A critical re-examination of $M^8 - H$ duality hypothesis: part I

M. Pitkänen

Email: matpitka6@gmail.com.
http://tgdtheory.com/.

November 28, 2021

Abstract

This article is the first part of an article representing a critical re-examination of $M^8 - H$ duality, which is one of the cornerstones of Topological Geometrodynamics (TGD). The original version of $M^8 - H$ duality assumed that space-time surfaces in M^8 can be identified as associative or co-associative surfaces. If the surface has associative tangent or normal space and contains a complex or co-complex surface, it can be mapped to a 4-surface in $H = M^4 \times CP_2$.

Later emerged the idea that octonionic analyticity realized in terms of real polynomials P algebraically continued to polynomials of complexified octonion could fulfill the dream. The vanishing of the real part $Re_Q(P)$ (imaginary part $Im_Q(P)$) in the quaternionic sense would give rise to an associative (co-associative) space-time surface.

The realization of the general coordinate invariance motivated the notion of strong form of holography (SH) in H allowing realization of a weaker form of $M^8 - H$ duality by assuming that associativity/co-associativity conditions are needed only at 2-D string world sheet and partonic 2-surfaces and possibly also at their light-like 3-orbits.

The outcome of the re-examination yielded both positive and negative surprises.

1. Although no interesting associative space-time surfaces are possible, every distribution of normal associative planes (co-associativity) is integrable.
2. Another positive surprise was that Minkowski signature is the only possible option. Equivalently, the image of M^4 as real co-associative subspace of O_c (complex valued octonion norm squared is real valued for them) by an element of local G_2 or rather, its subgroup $SU(3)$, gives a real co-associative space-time surface.
3. The conjecture based on naive dimensional counting, which was not correct, was that the polynomials P determine these 4-D surfaces as roots of $Re_Q(P)$. The normal spaces of these surfaces possess a fixed 2-D commuting sub-manifold or possibly their distribution allowing the mapping to H by $M^8 - H$ duality as a whole.

   If this conjecture were correct, strong form of holography (SH) would not be needed and would be replaced with extremely powerful number theoretic holography determining space-time surface from its roots and selection of real subspace of O_c characterizing the state of motion of a particle. erate
4. The concrete calculation of the octonion polynomial was the most recent step - carried already earlier [L2, L3, L4] but without realizing the implications of the extremely simple outcome. The imaginary part of the polynomial is proportional to the imaginary part of octonion itself. It turned out that the roots $P = 0$ of the octonion polynomial P are 12-D complex surfaces in O_c rather than being discrete set of points defined as zeros $X = 0, Y = 0$ of two complex functions of 2 complex arguments. The analogs of branes are in question. Already earlier 6-D real branes assignable to the roots of the real polynomial P at the light-like boundary of 8-D light-cone were discovered: also their complex continuations are 12-D [L8, L11].
5. P has quaternionic de-composition $P = Re_Q(P) + I_4 Im_Q(P)$ to real and imaginary parts in a quaternionic sense. The naive expectation was that the condition $X = 0$ implies that the resulting surface is a 4-D complex surface X^4_c with a 4-D real projection X^4_r, which could be co-associative.

The expectation was wrong! The equations $X = 0$ and $Y = 0$ involve the same(!) complex argument o_c^2 as a complex analog for the Lorentz invariant distance squared from the tip of the light-cone. This implies a cold shower. Without any additional conditions, $X = 0$ conditions have as solutions 7-D complex mass shells H_c^7 determined by the roots of P. The explanation comes from the symmetries of the octonionic polynomial.

There are solutions $X = 0$ and $Y = 0$ only if the two polynomials considered have a common a_c^2 as a root! Also now the solutions are complex mass shells H_c^7.

How could one obtain 4-D surfaces X_c^4 as sub-manifolds of H_c^7? One should pose a condition eliminating 4 complex coordinates: after that a projection to M^4 would produce a real 4-surface X^4 .

1. The key observation is that G_2 acts as the automorphism group of octonions respects the co-associativity of the 4-D real sub-basis of octonions. Therefore a local G_2 gauge transformation applied to a 4-D co-associative sub-space O_c gives a co-associative four-surface as a real projection. Octonion analyticity would correspond to G_2 gauge transformation: this would realize the original idea about octonion analyticity.
2. A co-associative X_c^4 satisfying also the conditions posed by the existence of $M^8 - H$ duality is obtained by acting with a local SU_3 transformation g to a co-associative plane $M^4 \subset M_c^8$. If the image point $g(p)$ is invariant under $U(2)$, the transformation corresponds to a local CP_2 element and the map defines $M^8 - H$ duality even if the co-associativity in geometric sense were not satisfied.

