14) of Theorem 2 exist only for periodic $\frac{p_j}{\hbar} = \frac{2\pi j}{2l}, E_j = \frac{1}{2M} p_j^2$ as

$$\Psi_{j\pm}(\mathbf{q}, t) = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \phi_{\pm}(\mathbf{q}, t) - \int \frac{\Delta_M \phi_{\pm}}{2} dt} = \exp \begin{cases} \pm p_j q - E_j t & \text{for even } j \\ \mp p_j q - E_j t & \text{for odd } j \end{cases}$$




Figure 1: Two local least action solutions $\phi_1(\mathbf{q}, t), \phi_2(\mathbf{q}, t)$ of the double slit experiment




Figure 2: Multiple local least action solutions $\phi_j(\mathbf{q}, t)$ of the single slit experiment

such that we can write with the Euler formula

$$\Psi'_j = \Psi_{j-} + \Psi_{j+} = \frac{1}{2} e^{-i \frac{E_j}{\hbar} t} \cos \frac{\pi j}{l} q$$

Superposing according to (16) of Theorem 2 the down, up ... with the up, down... motions leads

$$\Psi = \frac{\Psi'}{\int_{\mathbb{G}^n} \sqrt{\Psi' \Psi'^*} d\mathbf{q}} = \sum_j e^{-i \frac{E_j}{\hbar} t} \sqrt{\frac{2}{l}} \cos \frac{j\pi q}{l} \quad \text{with} \quad \Psi' = \sum_j \Psi'_j$$

This result matches the particle eigenfunction e.g. in [6, 8], with the key difference that it is fully consistent with the constrained Hamilton equation of Theorem 1 for $q \in \mathbb{G}^1$. \square

From this point of view, a key difference between classical least action dynamics and quantum mechanics is the fact that classical action is defined in unconstrained Riemann spaces $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ whereas the least action of Theorem 1 is defined in constrained Riemann spaces $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{G}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Due to the non-Lipschitz Dirac collision force of Theorem 1, these constraints imply multiple classical action solutions whose distribution can be represented by a wave function, which is interpreted as stochastics or diffraction in quantum physics.

The following example illustrates that the approach is also applicable to a single action and wave function solution, similar to Feynman's harmonic oscillator of Example 1.1. In this case the main differences are the choice of clocks inspired by [7] and the exploitation of metric tensors and coordinate invariance. Note that our main result in Theorem 1 allows both contexts to be combined.

Example 3.4: Consider a particle in a 3-dimensional Coulomb potential with time-scaled Hamiltonian $\frac{\hbar}{T}$ such that

$$\frac{\hbar}{T} + C = \frac{1}{2M} \frac{\partial \phi^T}{\partial \mathbf{q}'} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}'} = \frac{1}{2M} \frac{\partial \phi^T}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{q}}{\partial \mathbf{q}'} \frac{\partial \mathbf{q}^T}{\partial \mathbf{q}'} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}} = \frac{1}{2Tm} \frac{\partial \phi^T}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}} \quad T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{q}}} \quad (19)$$

with constant $C, M = 4m$, 3-dimensional Cartesian position \mathbf{q} centered at the origin of the gravitational or electrostatic field and the 4-dimensional 'square root coordinates' \mathbf{q}' [2, 7]

$$\begin{aligned} q_1 &= 2q'_1 q'_3 + 2q'_2 q'_4 \\ q_2 &= -2q'_1 q'_2 + 2q'_3 q'_4 \\ q_3 &= -q_1'^2 + q_2'^2 + q_3'^2 - q_4'^2 \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{q}}{\partial \mathbf{q}'} \frac{\partial \mathbf{q}^T}{\partial \mathbf{q}'} &= 4 \mathbf{q}'^T \mathbf{q}' \mathbf{I} = 4 \sqrt{\mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{q}} \mathbf{I} \end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: Multiple local least actions $\phi_{\pm}(\mathbf{q}, t)$ of the particle in a box experiment

Note that the use of the metric tensor $M\mathbf{I}$ significantly streamlines the calculations to follow as compared to [2, 7], as it avoids augmenting \mathbf{q} to 4 dimensions. Also the Hamiltonian ODE could equivalently be solved in \mathbf{q} or \mathbf{q}' . The time-scaled Hamilton-Jacobi dynamics in Theorem 1 of the Hamiltonian (19) can be solved for $-\infty < \tau < \infty$ with

$$\phi(\mathbf{q}', \tau) = \frac{M}{2\tau} \mathbf{q}'^T \mathbf{q}' - C\tau$$

This yields the tensorial Laplacian (5)

$$\frac{\Delta_M \phi}{T} = 0$$

The resulting normalized wave function (15, 16) of Theorem 2

$$\Psi(\mathbf{q}', \tau) = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \phi(\mathbf{q}', \tau) - \int \frac{\Delta_M \phi}{2T} d\tau} = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \phi(\mathbf{q}', \tau)} = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \int \frac{L}{T} d\tau} \quad (20)$$

solves the time-scaled Schrödinger equation (14) with $\frac{L}{T} = \frac{1}{2M} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}'}^T \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}'} + C$. Similarly to [2, 7], the dependence on τ in (20) can be turned into a dependence in energy $E = -\frac{M}{2} \omega^2$ using a

