Gauge Invariance for Classical Massless Particles with Spin

Jacob A. Barandes[1, *]

[1]*Jefferson Physical Laboratory, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138*
(Dated: July 28, 2023)

Wigner's quantum-mechanical classification of particle-types in terms of irreducible representations of the Poincaré group has a classical analogue, which we extend in this paper. We study the compactness properties of the resulting phase spaces at fixed energy, and show that in order for a classical massless particle to be physically sensible, its phase space must feature a classical-particle counterpart of electromagnetic gauge invariance. By examining the connection between massless and massive particles in the massless limit, we also derive a classical-particle version of the Higgs mechanism.

I. INTRODUCTION

The ingredients of classical physics are usually simpler to visualize and understand than those of quantum theory. Classical systems have definite configurations that are related to physical properties like spatial location, mass, momentum, and energy in a much more transparent way than is the case for abstract quantum states. It is therefore worthwhile to determine which seemingly quantum phenomena turn out to have classical realizations, if only to clarify the underpinnings of those phenomena without all the complexities that come along with Hilbert spaces, and to help foster the kind of physical intuition that can lead to new discoveries.

As an important example, intrinsic spin is often regarded as fundamentally quantum in nature, but there exists a fully classical description of relativistic point particles with arbitrary masses and fixed spin. This classical description makes it possible to distinguish between effects that are related to spin itself and effects that are connected specifically to quantum mechanics.

With the eventual goal of explicating and extending this framework,[1] we begin in Section II by suitably generalizing the usual Lagrangian formulation of classical physics to a more expressly Lorentz-covariant form. In Section III, we review the classification of particle-types in terms of transitive group actions of the Poincaré group, expanding on earlier work [2–4] and paralleling Wigner's classification [5] of quantum particle-types in terms of irreducible Hilbert-space representations of the Poincaré group. We will be most interested in the massless case, for which we present new results that include the emergence of a classical-particle form of electromagnetic gauge invariance. In Section IV, we revisit this appearance of gauge invariance from the perspective of the massive case in the massless limit, along the way deriving a classical-particle version of the Higgs mechanism, another novel result.

II. THE MANIFESTLY COVARIANT LAGRANGIAN FORMULATION

Consider a classical system with time parameter t, degrees of freedom q_α, Lagrangian L, and action functional

$$S[q] \equiv \int dt\, L(q, \dot{q}, t). \tag{1}$$

Here dots denote derivatives with respect to the time t, and we will assume that the system's configuration space is a linear manifold with a global coordinate system given by the degrees of freedom q_α. Before we apply this framework to classical relativistic point particles, we will find it useful to recast these ingredients in a form that is more manifestly compatible with relativistic invariance.

To do so, we begin by replacing t with an arbitrary smooth, monotonic parameter λ. Letting dots now denote derivatives with respect to λ, we can rewrite the action functional in the reparametrization-invariant form[2]

$$S[q, t] \equiv \int d\lambda\, \mathscr{L}(q, \dot{q}, t, \dot{t}), \tag{2}$$

where

$$\mathscr{L}(q, \dot{q}, t, \dot{t}) \equiv \dot{t}\, L(q, \dot{q}/\dot{t}, t). \tag{3}$$

Although we are not assuming that the degrees of freedom q_α have anything to do with physical space for now, it will be convenient to introduce a Cartesian-like raised/lowered-index notation according to

$$\begin{aligned}
q^t &\equiv c\,t, & q_t &\equiv -c\,t, \\
q^\alpha &\equiv q_\alpha, \\
p^t &\equiv H/c, & p_t &\equiv -H/c, \\
p^\alpha &\equiv p_\alpha,
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where p_α are the system's usual canonical momenta, H is the system's usual Hamiltonian derived from the original

---

* jacob_barandes@harvard.edu
[1] For a more comprehensive treatment of the results in this paper, see [1].

[2] For an early example of this technique, see [6]. For a more modern, pedagogical treatment, see [7].