   The co-associativity of the plane M^4 is preserved in the map because G_2 acts as an automorphism group of the octonions. If this map also preserves the value of 4-D complex mass squared, one can require that the intersections of X_c^4 with H_c^7 correspond to 3-D complex mass shells. One obtains holography with mass shells defined by the roots of P giving boundary data. The condition H images are analogous to Bohr orbits, corresponds to number theoretic holography.

   The group $SU(3)$ has interpretation as a Kac-Moody type analog of color group and the map defining space-time surface. This picture conforms with the H-picture in which gluon gauge potentials are identified as color gauge potentials. Note that at QFT limit the gauge potentials are replaced by their sums over parallel space-time sheets to give gauge fields as the space-time sheets are approximated with a single region of Minkowski space.

Before continuing, I must apologize for the still fuzzy organization of the material related to $M^8 - H$ duality. The understanding of its details has been a long and tedious process, which still continues, and there are unavoidably inaccuracies and even logical inconsistencies caused by the presence of archeological layers present.

Keywords: Octonions, quaternions, polynomials, (co-)associativity, minimal surfaces, branes, $M^8 - H$ duality.

Contents

1 Introduction **3**
- 1.1 Development of the idea about $M^8 - H$ duality . . . 3
- 1.2 Critical re-examination of the notion . . . 4

2 The situation before the cold shower **5**
- 2.1 Can one deduce the partonic picture from $M^8 - H$ duality? . . . 5
- 2.2 What happens to the "very special moments in the life of self"? . . . 5
- 2.3 What does SH mean and its it really needed? . . . 5
- 2.4 Questions related to partonic 2-surfaces . . . 6

3 Challenging $M^8 - H$ duality **8**
- 3.1 Explicit form of the octonionic polynomial . . . 8
  - 3.1.1 Surprises . . . 9
  - 3.1.2 General form of P and of the solutions to $P = 0$, $Re_Q(P) = 0$, and $Im_Q(P) = 0$ 10
  - 3.1.3 How does one obtain 4-D space-time surfaces? . . . 11
  - 3.1.4 What about string world sheets and partonic 2-surfaces? . . . 13

3.2 Is (co-)associativity possible? . . . 13
3.2.1 Challenging the notions of associativity and co-associativity . . . 13
3.2.2 How to identify the Minkowskian sub-space of O_c? . . . 15
3.2.3 The condition that $M^8 - H$ duality makes sense . . . 15
3.2.4 Co-associativity from octonion analyticity or/and from G_2 holography? . . 16
3.2.5 Does one obtain partonic 2-surfaces and strings at boundaries of ΔCD_8? . 17
3.2.6 What could be the counterparts of wormhole contacts at the level of M^8? . 18
3.3 Octonionic Dirac equation and co-associativity . . . 19
3.3.1 Octonionic Dirac equation . . . 19
3.3.2 Challenging the form of $M^8 - H$ duality for the map $M^4 \subset M^8$ to $M^4 \subset H$ 20

4 How to achieve periodic dynamics at the level of $M^4 \times CP_2$? 22
4.1 The unique aspects of Neper number and number theoretical universality of Fourier analysis . . . 22
4.2 Are CP_2 coordinates as functions of M^4 coordinates expressible as Fourier expansion 23
4.3 Connection with cognitive measurements as analogs of particle reactions . . . 23
4.4 Still some questions about $M^8 - H$ duality . . . 25
4.4.1 $M^8 - H$-duality as a generalized Fourier transform . . . 25
4.4.2 How to describe interactions of CDs? . . . 26
4.4.3 Zero energy states as scattering amplitudes and subjective time evolution as sequence of SSFRs . . . 26

5 Conclusions 28
5.1 Co-associativity is the only viable option . . . 28
5.2 The input from octonionic Dirac equation . . . 29
5.3 How the new picture differs from the earlier one? . . . 29

1 Introduction

$M^8 - H$ duality [L10, L8, L9, L15] has become a cornerstone of quantum TGD but several aspects of this duality are still poorly understood.

1.1 Development of the idea about $M^8 - H$ duality

A brief summary about the development of the idea is in order.

1. The original version of $M^8 - H$ duality assumed that space-time surfaces in M^8 can be identified as associative or co-associative surfaces. If the surface has associative tangent/normal space and contains a complex co-complex surface, it can be mapped to a 4-surface in $M^4 \times CP_2$.