Fourier transformation

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}(\Psi)(\mathbf{q}', E) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{iE}{\hbar} \int \frac{d\tau}{T}} \Psi(\mathbf{q}', \tau) d\tau = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \int \frac{1}{2M} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}'}^T \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \mathbf{q}'} + \frac{M\omega^2}{2} \mathbf{q}'^T \mathbf{q}' + C} d\tau \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_4=0}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} (E_j' - C) \tau} \psi_{j_1, \dots, j_4}(\mathbf{q}') \psi_{j_1, \dots, j_4}(\mathbf{q}'_o) d\tau \\
&= 2\pi \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_4=0}^{\infty} \delta(C - 2\hbar\omega j) \psi_{j_1, \dots, j_4}(\mathbf{q}') \psi_{j_1, \dots, j_4}(\mathbf{q}'_o)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\beta\tau} d\tau = 2\pi\delta(\beta)$, $\forall\beta$, and the eigenvalues $E_j' = \hbar\omega(j_1 + \dots + j_4 + 2)$ and eigenfunctions (8) from the harmonic oscillator Example 1.1. Note that $\phi(\mathbf{q}', \tau) = \phi(-\mathbf{q}', \tau)$ and hence $\Psi(\mathbf{q}', E) = \Psi(-\mathbf{q}', E)$ are point symmetric functions. This point symmetry excludes odd polynomials in $\psi_{j_1, \dots, j_4}(\mathbf{q}')$, so we can write $j_1 + \dots + j_4 = 2j - 2$ with the quantum number $j \in \mathbb{N}^+$. The spectrum in E is thus a sum of Dirac impulses at

$$E_j = -\frac{M}{2}\omega^2 = -\frac{m}{2} \frac{C^2}{\hbar^2 j^2}$$

An inverse Fourier transformation then turns the dependence from E back into the actual time t

$$\Psi(\mathbf{q}', t) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\Psi)(\mathbf{q}', t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\frac{iE}{\hbar} t} \mathcal{F}(\Psi) dE = \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_4=0}^{\infty} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} E_j t} \psi_{j_1, \dots, j_4}(\mathbf{q}') \psi_{j_1, \dots, j_4}(\mathbf{q}'_o)$$

This result matches the 3-dimensional Coulomb result in [2], with the key difference that it is based only on the classical Hamiltonian trajectories of Theorem 1. Neither zig-zag trajectories nor time-slicing of the Feynman path integral [2] are necessary, which considerably simplifies the computation. Note that [2] algebraically convert the Cartesian Hermite polynomials above to the more commonly used spherical Laguerre polynomials.

□

4 Concluding Remarks

Theorem 1 extends the classical Lagrangian dynamics within an unconstrained space \mathbb{R}^n to a constrained space $\mathbb{G}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. At the border $\partial\mathbb{G}^n$ of \mathbb{G}^n , a Dirac Lagrangian constraint force ensures that the constraint is not violated. This non-Lipschitz activation of the constraint force can lead to multiple, but deterministic, constrained least action solutions.

This result allows a classical least action interpretation of standard experiments of quantum physics. In the double-slit experiment, for instance, a main difference between

quantum mechanics and the classical least action is the fact that the former is defined in unconstrained Riemann spaces \mathbb{R}^n , leading to a single deterministic solution of the least action problem. By contrast, the non-Lipschitz Dirac collision force, introduced by inequality constraints $\mathbb{G}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, leads to a set of multiple solutions of a deterministic least action principle, which is interpreted as diffraction in quantum physics. To freely paraphrase Einstein, God may not play dice but perhaps the world is just ambiguous.

The approach of this paper also features a natural equivalence of the microscopic linear Schrödinger equation (4) with the macroscopic Hamilton equation (13), and thus a smooth transition across scales. In principle, this may also extend to general relativity, which is also based on Hamiltonian dynamics, with M a non-definite metric and t replaced by proper time. The equivalence was already known in [5] for the specific case of a quadratic Lagrangian in \mathbb{R}^n , and equations (15), (17) generalize to non-quadratic Lagrangians and to constrained actions the Feynman path integral computed in [5] along the extremal path in \mathbb{R}^n . For high-dimensional problems as e.g. in computational quantum chemistry, the differentiability of the classical paths should also make numerical or machine learning techniques more readily applicable.

References

- [1] Cohen-Tannoudji C., Diu B., and Laloe F., Quantum Mechanics, 2nd Ed., *Wiley*, 2019.
- [2] Duru I.H., Kleinert H., Quantum Mechanics of H-atoms from path integrals, *Fortschritte der Physik*, 1982.
- [3] Evans L.C., Partial Differential Equations, *American Mathematical Society*, 1991.
- [4] Feynman R.P., Space-Time Approach to Non-Relativistic Quantum Mechanics, *Review of Modern Physics*, 20(2), 1948.
- [5] Feynman R.P. and Hibbs A.R., Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals, *McGraw-Hill, New York*, 1965
- [6] Janke W., Kleinert H., Summing Paths for a Particle in the Box, *Lettera al Nuovo Cimento*, 1979.
- [7] Kleinert, H., Path Integrals in Quantum Mechanics, Statistics, Polymer Physics, and Financial Markets, *World Scientific*, 2009.

- [8] Liboff R.L., Introductory Quantum Mechanics, *Addison Wesley*, 1931
- [9] Lohmiller W. and Slotine J.J.E., On Contraction Analysis for Nonlinear Systems, *Automatica*, 34(6), 1998.
- [10] Lohmiller W. and Slotine, J.J.E., Contraction Theory with Inequality Constraints, *arXiv:2306.06628*, 2023.
- [11] Lohmiller W. and Slotine, J.J.E., Contraction Analysis of Nonlinear Distributed Systems, *International Journal of Control*, 2005.
- [12] Lovelock D. and Rund H., Tensors, Differential Forms, and Variational Principles, *Dover*, 1989.
- [13] Magnus K. and Mueller H.H., Grundlagen der technischen Mechanik, *Teubner*, 1990.
- [14] Pelster, A. and Wunderlin, A, On the generalization of the Duru-Kleinert-propagator transformations, *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter*, 89, 1992.
- [15] Sakoda, S., On the effective potential of Duru-Kleinert path integrals, *J. Math. Phys.* 58, 062111, 2017.