Lagrangian L in (1), and c is a constant with units of energy divided by momentum. The quantities p^t and p^α are then expressible in terms of the function (3) as

$$p^t = \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial \dot{q}_t}, \quad p^\alpha = \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial \dot{q}_\alpha}, \tag{5}$$

and one can show that the Euler-Lagrange equations take the symmetric-looking form

$$\dot{p}^t = \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial q_t}, \quad \dot{p}^\alpha = \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial q_\alpha}. \tag{6}$$

Moreover, the action functional (2) now takes a form that resembles a Lorentz-covariant dot product involving a square matrix $\eta \equiv \mathrm{diag}(-1, 1, \dots)$ that naturally generalizes the Minkowski metric tensor in Cartesian coordinates from special relativity,

$$S[q] = \int d\lambda \left(p_t \dot{q}^t + \sum_\alpha p_\alpha \dot{q}^\alpha \right) = \int d\lambda \left(p^t \ p^\alpha \right) \eta \begin{pmatrix} \dot{q}^t \\ \dot{q}^\alpha \end{pmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

despite the fact that, again, the degrees of freedom q_α are not assumed at this point to have anything to do with physical space. The action functional is then invariant under transformations

$$\begin{pmatrix} q^t \\ q^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} q^t \\ q^\alpha \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} p^t \\ p^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} p^t \\ p^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \tag{8}$$

for square matrices Λ satisfying the condition $\Lambda^{\mathrm{T}} \eta \Lambda = \eta$.

Thus, this reparametrization-invariant Lagrangian formulation motivates the introduction of phase-space variables $q^t, q^\alpha, p^t, p^\alpha$ that transform covariantly under a generalized notion of Lorentz transformations. We therefore refer to this framework as the manifestly covariant Lagrangian formulation of our classical system's dynamics.

III. TRANSITIVE GROUP ACTIONS OF THE POINCARÉ GROUP

Wigner showed in [5] that classifying the different Hilbert spaces that provide irreducible representations of the Poincaré group yields a systematic categorization of quantum-mechanical particle-types into massive, massless, and tachyonic cases.[3] As shown in various treatments, such as [2–4], there exists a classical analogue of this construction, one version of which we review here. Toward the end of this section and in the next section, we will present fundamental new results concerning previously unexamined features of the massless case.

––––––––

[3] See [8] for a pedagogical review.

A. Kinematics

We start by laying out a formulation of the kinematics of a system that we will eventually identify as a classical relativistic particle.

Given a classical system described by a manifestly covariant Lagrangian formulation, we say that its phase space provides a transitive or "irreducible" group action of the Poincaré group (or serves as a homogeneous space for the Poincaré group) if we can reach every state (q, p) in the system's phase space by starting from an arbitrary choice of reference state (q_0, p_0) and acting with an appropriate Poincaré transformation $(a, \Lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3} \rtimes O(1,3)$, where $a = (a^t, a^x, a^y, a^z)$ is a four-vector that parametrizes translations in spacetime and Λ is a Lorentz-transformation matrix. The Poincaré group singles out systems whose phase spaces consist of spacetime coordinates

$$X^\mu \equiv (c\,T, \mathbf{X})^\mu \equiv (c\,T, X, Y, Z)^\mu \tag{9}$$

and corresponding canonical four-momentum components

$$p^\mu \equiv \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial \dot{X}^\mu} \equiv (E/c, \mathbf{p})^\mu, \tag{10}$$

where we identify $H \equiv E$ as the system's energy. We will see that such a system formalizes the notion of a classical relativistic particle.

To be as general as possible, we allow the system to have an intrinsic spin represented by an antisymmetric spin tensor S with components

$$S^{\mu\nu} = -S^{\nu\mu}, \tag{11}$$

in terms of which we can define a proper three-vector $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$ and a three-dimensional pseudovector $\mathbf{S}$ according to

$$S^{\mu\nu} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{S}_x & \tilde{S}_y & \tilde{S}_z \\ -\tilde{S}_x & 0 & S_z & -S_y \\ -\tilde{S}_y & -S_z & 0 & S_x \\ -\tilde{S}_z & S_y & -S_x & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{\mu\nu}. \tag{12}$$

Hence, the system's phase space consists of states that we can denote by (X, p, S) and that, by definition, behave under Poincaré transformations (a, Λ) according to

$$(X, p, S) \mapsto (\Lambda X + a, \Lambda p, \Lambda S \Lambda^{\mathrm{T}}). \tag{13}$$

Taking our reference state to be

$$(0, p_0, S_0) \tag{14}$$

for convenient choices of p_0^μ and $S_0^{\mu\nu}$ that will be made on a case-by-case basis later, we can therefore write each state of our system as

$$(X, p, S) \equiv (a, \Lambda p_0, \Lambda S_0 \Lambda^{\mathrm{T}}). \tag{15}$$

Thus, the components a^μ of the four-vector a and the entries $\Lambda^\mu{}_\nu$ of the Lorentz-transformation matrix Λ effectively become the system's fundamental phase-space variables.

To keep our notation simple, we will refer to a^μ as X^μ in our work ahead, remembering that these variables are independent of the Lorentz-transformation variables $\Lambda^\mu{}_\nu$. We will therefore express the functional dependence of the system's manifestly covariant action functional as $S[X, \Lambda]$.