2. Later emerged the idea that octonionic analyticity realized in terms of a real polynomials P algebraically continued to polynomials of complexified octonion might realize the dream [L2, L3, L4]. The original idea was that the vanishing condition for the real/imaginary part of P in quaternion sense could give rise to co-assocative/associative sense.

   $M^8 - H$ duality concretizes number theoretic vision [L5, L6] summarized as adelic physics fusing ordinary real number based physics for the correlates of sensory experience and various p-adic physics ($p = 2, 3, ...$) as physics for the correlates of cognition. The polynomials of real variable restricted to be rational valued defines an extension or rationals via the roots of the polynomials and one obtains an evolutionary hierachy associated with these extensions increasing in algebraic complexity. These extensions induce extensions of p-adic numbers and the points of space-time surface in M^8 with coordinates in the extension of rationals define cognitive representations as unique discretizations of the space-time surface.

3. The realization of the general coordinate invariance in TGD framework [K2, K1, K4, L18] [L16] motivated the idea that strong form of holography (SH) in H could allow realizing $M^8 - H$ duality by assuming associativity/co-associativity conditions only at 2-D string

world sheet and partonic 2-surfaces and possibly also at their light-like 3-orbits at which the signature of the induced metric changes from Minkowskian to Euclidian.

1.2 Critical re-examination of the notion

In this article $M^8 - H$ duality is reconsidered critically.

1. The healthy cold shower was the learning that quaternion (associative) sub-spaces of quaternionic spaces are geodesic manifolds [A1]. The distributions of quaternionic normal spaces are however always integrable. Hence, co-associativity remains the only interesting option. Also the existence of co-commutative sub-manifolds of space-time surface demanding the existence of a 2-D integrable sub-distribution of subspaces is possible. This learning experience motivated a critical examination of the $M^8 - H$ duality hypothesis.

2. The basic objection is that for the conjectured associative option, one must assign to each state of motion of a particle its own octonionic structure since the time axis would correspond to the octonionic real axis. It was however clear from the beginning that there is an infinite number of different 4-D planes O_c in which the number theoretical complex valued octonion inner product reduces to real - the number theoretic counterpart for Riemann metric. In the co-associative case this is the only option. Also the Minkowski signature for the real projection turns out to be the only physically acceptable option. The mistake was to assume that Euclidian regions are co-associative and Minkowskian regions associative: both must be co-associative.

3. The concrete calculation of the octonion polynomial was the most recent step - carried already earlier [L2, L3, L4] but without realizing the implications of the extremely simple outcome. The imaginary part of the polynomial is proportional to the imaginary part of octonion itself. It turned out that the roots $P = 0$ of the octonion polynomial P are 12-D complex surfaces in O_c rather than being discrete set of points defined as zeros $X = 0, Y = 0$ of two complex functions of 2 complex arguments. The analogs of branes are in question. Already earlier 6-D real branes assignable to the roots of the real polynomial P at the light-like boundary of 8-D light-cone were discovered: also their complex continuations are 12-D [L8, L11].

4. P has quaternionic de-composition $P = Re_Q(P) + I_4 Im_Q(P)$ to real and imaginary parts in a quaternionic sense. The naive expectation was that the condition $X = 0$ implies that the resulting surface is a 4-D complex surface X^4_c with a 4-D real projection X^4_r, which could be co-associative.

   The expectation was wrong! The equations $X = 0$ and $Y = 0$ involve the same(!) complex argument o_c^2 as a complex analog for the Lorentz invariant distance squared from the tip of the light-cone. This implies a cold shower. Without any additional conditions, $X = 0$ conditions have as solutions 7-D complex mass shells H^7_c determined by the roots of P. The explanation comes from the symmetries of the octonionic polynomial.

   There are solutions $X = 0$ and $Y = 0$ only if the two polynomials considered have a common a_c^2 as a root! Also now the solutions are complex mass shells H^7_c.

5. How could one obtain 4-D surfaces X^4_c as sub-manifolds of H^7_c? One should pose a condition eliminating 4 complex coordinates: after that a projection to M^4 would produce a real 4-surface X^4 .

   A co-associative X^4_c is obtained by acting with a local SU_3 transformation g to a co-associative plane $M^4 \subset M^8_c$. If the image point $g(p)$ is invariant under $U(2)$, the transformation corresponds to a local CP_2 element and the map defines M^8-H duality even if the co-associativity in geometric sense were not satisfied.

