

# QUANTIZATION METHODS: A GUIDE FOR PHYSICISTS AND ANALYSTS

S. TWAREQUE ALI<sup>†</sup> AND MIROSLAV ENGIŠ<sup>‡</sup>

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. The problem	2
1.2. Stumbling blocks	4
1.3. Getting out of the quagmire	6
2. Canonical quantization and its generalizations	8
2.1. The early notion of quantization	8
2.2. Segal and Borel quantization	12
2.3. Segal quantization	13
2.4. Borel quantization	17
3. Geometric quantization	23
3.1. Prequantization	25
3.2. Real polarizations and half-densities	30
3.3. Complex polarizations	34
3.4. Half-forms and the metilinear correction	37
3.5. Blattner-Kostant-Sternberg pairing	40
3.6. Further developments	48
3.7. Some shortcomings	51
4. Deformation quantization	53
5. Berezin and Berezin-Toeplitz quantization on Kähler manifolds	57
6. Prime quantization	63
7. Coherent state quantization	69
7.1. The projective Hilbert space	69
7.2. Summary of coherent state quantization	72
8. Some other quantization methods	77
References	79

---

The work of the first author (STA) was partially supported by a grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada. The second author (ME) acknowledges support from GA AV ČR grants A1019005 and A1019304.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

Quantization is generally understood as the transition from classical to quantum mechanics. Starting with a classical system, one often wishes to formulate a quantum theory, which in an appropriate limit, would reduce back to the classical system of departure. In a more general setting, quantization is also understood as a correspondence between a classical and a quantum theory. In this context, one also talks about *dequantization*, which is a procedure by which one starts with a quantum theory and arrives back at its classical counterpart. It is well-known however, that not every quantum system has a meaningful classical counterpart and moreover, different quantum systems may reduce to the same classical theory. Over the years, the processes of quantization and dequantization have evolved into mathematical theories in their own right, impinging on areas of group representation theory and symplectic geometry. Indeed, the programme of geometric quantization is in many ways an offshoot of group representation theory on coadjoint orbits, while other techniques borrow heavily from the theory of representations of diffeomorphism groups.

In these pages we attempt to present an overview of some of the better known quantization techniques found in the current literature and used both by physicists and mathematicians. The treatment will be more descriptive than rigorous, for we aim to reach both physicists and mathematicians, including non-specialists in the field. It is our hope that an overview such as this will put into perspective the relative successes as well as shortcomings of the various techniques that have been developed and, besides delineating their usefulness in understanding the nature of the quantum regime, will also demonstrate the mathematical richness of the attendant structures. However, as will become clear, no one method solves the problem of quantization completely and we shall try to point out both the successes and relative shortcomings of each method.

**1.1. The problem.** The original concept of quantization (nowadays usually referred to as *canonical quantization*), going back to Weyl, von Neumann, and Dirac [73] [186] [261], consists in assigning (or rather, trying to assign) to the observables of classical mechanics, which are real-valued functions  $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$  of  $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = (p_1, \dots, p_n, q_1, \dots, q_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  (the phase space), self-adjoint operators  $Q_f$  on the Hilbert space  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  in such a way that

- (q1) the correspondence  $f \mapsto Q_f$  is linear;
- (q2)  $Q_1 = I$ , where  $1$  is the constant function, equal to one everywhere, and  $I$  the identity operator;
- (q3) for any function  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for which  $Q_{\phi \circ f}$  and  $\phi(Q_f)$  are well-defined,  $Q_{\phi \circ f} = \phi(Q_f)$ ; and
- (q4) the operators  $Q_{p_j}$  and  $Q_{q_j}$  corresponding to the coordinate functions  $p_j, q_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) are given by

$$(1.1) \quad Q_{q_j} \psi = q_j \psi, \quad Q_{p_j} \psi = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial q_j} \quad \text{for } \psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mathbf{q}).$$

The condition (q3) is usually known as the *von Neumann rule*. The domain of definition of the mapping  $Q : f \mapsto Q_f$  is called the space of *quantizable observables*, and one would of course like to make it as large as possible — ideally, it should include at least the infinitely differentiable functions  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , or some other convenient function space. The parameter  $h$ , on which the quantization map  $Q$  also depends, is usually a small positive number, identified with the *Planck constant*. (One also often uses the shorthand notation  $\hbar$  for the ratio  $h/2\pi$ ).

An important theorem of Stone and von Neumann [186] states that up to unitary equivalence, the operators (1.1) are the unique operators acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$ , which satisfy (a) the irreducibility condition,

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{there are no subspaces } \mathfrak{H}_0 \subset \mathfrak{H}, \text{ other than } \{0\} \text{ and } \mathfrak{H} \text{ itself, that are stable} \\ \text{under the action of all the operators } Q_{p_j} \text{ and } Q_{q_j}, j = 1, \dots, n, \end{array}$$

and (b) the commutation relations

$$(1.3) \quad [Q_{p_j}, Q_{p_k}] = [Q_{q_j}, Q_{q_k}] = 0, \quad [Q_{q_k}, Q_{p_j}] = \frac{ih}{2\pi} \delta_{jk} I.$$

The physical interpretation is as follows<sup>1</sup>. The classical system, of  $n$  linear degrees of freedom, moves on the phase space  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $q_j, p_j$  being the canonical position and momentum observables, respectively. Any classical state is given as a probability distribution (measure) on phase space. The states of the quantum system correspond to one-dimensional subspaces  $\mathbb{C}u$  ( $\|u\| = 1$ ) of  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , and the result of measuring an observable  $f$  in the state  $u$  leads to the probability distribution  $\langle \Pi(Q_f)u, u \rangle$ , where  $\Pi(Q_f)$  is the spectral measure of  $Q_f$ . In particular, if  $Q_f$  has pure point spectrum consisting of eigenvalues  $\lambda_j$  with unit eigenvectors  $u_j$ , the possible outcomes of measuring  $f$  will be  $\lambda_j$  with probability  $|\langle u, u_j \rangle|^2$ ; if  $u = u_j$  for some  $j$ , the measurement will be deterministic and will always return  $\lambda_j$ . Noncommutativity of operators corresponds to the impossibility of measuring simultaneously the corresponding observables. In particular, the canonical commutation relations (1.3) above express the celebrated Heisenberg uncertainty principle.

Evidently, for  $f = f(\mathbf{q})$  a polynomial in the position variables  $q_1, \dots, q_n$ , the linearity (q1) and the von Neumann rule (q3) dictate that  $Q_{f(\mathbf{q})} = f(Q_{\mathbf{q}})$  in the sense of spectral theory (functional calculus for commuting self-adjoint operators); similarly for polynomials  $f(\mathbf{p})$  in  $\mathbf{p}$ . The canonical commutation relations then imply that for any functions  $f, g$  which are at most linear in either  $\mathbf{p}$  or  $\mathbf{q}$ ,

$$(1.4) \quad [Q_f, Q_g] = \frac{ih}{2\pi} Q_{\{f,g\}},$$

---

<sup>1</sup>It is precisely because of this interpretation that one actually has to insist on the operators  $Q_f$  being self-adjoint (not just symmetric or “formally self-adjoint”). See Gieres [102] for a thorough discussion of this issue.

where

$$(1.5) \quad \{f, g\} = \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial q_j} \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_j} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_j} \frac{\partial g}{\partial q_j} \right)$$

is the *Poisson bracket* of  $f$  and  $g$ . It turns out that another desideratum on the quantization operator  $Q$ , motivated by physical considerations ([73], pp. 87-92), is that

(q5) the correspondence (1.4), between the classical Poisson bracket and the quantum commutator bracket, holds for all quantizable observables  $f$  and  $g$ .

Thus we are lead to the following problem: find a vector space  $Obs$  (as large as possible) of real-valued functions  $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , containing the coordinate functions  $p_j$  and  $q_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ), and a mapping  $Q : f \mapsto Q_f$  from  $Obs$  into self-adjoint operators on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that (q1)–(q5) are satisfied.

(Note that the axiom (q2) is, in fact, a consequence of either (q3) (taking  $\phi = 1$ ) or (q5) (taking  $f = p_1, g = q_1$ ); we have stated it separately for reasons of exposition.)

**1.2. Stumbling blocks.** Unfortunately, it turns out that the axioms (q1)–(q5) are not quite consistent. First of all, using (q1)–(q4) it is possible to express  $Q_f$  for  $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = p_1^2 q_1^2 = (p_1 q_1)^2$  in two ways with two different results (see [93], p. 17; or Arens and Babbitt [17]). Namely, let us temporarily write just  $p, q$  instead of  $p_1, q_1$  and  $P, Q$  instead of  $Q_{p_1}$  and  $Q_{q_1}$ , respectively. Then by the von Neumann rule (q3) for the squaring function  $\phi(t) = t^2$  and (q1),

$$pq = \frac{(p+q)^2 - p^2 - q^2}{2} \implies Q_{pq} = \frac{(P+Q)^2 - P^2 - Q^2}{2} = \frac{PQ + QP}{2};$$

and similarly

$$p^2 q^2 = \frac{(p^2 + q^2)^2 - p^4 - q^4}{2} \implies Q_{p^2 q^2} = \frac{P^2 Q^2 + Q^2 P^2}{2}.$$

However, a small computation using only the canonical commutation relations (1.3) (which are a consequence of either (q4) or (q5)) shows that

$$\frac{P^2 Q^2 + Q^2 P^2}{2} \neq \left( \frac{PQ + QP}{2} \right)^2.$$

Thus neither (q4) nor (q5) can be satisfied if (q1) and (q3) are and  $p_1^2, q_1^2, p_1^4, q_1^4, p_1 q_1$  and  $p_1^2 q_1^2 \in Obs$ .

Secondly, it is a result of Groenewold [120], later elaborated further by van Hove [131], that (q5) fails whenever (q1) and (q4) are satisfied and  $Obs$  contains all polynomials in  $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}$  of degree not exceeding four. To see this, assume, for simplicity, that  $n = 1$  (the argument for general  $n$  is the same), and let us keep the notations  $p, q, P, Q$  of the preceding paragraph and for the sake of brevity also set  $c = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi}$ . Note first of all that for any self-adjoint operator  $X$ ,

$$(1.6) \quad [X, P] = [X, Q] = 0 \implies X = dI \text{ for some } d \in \mathbb{C}.$$

(Indeed, any spectral projection  $E$  of  $X$  must then commute with  $P, Q$ , hence the range of  $E$  is a subspace invariant under both  $P$  and  $Q$ ; by irreducibility, this forces  $E = 0$  or  $I$ .) Set now  $X = Q_{pq}$ ; then, since

$$\{pq, p\} = p, \quad \{pq, q\} = -q,$$

we must have by (q5)

$$[X, P] = -cP, \quad [X, Q] = cQ.$$

As also

$$[\frac{PQ+QP}{2}, P] = -cP, \quad [\frac{PQ+QP}{2}, Q] = cQ,$$

it follows from (1.6) that

$$Q_{pq} \equiv X = \frac{PQ + QP}{2} + dI \quad \text{for some } d \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Next set  $X = Q_{q^m}$  ( $m = 1, 2, \dots$ ); then from

$$\{q^m, q\} = 0, \quad \{q^m, p\} = mq^{m-1}$$

we similarly obtain

$$X = Q_{q^m} = d_m I \quad \text{for some } d_m \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Furthermore, since

$$\{pq, q^m\} = -mq^m,$$

it follows that

$$cmX = [\frac{PQ+QP}{2} + dI, Q_{q^m}] = [\frac{PQ+QP}{2}, Q_{q^m}] = cmQ_{q^m}.$$

Thus (using also a similar argument for  $X = Q_{p^m}$ )

$$Q_{q^m} = Q_{p^m}, \quad Q_{p^m} = P^m, \quad \forall m = 1, 2, \dots$$

Now from

$$\{p^2, q^3\} = -6q^2p$$

we obtain that

$$6cQ_{q^2p} = [P^2, Q^3] = 3cPQ^2 + 3cQ^2P,$$

so

$$Q_{q^2p} = \frac{PQ^2 + Q^2P}{2}$$

and similarly for  $Q_{p^2q}$ . Thus finally, we have on the one hand

$$\{p^3, q^3\} = -9p^2q^2 \implies Q_{p^2q^2} = \frac{1}{9c}[P^3, Q^3] = Q^2P^2 + 2cQP + \frac{2}{3}c^2,$$

while on the other hand

$$\{p^2q, pq^2\} = -3p^2q^2 \implies$$

$$Q_{p^2q^2} = \frac{1}{3c} \left[ \frac{P^2Q + QP^2}{2}, \frac{PQ^2 + Q^2P}{2} \right] = Q^2P^2 + 2cQP + \frac{1}{3}c^2,$$

yielding a contradiction.

Thirdly, it can be shown that one arrives (by arguments of a similar nature as above) at a contradiction even if one insists on the axioms (q3), (q4) and (q5), but discards (q1) (linearity); see [85]. (Note that by (q3) with  $\phi(t) = ct$ , we still have at least homogeneity, i.e.  $Q_{cf} = cQ_f$  for any constant  $c$ .)

In conclusion, we see that not only the axioms (q1)–(q5) taken together, but even *any three* of the axioms (q1), (q3), (q4) and (q5) are inconsistent.

*Remark 1.* The idea of discarding the linearity axiom (q1) may seem a little wild at first sight, but there seems to be no physical motivation for assuming linearity, though it is definitely convenient from the computational point of view (cf. Tuynman [245], §5.1). In fact, nonlinear assignments  $f \mapsto Q_f$  do actually occur already in some existing approaches to geometric quantization, namely when one defines the quantum observables  $Q_f$  using the Blattner-Kostant-Sternberg kernels; cf. (3.66) in §3.7 below.  $\square$

*Remark 2.* The inconsistencies among the axioms above actually go even further. Namely, an analysis of the argument in [85] shows that, in fact, it only requires (q3) and (q5) alone to produce a contradiction. The combination (q1)+(q3) is satisfied e.g. by the map assigning to  $f$  the operator of multiplication by  $f$ , however this is uninteresting from the point of view of physics (noncommutativity is lost). Similarly, (q1)+(q4) can be satisfied but the outcome is of no physical relevance. The combination (q1)+(q5) is satisfied by the prequantization of van Hove (to be discussed in detail in §3.1 below). In conclusion, it thus transpires that with the exception of (q1)+(q5), and possibly also of (q4)+(q3) and (q4)+(q5), even any *two* of the axioms (q1), (q3), (q4) and (q5) are either inconsistent or lead to something trivial.  $\square$

*Remark 3.* From a purely mathematical viewpoint, it can, in fact, be shown that already (q3) and the canonical commutation relations (1.3) by themselves lead to a contradiction if one allows the space  $Obs$  to contain sufficiently “wild” functions (i.e. not  $C^\infty$  — for instance, the Peano curve function  $f$  mapping  $\mathbb{R}$  continuously onto  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ ). See again [85].  $\square$

**1.3. Getting out of the quagmire.** There are two traditional approaches on how to handle this disappointing situation. The first is to keep the four axioms (q1), (q2), (q4) and (q5) (possibly giving up only the von Neumann rule (q3)) but restrict the space  $Obs$  of quantizable observables. For instance, we have seen above that it may not contain simultaneously  $p_j^2, q_j^2$  and  $p_j^2 q_j^2$ , for any  $j$ ; however, taking  $Obs$  to be the set of all functions at most linear in  $\mathbf{p}$ , i.e.

$$f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = f_0(\mathbf{q}) + \sum_j f_j(\mathbf{q}) p_j, \quad f, f_j \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

and setting

$$Q_f = f_0(\hat{\mathbf{q}}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_j [f_j(\hat{\mathbf{q}}) Q_{p_j} + Q_{p_j} f_j(\hat{\mathbf{q}})],$$

where we have written  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$  for the vector operator  $Q_{\mathbf{q}}$ , it is not difficult to see that all of (q1),(q2),(q4) and (q5) are satisfied. Similarly one can use functions at most linear in  $\mathbf{q}$ , or, more generally, in  $a\mathbf{p} + b\mathbf{q}$  for some fixed constants  $a$  and  $b$ .

The second approach is to keep (q1),(q2) and (q4), but require (q5) to hold only asymptotically as the Planck constant  $h$  tends to zero. The simplest way to achieve this is as follows. By the remarks above, we know that the operator  $Q_f$  corresponding to  $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = e^{i\boldsymbol{\eta} \cdot \mathbf{q}}$  ( $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ) is  $Q_f = e^{i\boldsymbol{\eta} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}}}$ , and similarly for  $\mathbf{p}$ . Now an “arbitrary” function  $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$  can be expanded into exponentials via the Fourier transform,

$$f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \iint \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) e^{2\pi i(\boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \boldsymbol{\eta} \cdot \mathbf{q})} d\boldsymbol{\xi} d\boldsymbol{\eta}.$$

Let us now postulate that

$$Q_f = \iint \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) e^{2\pi i(\boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} + \boldsymbol{\eta} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}})} d\boldsymbol{\xi} d\boldsymbol{\eta} =: W_f,$$

where again,  $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = Q_{\mathbf{p}}$ . After a simple manipulation, the operator  $W_f$  can be rewritten as the oscillatory integral

$$(1.7) \quad W_f g(\mathbf{x}) = h^{-n} \iint f\left(\mathbf{p}, \frac{\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}}{2}\right) e^{2\pi i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{p}/h} g(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{p}.$$

This is the celebrated Weyl calculus of pseudodifferential operators (see Hörmander [129], Shubin [225], Taylor [238], for instance). The last formula allows us to define  $W_f$  as an operator from the Schwartz space  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  into the space  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$  of tempered distributions; conversely, it follows from the Schwartz kernel theorem that any continuous operator from  $\mathcal{S}$  into  $\mathcal{S}'$  is of the form  $W_f$  for some  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ . In particular, if  $f, g \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$  are such that  $W_f$  and  $W_g$  map  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  into itself (this is the case, for instance, if  $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ ), then so does their composition  $W_f W_g$ . Thus,  $W_f W_g = W_{f \sharp g}$  for some  $f \sharp g \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$  and we call  $f \sharp g$  the *twisted* (or *Moyal*) product of  $f$  and  $g$ . Now it turns out that under appropriate hypotheses on  $f$  and  $g$  (for instance, if  $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ , but much weaker assumptions will do), one has the asymptotic expansion

$$(1.8) \quad f \sharp g = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h^j \rho_j(f, g) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{where } \rho_0(f, g) = fg, \quad \rho_1(f, g) = \frac{i}{4\pi} \{f, g\}.$$

Hence, in particular,

$$(1.9) \quad f \sharp g - g \sharp f = \frac{ih}{2\pi} \{f, g\} + O(h^2) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0.$$

This is the asymptotic version of (q5). (Incidentally, for  $\phi$  a polynomial, one also gets an asymptotic version of the von Neumann rule (q3).) The validity of (q1), (q2), and (q4) follows immediately from the construction. See Chapter 2 in [93] for the details.

*Remark 4.* An elegant general calculus for non-commuting tuples of operators (of which (1.1) are an example), building essentially on (q1), (q2) and a version of (q3),

was developed by Nelson [181]. Generalizations of the Weyl calculus were studied by Anderson [13].  $\square$

The basic problem of quantization is to extend these two approaches from  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  to any symplectic manifold. The first of the above approaches leads to *geometric quantization*, and the second to *deformation quantization*. We shall discuss the former in Section 3 and the latter in Sections 4 and 5, and then mention some other approaches in Sections 6–8. Prior to that, we review in Section 2 two other approaches, the *Segal quantization* and the *Borel quantization*, which are straightforward generalizations of the canonical scheme. They take a slightly different route by working only with the configuration space  $\mathfrak{Q}$  (the phase space  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is basically forgotten completely, and its symplectic structure  $\omega$  is used solely for the purpose of defining the Poisson bracket), and quantizing only functions on  $\mathfrak{Q}$  and vector fields on it instead of functions on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ . This is the Segal quantization; the Borel quantization enhances it further by allowing for internal degrees of freedom (such as spin) with the aid of tools from representation theory — systems of imprimitivity and projection-valued measures. As mentioned earlier and as will emerge from the discussion, no one method completely solves the the problem of quantization, nor does it adequately answer all the questions raised. Consequently, we refrain from promoting one over the other, inviting the reader to formulate their own preference.

## 2. CANONICAL QUANTIZATION AND ITS GENERALIZATIONS

We discuss in some detail in this section the original idea of quantization, introduced in the early days of quantum mechanics – rather simple minded and ad hoc, but extremely effective – and some later refinements of it. Some useful references are [75], [81], [108], [111], [120], [124], [131], [180], [223] and [226].

**2.1. The early notion of quantization.** The originators of quantum theory used the following simple technique for quantizing a classical system: As before, let  $q_i, p_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , be the canonical position and momentum coordinates, respectively, of a free classical system with  $n$  degrees of freedom. Then their quantized counterparts,  $\widehat{q}_i, \widehat{p}_i$ , are to be realized as operators on the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mathbf{x})$ , by the prescription (see (1.1)):

$$(2.1) \quad (\widehat{q}_i \psi)(\mathbf{x}) = x_i \psi(\mathbf{x}) \quad (\widehat{p}_i \psi)(\mathbf{x}) = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \psi(\mathbf{x}),$$

on an appropriately chosen dense set of vectors  $\psi$  in  $\mathfrak{H}$ . This simple procedure is known as *canonical quantization*. Then, as mentioned earlier, the Stone-von Neumann *uniqueness theorem* [186] states that, up to unitary equivalence, this is the only representation which realizes the canonical commutation relations (CCR):

$$(2.2) \quad [\widehat{q}_i, \widehat{p}_j] = i\hbar I \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

irreducibly on a separable Hilbert space. Let us examine this question of irreducibility a little more closely.



The operators  $\widehat{q}_i, \widehat{p}_j$  and  $I$  are the generators of a representation of the Weyl-Heisenberg group on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mathbf{x})$ . This group (for a system with  $n$  degrees of freedom), which we denote by  $G_{WH}(n)$ , is topologically isomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^{2n+1}$  and consists of elements  $(\theta, \boldsymbol{\eta})$ , with  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , obeying the product rule

$$(2.3) \quad (\theta, \boldsymbol{\eta})(\theta', \boldsymbol{\eta}') = (\theta + \theta' + \xi(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}'), \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\eta}'),$$

where, the *multiplier*  $\xi$  is given by

$$(2.4) \quad \xi(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}') = \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\eta}^\dagger \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\eta}' = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q}' - \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{p}'), \quad \boldsymbol{\omega} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & -\mathbb{I}_n \\ \mathbb{I}_n & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix},$$

$\mathbb{I}_n$  being the  $n \times n$  identity matrix. This group is unimodular and nilpotent, with Haar measure  $d\theta d\boldsymbol{\eta}$ ,  $d\boldsymbol{\eta}$  being the Lebesgue measure of  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ . Each unitary irreducible representation (UIR) of  $G_{WH}(n)$  is characterized by a non zero real number, which we write as  $\frac{1}{\hbar}$ , and eventually identify  $\hbar = 2\pi\hbar$  with Planck's constant (of course, for a specific value of it). Each UIR is carried by the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mathbf{x})$  via the following unitary operators:

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} (U^h(\theta, \boldsymbol{\eta})\psi)(\mathbf{x}) &= \left( \exp \left[ \frac{i}{\hbar} \{ \theta + \boldsymbol{\eta}^\dagger \boldsymbol{\omega} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \} \right] \psi \right)(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \exp \left[ \frac{i}{\hbar} \left\{ \theta + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q} \right\} \right] \psi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}), \quad \psi \in \mathfrak{H}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the  $2n$  quantized (unbounded) operators,  $\widehat{\eta}_i = \widehat{q}_i$   $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and  $\widehat{\eta}_i = \widehat{p}_{i-n}$ ,  $i = n+1, n+2, \dots, 2n$ , which are the components of  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ , along with the identity operator  $I$  on  $\mathfrak{H}$ , are the infinitesimal generators spanning the representation of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}_{WH}(n)$  of the Weyl-Heisenberg group  $G_{WH}(n)$ . Since the representation (2.5) is irreducible, so also is the representation (2.1) of the Lie algebra. This is the precise mathematical sense in which we say that the algebra of Poisson brackets  $\{q_i, p_j\} = \delta_{ij}$  is irreducibly realized by the representation (2.2) of the CCR.

One could justifiably ask at this point, how many other elements could be added to the set  $\mathfrak{g}_{WH}(n)$  and the resulting enlarged algebra still be represented irreducibly on the same Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$ . In other words, does there exist a larger algebra, containing  $\mathfrak{g}_{WH}(n)$ , which is also irreducibly represented on  $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mathbf{x})$ ? To analyze this point further, let us look at functions  $u$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  which are real-valued homogeneous polynomials in the variables  $q_i$  and  $p_j$  of degree two. Any such polynomial can be written as:

$$(2.6) \quad u(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2n} \eta_i U_{ij} \eta_j = \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T U \boldsymbol{\eta},$$

where the  $U_{ij}$  are the elements of a  $2n \times 2n$  real, symmetric matrix  $U$ . Set

$$(2.7) \quad U = JX(u), \quad J = \boldsymbol{\omega}^{-1},$$

with  $X(u) = -JU$ , a  $2n \times 2n$  real matrix satisfying

$$(2.8) \quad X(u) = JX(u)^T J.$$

It follows, therefore, that every such homogeneous real-valued polynomial  $u$  is characterized by a  $2n \times 2n$  real matrix  $X(u)$  satisfying (2.8), and conversely, every such matrix represents a homogeneous real-valued polynomial of degree two via

$$(2.9) \quad u(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T JX(u) \boldsymbol{\eta}.$$

Computing the Poisson bracket of two such polynomials  $u$  and  $v$ , we easily see that

$$(2.10) \quad \{u, v\} = \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T J[X(u), X(v)] \boldsymbol{\eta}, \quad \text{where,} \quad [X(u), X(v)] = X(u)X(v) - X(v)X(u).$$

In other words, the set of homogeneous, real-valued, quadratic polynomials constitutes a closed algebra under the Poisson bracket operation, which we denote by  $\mathfrak{P}_2$ , and the corresponding set of matrices  $X(u)$  is closed under the bracket relation,

$$(2.11) \quad [X(u), X(v)] = X(\{u, v\}),$$

constituting thereby a matrix realization of the same algebra,  $\mathfrak{P}_2$ . In fact, it is not hard to see that this is a maximal subalgebra of the Poisson algebra  $(C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n}), \{\cdot, \cdot\})$  of all smooth functions on  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  with respect to the Poisson bracket (i.e., any other subalgebra which contains  $\mathfrak{P}_2$  must necessarily be the entire Poisson algebra). Moreover, we also see that

$$(2.12) \quad \{\eta_i, u\} = (X(u)\boldsymbol{\eta})_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, 2n,$$

or compactly,

$$(2.13) \quad \{\boldsymbol{\eta}, u\} = X(u)\boldsymbol{\eta},$$

which can be thought of as giving the action of the Poisson algebra of quadratic polynomials on  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ .

Consider now the *symplectic group*  $\text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ , of  $2n \times 2n$  real matrices  $S$ , satisfying  $SJS^T = J$  and  $\det S = 1$ . Let  $S = e^{\varepsilon X}$  be an element of this group, close to the identity, where  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $X$  is a  $2n \times 2n$  real matrix. The fact that  $S$  can be written this way is guaranteed by the exponential mapping theorem for Lie groups. The defining condition  $SJS^T = J$ , for an element of  $\text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ , then implies,

$$(\mathbb{I}_{2n} + \varepsilon X)J(\mathbb{I}_{2n} + \varepsilon X)^T + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3) = J.$$

Simplifying and dividing by  $\varepsilon$ ,

$$XJ + JX^T + \varepsilon XJX^T + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) = 0.$$

Hence, letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we find that

$$(2.14) \quad XJ + JX^T = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad X = JX^T J.$$

Thus,  $JX$  is a symmetric matrix and  $X$  a matrix of the type (2.8) with an associated second degree, homogeneous, real-valued polynomial:

$$(2.15) \quad X = X(u), \quad u(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T JX \boldsymbol{\eta}.$$

On the other hand, the matrices  $X$  in  $S = e^{\varepsilon X}$  constitute the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$  of the Lie group  $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ , and thus we have established an algebraic isomorphism  $\mathfrak{P}_2 \simeq \mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ . Moreover, the relations (2.10) and (2.13) together then constitute the Lie algebra of the *metaplectic group*<sup>2</sup>, which is the semi-direct product  $\mathbf{Mp}(2n, \mathbb{R}) = G_{WH}(n) \rtimes \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ . The Lie algebra,  $\mathfrak{mp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ , of this group consists, therefore, of all real-valued, first order and second order homogeneous polynomials in the variables  $q_i, p_i$   $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . The group  $\mathbf{Mp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$  has elements  $(\theta, \boldsymbol{\eta}, S)$  and the multiplication rule is:

$$(2.16) \quad (\theta, \boldsymbol{\eta}, S)(\theta', \boldsymbol{\eta}', S') = (\theta + \theta' + \xi(\boldsymbol{\eta}, S\boldsymbol{\eta}'), \boldsymbol{\eta} + S\boldsymbol{\eta}', SS'),$$

with the same multiplier  $\xi$  as in (2.4).

The metaplectic group has a UIR on the same space  $\mathfrak{H}$ , extending the representation of  $U^h$  of  $G_{WH}(n)$  given in (2.5). We denote this representation again by  $U^h$  and see that since  $(\theta, \boldsymbol{\eta}, S) = (\theta, \boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbb{I}_{2n})(0, \mathbf{0}, S)$ ,

$$(2.17) \quad U^h(\theta, \boldsymbol{\eta}, S) = U^h(\theta, \boldsymbol{\eta})U^h(S),$$

where for  $S = e^{\varepsilon X(u)}$ , the unitary operator  $U^h(S)$  can be shown [226] to be

$$(2.18) \quad U^h(S) = \exp \left[ -\frac{i\varepsilon}{\hbar} \widehat{X}(u) \right], \quad \widehat{X}(u) = -\frac{1}{2} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T JX(u) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}.$$

Furthermore, using the unitarity of  $U^h(S)$ , it is easily shown that

$$(2.19) \quad [\widehat{X}(u), \widehat{X}(v)] = i\hbar \widehat{X}(\{u, v\}),$$

that is, the quantization of  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  now extends to second degree, homogeneous polynomials in the manner  $u \rightarrow \widehat{X}(u) := \widehat{u}$ . The self-adjoint operators  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$  and  $\widehat{X}(u)$  of the representation of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{mp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ , on the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$ , satisfy the full set of commutation relations,

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} [\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \widehat{X}(u)] &= i\hbar X(u) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \\ [\widehat{X}(u), \widehat{X}(v)] &= i\hbar \widehat{X}(\{u, v\}). \end{aligned}$$

In the light of the Groenewold-van Hove results, mentioned earlier, this is the best one can do. In other words, it is not possible to find an algebra larger than  $\mathfrak{mp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ , which could also be irreducibly represented on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mathbf{x})$ . On the other hand, van Hove also showed that if one relaxes the irreducibility condition, then on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, d\boldsymbol{\eta})$ , it is possible to represent the full Poisson algebra of  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ . This is the so-called *prequantization* result, to which we shall return later.

---

<sup>2</sup>Due to some existing terminological confusion in the literature, this is a *different* metaplectic group from the one we will encounter in §3.5 below.

Given the present scheme of canonical quantization, a number of questions naturally arise.

- Let  $\mathfrak{Q}$  be the position space manifold of the classical system and  $q$  any point in it. Geometrically, the phase space of the system is the cotangent bundle  $\Gamma = T^*\mathfrak{Q}$ . If  $\mathfrak{Q}$  is linear, i.e.,  $\mathfrak{Q} \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ , then the replacement  $q_i \rightarrow x_i$ ,  $p_j \rightarrow -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$  works fine. But what if  $\mathfrak{Q}$  is not a linear space?
- How do we quantize observables which involve higher powers of  $q_i, p_j$ , such as for example  $f(q, p) = (q_i)^n (p_j)^m$ , when  $m + n \geq 3$ ?
- How should we quantize more general phase spaces, which are symplectic manifolds but not necessarily cotangent bundles?

In the rest of this Section we review two procedures which have been proposed to extend canonical quantization to provide, among others, the answer to the first of these questions.

**2.2. Segal and Borel quantization.** A method for quantizing on an arbitrary configuration space manifold  $\mathfrak{Q}$  was proposed by Segal [223], as a generalization of canonical quantization and very much within the same spirit. A group theoretical method was suggested by Mackey [167], within the context of the theory of *induced representations* of finite dimensional groups. A much more general method, combining the Segal and Mackey approaches, was later developed by Doebner, Tolar, Pasemann, Mueller, Angermann and Nattermann [75, 76, 180]. It cannot be applied to an arbitrary symplectic manifold, but only to cotangent bundles; the reason is that it distinguishes between the position variables  $q \in \mathfrak{Q}$  (the configuration space) and the momentum variables  $X \in T\mathfrak{Q}$  in an essential way. Functions  $f(q)$  of the spatial variables are quantized by the multiplication operators  $(\hat{f}\phi)(q) = f(q)\phi(q)$  on  $L^2(\mathfrak{Q}, \mu)$  with some measure  $\mu$ , while vector fields  $X$  are quantized by

$$\hat{X}\phi = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi}(X\phi + \operatorname{div}_\mu X \cdot \phi)$$

(the additional term  $\operatorname{div}_\mu X$  ensures that  $\hat{X}$  be a formally self-adjoint operator on  $L^2(\mathfrak{Q}, \mu)$ ). One then has the commutation relations

$$[\hat{X}, \hat{Y}] = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi}[\widehat{X, Y}], \quad [\hat{X}, \hat{f}] = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi}\widehat{Xf}, \quad [\hat{f}, \hat{g}] = 0,$$

which clearly generalize (1.3).

A method using infinite dimensional diffeomorphism groups, obtained from local current algebras on the physical space, was suggested by Goldin, et al. [105, 108, 111]. The relation to diffeomorphism groups of the configuration space was also noticed by Segal, who in fact in the same paper [223] lifted the theory to the cotangent bundle  $T^*\mathfrak{Q}$  and thereby anticipated the theory of geometric quantization. Segal also pointed out that the number of inequivalent such quantizations was related to the first cohomology group of  $\mathfrak{Q}$ .

**2.3. Segal quantization.** Let us elaborate a bit on the technique suggested by Segal. The configuration space  $\mathfrak{Q}$  of the system is, in general, an  $n$ -dimensional  $C^\infty$ -manifold. Since in the case when  $\mathfrak{Q} = \mathbb{R}^n$ , canonical quantization represents the classical position observables  $q_i$  as the operators  $\hat{q}_i$  of multiplication by the corresponding position variable, on the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mathbf{x})$ , Segal generalized this idea and defined an entire class of observables of position using the smooth functions  $f : \mathfrak{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Similarly, since canonical quantization on  $\mathfrak{Q} = \mathbb{R}^n$  replaces the classical observables of momentum,  $p_i$ , by derivatives with respect to these variables, in Segal's scheme an entire family of quantized momentum observables is obtained by using the vector fields  $X$  of the manifold  $\mathfrak{Q}$ .

With this idea in mind, starting with a general configuration space manifold, one first has to choose a Hilbert space. If the manifold is orientable, its volume form determines a measure,  $\nu$ , which is locally equivalent to the Lebesgue measure:

$$(2.21) \quad d\nu(\mathbf{x}) = \rho(\mathbf{x}) dx_1 dx_2 \dots dx_n, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{Q}.$$

where  $\rho$  is a positive, non-vanishing function. The quantum mechanical Hilbert space is then taken to be  $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\mathfrak{Q}, d\nu)$ . In local coordinates we shall write the vector fields of  $\mathfrak{Q}$  as

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i},$$

for  $C^\infty$ -functions  $a_i : \mathfrak{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The generalized quantum observables of position are then defined by the mappings,  $f \mapsto \hat{q}(f)$ , such that on some suitable dense set of vectors  $\psi \in \mathfrak{H}$ ,

$$(2.22) \quad (\hat{q}(f)\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x}).$$

Ignoring technicalities involving domains of these operators, they are easily seen to be self-adjoint ( $f$  is real). In order to obtain a set of quantized momentum observables, we first notice that quite generally the natural action of the vector field  $X$ ,  $\phi \mapsto X(\phi)$ , on a suitably chosen set of smooth functions  $\phi \in \mathfrak{H}$ , defines an operator on the Hilbert space. This operator may not be bounded and may not be self adjoint. However, denoting by  $X^*$  the adjoint of the operator  $X$ , the combination,

$$(2.23) \quad \hat{p}(X) = \frac{\hbar}{2i}[X - X^*],$$

does define a self-adjoint operator (if again we ignore domain related technicalities), and we take this to be the generalized momentum operator corresponding to the vector field  $X$ . An easy computation then leads to the explicit expression,

$$(2.24) \quad \hat{p}(X) = -i\hbar(X + K_X),$$

where  $K_X$  is the operator of multiplication by the function

$$(2.25) \quad k_X(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_\nu (X)(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ X(\log \rho)(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial a_i(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i} \right].$$

In terms of the Lie bracket  $[X, Y] = X \circ Y - Y \circ X$  of the vector fields, one then obtains for the quantized operators the following commutation relations, which clearly generalize the canonical commutation relations:

$$(2.26) \quad \begin{aligned} [0pt][\widehat{p}(X), \widehat{p}(Y)] &= -i\hbar \widehat{p}([X, Y]) \\ [\widehat{q}(f), \widehat{p}(X)] &= i\hbar \widehat{q}(X(f)) \\ [\widehat{q}(f), \widehat{q}(g)] &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

It ought to be pointed out here that the above commutation relations constitute an infinite dimensional Lie algebra,  $\mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q}) \oplus C^\infty(\mathfrak{Q})_{\mathbb{R}}$ . This is the Lie algebra of the (infinite-dimensional) group,  $\mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q}) \rtimes \text{Diff}(\mathfrak{Q})$ , the semi-direct product of the (additive) linear group of all complete vector fields of  $\mathfrak{Q}$  with the group (under composition) of diffeomorphisms of  $\mathfrak{Q}$  (generated by the elements of  $\mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})$ ). The product of two elements  $(f_1, \phi_1)$  and  $(f_2, \phi_2)$  of this group is defined as:

$$(f_1, \phi_1)(f_2, \phi_2) = (f_1 + \phi_1(f_2), \phi_1 \circ \phi_2).$$

The Lie algebra generated by the first set of commutation relations (for the momentum operators) in (2.26) is called a *current algebra*. When modelled on the physical space, rather than the configuration space, the relations (2.26) are precisely the *non-relativistic current algebra* introduced by Dashen and Sharpe [68]. The corresponding semi-direct product group was obtained in this context by Goldin [105].

Next note that if  $\theta$  is a fixed one-form of  $\mathfrak{Q}$ , then replacing  $\widehat{p}(X)$  by

$$(2.27) \quad \widehat{p}(X)' = \widehat{p}(X) + X \lrcorner \theta,$$

in (2.24) does not change the commutation relations in (2.26). Indeed, by choosing such one-forms appropriately, one can generate inequivalent families of representations of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q}) \oplus C^\infty(\mathfrak{Q})_{\mathbb{R}}$ . In particular, if  $\theta$  is logarithmically exact, i.e., if  $\theta = \frac{dF}{F}$ , for some smooth function  $F$ , then the representations generated by the two sets of operators,  $\{\widehat{p}(X), \widehat{q}(f)\}$  and  $\{\widehat{p}(X)', \widehat{q}(f)\}$  are unitarily equivalent. In other words, there exists a unitary operator  $V$  on  $\mathfrak{H}$  which commutes with all the  $\widehat{q}(f)$ ,  $f \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{Q})_{\mathbb{R}}$ , and such that

$$V\widehat{p}(X)V^* = \widehat{p}(X)', \quad X \in \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q}).$$

*Some simple examples.* The obvious example illustrating the above technique is provided by taking  $\mathfrak{Q} = \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, d\mathbf{x})$ . Consider the functions and vector fields,

$$(2.28) \quad f_i(\mathbf{x}) = x_i, \quad X_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \quad J_i = \varepsilon_{ijk} x_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}, \quad i, j, k = 1, 2, 3,$$

where  $\varepsilon_{ijk}$  is the well-known completely antisymmetric tensor (in the indices  $i, j, k$ ) and summation being implied over repeated indices. Quantizing these according to the above procedure we get the usual position, momentum and angular momentum

operators,

$$(2.29) \quad \widehat{q}_i := \widehat{q}(f_i) = x_i, \quad \widehat{p}_i = \widehat{p}(X_i) = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \quad \widehat{J}_i = \widehat{p}(J_i) = -i\hbar \varepsilon_{ijk} x_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}.$$

Computing the commutation relations between these operators, following (2.26), we get the well-known results,

$$(2.30) \quad \begin{aligned} [0pt][\widehat{q}_i, \widehat{q}_j] &= [\widehat{p}_i, \widehat{p}_j] = 0, \\ [\widehat{q}_i, \widehat{p}_j] &= i\hbar \delta_{ij} I, \quad [\widehat{q}_i, \widehat{J}_j] = i\hbar \varepsilon_{ijk} \widehat{q}_k, \\ [\widehat{p}_i, \widehat{J}_j] &= i\hbar \varepsilon_{ijk} \widehat{p}_k, \quad [\widehat{J}_i, \widehat{J}_j] = i\hbar \varepsilon_{ijk} \widehat{J}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Note that these are just the commutation relations between the infinitesimal generators of the orthochronous Galilei group  $\mathbf{G}_{\text{orth}}$  in a space of three dimensions and hence they define its Lie algebra, which now emerges as a subalgebra of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q}) \oplus C^\infty(\mathfrak{Q})_{\mathbb{R}}$ .