It is natural to introduce several derived tensors from the system's fundamental physical quantities $X^\mu, p^\mu, S^{\mu\nu}$. We define the system's orbital angular-momentum tensor L by

$$L^{\mu\nu} \equiv X^\mu p^\nu - X^\nu p^\mu = -L^{\nu\mu}, \qquad (16)$$

and L together with S make up the system's total angular-momentum tensor J:

$$J^{\mu\nu} \equiv L^{\mu\nu} + S^{\mu\nu} = -J^{\nu\mu}. \qquad (17)$$

Defining the four-dimensional Levi-Civita symbol by

$$\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \equiv \begin{cases} +1 & \text{for } \mu\nu\rho\sigma \text{ an even permutation of } txyz, \\ -1 & \text{for } \mu\nu\rho\sigma \text{ an odd permutation of } txyz, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
$$= -\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}, \qquad (18)$$

the system's Pauli-Lubanski pseudovector W is defined by

$$W^\mu \equiv -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} p_\nu S_{\rho\sigma} = (\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{S}, \ (E/c)\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{p} \times \tilde{\mathbf{S}})^\mu. \ (19)$$

The following quantities are then invariant under proper, orthochronous Poincaré transformations, and therefore represent fixed features (or Casimir invariants) of the system's phase space:

$$-m^2 c^2 \equiv p_\mu p^\mu, \qquad (20)$$
$$w^2 \equiv W_\mu W^\mu, \qquad (21)$$
$$s^2 \equiv \frac{1}{2} S_{\mu\nu} S^{\mu\nu} = \mathbf{S}^2 - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^2, \qquad (22)$$
$$\tilde{s}^2 \equiv \frac{1}{8} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} S^{\mu\nu} S^{\rho\sigma} = \mathbf{S} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{S}}. \qquad (23)$$

In the analogous quantum case, the third of these invariant quantities, the spin-squared scalar s^2, would be quantized in increments of $\hbar$ (or, more precisely, $\hbar^2$). In our classical context, we are essentially working in the limit of large quantum numbers, in which the correspondence principle holds and these quantities are free to take on fixed values from a continuous set of real numbers. Note, in particular, that the invariance of s^2 is entirely separate from issues of quantization, just as the invariance of m^2 does not require quantization.

B. Dynamics

We now turn to the system's dynamics.

In the absence of intrinsic spin, $S^{\mu\nu} = 0$, the system's manifestly covariant action functional is, from (7), given by

$$S_{\text{no spin}}[X, \Lambda] = \int d\lambda \, p_\mu \dot{X}^\mu = \int d\lambda \, (\Lambda p_0)_\mu \dot{X}^\mu. \quad (24)$$

We will eventually need to establish a definite relationship between the system's four-momentum p^μ and its four-velocity $\dot{X}^\mu \equiv dX^\mu/d\lambda$.

First, however, we will extend the action functional (24) to include intrinsic spin. We begin by introducing the standard Lorentz generators:

$$[\sigma_{\mu\nu}]^\alpha{}_\beta = -i\delta^\alpha_\mu \eta_{\nu\beta} + i\eta_{\mu\beta} \delta^\alpha_\nu. \qquad (25)$$

Using the composition property of Lorentz transformations applied to the case of infinitesimal shifts $\lambda \mapsto \lambda + d\lambda$ in the parameter λ,

$$\Lambda(\lambda + d\lambda) = \Lambda(d\lambda)\Lambda(\lambda)$$
$$= (1 - (i/2)d\theta^{\mu\nu}(\lambda)\sigma_{\mu\nu})\Lambda(\lambda), \qquad (26)$$

where $d\theta^{\mu\nu}$ are the components of an antisymmetric tensor of infinitesimal Lorentz boosts and angular displacements, we have

$$\dot{\Lambda}(\lambda) \equiv \lim_{d\lambda \to 0} \frac{\Lambda(\lambda + d\lambda) - \Lambda(\lambda)}{d\lambda}$$
$$= -\frac{i}{2}\dot{\theta}^{\mu\nu}(\lambda)\sigma_{\mu\nu}\Lambda(\lambda). \qquad (27)$$

Invoking the following trace identity satisfied by antisymmetric tensors $A^{\mu\nu} = -A^{\nu\mu}$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}[\sigma^{\mu\nu} A] = iA^{\mu\nu}, \qquad (28)$$

or, more explicitly,

$$\frac{1}{2}[\sigma^{\mu\nu}]^\alpha{}_\beta A^\beta{}_\alpha = iA^{\mu\nu}, \qquad (29)$$

we can express the rates of change $\dot{\theta}^{\mu\nu}(\lambda)$ according to

$$\dot{\theta}^{\mu\nu}(\lambda) = \frac{i}{2}\text{Tr}[\sigma^{\mu\nu}\dot{\Lambda}(\lambda)\Lambda^{-1}(\lambda)]. \qquad (30)$$

