

Notes on Heisenberg Space

Rich Schwartz

October 15, 2013

1 The Siegel Domain

We equip $\mathbf{C}^{2,1}$ with the Hermitian form

$$\langle Z, W \rangle = Z_1 \bar{W}_3 + Z_2 \bar{W}_2 + Z_3 \bar{W}_1. \quad (1)$$

\mathbf{CH}^2 is defined as the projectivization $[N_-] \subset \mathbf{CP}^2$, where

$$N_- = \{V \mid \langle V, V \rangle < 0\}. \quad (2)$$

This model of \mathbf{CH}^2 is sometimes called the *Siegel domain*.

The ideal boundary of \mathbf{CH}^2 is the set $[N_0] \subset \mathbf{CP}^2$, where

$$N_0 = \{V \mid \langle V, V \rangle = 0\}. \quad (3)$$

There is an inclusion $\mathbf{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{CP}^2$ given by the equations

$$(z, w) \rightarrow [z : w : 1]. \quad (4)$$

In this way, we identify \mathbf{C}^2 with a subset of \mathbf{CP}^2 . We have

$$[N_0] \cap \mathbf{C}^2 = \mathcal{Z}, \quad \mathcal{Z} = \{(z, w) \mid \Re(z) = -|w|^2/2\} \quad (5)$$

In fact, $[N_0]$ is the one-point compactification of \mathcal{Z} . If we define

$$\infty = [1 : 0 : 0], \quad (6)$$

then

$$[N_0] = \mathcal{Z} \cup \infty. \quad (7)$$

The set \mathcal{Z} is the boundary of the Siegel domain.

2 The Heisenberg Group

The *Heisenberg Group* is the space $\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{R}$, equipped with the group law

$$(z_1, t_1) * (z_2, t_2) = (z_1 + z_2, t_1 + t_2 + \Im(\bar{z}_1 z_2)). \quad (8)$$

That weird symbol denotes “imaginary part”. We’ll denote the Heisenberg group by \mathcal{H} . The space \mathcal{H} is closely related to the complex hyperbolic plane.

There is a natural map $\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, given by

$$(z, w) \rightarrow (w, -\Im(z)). \quad (9)$$

The inverse map is given by

$$(w, t) \rightarrow (-it - |w|^2/2, w). \quad (10)$$

Let’s work out the symmetries of \mathbf{CH}^2 in terms of their action on \mathcal{Z} and (using the map above) \mathcal{H} .

Rotation: Let u be a unit complex number. The map $(z, w) \rightarrow (z, uw)$ is clearly a symmetry of \mathcal{Z} . The corresponding map on \mathcal{H} is given by

$$(w, t) \rightarrow (uw, t). \quad (11)$$

Geometrically, this rotates around the vertical axis in \mathcal{H} . One can check that this map is an automorphism of \mathcal{H} , with respect to the above group law.

Vertical Translation: Let $s \in \mathbf{R}$. The map $(z, w) \rightarrow (z - is, w)$ is a symmetry of \mathcal{Z} . The corresponding map on \mathcal{H} is given by

$$(w, t) \rightarrow (0, s) * (w, t). \quad (12)$$

So, we get left multiplication by the element $(0, s)$.

Dilation: Let $s > 0$ be real. The map $(z, w) \rightarrow (s^2 z, sw)$ is a symmetry of \mathcal{Z} . The corresponding map on \mathcal{H} is given by

$$(w, t) \rightarrow (sw, s^2 t). \quad (13)$$

This is also an automorphism of \mathcal{H} .

Translation: Let $s \in \mathbf{R}$. The point $(-(y+s)^2/2, y+s)$ lies on $\mathcal{Z} \cap \mathbf{R}^2$ for all s . Expanding this out and using the fact that $x = -y^2/2$, we see that the map

$$(x, y) \rightarrow (x - sy - s^2/2, y + s) \quad (14)$$

preserves $\mathcal{Z} \cap \mathbf{R}^2$. But then this same map preserves \mathcal{Z} when we allow x and y to be complex variables. In short, the affine map

$$(z, w) \rightarrow (z - sw - s^2/2, w + s) \quad (15)$$

preserves \mathcal{Z} . The corresponding map on \mathcal{H} is given by

$$(w, t) \rightarrow (s, 0) * (w, t). \quad (16)$$

Again, we see left multiplication on \mathcal{H} .