Now let  $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) = (A_1(\mathbf{x}), A_2(\mathbf{x}), A_3(\mathbf{x}))$  be a magnetic vector potential,  $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$  the corresponding magnetic field. Consider the one form

$$\theta = -\frac{e}{c} \sum_{i=1}^3 A_i dx_i$$

( $e$  = charge of the electron and  $c$  = velocity of light). The set of quantized operators (2.31)

$$\widehat{q}(f) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{p}(X)' = -i\hbar X + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 \left[ \widehat{p}_i - \frac{2e}{c} A_i \right] a_i, \quad \text{where } X(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i},$$

realize a quantization of a nonrelativistic charged particle in a magnetic field. (For a “current algebraic” description, see Menikoff and Sharp [170].) In particular, if  $d\theta = 0$  (i.e.,  $\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B} = 0$ ), then  $\theta$  is closed, hence exact, and there is no magnetic field. Hence, from a physical point of view, the quantizations corresponding to different such  $\theta$  must all be unitarily equivalent and indeed, as noted above, this is also true mathematically. This point is illustrated by taking vector potential  $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) = \mu(x_2, x_1, 0)$  where  $\mu$  is a constant. Then  $\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = 0$  and the one-form  $\theta = -\frac{e\mu}{c} [x_2 dx_1 + x_1 dx_2]$  is logarithmically exact:

$$\theta = \frac{dF}{F}, \quad \text{with} \quad F = \exp\left[-\frac{e\mu}{c} x_1 x_2\right].$$

On the other hand, consider the case where  $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{B}{2} (-x_2, x_1, 0)$ ,  $B > 0$ . This is the case of a constant magnetic field  $\mathbf{B} = (0, 0, B)$  of strength  $B$  along the third axis. The corresponding one-form  $\theta = \frac{eB}{2c} [x_2 dx_1 - x_1 dx_2]$  is not closed and for each different value of  $B$  we get an inequivalent quantization.

As the next example, let  $\mathfrak{Q} = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{\mathbb{R}\}$ , the three dimensional Euclidean space with the third axis removed. We take the measure  $d\nu(\mathbf{x}) = d\mathbf{x}$  and the Hilbert space

$\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\mathfrak{Q}, d\nu)$ . Consider the vector potential,

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{\mu}{r^2}(-x_2, x_1, 0) \quad \mu > 0, \quad r^2 = (x_1)^2 + (x_2)^2.$$

Then  $\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = 0$  and the one-form

$$(2.32) \quad \theta(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mu e}{c r^2} [x_2 dx_1 - x_1 dx_2]$$

is closed. However,  $\theta$  is not exact, since we may write  $\theta = dF$ , with

$$(2.33) \quad F = -\frac{\mu e}{c} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{x_2}{x_1} \right),$$

which is a multivalued function on  $\mathfrak{Q}$ . Since  $\mathbf{B} = 0$ , physically the classical systems with  $\mathbf{A} = 0$  and  $\mathbf{A}$  given as above should be equivalent. However, the quantizations for the two cases (which can be easily computed using (2.27)) are inequivalent. This is an example of the Aharonov-Bohm effect (see [1]).

Finally, for the same configuration space  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{\mathbb{R}\}$ , consider the case in which the magnetic field itself is given by

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{2I}{c r^2} (-x_2, x_1, 0), \quad r^2 = (x_1)^2 + (x_2)^2.$$

This is the magnetic field generated by an infinite current bearing wire (of current strength  $I$ ) placed along the  $x_3$ -axis. The vector potential, given locally by

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{2I}{c} (0, 0, \phi), \quad -\frac{\pi}{2} < \phi = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{x_2}{x_1} \right) < \frac{\pi}{2},$$

does not give rise to a closed form and for each value of  $I$  one gets a different quantization.

As mentioned earlier, Segal actually suggested going over to the group of diffeomorphisms  $\text{Diff}(\mathfrak{Q})$  and its unitary representations, to attend to domain questions associated to  $\widehat{q}(f), \widehat{p}(X)$ , and then suggested a classification scheme for possible unitarily inequivalent quantizations in these terms. Note also, that the Segal quantization method is based on configuration space, rather than on phase space. As such, the primary preoccupation here is to generalize the method of canonical quantization. On the other hand, as we said before, Segal also extended the theory to phase space and in that sense, Segal's method leads to similar results as other methods that we shall study, on the representations of the Poisson algebra on Hilbert space.

At this point we should also mention that Goldin, Sharp and their collaborators proposed to describe quantum theory by means of unitary representations of groups of diffeomorphisms of the physical space [105, 107, 113]. Deriving the current algebra from second quantized canonical fields, their programme has succeeded in predicting unusual possibilities, including the statistics of *anyons* in two space dimensions [108, 109, 112, 165]. Diffeomorphisms of the physical space act naturally on the configuration space  $\mathfrak{Q}$  and thus form a subgroup. In fact, the unitary representations of this group are sufficient to characterize the quantum theory, so that the results of Goldin,



*et al.*, carry over to the quantization framework described in the next section. In particular, the unitarily inequivalent representations describing particle statistics were first obtained by Goldin, Menikoff and Sharp [108–110]. For an extended review of these ideas, see [106].

**2.4. Borel quantization.** We pass on to the related, and certainly more assiduously studied, method of *Borel quantization*. This method focuses on both the geometric and measure theoretic properties of the configuration space manifold  $\mathfrak{Q}$  as well as attempting to incorporate internal symmetries by lifting  $\mathfrak{Q}$  to a complex Hermitian vector bundle with connection and curvature, compatible with the Hermitian structure.

Consider a one-parameter family of diffeomorphisms  $s \mapsto \phi_s$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , which are sufficiently well behaved in the parameter  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , in an appropriate sense. Then,

$$(2.34) \quad \frac{d}{ds} f \circ \phi_s|_{s=0} = X(f),$$

where  $f$  is an arbitrary smooth function, defines a vector field  $X$ . Its quantized form  $\widehat{p}(X)$ , according to Segal's procedure will be a general momentum observable acting on  $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mathbf{x})$  in the manner

$$(2.35) \quad (\widehat{p}(X)\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = -i\hbar(X\psi)(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\partial a_i}{\partial x_i}(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{where} \quad X(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i},$$

and together, the set of all such momentum observables then form an algebra under the bracket operation (see (2.26)):

$$(2.36) \quad [\widehat{p}(X), \widehat{p}(Y)] = -i\hbar\widehat{p}([X, Y]).$$

We write  $\phi_s = \phi_s^X$ , to indicate the generator, and define the transformed sets

$$(2.37) \quad \phi_s^X(\Delta) = \{\phi_s^X(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \Delta\},$$

for each Borel set  $\Delta$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Next, denote the  $\sigma$ -algebra of the Borel sets of  $\mathfrak{Q} = \mathbb{R}^n$  by  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Corresponding to each  $\Delta \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , define an operator  $P(\Delta)$  on  $\mathfrak{H}$ :

$$(2.38) \quad (P(\Delta)\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = \chi_\Delta(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x}), \quad \chi_\Delta(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \Delta, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This is a projection operator,  $P(\Delta) = P(\Delta)^* = P(\Delta)^2$ , and has the following measure theoretic properties:

$$(2.39) \quad \begin{aligned} P(\emptyset) &= 0, & P(\mathbb{R}^n) &= I \\ P(\cup_{i \in J} \Delta_i) &= \sum_{i \in J} P(\Delta_i) & \text{if } \Delta_i \cap \Delta_j &= \emptyset, \quad i \neq j, \end{aligned}$$

where  $J$  is a discrete index set and the convergence of the sum is meant in the weak sense. Such a set of projection operators  $P(\Delta)$ ,  $\Delta \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , is called a (normalized)

projection valued measure (or PV-measure for short) on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Note that, for any  $\psi \in \mathfrak{H}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\psi(\Delta) &= \langle \psi | P(\Delta) \psi \rangle, \\ (2.40) \quad &= \int_{\Delta} \|\psi(\mathbf{x})\|^2 d\mathbf{x}, \quad \Delta \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n), \end{aligned}$$

defines a real measure, absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

It is then easily checked that for each  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$(2.41) \quad V(\phi_s^X) = \exp[-i\hbar s \hat{p}(X)],$$

defines a unitary operator on  $\mathfrak{H}$ , such that  $\{V, P\}$  is a *system of imprimitivity* in the sense:

$$(2.42) \quad V(\phi_s^X) P(\Delta) V(\phi_{-s}^X) = P(\phi_s^X(\Delta)).$$

Now considering *all* such one-parameter diffeomorphism groups and their associated systems of imprimitivity, we find that the collective system is certainly irreducibly realized on  $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mathbf{x})$ .

Suppose now that the system which we wish to quantize has some *internal degrees of freedom*, such as the spin of a particle. Thus there is some group  $G$  of internal symmetries, and for any UIR of  $G$  on some (auxiliary) Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{K}$ , we want to work on the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{K} \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mathbf{x})$  instead of just  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mathbf{x})$ ; and we would like (2.42) to be irreducibly realized on this  $\mathfrak{H}$ . For instance, for the free particle in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , to accommodate for its spin we need to replace<sup>3</sup>  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, d\mathbf{x})$  by  $\mathfrak{H} = \mathbb{C}^{2j+1} \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, d\mathbf{x})$ , with  $\mathbb{C}^{2j+1}$  carrying the  $j$ -th spinor representation of  $SU(2)$ ,  $j = 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{3}{2}, \dots$ .

The aim of Borel quantization is to construct such irreducible systems on arbitrary configuration space manifolds  $\mathfrak{Q}$ . It is clear that the problem is related to that of finding irreducible representations of the diffeomorphism group,  $\text{Diff}(\mathfrak{Q})$ , which admit systems of imprimitivity based on the Borel sets of  $\mathfrak{Q}$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{Q}$  be a configuration space manifold, of dimension  $n$ ,  $\mu$  a smooth measure on  $\mathfrak{Q}$  (i.e., locally equivalent to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) and let  $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}} = \mathbb{C}^k \otimes L^2(\mathfrak{Q}, d\mu)$ , where  $k \geq 1$  is an integer.

Let  $\tilde{P}(E)$  be the projection valued measure on  $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$ :

$$(2.43) \quad (\tilde{P}(E)\tilde{\psi})(x) = \chi_E(x)\tilde{\psi}(x), \quad \tilde{\psi} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}, \quad E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{Q}),$$

$\chi_E$  being the characteristic function of the set  $E$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{Q})$  denoting the set of all Borel sets of  $\mathfrak{Q}$ . Now let  $\mathfrak{H}$  be another Hilbert space and  $P$  a PV-measure on it (also defined over  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{Q})$ ).

*Definition 2.1.* The pair  $\{\mathfrak{H}, P\}$  is called a  $k$ -homogeneous localized quantum system if and only if it is unitarily equivalent to  $\{\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}, \tilde{P}\}$ , i.e., iff there exists a unitary map  $W : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$  such that

$$(2.44) \quad WP(E)W^{-1} = \tilde{P}(E), \quad E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{Q}).$$

---

<sup>3</sup>From a purely mathematical point of view, this amounts to replacing the original configuration space  $\mathbb{R}^3$  by its Cartesian product with a discrete set consisting of  $2j+1$  points.

Let  $f \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{Q})_{\mathbb{R}} = (\text{space of infinitely differentiable, real-valued functions on } \mathfrak{Q})$ .

*Definition 2.2.* Let  $\{\mathfrak{H}, P\}$  be a  $k$ -homogeneous localized quantum system. The self-adjoint operator,

$$(2.45) \quad \widehat{q}(f) = \int_{\mathfrak{Q}} f(x) dP_x,$$

defined on the domain,

$$\mathcal{D}(\widehat{q}(f)) = \{\psi \in \mathfrak{H} \mid \int_{\mathfrak{Q}} |f(x)|^2 d\langle \psi | P_x \psi \rangle < \infty\},$$

is called a generalized position operator.

Note that under the isometry (2.44),  $\widehat{q}(f)$  becomes the operator of multiplication by  $f$  on  $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$ . The following properties of these operators are easily verified:

- (1)  $\widehat{q}(f)$  is a bounded operator if and only if  $f$  is a bounded function.
- (2)  $\widehat{q}(f) = 0$  if and only if  $f = 0$ .
- (3)  $\widehat{q}(\alpha f) = \alpha \widehat{q}(f)$ , for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- (4)  $\widehat{q}(f + g) \supseteq \widehat{q}(f) + \widehat{q}(g)$  and  $\mathcal{D}(\widehat{q}(f) + \widehat{q}(g)) = \mathcal{D}(\widehat{q}(f)) \cap \mathcal{D}(\widehat{q}(g))$ .
- (5)  $\widehat{q}(f \cdot g) \supseteq \widehat{q}(f) \widehat{q}(g)$  and  $\mathcal{D}(\widehat{q}(f) \widehat{q}(g)) = \mathcal{D}(\widehat{q}(f \cdot g)) \cap \mathcal{D}(\widehat{q}(f))$ .

We had mentioned earlier the notion of a *shift* on the manifold  $\mathfrak{Q}$ . This is a one parameter group of diffeomorphisms:  $\phi_s : \mathfrak{Q} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Q}$ ,  $\phi_{s_2} \circ \phi_{s_1} = \phi_{s_1 + s_2}$ ,  $s, s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\phi_0$  being the identity map. Each such shift defines a *complete vector field*,  $X$  via,

$$(2.46) \quad X(f) := \frac{d}{ds} f \circ \phi_s|_{s=0},$$

$f$  being an arbitrary smooth function on the manifold and conversely, every such vector field  $X$  gives rise to a shift  $\phi_s^X$ , called the *flow* of the vector field:

$$(2.47) \quad \pi(\phi_{-s}^X) = e^{sX(x)},$$

where  $\pi(\phi_{-s}^X)$  is a linear operator on the space of smooth functions  $f$  on the manifold:

$$(2.48) \quad (\pi(\phi_{-s}^X)f)(x) = f(\phi_s^X(x)), \quad x \in \mathfrak{Q}.$$

There is a natural action of the shifts on Borel sets  $E \subset \mathfrak{Q}$ ,

$$(2.49) \quad E \longmapsto \phi_s^X(E) = \{\phi_s^X(x) \mid x \in E\}.$$

Since  $\phi_s^X$  is smooth, the resulting set  $\phi_s^X(E)$  is also a Borel set. We want to represent the shifts  $\phi_s^X$  on  $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$  as one-parameter unitary groups on Hilbert spaces  $\mathfrak{H}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{H})$  denote the set of all unitary operators on  $\mathfrak{H}$  and, as before,  $\mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})$  the set of all complete vector fields on the manifold  $\mathfrak{Q}$ .

*Definition 2.3.* Let  $\{\mathfrak{H}, P\}$  be a quantum system localized on  $\mathfrak{Q}$ . A map

$$(2.50) \quad V : \phi_s^X \longmapsto V(\phi_s^X) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{H}),$$

is called a shift of the localized quantum system if, for all  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})$ , the map  $s \longmapsto V(\phi_s^X)$  gives a strongly continuous representation of the additive group of  $\mathbb{R}$

and  $\{V(\phi_s^X), P\}$  is a system of imprimitivity with respect to the group of real numbers  $\mathbb{R}$  and the Borel  $\mathbb{R}$ -space  $\mathfrak{Q}$  with group action  $\phi_s^X$ , i.e.,

$$(2.51) \quad V(\phi_s^X)P(E)V(\phi_{-s}^X) = P(\phi_s^X(E)).$$

The triple  $\{\mathfrak{H}, P, V\}$  is called a *localized quantum system with shifts*.

Two localized quantum systems with shifts,  $\{\mathfrak{H}_j, P_j, V_j\}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , are said to be unitarily equivalent if there exists a unitary map  $W : \mathfrak{H}_1 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{H}_2$ , such that  $WP_1(E)W^{-1} = P_2(E)$ ,  $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{Q})$  and  $WV_1(\phi_s^X)W^{-1} = V_2(\phi_s^X)$ ,  $x \in \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . The map  $\widehat{p} : \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{H})$  (the set of all self-adjoint operators on  $\mathfrak{H}$ ), where  $\widehat{p}(X)$  is defined via Stone's theorem as the infinitesimal generator of

$$(2.52) \quad V(\phi_s^X) = \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}s\widehat{p}(X)\right],$$

is called the *kinematical momentum* of  $\{\mathfrak{H}, P, V\}$ .

The imprimitivity relation (2.51) has the following important consequences.

*Lemma 2.4.* Let  $\{\mathfrak{H}, P, V\}$  be a  $k$ -homogeneous localized quantum system with shifts. Then

$$(2.53) \quad V(\phi_s^X)\widehat{q}(f)V(\phi_{-s}^X) = \widehat{q}(f \circ \phi_s^X).$$

A  $k$ -homogeneous quantum system with shifts  $\{\mathfrak{H}, P, V\}$  is unitarily equivalent to  $\{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}, \widetilde{P}, \widetilde{V}\}$ , with  $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}$  and  $\widetilde{P}$  as in (2.43).

The representation  $\widetilde{V}$  acquires a very specific form. To understand it we need the concept of a cocycle. Let  $G$  be a locally compact group,  $H$  a standard Borel group,  $X$  a Borel  $G$ -space with group action  $x \longmapsto gx$  and  $[\nu]$  a  $G$ -invariant measure class on  $X$ . (This means that if  $\nu$  is any measure in the class, then so also is  $\nu_g$ , where  $\nu_g(E) = \nu(gE)$ , for all  $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{Q})$ .)

A Borel measurable map  $\xi : G \times X \longrightarrow H$  is called a *cocycle* of  $G$ , relative to the measure class  $[\nu]$  on  $X$ , with values in  $H$ , if

$$(2.54) \quad \begin{aligned} [0pt]\xi(e, x) &= 1, \\ \xi(g_1g_2, x) &= \xi(g_1, g_2x) \xi(g_2, x), \end{aligned}$$

for  $[\nu]$ -almost all  $x \in X$  and almost all (with respect to the Haar measure)  $g_1, g_2 \in G$  ( $e$  is the identity element of  $G$ ). Two cocycles  $\xi_1$  and  $\xi_2$  are said to be *cohomologous* or *equivalent* if there exists a Borel function  $\zeta : X \longrightarrow H$ , such that,

$$\xi_2(g, x) = \zeta(gx) \xi_1(g, x) \zeta(x)^{-1}$$

for almost all  $g \in G$  and  $x \in X$ . The equivalence classes  $[\xi]$  are called *cohomology classes of cocycles*. The following classification theorem for localized quantum systems then holds.

*Theorem 2.5.* Any localized  $k$ -homogeneous quantum system  $\{\mathfrak{H}, P, V\}$  on  $\mathfrak{Q}$ , with shifts, is unitarily equivalent to a canonical representation  $\{\tilde{\mathfrak{H}}, \tilde{P}, \tilde{V}\}$ , with  $\tilde{\mathfrak{H}} = \mathbb{C} \otimes L^2(\mathfrak{Q}, d\mu)$ , for some smooth measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathfrak{Q}$ ,

$$(\tilde{P}(E)\tilde{\psi})(x) = \chi_E(x)\tilde{\psi}(x),$$

for all  $\tilde{\phi} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$  and all  $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{Q})$ , and

$$(2.55) \quad (V(\phi_s^X)\tilde{\psi})(x) = \xi^X(s, \phi_{-s}^X(x)) \sqrt{\lambda(\phi_s^X, \phi_{-s}^X(x))} \tilde{\psi}(\phi_{-s}^X(x)),$$

for all  $\tilde{\psi} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{H}}$  and all  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})$ , where  $\xi^X$  is a cocycle of the Abelian group  $\mathbb{R}$  (relative to the class of smooth measures on  $\mathfrak{Q}$ ), having values in  $\mathcal{U}(k)$  (the group of  $k \times k$  unitary matrices) and  $\lambda$  is the unique smooth Radon-Nikodym derivative,

$$\lambda(\phi_s^X, x) = \frac{d\mu_{\phi_s^X}}{d\mu}(x).$$

Moreover, equivalence classes of  $k$ -homogeneous localized quantum systems are in one-to-one correspondence with equivalence classes of cocycle sets  $[\{\xi^X\}_{X \in \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})}]$ , where

$$\{\xi_1^X\}_{X \in \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})} \sim \{\xi_2^X\}_{X \in \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})}$$

if there exists a Borel function  $\zeta : \mathfrak{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(k)$ , such that, for all  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $x \in \mathfrak{Q}$ ,

$$\xi_2^X(s, x) = \zeta(\phi_s^X(x)) \xi_1^X(s, x) \zeta(x)^{-1}.$$

Differentiating (2.55) with respect to  $s$ , using (2.52), and then setting  $s = 0$ , we obtain,

$$(2.56) \quad \hat{p}(X)\tilde{\psi} = -i\hbar \mathfrak{L}_X \tilde{\psi} - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \operatorname{div}_\nu(X)\tilde{\psi} + \omega(X)\tilde{\psi},$$

where  $\mathfrak{L}_X \tilde{\psi}$  is the Lie derivative of  $\tilde{\psi}$  along  $X$  and,

$$(2.57) \quad [0pt] \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_\nu(X)(x) = \frac{d}{ds} \sqrt{\lambda(\phi_s^X, \phi_{-s}^X(x))}|_{s=0}$$

$$\alpha(X)(x) = -i\hbar \frac{d}{ds} \xi^X(s, \phi_{-s}^X(x))|_{s=0}.$$

The first two terms in (2.56) are linear in  $X$ . It is now possible to show that the following commutation relations hold:

$$(2.58) \quad [0pt] [\hat{q}(f), \hat{q}(g)] = 0,$$

$$[\hat{p}(X), \hat{q}(f)] = -i\hbar \hat{q}(\mathfrak{L}_X f),$$

$$[\hat{p}(X), \hat{p}(Y)] = -i\hbar \hat{p}([X, Y]) - i\hbar \Omega(X, Y),$$

for all  $f, g \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{Q})_{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})$ , and where,

$$(2.59) \quad \Omega(X, Y) = -i\hbar [\alpha(X), \alpha(Y)] + \mathfrak{L}_X \alpha(Y) - \mathfrak{L}_Y \alpha(X) - \alpha([X, Y]).$$

The two-form  $\Omega$  and the one-form  $\alpha$  on  $\mathfrak{Q}$  are related in the same way as the curvature two-form  $\frac{1}{\hbar} \Omega$  of a  $\mathbb{C}^1$ -bundle and its connection one-form  $\frac{1}{\hbar} \alpha(X)$ . Indeed, one can

show that if  $D$  is the covariant derivative defined by the connection, then  $D\Omega = 0$ , which is the *Bianchi identity*.

*Definition 2.6.* Let  $\{\mathfrak{H}, P, V\}$  be a  $k$ -homogeneous localized quantum system with shifts on  $\mathfrak{Q}$  and  $\Omega$  a differential two-form on  $\mathfrak{Q}$  with values in the set of all  $k \times k$  Hermitian matrices. The kinematical momentum  $\widehat{p}$  is called  $\Omega$ -compatible if in a canonical representation  $\{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}, \widetilde{P}, \widetilde{V}\}$ , the associated kinematical momenta  $\widetilde{p}$  satisfy

$$(2.60) \quad [\widetilde{p}(X), \widetilde{p}(Y)]\widetilde{\psi} = -i\hbar (\widetilde{p}([X, Y])\widetilde{\psi} + \Omega(X, Y)\widetilde{\psi}).$$

In this case, the quadruple  $\{\mathfrak{H}, \widehat{q}, \widehat{p}, \Omega\}$  is called an  $\Omega$ -compatible  $k$ -Borel kinematics.

In order to arrive at a classification theory of localized quantum systems, we first impose some additional smoothness conditions. An  $\Omega$ -compatible  $k$ -quantum Borel kinematics  $\{\mathfrak{H}, \widehat{q}, \widehat{p}, \Omega\}$  is said to be *differentiable* if it is equivalent to  $\{\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}}, \widetilde{q}, \widetilde{p}, \widetilde{\Omega}\}$ , where

- (1)  $\widetilde{\mathfrak{H}} = L^2(\mathbb{E}, \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle, d\nu)$  for a  $\mathbb{C}^k$ -bundle  $\mathbb{E}$  over  $\mathfrak{Q}$ , with Hermitian metric  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$  and a smooth measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathfrak{Q}$ .
- (2)  $\widetilde{\Omega}$  is a two-form with (self-adjoint) values in the endomorphism bundle  $L_{\mathbb{E}} = \mathbb{E} \otimes \mathbb{E}^*$ .
- (3)  $(\widetilde{q}(f)\sigma)(x) = f(x)\sigma(x)$ , for all  $f \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{Q})_{\mathbb{R}}$  and smooth sections  $\sigma \in \Gamma_0$  (= smooth sections of compact support).
- (4)  $\widetilde{p}(X)\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma_0$ , for all  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})$ .

We then have the following canonical representation of a differentiable quantum Borel kinematics:

*Theorem 2.7.* Let  $\{\mathfrak{H}, \widehat{q}, \widehat{p}, \Omega\}$  be a localized differentiable quantum Borel kinematics on  $\mathfrak{Q}$  in canonical representation. Then there is a Hermitian connection  $\nabla$  with curvature  $\frac{1}{\hbar} \Omega$  on  $\mathbb{E}$  and a covariantly constant self-adjoint section  $\Phi$  of  $L_{\mathbb{E}} = \mathbb{E} \otimes \mathbb{E}^*$ , the bundle of endomorphisms of  $\mathbb{E}$ , such that for all  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_c(\mathfrak{Q})$  and all  $\sigma \in \Gamma_0$ ,

$$(2.61) \quad \widehat{p}(X)\sigma = -i\hbar \nabla_X \sigma + \left(-\frac{i\hbar}{2} \mathbb{I} + \Phi\right) \text{div}_\nu(X)\sigma.$$

For an elementary quantum Borel kinematics, i.e., when the  $\mathbb{C}^k$ -bundle is a line bundle, one can give a complete classification of the possible equivalence classes of quantum Borel kinematics. Indeed, for Hermitian line bundles, one has the classification theorem:

*Theorem 2.8.* Let  $\mathfrak{Q}$  be a connected differentiable manifold and  $B$  a closed two-form on  $\mathfrak{Q}$  (i.e.,  $dB = 0$ ). Then there exists a Hermitian complex line bundle  $(\mathbb{E}, \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle, \nabla)$ , with compatible connection and curvature  $\frac{1}{\hbar} B$ , if and only if  $B$  satisfies the integrality condition

$$(2.62) \quad \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int_{\Sigma} B \in \mathbb{Z},$$

for all closed two-surfaces  $\Sigma$  in  $\mathfrak{Q}$ . Furthermore, the various equivalence classes of  $(\mathbb{E}, \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle, \nabla)$  (for fixed curvature  $\frac{1}{\hbar} B$ ) are parameterized by  $H^1(\mathfrak{Q}, \mathcal{U}(1)) \simeq \pi_1(\mathfrak{Q})^*$ , where  $\pi_1(\mathfrak{Q})^*$  denotes the group of characters of the first fundamental group of  $\mathfrak{Q}$ .

The classification of the associated elementary quantum Borel kinematics is then spelled out in the following theorem.

*Theorem 2.9.* The equivalence classes of elementary localized differentiable quantum Borel kinematics are in one-to-one correspondence with  $I^2(\mathfrak{Q}) \times \pi_1(\mathfrak{Q})^* \times \mathbb{R}$ , where  $I^2(\mathfrak{Q})$  denotes the set of all closed real two-forms on  $\mathfrak{Q}$ , satisfying the integrality condition (2.62).

For  $\mathbb{C}^k$ -bundles only a weaker result, for  $\Omega = 0$ , is known:

*Theorem 2.10.* The equivalence classes of  $(\Omega = 0)$ -compatible differentiable and localized  $k$ -quantum Borel kinematics are in one-to-one correspondence with the equivalence classes  $\{(D, A)\}$  of pairs of unitary representations  $D \in \text{Hom}(\pi_1(\mathfrak{Q}), \mathcal{U}(k))$  and self adjoint complex  $k \times k$  matrices  $A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^k) \cap D'$ , where  $D'$  is the commutant of the representation  $D$ , i.e.,  $D' = \{M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^k) \mid [M, D(g)] = 0, \forall g \in \pi_1(\mathfrak{Q})\}$ . Here two pairs  $(D_1, A_1)$  and  $(D_2, A_2)$  are equivalent if there is a unitary matrix  $U$  such that  $D_2 = UD_1U^{-1}$  and  $A_2 = UA_1U^{-1}$ .

Instead of enlarging the space of quantizable observables to include the Hamiltonian, the Borel quantization method then proceeds in a different way to treat the time evolution of the quantized system, leading ultimately to a nonlinear Schrödinger equation; see Ali [3], Doebner and Nattermann [76], Angermann, Doebner and Tolar [15], Angermann [14], Tolar [240], Pasemann [196] and Mueller [176] for the details. For a comparison with geometric quantization (to be discussed in the next section) see Zhao [266].

### 3. GEOMETRIC QUANTIZATION

We pass on to a treatment of *geometric quantization*, which in addition to being a physical theory has also emerged as a branch of mathematics. The starting point here is a real symplectic manifold  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  (the phase space) of dimension  $2n$ , with symplectic form  $\omega$ . For a function  $f$  on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , the corresponding Hamiltonian vector field  $X_f$  is given by  $\omega(\cdot, X_f) = df$ . The Poisson bracket of two functions is defined by

$$(3.1) \quad \{f, g\} = -\omega(X_f, X_g).$$

Starting with such a manifold as the arena of classical mechanics, the goal of geometric quantization is to assign to each such manifold  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \omega)$  a separable Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$  and a mapping  $Q : f \mapsto Q_f$  from a subspace  $Obs$  (as large as possible) of real-valued functions on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , which is a Lie algebra under the Poisson bracket, into self-adjoint linear operators on  $\mathfrak{H}$  in such a way that

- (Q1)  $Q_1 = I$ , where  $\mathbf{1}$  is the function constant one and  $I$  the identity operator on  $\mathfrak{H}$ ;
- (Q2) the mapping  $f \mapsto Q_f$  is linear;

(Q3)  $[Q_f, Q_g] = \frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} Q_{\{f,g\}}, \quad \forall f, g \in Obs;$

(Q4) the procedure is *functorial* in the sense that for two symplectic manifolds  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}, \omega^{(1)})$ ,  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(2)}, \omega^{(2)})$  and a diffeomorphism  $\phi$  of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}$  onto  $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(2)}$  which sends  $\omega^{(1)}$  into  $\omega^{(2)}$ , the composition with  $\phi$  should map  $Obs^{(2)}$  into  $Obs^{(1)}$  and there should be a unitary operator  $U_\phi$  from  $\mathfrak{H}^{(1)}$  onto  $\mathfrak{H}^{(2)}$  such that

$$(3.2) \quad Q_{f \circ \phi}^{(1)} = U_\phi^* Q_f^{(2)} U_\phi \quad \forall f \in Obs^{(2)};$$

(Q5) for  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \omega) = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  with the standard symplectic form, we should recover the operators  $Q_{q_j}, Q_{p_j}$  in (1.1).

*Remark 5.* The requirements (Q4) and (Q5) are, in some way, a substitute for the irreducibility condition (1.2), which may be difficult to interpret on a general symplectic manifold (i.e. in the absence of a global separation of coordinates into the  $q$  and  $p$  variables). Another, frequently used, possibility is to require that for some “distinguished” set of observables  $f$  the corresponding quantum operators  $Q_f$  should act irreducibly on  $\mathfrak{H}$ ; however, there seems to be no general recipe how one should choose such “distinguished” sets. The requirement that there be no nontrivial subspace in  $\mathfrak{H}$  invariant for all  $Q_f, f \in Obs$ , is *not* the correct substitute; see Tuynman [246] for a thorough discussion of this point. Also we gave up the von Neumann rule (q3), but it turns out that this is usually recovered to some extent, cf. [115].  $\square$

*Remark 6.* Observe that if there is a group  $G$  of symplectomorphisms acting on  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \omega)$ , then the covariance axiom (Q4) implies (taking  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_1 = \mathbf{\Gamma}_2 = \mathbf{\Gamma}$ ) that the quantization map  $f \mapsto Q_f$  is (essentially)  $G$ -invariant.  $\square$

The solution to the above problem was first given by Kostant [155] and Souriau [233]. It is accomplished in two steps: prequantization and polarization. *Prequantization* starts with introducing a complex Hermitian line bundle  $L$  over  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  with a connection  $\nabla$  whose curvature form satisfies  $\text{curv } \nabla = 2\pi\omega/\hbar$ . (For  $(L, \nabla)$  to exist it is necessary that the cohomology class of  $\omega/\hbar$  in  $H^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbb{R})$  be integral; this is known as the *prequantization condition*.) One then defines for each  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbf{\Gamma})$  the differential operator

$$(3.3) \quad Q_f = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \nabla_{X_f} + f$$

where the last  $f$  stands for the operator of multiplication by  $f$ . Plainly these operators satisfy (Q1), (Q2) and (Q4), and a short computation reveals that they also satisfy (Q3).

Unfortunately, (Q5) is manifestly violated for the operators (3.3); in fact, for  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  these operators act not on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  but on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ , so we need somehow to throw away half of the variables. More precisely, one checks that for  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  the operators (3.3) are given by

$$Q_f = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \sum_j \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_j} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial q_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} \right) + \left( f - \sum_j p_j \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_j} \right),$$



so restricting  $Q_f$  to the space of functions depending only on  $q$  and square-integrable over  $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$  one recovers the desired operators (1.1). For a general symplectic manifold  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \omega)$ , making sense of “functions depending on and square-integrable over only half of the variables” is achieved by *polarization*. The latter amounts, roughly speaking, to choosing a subbundle  $\mathcal{P}$  of complex dimension  $n$  in the complexified tangent bundle  $T\mathbf{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{C}}$  in a certain way and then restricting to functions on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  which are constant along the directions in  $\mathcal{P}$ <sup>4</sup>. This settles the “dependence on half of the variables”. As for the “square-integrability”, the simplest solution is the use of half-densities, which however does not give the correct quantization for the harmonic oscillator; one therefore has to apply the *metaplectic correction*, which amounts to using not half-densities but half-forms and gives the right answer for the harmonic oscillator (but not in some other cases, cf. [245]). Finally, for functions  $f$  which leave  $\mathcal{P}$  invariant, i.e.  $[X_f, \mathcal{P}] \subset \mathcal{P}$ , the corresponding operator given (essentially) by (3.3) maps a function constant along  $\mathcal{P}$  into another such function, and thus one arrives at the desired quantum operators.

Since geometric quantization is still probably the most widely used quantization method, we will now discuss all the above ingredients in some more detail prior to embarking on the discussion of other approaches.

**3.1. Prequantization.** The aim of prequantization is to construct a mapping  $f \mapsto Q_f$  satisfying all the required axioms except (Q5). For simplicity, let us start with the case when  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is a cotangent bundle:  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = T^*\mathbf{\Omega}$ . One can then define globally a real one-form  $\theta$  (the *symplectic potential*) satisfying

$$(3.4) \quad d\theta = \omega.$$

Actually, if  $m \in \mathbf{\Gamma}$  and  $\xi \in T_m\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , then one sets

$$\theta(\xi) := m(\pi_*\xi)$$

where  $\pi : \mathbf{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbf{\Omega}$  denotes the cotangent bundle projection and  $\pi_* : T\mathbf{\Gamma} \rightarrow T\mathbf{\Omega}$  is the derivative map of  $\pi$ . In terms of local coordinates  $q_j$  on  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  and  $(p_j, q_j)$  on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , one has

$$(3.5) \quad \theta = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j dq_j, \quad \omega = \sum_{j=1}^n dp_j \wedge dq_j.$$

The Hamiltonian field  $X_f$  of a function  $f$  on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is in these coordinates given by

$$(3.6) \quad X_f = \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_j} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial q_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} \right),$$

---

<sup>4</sup>If  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is a cotangent bundle, i.e.  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = T^*\mathbf{\Omega}$  for some configuration space  $\mathbf{\Omega}$ , one can polarize simply by restricting to functions depending on  $q$  only; however, for general symplectic manifolds the global separation into position and momentum coordinates is usually impossible. A well-known example of a physical system whose phase space is not a cotangent bundle is the phase space of classical spin (discussed extensively in Souriau [233]), which can be identified with the Riemann sphere  $\mathbf{S}^2$ .

and the Poisson bracket  $\{f, g\} = -\omega(X_f, X_g) = X_f g$  of two functions  $f, g$  is again expressed by (1.5).

A simple computation shows that  $[X_f, X_g] = -X_{\{f, g\}}$ , thus  $Q_f = -\frac{ih}{2\pi}X_f$  satisfies the conditions (Q2), (Q3) and (Q4). Unfortunately, (Q1) fails, since  $X_1 = 0$ . Let us try correcting this by taking

$$Q_f = -\frac{ih}{2\pi}X_f + f$$

(where the latter  $f$  is to be taken as the operator of multiplication by the function  $f$ ). Then  $Q_1 = I$ , as desired, but

$$[Q_f, Q_g] = \frac{ih}{2\pi}(Q_{\{f, g\}} + \{f, g\})$$

so now (Q3) is violated. Observe, however, that

$$X_f(\theta(X_g)) - X_g(\theta(X_f)) = -\theta(X_{\{f, g\}}) + \{f, g\}$$

by a straightforward computation using (3.6) and (3.5). Thus taking

$$(3.7) \quad Q_f = -\frac{ih}{2\pi}X_f - \theta(X_f) + f$$

it follows that all of (Q1) – (Q4) will be satisfied.

Having settled the case of the cotangent bundle, let us now turn to general symplectic manifolds  $(\Gamma, \omega)$ . By a theorem of Darboux, one can always cover  $\Gamma$  by local coordinate patches  $(p_j, q_j)$  such that the second formula in (3.5) (and, hence, also (3.6)) holds; however, the corresponding symplectic potentials need not agree on the intersections of two coordinate patches. Let us therefore examine what is the influence of a different choice of potential on the operator (3.7). If  $\omega = d\theta = d\theta'$ , then  $\theta' = \theta + du$  (locally) for some real function  $u$ ; then  $\theta'(X_f) - \theta(X_f) = X_f u = -e^u X_f e^{-u}$ , whence

$$(3.8) \quad e^{\frac{2\pi}{ih}u} Q'_f \phi = Q_f e^{\frac{2\pi}{ih}u} \phi, \quad \forall \phi \in C^\infty.$$

Recall now that, quite generally, a complex *line bundle*  $L$  over a manifold  $\Gamma$  is given by the following data:

- (1) a covering (atlas)  $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}}$  of  $\Gamma$  by coordinate patches,
- (2) a family of transition functions  $\{g_{\alpha\beta}\}_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}}$ , each  $g_{\alpha\beta}$  being a nonvanishing  $C^\infty$  function in  $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$ , satisfying the cocycle condition

$$(3.9) \quad g_{\alpha\beta} g_{\beta\gamma} = g_{\alpha\gamma} \quad \text{in } U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \cap U_\gamma$$

$$(\implies g_{\alpha\alpha} = 1, g_{\beta\alpha} = 1/g_{\alpha\beta}).$$

A *section*  $\phi$  of  $L$  is a family of functions  $\phi_\alpha : U_\alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$(3.10) \quad \phi_\alpha = g_{\alpha\beta} \phi_\beta \quad \text{in } U_\alpha \cap U_\beta.$$

(Similarly, one defines *vector bundles* by demanding that  $f_\alpha$  be mappings from  $U_\alpha$  into a (fixed) vector space  $\mathbb{V}$ , and  $g_{\alpha\beta} \in GL(\mathbb{V})$  be linear isomorphisms of  $\mathbb{V}$ ; more generally, a (*fiber*) *bundle* with some object  $\mathfrak{G}$  as fiber is defined by taking  $f_\alpha$  to be mappings from  $U_\alpha$  into  $\mathfrak{G}$ , and  $g_{\alpha\beta}$  to be isomorphisms of the object  $\mathfrak{G}$ .)