By an integration by parts, we can then recast the action functional (24) (up to an irrelevant boundary term) as

$$S_{\text{no spin}}[X, \Lambda] = \int d\lambda \, \frac{1}{2} L_{\mu\nu} \dot{\theta}^{\mu\nu}. \qquad (31)$$

With the alternative form (31) of the action functional in hand, we can straightforwardly introduce intrinsic spin into the system's dynamics by making the replacement $L_{\mu\nu} \mapsto J_{\mu\nu} \equiv L_{\mu\nu} + S_{\mu\nu}$. Converting the term involving

$L_{\mu\nu}$ back into the form (24), we thereby obtain the new action functional

$$S[X, \Lambda] = \int d\lambda\, \mathscr{L} = \int d\lambda \left(p_\mu \dot{X}^\mu + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[S\dot{\Lambda}\Lambda^{-1}] \right), \tag{32}$$

which now properly accounts for intrinsic spin. Explicitly, the last term, which encodes the system's intrinsic spin, is given by

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[S\dot{\Lambda}\Lambda^{-1}] \equiv \frac{1}{2}S^\alpha{}_\beta \dot{\Lambda}^\beta_\gamma (\Lambda^{-1})^\gamma{}_\alpha. \tag{33}$$

The equations of motion derived from this action functional are

$$\dot{p}^\mu = 0, \tag{34}$$
$$\dot{j}^{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{35}$$

and respectively express conservation of four-momentum and conservation of total angular momentum, in keeping with Noether's theorem and the symmetries of the dynamics under Poincaré transformations. It follows that the Pauli-Lubanski pseudovector (19) is conserved, $\dot{W}^\mu = 0$, and that the scalar quantities $-m^2c^2$ and w^2 defined in (20) and (21) are guaranteed to be constant, as required.

As shown in [9], constancy of the spin-squared scalar s^2 defined in (22) requires the imposition of an important Poincaré-invariant condition on the system's phase space. To see why, we make use of the equation of motion (35) to compute the rate of change of s^2:

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda}\left(\frac{1}{2}S_{\mu\nu}S^{\mu\nu} \right) = S_{\mu\nu}\dot{S}^{\mu\nu} = 2\dot{X}^\nu p^\mu S_{\mu\nu} = 0.$$

Keep in mind that without a definite relationship between the four-momentum p^μ and the four-velocity $\dot{X}^\mu$, this condition is nontrivial. Because it establishes a constraint on all solution trajectories in the system's phase space, we conclude that the following Lorentz-invariant condition must hold:

$$p_\mu S^{\mu\nu} = 0. \tag{36}$$

Combined with the system's equations of motion (34) and (35), this condition yields a pair of basic relationships between the system's four-momentum p^μ and its otherwise-unfixed four-velocity $\dot{X}^\mu$,

$$p \cdot \dot{X} = \pm mc^2\sqrt{-\dot{X}^2/c^2}, \tag{37}$$
$$m\sqrt{-\dot{X}^2/c^2}\, p^\mu = \mp m^2 \dot{X}^\mu, \tag{38}$$

where $p \cdot \dot{X} \equiv p_\mu \dot{X}^\mu$ and $\dot{X}^2 \equiv \dot{X}_\mu \dot{X}^\mu$. The equations (34)–(38) complete our specification of the system's dynamics.

Notice that the self-consistency condition (36), $p_\mu S^{\mu\nu} = 0$, is phrased entirely in terms of ingredients that have clear counterparts in classical field theory and in quantum theory—namely, linear and angular momentum. As we will see shortly, the condition (36) eliminates unphysical spin states that formally arise due to our use of a manifestly Lorentz-covariant formalism, and thereby serves a role that is closely related to the Lorenz equation $\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$ that appears both in the Proca field theory of a massive spin-1 boson and as the Lorenz-gauge condition in electromagnetism.

Indeed, for a plane-wave mode of the form $A^\mu(x) = \varepsilon^\mu \exp(ip \cdot x/\hbar)$ for a spin-1 field theory, where ε^μ is the wave's polarization four-vector and encodes the wave's underlying spin, the Lorenz equation reduces to $p_\mu \varepsilon^\mu = 0$, thereby eliminating one linear combination of polarizations and therefore one independent spin state from the underlying spin-1 boson. By contrast, our classical particle has a fixed but not quantized overall spin (22), and the self-consistency condition $p_\mu S^{\mu\nu} = 0$ removes a continuous infinity of unphysical spin states.