Inversion: The map $(a, b, c) \rightarrow (c, b, a)$ is an obvious symmetry of the Hermitian form we have introduced. The corresponding map on $\mathcal{Z} \cup \infty$ is given by $(z, w) \rightarrow (1/z, w/z)$. This map interchanges $(0, 0) \in \mathcal{Z}$ with ∞ . It is the analog of inversion. The corresponding action on $\mathcal{H} \cup \infty$ is given by

$$I(w, t) = \left(\frac{-w}{|w|^2/2 + it}, \Im \left(\frac{1}{|w|^2/2 + it} \right) \right). \quad (17)$$

Fibration: There is a canonical map $\pi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$, given by

$$\pi(w, t) = w. \quad (18)$$

We do not consider inversion to be a symmetry of \mathcal{H} . We call the other maps considered above *symmetries*. Every symmetry T of \mathcal{H} acts on \mathbf{C} via the rule

$$T^*(w) = \pi \circ T(w, s). \quad (19)$$

The definition turns out to be independent of the choice of s . The map $T \rightarrow T^*$ carries T to a similarity of \mathbf{C} . We say that T *covers* T^* .

The fibration is a nice way to study the structures in \mathcal{H} , because we can project them to \mathbf{C} and then draw them. This is one of secrets of understanding the 4-dimensional space \mathbf{CH}^2 : First look at how things intersect the boundary, then map to \mathcal{H} , then project to \mathbf{C} .

3 Structures in the Heisenberg Group

3.1 The Contact Plane Field

The map $\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ carries the complex line field tangent to \mathcal{Z} to a left-invariant plane field on \mathcal{H} . We can figure out this plane field using the symmetries above. We call this plane field the *contact plane field*. We call the planes of the contact field the *contact planes*. The name comes from the connection to contact geometry.

Lemma 3.1 *At $(0,0)$, the contact plane is $\mathbf{C} \times \{0\}$.*

Proof: Symmetry. The only plane through $(0,0)$ invariant under rotations is $\mathbf{C} \times \{0\}$. ♠

Lemma 3.2 *The contact plane field is the kernel of the 1-form*

$$dz - (xdy - ydx).$$

Proof: At the point $(1,0)$, the plane is spanned by the vectors

$$(1,0), \quad (i,1). \quad (20)$$

In real notation, these vectors are $(1,0,0)$ and $(0,1,1)$. We get this from setting $s = 1$ in Equation 14 and considering the resulting action on $\mathbf{C} \times \{0\}$. Note that both vectors are killed by the form $dz - dy$. So, the claim is true at $(1,0)$. But both the contact field and the kernel of the 1-form are invariant under rotations, dilations, and vertical translations. Hence, by symmetry, the claim is true everywhere. ♠

Let Π be any contact plane. The restriction $\pi : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ naturally gives Π a complex structure – i.e. a canonical identification with \mathbf{C} . We can say that a Π -circle is an ellipse $E \subset \Pi$ such that $\pi(E)$ is a circle. We will see this structure on Π come up below when we discuss \mathbf{C} -circles.

3.2 \mathcal{C} -circles

A \mathcal{C} -circle is the image in \mathcal{H} of the boundary of a \mathcal{C} -slice of \mathbf{CH}^2 .

Lemma 3.3 *A straight line in \mathcal{H} lies in a \mathcal{C} -circle iff the line is vertical.*

Proof: The set

$$\mathbf{CH}^2 \cap \{[z_1 : 0 : z_3]\} \tag{21}$$

is a \mathcal{C} -slice. The corresponding set in \mathcal{H} is the vertical line $0 \times \mathbf{R}$. It now follows from translation symmetry that any vertical line in \mathcal{H} lies in a \mathcal{C} -circle.