For later use, we also recall that  $L$  is said to be *Hermitian* if, in addition, there is given a family  $e_\alpha$  of positive  $C^\infty$  functions on  $U_\alpha$  such that

$$e_\alpha = |g_{\alpha\beta}|^{-2} e_\beta \quad \text{in } U_\alpha \cap U_\beta.$$

In that case, for two sections  $\phi, \psi$  one can define unambiguously their “local” scalar product — a function on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  — by

$$(\phi, \psi)_m = e_\alpha(m) \overline{\phi_\alpha(m)} \psi_\alpha(m), \quad \text{if } m \in U_\alpha.$$

Further, a mapping  $(\xi, \phi) \mapsto \nabla_\xi \phi$  from  $\mathfrak{X}(\mathbf{\Gamma}) \times \Gamma(L)$  into  $\Gamma(L)$ , where  $\Gamma(L)$  denotes the space of all smooth (i.e.  $C^\infty$ ) sections of  $L$  and  $\mathfrak{X}(\mathbf{\Gamma})$  the space of all smooth vector fields on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , is called a *connection* on  $L$  if it is linear in both  $\xi$  and  $\phi$ ,

$$(3.11) \quad \nabla_{f\xi} \phi = f \nabla_\xi \phi$$

and

$$(3.12) \quad \nabla_\xi (f\phi) = (\xi f)\phi + f \nabla_\xi \phi$$

for any  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbf{\Gamma})$ . The *curvature* of this connection is the 2-form on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  defined by

$$(3.13) \quad \text{curv}(\nabla)(\xi, \eta)\phi := i(\nabla_\xi \nabla_\eta - \nabla_\eta \nabla_\xi - \nabla_{[\xi, \eta]})\phi, \quad \forall \xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbf{\Gamma}), \phi \in \Gamma(L).$$

Finally, a connection on a Hermitian line bundle is said to be *compatible* (with the Hermitian structure) if

$$(3.14) \quad \xi(\phi, \psi) = (\nabla_{\bar{\xi}} \phi, \psi) + (\phi, \nabla_\xi \psi)$$

for  $\phi, \psi \in \Gamma(L)$  and complex vector fields  $\xi \in V(\mathbf{\Gamma})^\mathbb{C}$ .

Returning to our symplectic manifold  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \omega)$ , suppose now that we have an open cover  $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}}$  of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  and collections  $\{\theta_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}}$  and  $\{u_{\alpha\beta}\}_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}}$  such that  $\theta_\alpha$  is a symplectic potential on  $U_\alpha$  and  $\theta_\alpha = \theta_\beta + du_{\alpha\beta}$  on  $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$ . Comparing (3.8) and (3.10), we see that if we can take

$$(3.15) \quad g_{\alpha\beta} = \exp\left(-\frac{2\pi}{i\hbar} u_{\alpha\beta}\right)$$

then the local operators  $Q_f$  can be glued together into a well-defined global operator on the sections of the corresponding line bundle  $L$ .

The functions defined by the last formula satisfy the consistency condition (3.9) if and only if  $\exp(-\frac{2\pi}{i\hbar}(u_{\alpha\beta} + u_{\beta\gamma} + u_{\gamma\alpha})) = 1$ , that is, if and only if there exist integers  $n_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$  such that

$$u_{\alpha\beta} + u_{\beta\gamma} + u_{\gamma\alpha} = n_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \hbar$$

for all  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  such that  $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \cap U_\gamma$  is nonempty. One can show that this condition is independent of the choice of the cover  $\{U_\alpha\}$  etc. and is, in fact, a condition on  $\omega$ : it means that the de Rham cohomology class defined by  $\hbar^{-1}\omega$  in  $H^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbb{R})$  should be integral. This is known as the *integrality condition* (or *prequantization condition*), and we will assume it to be fulfilled throughout the rest of this section (Section 3). The bundle  $L$  is called the *prequantization bundle*.

Observe that since the transition functions (3.15) are unimodular<sup>5</sup> (because  $u_{\alpha\beta}$  are real), we can equip the bundle  $L$  with a Hermitian structure simply by taking  $e_\alpha = 1 \forall \alpha$ ; that is,

$$(\phi, \psi)_m = \overline{\phi_\alpha(m)} \psi_\alpha(m).$$

We finish this subsection by exhibiting a compatible connection  $\nabla$  on  $L$ , in terms of which the operators  $Q_f$  assume a particularly simple form. Namely, define, for  $\xi \in \mathfrak{X}(\Gamma)$ ,  $\psi \in \Gamma(L)$  and a local chart  $U_\alpha$ ,

$$(3.16) \quad (\nabla_\xi \psi)_\alpha := \xi \psi_\alpha + \frac{2\pi}{i\hbar} \theta_\alpha(\xi) \psi_\alpha.$$

One easily checks that this definition is consistent (i.e. that  $\phi := \nabla_\xi \psi$  satisfies the relations (3.10)) and that  $\nabla$  satisfies (3.11), (3.12) and (3.14), i.e. defines a compatible connection. Now comparing (3.7) and (3.16) we see that the prequantum operators  $Q_f$  can be rewritten simply as

$$(3.17) \quad Q_f = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \nabla_{X_f} + f.$$

To summarize our progress, we have shown that on an arbitrary symplectic manifold  $(\Gamma, \omega)$  such that  $\hbar^{-1}\omega$  satisfies the integrality condition, there exists a Hermitian line bundle  $L$  and operators  $Q_f$  on  $\Gamma(L)$  (the space of smooth sections of  $L$ ) such that the correspondence  $f \mapsto Q_f$  satisfies the conditions (Q1) – (Q4). In more detail — there is a compatible connection  $\nabla$  on  $L$ , and the operators  $Q_f$  are given by the formula (3.17).

*Remark 7.* It can be shown that the curvature of the connection (3.16) is given by

$$\text{curv}(\nabla) = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \omega.$$

The fact that, for a given symplectic manifold  $(\Gamma, \omega)$ , there exists a Hermitian line bundle  $L$  with a compatible connection  $\nabla$  satisfying  $\text{curv}(\nabla) = 2\pi\omega$  if and only if  $\omega$  satisfies the integrality condition, is the content of a theorem of A. Weil [257] (see also [155]). Furthermore, the equivalence classes of such bundles  $(L, \nabla, (\cdot, \cdot))$  are then parameterized by the elements of the first cohomology group  $H^1(\Gamma, \mathbf{T})$  with coefficients in the circle group  $\mathbf{T}$ . This should be compared to the content of Theorem 2.9, which we stated in the context of Borel quantization.  $\square$

*Remark 8.* In another guise, the integrability condition can be expressed by saying that the integral of  $\omega$  over any closed orientable 2-dimensional surface in  $\Gamma$  should be an integer multiple of  $2\pi$ . This is reminiscent of the Bohr-Sommerfeld quantization condition, familiar from the old quantum theory.  $\square$

---

<sup>5</sup>In general, if the transition functions  $g_{\alpha\beta}$  of a (fiber) bundle all belong to a group  $G$ ,  $G$  is said to be the *structure group* of the bundle. Thus the line bundle  $L$  above has structure group  $U(1)$ , and, similarly, the frame bundles  $\mathcal{F}^k \mathcal{P}$  to be constructed in the next subsection have structure groups  $GL(k, \mathbb{R})$ .

*Remark 9.* It is possible to give an alternative description of the whole construction above in the language of *connection forms*. Namely, let  $L^\times$  denote the line bundle  $L$  with the zero section removed. The *fundamental vector field* on  $L^\times$  corresponding to  $c \in \mathbb{C}$  is defined by

$$(\eta_c f)(m, z) = \frac{d}{dt} f(e^{2\pi i c t} z) \Big|_{t=0}, \quad \forall m \in \Gamma, z \in L_m^\times,$$

for any function  $f$  on  $L^\times$ . A *connection form* is a one-form  $\alpha$  on  $L^\times$  which is  $\mathbb{C}^\times$ -invariant and satisfies  $\alpha(\eta_c) = c \ \forall c \in \mathbb{C}$ ; in other words, it is locally given by  $\alpha = \pi^* \Theta + i \frac{dz}{z}$ , with  $\Theta$  a one-form on  $\Gamma$  and  $z$  the coordinate in the fiber  $L_m^\times \simeq \mathbb{C}^\times$ . A vector field  $\zeta$  on  $L^\times$  is called *horizontal* (with respect to  $\alpha$ ) if  $\alpha(\zeta) = 0$ . It can be shown that every vector field  $\xi$  on  $\Gamma$  has a unique *horizontal lift*  $\tilde{\xi}$  on  $L^\times$ , defined by the requirements that

$$\pi_* \tilde{\xi} = \xi \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(\tilde{\xi}) = 0 \text{ (i.e. } \tilde{\xi} \text{ is horizontal).}$$

One can then easily verify that the recipe

$$(\nabla_\xi \phi) := \tilde{\xi} \phi_\beta \quad \text{in a local chart } U_\beta,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\nabla_\xi \phi = 2\pi i \phi^* \alpha(\xi) \phi,$$

defines a connection on  $L^\times$ . Our connection (3.16) corresponds to the choice

$$\alpha_\beta = \frac{2\pi}{h} \theta_\beta + i \frac{dz}{z} \quad \text{in a local chart } U_\beta \times \mathbb{C}^\times.$$

See Sniatycki [231], Section 3.1 for the details.  $\square$

*Remark 10.* Still another (equivalent) description may be based on the use of connection one-forms in a principal  $U(1)$ -bundle over  $\Gamma$  and the Reeb vector field therein; see [246] and the references therein.  $\square$

We conclude by mentioning also an alternative characterization of the prequantum operators  $Q_f$  when the Hamiltonian field  $X_f$  of  $f$  is complete. In that case, the field  $X_f$  generates a one-parameter group (a *flow*)  $\rho_t = \exp(tX_f)$  of canonical transformations (symplectomorphisms) of  $(\Gamma, \omega)$ . This flow lifts uniquely to a flow — again denoted  $\rho_t$  — of linear connection-preserving transformations on  $\Gamma(L)$ . The operator  $Q_f$  is then given by

$$Q_f \phi = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \frac{d}{dt} (\rho_t \phi) \Big|_{t=0}.$$

For the details we refer to Sniatycki [231], Section 3.3. In particular, since the induced transformations  $\rho_t$  on  $\Gamma(L)$  are unitary, it follows by the Stone theorem that  $Q_f$  are (essentially) self-adjoint operators on the Hilbert space

$$\mathfrak{H}_{\text{preq}} := \text{the completion of } \left\{ \phi \in \Gamma(L) : \int_{\Gamma} (\phi, \phi)_m |\omega^n| < \infty \right\}$$

of all square-integrable sections of  $L$ . This is also akin to the construction of the operators  $\widehat{p}(X)$  in Borel quantization (see (2.56)).

**3.2. Real polarizations and half-densities.** We now discuss the second step of geometric quantization — namely, making sense of “functions depending on” and “square-integrable over” only half of the variables. The simplest way of doing this is via real polarizations and half-densities, which we now proceed to describe.

A (real) *distribution*<sup>6</sup>  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $\Gamma$  is a map which assigns to each point  $m \in \Gamma$  a linear subspace  $\mathcal{D}_m$  of  $T_m\Gamma$  such that

- (i)  $\dim \mathcal{D}_m = k$  (a constant independent of  $m \in \Gamma$ )
- (ii)  $\forall m_0 \in \Gamma \exists$  a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $m_0$  and vector fields  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  on  $U$  such that  $\forall m \in U$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_m$  is spanned by  $X_1|_m, \dots, X_k|_m$ .

A distribution is called *involutive* if for any two vector fields  $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}$  (i.e.  $X_m, Y_m \in \mathcal{D}_m \forall m$ ) implies that  $[X, Y] \in \mathcal{D}$  as well; and *integrable* if for each  $m_0 \in \Gamma$  there exists a submanifold  $N$  of  $\Gamma$  passing through  $m_0$  and such that  $\forall m \in N : \mathcal{D}_m = T_m N$ . A theorem of Frobenius asserts that for real distributions, the notions of integrability and involutiveness are equivalent. An integrable distribution is also called a *foliation*, and the maximal connected submanifolds  $N$  as above are called its *leaves*. A foliation is called *reducible* (or *fibrating*) if the set of all leaves — denoted  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  — can be given a structure of a manifold in such a way that the natural projection map  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  is a (smooth) submersion.

So far, all these definitions make sense for an arbitrary (smooth) manifold  $\Gamma$ . If  $\Gamma$  is symplectic, then we further define  $\mathcal{D}$  to be *isotropic* if  $\omega(X, Y) = 0 \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{D}$ ; and *Lagrangian* if it is maximal isotropic, i.e.  $\dim \mathcal{D}_m = n := \frac{1}{2} \dim \Gamma \forall m \in \Gamma$ . A Lagrangian foliation is called a *real polarization* on  $\Gamma$ .

One can prove the following alternative characterization of real polarizations: a smooth distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $\Gamma$  is a real polarization if and only if for each  $m_0 \in \Gamma$  there exists a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $m_0$  and  $n$  independent functions  $f_1, \dots, f_n$  on  $U$  (i.e.  $\forall m \in U : df_1, \dots, df_n$  are independent in  $T_m^*\Gamma$ ) such that:

- (i)  $\forall m \in U$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_m$  is spanned by  $X_{f_1}|_m, \dots, X_{f_n}|_m$ ;
- (ii)  $\{f_i, f_j\} = 0$  on  $U$ ,  $\forall i, j = 1, \dots, n$ .

(That is —  $\mathcal{D}$  is locally spanned by commuting Hamiltonian vector-fields.)

Now we say that a section  $\phi$  of our prequantization bundle  $L$  with connection  $\nabla$  (constructed in the preceding subsection) is *covariantly constant* along  $\mathcal{D}$  if

$$\nabla_X \phi = 0, \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{D}.$$

In view of the compatibility relation (3.14), the “local” scalar product  $(\phi, \psi)$  of two covariantly constant sections is then a function on  $\Gamma$  constant along  $\mathcal{D}$  (i.e.  $X(\phi, \psi) = 0 \forall X \in \mathcal{D}$ ), hence, defines a function on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ .

Let us now deal with the issue of “integrating” over  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ .

The simplest solution would be to take the integral of  $(\phi, \psi)_m$  with respect to some measure on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ . That is, if  $\mu$  is a (nonnegative regular Borel) measure on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ , let

---

<sup>6</sup>This is not to be confused with the distributions (generalized functions) in the sense of L. Schwartz!

$\mathfrak{H}$  be the Hilbert space of all sections  $\phi$  of  $L$  such that  $\phi$  is covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{D}$  and

$$\int_{\Gamma/\mathcal{D}} (\phi, \psi)_m d\mu(x) < \infty$$

(where, for each  $x \in \Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ ,  $m$  is an arbitrary point in the fiber  $\pi^{-1}(x)$  above  $x$ ). For a real function  $f$  on  $\Gamma$ , the quantum operator could then be defined on  $\mathfrak{H}$  by

$$(3.19) \quad Q_f \phi = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \nabla_{X_f} \phi + f\phi,$$

granted this takes  $\phi \in \mathfrak{H}$  again into a section covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{D}$ . In view of (3.12) and (3.13), the latter is readily seen to be the case if

$$(3.20) \quad [X_f, X] \in \mathcal{D} \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Hence, proclaiming the set of all functions satisfying (3.20) to be the space *Obs* of quantizable observables, we have arrived at the desired quantization recipe.

Unfortunately, there seems to be no canonical choice for the measure  $\mu$  on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  in general. For this reason, it is better to incorporate the choice of measure directly into the bundle  $L$ : that is, to pass from the prequantum line bundle  $L$  of §3.1 to the tensor product of  $L$  with some “bundle of measures on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ ”. In order for this product to make sense, we must (first of all define this “bundle of measures” over  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ , and second) turn the latter bundle into a bundle over  $\Gamma$  (instead of  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ ). Let us now explain how all this is done.

Consider, quite generally, a manifold  $\mathcal{X}$  of dimension  $n$ , and let  $\pi : \mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  be the bundle of  $n$ -frames<sup>7</sup> over  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e. the fiber  $\mathcal{F}_x^n \mathcal{X}$  at  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  consists of all ordered  $n$ -tuples of linearly independent vectors  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$  from  $T_x \mathcal{X}$ . The group  $GL(n, \mathbb{R})$  of real nonsingular  $n \times n$  matrices acts on  $\mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{X}$  in a natural way: if  $\xi_{jk}$  are the coordinates of  $\xi_j$  with respect to some local chart  $U \times \mathbb{R}^n$  of  $T_x \mathcal{X}$ , then  $g \in GL(n, \mathbb{R})$  acts by

$$(\xi \cdot g)_{jk} = \sum_{l=1}^n \xi_{jl} g_{lk}.$$

Now recall that one possible definition of a complex  $n$ -form is that it is a mapping  $\eta : \mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  assigning to a point  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and an  $n$ -frame  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathcal{F}_x^n \mathcal{X}$  a complex number  $\eta_x(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$  such that

$$\eta_x(\xi \cdot g) = \eta_x(\xi) \cdot \det g \quad \forall g \in GL(n, \mathbb{R}).$$

By analogy, we therefore define a *density* on  $\mathcal{X}$  as a mapping  $\nu$  from  $\mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{X}$  into  $\mathbb{C}$  satisfying

$$\nu_x(\xi \cdot g) = \nu_x(\xi) \cdot |\det g| \quad \forall g \in GL(n, \mathbb{R}),$$

and, more generally, an  $r$ -density, where  $r$  is any (fixed) real number, by

$$(3.21) \quad \nu_x(\xi \cdot g) = \nu_x(\xi) \cdot |\det g|^r \quad \forall g \in GL(n, \mathbb{R}).$$

---

<sup>7</sup>The bundle  $\mathcal{F}^k \mathcal{X}$  of  $k$ -frames, where  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , is defined similarly; in particular,  $\mathcal{F}^1 \mathcal{X}$  is just the tangent bundle without the zero section.



Similarly, one defines, for a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  on a manifold, an  $r$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -density as a mapping from the bundle  $\mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{D}$  ( $n = \dim \mathcal{D}$ ) of  $n$ -frames of  $\mathcal{D}$  (i.e. the fiber  $\mathcal{F}_m^n\mathcal{D}$  consists of all ordered bases of  $\mathcal{D}_m$ ) into  $\mathbb{C}$  which satisfies

$$(3.22) \quad \nu_m(\xi \cdot g) = \nu_x(\xi) \cdot |\det g|^r \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{D}, \forall g \in GL(n, \mathbb{R}).$$

Let us now apply this to the case of  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D}$  with  $\mathcal{D}$  a real polarization as above. Thus, a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -density on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D}$  is a function  $\phi$  which assigns to any ordered  $n$ -tuple of independent tangent vectors  $\xi_j \in T_x(\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D})$  a complex number  $\phi_x(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$  such that (3.21) holds with  $r = \frac{1}{2}$ . We now define a “lift” from  $\frac{1}{2}$ -densities on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D}$  to  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -densities on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  as follows. Let  $m \in \mathbf{\Gamma}$  and let  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$  be a frame of  $T_{\pi(m)}(\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D})$ , where  $\pi : \mathbf{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D}$  denotes the canonical projection. Then there exists a unique dual basis  $c_1, \dots, c_n \in T_{\pi(m)}^*(\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D})$ , defined by  $c_j(\xi_k) = \delta_{jk}$ . This basis is mapped by  $\pi^*$  onto  $n$  independent vectors of  $T_m^*\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , and we can therefore define tangent vectors  $\tilde{\xi}_j \in T_m\mathbf{\Gamma}$  by the recipe

$$\omega(\cdot, \tilde{\xi}_j) = \pi_m^* c_j.$$

From the properties of the symplectic form  $\omega$  one easily sees that  $\pi_* \tilde{\xi}_j = 0$ , that is,  $\tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n$  is, in fact, a basis of  $\mathcal{D}_m$ , and the correspondence  $(\xi) \mapsto (\tilde{\xi})$  between the frames of  $T_{\pi(m)}(\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D})$  and the frames of  $\mathcal{D}_m$  is bijective. For a half-density  $\phi$  on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D}$ , we can therefore define a function  $\tilde{\phi}$  on  $\mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{D}$  by

$$\tilde{\phi}(\tilde{\xi}) := \phi(\xi).$$

An easy computation shows that

$$\tilde{\phi}(\tilde{\xi} \cdot g) = \tilde{\phi}(\widetilde{\xi \cdot g^{-1T}}) = \tilde{\phi}(\tilde{\xi}) \cdot |\det g^{-1T}|^{1/2},$$

where  $^T$  stands for matrix transposition. Thus  $\tilde{\phi}$  is a  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -density on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ .

Let us denote by  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{D}}$  the complex fibre bundle of  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -densities on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ . (That is: the fiber  $\mathcal{B}_m^{\mathcal{D}}$  consists of all functions  $\nu_m : \mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  satisfying (3.22), and the sections of  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{D}}$  are thus  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -densities on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ .) The map  $\phi \mapsto \tilde{\phi}$  above thus defines a lifting from  $\Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D})$ , the (similarly defined) line bundle of  $\frac{1}{2}$ -densities on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D}$ , into  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{D}}$ . It turns out that the image of this lifting consists precisely of the sections of  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{D}}$  which are “covariantly constant” along  $\mathcal{D}$ . Namely, for any  $\zeta \in \mathcal{D}$  one can define a mapping  $\nabla_{\zeta}$  on  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{D}}$  as follows: if  $\nu$  is a  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -density, then

$$(3.23) \quad (\nabla_{\zeta} \nu)_m(\eta_{\sharp}) := \zeta(\nu(\eta))|_m \quad \forall m \in \mathbf{\Gamma},$$

where  $\eta_{\sharp}$  is an arbitrary frame in  $\mathcal{D}_m$  and  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ , where  $\eta_j$  are  $n$  linearly independent locally Hamiltonian vector fields on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  which span  $\mathcal{D}$  in a neighbourhood of  $m$  and such that  $\eta|_m = \eta_{\sharp}$  (such vector fields exist because  $\mathcal{D}$  is a polarization, cf. (3.18)). It is not difficult to verify that  $\nabla_{\zeta} \nu$  is independent of the choice of  $\eta$ , and that  $\nabla$  satisfies the axioms (3.11) and (3.12), and is thus a well-defined partial connection on  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{D}}$ . (The term “partial” refers to the fact that it is defined for  $\zeta \in \mathcal{D}$  only.) From (3.23) it also follows that  $\nabla$  is *flat*, i.e.

$$\nabla_{\xi} \nabla_{\zeta} - \nabla_{\zeta} \nabla_{\xi} = \nabla_{[\xi, \zeta]} \quad \forall \xi, \zeta \in \mathcal{D}.$$



Now it can be proved that a  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -density  $\nu$  on  $\Gamma$  is a lift of a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -density  $\phi$  on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ , i.e.  $\nu = \tilde{\phi}$ , if and only if

$$\nabla_{\zeta}\nu = 0 \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathcal{D},$$

i.e. if and only if  $\nu$  is covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{D}$ .

Coming back to our quantization business, consider now the tensor product

$$(3.24) \quad QB := L \otimes \mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{D}}$$

(the *quantum bundle*) with the (partial) connection given by

$$(3.25) \quad \nabla_{\zeta}(s \otimes \nu) = \nabla_{\zeta}s \otimes \nu + s \otimes \nabla_{\zeta}\nu \quad (\zeta \in \mathcal{D}, s \in \Gamma(L), \nu \in \Gamma(\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{D}})).$$

Collecting all the ingredients above, it transpires that for any two sections  $\phi = s \otimes \nu$  and  $\psi = r \otimes \mu$  of  $QB$  which are covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{D}$  (i.e.  $\nabla_{\zeta}\phi = \nabla_{\zeta}\psi = 0$ ,  $\forall \zeta \in \mathcal{D}$ ), we can unambiguously define a half-density  $(\phi, \psi)$  on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  by the formula

$$(\phi, \psi)_{\pi(m)}(\pi_*\xi) := (s, r)_m \overline{\nu_m(\zeta)} \mu_m(\zeta) |\epsilon_{\omega}(\zeta, \xi)|,$$

where  $(\zeta, \xi)$  is an arbitrary basis of  $T_m\Gamma$  such that  $(\zeta)$  is a basis of  $\mathcal{D}_m$ , and

$$(3.26) \quad \epsilon_{\omega} = \frac{(-1)^{n(n-1)/2}}{n!} \omega^n$$

is the symplectic volume on  $\Gamma$ . Now introduce the Hilbert space

$$\mathfrak{H} = \text{the completion of } \left\{ \psi \in \Gamma(QB) : \nabla_{\zeta}\psi = 0 \ \forall \zeta \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } \int_{\Gamma/\mathcal{D}} (\psi, \psi) < \infty \right\}$$

of all square-integrable sections of  $QB$  covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{D}$ , with the obvious scalar product.

Finally, for a vector field  $\zeta$  on  $\Gamma$ , let  $\rho_t = \exp(t\zeta)$  be again the associated flow of diffeomorphisms of  $\Gamma$ . The derived map  $\rho_{t*}$  on the tangent vectors defines a flow  $\tilde{\rho}_t$  on  $\mathcal{F}^n\Gamma$ :

$$\tilde{\rho}_t(m, (\xi_j)) := (\rho_t m, (\rho_{t*}\xi_j)).$$

One can prove that if

$$(3.27) \quad [\zeta, \mathcal{D}] \subset \mathcal{D} \quad (\text{i.e. } [\zeta, \eta] \in \mathcal{D} \ \forall \eta \in \mathcal{D})$$

then  $\tilde{\rho}_t$  maps the subbundle  $\mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{F}^n\Gamma$  into itself, and we can therefore define a lift  $\tilde{\zeta}$  of  $\zeta$  to  $\mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{D}$  by the recipe

$$\tilde{\zeta}(m, (\xi)) := \left. \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\rho}_t(m, (\xi)) \right|_{t=0}.$$

Now if  $\nu$  is a  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -density then it is a function on  $\mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{D}$ , hence we can apply  $\tilde{\zeta}$  to it, and the result  $\tilde{\zeta}\nu := \mathcal{L}_{\zeta}\nu$  will again be a  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -density. Further,  $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta}\nu$  is linear in  $\nu$ ;

$$(3.28) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\zeta}(g\nu) = g\mathcal{L}_{\zeta}\nu + (\zeta g)\nu;$$

if  $\eta$  is another vector field for which  $[\eta, \mathcal{D}] \subset \mathcal{D}$ , then

$$(3.29) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\zeta}\mathcal{L}_{\eta} - \mathcal{L}_{\eta}\mathcal{L}_{\zeta} = \mathcal{L}_{[\zeta, \eta]};$$

and if  $\zeta$  is a locally Hamiltonian vector field in  $\mathcal{D}$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_\zeta\nu = \nabla_\zeta\nu$  coincides with the partial connection  $\nabla_\zeta$  constructed above.

Now we are ready to define (at last!) the quantum operators. Namely, if  $f : \mathbf{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a smooth function whose Hamiltonian vector field  $X_f$  satisfies (3.27), i.e.

$$(3.30) \quad [X_f, \mathcal{D}] \subset \mathcal{D},$$

then the quantum operator  $Q_f$  is defined on sections of  $QB$  as follows:

$$(3.31) \quad Q_f(s \otimes \nu) := \left( -\frac{ih}{2\pi} \nabla_{X_f} s + fs \right) \otimes \nu + s \otimes \left( -\frac{ih}{2\pi} \mathcal{L}_{X_f} \nu \right).$$

From the properties of  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\nabla$  it transpires that if  $s \otimes \nu$  is covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{D}$  then so is  $Q_f(s \otimes \nu)$ , and so  $Q_f$  gives rise to a well-defined operator (denoted again by  $Q_f$ ) on the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$  introduced above; it can be shown that if  $X_f$  is complete then  $Q_f$  is (essentially) self-adjoint.

The space of all real functions  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbf{\Gamma})$  satisfying (3.30) is, by definition, the space  $Obs$  of quantizable observables.

Unfortunately, it turns out that, no matter how elegant, the quantization procedure described in this section gives sometimes incorrect answers: namely, for the one-dimensional harmonic oscillator (corresponding to the observable  $f = \frac{1}{2}(p^2 + q^2)$  on the phase space  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbb{R}^2$  with the usual symplectic form  $\omega = dp \wedge dq$ ), one has first of all to modify the whole procedure further by allowing “distribution valued” sections<sup>8</sup> of  $QB$  (see §3.6.1 below), and even then the energy levels come out as  $nh/2\pi$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , instead of the correct answer  $(n - \frac{1}{2})h/2\pi$ . It turns out that the reason for this failure is the use of half-densities above instead of the so-called half-forms; in order to describe how the situation can still be saved, we need to introduce complex tangent spaces and complex polarizations. We therefore proceed to describe this extended setup in the next subsection, and then describe the necessary modifications in §3.4.<sup>9</sup>

**3.3. Complex polarizations.** From now on, we start using complex objects such as the complexified tangent bundle  $T\mathbf{\Gamma}^\mathbb{C}$ , complex vector fields  $\xi \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbf{\Gamma})^\mathbb{C}$ , etc., and the bar  $\overline{\phantom{x}}$  will denote complex conjugation. A *complex polarization*  $\mathcal{P}$  on the manifold  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is a complex distribution on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  such that

- (i)  $\mathcal{P}$  is involutive (i.e.  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P} \implies [X, Y] \in \mathcal{P}$ )
- (ii)  $\mathcal{P}$  is Lagrangian (i.e.  $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{P} = n \equiv \frac{1}{2} \dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{\Gamma}$  and  $\omega(X, Y) = 0 \ \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{P}$ )
- (iii)  $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{P}_m \cap \overline{\mathcal{P}}_m =: k$  is constant on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  (i.e. independent of  $m$ )
- (iv)  $\mathcal{P} + \overline{\mathcal{P}}$  is involutive.

Again, one can prove an alternative characterization of complex polarizations along the lines of (3.18): namely, a complex distribution  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is a complex polarization

<sup>8</sup>This time the distributions *are* those of L. Schwartz (not subbundles of  $T\mathbf{\Gamma}$ ).

<sup>9</sup>Another reason for allowing complex polarizations is that there are symplectic manifolds on which no real polarizations exist — for instance, the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^2$ .

if and only if  $\forall m_0 \in \Gamma$  there is a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $m_0$  and  $n$  independent complex  $C^\infty$  functions  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  on  $U$  such that

(3.32)

- (i)  $\forall m \in U$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_m$  is spanned (over  $\mathbb{C}$ ) by the Hamiltonian vector fields  $X_{z_1}|_m, \dots, X_{z_n}|_m$ ;
- (ii)  $\{z_j, z_k\} = 0$  on  $U \ \forall j, k = 1, \dots, n$ ;
- (iii)  $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{P}_m \cap \overline{\mathcal{P}}_m =: k$  is constant on  $\Gamma$  (i.e. independent of  $m$  and  $U$ );
- (iv) the functions  $z_1, \dots, z_k$  are real and  $\forall m \in U$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_m \cap \overline{\mathcal{P}}_m$  is spanned by  $X_{z_1}|_m, \dots, X_{z_k}|_m$ .

To each complex polarization there are associated two *real* involutive (and, hence, integrable) distributions  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}$  on  $\Gamma$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &= \mathcal{P} \cap \overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap T\Gamma & (\text{so } \mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{C}} &= \mathcal{P} \cap \overline{\mathcal{P}}, \dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{D} = k) \\ \mathcal{E} &= (\mathcal{P} + \overline{\mathcal{P}}) \cap T\Gamma & (\text{so } \mathcal{E}^{\mathbb{C}} &= \mathcal{P} + \overline{\mathcal{P}}, \dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{E} = 2n - k). \end{aligned}$$

One has  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{D}^\perp$ ,  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{E}^\perp$  (the orthogonal complements with respect to  $\omega$ ), so that, in particular,  $X_f \in \mathcal{E} \iff f$  is constant along  $\mathcal{D}$  (i.e.  $\xi f = 0 \ \forall \xi \in \mathcal{D}$ ), and similarly  $X_f \in \mathcal{D} \iff f$  is constant along  $\mathcal{E}$ .

A complex polarization is called *admissible* if the space of leaves  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  admits a structure of a manifold such that  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  is a submersion. In that case,  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} := \pi_* \mathcal{E}$  defines a real integrable distribution of dimension  $2(n-k)$  on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ , and using the Newlander-Nirenberg theorem one can show that the mapping  $\mathcal{J} : T_x \mathbb{L} \rightarrow T_x \mathbb{L}$  defined on each leaf  $\mathbb{L}$  of  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$  in  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  by

$$\mathcal{J}(\pi_* \operatorname{Re} w) = \pi_* \operatorname{Im} w$$

is an integrable complex structure on  $\mathbb{L}$  and if  $X_{z_1}, \dots, X_{z_k}$  are local Hamiltonian vector fields as in (3.32) then the functions  $z_{k+1}, \dots, z_n$  form, when restricted to  $\mathbb{L}$ , a local system of complex coordinates which makes  $\mathbb{L}$  a complex manifold. In particular, if  $z$  is a complex function on an open set  $U \subset \Gamma$ , then  $X_z \in \mathcal{P}$  if and only if locally  $z = \tilde{z} \circ \pi$  where  $\tilde{z} : \pi^{-1}(U) \subset \Gamma/\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is holomorphic when restricted to any leaf of  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ .

Throughout the rest of this section, unless explicitly stated otherwise, we will consider only admissible complex polarizations.

Let us now proceed to define the quantum Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$  and the quantum operators  $Q_f$  in this new setting. For real polarizations  $\mathcal{D}$ , we did this by identifying functions on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  with sections on  $\Gamma$  covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{D}$ , and then solving the problem of integration by lifting the half-densities on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  to  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -densities on  $\Gamma$ . For complex polarizations, the “quotient”  $\Gamma/\mathcal{P}$  does not make sense; and if we use  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  instead, then, since  $\dim \Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  can be smaller than  $n$  in general, the passage from half-densities on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  to “ $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -densities” on  $\Gamma$  breaks down. What we do is, then, that we trust our good luck and just carry out the final quantization procedure as described for real polarizations, and see if it works — and it does!

Let us start by defining  $\mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$  to be the bundle of all complex frames of  $\mathcal{P}$ .<sup>10</sup> There is a natural action of  $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ , written as  $(\eta) \mapsto (\eta) \cdot g$ , on the fibers of  $\mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$ , and we define a  $-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}$ -density  $\nu$  on  $\Gamma$  as a complex function on  $\mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$  such that

$$(3.33) \quad \nu_m((\eta) \cdot g) = \nu_m((\eta)) \cdot |\det g|^{-1/2} \quad \forall (\eta) \in \mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}, \quad \forall g \in GL(n, \mathbb{C}),$$

and denote the (complex line) bundle of all  $-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}$ -densities on  $\Gamma$  by  $\mathcal{B}^\mathcal{P}$ . Next we define  $\nabla_\zeta \nu$ , for  $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}$ , by

$$(3.34) \quad (\nabla_\zeta \nu)_m((\eta)|_m) = \frac{\zeta[\nu((\eta))] \cdot |\epsilon_{\omega,k}(\eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_n, \bar{\eta}_{k+1}, \dots, \bar{\eta}_n)|^{1/4}}{|\epsilon_{\omega,k}(\eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_n, \bar{\eta}_{k+1}, \dots, \bar{\eta}_n)|^{1/4}} \Big|_m$$

where  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  are any vector fields which span  $\mathcal{P}$  in a neighbourhood of  $m$  such that  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_k$  are real Hamiltonian vector fields spanning  $\mathcal{D}$ , and  $\epsilon_{\omega,k}$  is the  $2(n-k)$ -form defined by

$$(3.35) \quad \epsilon_{\omega,k} = \frac{(-1)^{(n-k)(n-k-1)/2}}{(n-k)!} \omega^{n-k}$$

(so that, in particular,  $\epsilon_{\omega,0} = \epsilon_\omega$  is the volume form (3.26)). It again turns out that  $\nabla_\zeta \nu$  is a  $-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}$ -density if  $\nu$  is<sup>11</sup>, and defines thus a flat partial connection on  $\mathcal{B}^\mathcal{P}$ . The formula (3.25) then defines a partial connection on the quantum bundle  $QB := L \otimes \mathcal{B}^\mathcal{P}$  ( $L$  being, as before, the prequantum bundle from §3.1). Now if  $\phi = s \otimes \nu$ ,  $\psi = r \otimes \mu$  are two arbitrary (smooth) sections of  $QB$ , then we set

$$(3.36) \quad (\phi, \psi)_m(\pi_*(\zeta_{k+1}, \dots, \zeta_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)) := (s, r)_m \overline{\nu_m(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)} \mu_m(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \cdot |\epsilon_{\omega,k}(\zeta_{k+1}, \dots, \zeta_n, \bar{\zeta}_{k+1}, \dots, \bar{\zeta}_n)|^{1/2} \cdot |\epsilon_\omega(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)|$$

where  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$  is any basis of  $T_m\Gamma^\mathbb{C}$  such that  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k$  is a basis of  $\mathcal{D}_m^\mathbb{C} = \mathcal{P}_m \cap \overline{\mathcal{P}}_m$  and  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n$  is a basis of  $\mathcal{P}_m$ , and  $\epsilon_{\omega,k}$  and  $\epsilon_\omega$  are the forms given by (3.35) and (3.26), respectively. This time not every basis of  $T_{\pi(m)}(\Gamma/\mathcal{D})^\mathbb{C}$  arises as  $\pi_*(\zeta_{k+1}, \dots, \zeta_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$  with  $\zeta, \xi$  as above, but it is easily seen that the values of  $(\phi, \psi)_m$  on different frames are related in the correct way and thus  $(\phi, \psi)_m$  extends to

<sup>10</sup>The superscript  $\mathbb{C}$  is just to remind us that this is a complex object; there is no such thing as  $\mathcal{F}^n\mathcal{P}^\mathbb{R}$ !

<sup>11</sup>The factor  $|\epsilon_{\omega,k}|^{1/4}$  in (3.34) needs some explanation. The reason for it is that if we defined  $\nabla_\zeta \nu$  simply by the same formula (3.23) as for the real polarizations, then  $\nabla_\zeta \nu$  might fail to be a  $-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}$ -density: it would have satisfied the relation (3.33) only if there were no absolute value around  $\det g$  there. (That is, if  $(\hat{\eta}) = (\eta) \cdot g$  is another frame satisfying the conditions imposed on  $\eta$ , then we have  $\zeta(\det g) = 0$ , which need not imply  $\zeta|\det g| = 0$ .) This difficulty does not arise for real polarizations (since then  $\det g$  is locally of constant sign), nor for the half-forms discussed in the next subsection (where there is no absolute value around the determinant). On the other hand, (3.34) has the advantage that it defines  $\nabla_\zeta$  consistently not only for  $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}$ , but even for  $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}^\mathbb{C} = \mathcal{P} + \overline{\mathcal{P}}$ ; however, we will not need this refinement in the sequel.