   The co-associativity of the plane M^4 is preserved in the map because G_2 acts as an automorphism group of the octonions. If this map also preserves the value of 4-D complex mass squared, one can require that the intersections of X^4_c with H^7_c correspond to 3-D complex mass shells. One obtains holography with mass shells defined by the roots of P giving boundary data. The condition H images are analogous to Bohr orbits, corresponds to number theoretic holography.

It this, still speculative, picture is correct, it would fulfil the original dream about solving classical TGD exactly in terms of roots for real/imaginary parts of octonionic polynomials in M^8 and by mapping the resulting space-time surfaces to H by $M^8 - H$ duality. In particular, strong form of holography (SH) would not be needed at the level of H, and would be replaced with a dramatically stronger number theoretic holography.

2 The situation before the cold shower

The view about $M^8 - H$ duality before the cold shower - leading to what I dare to call a break-through - helps to gain idea about the phenomenological side of $M^8 - H$ duality. Most of the phenomenology survives the transition to a more precise picture. This section is however not absolutely necessary for what follows it.

2.1 Can one deduce the partonic picture from $M^8 - H$ duality?

The M^8 counterparts for partons and their light like orbits in H can be understood in terms of octonionic Dirac equation in M^8 as an analog for the algebraic variant of ordinary Dirac equation at the level of momentum space [L15, L14] but what about the identification of partonic 2-surfaces as interaction vertices at which several partonic orbits meet? Can one deduce the phenomenological view about elementary particles as pairs of wormhole contacts connected by magnetic flux tubes from $M^8 - H$ duality? There is also the question whether partonic orbits correspond to their own sub-CDs as the fact that their rest systems correspond to different octonionic real axes suggests.

There are also some questions which have become obsolote. For instance: qhy should the partonic vertices reside at $t = r_n$ branes? This became obsolste with the realization that M^8 is analogous to momentum space so that the identification as real octonionic coordinate corresponds now to a component of 8-momentum identifiable as energy. Furthermore, the assumption the associativity of the 4-surface in M^8 had to be replaced with-co-associtivity and octonionic real coordinate does not have interpretation as time coordinate is associative surface

$M^8 - H$ duality indeed conforms with the phenomenological picture about scattering diagrams in terms of partonic orbits [L18, L17] [L17, L18] [L18], and leads to the view about elementary particles as pairs of Euclidian wormhole contacts associated with flux tubes carrying monopole flux.

2.2 What happens to the "very special moments in the life of self"?

The original title was "What happens at the "very special moments in the life of self?" but it turned out that "at" must be replaced with "to". The answer to the new question would be "They disappear from the glossary".

The notion of "very special moments in the life of self" (VPM) [L8, L11] makes sense if M^8 has interpretation as an 8-D space-time. M^4 projections of VPMs were originally identified as hyperplanes $t = r_n$, where t is time coordinate and r_n is a root of the real polynomial defining octonionic polynomial as its algebraic continuation.

The interpretation of M^8 as cotangent space of H was considered from the beginning but would suggest the interpretation of M^8 as the analog of momentum space. It is now clear that this interpretation is probably correct and that $M^8 - H$ duality generalizes the momentum-position duality of wave mechanics. Therefore one should speak of $E = r_n$ plane and simply forget the misleading term VMP. VPMs would correspond to constant values of the M^8 energy assignable to M^4 time coordinate.

The identification of space-time surface as co-associative surface with quaternionic normal space containing integrable distribution of 2-D commutative planes essential for $M^8 - H$ duality is also in conflict with the original interpretation. Also the modification of $M^8 - H$ duality in M^4 degrees of freedom forced by Uncertainty Principle [L22] has led to the conclusion that VMPs need not have a well-defined images in H.

2.3 What does SH mean and its it really needed?

SH has been assumed hitherto but what is its precise meaning?

1. Hitherto, SH at the level of H is believed to be needed: it assumes that partonic 2-surfaces and/or string world sheets serve as causal determinants determining X^4 via boundary conditions.

   (a) The normal or tangent space of X^4 at partonic 2-surfaces and possibly also at string world sheets has been assumed to be associative that is quaternionic. This condition should be true at the entire X^4.

   (b) Tangent or normal space has been assumed to contain preferred M^2 which could be replaced by an integrable distribution of $M^2(x) \subset M^4$. At string world sheets only the tangent space can be associative. At partonic 2-surfaces also normal space could be associative. This condition would be true only at string world sheets and partonic 2-surfaces so that only these can be mapped to H by $M^8 - H$ duality and continued to space-time surfaces as preferred extremals satisfying SH.

The current work demonstrates that although SH could be used at the level of SH, this is not necessary. Co-associativity together with co-commutativity for string world sheets allows the mapping of the real space-time surfaces in M^8 to H implying exact solvability of the classical TGD.