Conversely, suppose that L is a straight line lying in a \mathcal{C} -circle. Applying Heisenberg symmetries, we can assume that L goes through the origin. But then L corresponds to a \mathcal{C} -slice in \mathbf{CH}^2 containing $(0, 0)$ and ∞ . Such a \mathcal{C} -slice is unique and must be the one we have already considered, namely $0 \times \mathbf{R}$. ♠

Call a curve in \mathcal{H} *non-straight* if it is not a straight line.

Lemma 3.4 *A loop X in \mathcal{H} is a non-straight \mathcal{C} -circle if and only if X is a Π -circle contained in the contact plane Π through its own center of mass.*

Proof: For the purposes of this lemma, call a loop *good* if it is a Π -circle contained in the contact plane Π through its own center of mass. The one point compactification of the set

$$\mathbf{CH}^2 \cap \{(-1/2, w, 1) \mid |w| = 1\} \tag{22}$$

is a \mathcal{C} -slice. The corresponding \mathcal{C} -circle in \mathcal{H} is $S^1 \times \{0\}$, where S^1 is the unit circle in \mathbf{C} . Note that the center of mass of X is the origin, and X is contained in $\mathbf{C} \times \{0\}$ and $\pi(X) = S^1$. So, $S^1 \times \{0\}$ is good and also a \mathcal{C} -circle.

Using Heisenberg symmetries, we see that every good loop is a \mathcal{C} -circle. Conversely, we can move a \mathcal{C} -circle by Heisenberg symmetries so that it contains the two points $(\pm 1, 0)$. But then, by uniqueness of \mathcal{C} -slices, the loop we get must be the one we first considered. Moreover, the Heisenberg symmetries preserve goodness. Hence, all \mathcal{C} -circles are good. ♠

3.3 \mathbf{R} -circles

A \mathbf{R} -circle is the image in \mathcal{H} of the boundary of a \mathbf{R} -slice of \mathbf{CH}^2 .

We call a curve $\gamma \subset \mathcal{H}$ *integral* if it is always tangent to the contact plane field. The \mathbf{C} -circles are not contact.

Lemma 3.5 *A straight line in \mathcal{H} lies in an \mathbf{R} -circle if and only if it is contact.*

Proof: The set $\mathbf{CH}^2 \cap \mathbf{R}^2$ is the image of the parabola $x < -y^2/2$. The ideal boundary is the parabola $x = -y^2/2$. The corresponding \mathbf{R} -slice in \mathcal{H} is the line $\mathbf{R} \times \{0\}$. This line is integral.

The image of $\mathbf{R} \times \{0\}$ under any Heisenberg symmetry is again an \mathbf{R} -circle. It is not hard to show that any straight line integral to the plane field can be obtained this way. Hence, every integral straight line lies in an \mathbf{R} -circle.

Conversely, any straight \mathbf{R} -circle corresponds to an \mathbf{R} -slice which can be moved to $\mathbf{CH}^2 \cap \mathbf{R}^2$ by symmetries which fix ∞ . Hence every straight \mathbf{R} -circle is an integral straight line. ♠

We recall a definition from classical geometry. A *Lemniscate* is any curve which is similar to the one given, in polar coordinates, by $r^2 = \cos(2\theta)$. At the same time, a Lemniscate is what you get when you invert a square hyperbola $xy = a$.

Lemma 3.6 *A loop X in \mathcal{H} is non-straight \mathbf{R} -circle if and only if X is integral and $\pi(X)$ is a lemniscate.*

Proof: Call X *good* if X is integral and projects to a lemniscate.

We apply the Heisenberg inversion I from Equation 17 to the \mathbf{R} -circle $\gamma = \mathbf{R} \times \{1\}$. Parametrizing this \mathbf{R} -circle by $(s, 1)$, we see that the first coordinate of $I(\gamma)$ is given by

$$\frac{-1}{s/2 + i/s}. \tag{23}$$

But the curve $s \rightarrow s/2 + i/s$ lies on the hyperbola $xy = 1/2$. Hence the first coordinate of $I(\gamma)$ is a Lemniscate. Hence $I(\gamma)$ is both good and an \mathbf{R} -circle.