It should be noted that the correction factor  $|\epsilon_{\omega,k}|^{1/4}$  is such that the combination  $\nu(\eta) \cdot |\epsilon_{\omega,k}(\eta_{k+1}, \dots, \bar{\eta}_n)|^{1/4}$  depends only on the vectors  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_k$  spanning  $\mathcal{D}$ , and defines thus a  $-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}$ -density on  $\Gamma$ .

define consistently a unique density on  $\mathcal{F}_{\pi(m)}^{2n-k}(\Gamma/\mathcal{D})^{\mathbb{C}}$  (the fiber at  $\pi(m)$  of the bundle of all complex  $(2n - k)$ -frames on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ ). From the proof of the Frobenius theorem one can show that for any local Hamiltonian vector fields  $X_{z_1}, \dots, X_{z_n}$  as in (3.32) there exist vector fields  $Y_1, \dots, Y_k$  (possibly on a subneighbourhood of  $U$ ) such that  $\pi_*(X_{z_{k+1}}, \dots, X_{z_n}, X_{\bar{z}_{k+1}}, \dots, X_{\bar{z}_n}, Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$  is a basis of  $T_{\pi(m)}(\Gamma/\mathcal{D})^{\mathbb{C}}$  which depends only on  $\pi(m)$ , and  $\epsilon_{\omega}(X_{z_1}, \dots, X_{z_n}, X_{\bar{z}_{k+1}}, \dots, X_{\bar{z}_n}, Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$  is a function constant on the leaves of  $\mathcal{D}$ . Taking these vector fields for the  $\zeta_j$  and  $\xi_j$  in (3.36), it can be proved in the same way as for the real polarizations that

$$\eta(\phi, \psi)_m(\pi_*(X_z, X_{\bar{z}}, Y)) = (\nabla_{\bar{\eta}}\phi, \psi)_m(\pi_*(X_z, X_{\bar{z}}, Y)) + (\phi, \nabla_{\eta}\psi)_m(\pi_*(X_z, X_{\bar{z}}, Y))$$

for any  $\eta \in \mathcal{D}_m$ . Thus, in particular, if  $\phi, \psi$  are covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{D}$ , then  $(\phi, \psi)_m$  depends only on  $\pi(m)$  and defines thus a density on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ .

We can therefore define, as before, the Hilbert space  
(3.37)

$$\mathfrak{H} = \text{the completion of } \left\{ \psi \in \Gamma(QB) : \nabla_{\zeta}\psi = 0 \ \forall \zeta \in \mathcal{P} \text{ and } \int_{\Gamma/\mathcal{D}} (\psi, \psi) < \infty \right\}$$

of square-integrable sections of  $QB$  covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{P}$  (with the obvious inner product).

Finally, if  $\zeta$  is a real vector field on  $\Gamma$  satisfying  $[\zeta, \mathcal{P}] \subset \mathcal{P}$ , with the associated flow  $\rho_t$ , and  $\nu$  a  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -density on  $\Gamma$ , then we may again define  $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta}\nu$  by

$$(3.38) \quad (\mathcal{L}_{\zeta}\nu)_m(\eta) = \frac{d}{dt} \nu_{\rho_t m}(\tilde{\rho}_t(\eta)) \Big|_{t=0}, \quad (\eta \in \mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}})$$

and show that  $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta}\nu$  is again a  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -density and that  $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta}$  has all the properties of a “flat partial Lie derivative” ((3.28) and (3.29)) and that  $\mathcal{L}_{X_f} = \nabla_{X_f}$  whenever  $f$  is a real function for which  $X_f \in \mathcal{P}$  (hence  $X_f \in \mathcal{D}$ ). Now the operator

$$(3.39) \quad Q_f(s \otimes \nu) := \left( -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \nabla_{X_f} s + f s \right) \otimes \nu + s \otimes \left( -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \mathcal{L}_{X_f} \nu \right),$$

defined for any real function  $f$  such that

$$(3.40) \quad [X_f, \mathcal{P}] \subset \mathcal{P},$$

maps sections covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{P}$  again into such sections, and thus defines an operator on  $\mathfrak{H}$ , which can be shown to be self-adjoint if  $X_f$  is complete.

Having extended the method of §3.2 to complex polarizations, we now describe the modification needed to obtain the correct energy levels for the harmonic oscillator: the metalinear correction.

**3.4. Half-forms and the metalinear correction.** What this correction amounts to is throwing away the absolute value in the formula (3.33); that is, to pass from half-densities to *half-forms*. To do that we obviously need to have the square root of the determinant in (3.33) defined in a consistent manner; this is achieved by passing from  $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$  to the *metalinear group*  $ML(n, \mathbb{C})$ , and from the frame bundle  $\mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}}$  to the bundle  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}}$  of *metalinear  $\mathcal{P}$ -frames*.

The group  $ML(n, \mathbb{C})$  consists, by definition, of all pairs  $(g, z) \in GL(n, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C}^\times$  satisfying

$$z^2 = \det g$$

with the group law

$$(g_1, z_1) \cdot (g_2, z_2) := (g_1 g_2, z_1 z_2).$$

We will denote by  $p$  and  $\lambda$  the canonical projections

$$\begin{aligned} p : ML(n, \mathbb{C}) &\rightarrow GL(n, \mathbb{C}) : & (g, z) &\mapsto g, \\ \lambda : ML(n, \mathbb{C}) &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times & : & (g, z) \mapsto z, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. To define the bundle  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$ , suppose that  $\{U_\alpha\}$  is a trivializing cover of  $\mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$  (i.e.  $U_\alpha$  are local patches on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  such that the restrictions  $\mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}|_{U_\alpha}$  are isomorphic to Cartesian products  $U_\alpha \times GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ ) with the corresponding transition functions  $g_{\alpha\beta} : U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \rightarrow GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ . Suppose furthermore that there exist (continuous) lifts  $\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} : U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \rightarrow ML(n, \mathbb{C})$  such that  $p\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} = g_{\alpha\beta}$  and that the cocycle conditions  $\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}\tilde{g}_{\beta\gamma} = \tilde{g}_{\alpha\gamma}$  are satisfied. Then the cover  $\{U_\alpha, \tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}\}$  defines the desired bundle  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$ . It turns out that such lifts  $\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}$  exist (possibly after refining the cover  $\{U_\alpha\}$  if necessary) if and only if the cohomology class determined by the bundle  $\mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$  in  $H^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbf{Z}_2)$  vanishes; from now on, we will assume that this condition is satisfied.

The mapping  $\tilde{p} : \hat{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$ , obtained upon applying  $p$  in each fiber, yields then a 2-to-1 covering of  $\mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$  by  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$ .

A  $-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}$ -form on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is, by definition, a function  $\tilde{\nu} : \hat{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  satisfying

$$\tilde{\nu}_m(\tilde{\xi} \cdot \tilde{g}) = \tilde{\nu}_m(\tilde{\xi}) \cdot \lambda(\tilde{g})^{-1} \quad \forall \tilde{\xi} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}, \forall \tilde{g} \in ML(n, \mathbb{C}).$$

The complex line bundle of all  $-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}$ -forms will be denoted by  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\mathcal{P}$ .

Next we define the (partial) connection  $\nabla$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n$  be local Hamiltonian vector fields spanning  $\mathcal{P}$  in a neighbourhood of a point  $m_0 \in \mathbf{\Gamma}$  (cf. (3.32)). Since  $\tilde{p}$  is a local homeomorphism, there exists a local lifting  $(\tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_n) \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$  (possibly defined on a smaller neighbourhood of  $m_0$ ) such that  $\tilde{p}(\tilde{\eta}_j) = \eta_j$ . We can also arrange that  $(\tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_n)|_{m_0}$  coincides with any given metaframe  $\tilde{f}_0 \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}^n_{m_0} \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$ . For  $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}$ , we then define

$$(\nabla_\zeta \tilde{\nu})_{m_0}(\tilde{f}_0) := \zeta \tilde{\nu}(\tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_n)|_{m_0}.$$

One checks as usual that this definition is consistent (i.e. independent of the choice of the Hamiltonian metaframe  $\tilde{\eta}$  satisfying  $\tilde{\eta}|_{m_0} = \tilde{f}_0$ ) and defines again a  $-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}$ -form on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ ; further, the resulting map  $\nabla$  is again a flat partial connection on  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\mathcal{P}$ . Denoting by  $QB$  the tensor product (quantum bundle)

$$QB := L \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^\mathcal{P}$$

(with  $L$  the prequantization bundle from §3.1), we then have the corresponding partial connection (3.25) in  $QB$ .

For arbitrary two sections  $\phi = s \otimes \tilde{\nu}$  and  $\psi = r \otimes \tilde{\mu}$  of  $QB$ ,  $m \in \mathbf{\Gamma}$  and  $\tilde{f} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}^n_m \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$  a metaframe at  $m$ , denote  $(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) = \tilde{p}(\tilde{f})$  and choose  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n \in T_m \mathbf{\Gamma}^\mathbb{C}$  such that

$\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$  is a basis of  $T_m \mathbf{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . Assume that  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k$  is a basis of  $\mathcal{D}_m^{\mathbb{C}}$ . Then a function  $(\phi, \psi)_m$  can be defined on  $\mathcal{F}_{\pi(m)}^{2n-k}(\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D})^{\mathbb{C}}$  by

$$(3.41) \quad (\phi, \psi)_m(\pi_*(\zeta_{k+1}, \dots, \zeta_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)) := (s, r)_m \overline{\tilde{\nu}_m(\tilde{f})} \tilde{\mu}_m(\tilde{f}) \cdot \\ \cdot |\epsilon_{\omega, k}(\zeta_{k+1}, \dots, \zeta_n, \bar{\zeta}_{k+1}, \dots, \bar{\zeta}_n)|^{1/2} \cdot |\epsilon_{\omega}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)|.$$

Although  $(\phi, \psi)_m$  is again defined only on a certain subset of  $\mathcal{F}_{\pi(m)}^{2n-k}(\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D})^{\mathbb{C}}$ , one can check as before that it extends consistently to a (unique) density on  $\mathcal{F}_{\pi(m)}^{2n-k}(\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D})^{\mathbb{C}}$ , and, further, if  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{P}$  then  $(\phi, \psi)_m$  depends only on  $\pi(m)$ , and thus defines a (unique) density on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D}$ .

Finally, if  $\zeta$  is a real vector field on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  preserving  $\mathcal{P}$  (i.e.  $[\zeta, \mathcal{P}] \subset \mathcal{P}$ ), then the associated flow  $\rho_t$  (which satisfies  $\tilde{\rho}_{t*} \mathcal{P}_m \subset \mathcal{P}_{\rho_t m}$ ) induces a flow  $\tilde{\rho}_t$  on  $\mathcal{P}$ -frames which, for  $t$  small enough, lifts uniquely to a flow  $\tilde{\tilde{\rho}}_t$  on the metaframes such that  $\tilde{\tilde{\rho}}_t \tilde{\tilde{\rho}}_t = \tilde{\rho}_t \tilde{\rho}_t$ . Using this action we define

$$(3.42) \quad (\mathcal{L}_{\zeta} \tilde{\nu})(\tilde{f}) := \left. \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\nu}_{\rho_t m}(\tilde{\rho}_t \tilde{f}) \right|_{t=0}, \quad \tilde{f} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_m^{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

As before, it is easily seen that  $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta} \tilde{\nu}$  is again a  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -form, for any  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -form  $\tilde{\nu}$ , that  $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta}$  satisfies the axioms (3.28) and (3.29) of a “flat partial Lie derivative”, and that  $\mathcal{L}_{X_f} = \nabla_{X_f}$  if  $f$  is a real function with  $X_f \in \mathcal{P}$ .

Introducing the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$  as before,

$$\mathfrak{H} = \text{the completion of } \left\{ \psi \in \Gamma(QB) : \nabla_{\zeta} \psi = 0 \ \forall \zeta \in \mathcal{P} \text{ and } \int_{\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D}} (\psi, \psi) < \infty \right\},$$

a straightforward modification of the corresponding arguments for  $-\frac{1}{2}$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -densities shows that the operators defined by (3.39), i.e.

$$(3.43) \quad Q_f(s \otimes \nu) := \left( -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \nabla_{X_f} s + f s \right) \otimes \nu + s \otimes \left( -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \mathcal{L}_{X_f} \nu \right)$$

(but now with the Lie derivative (3.38) replaced by (3.42) etc.), for  $f : \mathbf{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that (3.40) holds, are densely defined operators of  $\mathfrak{H}$  into itself; and if  $X_f$  is complete, they are self-adjoint.

We have thus arrived at the final recipe of the original geometric quantization of Kostant and Souriau: that is, starting with a phase space — a symplectic manifold  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \omega)$  — satisfying the integrality condition:

$$h^{-1}[\omega] \text{ is an integral class in } H^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbb{R}),$$

and with a complex polarization  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  satisfying the condition for the existence of the metaplectic structure:

$$\text{the class of } \mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}} \text{ in } H^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbb{Z}_2) \text{ vanishes,}$$

we have constructed the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$  as (the completion of) the space of all sections of the quantum bundle  $QB = L \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{P}}$  which are covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{P}$  and

square-integrable over  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$ ; and for a function  $f$  belonging to the space

$$(3.44) \quad \text{Obs} = \{f : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; [X_f, \mathcal{P}] \subset \mathcal{P}\}$$

(the *space of quantizable observables*) we have defined by (3.43) the corresponding quantum operator  $Q_f$  on  $\mathfrak{H}$ , which is self-adjoint if the Hamiltonian field  $X_f$  of  $f$  is complete, and such that the correspondence  $f \mapsto Q_f$  satisfies the axioms (Q1) – (Q5) we have set ourselves in the beginning.<sup>12</sup>

**3.5. Blattner-Kostant-Sternberg pairing.** The space (3.44) of quantizable observables is often rather small: for instance, for  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  (with the standard symplectic form) and the vertical polarization  $\partial/\partial p_1, \dots, \partial/\partial p_n$ , the space  $\text{Obs}$  essentially coincides with functions at most linear in  $p$ , thus excluding, for instance, the kinetic energy  $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{p}\|^2$ . There is a method of extending the quantization map  $Q$  to a larger space of functions<sup>13</sup> so that  $Q_f$  is still given by (3.43) if  $f$  satisfies (3.40), while giving the correct answer  $Q_f = -\frac{\hbar^2}{8\pi}\Delta$  for the kinetic energy  $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{p}\|^2$ . The method is based on a pairing of half-forms, due to Blattner, Kostant and Sternberg [35], which we now proceed to describe.

Suppose  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$  are two (complex) polarizations for which there exist two real foliations  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$  (of constant dimensions  $k$  and  $2n - k$ , respectively) such that

$$(3.45) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{P}' &= \hat{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbb{C}}, \\ \overline{\mathcal{P}} + \mathcal{P}' &= \hat{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbb{C}}, \end{aligned}$$

$\Gamma/\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  has a manifold structure and  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma/\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  is a submersion.

Pairs of polarizations satisfying the first and the third condition are called *regular*<sup>14</sup>, if in addition  $\hat{\mathcal{D}} = \{0\}$  (which implies that the second condition also holds, with  $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = T\Gamma$ ), they are called *transversal*. If the polarizations  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$  are *positive*, which means that

$$(3.46) \quad i\omega(x, \bar{x}) \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{P},$$

and similarly for  $\mathcal{P}'$ , then  $\overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{P}'$  is automatically involutive, so the first condition in (3.45) is equivalent to the (weaker) property that  $\overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{P}'$  be of constant rank.

For  $m \in \Gamma$ , choose a basis  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n, \xi'_{k+1}, \dots, \xi'_n, t_1, \dots, t_k$  of  $T_m\Gamma^{\mathbb{C}}$  such that  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k$  span  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$ ,  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$  span  $\mathcal{P}_m$  and  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k, \xi'_{k+1}, \dots, \xi'_n$  span  $\mathcal{P}'_m$ . Now if  $\phi = s \otimes \nu$  and  $\psi = r \otimes \mu$  are (local) sections of  $L \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $L \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{P}'}$ , respectively,

<sup>12</sup>In (Q4), one of course takes the polarizations on the two manifolds which correspond to each other under the given diffeomorphism.

<sup>13</sup>However, on the extended domain  $Q$  does in general no longer satisfy the axiom (Q3); see the discussion in §3.7 below.

<sup>14</sup>This definition of regularity slightly differs from the original one in [37], where it is additionally required that the Blattner obstruction (3.61) vanish.



then we can “define” a function on  $\mathcal{F}^{2n-k}(\mathbf{\Gamma}/\hat{\mathcal{D}})^{\mathbb{C}}$  by

$$(3.47) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \phi, \psi \rangle_m(\pi_*(\xi_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_n, \bar{\xi}'_{k+1}, \dots, \bar{\xi}'_n, t_1, \dots, t_k)) &= (s, r)_m \overline{\nu_m((\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)^{\sim})} \cdot \\ &\cdot \mu_m((\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k, \xi'_{k+1}, \dots, \xi'_n)^{\sim}) \cdot \\ &\cdot \sqrt{\epsilon_{\omega, k}(\xi_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_n, \bar{\xi}'_{k+1}, \dots, \bar{\xi}'_n)} \cdot |\epsilon_{\omega}(\xi_1, \dots, t_k)|. \end{aligned}$$

(Here  $\epsilon_{\omega, k}$  is given by (3.35)). Moreover, if  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$ , respectively, then this expression is independent of the choice of  $m$  in the fiber above  $\pi(m)$ , and thus defines a density — denoted  $(\phi, \psi)_{\pi(m)}$  — on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}/\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ . However, there are two problems with (3.47): first, we need to specify which metaframes  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)^{\sim}$  above  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$  and  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi'_n)^{\sim}$  above  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi'_n)$  to choose; and, second, we must specify the choice of the branch of the square root of  $\epsilon_{\omega, k}$ .

Both problems are solved by introducing the *metaplectic frame bundle* on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , which, basically, amounts to a recipe for choosing metilinear lifts  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{P}}$  of  $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P}}$  for all complex polarizations  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  *simultaneously*.<sup>15</sup>

*Remark 11.* On an abstract level, the basic idea behind the half-form pairing can be visualized as follows (Rawnsley [210]). Let  $\mathcal{P}^{\perp} \subset T^*\mathbf{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{C}}$  denote the bundle of one-forms vanishing on  $\mathcal{P}$ ; in view of the Lagrangianity of  $\mathcal{P}$ , the mapping  $\xi \mapsto \omega(\xi, \cdot)$  is an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{P}$  onto  $\mathcal{P}^{\perp}$ . The exterior power  $\bigwedge^n \mathcal{P}^{\perp} =: K^{\mathcal{P}}$  is a line bundle called the canonical bundle of  $\mathcal{P}$ . If the polarization  $\mathcal{P}$  is positive, then the Chern class of  $K^{\mathcal{P}}$  is determined by  $\omega$ , so that  $K^{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $K^{\mathcal{P}'}$  are isomorphic for any two positive polarizations  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$ . In this case the bundle  $K^{\mathcal{P}} \otimes \overline{K^{\mathcal{P}'}}$  is trivial, and a choice of trivialization will yield the pairing. In particular, if  $\overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{P}' = \{0\}$ , then exterior multiplication defines an isomorphism of  $K^{\mathcal{P}} \otimes \overline{K^{\mathcal{P}'}}$  with  $\bigwedge^{2n} T^*\mathbf{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{C}}$ , and the latter is trivialized by the volume form  $\epsilon_{\omega}$ ; hence one can define  $\langle \nu, \mu \rangle$  by

$$i^n \langle \nu, \mu \rangle \epsilon_{\omega} = \mu \wedge \bar{\nu}, \quad \mu \in \Gamma(K^{\mathcal{P}}), \nu \in \Gamma(K^{\mathcal{P}'}).$$

If  $\overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{P}'$  has only constant rank, then the positivity of  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$  implies that the first two conditions in (3.45) hold, for some real foliation  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  and some real distribution (but not necessarily a foliation)  $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \hat{\mathcal{D}}^{\perp}$  on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ . Then  $\omega$  induces a nonsingular skew form  $\omega_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}$  on  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}/\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ , and  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$  project to Lagrangian subbundles  $\mathcal{P}/\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'/\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  of  $(\hat{\mathcal{E}}/\hat{\mathcal{D}})^{\mathbb{C}}$  such that  $\overline{\mathcal{P}/\hat{\mathcal{D}}} \cap (\mathcal{P}'/\hat{\mathcal{D}}) = \{0\}$ . Thus  $K^{\mathcal{P}/\hat{\mathcal{D}}}$  and  $K^{\mathcal{P}'/\hat{\mathcal{D}}}$  can be paired by exterior multiplication as above. To lift this pairing back to  $K^{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $K^{\mathcal{P}'}$ , consider  $m \in \mathbf{\Gamma}$  and a frame  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$  of  $\mathcal{P}_m$  such that  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k$  is a frame of  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$ . Then any  $\nu \in K^{\mathcal{P}}_m$  is of the form

$$\nu = a \omega(\xi_1, \cdot) \wedge \omega(\xi_2, \cdot) \wedge \dots \wedge \omega(\xi_n, \cdot)$$

<sup>15</sup>More precisely, for all positive complex polarizations (see the definition below). In other words, the choice of a metaplectic frame bundle uniquely determines a metilinear frame bundle for each positive complex polarization.

for some  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ . The projections  $\tilde{\xi}_j$  of  $\xi_j \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m^{\perp \mathbb{C}}$  onto  $(\hat{\mathcal{E}}/\hat{\mathcal{D}})_m^{\mathbb{C}}$ ,  $j = k+1, \dots, n$ , then form a frame for  $(\mathcal{P}/\hat{\mathcal{D}})_m$ , and we set

$$\tilde{\nu}(\tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_k) := a \omega_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(\tilde{\xi}_{k+1}, \cdot) \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}(\tilde{\xi}_n, \cdot) \in K_m^{\mathcal{P}/\hat{\mathcal{D}}}.$$

Projecting  $\mu \in K_m^{\mathcal{P}'}$  in the same fashion, we then put  $\langle \nu, \mu \rangle_m := \langle \tilde{\nu}, \tilde{\mu} \rangle_m$ . Thus in any case we end up with a  $-2\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ -density on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , which defines, using the volume density  $|\epsilon_\omega|$ , a 2-density on  $T\mathbf{\Gamma}$  normal to  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  (i.e. vanishing if any of its arguments is in  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ ). Thus if  $\langle \nu, \mu \rangle_m$  is covariantly constant along the leaves, we can project down to a 2-density on  $T(\mathbf{\Gamma}/\hat{\mathcal{D}})$ . Now if the Chern class of  $K^{\mathcal{P}}$  is even — in which case  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \omega)$  is called *metaplectic* — then the symplectic frame bundle of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  has a double covering, by means of which one can canonically construct a square root  $Q^{\mathcal{P}}$  of  $K^{\mathcal{P}}$ , for any positive polarization  $\mathcal{P}$ . (Sections of  $Q^{\mathcal{P}}$  are called half-forms *normal* to  $\mathcal{P}$ .) Further, these square roots still have the property that  $Q^{\mathcal{P}} \otimes \overline{Q^{\mathcal{P}'}}$  is trivial. Applying the “square root” to the above construction, one thus ends up with a density on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}/\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ . Integrating this density gives a complex number, and we thus finally arrive at the desired pairing

$$\Gamma(Q^{\mathcal{P}}) \times \overline{\Gamma(Q^{\mathcal{P}'})} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}.$$

In particular, choosing  $\mathcal{P}' = \mathcal{P}$  (i.e. pairing a polarization with itself), passing from  $Q^{\mathcal{P}}$  to the tensor product  $L \otimes Q^{\mathcal{P}}$  with the prequantum bundle, and using again Lie differentiation to define a partial connection along  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  in the densities on  $T\mathbf{\Gamma}$  normal to  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ , we can also continue as before and recover in this way in an equivalent guise the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$  and the quantum operators  $Q_f$  from the preceding subsection(s).  $\square$

We now give some details about the construction of the metaplectic frame bundle. As this is a somewhat technical matter, we will confine ourselves to the simplest case of transversal polarizations, i.e. such that (3.45) holds with  $\hat{\mathcal{D}} = \{0\}$  (and, hence,  $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = T\mathbf{\Gamma}$ ); the general case can be found in [231], Chapter 5, or [37]. We will also assume throughout that the polarizations are positive, i.e. (3.46) holds.

A *symplectic frame* at  $m \in \mathbf{\Gamma}$  is an (ordered) basis  $(u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_n) \equiv (u, v)$  of  $T_m \mathbf{\Gamma}$  such that

$$\omega(u_j, u_k) = \omega(v_j, v_k) = 0, \quad \omega(u_j, v_k) = \delta_{jk}.$$

The collection of all such frames forms a right principal  $Sp(n, \mathbb{R})$  bundle  $\mathcal{F}^\omega \mathbf{\Gamma}$ , the *symplectic bundle*; here  $Sp(n, \mathbb{R})$ , the  $n \times n$  *symplectic group*, consists of all  $g \in GL(2n, \mathbb{R})$  which preserve  $\omega$  (i.e.  $\omega(g\xi, g\eta) = \omega(\xi, \eta)$ ). The group  $Sp(n, \mathbb{R})$  can be realized as the subgroup of  $2n \times 2n$  real matrices  $g$  satisfying  $g^t J g = J$ , where  $J$  is the block matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . The fundamental group of  $Sp(n, \mathbb{R})$  is infinite cyclic, hence there exists a unique double cover  $Mp(n, \mathbb{R})$ , called the *metaplectic group*. We denote by  $p$  the covering homomorphism. The *metaplectic frame bundle*  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^\omega \mathbf{\Gamma}$  is a right principal  $Mp(n, \mathbb{R})$  bundle over  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  together with a map  $\tau : \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^\omega \mathbf{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^\omega \mathbf{\Gamma}$  such that  $\tau(\tilde{\xi} \cdot \tilde{g}) = \tau(\tilde{\xi}) \cdot p(\tilde{g})$ , for all  $\tilde{\xi} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^\omega \mathbf{\Gamma}$  and  $\tilde{g} \in Mp(n, \mathbb{R})$ . The existence of

$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^\omega \Gamma$  is equivalent to the characteristic class of  $\mathcal{F}^\omega \Gamma$  in  $H^2(\Gamma, \mathbf{Z})$  being even (cf. the construction of the metilinear frame bundle  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^\mathbb{C}$ ).

A *positive Lagrangian frame* at  $m \in \Gamma$  is a frame  $(w_1, \dots, w_n) \equiv w \in T_m \Gamma^\mathbb{C}$  such that

$$(3.48) \quad \omega(w_j, w_k) = 0 \quad \forall j, k = 1, \dots, n,$$

and

$$(3.49) \quad i\omega(w_j, \bar{w}_j) \geq 0 \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, n.$$

The corresponding *bundle of positive Lagrangian frames* is denoted by  $\mathcal{L}^\omega \Gamma$ .

In terms of a given symplectic frame  $(u, v)$ , a positive Lagrangian frame can be uniquely expressed as

$$(3.50) \quad w = (u, v) \begin{bmatrix} U \\ V \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $U, V$  are  $n \times n$  matrices satisfying

$$(3.51) \quad \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} U \\ V \end{bmatrix} = n, \quad U^t V = V^t U,$$

in view of (3.48), and

$$(3.52) \quad i(V^* U - U V^*) \text{ is positive semidefinite}$$

in view of (3.49). This sets up a bijection between the set of all positive Lagrangian frames at a point  $m \in \Gamma$  and the set  $\Pi$  of all matrices  $U, V$  satisfying (3.51) and (3.52). The action of  $Sp(n, \mathbb{R})$  on  $\Pi$  by left matrix multiplication defines thus an action on  $\mathcal{L}^\omega \Gamma$  and a positive Lagrangian frame  $w$  at  $m$  can be identified with the function  $w^\sharp : \mathcal{F}^\omega \Gamma \rightarrow \Pi$  satisfying

$$w^\sharp((u, v) \cdot g) = g^{-1} w^\sharp(u, v) \quad \forall g \in Sp(n, \mathbb{R})$$

by the recipe

$$(3.53) \quad w = (u, v) w^\sharp(u, v).$$

From (3.51) it follows that the matrix  $C$  defined by

$$C := U - iV$$

is nonsingular, and that the matrix  $W$  defined by

$$W = (U + iV)C^{-1}$$

is symmetric ( $W^t = W$ ). From (3.52) it then follows that  $\|W\| \leq 1$ , i.e.  $W$  belongs to the closed unit ball

$$\mathbb{B} := \{W \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} : W^t = W, \|W\| \leq 1\}$$

of symmetric complex  $n \times n$  matrices.

Since

$$(3.54) \quad U = \frac{(I + W)C}{2}, \quad V = \frac{i(I - W)C}{2},$$

the mapping  $\begin{bmatrix} U \\ V \end{bmatrix} \mapsto (W, C)$  sets up a bijection between  $\Pi$  and  $\mathbb{B} \times GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ . The action of  $Sp(n, \mathbb{R})$  on  $\Pi$  translates into

$$g \cdot (W, C) =: (g_{\sharp}(W), \alpha(g, W)C),$$

where  $g_{\sharp}$  is a certain (fractional linear) mapping from  $\mathbb{B}$  into itself and  $\alpha$  is a certain (polynomial) mapping from  $Sp(n, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{B}$  into  $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ . Since  $\mathbb{B}$  is contractible, there exists a unique lift  $\tilde{\alpha} : Mp(n, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{B} \rightarrow ML(n, \mathbb{C})$  of  $\alpha$  such that

$$\tilde{\alpha}(\tilde{e}, W) = \tilde{I} \quad \forall W \in \mathbb{B},$$

where  $\tilde{e}$  and  $\tilde{I}$  stand for the identities in  $Mp(n, \mathbb{R})$  and  $ML(n, \mathbb{C})$ , respectively, and

$$p(\tilde{\alpha}(\tilde{g}, W)) = \alpha(p(\tilde{g}), W) \quad \forall \tilde{g} \in Mp(n, \mathbb{R}), \forall W \in \mathbb{B},$$

where  $p$  also denotes (on the left-hand side), as before, the canonical projection of  $ML(n, \mathbb{C})$  onto  $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ . Let  $\tilde{\Pi} = \mathbb{B} \times ML(n, \mathbb{C})$ ; then there is a left action of  $Mp(n, \mathbb{R})$  on  $\tilde{\Pi}$  defined by

$$\tilde{g} \cdot (W, \tilde{C}) := (p(\tilde{g})_{\sharp}(W), \tilde{\alpha}(\tilde{g}, W)\tilde{C}), \quad \tilde{g} \in Mp(n, \mathbb{R}),$$

and  $\tilde{\Pi}$  is a double cover of  $\Pi$  with the covering map  $\tau : \tilde{\Pi} \rightarrow \Pi$  given by (3.54) with  $C$  replaced by  $p(\tilde{C})$ . In analogy with (3.53), we now define a *positive metilinear Lagrangian frame* as a function  $\tilde{w}^{\sharp} : \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{\omega} \mathbf{\Gamma} \rightarrow \tilde{\Pi}$  such that

$$\tilde{w}^{\sharp}(\widetilde{(u, v)} \cdot \tilde{g}) = \tilde{g}^{-1} \cdot \tilde{w}^{\sharp}(\widetilde{(u, v)}) \quad \forall \widetilde{(u, v)} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_m^{\omega} \mathbf{\Gamma}, \forall \tilde{g} \in Mp(n, \mathbb{R}),$$

and let  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\omega} \mathbf{\Gamma}$  be the corresponding bundle of all such frames. The covering map  $\tau : \tilde{\Pi} \rightarrow \Pi$  gives rise to the similar map  $\tilde{\tau} : \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\omega} \mathbf{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^{\omega} \mathbf{\Gamma}$ , showing that the former is a double cover of the latter. Finally, the obvious right action of  $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$  on  $\mathcal{L}^{\omega} \mathbf{\Gamma}$  lifts uniquely to a right action of  $ML(n, \mathbb{C})$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\omega} \mathbf{\Gamma}$ .

Let now  $\mathcal{P}$  be a positive polarization on  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \omega)$ . Then the bundle  $\mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}}$  of  $\mathcal{P}$ -frames is a subbundle of  $\mathcal{L}^{\omega} \mathbf{\Gamma}$  invariant under the action of  $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$  just mentioned. The inverse image of  $\mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}}$  under  $\tilde{\tau}$  is a subbundle  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}}$  of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\omega} \mathbf{\Gamma}$  invariant under the action of  $ML(n, \mathbb{C})$ , and  $\tilde{\tau}$  restricted to  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}}$  defines a double covering  $\tilde{\tau} : \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^n \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . It follows that  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^n \mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{C}}$  is a metilinear frame bundle of  $\mathcal{P}$ , which we will call the metilinear frame bundle *induced* by  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\omega} \mathbf{\Gamma}$ .

Finally, notice that for two positive polarizations  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$  satisfying the transversality condition

$$(3.55) \quad \overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{P}' = \{0\}$$

and frames  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \equiv \xi$  and  $(\xi'_1, \dots, \xi'_n) \equiv \xi'$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$ , respectively, at some point  $m \in \mathbf{\Gamma}$  as in (3.47) (with  $k = 0$ ), if we identify  $\xi$  and  $\xi'$  with the matrices  $\begin{bmatrix} U \\ V \end{bmatrix}$

and  $\begin{bmatrix} U' \\ V' \end{bmatrix}$  as in (3.50) with respect to some choice of a symplectic frame  $(u, v)$  at  $m$ , then the expression  $\epsilon_{\omega, k}(\dots)$  in (3.47) reduces to

$$(3.56) \quad \det \left[ \frac{\omega(\xi_j, \bar{\xi}'_l)}{i} \right]_{j,l=1}^n = \det \left[ \frac{1}{2} C'^*(I - W'^*W)C \right],$$

with  $(W, C)$  and  $(W', C')$  as in (3.54). The transversality hypothesis implies that the matrix on the left-hand side is invertible, hence so must be  $I - W'^*W$ . Since the subset  $\mathbb{B}_0$  of all matrices in  $\mathbb{B}$  for which 1 is not an eigenvalue is contractible, there exists a unique map  $\tilde{\gamma} : \mathbb{B}_0 \rightarrow ML(n, \mathbb{C})$  such that

$$p(\tilde{\gamma}(S)) = I - S \quad \forall S \in \mathbb{B}_0, \quad \text{and } \tilde{\gamma}_0 = \tilde{I}.$$

(Note that  $\tilde{\gamma}$  is independent of the polarizations  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$  !) Consequently, the function

$$\lambda \left( \frac{1}{2} \tilde{C}'^* \tilde{\gamma} (I - W'^*W) \tilde{C} \right),$$

with  $\lambda$  having the same meaning as in §3.4, gives the sought definition of the square root of (3.56) which makes the right-hand side of (3.47) well-defined and independent of the choice of the metalinear frames  $\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}'$  above  $\xi$  and  $\xi'$ .

Finally, integrating the density (3.47) over  $\Gamma/\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ , we obtain the sesquilinear pairing

$$(3.57) \quad \phi, \psi \mapsto \langle \phi, \psi \rangle \in \mathbb{C}$$

between sections  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  of  $L \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $L \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{P}'}$  covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$ , respectively. This is the *Blattner-Kostant-Sternberg pairing* (or just BKS-pairing for short) originally introduced in [35].

Unfortunately, there seems to be no known general criterion for the existence of  $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle$ , i.e. for the integrability of the density (3.47). All one can say in general is that  $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle$  exists if both  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are compactly supported. In many concrete situations, however, (3.57) extends continuously to the whole Hilbert spaces  $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}'}$  defined by (3.37) for the polarizations  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$ , respectively, and, further, the operator  $H_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'} : \mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}'}$  defined by

$$(\psi, H_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'}\phi)_{\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}'}} = \langle \psi, \phi \rangle \quad \forall \phi \in \mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}}, \psi \in \mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}'},$$

turns out to be, in fact, unitary. For instance, for  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}'$ ,  $H_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'}$  is just the identity operator (so that the BKS pairing coincides with the inner product in  $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$ ), and for  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$  the polarizations spanned by the  $\partial/\partial p_j$  and the  $\partial/\partial q_j$ , respectively,  $H_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'}$  is the Fourier transform. It may happen, though, that  $H_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'}$  is bounded and boundedly invertible but not unitary [211]; no example is currently known where  $H_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'}$  would be unbounded.

Turning finally to our original objective — the extension of the quantization map  $f \mapsto Q_f$  — let now  $f$  be a real function on  $\Gamma$  such that  $X_f$  does not necessarily preserve the polarization  $\mathcal{P}$ . The flow  $\rho_t = \exp(tX_f)$  generated by  $X_f$  then takes  $\mathcal{P}$  into a polarization  $\tilde{\rho}_t\mathcal{P} =: \mathcal{P}_t$ , which may be different from  $\mathcal{P}$ . The flow  $\rho_t$  further induces the corresponding flows on the spaces  $\Gamma(L)$  of sections of the prequantum

bundle  $L$ , as well as from sections of the metilinear bundle  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{P}}$  into the sections of  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{P}_t}$ ; hence, it gives rise to a (unitary) mapping, denoted  $\rho_t^\sharp$ , from the quantum Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}_t} =: \mathfrak{H}_t$  into  $\mathfrak{H}$ . Assume now that for all sufficiently small positive  $t$ , the polarizations  $\mathcal{P}_t$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  are such that the BKS pairing between them is defined on (or extends by continuity to) all of  $\mathfrak{H}_t \times \mathfrak{H}$  and the corresponding operator  $H_{\mathcal{P}_t \mathcal{P}} =: H_t$  is unitary. Then the promised quantum operator given by the BKS pairing is

$$(3.58) \quad Q_f \phi = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \frac{d}{dt} (H_t \circ \rho_t^\sharp) \Big|_{t=0}.$$

In view of the remarks in the penultimate paragraph, in practice it may be difficult to verify the (existence and) unitarity of  $H_t$ , but one may still use (3.58) to compute  $Q_f$  on a dense subdomain and investigate the existence of a self-adjoint extension afterwards.

Observe also that for  $f \in \text{Obs}$ , i.e. for functions preserving the polarization ( $[X_f, \mathcal{P}] \subset \mathcal{P}$ ), one has  $\mathcal{P}_t = \mathcal{P}$  and  $H_t = I \ \forall t > 0$ , and, hence, it can easily be seen that (3.58) reduces just to our original prescription (3.43). In particular, if  $f$  is constant along  $\mathcal{P}$  (i.e.  $X_f \in \mathcal{P}$ ), then  $Q_f$  is just the operator of multiplication by  $f$ .

If the polarization  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{D}$  is real and its leaves are simply connected, it is possible to give an explicit local expression for the operator (3.58). Namely, let  $V$  be a contractible coordinate patch on  $\Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  such that on  $\pi^{-1}(V)$  (where, as before,  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma/\mathcal{D}$  is the canonical submersion) there exist real functions  $q_1, \dots, q_n$ , whose Hamiltonian vector fields span  $\mathcal{P}|_{\pi^{-1}(V)}$ , and functions  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  such that  $\omega|_{\pi^{-1}(V)} = \sum_{j=1}^n dp_j \wedge dq_j$ . Using a suitable reference section on  $\pi^{-1}(V)$  covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{P}$ , the subspace in  $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$  of sections supported in  $\pi^{-1}(V)$  can be identified with  $L^2(V, dq_1 \dots dq_n)$ . If  $\psi$  is such a section, then under this identification, the operator (3.58) is given by

$$(3.59) \quad Q_f \psi = \frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \frac{d\psi_t}{dt} \Big|_{t=0},$$

where

$$(3.60) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_t(q_1, \dots, q_n) = & \left( \frac{2\pi}{i\hbar} \right)^{n/2} \int \exp \left[ -\frac{2\pi}{i\hbar} \int_0^t (\theta(X_f) - f) \circ \rho_{-s} ds \right] \times \\ & \times \sqrt{\det [\omega(X_{q_j}, \rho_t X_{q_k})]_{j,k=1}^n} \psi(q_1 \circ \rho_{-t}, \dots, q_n \circ \rho_{-t}) dp_1 \dots dp_n, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\theta = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j dq_j$  and  $\rho_t$  is, as usual, the flow generated by  $X_f$ . See [231], Section 6.3.

The conditions (3.45), under which the BKS pairing was constructed here, can be somewhat weakened, see Blattner [37].<sup>16</sup> In particular, for positive polarizations the pairing can still be defined even if the middle condition in (3.45) is omitted.

<sup>16</sup>Originally, the pairing was defined in Blattner's paper [35] for a pair of transversal real polarizations; the transversality hypothesis was then replaced by regularity in [36], and finally regular pairs of positive complex polarizations were admitted in [37].