C. Classification of the Transitive Group Actions

Specializing to the *orthochronous* Poincaré group, classifying the different systems whose phase spaces give transitive group actions is a straightforward exercise that parallels Wigner's approach in [5]. As derived in detail in [1], one finds that each such system can describe a massive particle $m^2 > 0$ or a massless particle $m^2 = 0$ with either positive energy $E = p^t c > 0$ or negative energy $E = p^t c < 0$, or a tachyon $m^2 < 0$, or the vacuum $p^\mu = 0$. Furthermore, the relations (37) and (38) imply that for each of these cases, the four-momentum is parallel to the four-velocity, $p^\mu \propto \dot{X}^\mu$. It then follows immediately from the equations of motion (34) and (35) that $L^{\mu\nu}$ and $S^{\mu\nu}$ are separately conserved.

For a massive particle, we can take the reference state (14) to describe the particle at rest, with reference four-momentum

$$p_0^\mu = (mc, \mathbf{0})^\mu. \tag{39}$$

The condition (36) then eliminates unphysical spin degrees of freedom and implies that the particle's spin tensor (12) reduces to the three-dimensional spin pseudovector $\mathbf{S}$, whose possible orientations fill out a compact, fixed-energy region of the particle's phase space.

By contrast, for massless particles and tachyons, the little group of Lorentz transformations that preserve the particle's reference four-momentum p_0^μ dictates that the particle's phase space at any fixed energy is seemingly noncompact, leading to infinite entropies and other thermodynamic pathologies, besides problems that arise

in the corresponding quantum field theories.[4] For a tachyon, the only way to eliminate this noncompactness is to require that the spin tensor vanishes, $S^{\mu\nu} = 0$, meaning that tachyons are naturally spinless.

For a massless particle, by contrast, the story is more interesting. We can take the massless particle's reference four-momentum to be

$$p_0^\mu = (E/c, 0, 0, E/c)^\mu, \qquad (40)$$

and the phase-space self-consistency condition (36), $p_\mu S^{\mu\nu} = 0$, then implies the corresponding reference spin tensor

$$S_0^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & S_{0,y} & -S_{0,x} & 0 \\ -S_{0,y} & 0 & S_{0,z} & -S_{0,y} \\ S_{0,x} & -S_{0,z} & 0 & S_{0,x} \\ 0 & S_{0,y} & -S_{0,x} & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{\mu\nu}. \qquad (41)$$

The most general little-group transformation preserving the reference four-momentum (40) consists of a Lorentz-transformation matrix Λ of the form[5]

$$\Lambda(\alpha, \beta, \theta) = L(\alpha, \beta)R(\theta), \qquad (42)$$

where

$$R(\theta) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos\theta & \sin\theta & 0 \\ 0 & -\sin\theta & \cos\theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \qquad (43)$$

is a pure rotation by an angle θ around the z axis and where

$$L(\alpha, \beta) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1+\zeta & \alpha & \beta & -\zeta \\ \alpha & 1 & 0 & -\alpha \\ \beta & 0 & 1 & -\beta \\ \zeta & \alpha & \beta & 1-\zeta \end{pmatrix} \qquad (44)$$

is a complicated combination of Lorentz boosts and rotations. One can show that

$$R(\theta_1)R(\theta_2) = R(\theta_1 + \theta_2), \qquad (45)$$
$$L(\alpha_1, \beta_1)L(\alpha_2, \beta_2) = L(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \beta_1 + \beta_2), \qquad (46)$$

so rotations $R(\theta)$ around the z axis and the Lorentz transformations $L(\alpha, \beta)$ respectively form a pair of commutative subgroups of the particle's little group. Noting that

$$R(\theta)L(\alpha, \beta)R^{-1}(\theta)$$
$$= L(\alpha\cos\theta + \beta\sin\theta, -\alpha\sin\theta + \beta\cos\theta), \qquad (47)$$

we identify the little group as $ISO(2)$, which is the noncompact group of rotations and translations in the two-dimensional Euclidean plane.