The rest of the proof follows from the kind of symmetry used several times already. ♠

3.4 Bisectors and Spinal Spheres

Recall that a *bisector* in \mathbf{CH}^2 is the equidistant set between two points.

Lemma 3.7 *The set $X = (\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{C}) \cap \mathbf{CH}^2$ is a bisector.*

Proof: Consider the points

$$p_{\pm} = (-1 \pm i : 0 : 1) \in \mathbf{CH}^2. \quad (24)$$

Given $q = (s : w : 1) \in X$, we compute

$$\langle p_{\pm}, p_{\pm} \rangle = -2; \quad \langle q, p_{\pm} \rangle = (s - 1) \pm i. \quad (25)$$

Therefore, the quantity

$$\cosh(d(p_{\pm}, q)) = \frac{\langle p_{\pm}, q \rangle \langle q, p_{\pm} \rangle}{\langle p_{\pm}, p_{\pm} \rangle \langle q, q \rangle} = \frac{(s - 1)^2 + 1}{-2 \langle q, q \rangle} \quad (26)$$

is the same for both points p_+ and p_- . ♠

A *spinal sphere* is the ideal boundary of a bisector. We call a spinal sphere in \mathcal{H} *straight* if it contains ∞ .

Lemma 3.8 *A surface in \mathcal{H} is a straight spinal sphere if and only if it is a contact plane.*

Proof: The spinal sphere in \mathcal{H} corresponding to the bisector we have just considered is $\mathbf{C} \times \{0\}$. This is certainly a contact plane. As above, the rest of the lemma follows from symmetry. ♠

The contact plane $\mathbf{C} \times \{0\}$ has a double (singular) foliation:

- The \mathbf{C} -circles $\{|z| = r\} \times \{0\}$ give one singular foliation.
- The straight \mathbf{R} -circles through the origin give the other one.

These give a natural polar coordinate system to the spinal sphere. By symmetry, these foliations exist on all the spinal spheres, not just the straight ones.

The non-straight spinal spheres are a bit messier to describe and I won't do it. They are all smooth spheres with these two singular foliations.

4 The Carnot Metric

The Heisenberg symmetries discussed above all cover similarities of \mathcal{C} . It turns out that there is a metric on \mathcal{H} such that all Heisenberg symmetries are similarities. The metric is defined as follows. On each contact plane Π , we put the Euclidean metric which makes $\pi : \Pi \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ an isometry. We then define the length of an integral curve to be the integral of the its speed! This definition makes no sense for non-integral curves. We define the *Carnot distance* between two points to be the infimal length of an integral curve connecting them.

Lemma 4.1 *The Carnot distance from $(0,0)$ to $(0, 2\pi r^2)$ is $2\pi r$.*

Proof: Use the contact form $dz - (xdy + ydx)$, and Green's Theorem, and the isoperimetric inequality. The best curve in this case is a helix which projects to the circle of radius r centered at the origin. ♠

Lemma 4.2 *The Carnot distance from $(0,0)$ to $(r,0)$ is r .*

Proof: The segment $[0, r] \times \{0\}$ is the best integral connector in this case. ♠

Notice that when r is small, the distance from $(0,0)$ to $(0, \pi r^2)$ is huge in comparison to the Euclidean distance between the two points. Thus, the Carnot metric is not bi-lipschitz equivalent to the Euclidean metric (or any Riemannian metric) on \mathcal{H} . Indeed, it turns out that the Hausdorff dimension of \mathcal{H} , with respect to the Carnot metric, is 4-dimensional. This crazy-sounding statement is not so hard to prove. Using Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 and symmetry, one can see that it takes about $O(\epsilon^{-4})$ Carnot-balls of diameter ϵ to fill up the unit Carnot ball.