In that case, a new complication can arise: it may happen that for two sections  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  which are covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$ , respectively, their “local scalar product”  $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_m$  is not covariantly constant along  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  (i.e. does not depend only on  $\pi(m)$ ). More precisely:  $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_m$  is covariantly constant whenever  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are if and only if the one-form  $\chi_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'}$  (the *Blattner obstruction*) defined on  $\bar{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{P}'$  by

$$(3.61) \quad \chi_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'} := \sum_{j=1}^{n-k} \omega([v_j, w_j], \cdot)$$

vanishes. Here  $k = \dim \bar{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{P}'$  and  $v_1, \dots, v_{n-k}, w_1, \dots, w_{n-k}$  are (arbitrary) vector fields in  $\bar{\mathcal{P}} + \mathcal{P}'$  such that

$$\omega(v_i, v_j) = \omega(w_i, w_j) = 0, \quad \omega(v_i, w_j) = \delta_{ij}.$$

The simplest example when  $\chi_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'} \neq 0$  is  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^4$  (with the usual symplectic form) and  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$  spanned by  $\partial/\partial p_1, \partial/\partial p_2$  and  $p_1\partial/\partial p_1 + p_2\partial/\partial p_2, p_2\partial/\partial q_1 - p_1\partial/\partial q_2$ , respectively.

We remark that so far there are no known ways of defining the BKS pairing if the dimension of  $\bar{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{P}'$  varies, or if the intersection is not of the form  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathbb{C}}$  for a real distribution  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  which is fibrating. Robinson [218] showed how to define the “local” product  $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_m$  for a completely arbitrary pair of polarizations  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$ , however his pairing takes values not in a bundle of densities but in a certain line bundle over  $\Gamma$  (coming from higher cohomology groups) which is not even trivial in general, so it is not possible to integrate the local products into a global ( $\mathbb{C}$ -valued) pairing. (For a regular pair of positive polarizations, Robinson’s bundle is canonically isomorphic to the bundle of densities on  $\Gamma$ .)

A general study of the integral kernels mediating BKS-type pairings was undertaken by Gawędzki [97] [96]; he also obtained a kernel representation for the quantum operators  $Q_f$ . His kernels seem actually very much akin to the reproducing kernels for vector bundles investigated by Peetre [201] and others, cf. the discussion in Section 5 below.

A completely different method of extending the correspondence  $f \mapsto Q_f$  was proposed by Kostant in [156]. For a set  $\mathcal{X}$  of vector fields on  $\Gamma$  and a polarization  $\mathcal{P}$ , denote by  $(\text{ad } \mathcal{P})\mathcal{X}$  the set  $\{[X, Y]; X \in \mathcal{X}, Y \in \mathcal{P}\}$ , and let

$$C_{\mathcal{P}}^k := \{f \in C^\infty(\Gamma) : (\text{ad } \mathcal{P})^k \{X_f\} \subset \mathcal{P}\}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Then, in view of the involutivity of  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $C_{\mathcal{P}}^k \subset C_{\mathcal{P}}^{k+1}$ , and, in fact,  $C_{\mathcal{P}}^0$  is the space of functions constant along  $\mathcal{P}$ , and  $C_{\mathcal{P}}^1 = \text{Obs}$ ; one can think of  $C_{\mathcal{P}}^k$  as the space of functions which are “polynomial of degree at most  $k$  in the directions transversal to  $\mathcal{P}$ ”. Kostant’s method extends the domain of the mapping  $f \mapsto Q_f$  to the union  $C_{\mathcal{P}}^* := \bigcup_{k \geq 0} C_{\mathcal{P}}^k$ ; though phrased in completely geometric terms, in the end it essentially boils down just to choosing a particular ordering of the operators  $P_j$  and  $Q_j$  (cf. Section 6 below). Namely, let  $\mathcal{P}'$  be an auxiliary polarization on  $\Gamma$  such that locally near any  $m \in \Gamma$ , there exist functions  $q_1, \dots, q_n$  and  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  such that  $X_{q_j}$



span  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $X_{p_j}$  span  $\mathcal{P}'$ , and  $\{q_j, p_k\} = \delta_{jk}$ . (Such polarizations are said to be *Heisenberg related*.) Now if  $f$  is locally of the form  $p^m \phi(q)$  (any function from  $C_{\mathcal{P}}^*$  is a sum of such functions), then

$$Q_f = \left( \frac{ih}{2\pi} \right)^{|\mathbf{m}|-1} \sum_{0 \leq |\mathbf{k}| \leq |\mathbf{m}|} \left( \frac{|\mathbf{k}|}{2} - 1 \right) \binom{\mathbf{m}}{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\partial^{|\mathbf{k}|} \phi}{\partial q^{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{\partial^{|\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{k}|}}{\partial q^{\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{k}}}.$$

Here  $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$  is a multiindex,  $|\mathbf{m}| = m_1 + \dots + m_n$ , and similarly for  $\mathbf{k}$ . Again, however, the axiom (Q3) is no longer satisfied by these operators on the extended domain, and, further, the operator  $Q_f$  depends also on the auxiliary polarization  $\mathcal{P}'$ : if  $f \in C_{\mathcal{P}}^k$ , then  $Q_f$  is a differential operator of order  $k$ , and choosing a different auxiliary polarization  $\mathcal{P}'$  (Heisenberg related to  $\mathcal{P}$ ) results in an error term which is a differential operator of order  $k - 2$ . We will say nothing more about this method here.

**3.6. Further developments.** In spite of the sophistication of geometric quantization, there are still quite a few things that can go wrong: the integrality condition may be violated, polarizations or the metaplectic structure need not exist, the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$  may turn out to be trivial, there may be too few quantizable functions, etc. We will survey here various enhancements of the original approach that have been invented in order to resolve some of these difficulties, and then discuss the remaining ones in the next subsection.

**3.6.1. Bohr-Sommerfeld conditions and distributional sections.** An example when the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$  turns out to be trivial — that is, when there are no square-integrable covariantly constant sections of  $QB$  except the constant zero — is that of  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  ( $\simeq \mathbb{R}^2$  with the origin deleted), with the standard symplectic form, and the circular (real) polarization  $\mathcal{D}$  spanned by  $\partial/\partial\theta$ , where  $(r, \theta)$  are the polar coordinates in  $\mathbb{C} \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$ . The leaves space  $\mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D}$  can be identified with  $\mathbb{R}^+$ ; upon employing a suitable reference section, sections of the quantum bundle (3.24) can be identified with functions on  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , and covariantly constant ones with those satisfying  $f(e^{i\theta}z) = e^{2\pi i r \theta / h} f(z)$ . (See [241], pp. 79-83.) However, as the coordinate  $\theta$  is cyclic, this forces the support of  $f$  to be contained in the union of the circles

$$(3.62) \quad r = \frac{kh}{2\pi}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

As the latter is a set of zero measure, we get  $\mathfrak{H} = \{0\}$ .

A similar situation can arise whenever the leaves of  $\mathcal{D}$  are not simply connected.

In general, for any leaf  $\Lambda$  of  $\mathcal{D}$ , the partial connection  $\nabla$  on the quantum line bundle  $QB$  induces a flat connection in the restriction  $QB|_{\Lambda}$  of  $QB$  to  $\Lambda$ . For any closed loop  $\gamma$  in  $\Lambda$ , a point  $m$  on  $\gamma$  and  $\phi \in QB_m \setminus \{0\}$ , the parallel transport with respect to the latter connection of  $\phi$  along  $\gamma$  transforms  $\phi$  into  $c\phi$ , for some  $c \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ ; the set of all  $c$  that arise in this way forms a group, the *holonomy group*  $G_{\Lambda}$  of  $\Lambda$ . Let  $\sigma$  be the set of all leaves  $\Lambda \in \mathbf{\Gamma}/\mathcal{D}$  whose holonomy groups are trivial, i.e.  $G_{\Lambda} = \{1\}$ . The preimage  $\mathcal{S} = \pi^{-1}(\sigma) \subset \mathbf{\Gamma}$  is called the *Bohr-Sommerfeld variety*, and it can be



shown that any section of  $QB$  covariantly constant along  $\mathcal{D}$  has support contained in  $\mathcal{S}$ . In the example above,  $\mathcal{S}$  is the union of the circles (3.62).

For *real* polarizations  $\mathcal{P}$  such that all Hamiltonian vector fields contained in  $\mathcal{P}$  are complete (the *completeness condition*), the problem can be solved by introducing distribution-valued sections of  $QB$ . See [231], Section 4.5, and [262], pp. 162–164. In the example above, this corresponds to taking  $\mathfrak{H}$  to be the set of all functions  $\phi$  which are equal to  $\phi_k$  on the circles (3.62) and vanish everywhere else, i.e.

$$(3.63) \quad \phi(re^{i\theta}) = \begin{cases} \phi_k e^{ki\theta} & \text{if } r = k \frac{h}{2\pi}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

with the inner product

$$(\phi, \psi) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \bar{\phi}_k \psi_k.$$

For real functions  $f$  satisfying

$$(3.64) \quad [X_f, \mathcal{P}] \subset \mathcal{P}$$

(i.e. preserving the polarization), the quantum operators  $Q_f$  can then be defined, essentially, in the same way as before, and extending the BKS pairing to distribution-valued sections (see [231], Section 5.1), one can also extend the domain of the correspondence  $f \mapsto Q_f$  to some functions  $f$  for which (3.64) fails.

For complex polarizations, there exist some partial results (e.g. Mykytiuk [177]), but the problem is so far unsolved in general.

*Remark 12.* It turns out that in the situation from the penultimate paragraph, the subspaces  $\mathfrak{H}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{H}$  consisting of sections supported on a given connected component  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$  of the Bohr-Sommerfeld variety  $\mathcal{S}$  are invariant under all operators  $Q_f$  (both if  $f$  satisfies (3.64) or if  $Q_f$  is obtained by the BKS pairing); that is,  $\mathfrak{H}$  is reducible under the corresponding set of quantum operators. One speaks of the so-called *superselection rules* ([231], Section 6.4).  $\square$

**3.6.2. Cohomological correction.** Another way of attacking the problem of non-existence of square-integrable covariantly constant sections is the use of higher cohomology groups.

Let  $k \geq 0$  be an integer and let  $QB$  be the quantum bundle  $L \otimes \mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{P}}$  or  $L \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{P}}$  constructed in §§3.3 (or 3.2) and 3.4, respectively. A  $k$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -form with values in  $QB$  is a  $k$ -linear and alternating map which assigns a smooth section  $\alpha(X_1, \dots, X_k)$  of  $QB$  to any  $k$ -tuple of vector fields  $X_1, \dots, X_k \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}$ . We denote the space of all such forms by  $\Lambda^k(\Gamma, \mathcal{P})$ ; one has  $\Lambda^0(\Gamma, \mathcal{P}) = \Gamma(QB)$ , and, more generally, any  $\alpha \in \Lambda^k(\Gamma, \mathcal{P})$  can be locally written as a product  $\alpha = \beta\tau$  where  $\tau$  is a section of  $QB$  covariantly constant along  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $\beta$  is an ordinary complex  $k$ -form on  $\Gamma$ , with two such products  $\beta\tau$  and  $\beta'\tau$  representing the same  $k$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -form whenever  $\beta - \beta'$  vanishes when restricted to  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ .

The operator  $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{P}} : \Lambda^k(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \Lambda^{k+1}(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathcal{P})$  is defined by

$$(\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{P}}\alpha)(X_1, \dots, X_{k+1}) = \sum_{\sigma} \left( \nabla_{X_{\sigma(1)}}(\alpha(X_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, X_{\sigma(k+1)})) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{k}{2} \alpha([X_{\sigma(1)}, X_{\sigma(2)}], X_{\sigma(3)}, \dots, X_{\sigma(k+1)}) \right)$$

where the summation extends over all cyclic permutations  $\sigma$  of the index set  $1, 2, \dots, k+1$ . It can be checked that  $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{P}}^2 = 0$ ; hence, we can define the *cohomology groups*  $H^k(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathcal{P})$  as the quotients  $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{P}}|_{\Lambda^k}) / \text{Ran}(\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{P}}|_{\Lambda^{k-1}})$  of the  $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{P}}$ -closed  $k$ - $\mathcal{P}$ -forms by the  $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{P}}$ -exact ones.

Finally, for each real function  $f$  satisfying (3.64) (i.e. preserving the polarization), one can extend the operator  $Q_f$  given by (3.43) (or (3.31) or (3.39)) to  $\Lambda^k(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathcal{P})$  by setting

(3.65)

$$(Q_f\alpha)(X_1, \dots, X_k) := Q_f(\alpha(X_1, \dots, X_k)) + \frac{ih}{2\pi} \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha(X_1, \dots, [X_f, X_j], \dots, X_k).$$

It can be checked that  $Q_f$  commutes with  $\bar{\partial}_{\mathcal{P}}$ , and thus induces an operator — also denoted  $Q_f$  — on the cohomology groups  $H^k(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathcal{P})$ .

Now it may happen that even though  $H^0(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathcal{P})$  contains no nonzero covariantly constant sections, one of the higher cohomology groups  $H^k(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathcal{P})$  does, and one can then use it as a substitute for  $\mathfrak{H}$  (and (3.65) as a substitute for (3.43)). For instance, in the above example of  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  with the circular polarization, one can show that using  $H^1(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathcal{P})$  essentially gives the same quantization as the use of the distributional sections in §3.6.1 (see Simms [227]). However, in general there are still some difficulties left — for instance, we need to define an inner product on  $H^k(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathcal{P})$  in order to make it into a Hilbert space, etc. The details can be found in Woodhouse [262], Section 6.4, Rawnsley [209], or Puta [207] and the references given there.

**3.6.3.  $Mp^{\mathbb{C}}$ -structures.** One more place where the standard geometric quantization can break down is the very beginning: namely, when the integrality condition  $h^{-1}[\omega] \in H^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbf{Z})$ , or the condition for the existence of the metaplectic structure  $\frac{1}{2}c_1(\omega) \in H^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbf{Z})$ , are not satisfied. This is the case, for instance, for the odd-dimensional harmonic oscillator, whose phase space is the complex projective space  $\mathbb{C}P^n$  with even  $n$ . It turns out that this can be solved by extending the whole method of geometric quantization to the case when the *sum*  $h^{-1}[\omega] + \frac{1}{2}c_1(\omega)$ , rather than the two summands separately, is integral. This was first done by Czyz [66] for compact Kähler manifolds, using an axiomatic approach, and then by Hess [128], whose method was taken much further by Rawnsley and Robinson [212] (see Robinson [219] for a recent survey).

The main idea is to replace the two ingredients just mentioned — the prequantum bundle and the metaplectic structure — by a single piece of data, called the *prequantized  $Mp^{\mathbb{C}}$  structure*. To define it, consider, quite generally, a real vector space

$V$  of dimension  $2n$  with a symplectic form  $\Omega$  and an irreducible unitary projective representation  $W$  of  $V$  on a separable complex Hilbert space  $\mathbb{H}$  such that

$$W(x)W(y) = e^{-\pi i \Omega(x,y)/h} W(x+y), \quad \forall x, y \in V.$$

By the Stone-von Neumann theorem,  $W$  is unique up to unitary equivalence; consequently, for any  $g \in Sp(V, \Omega)$  there exists a unitary operator  $U$  on  $\mathbb{H}$  (unique up to multiplication by a unimodular complex number) such that  $W(gx) = UW(x)U^*$  for all  $x \in V$ . Denote by  $Mp^{\mathbb{C}}(V, \Omega)$  the group of all such  $U$ 's as  $g$  ranges over  $Sp(V, \Omega)$ , and let  $\sigma : Mp^{\mathbb{C}}(V, \Omega) \rightarrow Sp(V, \Omega)$  be the mapping given by  $\sigma(U) = g$ . The kernel of  $\sigma$  is just  $U(1)$ , identified with the unitary scalar operators in  $\mathbb{H}$ . There is a unique character  $\eta : Mp^{\mathbb{C}}(V, \Omega) \rightarrow U(1)$  such that  $\eta(\lambda I) = \lambda^2 \forall \lambda \in U(1)$ ; the kernel of  $\eta$  is our old friend, the metaplectic group  $Mp(V, \Omega)$ . Let now  $Sp(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \omega)$  denote the symplectic frame bundle of the manifold  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , which we think of as being modelled fiberwise on  $(V, \Omega)$ . An  $Mp^{\mathbb{C}}$ -structure on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is a principal  $Mp^{\mathbb{C}}(V, \Omega)$  bundle  $P \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbf{\Gamma}$  together with a  $\sigma$ -equivariant bundle map  $P \rightarrow Sp(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \omega)$ . An  $Mp^{\mathbb{C}}$  structure is called *prequantized* if, in addition, there exists an  $Mp^{\mathbb{C}}(V, \Omega)$ -invariant  $u(1)$ -valued one-form  $\gamma$  on  $P$  such that  $d\gamma = \frac{2\pi}{ih} \pi^* \omega$  and  $\gamma(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{2} \eta_*$  for all  $z$  in the Lie algebra of  $Mp^{\mathbb{C}}(V, \Omega)$ ; here  $\mathbf{z}$  is the fundamental vertical vector field corresponding to  $z$ .

It turns out that  $Mp^{\mathbb{C}}$  structures always exist on any symplectic manifold, and prequantized ones exist if and only if the combined integrality condition

$$\text{the class } h^{-1}[\omega] + \frac{1}{2}c_1(\omega)^{\mathbb{R}} \in H^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbb{R}) \text{ is integral}$$

is fulfilled. In that case, if  $\mathcal{P}$  is a positive polarization on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , one can again consider partial connections and covariantly constant sections of  $P$ , and define the corresponding Hilbert spaces and quantum operators more or less in the same way as before. Details can be found in Rawnsley and Robinson [212] and Blattner and Rawnsley [40]. It is also possible to define the BKS pairing in this situation.

**3.7. Some shortcomings.** Though the method of geometric quantization has been very successful, it has also some drawbacks. One of them is the dependence on the various ingredients, i.e. the choice of the prequantum bundle, metaplectic structure (or prequantized  $Mp^{\mathbb{C}}$ -structure), and polarization. The (equivalence classes of) various possible choices of the prequantum bundle are parameterized by the elements of the cohomology group  $H^1(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbf{T})$ , and have very sound physical interpretation (for instance, they allow for the difference between the bosons and the fermions, see Souriau [233]). The situation with the choices for the metaplectic structure, which are parameterized by  $H^1(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ , is already less satisfactory (for instance, for the harmonic oscillator, only one of the two choices gives the correct result for the energy levels; see [241], pp. 150–153). But things get even worse with the dependence on polarization. One would expect the Hilbert spaces associated to two different polarizations of the same symplectic manifold to be in some “intrinsic” way unitarily equivalent; more specifically, for any two polarizations  $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}'$  for which the BKS pairing exists, one would expect the corresponding operator  $H_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'}$  to be unitary, and such

that the corresponding quantum operators satisfy  $Q'_f H_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'} = H_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'} Q_f$  for any real observable  $f$  quantizable with respect to both  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$ . We have already noted in §3.5 that the former need not be the case ( $H_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'}$  can be a bounded invertible operator which is not unitary, nor even a multiple of a unitary operator), and it can be shown that even if  $H_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}'}$  is unitary, the latter claim can fail too (cf. [242]). Finally, it was shown by Gotay [114] that there are symplectic manifolds on which there do not exist any polarizations whatsoever.<sup>17</sup> Such phase spaces are, of course, “unquantizable” from the point of view of conventional geometric quantization theory.

Another drawback, perhaps the most conspicuous one, is that the space of quantizable observables is rather small; e.g. for  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and polarization given by the coordinates  $q_1, \dots, q_n$ , the space  $Obs$  consists of functions at most linear in  $p$ , thus excluding, for instance, the kinetic energy  $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{p}\|^2$ . The extension of the quantization map  $f \mapsto Q_f$  by means of the BKS pairing<sup>18</sup>, described in §3.5, (which gives the correct answer  $Q_f = -\frac{\hbar^2}{8\pi}\Delta$  for the kinetic energy  $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{p}\|^2$ ) is not entirely satisfactory, for the following reasons. First of all, as we have already noted in §3.5, it is currently not known under what conditions the pairing extends from compactly supported sections to the whole product  $\mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}} \times \mathfrak{H}_{\mathcal{P}_t}$  of the corresponding quantum Hilbert spaces; and even if the pairing so extends, it is not known under what conditions the derivative at  $t = 0$  in (3.58) exists. (And neither is it even known under what conditions the polarizations  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_t$  are such that the pairing can be defined in the first place — e.g. transversal etc.) Consequently, it is also unknown for which functions  $f$  the quantum operator  $Q_f$  is defined at all. For instance, using the formulas (3.59) and (3.60), Bao and Zhu [23] showed that for  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbb{R}^2$  (with the usual symplectic form) and  $f(p, q) = p^m$ ,  $Q_f$  is undefined as soon as  $m \geq 3$  (the integral in (3.60) then diverges as  $t \rightarrow 0$ ). Second, even when  $Q_f$  is defined all right, then, as we have also already noted in §3.5, owing to the highly nonexplicit nature of the formula (3.58) it is not even possible to tell beforehand whether this operator is at least formally symmetric, not to say self-adjoint. Third, even if  $Q_f$  are well defined and self-adjoint, their properties are not entirely satisfactory: for instance, in another paper by Bao and Zhu [22] they showed that for  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $f(p, q) = p^2 g(q)$ , one can again compute from (3.59) – (3.60) that (upon identifying  $\mathfrak{H}$  with  $L^2(\mathbb{R}, dq)$  by means of a suitable reference section)

$$(3.66) \quad Q_f \psi = \left(\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi}\right)^2 \left[ g\psi'' + g'\psi' + \left(\frac{g''}{4} - \frac{g'^2}{16g}\right)\psi \right],$$

so that, in particular, the dependence  $f \mapsto Q_f$  is not even linear(!). Finally, from the point of view of our axioms (Q1) – (Q5) set up in the beginning, the most serious

<sup>17</sup>It should be noted that — unlike the cohomology groups  $H^1(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbf{T})$  for the choices of the prequantum bundle and  $H^1(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mathbf{Z}_2)$  for the choice of the metaplectic structure — there seems to be, up to the authors’ knowledge, no known classifying space for the set of all polarizations on a given symplectic manifold, nor even a criterion for their existence.

<sup>18</sup>Sometimes this is also called the *method of infinitesimal pairing*.

drawback of (3.58) is that the operators  $Q_f$  so defined do not, in general, satisfy the commutator condition (Q3)!

*Remark 13.* For functions  $f$  such that  $X_f$  leaves  $\mathcal{P} + \overline{\mathcal{P}}$  invariant, it was shown by Tuynman that  $Q_f$  can be identified with a certain Toeplitz-type operator; see [242].  $\square$

For some further comments on why the standard theory of geometric quantization may seem unsatisfactory, see Blattner [38], p. 42, or Ali [3].

Finally, we should mention that in the case when  $\Gamma$  is a coadjoint orbit of a Lie group  $G$ , which operates on  $\Gamma$  by  $\omega$ -preserving diffeomorphisms, the geometric quantization is intimately related to the representation theory of  $G$  (the orbit method); see Kirillov [147], Chapter 14, and Vogan [256] for more information.

For further details on geometric quantization, the reader is advised to consult the extensive bibliography on the subject. In our exposition in §§3.2–3.6 we have closely followed the beautiful CWI syllabus of Tuynman [241], as well as the classics by Woodhouse [262] (see also the new edition [263]) and Sniatycki [231]; the books by Guillemin and Sternberg [123] and Hurt [133] are oriented slightly more towards the theory of Fourier integral operators and the representation theory, respectively. Other worthwhile sources include the papers by Sniatycki [230], Blattner and Rawnsley [39] [40], Czyz [66], Gawedzki [97], Hess [128], Rawnsley and Robinson [212], Robinson [218], Blattner [35] [36] [37], Tuynman [245] [246] [242] [243], Rawnsley [210], Kostant [156] [157] [155], and Souriau [233], the surveys by Blattner [38], Ali [3], Echeverria-Enriquez et al. [78], or Kirillov [148], and the recent books by Bates and Weinstein [28] and Puta [207], as well as the older one by Simms and Woodhouse [228].

#### 4. DEFORMATION QUANTIZATION

Deformation quantization tries to resolve the difficulties of geometric quantization by relaxing the axiom (Q3) to

$$(4.1) \quad [Q_f, Q_g] = -\frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} Q_{\{f,g\}} + O(\hbar^2).$$

Motivated by the asymptotic expansion for the Moyal product (1.8), one can try to produce this by first constructing a formal associative but noncommutative product  $*_{\hbar}$  (a *star product*), depending on  $\hbar$ , such that, in a suitable sense,

$$(4.2) \quad f *_{\hbar} g = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \hbar^j C_j(f, g)$$

as  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ , where the bilinear operators  $C_j$  satisfy

$$(4.3) \quad C_0(f, g) = fg, \quad C_1(f, g) - C_1(g, f) = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \{f, g\},$$

$$(4.4) \quad C_j(f, \mathbf{1}) = C_j(\mathbf{1}, f) = 0 \quad \forall j \geq 1.$$

Here “formal” means that  $f *_h g$  is not required to actually exist for any given value of  $h$ , but we only require the coefficients  $C_j : Obs \times Obs \rightarrow Obs$  to be well defined mappings for some function space  $Obs$  on  $\Gamma$  and satisfy the relations which make  $*_h$  formally associative. As a second step, one looks for an analogue of the Weyl calculus, i.e. one wants the product  $*_h$  to be genuine (not only formal) bilinear mapping from  $Obs \times Obs$  into  $Obs$  and seeks a linear assignment to each  $f \in Obs$  of an operator  $Q_f$  on a (fixed) separable Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$ , self-adjoint if  $f$  is real-valued, such that<sup>19</sup>

$$(4.5) \quad Q_f Q_g = Q_{f *_h g}.$$

Further, we also want the construction to satisfy the functoriality (=covariance) condition (Q4), which means that the star product should commute with any symplectic diffeomorphism  $\phi$ ,

$$(4.6) \quad (f \circ \phi) *_h (g \circ \phi) = (f *_h g) \circ \phi.$$

Finally, for  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  the star product should reduce to, or at least be in some sense equivalent to, the Moyal product.

The first step above is the subject of *formal deformation quantization*, which was introduced by Bayen, Flato, Fronsdal, Lichnerowicz and Sternheimer [29]. Namely, one considers the ring  $\mathcal{A} = C^\infty(\Gamma)[[h]]$  of all formal power series in  $h$  with  $C^\infty(\Gamma)$  coefficients, and seeks an associative  $\mathbb{C}[[h]]$ -linear mapping  $* : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  such that (4.2), (4.3) and (4.4) hold. This is a purely algebraic problem which had been solved by Gerstenhaber [101], who showed that the only obstruction for constructing  $*$  are certain Hochschild cohomology classes  $c_n \in H^3(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$  (the construction is possible if and only if all  $c_n$  vanish). Later Dewilde and Lecomte [72] showed that a formal star product exists on any symplectic manifold (thus the cohomological obstructions in fact never occur). More geometric constructions were subsequently given by Fedosov [87] (see also his book [88]) and Omori, Maeda and Yoshioka [192], but the question remained open whether the star product exists also for any Poisson manifold (i.e. for Poisson brackets given locally by  $\{f, g\} = \omega^{ij}(\partial_i f \cdot \partial_j g - \partial_j f \cdot \partial_i g)$  where the 2-form  $\omega$  is allowed to be degenerate). This question was finally settled in the affirmative by Kontsevich [154] on the basis of his “formality conjecture”. Yet another approach to formal deformation quantization on a symplectic manifold can be found in Karasev and Maslov [145]; star products with some additional properties (admitting a *formal trace*) are discussed in Connes, Flato and Sternheimer [64] and Flato and Sternheimer [92], and classification results are also available [34], [71], [183].

A formal star product is called *local* if the coefficients  $C_j$  are differential operators. If the manifold  $\Gamma$  has a complex structure (for instance, if  $\Gamma$  is Kähler), the star product is said to admit *separation of variables*<sup>20</sup> if  $f *_h g = fg$  (i.e.  $C_j(f, g) = 0 \forall j \geq 1$ ) whenever  $f$  is holomorphic or  $g$  is anti-holomorphic. See Karabegov [136], [137] for a systematic treatment of these matters.

<sup>19</sup>This is the condition which implies that  $*_h$  must be associative (since composition of operators is).

<sup>20</sup>Or to be of *Wick type*; *anti-Wick type* is similarly obtained upon replacing  $f *_h g$  by  $g *_h f$ .



The second step<sup>21</sup>, i.e. associating the Hilbert space operators  $Q_f$  to each  $f$ , is more technical. In the first place, this requires that  $f *_h g$  actually exist as a function on  $\Gamma$  for some (arbitrarily small) values of  $h$ . Even this is frequently not easy to verify for the formal star products discussed above. The usual approach is therefore, in fact, from the opposite — namely, one starts with some geometric construction of the operators  $Q_f$ , and then checks that the operation  $*$  defined by (4.5) is a star product, i.e. satisfies (4.2), (4.3) and (4.4).

In other words, one looks for an assignment  $f \mapsto Q_f$ , depending on the Planck parameter  $h$ , of operators  $Q_f$  on a separable Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$  to functions  $f \in C^\infty(\Gamma)$ , such that as  $h \rightarrow 0$ , there is an asymptotic expansion

$$(4.7) \quad Q_f^{(h)} Q_g^{(h)} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h^j Q_{C_j(f,g)}^{(h)}$$

for certain bilinear operators  $C_j : C^\infty(\Gamma) \times C^\infty(\Gamma) \rightarrow C^\infty(\Gamma)$ . Here (4.7) should be interpreted either in the weak sense, as

$$\left\langle a, \left[ Q_f^{(h)} Q_g^{(h)} - \sum_{j=1}^N h^j Q_{C_j(f,g)}^{(h)} \right] b \right\rangle = O(h^{N+1}) \quad \forall a, b \in \mathfrak{H}, \quad \forall N = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  stands for the inner product in  $\mathfrak{H}$ , or in the sense of norms

$$\left\| Q_f^{(h)} Q_g^{(h)} - \sum_{j=1}^N h^j Q_{C_j(f,g)}^{(h)} \right\| = O(h^{N+1}) \quad \forall N = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

where  $\| \cdot \|$  is the operator norm on  $\mathfrak{H}$ . Further,  $Q_f$  should satisfy the covariance condition (Q4), should (in some sense) reduce to the Weyl operators  $W_f$  for  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , and preferably, the  $C_j$  should be local (i.e. differential) operators.

For Kähler manifolds, these two problems are solved by the Berezin and Berezin-Toeplitz quantizations, respectively, which will be described in the next section. For a general symplectic (or even Poisson) manifold, analogous constructions seem to be so far unknown. An interesting method for constructing non-formal star products on general symplectic manifolds, using integration over certain two-dimensional surfaces (membranes) in the complexification  $\Gamma^\mathbb{C} \simeq \Gamma \times \Gamma$  of the phase space  $\Gamma$ , has recently been proposed by Karasev [142].

A systematic approach to such constructions<sup>22</sup> has been pioneered by Rieffel [214] [215] [216]. He defines a *strict deformation quantization* as a dense  $*$ -subalgebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $C^\infty(\Gamma)$  equipped, for each sufficiently small positive  $h$ , with a norm  $\| \cdot \|_h$ , an involution  $^*$  and an associative product  $\times_h$ , continuous with respect to  $\| \cdot \|_h$ , such that

- $h \mapsto \mathcal{A}_h :=$  the completion of  $(\mathcal{A}, ^*, \times_h)$  with respect to  $\| \cdot \|_h$ , is a continuous field of  $C^*$ -algebras;

<sup>21</sup>This is what we might call *analytic deformation quantization*.

<sup>22</sup>Sometimes referred to as  *$C^*$ -algebraic deformation quantization* (Landsman [164]).

- $^*$ ,  $\times_0$  and  $\|\cdot\|_0$  are the ordinary complex conjugation, pointwise product and supremum norm on  $C^\infty(\Gamma)$ , respectively;
- $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|(f \times_h g - g \times_h f) + \frac{ih}{2\pi}\{f, g\}\|_h = 0$ .

Using the Gelfand-Naimark theorem, one can then represent the  $C^*$ -algebras  $\mathcal{A}_h$  as Hilbert space operators, and thus eventually arrive at the desired quantization rule  $f \mapsto Q_f$ . (One still needs to worry about the covariance and irreducibility conditions (Q4) and (Q5), which are not directly built into Rieffel's definition, but let us ignore these for a moment.) The difficulty is that examples are scarce — all of them make use of the Fourier transform in some way and are thus limited to a setting where the latter makes sense (for instance, one can recover the Moyal product in this way). In fact, the motivation behind the definition comes from operator algebras and Connes' non-commutative differential geometry rather than quantization. A broader concept is a *strict quantization* [217]: it is defined as a family of  $*$ -morphisms  $T_h$  from a dense  $*$ -subalgebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $C^\infty(\Gamma)$  into  $C^*$ -algebras  $\mathcal{A}_h$ , for  $h$  in some subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  accumulating at 0, such that  $\text{Ran } T_h$  spans  $\mathcal{A}_h$  for each  $h$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_0 = C^\infty(\Gamma)$  and  $T_0$  is the inclusion map of  $\mathcal{A}$  into  $\mathcal{A}_0$ , the functions  $h \mapsto \|T_h(f)\|_h$  are continuous for each  $f \in \mathcal{A}$ , and

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|T_h(f)T_h(g) - T_h(fg)\|_h \rightarrow 0, \\ & \|[T_h(f), T_h(g)] + \frac{ih}{2\pi}T_h(\{f, g\})\|_h \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $h \rightarrow 0$ , for each  $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$ . (Thus the main difference from strict deformation quantization is that the product  $T_h(f)T_h(g)$  is not required to be in the range of  $T_h$ .) Comparing the second condition with (4.1) we see that  $Q_f = T_h(f)$  gives the quantization rule we wanted. (We again temporarily ignore (Q4) and (Q5).) Though this seems not to have been treated in Rieffel's papers, it is also obvious how to modify these definitions so as to obtain the whole expansion (4.2) instead of just (4.1).

Strict quantizations are already much easier to come by, see for instance Landsman [160] for coadjoint orbits of compact connected Lie groups. However, even the notion of strict quantization is still unnecessarily restrictive — we shall see below that one can construct interesting star-products even when (4.8) is satisfied only in a much weaker sense. (The Berezin-Toeplitz quantization is a strict quantization but not strict deformation quantization; the Berezin quantization is not even a strict quantization.)

Recently, a number of advances in this “operator-algebraic” deformation quantization have come from the theory of symplectic groupoids, see Weinstein [259], Zakrzewski [264], Landsman [161] [163], and the books of Landsman [162] and Weinstein and Cannas da Silva [58]. A discussion of deformation quantization of coadjoint orbits of a Lie group, which again exhibits an intimate relationship to group representations and the Kirillov orbit method, can be found e.g. in Vogan [256], Landsman [160], Bar-Moshe and Marinov [24], Lledo [166], and Fioresi and Lledo [91]. A gauge-invariant



quantization method which, in the authors' words, "synthesizes the geometric, deformation and Berezin quantization approaches", was proposed by Fradkin and Linetsky [95] and Fradkin [94].

We remark that, in a sense, the second step in the deformation quantization is not strictly necessary — an alternate route is to cast the von Neumann formalism, interpreting  $\langle \Pi(Q_f)u, u \rangle$  (where  $\Pi(Q_f)$  is the spectral measure of  $Q_f$ ) as the probability distribution of the result of measuring  $f$  in the state  $u$ , into a form involving only products of operators, and then replace the latter by the corresponding star products. Thus, for instance, instead of looking for eigenvalues of an operator  $Q_f$ , i.e. solving the equation  $Q_f u = \lambda u$ , with  $\|u\| = 1$ , one looks for solutions of  $f * \pi = \lambda \pi$ , with  $\pi = \bar{\pi} = \pi * \pi$  ( $\pi$  corresponds to the projection operator  $\langle \cdot, u \rangle u$ ); or, more generally, one defines the (*star*-) *spectrum* of  $f$  as the support of the measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  for which

$$\text{Exp}(tf) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i \lambda t/h} d\mu(\lambda)$$

(in the sense of distributions) where  $\text{Exp}(tf)$  is the *star exponential*

$$\text{Exp}(tf) := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \left( \frac{2\pi t}{ih} \right)^m \underbrace{f * \cdots * f}_{m \text{ times}}.$$

See Bayen et al. [29]. In this way, some authors even perceive deformation quantization as a device for "freeing" the quantization of the "burden" of the Hilbert space.

Some other nice articles on deformation quantization are Sternheimer [237], Arnal, Cortet, Flato and Sternheimer [19], Weinstein [260], Fernandes [89], and Blattner [38]; two recent survey papers are Gutt [125] and Dito and Sternheimer [74]. See also Neumaier [185], Bordemann and Waldmann [46], Karabegov [138] [140], Duval, Gradechi and Ovsienko [77], and the above mentioned books by Fedosov [88] and Landsman [162] and papers by Rieffel [215] [217].

## 5. BEREZIN AND BEREZIN-TOEPLITZ QUANTIZATION ON KÄHLER MANIFOLDS

Recall that a Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$  whose elements are functions on a set  $\Gamma$  is called a *reproducing kernel Hilbert space* (rkhs for short) if for each  $x \in \Gamma$ , the evaluation map  $\phi \mapsto \phi(x)$  is continuous on  $\mathfrak{H}$ . By the Riesz-Fischer representation theorem, this means that there exist vectors  $K_x \in \mathfrak{H}$  such that

$$\phi(x) = \langle K_x, \phi \rangle \quad \forall \phi \in \mathfrak{H}.$$

The function

$$K(x, y) = \langle K_x, K_y \rangle, \quad x, y \in \Gamma$$

is called the *reproducing kernel* of  $\mathfrak{H}$ . Let us assume further that the scalar product in  $\mathfrak{H}$  is in fact the  $L^2$  product with respect to some measure  $\mu$  on  $\Gamma$ . (Thus  $\mathfrak{H}$  is a

subspace of  $L^2(\Gamma, \mu)$ .) Then any bounded linear operator  $A$  on  $\mathfrak{H}$  can be written as an integral operator,

$$\begin{aligned} A\phi(x) &= \langle K_x, A\phi \rangle = \langle A^* K_x, \phi \rangle = \int_{\Gamma} \phi(y) \overline{A^* K_x(y)} d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_{\Gamma} \phi(y) \langle A^* K_x, K_y \rangle d\mu(y) = \int_{\Gamma} \phi(y) \langle K_x, AK_y \rangle d\mu(y), \end{aligned}$$

with kernel  $\langle K_x, AK_y \rangle$ . The function

$$(5.1) \quad A(x, y) = \frac{\langle K_x, AK_y \rangle}{\langle K_x, K_y \rangle}$$

restricted to the diagonal is called the *lower* (or *covariant*) symbol  $\tilde{A}$  of  $A$ :

$$(5.2) \quad \tilde{A}(x) := A(x, x) = \frac{\langle K_x, AK_x \rangle}{\langle K_x, K_x \rangle}.$$

Clearly the correspondence  $A \mapsto \tilde{A}$  is linear, preserves conjugation (i.e.  $\widetilde{A^*} = \overline{\tilde{A}}$ ) and for the identity operator  $I$  on  $\mathfrak{H}$  one has  $\tilde{I} = \mathbf{1}$ .

For any function  $f$  such that  $f\mathfrak{H} \subset L^2(\Gamma, \mu)$  — for instance, for any  $f \in L^\infty(\Gamma, \mu)$  — the *Toeplitz operator* on  $\mathfrak{H}$  is defined by  $T_f(\phi) = P(f\phi)$ , where  $P$  is the orthogonal projection of  $L^2$  onto  $\mathfrak{H}$ . In other words,

$$(5.3) \quad T_f\phi(x) = \langle K_x, f\phi \rangle = \int_{\Gamma} \phi(y) f(y) K(x, y) d\mu(y).$$

The function  $f$  is called the *upper* (or *contravariant*<sup>23</sup>) symbol of the Toeplitz operator  $T_f$ . The operator connecting the upper and the lower symbol

$$(5.4) \quad f \mapsto \tilde{T}_f, \quad \tilde{T}_f(x) = \int_{\Gamma} f(y) \frac{|K(x, y)|^2}{K(x, x)} d\mu(y) =: Bf(x),$$

is called the *Berezin transform*. (It is defined only at points  $x$  where  $K(x, x) \neq 0$ .)