These little-group transformations act nontrivially on the particle's reference spin tensor (41):

$$L(\alpha, \beta)S_0 L^{\mathrm{T}}(\alpha, \beta)$$
$$= S_0 + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\beta S_{0,z} & \alpha S_{0,z} & 0 \\ \beta S_{0,z} & 0 & 0 & \beta S_{0,z} \\ \alpha S_{0,z} & 0 & 0 & -\alpha S_{0,z} \\ 0 & -\beta S_{0,z} & \alpha S_{0,z} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (48)$$

Hence, the only way to ensure that the massless particle has a compact phase space at fixed reference energy while still allowing for nonzero spin is to impose the following equivalence relation on the particle's phase space:

$$(X, p, S) \cong (X, p, S'). \qquad (49)$$

This equivalence relation is a new result. Just as the self-consistency condition (36), $p_\mu S^{\mu\nu} = 0$, is the classical-particle analogue of the Lorenz-gauge condition $\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$ for the gauge potential A_μ in electromagnetism, the equivalence relation (49) is a classical-particle manifestation of electromagnetic gauge invariance $A_\mu \cong A_\mu + \partial_\mu f$. Indeed, for the case of plane waves $A^\mu = \varepsilon^\mu \exp(ip \cdot x/\hbar)$ and $f = \alpha \exp(ip \cdot x/\hbar)$, where the polarization four-vector ε^μ encodes the wave's underlying spin, electromagnetic gauge invariance reduces to an equivalence relation of the form $\varepsilon^\mu \cong \varepsilon^\mu + (i\alpha/\hbar)p^\mu$ for the wave's polarization, and therefore implies an equivalence relation on the wave's underlying spin directly analogous to (49).

In particular, in the same sense in which electromagnetic gauge invariance is responsible for removing unphysical spin states, and furthermore implies that all observable quantities must be gauge invariant, the equivalence relation (49) cuts the classical massless particle's phase space at fixed energy down to a compact extent, with the implication that (49) must be an invariance of all observable quantities. The distinct physical states of the massless particle are then characterized by a spacetime position X^μ, a four-momentum p^μ, and a helicity $\sigma \equiv (\mathbf{p}/|\mathbf{p}|) \cdot \mathbf{S}$.[6]

Components of the spin tensor $S^{\mu\nu}$ that are transverse to the particle's three-momentum $\mathbf{p}$ are not invariant under the equivalence relation (49). As a consequence, $S^{\mu\nu}$ cannot directly appear in Lorentz-covariant interaction terms in equations of motion that couple the particle to other systems, in close analogy with the fact that gauge invariance precludes the electromagnetic gauge potential

---

[4] See, for example, [10, 11], but also [12] for a more optimistic take.

[5] For a derivation, see, for example, [1, 8].

[6] Note that if we permit parity transformations, which map $\sigma \mapsto -\sigma$, then we must require that the equivalence relation (49) hold only for states that share the same helicity σ.

A_μ from showing up directly in Lorentz-covariant field equations outside of the gauge-invariant Faraday tensor $F_{\mu\nu} \equiv \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$.

IV. THE MASSLESS LIMIT

We can better understand the origin of the novel equivalence relation (49) by starting with the massive case $m > 0$ and then taking the massless limit $m \to 0$.

Our original massive-particle reference state (39) degenerates for $m \to 0$, so we instead take the massive particle's reference four-momentum to be

$$\bar{p}^\mu \equiv (\bar{p}^t, 0, 0, \bar{p}^z)^\mu = \left(\sqrt{(\bar{p}^z)^2 + m^2 c^2}, 0, 0, \bar{p}^z\right)^\mu. \quad (50)$$

This choice has the correct $m \to 0$ limit (40):

$$\lim_{m \to 0} \bar{p}^\mu = (E_0/c, 0, 0, E_0/c)^\mu, \quad E_0 \equiv \bar{p}^z c. \quad (51)$$

Moreover, (50) is related to our original choice (39) of reference four-momentum for the massive particle by a simple Lorentz boost $\bar{\Lambda}$ along the z direction,

$$\bar{p}^\mu = \bar{\Lambda}^\mu_\nu p_0^\nu, \quad (52)$$

and the new reference value $\bar{S}$ of the massive particle's spin tensor is related to its original reference value S_0 according to

$$\bar{S}^{\mu\nu} \equiv (\bar{\Lambda} S_0 \bar{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{T}})^{\mu\nu}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\bar{p}^z}{mc} S_{0,y} & -\frac{\bar{p}^z}{mc} S_{0,x} & 0 \\ -\frac{\bar{p}^z}{mc} S_{0,y} & 0 & S_{0,z} & -\frac{\bar{p}^t}{mc} S_{0,y} \\ \frac{\bar{p}^z}{mc} S_{0,x} & -S_{0,z} & 0 & \frac{\bar{p}^t}{mc} S_{0,x} \\ 0 & \frac{\bar{p}^t}{mc} S_{0,y} & -\frac{\bar{p}^t}{mc} S_{0,x} & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{\mu\nu}. \quad (53)$$

For $m \to 0$, we have $\bar{p}^t, \bar{p}^z \to E_0/c$, so the components $\bar{S}^{\mu\nu}$ of the spin tensor involving $\bar{p}^t/mc$ or $\bar{p}^z/mc$ diverge. Furthermore, there is a discrete mismatch in the particle's spin-squared scalar (22) between the massive case and the massless case:

$$s^2 = S_{0,x}^2 + S_{0,y}^2 + S_{0,z}^2 \quad \text{(massive)}$$
$$\neq S_{0,z}^2 \quad \text{(massless)}. \quad (54)$$

These discrepancies are hints that the massive case includes spin degrees of freedom that need to be removed before taking the massless limit.