2.4 Questions related to partonic 2-surfaces

There are several questions related to partonic 2-surfaces.

Q1: What are the M^8 pre-images of partons and their light-like partonic orbits in H?

It will be found that the octonionic Dirac equation in M^8 implies that octo-spinors are located to 3-D light-like surfaces Y^3_r - actually light-cone boundary and its 3-D analogs at which number theoretic norm squared is real and vanishes - or to the intersections of X^3_r with the 6-D roots of P in which case Dirac equation trivializes and massive states are allowed. They are mapped to H by $M^8 - H$ duality.

Remark: One can ask whether the same is true in H in the sense that modified Dirac action would be localized to 3-D light-like orbits and 3-D ends of the space-time surfaces at the light-like boundaries of CD having space-like induced metric. Modified Dirac action would be defined by Cherm-Simons term and would force the classical field equations for the bosonic Chern-Simons term. If the interior part of the modified Dirac action is absent, the bosonic action is needed to define the space-time surfaces as extremals. They would be minimal surfaces and universal by their holomorphy and would not depend on coupling parameters so that very general actions can have them as preferred extremals. This issue remains still open.

The naïve - and as it turned out, wrong - guess was that the images of the light-like surfaces should be light-like surfaces in H at the boundaries of Minkowskian and Euclidian regions (wormhole contacts). In the light-like case Y^3_r corresponds to the light-cone boundary so that this would be the case. X^3_r however turns out to correspond to a hyperboloid in M^4 as an analog of a mass shell and is not identifiable as a partonic orbit.

It turned out that the complex surface X^4_c allows real sections in the sense that the number theoretic complex valued metric defined as a complex continuation of Minkowski norm is real at 4-D surfaces: call them Z^4_r. They are bounded by a 3-D region at Z^3_r at which the value of norm squared vanishes. This surface is an excellent candidate for the pre-image of the light-like orbit of partonic 2-surface serving as a topological vertex. One has therefore strings worlds sheets, partonic 2-surfaces and their light-like orbits and they would connect the "mass shells" at X^4_r. All ingredients for SH would be present.

The intersections of Z^3_r with X^3_r identifiable as the section of X^4_r $a = constant$ hyperboloid would give rise to partonic 2-surfaces appearing as topological reaction vertices.

The assumption that the 4-D tangent space at these light-like 3-surfaces is co-associative, would give an additional condition determining the image of this surface in H, so that the boundary conditions for SH would become stronger. One would have boundary conditions at light-like partonic orbits. Note that string world sheets are assumed to have light-like boundaries at partonic orbits.

Q2: Why should partonic 2-surfaces appear as throats of wormhole contact in H? Wormhole contacts do not appear in M^8.

1. In M^8 light-like orbits are places where the Minkowskian signature changes to Euclidian. Does M^8-H duality map the images of these coinciding roots for Euclidian and Minkowskian branches to different throats of the wormhole contact in H so that the intersection would disappear?

2. This is indeed the case. The intersection of Euclidian and Minkowskian branches defines a single 3-surface but the tangent and normal spaces of branches are different. Therefore their H images under M^8-H duality for the partonic 2-surface are different since normal spaces correspond to different CP_2 coordinates. These images would correspond to the two throats of wormhole contact so that the H-image by SH is 2-sheeted. One would have wormhole contacts in H whereas in M^8 the wormhole contact would reduce to a single partonic 2-surface.

3. The wormhole contact in H can have only Euclidian signature of the induced metric. The reason is that the M^4 projections of the partonic surfaces in H are identical so that the points with same M^4 coordinates have different CP_2 coordinates and their distance is space-like.

Q3: In H picture the interpretation of space-time surfaces as analogs of Feynman graphs assumes that several partonic orbits intersect at partonic 2-surfaces. This assumption could be of course wrong.This raises questions.

What the pre-images of partonic 2-surfaces are in M^8? Why should several partonic orbits meet at a given partonic 2-surface? Is this needed at all?

The space-time surface X^4_r associated intersects the surface X^6_r associated with different particle - say with different value of mass along 2-D surface. Could this surface be identified as partonic 2-surface X^2_r? This occurs symmetrically so that one has a pair of 2-surfaces X^2_r. What does this mean? Could these surface map to the throats of wormhole contact in H?

Why several partonic surfaces would co-incide in topological reaction vertex at the level of H? At this moment is is not clear whether this is forced by M^8 picture.