In general, an operator  $A$  need not be uniquely determined by its lower symbol  $\tilde{A}$ ; however, this is always the case if  $\Gamma$  is a complex manifold and the elements of  $\mathfrak{H}$  are *holomorphic* functions. (This is a consequence of the fact that  $A(x, y)$  is then a meromorphic function of the variables  $y$  and  $\bar{x}$ , hence also of  $u = y + \bar{x}$  and  $v = i(y - \bar{x})$ , and thus is uniquely determined by its restriction to the real axes  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , i.e. to  $x = y$ .) In that case the correspondence  $A \leftrightarrow \tilde{A}$  is a bijection from the space  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$  of all bounded linear operators on  $\mathfrak{H}$  onto a certain subspace  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{H}} \subset C^\omega(\Gamma)$  of real-analytic functions on  $\Gamma$ , and one can therefore transfer the

---

<sup>23</sup>The adjectives *upper* and *lower* seem preferable to the more commonly used *contravariant* and *covariant*, as the latter have quite different meanings in differential geometry. The terms *active* and *passive* are also used.

operator multiplication in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$  to a non-commutative and associative product  $*_{\mathfrak{H}}$  on  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{H}}$ . Specifically, one has

$$(5.5) \quad (f *_{\mathfrak{H}} g)(y) = \int_{\Gamma} f(y, x) g(x, y) \frac{|K(x, y)|^2}{K(y, y)} d\mu(x), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{H}},$$

where  $f(x, y), g(x, y)$  are functions on  $\Gamma \times \Gamma$ , holomorphic in  $x$  and  $\bar{y}$ , such that  $f(x, x) = f(x)$  and  $g(x, x) = g(x)$  (cf. (5.1) and (5.2)).

In particular, these considerations can be applied when  $\mathfrak{H}$  is the Bergman space  $A^2(\Gamma, \mu)$  of all holomorphic functions in the Lebesgue space  $L^2(\Gamma, \mu)$  on a complex manifold  $\Gamma$  equipped with a measure  $\mu$  such that  $A^2(\Gamma, \mu) \neq \{0\}$ . Suppose now that we have in fact a family  $\mu_h$  of such measures, indexed by a small real parameter  $h > 0$ . (It suffices that  $h$  — the Planck constant — range over some subset of  $\mathbb{R}_+$  having 0 as an accumulation point.) Then one gets a family of Hilbert spaces  $\mathfrak{H}_h = A^2(\Gamma, \mu_h)$  and of the corresponding products  $*_{\mathfrak{H}_h} =: *_h$  on the spaces  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{H}_h} =: \mathcal{A}_h$ . Berezin's idea (phrased in today's terms) was to choose the measures  $\mu_h$  in such a way that these products  $*_h$  yield a star-product. More specifically, let  $(\mathcal{A}, *)$  be the direct sum of all algebras  $(\mathcal{A}_h, *_h)$ , and let  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  be a linear subset of  $\mathcal{A}$  such that each  $f = \{f_h(x)\}_h \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  has an asymptotic expansion

$$(5.6) \quad f_h(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h^j f_j(x) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0$$

with real-analytic functions  $f_j(x)$  on  $\Gamma$ . We will say that  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  is *total* if for any  $N > 0$ ,  $x \in \Gamma$  and  $F \in C^\omega(\Gamma)[[h]]$  there exists  $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  whose asymptotic expansion (5.6) coincides with  $F(x)$  modulo  $O(h^N)$ . Suppose that we can show that there exists a total set  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subset \mathcal{A}$  such that for any  $f, g \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ , one has  $f * g \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  and

$$(5.7) \quad (f * g)_h(x) = \sum_{i,j,k \geq 0} C_k(f_i, g_j)(x) h^{i+j+k} \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0,$$

where  $C_k : C^\omega(\Gamma) \times C^\omega(\Gamma) \rightarrow C^\omega(\Gamma)$  are some bilinear differential operators such that

$$(5.8) \quad C_0(\phi, \psi) = \phi\psi, \quad C_1(\phi, \psi) - C_1(\psi, \phi) = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \{\phi, \psi\}.$$

Then the recipe

$$(5.9) \quad \left( \sum_{i \geq 0} f_i h^i \right) * \left( \sum_{j \geq 0} g_j h^j \right) := \left( \sum_{i,j,k \geq 0} C_k(f_i, g_j) h^{i+j+k} \right)$$

gives a star-product on  $C^\infty(\Gamma)[[h]]$  discussed in the preceding section. Moreover, this time it is not just a formal star product, since for functions in the total set  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  it really exists as an element of  $C^\infty(\Gamma)$ , and, in fact, for each  $h$  we can pass from  $\mathcal{A}_h$  back to  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_h)$  and thus represent  $f_h(x)$  as an operator  $\text{Op}^{(h)} f$  on the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}_h$ . If we can further find a linear and conjugation-preserving “lifting”

$$(5.10) \quad f \mapsto Lf$$

from  $C^\infty(\mathbf{\Gamma})$  (or a large subspace thereof) into  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $(L\phi)_0 = \phi$ , then the mapping

$$\phi \mapsto \text{Op}^{(h)}(L\phi) =: Q_\phi$$

will be the desired quantization rule, provided we can take care of the axioms (Q4) (functoriality) and (Q5) (the case of  $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \simeq \mathbb{C}^n$ ). (It is easy to see that for real-valued  $\phi$  the operators  $\text{Op}^{(h)}(L\phi)$  are self-adjoint.)

To see how to find measures  $\mu_h$  satisfying (5.7)–(5.8), consider first the case when there is a group  $G$  acting on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  by biholomorphic transformations preserving the symplectic form  $\omega$ . In accordance with our axiom (Q4), we then want the product  $*$  to be  $G$ -invariant, i.e. to satisfy (4.6). An examination of (5.5) shows that for two Bergman spaces  $\mathfrak{H} = A^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mu)$  and  $\mathfrak{H}' = A^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \mu')$ , the products  $*_{\mathfrak{H}}$  and  $*_{\mathfrak{H}'}$  coincide if and only if

$$(5.11) \quad \frac{|K(x, y)|^2}{K(y, y)} d\mu(x) = \frac{|K'(x, y)|^2}{K'(y, y)} d\mu'(x).$$

In particular,  $d\mu'/d\mu$  has to be a squared modulus of an analytic function; conversely, if  $d\mu' = |F|^2 d\mu$  with holomorphic  $F$ , then one can easily check that  $K(x, y) = \overline{F(x)}F(y)K'(x, y)$ , and hence (5.11) holds. Thus the requirement that  $*_{\mathfrak{H}}$  be  $G$ -invariant means that there exist analytic functions  $\phi_g$ ,  $g \in G$ , such that

$$d\mu(g(x)) = |\phi_g(x)|^2 d\mu(x).$$

Assuming now that  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the ( $G$ -invariant) measure  $\nu = \bigwedge^n \omega$  on  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ ,

$$d\mu(x) = w(x) d\nu(x),$$

the last condition means that

$$w(g(x)) = w(x) |\phi_g(x)|^2.$$

Hence the form  $\partial\bar{\partial} \log w$  is  $G$ -invariant. But the simplest examples of  $G$ -invariant forms (and if  $G$  is sufficiently “ample”, the only ones) are clearly the constant multiples of the form  $\omega$ . Thus if  $\omega$  lies in the range of  $\partial\bar{\partial}$ , i.e. if  $\omega$  is not only symplectic but Kähler, we are led to take

$$(5.12) \quad d\mu_h(x) = e^{-\alpha\Phi(x)} d\nu(x)$$

where  $\alpha = \alpha(h)$  depends only on  $h$  and  $\Phi$  is a *Kähler potential* for the form  $\omega$  (i.e.  $\omega = \partial\bar{\partial}\Phi$ ).

In his papers [31], Berezin showed that for  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbb{C}^n$  with the standard Kähler form  $\omega = i \sum_j dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j$ , as well as for  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \omega)$  a bounded symmetric domain with the invariant metric, choosing  $\mu_h$  as in (5.12) with  $\alpha = 1/h$  indeed yields an (invariant) product  $*$  satisfying (5.7)–(5.8), and hence one obtains a star product. Berezin did not consider the “lifting” (5.10) (in fact, he viewed his whole procedure as a means of freeing the quantum mechanics from the Hilbert space!), but he established an asymptotic formula for the Berezin transform  $B = B_h$  in (5.4) as  $h \rightarrow 0$  from which it follows that one can take as the lifting  $Lf$  of  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbf{\Gamma})$  the Toeplitz operators

$T_f = T_f^{(h)}$  given by (5.3). Finally, in the case of  $\Gamma = \mathbb{C}^n \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  one obtains for  $T_{\text{Re } z_j}$  and  $T_{\text{Im } z_j}$  operators which can be shown to be unitarily equivalent to the Schrödinger representation (1.1). Thus we indeed obtain the desired quantization rule.

For a long time, the applicability of Berezin's procedure remained confined essentially to the above two examples, in other words, to Hermitian symmetric spaces. The reason was that it is not so easy to prove the formulas (5.7)–(5.8) for a general Kähler manifold (with the measures given by (5.12)). Doing this is tantamount to obtaining the asymptotics (as  $h \rightarrow 0$ ) of the Berezin transform (5.4), which in turn depend on the asymptotics of the reproducing kernels  $K_h(x, y)$ . For  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and bounded symmetric domains, these kernels can be computed explicitly, and turn out to be given by

$$(5.13) \quad K_\alpha(x, y) = c(\alpha) e^{\alpha \Phi(x, y)},$$

where  $c(\alpha)$  is a polynomial in  $\alpha$  and  $\Phi(x, y)$  is a function analytic in  $x, \bar{y}$  which coincides with the potential  $\Phi(x)$  for  $x = y$ . It follows that

$$B_\alpha f(x) = c(\alpha) \int_\Gamma f(y) e^{-\alpha S(x, y)} dy$$

where  $S(x, y) = \Phi(x, y) + \Phi(y, x) - \Phi(x, x) - \Phi(y, y)$ , and one can apply the standard Laplace (=stationary phase, WJKB) method to get the asymptotics (5.4).<sup>24</sup>

Thus what we need is an analog of the formula (5.13) for a general Kähler manifold. This was first established by Peetre and the second author for  $(\Gamma, \omega)$  the annulus in  $\mathbb{C}$  with the Poincaré metric and  $x = y$  [79], and then extended, in turn, to all planar domains with the Poincaré metric [80], to some Reinhardt domains in  $\mathbb{C}^2$  with a natural rotation-invariant form  $\omega$  [81], and finally to all smoothly bounded strictly-pseudoconvex domains in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  with Kähler form  $\omega$  whose potential  $\Phi$  behaves like a power of  $\text{dist}(\cdot, \partial\Gamma)$  near the boundary [82] [84].

So far we have tacitly assumed that the potential  $\Phi$  is a globally defined function on  $\Gamma$ . We hasten to remark that almost nothing changes if  $\Phi$  exists only locally (which it always does, in view of the Kählerness of  $\omega$ ); the only change is that instead of functions one has to consider sections of a certain holomorphic Hermitian line bundle, whose Hermitian metric in the fiber is locally given by  $e^{-\alpha \Phi(x)}$ , and for this bundle to exist certain cohomology integrality conditions (identical to the prequantization conditions in the geometric quantization) have to be satisfied. For a more detailed discussion of reproducing kernels and of the upper and lower symbols of operators in the line (or even vector) bundle setting, see Pasternak-Winiarski [197], Pasternak-Winiarski and Wojcieszynski [198] and Peetre [201].

We also remark that Berezin quantization of cotangent bundles (i.e.  $\Gamma = T^*\mathfrak{Q}$  with the standard symplectic form  $\omega$ ) was announced by Šereševskii [224], who however was able to quantize only functions polynomial in the moment variables  $p$ .

---

<sup>24</sup>The function  $S(x, y)$  appeared for the first time in the paper of Calabi [57] on imbeddings of Kähler manifolds into  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , under the name of *diastatic function*.

In the Berezin quantization, the formula (4.1) is satisfied only in the following weak sense,

$$\langle K_x^{(h)}, ([Q_\phi^{(h)}, Q_\psi^{(h)}] + \frac{ih}{2\pi} Q_{\{\phi, \psi\}}^{(h)}) K_y^{(h)} \rangle = O(h^2) \quad \forall x, y \in \Gamma, \quad \forall \phi, \psi \in C^\infty(\Gamma).$$

(We write  $Q_\phi^{(h)}$  instead of  $Q_\phi$  etc. in order to make clear the dependence on  $h$ .) A natural question is whether one can strengthen this to hold in the operator norm. More specifically, using the lifting  $L : f \mapsto T_f^{(h)}$  given by the Toeplitz operators, one would like to replace (5.7) by

$$(5.14) \quad \left\| T_f^{(h)} T_g^{(h)} - \sum_{j=0}^N h^j T_{C_j(f, g)}^{(h)} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_h)} = O(h^{N+1})$$

for all  $N > 0$ , for some bilinear differential operators  $C_j$  satisfying (5.8). This is called the *Berezin-Toeplitz* (or *Wick*) quantization. In the language of the preceding section, Berezin-Toeplitz quantization (unlike Berezin quantization) is an example of a strict quantization in the sense of Rieffel. (Here and throughout the rest of this section, the Toeplitz operators are still taken with respect to the measures (5.12) with  $\alpha = 1/h$ .)

Curiously enough, (5.14) was first established not for  $\Gamma = \mathbb{C}^n$  with the Euclidean metric, but for the unit disc and the Poincaré metric; see Klimek and Lesniewski [150]. The same authors subsequently extended these results to any plane domain using uniformization [151], and to bounded symmetric domains with Borthwick and Upmeyer [49]. (Supersymmetric generalizations also exist, see [50].) The case of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  was treated later by Coburn [63]. For compact Kähler manifolds (with holomorphic sections of line bundles in place of holomorphic functions), a very elegant treatment was given by Bordemann, Meinrenken and Schlichenmaier [45] using the theory of generalized Toeplitz operators of Boutet de Monvel and Guillemin [53]; see also Schlichenmaier [221] [222], Karabegov and Schlichenmaier [141], Guillemin [122], Zelditch [265] and Catlin [59]. The same approach also works for smoothly bounded strictly pseudoconvex domains in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  with Kähler forms  $\omega$  whose potential behaves nicely at the boundary, see [84], as well as for  $\Gamma = \mathbb{C}^n$  with the standard (=Euclidean) Kähler form [47]. For some generalizations to non-Kähler case see Borthwick and Uribe [51].

We remark that the star products (5.9) determined by the  $C_j$  in (5.14) and in (5.7) are not the same; they are, however, equivalent, in the following sense. If one views the Berezin transform (5.4) formally as a power series in  $h$  with differential operators on  $\Gamma$  as coefficients, then

$$B_h(f *_{BT} g) = (B_h f) *_B (B_h g),$$

where  $*_B$  and  $*_{BT}$  stand for the star products (B=Berezin, BT=Berezin-Toeplitz) coming from (5.7) and (5.14), respectively. In the terminology of [136], the two products are *duals* of each other. See the last page in [84] for the details. The Berezin-Toeplitz star product  $*_{BT}$  is usually called *Wick*, and the Berezin star product  $*_B$  *anti-Wick*. (For  $\Gamma = \mathbb{C}^n \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , they are further related to the Moyal-Weyl product  $*_{MW}$

from Section 1 by  $B_h^{1/2}(f *_M g) = B_h^{1/2} f *_B B_h^{1/2} g$ , or  $B_h^{1/2}(f *_B g) = B_h^{1/2} f *_M B_h^{1/2} g$ , where  $B_h^{1/2} = e^{h\Delta/2}$  is the square root of  $B_h = e^{h\Delta}$ .)

Berezin's ideas were initially developed further only in the context of symmetric (homogeneous) spaces, i.e. in the presence of a transitive action of a Lie group. The coefficients  $C_j(\cdot, \cdot)$  are then closely related to the invariant differential operators on  $\Gamma$ ; see Moreno [174], Moreno and Ortega-Navarro [175], Arnal, Cahen and Gutt [18] and Bordemann et al. [43] for some interesting results on star products in this context. Some connections with Rieffel's  $C^*$ -algebraic theory can be found in Radulescu [208]. Formal Berezin and Berezin-Toeplitz star products on arbitrary Kähler manifolds were studied by Karabegov [136], [139], Karabegov and Schlichenmaier [141] and Reshetikhin and Takhtajan [213] (cf. also Cornalba and Taylor [65] for a formal expansion of the Bergman kernel); see also Hawkins [127].

Evidently, a central topic in these developments is the dependence of the reproducing kernel  $K_\mu(x, y)$  of a Bergman space  $A^2(\Gamma, \mu)$  on the measure  $\mu$ . This dependence is still far from being well understood. For instance, for  $(\Gamma, \omega)$  a Hermitian symmetric space (or  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ) with the invariant metric and the corresponding Kähler form  $\omega$ ,  $\Phi$  a potential for  $\omega$ , and  $\nu = \bigwedge^n \omega$  the Liouville (invariant) measure ( $n = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \Gamma$ ), the weight function  $w(x) = e^{-\alpha\Phi(x)}$  (with  $\alpha \gg 0$ ) has the property that

$$K_{w d\nu}(x, x) = \frac{\text{const.}}{w(x)}.$$

The existence of similar weights  $w$  on a general Kähler manifold is an open problem. See Odziejewicz [188], p. 584, for some remarks and physical motivation for studying equations of this type. Some results on the dependence  $\mu \mapsto K_\mu$  are in Pasternak-Winiarski [199].

## 6. PRIME QUANTIZATION

The most straightforward way of extending (1.1) to more general functions on  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  is to specify a *choice of ordering*. For instance, for a polynomial

$$(6.1) \quad f(p, q) = \sum_{m, k} a_{mk} q^m p^k$$

one can declare that  $Q_f = f(Q_p, Q_q)$  with the  $Q_q$  ordered to the left of the  $Q_p$ :

$$(6.2) \quad Q(f) = \sum_{m, k} a_{mk} Q_q^m Q_p^k.$$

(Here  $m, k$  are multiindices and we ignore the subtleties concerning the domains of definition etc. We will also sometimes write  $Q(f)$  instead of  $Q_f$ , for typesetting reasons.) Extending this (formally) from polynomials to entire functions, in particular to the exponentials  $e^{2\pi i(p \cdot \xi + q \cdot \eta)}$ , we get<sup>25</sup>

$$Q(e^{2\pi i(p \cdot \xi + q \cdot \eta)}) = e^{2\pi i \eta \cdot Q(q)} e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot Q(p)}.$$

---

<sup>25</sup>Here we are using the real scalar product notation  $p \cdot \xi = p_1 \xi_1 + \dots + p_n \xi_n$ .



Finally, decomposing an “arbitrary” function  $f(p, q)$  into exponentials via the Fourier transform, as in Section 1, we arrive at a quantization recipe

$$(6.3) \quad Q_f \phi(x) = \iint f(p, x) e^{2\pi i(x-y) \cdot p/h} \phi(y) dp dy.$$

Similarly, using instead of (6.2) the opposite choice of ordering

$$(6.4) \quad Q\left(\sum_{m,k} q^k p^m\right) = \sum_{m,k} Q_p^k Q_q^m$$

we arrive at

$$(6.5) \quad Q_f \phi(x) = \iint f(p, y) e^{2\pi i(x-y) \cdot p/h} \phi(y) dp dy.$$

The rules (6.5) and (6.3) are the standard Kohn-Nirenberg calculi of pseudodifferential operators, see [153], [93], §23. A more sophisticated set of ordering rules generalizing (6.3) and (6.5) can be obtained by fixing a  $t \in [0, 1]$  and setting

$$(6.6) \quad Q_f \phi(x) = \iint f(p, (1-t)x + ty) e^{2\pi i(x-y) \cdot p/h} \phi(y) dp dy.$$

The choice  $t = \frac{1}{2}$  gives the Weyl calculus (1.7), which can thus be thought of as corresponding to a “symmetric” ordering of  $Q_q$  and  $Q_p$ .

The drawback of (6.2) and (6.4) is that they need not be self-adjoint operators for real-valued symbols  $f$ . This can be remedied by viewing  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  as  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and making the change of coordinates  $z = (q + ip)/\sqrt{2}$ ,  $\bar{z} = (q - ip)/\sqrt{2}$ . The operators  $Q_z$  and  $Q_{\bar{z}} = Q_z^*$  are then the *annihilation* and *creation* operators

$$Q_z = \frac{Q_q + iQ_p}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad Q_z^* = \frac{Q_q - iQ_p}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

One can then again assign to a polynomial  $f(z, \bar{z}) = \sum b_{mk} z^m \bar{z}^k$  either the operator

$$Q_f = \sum b_{mk} Q(z)^m Q(z)^{*k}$$

or the operator

$$Q_f = \sum b_{mk} Q(z)^{*k} Q(z)^m$$

which is called the Wick (or normal) and the anti-Wick (anti-normal) ordering, respectively. The corresponding Wick and anti-Wick calculi are discussed in §3.7 of Folland’s book [93]. The anti-Wick calculus turns out not to be so interesting, but the Wick calculus has an important reformulation if we replace the underlying Hilbert space  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , on which the operators  $Q_f$  act, by the *Fock* (or *Segal-Bargmann*) space  $A^2(\mathbb{C}^n, \mu_h)$  of all entire functions on  $\mathbb{C}^n$  square-integrable with respect to the Gaussian measure  $d\mu_h(z) := (\pi h)^{-n} e^{-|z|^2/h} dz$  ( $dz$  being the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ). Namely, the Bargmann transform

$$(6.7) \quad \beta : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \ni f \longmapsto \beta f(z) := (2\pi h)^{n/4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) e^{2\pi i x \cdot z - h\pi^2 x \cdot x - z \cdot z/2h} dx \in A^2(\mathbb{C}^n, \mu_h)$$



is a unitary isomorphism and upon passing from  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  to  $A^2(\mathbb{C}^n, \mu_h)$  via  $\beta$ , the operators  $Q_f$  become the familiar Toeplitz operators (5.3):

$$(6.8) \quad \beta Q_f \beta^{-1} = T_f, \text{ with } T_f \phi(x) := \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} f(y) \phi(y) K_h(x, y) d\mu_h(y),$$

where  $K_h(x, y) = e^{x\bar{y}/h}$  is the reproducing kernel for the space  $A^2(\mathbb{C}^n, \mu_h)$ . In this way, we thus recover on  $\mathbb{C}^n$  the Berezin-Toeplitz quantization discussed in the preceding section.

Another way of writing (6.8) is

$$(6.9) \quad T_f = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} f(y) \Delta_y dy,$$

where  $\Delta_y = |k_y\rangle\langle k_y| = \langle k_y, \cdot \rangle k_y$  is the rank-one projection operator onto the complex line spanned by the unit vector

$$(6.10) \quad k_y := \frac{K_h(\cdot, y)}{\|K_h(\cdot, y)\|}.$$

This suggests looking, quite generally, for quantization rules of the form (6.9), with a set of “quantizers”  $\Delta_y$  ( $y \in \Gamma$ ) which may be thought of as reflecting the choice of ordering. This is the basis of the *prime quantization* method introduced in [9] (see also [205]), where it is also explained how the choice of the quantizers (hence also of the ordering) is to be justified on physical grounds. The main result of [9] is that if the quantizers  $\Delta_y$  are bounded positive operators,  $\Delta_y \geq 0$ , on some (abstract) Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$ , then there exists a direct integral Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K} = \int_{\Gamma}^{\oplus} \mathcal{K}_x d\nu(x)$  (see [54]), where  $\mathcal{K}_x$  is a family of separable Hilbert spaces indexed by  $x \in \Gamma$  and  $\nu$  is a measure on  $\Gamma$ , and an isometry  $\iota : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  of  $\mathfrak{H}$  onto a subspace of  $\mathcal{K}$  such that

- (i)  $\iota\mathfrak{H}$  is a “vector-valued” reproducing kernel Hilbert space, in the sense that for each  $x \in \Gamma$  there is a bounded linear operator  $E_x$  from  $\iota\mathfrak{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}_x$  such that for any  $f = \int_{\Gamma}^{\oplus} f_y d\nu(y) \in \iota\mathfrak{H}$ , one has

$$(6.11) \quad f_x = \int_{\Gamma} E_x E_y^* f_y d\nu(y) \quad \forall x \in \Gamma.$$

- (ii)  $\iota\Delta_y\iota^* = E_y^* E_y$ .

The operators

$$T_f = \int_{\Gamma} f(y) \Delta_y d\nu(y)$$

thus satisfy

$$(6.12) \quad T_f = \int_{\Gamma} f(y) \iota^* E_y^* E_y \iota d\nu(y).$$

If  $\mathcal{K}_x = \mathbb{C}$  for every  $x \in \Gamma$ , one can identify  $\mathcal{K}$  with  $L^2(\Gamma, \nu)$ ,  $\iota$  with an inclusion map of  $\mathfrak{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$ , and  $E_x$  with the functional  $\langle K_x, \cdot \rangle$  for some vector  $K_x \in \mathfrak{H}$ ; thus (6.11)

becomes

$$f(x) = \int_{\mathbf{\Gamma}} f(y) K(x, y) d\nu(y) \quad \forall f \in \mathfrak{H}, \text{ where } K(x, y) := \langle K_x, K_y \rangle,$$

so  $\mathfrak{H}$  is an (ordinary) reproducing kernel Hilbert subspace of  $L^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \nu)$  with reproducing kernel  $K(x, y)$ , and (6.12) reads

$$T_f = \int_{\mathbf{\Gamma}} f(y) |K_y\rangle \langle K_y| d\nu(y),$$

i.e.  $T_f$  is the Toeplitz type operator

$$T_f \phi = P(f\phi)$$

where  $P$  is the orthogonal projection of  $L^2(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \nu)$  onto  $\mathfrak{H}$ . In particular, for  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbb{C}^n$  and  $\nu$  the Gaussian measure we recover (6.8) and (6.9).

Note that the Weyl quantization operators (1.7), transferred to  $A^2(\mathbb{C}^n, \mu_h)$  via the Bargmann transform (6.7), can also be written in the form (6.9), namely (cf. [93], p. 141)

$$(6.13) \quad \beta W_f \beta^{-1} = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} f(y) s_y dy,$$

where  $y = q - ip$  ( $(p, q) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ) and

$$s_y \phi(z) = \phi(2y - z) e^{2\bar{y} \cdot (z - y)/h}$$

is the self-adjoint unitary map of  $A^2(\mathbb{C}^n, \mu_h)$  induced by the symmetry  $z \mapsto 2y - z$  of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . In contrast to (6.9), however, this time the quantizers  $s_y$  are not positive operators.

Given  $\Delta_y$ , one can also consider the “dequantization” operator  $T \mapsto \tilde{T}$ ,

$$(6.14) \quad \tilde{T}(y) := \text{Trace}(T \Delta_y),$$

which assigns functions to operators. For the Weyl calculus, it turns out that  $\tilde{W}_f = f$ , a reflection of the fact that the mapping  $f \mapsto W_f$  is a unitary map from  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$  onto the space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators (an observation due to Pool [204]). For the Wick calculus (6.9),  $\tilde{T}_f$  is precisely the Berezin transform of  $f$ , discussed above, and the function  $\tilde{T}$  is the lower (covariant, passive) symbol of the operator  $T$  (and  $f$  is the upper (contravariant, active) symbol of the Toeplitz operator  $T_f$ ). Using the same ideas as in the previous section, one can thus try to construct, for a general set of quantizers  $\Delta_y$ , a Berezin-Toeplitz type star product

$$f *_h g = \sum_{j \geq 0} C_j(f, g) h^j, \quad f, g \in C^\infty(\mathbf{\Gamma}),$$

by establishing an asymptotic expansion for the product of two operators of the form (6.9),

$$T_f T_g = \sum_{j \geq 0} h^j T_{C_j(f, g)} \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0,$$

and, similarly, a Berezin-type star product by setting

$$\tilde{T}_f *_h \tilde{T}_g := \widetilde{T_f T_g}.$$

In this way we see that the formula (6.9), which at first glance might seem more like a mathematical exercise in pseudodifferential operators rather than a sensible quantization rule, effectively leads to most of the developments (at least for  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ ) we did in the previous two sections.

In the context of  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , or, more generally, of a coadjoint orbit of a Lie group, the “quantizers” and “dequantizers” above seem to have been first studied systematically by Gracia-Bondia [116]; in a more general setting, by Antoine and Ali [6]. Two recent papers on this topic, with some intriguing ideas, are Karasev and Osborn [146]. For some partial results on the Berezin-Toeplitz star-products for general quantizers, see Engliš [86]. The operators (6.6) and the corresponding “twisted product”  $f \sharp g$  defined by  $Q_{f \sharp g} = Q_f Q_g$  were investigated by Unterberger [247] (for  $t = 1/2$ , see Hörmander [129]); a relativistic version, with the Weyl calculus replaced by “Klein-Gordon” and “Dirac” calculi, was developed by Unterberger [250]. The formula (6.13) for the Weyl operator makes sense, in general, on any Hermitian symmetric space  $\Gamma$  in the place of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , with  $s_y$  the self-adjoint unitary isomorphisms of  $A^2(\Gamma)$  induced by the geodesic symmetry around  $y$ ; in this context, the Weyl calculus on bounded symmetric domains was studied by Upmeyer [254], Unterberger and Upmeyer [253], and Unterberger [248] [252]. Upon rescaling and letting  $h \rightarrow 0$ , one obtains the so-called Fuchs calculus [249]. A general study of invariant symbolic calculi (6.9) on bounded symmetric domains has recently been undertaken by Arazy and Upmeyer [16].

An important interpretation of the above-mentioned equality of the  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ -norm of a function  $f$  and the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the Weyl operator  $W_f$  is the following. Consider once more the map

$$\Gamma : f \mapsto T_f$$

mapping a function  $f$  to the corresponding Toeplitz operator (6.8), and let  $\Gamma^*$  be its adjoint with respect to the  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$  inner product on  $f$  and the Hilbert-Schmidt product on  $T_f$ . One then checks easily that  $\Gamma^*$  coincides with the dequantization operator (6.14). Now by the abstract Hilbert-space operator theory,  $\Gamma$  admits the polar decomposition

$$(6.15) \quad \Gamma = WR, \quad \text{with } R := (\Gamma^* \Gamma)^{1/2} \text{ and } W \text{ a partial isometry with initial space } \overline{\text{Ran } \Gamma^*} \text{ and final space } \overline{\text{Ran } \Gamma}.$$

A simple calculation shows, however, that  $\Gamma^* \Gamma$  is precisely the Berezin transform associated to  $A^2(\mathbb{C}^n, \mu_h)$ ,

$$\Gamma^* \Gamma f(y) = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} f(x) \frac{|K_h(y, x)|^2}{K_h(y, y)} d\mu_h(x) = e^{h\Delta} f(y),$$

and using the Fourier transform to compute the square root  $(\Gamma^* \Gamma)^{1/2}$  one discovers that  $W$  is precisely the Weyl transform  $f \mapsto W_f$ . This fact, first realized by Orsted and Zhang [194] (see also Peetre and Zhang [202] for a motivation coming from

decompositions of tensor products of holomorphic discrete series representations), allows us to define an analogue of the Weyl transform by (6.15) for any reproducing kernel subspace of any  $L^2$  space. For the standard scale of weighted Bergman spaces on bounded symmetric domains in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , this generalization has been studied in Orsted and Zhang [194] and Davidson, Olafsson and Zhang [69]; the general case seems to be completely unexplored at present.

From the point of view of group representations, the unit vectors  $k_y$  in (6.10) are the *coherent states* in the sense of Glauber [103], Perelomov [203] and Onofri [193]. Namely, the group  $G$  of all distance-preserving biholomorphic self-maps of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  (which coincides with the group of orientation-preserving rigid motions  $x \mapsto Ax + b$ ,  $A \in U(n)$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ) acts transitively on  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and induces a projective unitary representation

$$U_g : \phi(x) \mapsto \phi(gx) e^{-\langle b, Ax \rangle / h - |b|^2 / 2h} \quad (gx = Ax + b, \quad g \in G)$$

of  $G$  in  $A^2(\mathbb{C}^n)$ ; and the vectors  $k_y$  are unit vectors satisfying

$$(6.16) \quad U_g k_y = \epsilon k_{gy}$$

for some numbers  $\epsilon = \epsilon(g, y)$  of unit modulus. Coherent states for a general group  $G$  of transformations acting transitively on a manifold  $\Gamma$ , with respect to a projective unitary representation  $U$  of  $G$  in a Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$ , are similarly defined as a family  $\{k_y\}_{y \in \Gamma}$  of unit vectors in  $\mathfrak{H}$  indexed by the points of  $\Gamma$  such that (6.16) holds. Choosing a basepoint  $0 \in \Gamma$  and letting  $H$  be the subgroup of  $G$  which leaves the subspace  $\mathbb{C}k_0$  invariant (i.e.  $g \in H$  iff  $U_g k_0 = \epsilon(g)k_0$  for some  $\epsilon(g) \in \mathbb{C}$  of modulus 1), we can identify  $\Gamma$  with the homogeneous space  $G/H$ . Suppose that there exists a biinvariant measure  $dg$  on  $G$ , and let  $dm$  be the corresponding invariant measure on  $\Gamma = G/H$ . We say that the coherent states  $\{k_y\}_{y \in \Gamma}$  are *square-integrable* if

$$\int_{\Gamma} |\langle k_x, k_y \rangle|^2 dm(y) =: d < \infty$$

(in view of (6.16), the value of the integral does not depend on the choice of  $x \in \Gamma$ ). If the representation  $U$  is irreducible, it is then easy to see from the Schur lemma that

$$\frac{1}{d} \int_{\Gamma} |k_y\rangle \langle k_y| dm(y) = I \quad (\text{the identity on } \mathfrak{H}).$$

It follows that the mapping  $\mathfrak{H} \ni f \mapsto f(y) := \langle k_y, f \rangle$  identifies  $\mathfrak{H}$  with a subspace of  $L^2(\Gamma, dm)$  which is a reproducing kernel space with kernel  $K(x, y) = d^{-1} \langle k_x, k_y \rangle$ . Thus, in some sense, the quantizers  $\Delta_y$  above and their associated reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces may be regarded as generalizations of the coherent states to the situation when there is no group action present. For more information on coherent states and their applications in quantization, see for instance Klauder [149], Odziejewicz [189], Unterberger [251], Ali and Goldin [10], Antoine and Ali [6], Ali [4], Bartlett, Rowe and Repka [220], and the survey by Ali, Antoine, Gazeau and Mueller [7], as well as the recent book [8], and the references therein. An interesting characterization of the cut locus of a compact homogeneous Kähler manifold in terms of orthogonality

of coherent states has recently been given by Berceanu [30]. We will have more to say about coherent states in Section 7 below.

Another way of arriving at the Toeplitz-type operators (6.8) is via geometric quantization. Namely, consider a phase space  $(\Gamma, \omega)$  which admits a Kähler polarization  $F$ , i.e. one for which  $F \cap \overline{F} = \{0\}$  (hence  $F + \overline{F} = T_{\mathbb{C}}^*\Gamma$ ). The functions constant along  $F$  can then be interpreted as holomorphic functions, the corresponding  $L^2$ -space becomes the Bergman space, and the quantum operators (3.3) become, as has already been mentioned above, Toeplitz operators. This link between geometric and Berezin quantization was discovered by Tuynman [242] [243], who showed that on a compact Kähler manifold (as well as in some other situations) the operators  $Q_f$  of the geometric quantization coincide with the Toeplitz operators  $T_{f+h\Delta f}$ , where  $\Delta$  is the Laplace-Beltrami operator. Later on this connection was examined in detail in a series of papers by Cahen [55] and Cahen, Gutt and Rawnsley [56] (parts I and II of [56] deal with compact manifolds, part III with the unit disc, and part IV with homogeneous spaces). See also Nishioka [187] and Odziejewicz [189].

In a sense, the choice of polarization in geometric quantization plays a similar role as the choice of ordering discussed in the paragraphs above, see Ali and Doebner [9]. Another point of view on the ordering problem in geometric quantization is addressed in Bao and Zhu [22].

## 7. COHERENT STATE QUANTIZATION

The method of coherent state quantization is in some respects a particular case of the prime quantization from the previous section, exploiting the prequantization of the projective Hilbert space. Some representative references are by Odziejewicz [188] [189] [190] [191] and Ali [4] [6] [11]. We begin with a quick review of the symplectic geometry of the projective Hilbert space.

**7.1. The projective Hilbert space.** Let  $\mathfrak{H}$  be a Hilbert space of dimension  $N$ , which could be (countably) infinite or finite. As a set, the *projective Hilbert space*  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  will be identified with the collection of all orthogonal projections onto one-dimensional subspaces of  $\mathfrak{H}$  and for each non-zero vector  $\psi \in \mathfrak{H}$  let  $\Psi = \frac{1}{\|\psi\|^2}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  denote the corresponding projector. There is a natural Kähler structure on  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  as we now demonstrate. An analytic atlas of  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  is given by the coordinate charts

$$(7.1) \quad \{(V_\Phi, \mathbf{h}_\Phi, \mathfrak{H}_\Phi) \mid \phi \in \mathfrak{H} \setminus \{0\}\},$$

where

$$(7.2) \quad V_\Phi = \{\Psi \in \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H}) \mid \langle\phi|\psi\rangle \neq 0\}$$

is an open, dense set in  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$ ;

$$(7.3) \quad \mathfrak{H}_\Phi = (I - \Phi)\mathfrak{H} = \langle\phi\rangle^\perp$$

is the subspace of  $\mathfrak{H}$  orthogonal to the range of  $\Phi$  and  $\mathbf{h}_\phi : V_\Phi \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_\Phi$  is the diffeomorphism

$$(7.4) \quad \mathbf{h}_\phi(\Psi) = \frac{1}{\langle \hat{\phi} | \psi \rangle} (I - \Phi)\psi, \quad \hat{\phi} = \frac{\phi}{\|\phi\|}.$$

Since  $V_\Phi$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{H}$ , it is often enough to consider only one coordinate chart. Thus, we set  $e_0 = \hat{\phi}$  and choose an orthonormal basis  $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{N-1}$  of  $\mathfrak{H}_\Phi$  to obtain a basis of  $\mathfrak{H}$  which will be fixed from now on. We may then identify  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  with  $\mathbb{CP}^N$ : For arbitrary  $\Psi \in \mathfrak{H}$  we set

$$(7.5) \quad z_j = \langle e_j | \psi \rangle, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, N-1,$$

and the coordinates of  $\Psi \in \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  are the standard homogeneous coordinates

$$(7.6) \quad \langle e_j | \mathbf{h}_\phi(\Psi) \rangle = Z_j = \frac{z_j}{z_0}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, N-1,$$

of projective geometry.

The projection map  $\pi : \mathfrak{H} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  that assigns to each  $\psi \in \mathfrak{H} \setminus \{0\}$  the corresponding projector  $\Psi \in \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  is holomorphic in these coordinates. For  $\Phi \in \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  we have  $\pi^{-1}(\Psi) = \mathbb{C}^* \psi$  where  $\mathbb{C}^* = \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , and so  $\pi : \mathfrak{H} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  is a  $GL(1, \mathbb{C})$  principal bundle, sometimes called the *canonical line bundle* over  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$ . We will denote the associated holomorphic line bundle by  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$  and write elements in it as  $(\Psi, \psi)$ , where  $\psi \in \Psi(\mathfrak{H})$ . (We again write  $\pi$  for the canonical projection.) A local trivialization of  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$  over  $V_\Phi$  is given by the (holomorphic) reference section  $\hat{s}$  of  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$ :

$$(7.7) \quad \hat{s}(\Psi) = (\Psi, \frac{\psi}{\langle \hat{\phi} | \psi \rangle}),$$

and any other section  $s : V_\Phi \rightarrow \mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$  is given by

$$(7.8) \quad s(\Psi) = (\Psi, \kappa(\Psi))$$

where  $\kappa : \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{H} \setminus \{0\}$  is a holomorphic map with  $\frac{|\kappa(\Psi)\rangle \langle \kappa(\Psi)|}{\|\kappa(\Psi)\|^2} = \Psi$ . Denote by  $s_0$  the zero-section of  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$ . The identification map  $\imath_{\mathbb{L}} : \mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H}) \setminus s_0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$  given as

$$(7.9) \quad \imath_{\mathbb{L}}(\Psi, \psi) = \psi,$$

yields a global coordinatization of  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H}) \setminus s_0$ . For any  $\psi \in \mathfrak{H}$  let  $\langle \psi |$  be its dual element. The restriction of  $\langle \psi |$  to the fibre  $\pi^{-1}(\Psi')$  in  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$ , for arbitrary  $\Psi' \in \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$ , then yields a section  $s_{\Psi'}^*$  of the dual bundle  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})^*$  of  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$ . Moreover, the map  $\Psi' \mapsto s_{\Psi'}^*$  is antilinear between  $\mathfrak{H}$  and  $\Gamma(\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})^*)$ . We may hence realize  $\mathfrak{H}$  as a space of holomorphic sections.