Our approach for removing these ill-behaved spin degrees of freedom is motivated by a corresponding procedure in quantum field theory that was originally developed by Stueckelberg in [13]. We start with the redefinition

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bar{S}_x \\ \bar{S}_y \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \frac{mc}{\bar{p}^t}\begin{pmatrix} \bar{S}_x + \bar{p}^t \varphi_x \\ \bar{S}_y + \bar{p}^t \varphi_y \end{pmatrix} = \frac{mc}{\bar{p}^t}\begin{pmatrix} \bar{S}_x \\ \bar{S}_y \end{pmatrix} + mc\begin{pmatrix} \varphi_x \\ \varphi_y \end{pmatrix}, \quad (55)$$

where $\varphi_x(\lambda)$ and $\varphi_y(\lambda)$ are arbitrary new functions on the particle's worldline. The particle's spin tensor (53) then has the decomposition

$$\bar{S}^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\bar{p}^z}{\bar{p}^t} S_{0,y} & -\frac{\bar{p}^z}{\bar{p}^t} S_{0,x} & 0 \\ -\frac{\bar{p}^z}{\bar{p}^t} S_{0,y} & 0 & S_{0,z} & -S_{0,y} \\ \frac{\bar{p}^z}{\bar{p}^t} S_{0,x} & -S_{0,z} & 0 & S_{0,x} \\ 0 & S_{0,y} & -S_{0,x} & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{\mu\nu}$$
$$+ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \bar{p}^z \varphi_y & -\bar{p}^z \varphi_x & 0 \\ -\bar{p}^z \varphi_y & 0 & 0 & -\bar{p}^t \varphi_y \\ \bar{p}^z \varphi_x & 0 & 0 & \bar{p}^t \varphi_x \\ 0 & \bar{p}^t \varphi_y & -\bar{p}^t \varphi_x & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (56)$$

and the spin-squared scalar (22) becomes

$$s^2 = \left(1 - \left(\frac{\bar{p}^z}{\bar{p}^t}\right)^2\right)\left((S_{0,x} + \bar{p}^t \varphi_x)^2 + (S_{0,y} + \bar{p}^t \varphi_y)^2\right) + S_{0,z}^2. \quad (57)$$

The particle's spin tensor (56) is now invariant under the simultaneous transformations

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bar{S}_x \\ \bar{S}_y \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \bar{S}_x \\ \bar{S}_y \end{pmatrix} - \bar{p}^t \begin{pmatrix} f_x \\ f_y \end{pmatrix}, \quad (58)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi_x \\ \varphi_y \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_x \\ \varphi_y \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} f_x \\ f_y \end{pmatrix}, \quad (59)$$

where $f_x(\lambda), f_y(\lambda)$ are arbitrary functions on the particle's worldline.

Our massive particle's original phase space, with states labeled as (X, p, S), is therefore equivalent to a *formally enlarged* phase space consisting of states (X, p, S, φ) under the equivalence relation $(\bar{X}, \bar{p}, \bar{S}, \varphi) \cong (\bar{X}, \bar{p}, \bar{S} - \bar{p}^t f, \varphi + f)$, suitably generalized from the reference state $(\bar{X}, \bar{p}, \bar{S}, \varphi)$ to general states (X, p, S, φ) of the system. Indeed, one can check that the specific choice $(f_x, f_y) \equiv -(\varphi_x, \varphi_y)$ yields $(\bar{X}, \bar{p}, \bar{S} + \bar{p}^t \varphi, 0)$, which gives back the state $(\bar{X}, \bar{p}, \bar{S})$ after undoing the redefinition (55) of $\bar{S}^{\mu\nu}$.