Octonionic Dirac equation implies that M^8 has interpretation as analog of momentum space so that interaction vertices are replaced by multilocal vertices representing momenta and propagators become local being in this sense analogous to vertices of QFT. One could of course argue that without the gluing along ends there would be no interactions since the interactions in X^6_r for two 3-surfaces consist in the generic case of a discrete set of points. One could also ask whether the surfaces Y^3_r associated with the space-time surfaces X^4_r associated with incoming particles must intersect along partonic 2-surface rather than at discrete set of points.

The meeting along ends need not be true at the level of M^8 since the momentum space interpretation would imply that momenta do not differ much so that particles should have identical masses: for this to make sense one should assume that the exchanged virtual particles are massless. One other hand, if momenta are light-like for Y^3_r, this might be the case.

Q4: Why two wormhole contacts and monopole flux tubes connecting them at the level of H? Why monopole flux?

1. The tangent spaces of the light-like orbits have different light-like direction. Intuitively, this corresponds to different directions of light-like momenta. Momentum conservation requires more than one partonic orbit changing its direction meeting at partonic 2-surface. By light-likeness, the minimum is 2 incoming and two outgoing lines giving a 4-vertex. This allows the basic vertices involving Ψ and $\overline{Psi}$ at opposite throats of wormhole contacts. Also a higher number of partonic orbits is possible.

2. A two-sheeted closed monopole flux tube having wormhole contacts as its "ends" is suggested by elementary particle phenomenology. Since M^8 homology is trivial, there is no monopole field in M^8. If M^8-H duality is continuous it maps homologically trivial partonic 2-surfaces to homologically trivial 2-surfaces in H. This allows the wormhole throats in H to have

opposite homology charges. Since the throats cannot correspond to boundaries there must be second wormhole contact and closed flux tube.

3. What does the monopole flux for a partonic 2-surface mean at the level of M^8? The distribution of quaternionic 4-D tangent/normal planes containing preferred M^2 and associated with partonic 2-surface in M^8 would define a homologically on-trivial 2-surface in CP_2. The situation is analogous to a distribution of tangent planes or equivalently normal vectors in S^2.

Q4: What is the precise form of $M^8 - H$ duality: does it apply only to partonic 2-surfaces and string world sheets or to the entire space-time surfaces?

$M^8 - H$ duality is possible if the X^4 in M^8 contains also integrable distribution of complex tangent or normal 2-planes at which 4-D tangent space is quaternionic/associative. String world sheets and partonic 2-surfaces define these distributions.

The minimum condition allowed by SH in H is that string world sheets and there is a finite number of partonic 2-surfaces and string world sheets. In this case only these 2-surfaces can be mapped to H and SH assigns to them a 4-D space-time surface. The original hypothesis was that these surfaces define global orthogonal slicings of the X^4 so that $M^8 - H$ duality could be applied to the entire X^4. This condition is probably too strong.

3 Challenging $M^8 - H$ duality

$M^8 - H$ duality involves several alternative options and in the following arguments possibly leading to a unique choice are discuses.

1. Are both associativity and co-associativity possible or is only either of these options allowed? Is it also possible to pose the condition guaranteeing the existence of 2-D complex sub-manifolds identifiable as string world sheets necessary to map the entire space-time surface from M^8 to H? In other words, is the strong form of holography (SH) needed in M^8 and/or H or is it needed at all?

2. The assignment of the space-time surface at the level of M^8 to the roots of real or imaginary part (in quaternionic sense) of octonionic polynomial P defined as an algebraic continuation of real polynomial is an extremely powerful hypothesis in adelic physics [L6, L5] and would mean a revolution in biology and consciousness theory.

   Does P fix the space-time surface with the properties needed to realize $M^8 - H$ duality or is something more needed? Does the polynomial fix the space-time surface uniquely - one would have extremely strong number theoretic holography - so that one would have number theoretic holography with coefficients of a real polynomial determining the space-time surface?

3. $M^8 - H$ duality involves mapping of $M^4 \subset M^8$ to $M^4 \subset H$. Hitherto it has been assumed that this map is direct identification. The form of map should however depend on the interpretation of M^8. In octonionic Dirac equation M^8 coordinates are in the role of momenta [L15]. This suggests the interpretation of M^8 as an analog of 8-D momentum space. If this interpretation is correct, Uncertainty Principles demands that the map $M^4 \subset M^8 \to M^4 \subset H$ is analogous to inversion mapping large momenta to small distances.

4. Twistor lift of TGD [K8] is an essential part of the TGD picture. Ttwistors and momentum twistors provide dual approaches to twistor Grassmann amplitudes. Octonionic Dirac equation suggests that M^8 and H are in a similar dual relation. Could $M^8 - H$ duality allow a generalization of twistorial duality to TGD framework?