The tangent space  $T_\Psi \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  to  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  at the point  $\Psi$  has a natural identification with  $\mathfrak{H}_\Psi$  (obtainable, for example, by differentiating curves in  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  passing through  $\Psi$ ). The complex structure of  $\mathfrak{H}_\Psi$  then endows the tangent space  $T_\Psi \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  with an

integrable complex structure  $J_\Psi$ , making  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  into a Kähler manifold. The corresponding canonical 2-form  $\Omega_{FS}$ , called the *Fubini-Study 2-form*, is given pointwise by

$$(7.10) \quad \Omega_{FS}(X_\Psi, Y_\Psi) = \frac{1}{2i}(\langle \xi | \zeta \rangle - \langle \zeta | \xi \rangle),$$

where  $\xi, \zeta \in \mathfrak{H}_\Psi$  correspond to the tangent vectors  $X_\Psi, Y_\Psi$  respectively. The associated Riemannian metric  $g_{FS}$  is given by

$$(7.11) \quad g_{FS}(X_\Psi, Y_\Psi) = \frac{1}{2}(\langle \xi | \zeta \rangle + \langle \zeta | \xi \rangle) = \Omega_{FS}(X_\Psi, J_\Psi Y_\Psi).$$

In the local coordinates  $Z_j$ , defined in (7.6),  $\Omega_{FS}$  assumes the form

$$(7.12) \quad \Omega_{FS} = \frac{1}{1 + \|\mathbf{Z}\|^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^{N-1} \left[ \delta_{jk} - \frac{Z_j \bar{Z}_k}{1 + \|\mathbf{Z}\|^2} \right] d\bar{Z}_j \wedge dZ_k, \quad \mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_{N-1}).$$

Thus, clearly,  $d\Omega_{FS} = 0$ , implying that  $\Omega_{FS}$  is a *closed* 2-form, derivable from the real Kähler potential

$$(7.13) \quad \Phi(\mathbf{Z}, \bar{\mathbf{Z}}) = \log [1 + \|\mathbf{Z}\|^2].$$

$$(7.14) \quad \text{(That is, } \Omega_{FS} = \sum_{j,k=1}^{N-1} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial \bar{Z}_j \partial Z_k} d\bar{Z}_j \wedge dZ_k.)$$

A Hermitian metric  $H_{FS}$  and a connection  $\nabla_{FS}$  on  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$  can be defined using the inner product of  $\mathfrak{H}$ : Indeed, since  $\pi^{-1}(\Psi) = \{\Psi\} \times \mathbb{C}\psi$ , the Hermitian structure  $H_{FS}$  is given pointwise by

$$(7.14) \quad H_{FS}((\Psi, \psi), (\Psi, \psi')) = \langle \psi | \psi' \rangle$$

for all  $(\Psi, \psi), (\Psi, \psi') \in \pi^{-1}(\Psi)$ . We will use the identification map  $\iota_{\mathbb{L}}$  defined in (7.9) to construct a connection on  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$ . Define the 1-form  $\alpha$  on  $\mathfrak{H}$  by

$$(7.15) \quad \alpha(\psi) = \frac{\langle d\psi | \psi \rangle}{\|\psi\|^2}.$$

Then the pullback

$$(7.16) \quad \alpha_{FS} = \iota_{\mathbb{L}}^* \alpha$$

defines a  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -invariant 1-form on  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$  whose horizontal space at  $(\Psi, \psi) \in \mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$  is  $\mathfrak{H}_\Psi$ . For an arbitrary section  $s : V_\Phi \rightarrow \mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H}) \setminus s_0$  as in (7.8), the pullback

$$(7.17) \quad -i\theta_{FS} = s^* \alpha_{FS}$$

defines a local 1-form  $\theta_{FS}$  on  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$ . Pointwise,

$$(7.18) \quad \theta_{FS}(\Psi) = i \frac{\langle d\kappa(\Psi) | \kappa(\Psi) \rangle}{\|\kappa(\Psi)\|^2} = i\bar{\partial} \log \|\kappa(\Psi)\|^2,$$

where  $\bar{\partial}$  denotes exterior differentiation with respect to the anti-holomorphic variables. In terms of the coordinatization introduced in (7.5), with  $f$  as the holomorphic function representing  $\kappa$ , we have

$$(7.19) \quad \theta_{FS}(\mathbf{Z}) = i \frac{df(\mathbf{Z})}{f(\mathbf{Z})} + i \frac{\sum_j Z_j d\bar{Z}_j}{1 + \|\mathbf{Z}\|^2}.$$

Furthermore,  $\theta_{FS}$  locally defines a compatible connection  $\nabla_{FS}$

$$(7.20) \quad \nabla_{FS} s = -i\theta_{FS} \otimes s,$$

and it is easy to verify that

$$(7.21) \quad \Omega_{FS} = \partial\theta_{FS} = \text{curv}\nabla_{FS},$$

where  $\partial$  denotes exterior differentiation with respect to the holomorphic variables and  $\text{curv}\nabla_{FS}$  is the curvature form of the line bundle  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$ .

Thus the Hermitian line bundle  $(\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H}), H_{FS}, \nabla_{FS})$  is a prequantization of  $(\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H}), \Omega_{FS})$  in the sense of geometric quantization.

**7.2. Summary of coherent state quantization.** The prequantization of  $(\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H}), \Omega_{FS})$  can be exploited to obtain a prequantization of an arbitrary symplectic manifold  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \Omega)$  whenever there exists a *symplectomorphism*  $\text{Coh}$  of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  into  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$ . In this case,  $\Omega = \text{Coh}^*\Omega_{FS}$  and the line bundle  $L := \text{Coh}^*\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H})$ , equipped with the Hermitian metric  $\text{Coh}^*H_{FS}$  and (compatible) connection  $\Delta_K := \text{Coh}^*\nabla_{FS}$ , is a prequantization of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , i.e. in particular,  $\Omega = \text{curv}(\text{Coh}^*\nabla_{FS})$ . The expression

$$(7.22) \quad \theta_K(x) := i(\text{Coh}^*\theta_{FS})(x),$$

defines a 1-form on  $L$ , for which  $\Omega = d\theta_K$ . The Hermitian metric  $H_K = \text{Coh}^*H_{FS}$  and the compatible connection  $\nabla_K$  are given by

$$(7.23) \quad H_K((x, \psi), (x, \psi')) = \langle \psi, \psi' \rangle$$

$$(7.24) \quad \nabla_K \text{coh} = -i\theta_K \otimes \text{coh},$$

where  $\text{coh}$  denotes a smooth section of  $L$  and  $\text{curv}\nabla_K = \Omega$ . More generally, if  $\text{Coh} : \mathbf{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  is only assumed to be a smooth map, not necessarily a symplectomorphism, the above scheme gives us a prequantization of the symplectic manifold  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \Omega_K)$  where  $\Omega_K = \text{Coh}^*\Omega_{FS}$ . That is, one has:

*Proposition 7.1.* The triple  $(\pi : L \rightarrow \mathbf{\Gamma}, H_K, \nabla_K)$ , where  $\nabla_K \text{coh} = -i\theta_K \otimes \text{coh}$ , is a Hermitian line bundle with compatible connection, and  $\text{curv}\nabla_K = \Omega_K$ .

To make the connection with coherent states, we note that the elements of  $L$  are pairs  $(x, \psi)$  with  $\psi \in \mathfrak{H}$  and  $\frac{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}{\|\psi\|^2} = \Psi = \text{Coh}(x)$ . Let  $U \subset \mathbf{\Gamma}$  be an open dense set such that the restriction of  $\mathbb{L}$  to  $U$  is trivial. Let  $\text{coh} : U \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$  be a smooth section of  $L$ , that is, a smooth map satisfying

$$(7.25) \quad \text{Coh}(x) = \frac{|\text{coh}(x)\rangle\langle\text{coh}(x)|}{\|\text{coh}(x)\|^2}$$



(such maps can always be found). Let us also write  $\eta_x = \text{coh}(x)$ ,  $\forall x \in U$ . Assume furthermore that the condition

$$(7.26) \quad \int_{\Gamma} |\eta_x\rangle\langle\eta_x| d\nu(x) = I_{\mathfrak{H}}$$

is satisfied, where  $I_{\mathfrak{H}}$  is the identity operator on  $\mathfrak{H}$  and  $\nu$  is the Liouville measure on  $\Gamma$ , arising from  $\Omega$ . We call the vectors  $\eta_x$  the *coherent states* of the prequantization.

In terms of the reproducing kernel  $K(x, y) = \langle\eta_x|\eta_y\rangle$  and locally on  $U$ ,

$$\theta_K(x) = d_1 \log K(x_1, x_2)|_{x_1=x_2=x}$$

( $d_1$  denoting exterior differentiation with respect to  $x_1$ ). Once we have (7.26), we can define a quantization via the recipe

$$(7.27) \quad f \longmapsto Q_f = \int_{\Gamma} f(x) |\eta_x\rangle\langle\eta_x| d\nu(x).$$

Note that this is a particular case of the “prime quantization” discussed in Section 6.

As a consequence of Proposition 7.1 we see that  $\Omega_K$  so constructed has integral cohomology. Thus the pair  $(\Gamma, \Omega_K)$  satisfies the *integrality condition*. We have thus obtained a geometric prequantization on  $(\Gamma, \Omega_K)$  from the natural geometric prequantization of  $(\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H}), \Omega_{FS})$  via the family of coherent states  $\{\eta_x\}$ . While the new two-form  $\Omega_K$  on  $\Gamma$  is integral, this is not necessarily the case for the original form  $\Omega$ . If it is, then there exists a geometric prequantization on  $(\Gamma, \Omega)$  which we may compare with the prequantization obtained using the coherent states. The original prequantization is said to be *projectively induced* if  $\Omega = \Omega_K$ ; if furthermore,  $\Gamma$  has a complex structure which is preserved by Coh, the symplectic manifold  $(\Gamma, \Omega)$  turns out to be a Kähler manifold. For the Berezin quantization, discussed in Section 5, the coherent states can be shown to give rise to a projectively induced prequantization if  $\Gamma$  is a Hermitian symmetric space.

It ought to be pointed out that while the map  $\text{Coh} : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H})$  yields a prequantization of  $(\Gamma, \Omega)$ , the method outlined above does not give an explicit way to determine  $\mathfrak{H}$  itself. However, starting with the Hilbert space  $L^2(\Gamma, \nu)$ , one can try to obtain subspaces  $\mathfrak{H}_K \subset L^2(\Gamma, \nu)$ , for which there are associated coherent states. Note that (7.26) then means that  $\mathfrak{H}_K$  will be, in fact, a reproducing kernel space (with reproducing kernel  $\langle\eta_x, \eta_y\rangle$ ).

*Two simple examples.* Consider a free particle, moving on the configuration space  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Then,  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^6$ , is the phase space. This is a symplectic manifold with two-form  $\Omega = \sum_{i=1}^3 dp_i \wedge dq_i$ . Let  $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\Gamma, d\mathbf{p} d\mathbf{q})$  and let us look for convenient subspaces of it which admit reproducing kernels. Let  $e : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a measurable function, depending only on the modulus  $\|\mathbf{k}\|$  and satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |e(\mathbf{k})|^2 d\mathbf{k} = 1.$$

For  $\ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , denote by  $\mathcal{P}_\ell$  the Legendre polynomial of order  $\ell$ ,

$$\mathcal{P}_\ell(x) = \frac{1}{2^\ell \ell!} \frac{d^\ell}{dx^\ell} (x^2 - 1)^\ell.$$

Define

$$(7.28) \quad K_{e,\ell}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}') = \frac{2\ell + 1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}')} \mathcal{P}_\ell \left( \frac{(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}) \cdot (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}')}{\|\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}\| \|\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}'\|} \right) \overline{e(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p})} e(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}) d\mathbf{k}.$$

It is then straightforward to verify [12] that  $K_{e,\ell}$  is a reproducing kernel with the usual properties,

$$(7.29) \quad \begin{aligned} [0pt] K_{e,\ell}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) &> 0, \quad (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) \in \Gamma, \\ K_{e,\ell}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}') &= \overline{K_{e,\ell}(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}'; \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})}, \\ K_{e,\ell}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}') &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} K_{e,\ell}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}'', \mathbf{p}'') K_{e,\ell}(\mathbf{q}'', \mathbf{p}''; \mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}') d\mathbf{p}'' d\mathbf{q}'', \end{aligned}$$

and we have the associated family of *coherent states*,

$$(7.30) \quad \mathfrak{S} = \{\xi_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}} \in \mathfrak{H} \mid \xi_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}') = K_{e,\ell}(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}'; \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}), \quad (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}), (\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}') \in \Gamma\}$$

which span a Hilbert subspace  $\mathfrak{H}_{e,\ell} \subset \mathfrak{H}$  and satisfy the resolution of the identity on it:

$$(7.31) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} |\xi_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}\rangle \langle \xi_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}| d\mathbf{p} d\mathbf{q} = I_{e,\ell}.$$

Using these coherent states we can do a prime quantization as in (7.27), i.e.,

$$(7.32) \quad f \longmapsto Q_f = \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) |\xi_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}\rangle \langle \xi_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}| d\mathbf{p} d\mathbf{q}.$$

In particular, we get for the position and momentum observable the operators,

$$(7.33) \quad Q_{q_j} \equiv \widehat{q}_j = q_j - i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j}, \quad Q_{p_j} \equiv \widehat{p}_j = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial q_j}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3,$$

on  $\mathfrak{H}_{e,\ell}$ , so that

$$[\widehat{q}_i, \widehat{p}_j] = i\hbar \delta_{ij} I_{e,\ell}.$$

This illustrates how identifying appropriate reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces can lead to a physically meaningful quantization of the classical system.

Let us next try to bring out the connection between this quantization and the natural prequantization on  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H}_{e,\ell})$ . Consider the map

$$(7.34) \quad \text{Coh} : \Gamma = \mathbb{R}^6 \longrightarrow \mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H}_{e,\ell}), \quad \text{Coh}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) = \frac{|\xi_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}\rangle \langle \xi_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}|}{\|\xi_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}}\|^2}.$$

It is straightforward, though tedious, to verify that

$$(7.35) \quad \text{Coh}^* \Omega_{FS} = \Omega = \sum_{i=1}^3 dp_i \wedge dq_i.$$

Hence  $\Omega$  is projectively induced. The pullback  $L = \text{Coh}^* \mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H}_{e,\ell})$  of the canonical line bundle  $\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{H}_{e,\ell})$  (over  $\mathbb{CP}(\mathfrak{H}_{e,\ell})$ ) under  $\text{Coh}$  gives us a line bundle over  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^6$ .

Take a reference section  $\widehat{s}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) = \xi_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}}$  in  $L$ . Square-integrable sections of this bundle form a Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}_L$ , with scalar product

$$\langle s_1 | s_2 \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} \overline{\Psi_1(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})} \Psi_2(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) K_{e,\ell}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) d\mathbf{q} d\mathbf{p}, \quad s_i(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) = \widehat{s} \Psi_i, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

and again,  $\mathfrak{H}_L$  is naturally (unitarily) isomorphic to  $L^2(\Gamma, d\mathbf{q} d\mathbf{p})$ . We take the symplectic potential

$$\theta = \sum_{i=1}^3 p_i dq_i,$$

so that  $\Omega = d\theta$ , and thus we obtain a prequantization, as in §3.1, yielding the position and momentum operators

$$\widehat{q}_j = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} + q_j, \quad \widehat{p}_j = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial q_j},$$

which are the same as in (7.33), but now act on the (larger) space  $L^2(\Gamma, d\mathbf{q} d\mathbf{p})$ .

Our second example, following [99] and [100], is somewhat unorthodox and makes use of a construction of coherent states associated to the principal series representation of  $SO_0(1, 2)$ . The quantization is performed using (7.27). The coherent states in question are defined on the space  $S^1 \times \mathbb{R} = \{x \equiv (\beta, J) \mid 0 \leq \beta < 2\pi, J \in \mathbb{R}\}$ , which is the phase space of a particle moving on the unit circle. The  $J$  and  $\beta$  are canonically conjugate variables and define the symplectic form  $dJ \wedge d\beta$ . Let  $\mathfrak{H}$  be an abstract Hilbert space and let  $\{\psi_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$  be an orthonormal basis of it. Consider next the set of functions,

$$(7.36) \quad \phi_n(x) = e^{(-\epsilon n^2/2)} e^{n(\epsilon J + i\beta)}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

defined on  $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\epsilon > 0$  is a parameter which can be arbitrarily small. These functions are orthonormal with respect to the measure,

$$d\mu(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{\pi}} \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-\epsilon J^2} dJ d\beta.$$

Define the normalization factor,

$$(7.37) \quad \mathcal{N}(J) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\phi_n(x)|^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{(-\epsilon n^2)} e^{2n\epsilon J} < \infty$$

(which is proportional to an elliptic Theta function), and use it to construct the coherent states

$$(7.38) \quad \eta_x := \eta_{J,\beta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}(J)}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \overline{\phi_n(x)} \psi_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}(J)}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{(-\epsilon n^2/2)} e^{n(\epsilon J - i\beta)} \psi_n.$$

These are easily seen to satisfy  $\|\eta_{J,\beta}\| = 1$  and the resolution of the identity

$$(7.39) \quad \int_{S^1 \times \mathbb{R}} |\eta_{J,\beta}\rangle \langle \eta_{J,\beta}| \mathcal{N}(J) d\mu(x) = I_{\mathfrak{H}} ,$$

so that the map

$$W : \mathfrak{H} \longrightarrow L^2(S^1 \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}(J) d\mu), \quad \text{where} \quad (W\phi)(J, \beta) = \langle \eta_{J,\beta} | \phi \rangle ,$$

is a linear isometry onto a subspace of  $L^2(S^1 \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}(J) d\mu)$ . Denoting this subspace by  $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{hol}}$ , we see that it consists of functions of the type,

$$(W\phi)(J, \beta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}(J)}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n z^n := \frac{F(z)}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}(J)}},$$

where we have introduced the complex variable  $z = e^{\epsilon J + i\beta}$  and  $c_n = e^{-\epsilon n^2/2} \langle \psi_n | \phi \rangle$ . The function  $F(z)$  is entire analytic and the choice of the subspace  $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{hol}} \subset L^2(S^1 \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{N}(J) d\mu)$  — that is, of the coherent states (7.38) — is then akin to choosing a polarization.

In view of (7.26) and (7.27), the quantization rule for functions  $f$  on the phase space  $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}$  becomes

$$(7.40) \quad Q_f := \int_{S^1 \times \mathbb{R}} f(J, \beta) |\eta_{J,\beta}\rangle \langle \eta_{J,\beta}| \mathcal{N}(J) d\mu(x).$$

For  $f(J, \beta) = J$ ,

$$(7.41) \quad Q_J = \int_{S^1 \times \mathbb{R}} J |\eta_{J,\beta}\rangle \langle \eta_{J,\beta}| \mathcal{N}(J) d\mu(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n |\psi_n\rangle \langle \psi_n| .$$

This is just the angular momentum operator, which as an operator on  $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{hol}}$  is seen to assume the form  $Q_J = -i \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta}$ . For an arbitrary function of  $\beta$ , we get similarly

$$(7.42) \quad Q_{f(\beta)} = \int_{S^1 \times \mathbb{R}} f(\beta) |\eta_{J,\beta}\rangle \langle \eta_{J,\beta}| \mathcal{N}(J) d\mu(x) = \sum_{n,n'} e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{4}(n-n')^2} c_{n-n'}(f) |\psi_n\rangle \langle \psi_{n'}| ,$$

where  $c_n(f)$  is the  $n$ th Fourier coefficient of  $f$ . In particular, we have for the “angle” operator:

$$(7.43) \quad Q_\beta = \pi I_{\mathfrak{H}} + \sum_{n \neq n'} i \frac{e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{4}(n-n')^2}}{n - n'} |\psi_n\rangle \langle \psi_{n'}| ,$$

and for the “fundamental Fourier harmonic” operator

$$(7.44) \quad Q_{e^{i\beta}} = e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{4}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\psi_{n+1}\rangle \langle \psi_n| ,$$

which, on  $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{hol}}$ , is the operator of multiplication by  $e^{i\beta}$  up to the factor  $e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{4}}$  (which can be made arbitrarily close to unity). Interestingly, the commutation relation

$$(7.45) \quad [Q_J, Q_{e^{i\beta}}] = Q_{e^{i\beta}} ,$$

is “canonical” in that it is in exact correspondence with the classical Poisson bracket

$$\{J, e^{i\beta}\} = ie^{i\beta}.$$

## 8. SOME OTHER QUANTIZATION METHODS

Apart from geometric and deformation quantization, other quantization methods exist; though it is beyond our expertise to discuss them all here, we at least briefly indicate some references.

For quantization by *Feynman path integrals*, a standard reference is Feynman and Hibbs [90] or Glimm and Jaffe [104]; a recent survey is Grosche and Steiner [121]. Path integrals are discussed also in Berezin’s book [32], and a local deformation quantization formula resembling the Feynman expansion in a 2d quantum field theory lies also at the core of Kontsevich’s construction [154] of star product on any Poisson manifold. (More precisely, Kontsevich’s formula is an expansion of a certain Feynman integral at a saddle point, see Cattaneo and Felder [60].) Connections between Feynman path integrals, coherent states, and the Berezin quantization are discussed in Kochetov and Yarunin [152], Odziejewicz [189], Horowski, Kryszewski and Odziejewicz [130], Klauder [149], Chapter V in Berezin and Shubin [33], Marinov [168], Charles [61], and Bodmann [41]. For a discussion of Feynman path integrals in the context of geometric quantization, see Gawedzki [98], Wiegmann [258], and Chapter 9 in the book of Woodhouse [263].

Another method is the *asymptotic quantization* of Karasev and Maslov [144]. It can be applied on any symplectic manifold, even when no polarization exists and the geometric quantization is thus inapplicable. It is based on patching together local Weyl quantizations in Darboux coordinate neighbourhoods, the result being a quantization rule assigning to any  $f \in C^\infty(\Gamma)$  a Fourier integral operator on a sheaf of function spaces over  $\Gamma$  such that the condition (4.1) is satisfied. The main technical point is the use of the Maslov canonical operator (see e.g. Mishchenko, Sternin and Shatalov [171]). The main disadvantage of this procedure is its asymptotic character: the operators gluing together the local patches into the sheaf are defined only modulo  $O(h)$ , and so essentially everything holds just modulo  $O(h)$  (or, in an improved version, modulo  $O(h^\infty)$  or modulo the smoothing operators). The ideas of Karasev and Maslov were further developed in their book [145] (see also Karasev [143]), in Albeverio and Daletskii [2], and Maslov and Shvedov [169]. A good reference is Patissier and Dazord [70], where some obscure points from the original exposition [144] are also clarified. For comparison of this method with the geometric and deformation quantizations, see Patissier [200].

We remark that this asymptotic quantization should not be confused with the “asymptotic quantization” which is sometimes alluded to in the theory of Fourier integral operators and of generalized Toeplitz operators (in the sense of Boutet de Monvel and Guillemin), see e.g. Boutet de Monvel [52] or Bony and Lerner [42] (though the two are not totally unrelated). Another two asymptotic quantizations

exist in coding theory (see e.g. Neuhoff [184], Gray and Neuhoff [117]) and in quantum gravity (Ashtekar [20]).

*Stochastic quantization* is based, roughly speaking, on viewing the quantum indeterminacy as a stochastic process, and applying the methods of probability theory and stochastic analysis. They are actually two of the kind, the geometro-stochastic quantization of Prugovečki [206] and the stochastic quantization of Parisi and Wu [195]. The former arose, loosely speaking, from Mackey’s systems of imprimitivity  $(U, E)$  (Mackey [167] — see the discussion of Borel quantization in §2.4 above), with  $U$  a unitary representation of a symmetry group and  $E$  a projection-valued measure satisfying  $U_g E(m) U_g^* = E(gm)$  for any Borel set  $m$ , by demanding that  $E$  be not necessarily projection but only positive-operator valued (POV) measure; this leads to appearance of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces and eventually makes contact with the prime quantization discussed in the preceding section. See Ali and Prugovečki [12]; a comparison with Berezin quantization is available in Ktorides and Papaloucas [159]. The stochastic quantization of Parisi and Wu originates in the analysis of perturbations of the equilibrium solution of a certain parabolic stochastic differential equation (the Langevin equation), and we won’t say anything more about it but refer the interested reader to Chaturvedi, Kapoor and Srinivasan [62], Damgaard and Hüffel [67], Namsrai [179], Mitter [172], or Namiki [178]. A comparison with geometric quantization appears in Hajra and Bandyopadhyay [126] and Bandyopadhyay [21]. Again, the term “stochastic quantization” is sometimes also used as a synonym for the *stochastic mechanics* of Nelson [182].

Finally, we mention briefly the method of *quantum states* of Souriau [235]. It builds on the notions of diffeological space and diffeological group, introduced in [234], which are too technical to describe here, and uses a combination of methods of harmonic and convex analysis. See the expository article [236] for a summary of later developments. Currently, the connections of this method with the other approaches to quantization seem unclear (cf. Blattner [38]).

The subject of quantization is vast and it is not the ambition, nor within the competence, of the present authors to write a comprehensive overview, so we better stop our exposition at this point, with an apology to the reader for those topics that were omitted, and to all authors whose work went unmentioned. We have not, for instance, at all touched the important and fairly complex problem of quantization with constraints, including BFV and BRST quantizations (see Sniatycki [232], Tuynman [244], Ibort [134], Batalin and Tyutin [27], Batalin, Fradkin and Fradkina [26], Kostant and Sternberg [158], Grigoriev and Lyakhovich [119]) and the relationship between quantization and reduction (Sjamaar [229], Tian and Zhang [239], Jorjadze [135], Bordemann, Herbig and Waldmann [44], Mladenov [173], Huebschmann [132], Vergne [255]); or quantum field theory and field quantization (Greiner and Reinhardt [118], Borchers and Barnard [25]), etc. Some useful surveys concerning the topics we have covered, as well as some of those that we have not, are Sternheimer [237], Weinstein [260], Fernandes [89], Echeverria-Enriquez et al. [78],

Sniatycki [230], Ali [3], Blattner [38], Tuynman [245], Borthwick [48], and the books of Fedosov [88], Landsman [162], Bates and Weinstein [28], Souriau [233], Perelomov [203], Bandyopadhyay [21], Greiner and Reinhardt [118] and Woodhouse [263] mentioned above.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. This survey is based on an appendix to the habilitation thesis of the second author [83] and on lecture notes from a course on quantization techniques given at Cotonou, Benin, by the first author [5]. The authors would like to thank G. Tuynman for many helpful conversations on geometric quantization and record their gratitude to J.-P. Antoine, J.-P. Gazeau and G.A. Goldin, for constructive feedback on the manuscript.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Aharonov and D. Bohm: *Significance of electromagnetic potentials in the quantum theory*, Phys. Rev. **115** (1959), 485-491.
- [2] S. Albeverio, A.Yu. Daletskii: *Asymptotic quantization for solution manifolds of some infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems*, J. Geom. Phys. **19** (1996), 31-46.
- [3] S.T. Ali: *Survey of quantization methods*, Classical and quantum systems (Goslar 1991), pp. 29-37, World Scientific, River Edge, NJ, 1993.
- [4] S.T. Ali: *Coherent states and quantization*, Spline functions and the theory of wavelets (Montreal, PQ, 1996), pp. 233-243, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, vol. 18, AMS, Providence, 1999.
- [5] S.T. Ali: *Quantization techniques: a quick overview*, Contemporary Problems in Mathematical Physics (Cotonou, Benin, 2001), pp. 3-78, World Scientific, Singapore, 2002.
- [6] S.T. Ali, J.-P. Antoine: *Quantum frames, quantization and dequantization*, Quantization and infinite-dimensional systems (Bialowieza, 1993), pp. 133-145, Plenum, New York, 1994.
- [7] S.T. Ali, J.-P. Antoine, J.-P. Gazeau, U.A. Mueller: *Coherent states and their generalizations: a mathematical overview*, Rev. Math. Phys. **7** (1995), 1013-1104.
- [8] S.T. Ali, J.-P. Antoine, J.-P. Gazeau, *Coherent States, Wavelets, and Their Generalizations*, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 2000.
- [9] S.T. Ali, H.-D. Doebner: *Ordering problem in quantum mechanics: Prime quantization and its physical interpretation*, Phys. Rev. **A** 41 (1990), 1199-1210.
- [10] S.T. Ali, G.A. Goldin: *Quantization, coherent states and diffeomorphism groups*, Differential geometry, group representations, and quantization, pp. 147-178, Lecture Notes in Phys., vol. 379, Springer, Berlin, 1991.
- [11] S.T. Ali, U.A. Mueller: *Quantization of a classical system on a coadjoint orbit of the Poincaré group in 1 + 1 dimensions*, J. Math. Phys. **35** (1994), 4405-4422.
- [12] S.T. Ali, E. Prugovečki: *Mathematical problems of stochastic quantum mechanics: harmonic analysis on phase space and quantum geometry*, Acta Appl. Math. **6** (1986), 1-18; *Extended harmonic analysis of phase space representations for the Galilei group*, Acta Appl. Math. **6** (1986), 19-45; *Harmonic analysis and systems of covariance for phase space representations of the Poincaré group*, Acta Appl. Math. **6** (1986), 47-62.
- [13] R.F.V. Anderson: *The Weyl functional calculus*, J. Funct. Anal. **4** (1969), 240-267; *On the Weyl functional calculus*, J. Funct. Anal. **6** (1970), 110-115; *The multiplicative Weyl functional calculus*, J. Funct. Anal. **9** (1972), 423-440.
- [14] B. Angermann, *Über Quantisierungen lokalisierbarer Systeme — physikalisch interpretierbare mathematische Modelle*, Dissertation, Technische Universität Clausthal, 1983.

- [15] B. Angermann, H.-D. Doebner, J. Tolar: *Quantum kinematics on smooth manifolds*, Nonlinear partial differential operators and quantization procedures, pp. 171–208, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1983.
- [16] J. Arazy, H. Upmeyer: *Invariant symbolic calculi and eigenvalues of invariant operators on symmetric domains*, Function spaces, interpolation theory, and related topics (Lund, 2000) (A. Kufner, M. Cwikel, M. Engliš, L.-E. Persson, and G. Sparr, eds.), pp. 151–211, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2002.
- [17] R. Arens, D. Babbitt: *Algebraic difficulties of preserving dynamical relations when forming quantum-mechanical operators*, J. Math. Phys. **6** (1965), 1071–1075.
- [18] D. Arnal, M. Cahen, S. Gutt: *Representation of compact Lie groups and quantization by deformation*, Acad. Roy. Belg. Bull. Cl. Sci. (5) **74** (1988), 123–141.
- [19] D. Arnal, J.C. Cortet, M. Flato, D. Sternheimer: *Star-products: quantization and representation without operators*, Field Theory, Quantization and Statistical Physics, D. Reidel, 1981, pp. 85–111.
- [20] A. Ashtekar, *Asymptotic quantization*, Monographs and textbooks in physical science. Lecture notes, vol. 2, Bibliopolis, Naples, 1987; *New perspectives in canonical gravity*, Bibliopolis, Naples, 1988.
- [21] P. Bandyopadhyay, *Geometry, topology and quantization*, Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 386, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1996.
- [22] D.H. Bao, Z.Y. Zhu: *Ordering problem in geometric quantization*, J. Phys. A **25** (1992), 2381–2385.
- [23] D.H. Bao, Z.Y. Zhu: *Operator ordering problem and coordinate-free nature of geometric quantization*, Comm. Theor. Phys. **25** (1996), 189–194.
- [24] D. Bar-Moshe, M.S. Marinov: *Realization of compact Lie algebras in Kähler manifolds*, J. Phys. A **27** (1994), 6287–6298.
- [25] A. Barnard, R.E. Borcherds: *Quantum field theory*, 76 pp., preprint math-ph/0204014.
- [26] I.A. Batalin, E.S. Fradkin, T.E. Fradkina: *Another version for operatorial quantization of dynamical systems with irreducible constraints*, Nuclear Phys. B **314** (1989), 158–174; Erratum ibid. **323** (1989), 734–735; *Generalized canonical quantization of dynamical systems with constraints and curved phase space*, Nuclear Phys. B **332** (1990), 723–736.
- [27] I.A. Batalin, I.V. Tyutin: *Quantum geometry of symbols and operators*, Nuclear Phys. B **345** (1990), 645–658.
- [28] S. Bates, A. Weinstein, *Lectures on the geometry of quantization*, Berkeley Mathematics Lecture Notes, vol. 8, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1997.
- [29] F. Bayen, M. Flato, C. Fronsdal, A. Lichnerowicz, D. Sternheimer: *Deformation theory and quantization*, Lett. Math. Phys. **1** (1977), 521–530; Ann. Phys. **111** (1978), 61–110 (part I), 111–151 (part II).
- [30] S. Berceanu: *Coherent states and geodesics: cut locus and conjugate locus*, J. Geom. Phys. **21** (1997), 149–168; *A remark on Berezin’s quantization and cut locus*, Quantizations, deformations and coherent states (Białowieża, 1996), Rep. Math. Phys., vol. 40, 1997, pp. 159–168.
- [31] F.A. Berezin: *Quantization*, Math. USSR Izvestiya **8** (1974), 1109–1163; *Quantization in complex symmetric spaces*, Math. USSR Izvestiya **9** (1975), 341–379; *General concept of quantization*, Comm. Math. Phys. **40** (1975), 153 – 174.
- [32] F.A. Berezin, *The method of second quantization*, 2nd edition, Nauka, Moscow, 1986 (in Russian.)
- [33] F.A. Berezin, M.A. Shubin, *The Schrödinger equation*, Moscow, 1983; English translation Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1991.
- [34] M. Bertelson, M. Cahen, S. Gutt: *Equivalence of star products*, Class. Quant. Grav. **14** (1997), A93–A107.



- [35] R.J. Blattner: *Quantization and representation theory*, Harmonic analysis on homogeneous spaces (Williamstown, 1972), pp. 147–165, Proc. Symp. Pure Math., vol. XXVI, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1973.
- [36] R.J. Blattner: *Pairing of half-form spaces*, Géométrie symplectique et physique mathématique (Aix-en-Provence, 1974), pp. 175–186, CNRS, Paris, 1975.
- [37] R.J. Blattner: *The metilinear geometry of non-real polarizations*, Differential geometrical methods in mathematical physics (Bonn, 1975), pp. 11–45, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 570, Springer, Berlin, 1977.
- [38] R.J. Blattner: *Some remarks on quantization*, Symplectic geometry and mathematical physics (Aix-en-Provence, 1990), pp. 37–47, Progr. Math., vol. 99, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1991.
- [39] R.J. Blattner, J.H. Rawnsley: *Quantization of the action of  $U(k, l)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{2(k+l)}$* , J. Funct. Anal. **50** (1983), 188–214.
- [40] R.J. Blattner, J.H. Rawnsley: *A cohomological construction of half-forms for nonpositive polarizations*, Bull. Soc. Math. Belg. Sér. B **38** (1986), 109–130.
- [41] B.G. Bodmann: *Construction of self-adjoint Berezin-Toeplitz operators on Kähler manifolds and a probabilistic representation of the associated semigroups*, preprint math-ph/0207026.
- [42] J.-M. Bony, N. Lerner: *Quantification asymptotique et microlocalisations d’ordre supérieur*, Séminaire sur les équations aux dérivées partielles 1986–1987, Exp. No. II-III, 29 pp., École Polytech., Palaiseau (1987); Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **22** (1989), 377–433.
- [43] M. Bordemann, M. Brischle, C. Emmrich, S. Waldmann: *Phase space reduction for star-products: an explicit construction for  $\mathbb{C}P^n$* , Lett. Math. Phys. **36** (1996), 357–371; *Subalgebras with converging star products in deformation quantization: an algebraic construction for  $\mathbb{C}P^n$* , J. Math. Phys. **37** (1996), 6311–6323.
- [44] M. Bordemann, H.-C. Herbig, S. Waldmann: *BRST cohomology and phase space reduction in deformation quantization*, Comm. Math. Phys. **210** (2000), 107–144.
- [45] M. Bordemann, E. Meinrenken, M. Schlichenmaier: *Toeplitz quantization of Kähler manifolds and  $\mathfrak{gl}(N)$ ,  $N \rightarrow \infty$  limits*, Comm. Math. Phys. **165** (1994), 281–296.
- [46] M. Bordemann, S. Waldmann: *A Fedosov star product of Wick type for Kähler manifolds*, Lett. Math. Phys. **41** (1997), 243–253.
- [47] D. Borthwick: *Microlocal techniques for semiclassical problems in geometric quantization*, Perspectives on quantization (South Hadley, MA, 1996), pp. 23–37, Contemp. Math., vol. 214, AMS, Providence, 1998.
- [48] D. Borthwick: *Introduction to Kähler quantization*, First Summer School in Analysis and Mathematical Physics (Cuernavaca Morelos, 1998), pp. 91–132, Contemp. Math. 260, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2000.
- [49] D. Borthwick, A. Lesniewski, H. Upmeyer: *Nonperturbative deformation quantization of Cartan domains*, J. Funct. Anal. **113** (1993), 153–176.
- [50] D. Borthwick, S. Klimek, A. Lesniewski, M. Rinaldi: *Matrix Cartan superdomains, super Toeplitz operators, and quantization*, J. Funct. Anal. **127** (1995), 456–510.
- [51] D. Borthwick, A. Uribe: *Almost complex structures and geometric quantization*, Math. Res. Lett. **3** (1996), 845–861.
- [52] L. Boutet de Monvel: *Toeplitz operators — an asymptotic quantization of symplectic cones*, Stochastic processes and their applications in mathematics and physics (Bielefeld, 1985), Math. Appl., vol. 61, pp. 95–106, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1990.
- [53] L. Boutet de Monvel, V. Guillemin, *The spectral theory of Toeplitz operators*, Ann. Math. Studies, vol. 99, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1981.
- [54] O. Bratteli, D. Robinson, *Operator algebras and quantum statistical mechanics, vol. I*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin-Heidelberg, 1979.