We can now safely take the massless limit of the system's redefined spin tensor (56):

$$\lim_{m \to 0} \bar{S}^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & S_{0,y} & -S_{0,x} & 0 \\ -S_{0,y} & 0 & S_{0,z} & -S_{0,y} \\ S_{0,x} & -S_{0,z} & 0 & S_{0,x} \\ 0 & S_{0,y} & -S_{0,x} & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{\mu\nu}$$
$$+ \frac{E}{c}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \varphi_y & -\varphi_x & 0 \\ -\varphi_y & 0 & 0 & -\varphi_y \\ \varphi_x & 0 & 0 & \varphi_x \\ 0 & \varphi_y & -\varphi_x & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{\mu\nu} \quad (60)$$

and

$$\lim_{m \to 0} s^2 = S_{0,z}^2. \quad (61)$$

The degrees of freedom describing spin components perpendicular to the particle's reference three-momentum $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ no longer contribute to the particle's spin-squared scalar s^2. If we remove these ancillary degrees of freedom by setting φ_x, φ_y equal to zero, then the particle's spin tensor (60) reduces correctly to the reference spin tensor (41) for a massless particle, and our equivalence relation (58) reduces to the gauge invariance (49). We have therefore completed our recovery of the massless case from the $m \to 0$ limit of a massive particle.

We can run these arguments in reverse to obtain a classical-particle counterpart of the celebrated Higgs mechanism. Recall that in the simplest version of the field-theoretic Higgs mechanism, we start with a massless spin-1 boson and then spontaneously break the underlying gauge invariance. The overall effect is to give the original spin-1 boson a nonzero mass while augmenting its two spin states with another spin state from a Higgs boson, so that we now have the necessary three spin states for a massive spin-1 boson. Analogously, suppose that we start with a classical massless particle with reference four-momentum (40), $p_0^\mu = (E/c, 0, 0, E/c)^\mu$, and phase-space equivalence relation (49), $(X, p, S) \cong (X, p, S')$. Running the analysis of this section in the other direction, we see that we can transform the massless particle into a massive particle if we augment the particle's phase space with ancillary "Higgs" degrees of freedom φ_x, φ_y.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

[1] J. A. Barandes. "Manifestly Covariant Lagrangians, Classical Particles with Spin, and the Origins of Gauge Invariance", 2019. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.08892, arXiv:1911.08892.

[2] A. P. Balachandran, G. Marmo, B.-S. Skagerstam, and A. Stern. *Gauge Symmetries and Fibre Bundles - Applications to Particle Dynamics*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1st edition, 1983. arXiv:1702.08910, doi:10.1007/3-540-12724-0.

[3] J.-M. Souriau. *Structure of Dynamical Systems*. Birkhäuser, 1st edition, 1997.

[4] M. Rivas. *Kinematical Theory of Spinning Particles*. Springer, 2002.

[5] E. P. Wigner. "On Unitary Representations of the Inhomogeneous Lorentz Group". *Annals of Mathematics*, 40(1):149–204, 1939. doi:10.2307/1968551.

[6] P. A. M. Dirac. "Relativity Quantum Mechanics with an Application to Compton Scattering". *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 111(758):405–423, 1926. URL: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/abs/10.1098/rspa.1926.0074, doi:10.1098/rspa.1926.0074.

[7] A. Deriglazov and B. Rizzuti. "Reparametrization-invariant formulation of classical mechanics and the Schrödinger equation". *American Journal of Physics*, 79(8):882–885, 2011. URL: https://aapt.scitation.org/doi/10.1119/1.3593270, arXiv:1105.0313, doi:10.1119/1.3593270.

[8] S. Weinberg. *The Quantum Theory of Fields*, Volume 1. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

[9] B.-S. Skagerstam and A. Stern. "Lagrangian Descriptions of Classical Charged Particles with Spin". *Physica Scripta*, 24:493–497, 1981. URL: https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/0031-8949/24/3/002, doi:10.1088/0031-8949/24/3/002.

[10] E. P. Wigner. "Invariant Quantum Mechanical Equations of Motion", in *Theoretical Physics*, pages 161–184. International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna Austria, 1963. URL: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-662-09203-3_18, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-09203-3_18.

[11] L. F. Abbott. "Massless particles with continuous spin indices". *Physical Review D*, 13(8):2291–2294, April 1976. URL: https://journals.aps.org/prd/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevD.13.2291, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.13.2291.

[12] P. Schuster and N. Toro. "On the theory of continuous-spin particles: wavefunctions and soft-factor scattering amplitudes". *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2013(104), 2013. URL: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/JHEP09(2013)104, arXiv:1302.1198, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2013)104.

[13] E. C. G. Stueckelberg. "Die Wechselwirkungskräfte in der Elektrodynamik und in der Feldtheorie der Kernkraäfte". *Helvetica Physica Acta*, 11(3):225–244, 299–328, 1938. URL: https://www.e-periodica.ch/digbib/view?pid=hpa-001:1938:11::636#227, doi:10.5169/seals-110852.