3.1 Explicit form of the octonionic polynomial

What does the identification of the octonionic polynomial P as an octonionic continuation of a polynomial with real or complexified coefficients imply? In the following I regard M^8_c as O^8_c and consider products for complexified octonions.

Remark: In adelic vision the coefficients of P must be rationals (or at most algebraic numbers in some extension of rationals).

One interesting situation corresponds to the real subspace of O_c spanned by $\{I_0, iI_k\}$, $= 1, ..7$, with a number theoretic metric signature $(1, -1, -1..., -1)$ of M^8 which is complex valued except at in various reals subspaces.This subspace is associative. The original proposal was that Minkowskian space-time regions as projections to this signature are associative whereas Euclidian regions are co-associative. It however turned out that associative space-time surfaces are physically uninteresting.

The canonical choice $(iI_0, I_1, I_2, iI_3, I_4, iI_5, I_6, iI_7)$ defining the complexification of the tangent space represents a co-associative sub-space realizing Minkowski signature. It turns out that both Minkowskian and Euclidian space-time regions must be co-associative .

3.1.1 Surprises

The explicit calculation of the octonionic polynomial yielded a chilling result. If one poses (co-)associativity conditions as vanishing of the imaginary or real part in quaterionic sense: $Im_Q(P) = 0$ or $Re_Q(P) = 0$, the outcome is that the space-time surface is just M^4 or E^4. Second chilling result is that quaternionic sub-manifolds are geodesic sub-manifolds. This led to the question how to modify the (co-)associativity hypothesis.

The vision has been that space-time surfaces can be identified as roots for the imaginary (co-associative) part $Im_Q(O)$ or real part $Im_Q(O)$ of octonionic polynomial using the standard decomposition $(1, e_1, e_2, e_3)$.

1. The naïve counting of dimensions suggests that one obtains 4-D surfaces. The surprise was that also 6-D brane like entities located at the boundary of M^8 light-cone and with topology of 6-sphere S^6 are possible. They correspond to the roots of a real polynomial $P(o)$ for the choice $(1, iI_1, ..., iI_7)$. The roots correspond to the values of the real octonion coordinate interpreted as values of linear M^4 time in the proposal considered. Also for the canonical proposal one obtains a similar result. In O_c they correspond to 12-D complex surfaces X^6_c satisfying the same condition conditions $x_0^2 + r^2 = 0$ and $P(x_0) = 0$.

2. There was also another surprise. As already described, the general form for the octonionic polynomial $P(o)$ induced from a real polynomial is extremely simple and reduces to $X(t^2, r^2)I_0 + iY(t^2, r^2)Im(o)$. There are only two complex variables t and r^2 involved and the solutions of $P = 0$ are 12-D complex surfaces X^6_c in O_c. Also the special solutions have the same dimension.

3. In the case of co-associativity 8 conditions are needed for $Re_Q(P) = 0$: note that $X = 0$ is required. The naive expectation is that this gives a complex manifold X^4_c with 4-D real projection X^4_r as an excellent candidate for a co-associative surface.

   The expectation turned out to be wrong: in absence of any additional conditions the solutions are complex 7-dimensional mass shells! This is due to the symmetries of the octonionic polynomials as algebraic continuation of a real polynomial.

4. The solution of the problem is to change the interpretation completely. One must assign to the 7-D complex mass shell H^7_c a 3-D complex mass shell H^3_c.

   One can do this by assuming space-time surface is surface intersecting the7-D mass shell obtained as a deformation of $M^4_c \subset M^8_c$ by acting with local $SU(3)$ gauge transformation and requiring that the image point is invariant under $U(2)$. If the 4-D complex mass squared remains invariant in this transformation, X^4_c intersects H^7_c.

   With these assumptions, a local CP_2 element defines X^4_c and X^4_r is obtained as its real projection in M^4. This definition assigns to each point of M^4 a point of CP_2 so that $M^8 - H$ duality is well-defined.

   One obtains holography in which the fixing of 3-D mass shells fixes the 4-surface and also assigns causal diamond with the pair of mass shells with opposite energies. If the space-time surface is analog of Bohr orbit, also its preimage under $M^8 - H$ duality should be such and P would determine 4-surface highly uniquely [L24] and one would have number theoretic holography.

3.1.2 General form of P and of the solutions to $P = 0$, $Re_Q(P) = 0$, and $Im_Q(P) = 0$

It is convenient to introduce complex coordinates for O_c since the formulas obtained allow projections to various real sections of O_c.