- [55] M. Cahen: *Déformations et quantification*, Physique quantique et géométrie (Paris, 1986), pp. 43–62, Travaux en Cours, vol. 32, Hermann, Paris, 1988.
- [56] M. Cahen, S. Gutt, J. Rawnsley: *Quantization of Kähler manifolds. I: Geometric interpretation of Berezin's quantization*, J. Geom. Physics **7**, 45–62 (1990); *II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **337**, 73–98 (1993); *III*, Lett. Math. Phys. **30**, 291–305 (1994); *IV*, Lett. Math. Phys. **34** (1995), 159–168.
- [57] E. Calabi: *Isometric imbedding of complex manifolds*, Ann. Math. **58** (1953), 1–23.
- [58] A. Cannas da Silva, A. Weinstein, *Geometric models for noncommutative algebras*, Berkeley Mathematics Lecture Notes, vol. 10, AMS, Providence; Berkeley Center for Pure and Applied Mathematics, Berkeley, 1999.
- [59] D. Catlin: *The Bergman kernel and a theorem of Tian*, Analysis and geometry in several complex variables (Katata, 1997), Trends in Math., pp. 1–23, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1999.
- [60] A.S. Cattaneo, G. Felder: *A path integral approach to the Kontsevich quantization formula*, Comm. Math. Phys. **212** (2000), 591–611, preprint math.QA/9902090.
- [61] L. Charles: *Feynman path integral and Toeplitz quantization*, Helv. Phys. Acta **72** (1999), 341–355; *Berezin-Toeplitz operators, a semi-classical approach*, Comm. Math. Phys. **239** (2003), 1–28; *Quasimodes and Bohr-Sommerfeld conditions for the Toeplitz operators*, Comm. Partial Diff. Eqs. **28** (2003), 1527–1566.
- [62] S. Chaturvedi, A.K. Kapoor, V. Srinivasan, *Stochastic quantization scheme of Parisi and Wu*, Monographs and Textbooks in Physical Science. Lecture Notes, vol. 16, Bibliopolis, Naples, 1990.
- [63] L.A. Coburn: *Deformation estimates for the Berezin-Toeplitz quantization*, Comm. Math. Phys. **149** (1992), 415–424; *Berezin-Toeplitz quantization*, Algebraic methods in operator theory, pp. 101–108, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1994.
- [64] A. Connes, M. Flato: *Closed star products and cyclic cohomology*, Lett. Math. Phys. **24** (1992), 1–12; A. Connes, M. Flato, D. Sternheimer: *Closedness of star products and cohomologies*, Lie theory and geometry, pp. 241–259, Progr. Math., vol. 123, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1994.
- [65] L. Cornalba, W. Taylor IV: *Holomorphic curves from matrices*, Nuclear Phys. B **536** (1999), 513–552, preprint hep-th/9807060.
- [66] J. Czyz: *On geometric quantization and its connections with the Maslov theory*, Rep. Math. Phys. **15** (1979), 57–97; *On geometric quantization of compact, complex manifolds*, Rep. Math. Phys. **19** (1984), 167–178.
- [67] P.H. Damgaard, H. Hüffel: *Stochastic quantization*, Phys. Rep. **152** (1987), 227–398.
- [68] R. Dashen and D.H. Sharp: *Currents as coordinates for hadron dynamics*, Phys. Rev. **165** (1968), 1857–1866.
- [69] M. Davidson, G. Olafsson, G. Zhang: *Laplace and Segal-Bargmann transforms on Hermitian symmetric spaces and orthogonal polynomials*, J. Funct. Anal. **204** (2003), 157–195; *Segal-Bargmann transform on Hermitian symmetric spaces and orthogonal polynomials*, preprint math.RT/0206275; M. Davidson, G. Olafsson: *The generalized Segal-Bargmann transform and special functions*, preprint math.RT/0307343.
- [70] P. Dazord, G. Patissier: *La première classe de Chern comme obstruction à la quantification asymptotique*, Symplectic geometry, groupoids, and integrable systems (Berkeley, CA, 1989), pp. 73–97, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., vol. 20, Springer, New York, 1991.
- [71] P. Deligne: *Déformations de l'algèbre des fonctions d'une variété symplectique: comparaison entre Fedosov et Dewilde*, Lecomte, Sel. Math. **1** (4) (1995), 667–697.
- [72] M. Dewilde, P.B.A. Lecomte: *Existence of star products and of formal deformations of the Poisson Lie algebra of arbitrary symplectic manifolds*, Lett. Math. Phys. **7** (1983), 487–496.
- [73] P.A.M. Dirac, *The principles of quantum mechanics*, 3rd edition, Oxford, London, 1947.

- [74] G. Dito, D. Sternheimer: *Deformation quantization: genesis, developments, and metamorphoses*, Proceedings of the meeting between mathematicians and theoretical physicists (Strasbourg, 2001), IRMA Lectures in Math. Theoret. Phys., vol. 1, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2002, pp. 9–54, preprint math.QA/0201168.
- [75] H.D. Doebner, P. Šťovíček and J. Tolar: *Quantization of kinematics on configuration manifolds*, Rev. Math. Phys. **13** (2001), 1–47, preprint math-ph/0104013.
- [76] H.-D. Doebner, P. Nattermann: *Borel quantization: kinematics and dynamics*, Acta Phys. Polon. B **27** (1996), 2327–2339.
- [77] C. Duval, A.M. El Gradechi, V. Ovsienko: *Projectively and conformally invariant star-products*, preprint math.QA/0301052.
- [78] A. Echeverria-Enriquez, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, N. Roman-Roy, C. Victoria-Monge: *Mathematical foundations of geometric quantization*, Extracta Math. **13** (1998), 135–238.
- [79] M. Engliš, J. Peetre: *On the correspondence principle for the quantized annulus*, Math. Scand. **78** (1996), 183–206.
- [80] M. Engliš: *Asymptotics of the Berezin transform and quantization on planar domains*, Duke Math. J. **79** (1995), 57–76.
- [81] M. Engliš: *Berezin quantization and reproducing kernels on complex domains*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **348** (1996), 411–479.
- [82] M. Engliš: *A Forelli-Rudin construction and asymptotics of weighted Bergman kernels*, J. Funct. Anal. **177** (2000), 257–281.
- [83] M. Engliš: *Bergman kernels in analysis, operator theory and mathematical physics*, Habilitation (DrSc.) thesis, Prague, October 2000.
- [84] M. Engliš: *Weighted Bergman kernels and quantization*, Comm. Math. Phys. **227** (2002), 211–241.
- [85] M. Engliš: *A no-go theorem for nonlinear canonical quantization*, Comm. Theor. Phys. **37** (2002), 287–288.
- [86] M. Engliš: *Berezin-Toeplitz quantization and invariant symbolic calculi*, Lett. Math. Phys. **65** (2003), 59–74.
- [87] B.V. Fedosov: *A simple geometric construction of deformation quantization*, J. Diff. Geo. **40** (1994), 213–238.
- [88] B.V. Fedosov, *Deformation quantization and index theory*, Mathematical Topics, vol. 9, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [89] R.L. Fernandes: *Deformation quantization and Poisson geometry*, Resenhas IME-USP **4** (2000), 325–359.
- [90] R.P. Feynman, A.R. Hibbs, *Quantum mechanics and path integrals*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965.
- [91] R. Fiorese, M.A. Lledo: *A review on deformation quantization of coadjoint orbits of semisimple Lie groups*, preprint math.QA/0111132.
- [92] M. Flato, D. Sternheimer: *Closedness of star products and cohomologies*, Lie theory and geometry, in honor of B. Kostant (J.-L. Brylinski, R. Brylinski, V. Guillemin, V. Kac, eds.), Birkhauser, Boston, 1994.
- [93] G.B. Folland, *Harmonic analysis in phase space*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 122, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1989.
- [94] E.S. Fradkin: *Towards a quantum field theory in curved phase space*, Proceedings of the Second International A.D. Sakharov Conference on Physics (Moscow, 1996), pp. 746–756, World Scientific, River Edge, 1997.
- [95] E.S. Fradkin, V. Ya. Linetsky: *BFV approach to geometric quantization*, Nuclear Phys. B **431** (1994), 569–621; *BFV quantization on Hermitian symmetric spaces*, Nuclear Phys. B **444** (1995), 577–601.

- [96] K. Gawędzki: *On extensions of Kostant quantization procedure*, Géométrie symplectique et physique mathématique (Aix-en-Provence, 1974), pp. 211–216, CNRS, Paris, 1975.
- [97] K. Gawędzki: *Fourier-like kernels in geometric quantization*, Dissertationes Math. **128** (1976).
- [98] K. Gawędzki: *Geometric quantization and Feynman path integrals for spin*, Differential geometric methods in mathematical physics (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Bonn, Bonn, 1975), pp. 67–71, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 570, Springer, Berlin, 1977.
- [99] J.-P. Gazeau: *Coherent states and quantization of the particle motion on the line, on the circle, on 1+1-de Sitter space-time and of more general systems*, preprint, to appear in the Proceedings of COPROMAPH3 (Cotonou, Benin, Nov 2003), World Scientific, Singapore.
- [100] J.-P. Gazeau, W. Piechocki: *Asymptotic coherent states quantization of a particle in de Sitter space*, preprint hep-th/0308019 v1 4 Aug 2003.
- [101] M. Gerstenhaber: *On deformations of rings and algebras*, Ann. Math. **79** (1964), 59–103.
- [102] F. Gieres: *Mathematical surprises and Dirac’s formalism in quantum mechanics*, Rep. Prog. Phys. **63** (2000), 1893–1946, preprint quant-ph/9907069.
- [103] R.J. Glauber: *Coherent and incoherent states of the radiation field*, Phys. Rev. (2) **131** (1963), 2766–2788.
- [104] J. Glimm, A. Jaffe, *Quantum physics. A functional integral point of view*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1987.
- [105] G.A. Goldin: *Non-relativistic current algebras as unitary representations of groups*, J. Math. Phys. **12** (1971), 462–487.
- [106] G.A. Goldin: *Lectures on diffeomorphism groups in quantum physics*, preprint, to appear in the Proceedings of COPROMAPH3 (Cotonou, Benin, Nov 2003), World Scientific, Singapore.
- [107] G.A. Goldin, J. Grodnik, R.T. Powers and D.H. Sharp: *Nonrelativistic current algebra in the ‘N/V’ limit*, J. Math. Phys. **15** (1974), 88–100.
- [108] G.A. Goldin, R. Menikoff and D.H. Sharp: *Particle statistics from induced representations of a local current group*, J. Math. Phys. **21** (1980), 650–664.
- [109] G.A. Goldin, R. Menikoff and D.H. Sharp: *Representations of a local current algebra in non-simply connected space and the Aharonov-Bohm effect*, J. Math. Phys. **22** (1981), 1664–1668.
- [110] G.A. Goldin, R. Menikoff and D.H. Sharp: *Diffeomorphism groups, gauge groups and quantum theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51** (1983), 2246–2249.
- [111] G.A. Goldin, R. Menikoff and D.H. Sharp: *Induced representations of the group of diffeomorphisms of  $\mathbb{R}^{3n}$* , J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **16** (1983), 1827–1833.
- [112] G.A. Goldin and D.H. Sharp: *Diffeomorphism groups, anyon fields and q-commutators*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** (1996), 1183–1187.
- [113] G.A. Goldin and D.H. Sharp: *Lie algebras of local currents and their representations*, Group Representations in Mathematics and Physics: Battelle-Seattle 1969 Rencontres, pp. 300–310, Lecture Notes in Phys., vol. 6, Springer, Berlin, 1970.
- [114] M.J. Gotay: *A class of nonpolarizable symplectic manifolds*, Monatsh. Math. **103** (1987), 27–30.
- [115] M.J. Gotay, H.B. Grundling, G.M. Tuynman: *Obstruction results in quantization theory*, J. Nonlinear Sci. **6** (1996), 469–498.
- [116] J.M. Gracia-Bondia: *Generalized Moyal quantization on homogeneous symplectic spaces*, Deformation theory and quantum groups with applications to mathematical physics (Amherst, MA, 1990), pp. 93–114, Contemp. Math., vol. 134, AMS, Providence, 1992.
- [117] R.M. Gray, D.L. Neuhoff: *Quantization*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **44** (1998), 2325–2383.
- [118] W. Greiner, J. Reinhardt, *Field quantization*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [119] M.A. Grigoriev, S.L. Lyakhovich: *Fedosov quantization as a BRST theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **218** (2001), 437–457, preprint hep-th/0003114.

- [120] H.J. Groenewold: *On the principles of elementary quantum mechanics*, Physica **12** (1946), 405–460.
- [121] C. Grosche: *An introduction into the Feynman path integral*, preprint hep-th/9302097; C. Grosche, F. Steiner, *Handbook of Feynman path integrals*, Springer tracts in modern physics 145, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [122] V. Guillemin: *Star products on pre-quantizable symplectic manifolds*, Lett. Math. Phys. **35** (1995), 85–89.
- [123] V. Guillemin, S. Sternberg, *Geometric asymptotics*, Math. Surveys, vol. 14, AMS, Providence, 1977.
- [124] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg, *Symplectic Techniques in Physics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984.
- [125] S. Gutt: *Variations on deformation quantization*, Conférence Moshé Flato (Dijon, 1999), vol. I, pp. 217–254, Math. Phys. Stud. 21, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2000, preprint math.QA/0003107.
- [126] K. Hajra, P. Bandyopadhyay: *Equivalence of stochastic, Klauder and geometric quantization*, Internat. J. Modern Phys. A **7** (1992), 1267–1285.
- [127] E. Hawkins: *The correspondence between geometric quantization and formal deformation quantization*, preprint math/9811049 (1998).
- [128] H. Hess: *On a geometric quantization scheme generalizing those of Kostant-Souriau and Czyz*, Differential geometric methods in mathematical physics (Clausthal-Zellerfeld, 1978), pp. 1–35, Lecture Notes in Phys., vol. 139, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1981.
- [129] L. Hörmander: *The Weyl calculus of pseudodifferential operators*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **32** (1979), 359–443.
- [130] M. Horowski, A. Kryszewski, A. Odziejewicz: *Classical and quantum mechanics on the unit ball in  $\mathbb{C}^n$* , Rep. Math. Phys. **24** (1986), 351–363.
- [131] L. van Hove: *Sur certaines représentations unitaires d’un groupe infini de transformations*, Mem. Acad. Roy. de Belgique, Classe des Sci. **26** (1951), no. 6.
- [132] J. Huebschmann: *Kähler quantization and reduction*, preprint math/0207166.
- [133] N.E. Hurt, *Geometric quantization in action*, Dordrecht, Reidel, 1983.
- [134] L.A. Ibort: *On the geometrical and cohomological foundations of BRST quantization*, Quantization of constrained systems and conformal field theory (J.F. Cariñena, ed.), G.I.F.T., Zaragoza, 1990, pp. 201–255.
- [135] G.P. Jorjadze: *Hamiltonian reduction and quantization on symplectic manifolds*, Mem. Diff. Eqs. Math. Phys. **13** (1998), 1–98.
- [136] A.V. Karabegov: *Deformation quantization with separation of variables on a Kähler manifold*, Comm. Math. Phys. **180** (1996), 745–755.
- [137] A.V. Karabegov: *Cohomological classification of deformation quantizations with separation of variables*, Lett. Math. Phys. **43** (1998), 347–357.
- [138] A.V. Karabegov: *On the canonical normalization of a trace density of deformation quantization*, Lett. Math. Phys. **45** (1998), 217–228.
- [139] A.V. Karabegov: *On deformation quantization on a Kählerian manifold that is related to the Berezin quantization*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **30** (1996), 87–89; Funct. Anal. Appl. **30** (1996), 142–144.
- [140] A.V. Karabegov: *Pseudo-Kähler quantization on flag manifolds*, Comm. Math. Phys. **200** (1999), 355–379.
- [141] A.V. Karabegov, M. Schlichenmaier: *Identification of Berezin-Toeplitz deformation quantization*, J. reine angew. Math. **540** (2001), 49–76, preprint math.QA/0006063.
- [142] M.V. Karasev: *Quantization by means of two-dimensional surfaces (membranes): geometrical formulas for wave-functions*, Symplectic geometry and quantization (Sanda and Yokohama, 1993), pp. 83–113, Contemp. Math., vol. 179, AMS, Providence, 1994; *Geometric star-products*,

- ibid., pp. 115–121; *Geometric coherent states, membranes, and star products*, Quantization, coherent states, and complex structures (Białowieża, 1994), pp. 185–199, Plenum, New York, 1995; *Quantization and coherent states over Lagrangian submanifolds*, Russian J. Math. Phys. **3** (1995), 393–400.
- [143] M.V. Karasev: *Simple quantization formula*, Symplectic geometry and mathematical physics (Aix-en-Provence, 1990), pp. 234–244, Progr. Math., vol. 99, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1991.
  - [144] M.V. Karasev, V.P. Maslov: *Asymptotic and geometric quantization*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **39** (1984), 115–173; Russian Math. Surveys **39** (1985), 133–205; *Pseudodifferential operators and the canonical operator on general symplectic manifolds*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **47** (1983), 999–1029; Math. USSR-Izv. **23** (1984), 277–305; *Global asymptotic operators of a regular representation*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **257** (1981), 33–37; Soviet Math. Dokl. **23** (1981), 228–232.
  - [145] M.V. Karasev, V.P. Maslov, *Nonlinear Poisson brackets. Geometry and quantization*, Nauka, Moscow, 1991.
  - [146] M.V. Karasev: *Quantization and intrinsic dynamics*, Asymptotic methods for wave and quantum problems, pp. 1–32, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 208, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2003, preprint math-ph/0207047; M.V. Karasev, T.A. Osborn: *Quantum magnetic algebra and magnetic curvature*, preprint quant-ph/0311053.
  - [147] A.A. Kirillov, *Elements of the theory of representations*, 2nd edition, Nauka, Moscow, 1978 (in Russian); English translation of the 1st edition: Grundlehren Math. Wissensch., Band 220 Springer, Berlin-New York, 1976.
  - [148] A.A. Kirillov: *Geometric quantization*, Dynamical systems IV, pp. 139–176, Encyclopaedia Math. Sci., vol. 4, Springer, Berlin, 2001.
  - [149] J.R. Klauder: *Continuous representations and path integrals, revisited*, Path integrals and their applications in quantum, statistical and solid state physics (Proc. NATO Advanced Study Inst., State Univ. Antwerp, Antwerp, 1977), pp. 5–38, NATO Adv. Study Inst. Ser., Ser. B: Physics, vol. 43, Plenum, New York-London, 1978.
  - [150] S. Klimek, A. Lesniewski: *Quantum Riemann surfaces, I: The unit disc*, Comm. Math. Phys. **146** (1992), 103–122.
  - [151] S. Klimek, A. Lesniewski: *Quantum Riemann surfaces, II: The discrete series*, Lett. Math. Phys. **24** (1992), 125–139; *III: The exceptional cases*, Lett. Math. Phys. **32** (1994), 45–61.
  - [152] E.A. Kochetov, V.S. Yarusin: *Coherent-state path integral for transition amplitude: a theory and applications*, Phys. Scripta **51** (1995), 46–53.
  - [153] J.J. Kohn, L. Nirenberg: *An algebra of pseudo-differential operators*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **18** (1965), 269–305.
  - [154] M. Kontsevich: *Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds*, preprint q-alg/9709040 (1997).
  - [155] B. Kostant: *Quantization and unitary representations*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 170, Springer, Berlin, 1970.
  - [156] B. Kostant: *Symplectic spinors*, Symposia Mathematica, vol. 14, pp. 139–152, Academic Press, London, 1974.
  - [157] B. Kostant: *On the definition of quantization*, Géométrie symplectique et physique mathématique (Aix-en-Provence, 1974), pp. 187–210, Colloq. Internat. CNRS, vol. 237, Éditions Centre Nat. Recherche Sci., Paris, 1975.
  - [158] B. Kostant, S. Sternberg: *Symplectic reduction, BRS cohomology, and infinite-dimensional Clifford algebras*, Ann. Phys. **176** (1987), 49–113.
  - [159] C.N. Ktorides, L.C. Papaloucas: *A special construction of Berezin’s L-kernel*, Found. Phys. **17** (1987), 201–207.
  - [160] N.P. Landsman: *Strict quantization of coadjoint orbits*, J. Math. Phys. **39** (1998), 6372–6383.

- [161] N.P. Landsman: *Classical and quantum representation theory*, Proc. Seminar 1989–1990 Mathem. Struct. in Field Theory (Amsterdam), pp. 135–163, CWI Syllabi, vol. 39, Math. Centrum, Centrum Wisk. Inform. Amsterdam, 1996.
- [162] N.P. Landsman, *Mathematical topics between classical and quantum mechanics*, Springer, New York, 1998.
- [163] N.P. Landsman: *Lie grupoid  $C^*$ -algebras and Weyl quantization*, Comm. Math. Phys. **206** (1999), 367–381.
- [164] N.P. Landsman: *Quantization and the tangent grupoid*, Operator algebras and mathematical physics (Constanța, 2001), pp. 251–265, Theta, Bucharest, 2003, preprint math-ph/0208004.
- [165] J.M. Leinaas and J. Myrheim: *On the theory of identical particles*, Nuovo Cimento B **37** (1977), 1–.
- [166] M.A. Lledo: *Deformation quantization of coadjoint orbits*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **14** (2000), 2397–2400, preprint math.QA/0003142.
- [167] G.W. Mackey, *Induced representations of groups and quantum mechanics*, Benjamin, New York, 1968.
- [168] M.S. Marinov: *Path integrals on homogeneous manifolds*, J. Math. Phys. **36** (1995), 2458–2469; D. Bar-Moshe, M.S. Marinov: *Berezin quantization and unitary representations of Lie groups*, Transl. Amer. Math. Soc. **177** (1996), 1–21.
- [169] V.P. Maslov, O.Yu. Shvedov: *Geometric quantization in the Fock space*, Topics in statistical and theoretical physics, pp. 123–157, AMS Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 177, AMS, Providence, 1996.
- [170] R. Menikoff and D.H. Sharp: *A gauge invariant formulation of quantum electrodynamics using local currents*, J. Math. Phys. **18** (1977), 471–482.
- [171] A.S. Mishchenko, B.Yu. Sternin, V.E. Shatalov, *Lagrangian manifolds and the method of the canonical operator*, Nauka, Moscow, 1978.
- [172] P.K. Mitter: *Stochastic approach to Euclidean quantum field theory*, New perspectives in quantum field theories (Jaca, 1985), pp. 189–207, World Sci., Singapore, 1986.
- [173] I. Mladenov: *Quantization on curved manifolds*, Geometry, integrability and quantization (Varna, 2001), pp. 64–104, Coral Press, Sofia, 2002.
- [174] C. Moreno: *\*-products on some Kähler manifolds*, Lett. Math. Phys. **11** (1986), 361–372; *Invariant star products and representations of compact semisimple Lie groups*, Lett. Math. Phys. **12** (1986), 217–229; *Geodesic symmetries and invariant star products on Kähler symmetric spaces*, Lett. Math. Phys. **13** (1987), 245–257.
- [175] C. Moreno, P. Ortega-Navarro: *Deformations of the algebra of functions on Hermitian symmetric spaces resulting from quantization*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. A (N.S.) **38** (1983), 215–241.
- [176] U.A. Mueller, *Zur Quantisierung physikalischer Systeme mit inneren Freiheitsgraden*, doctoral dissertation, Technische Universität Clausthal, Clausthal, 1987.
- [177] I. Mykytiuk: *Geometric quantization: Hilbert space structure on the space of generalized sections*, Rep. Math. Phys. **43** (1999), 257–266.
- [178] M. Namiki: *Basic ideas of stochastic quantization*, Progr. Theoret. Phys. Suppl. **111** (1993), 1–41; *Stochastic quantization*, Lecture Notes in Physics. New Series m: Monographs, vol. 9, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [179] K. Namsrai, *Nonlocal quantum field theory and stochastic quantum mechanics*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht-Boston, 1986.
- [180] P. Nattermann, *Dynamics in Borel quantization: Nonlinear Schrödinger equations vs. Master Equations*, doctoral dissertation, Technische Universität Clausthal, Clausthal, 1997.
- [181] E. Nelson: *Operants: a functional calculus for non-commuting operators*, 172–187, Functional Analysis and Related Fields (F.E. Browder, ed.), Springer-Verlag, New York, 1970.

- [182] E. Nelson, *Quantum fluctuations*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1985; *What is stochastic mechanics?*, Mathématiques finitaires et analyse non standard, pp. 1–4, Publ. Math. Univ. Paris VII, vol. 31, Univ. Paris VII, Paris, 1989.
- [183] R. Nest, B. Tsygan: *Algebraic index theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **172** (1995), 223–262; *Algebraic index theory for families*, Adv. Math. **113** (1995), 151–205.
- [184] D.L. Neuhoff: *The other asymptotic theory of lossy source coding*, Coding and quantization (Piscataway, NJ, 1992), pp. 55–65, DIMACS Ser. Discrete Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci., vol. 14, AMS, Providence, 1993.
- [185] N. Neumaier: *Local  $\nu$ -Euler derivations and Deligne’s characteristic class of Fedosov star products and star products of special type*, Comm. Math. Phys. **230** (2002), 271–288, preprint math.QA/9905176; *Universality of Fedosov’s construction for star products of Wick type on pseudo-Kähler manifolds*, Rep. Math. Phys. **52** (2003), 43–80, preprint math.QA/0204031.
- [186] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1955.
- [187] M. Nishioka: *Geometric quantization of curved phase space*, Hadronic J. **5** (1981/82), 207–213.
- [188] A. Odziejewicz: *On reproducing kernels and quantization of states*, Comm. Math. Phys. **114** (1988), 577–597.
- [189] A. Odziejewicz: *Coherent states and geometric quantization*, Comm. Math. Phys. **150** (1992), 385–413.
- [190] A. Odziejewicz, M. Świątochowski: *Coherent states map for mic-kepler system*, J. Math. Phys. **38** (1997), 5010–5030.
- [191] A. Odziejewicz: *Covariant and contravariant Berezin symbols of bounded operators*, Quantization and infinite-dimensional systems (Białowieża, 1993) (J.-P. Antoine, S.T. Ali, W. Lisiecki, I.M. Mladenov, A. Odziejewicz, eds.), Plenum, New York, 1994, pp. 99–108.
- [192] H. Omori, Y. Maeda, A. Yoshioka: *Weyl manifolds and deformation quantization*, Adv. Math. **85** (1991), 224–255.
- [193] E. Onofri: *A note on coherent state representation of Lie groups*, J. Math. Phys. **16** (1975), 1087–1089.
- [194] B. Ørsted, G. Zhang: *Weyl quantization and tensor products of Fock and Bergman spaces*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **43** (1994), 551–582.
- [195] G. Parisi, Y.S. Wu: *Perturbation theory without gauge fixing*, Sci. Sinica **24** (1981), 483–496; reprinted in Current topics in Chinese science, Section A – Physics, Vol. 1, pp. 69–82.
- [196] F.B. Pasemann, *Eine geometrische Methode der Quantisierung: Vektorfelddarstellungen*, doctoral dissertation, Technische Universität Clausthal, Clausthal, 1977.
- [197] Z. Pasternak-Winiarski: *On reproducing kernels for holomorphic vector bundles*, Quantization and infinite-dimensional systems (Białowieża, 1993) (J.-P. Antoine, S.T. Ali, W. Lisiecki, I.M. Mladenov, A. Odziejewicz, eds.), Plenum, New York, 1994, pp. 109–112.
- [198] Z. Pasternak-Winiarski, J. Wojcieszynski: *Bergman spaces and kernels for holomorphic vector bundles*, Demonstr. Math. **30** (1997), 199–214.
- [199] Z. Pasternak-Winiarski: *On the dependence of the reproducing kernel on the weight of integration*, J. Funct. Anal. **94** (1990), 110–134; *On the dependence of the Bergman section on deformations of the volume form and the Hermitian structure*, preprint, Singularity theory seminar, Institute of Mathematics, Warsaw University of Technology, 1996.
- [200] G. Patissier: *Quantification d’un variété symplectique*, Séminaire de géométrie, 1985–1986, pp. 35–54, Publ. Dép. Math. Nouvelle Sér. B, 86-4, Univ. Claude-Bernard, Lyon, 1986.
- [201] J. Peetre: *The Berezin transform and Ha-plitz operators*, J. Operator Theory **24** (1990), 165–186.
- [202] J. Peetre, G. Zhang: *A weighted Plancherel formula III. The case of hyperbolic matrix ball*, Collect. Math. **43** (1992), 273–301.



- [203] A. Perelomov, *Generalized coherent states and their applications*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.
- [204] J.C.T. Pool: *Mathematical aspects of the Weyl correspondence*, J. Math. Phys. **7** (1966), 66–76.
- [205] E. Prugovečki: *Consistent formulation of relativistic dynamics for massive spin-zero particles in external fields*, Phys. Rev. D **18** (1978), 3655–3673.
- [206] E. Prugovečki, *Stochastic quantum mechanics and quantum spacetime*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht-Boston, 1984.
- [207] M. Puta, *Hamiltonian mechanical systems and geometric quantization*, Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 260, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1993.
- [208] F. Radulescu: *The  $\Gamma$ -equivariant form of the Berezin quantization of the upper half-plane*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **133** (1998), no. 630; *Quantum dynamics and Berezin’s deformation quantization*, Operator algebras and quantum field theory (Rome, 1996), pp. 383–389, Intern. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998.
- [209] J.H. Rawnsley: *On the cohomology groups of a polarization and diagonal quantization*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **230** (1977), 235–255.
- [210] J.H. Rawnsley: *On the pairing of polarizations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **58** (1978), 1–8.
- [211] J.H. Rawnsley: *A nonunitary pairing of polarizations for the Kepler problem*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **250** (1979), 167–180.
- [212] J.H. Rawnsley, P.L. Robinson: *The metaplectic representation,  $Mp^c$  structures and geometric quantization*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **81** (1989), no. 410, iv+92 pp.
- [213] N. Reshetikhin, L. Takhtajan: *Deformation quantization of Kähler manifolds*, L.D. Faddeev’s seminar on mathematical physics, pp. 257–276, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 201, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2000, preprint math/9907171.
- [214] M.A. Rieffel: *Deformation quantization and operator algebras*, Operator theory: operator algebras and applications (Durham, NH, 1988), pp. 411–423, Proc. Symp. Pure Math., vol. 51, 1990.
- [215] M.A. Rieffel: *Quantization and  $C^*$ -algebras*,  $C^*$ -algebras: 1943–1993 (San Antonio, 1993), pp. 66–97, Contemp. Math., vol. 167, AMS, Providence, 1994.
- [216] M.A. Rieffel: *Deformation quantization for actions of  $\mathbb{R}^d$* , Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **106** (1993), no. 506.
- [217] M.A. Rieffel: *Questions on quantization*, Operator algebras and operator theory (Shanghai 1997), pp. 315–326, Contemp. Math., vol. 228, AMS, Providence, 1998.
- [218] P.L. Robinson: *A cohomological pairing of half-forms*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **301** (1987), 251–261.
- [219] P.L. Robinson: *A report on geometric quantization*, Differential geometry: partial differential equations on manifolds (Los Angeles, 1990), pp. 403–415, Proc. Symp. Pure Math., vol. 54, Part I, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1993.
- [220] D.J. Rowe: *Quantization using vector coherent state methods*, Quantization, coherent states, and Poisson structures (Białowieża, 1995), pp. 157–175, PWN, Warsaw, 1998; S.D. Bartlett, D.J. Rowe, J. Repka: *Vector coherent state representations, induced representations, and geometric quantization: I. Scalar coherent state representations*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35** (2002), 5599–5623, preprint quant-ph/0201129; *II. Vector coherent state representations*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35** (2002), 5625–5651, preprint quant-ph/0201130; D.J. Rowe, J. Repka: *Coherent state triplets and their inner products*, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002), 5400–5438, preprint math-ph/0205034.
- [221] M. Schlichenmaier: *Deformation quantization of compact Kähler manifolds by Berezin-Toeplitz quantization*, Conference Moshé Flato 1999 (September 1999, Dijon, France), Vol. 2, pp. 289–306, Kluwer, 2000, preprint math.QA/9910137; *Zwei Anwendungen algebraisch-geometrischer Methoden in der theoretischen Physik: Berezin-Toeplitz Quantisierung und globale Algebren der zweidimensionalen konformen Feldtheorie*, Habilitation thesis, Mannheim, 1996.

- [222] M. Schlichenmaier: *Deformation quantization of compact Kähler manifolds via Berezin-Toeplitz operators*, Group Theoretical Methods in Physics (Goslar, 1996), World Sci., 1997, pp. 396–400; *Berezin-Toeplitz quantization of compact Kähler manifolds*, Quantization, coherent states and Poisson structures (Białowieża, 1995), PWN, pp. 101–115, 1998, preprint q-alg/9601016; *Berezin-Toeplitz quantization and Berezin symbols for arbitrary compact Kähler manifolds*, Coherent States, Quantization and Gravity (Białowieża, 1998) (M. Schlichenmaier, A. Strasburger, S.T. Ali, A. Odziejewicz, eds.), Warsaw Univ. Press, 2001, pp. 45–56, preprint math.QA/9902066.
- [223] I.E. Segal: *Quantization of nonlinear systems*, J. Math. Phys. **1** (1960), 468–488.
- [224] I.A. Šereševskii: *Quantization in cotangent bundles*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **245** (1979), 1057–1060 (in Russian); Soviet Math. Dokl. **20** (1979), 402–405.
- [225] M.A. Shubin, *Pseudodifferential operators and spectral theory*, Nauka, Moscow, 1978; English translation Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [226] R. Simon, E. C. G. Sudarshan and N. Mukunda: *Gaussian pure states in quantum mechanics and the symplectic group*, Phys. Rev. **A37** (1988), 3028–3038.
- [227] D.J. Simms: *An outline of geometric quantization (d’après Kostant)*, Differential geometrical methods in mathematical physics (Bonn, 1975), pp. 1–10, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 570, Springer, Berlin, 1977.
- [228] D.J. Simms, N.M.J. Woodhouse, *Lectures on geometric quantization*, Lecture Notes in Physics, vol. 53, Springer, New York, 1976.
- [229] R. Sjamaar: *Symplectic reduction and Riemann-Roch formulas for multiplicities*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **33** (1996), 327–338.
- [230] J. Sniatycki: *On geometric quantization of classical systems*, Mathematical foundations of quantum theory (Loyola Univ., New Orleans, 1977), pp. 287–297, Acad. Press, New York, 1978.
- [231] J. Sniatycki, *Geometric quantization and quantum mechanics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980.
- [232] J. Sniatycki: *Constraints and quantization*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1037, pp. 293–310, 1983.
- [233] J.-M. Souriau, *Structure des systèmes dynamiques*, Dunod, Paris, 1969; English translation *Structure of dynamical systems*, Progr. Math., vol. 149, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1997.
- [234] J.-M. Souriau: *Groupes différentiels*, Differential geometrical methods in mathematical physics (Aix-en-Provence/Salamanca, 1979), pp. 91–128, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 836, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1980.
- [235] J.-M. Souriau: *Quantification géométrique*, Physique quantique et géométrie (Paris, 1986), pp. 141–193, Travaux en Cours, vol. 32, Hermann, Paris, 1988.
- [236] J.-M. Souriau: *Des particules aux ondes: quantification géométrique*, Huyghen’s principle 1690–1990: theory and applications (The Hague and Scheveningen, 1990), pp. 299–341, Stud. Math. Phys., vol. 3, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992.
- [237] D. Sternheimer: *Deformation quantization: twenty years after*, Particles, Fields and Gravitation (Łódź, 1998), pp. 107–145, AIP Conf. Proc., vol. 453, Amer. Inst. Phys., Woodbury, 1998; *Star products: Their ubiquity and unicity*, Modern group theoretical methods in physics (Paris, 1995), pp. 255–265, Math. Phys. Stud., vol. 18, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1995.
- [238] M.E. Taylor, *Pseudodifferential operators*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1981.
- [239] Y. Tian, W. Zhang: *An analytic proof of the geometric quantization conjecture of Guillemin-Sternberg*, Invent. Math. **132** (1998), 229–259.
- [240] J. Tolar: *Borel quantization and the origin of topological effects in quantum mechanics*, Differential geometry, group representations, and quantization, pp. 179–190, Lecture Notes in Phys., vol. 379, Springer, Berlin, 1991.

- [241] G.M. Tuynman, *Geometric quantization*, Proceedings Seminar 1983–1985: Mathematical structures in field theories. Vol. 1, CWI Syllabus, vol. 8, Math. Centrum, CWI, Amsterdam, 1985.
- [242] G.M. Tuynman: *Generalized Bergman kernels and geometric quantization*, J. Math. Phys. **28** (1987), 573–583.
- [243] G.M. Tuynman: *Quantization: towards a comparison between methods*, J. Math. Phys. **28** (1987), 2829–2840.
- [244] G.M. Tuynman: *What are the rules of the game called BRST?*, Proc. Mathematical Aspects of Classical Field Theory (Seattle, WA, 1991), Contemp. Math., vol. 132, AMS, Providence, 1992, pp. 625–633.
- [245] G.M. Tuynman: *What is prequantization, and what is geometric quantization?*, Mathematical Structures in Field Theory (Proc. Seminar 1989–1990), CWI Syllabi, vol. 39, Math. Centrum, CWI, Amsterdam, pp. 1–28, 1996.
- [246] G.M. Tuynman: *Prequantization is irreducible*, Pub. IRMA, Lille **37** (1995), no. XV, 1–13; Indag. Math. (N.S.) **9** (1998), 607–618.
- [247] A. Unterberger: *Encore des classes de symboles*, Séminaire Goulaouic-Schwartz (1977/1978), Exp. No. 6, École Polytech., Palaiseau, 1978.
- [248] A. Unterberger: *Quantification des certains espaces hermitiens symétriques*, Séminaire Goulaouic-Schwartz 1979/1980, Exp. No. 16, École Polytech., Palaiseau, 1980.
- [249] A. Unterberger: *The calculus of pseudodifferential operators of Fuchs type*, Comm. Partial Diff. Equations **9** (1984), 1179–1236.
- [250] A. Unterberger: *Pseudodifferential analysis, quantum mechanics and relativity*, Comm. Partial Diff. Equations **13** (1988), 847–894; *Quantification relativiste*, Mém. Soc. Math. France (N.S.) **44–45** (1991); *Quantization, symmetries and relativity*, Perspectives on quantization (South Hadley, 1996), pp. 169–187, Contemp. Math., vol. 214, AMS, Providence, 1998.
- [251] A. Unterberger: *Quantization: some problems, tools, and applications*, Operator theory and complex and hypercomplex analysis (Mexico City, 1994), pp. 285–298, Contemp. Math., vol. 212, AMS, Providence, 1998.
- [252] A. Unterberger: *Composition formulas associated with symbolic calculi and applications*, preprint ESI no. 822 (<http://www.esi.ac.at/ESI-Preprints.html>), Erwin-Schrödinger-Institute, Wien (1999).
- [253] A. Unterberger, H. Upmeyer, *Pseudodifferential analysis on symmetric cones*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1996.
- [254] H. Upmeyer: *Weyl quantization on symmetric spaces I. Hyperbolic matrix domains*, J. Funct. Anal. **96** (1991), 297–330; *Weyl quantization of complex domains*, Operator algebras and topology (Craiova, 1989), Pitman Research Notes in Math., vol. 270, pp. 160–178, Harlow, Longman, 1992.
- [255] M. Vergne: *Quantification géométrique et réduction symplectique*, Séminaire Bourbaki 2000/2001, Astérisque **282** (2002), Exp. no. 888, 249–278.
- [256] D.A. Vogan, Jr.: *Noncommutative algebras and unitary representations*, The mathematical heritage of Hermann Weyl (Durham, NC, 1987), pp. 35–60, Proc. Symp. Pure Math., vol. 48, AMS, Providence, 1988.
- [257] A. Weil, *Variétés Kähleriennes*, Hermann, Paris, 1958.
- [258] P.B. Wiegmann: *Multivalued functionals and geometrical approach for quantization of relativistic particles and strings*, Nuclear Phys. B **323** (1989), 311–329.
- [259] A. Weinstein: *Symplectic groupoids, geometric quantization, and irrational rotation algebras*, Symplectic geometry, groupoids, and integrable systems (Berkeley, 1989), pp. 281–290, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., vol. 20, Springer, New York, 1991.

- [260] A. Weinstein: *Deformation quantization*, Séminaire Bourbaki, exposé 789, Astérisque **227** (1994), 389–409.
- [261] H. Weyl, *The theory of groups and quantum mechanics*, Dover, New York, 1931.
- [262] N. Woodhouse, *Geometric quantization*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1980.
- [263] N.M.J. Woodhouse, *Geometric quantization*, 2nd edition. Oxford Math. Monographs, Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1992.
- [264] S. Zakrzewski: *Geometric quantization of Poisson groups — diagonal and soft deformations*, Symplectic geometry and quantization (Sanda and Yokohama, 1993), pp. 271–285, Contemp. Math., vol. 179, AMS, Providence, 1994.
- [265] S. Zelditch: *Szegő kernels and a theorem of Tian*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **6** (1998), 317–331.
- [266] Q. Zhao: *Quantum kinematics and geometric quantization*, J. Geom. Phys. **21** (1996), 34–42.

<sup>†</sup>DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY, MONTRÉAL, QUÉBEC, CANADA H4B 1R6  
*Email address:* stali@mathstat.concordia.ca

<sup>‡</sup>MÚ AV ČR, ŽITNÁ 25, 11567 PRAHA 1, CZECH REPUBLIC  
*Email address:* englis@math.cas.cz