1. To see what happens, one can calculate o_c^2. Denote o_c by $o_c = tI_0 + \overline{o_c}$ and the norm squared of $\overline{o}$ by r^2, where $r^2 = \sum o_k^2$ where o_k are the complex coordinates of octonion. Number theoretic norm squared for o_c is $t^2 + r^2$ and reduces to a real number in the real sections of O_c. For instance, in the section $(I_1, iI3, iI_5, iI_7)$ the norm squared is $-x_1^2 + x_3^2 + x_5^2 + x_7^2$ and defines Minkowskian norm squared.

   For o^2 one has:

   $$o^2 = t^2 - r^2 + 2t\overline{o} \equiv X_2 + \overline{Y}_2 \ .$$

   For o^3 one obtains

   $$o^3 = tX_2 - \overline{o} \cdot \overline{Y}_2 + t\overline{Y}_2 + X_2\overline{o} \ .$$

   Clearly, $Im_Q(o^n)$ has always the same direction as $Im_Q(o)$. Hence one can write in the general case

   $$o^n = X + Y\overline{o} \ . \tag{3.1}$$

   This trivial result was obtained years ago but its full implications became evident only while preparing the current article. The point is that the solutions to associativity/co-associativity conditions by putting $Re(Q(P) = 0$ or $Im_Q(P) = 0$ are trivial: just M^4 or E^4. What goes wrong with basic assumptions, will be discussed later.

   Remark: In M^8 sub-space one has imaginary $\overline{o}$ is proportional to the commuting imaginary unit.

2. It is easy to deduce a recursion formula for the coefficients for X and Y for n:th power of o_c. Denote by t the coordinate associated with the real octonion unit (not time coordinate). One obtains

   $$\begin{aligned} o_c^n &= X_n I_0 + Y_n \overline{o} \ , \\ X_n &= tX_{n-1} - rY_{n-1} \ , \\ Y_n &= tY_{n-1} + rX_{n-1} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

   In the co-associative case one has $t = 0$ or possibly constant $t = T$ (note that in the recent interpretation t does not have interpretation as time coordinate). The reason is that the choice of octonionic coordinates is unique apart from translation along the real axis from the condition that the coefficients of P remain complex numbers in powers of the new variable.

3. The simplest option correspond to $t = 0$. One can criticize this option since the quaternionicity of normal space should not be affected if t is constant different from zero. In any case, for $t = 0$ the recursion formula gives for the polynomial $P(o_c)$ the expression

   $$P(o_c) = \sum (-1)^n r^{2n} (p_{2n-1} I_0 + p_{2n}\overline{o}) \ . \tag{3.3}$$

   Denoting the even and of odd parts of P by P_{even} and P_{odd}, the roots $r_{k,odd}$ of $X = Re(P(o_c))$ are roots P_{odd} and roots $r_{k,even}$ of $Y = Im(P(o_c))$ are roots of P_{even}. Co-associativity gives roots of X and the roots of P as simultaneous roots of P_{odd} and P_{even}. The interpretation of roots is as in general complex mass squared values.

In the general case, the recursion relation would give the solution

$$
\begin{pmatrix} X_n \\ Y_n \end{pmatrix} = A^n \begin{pmatrix} t \\ r \end{pmatrix}
$$
$$
A = \begin{pmatrix} t & -r \\ r & t \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4}
$$

One can diagonalize the matrix appearing in the iteration by solving the eigenvalues $\lambda_\pm = t \pm ir$ and eigenvectors $X_\pm = (\pm i, 1)$ and by expressing $(X_1, Y_1) = (t, r)$ in terms of the eigenvectors as $(t, r) = ((it + r)X_+ + (r - it)X_-)/2$. This gives

$$
\begin{pmatrix} X_n \\ Y_n \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} (t+ir)^n i - (t-ir)^n i \\ (t+ir)^n + (t-ir)^n \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.5}
$$

This gives

$$
\begin{array}{l}
P(o_c) = P_1 I_0 + P_2 \overline{o} \ , \\
P_1(r) = \sum X_n p_n r^{2n} \ , \\
P_2(r) = \sum Y_n p_n r^{2n} \ .
\end{array} \tag{3.6}
$$

For the restriction to M^4_c, r^2 reduces to complex 4-D mass squared given by the root r_n. In general case r^2 corresponds to complex 8-D mass squared. All possible signatures are obtained by assuming M^8_c coordinates to be either real or imaginary (the number theoretical norm squared is real with this restriction).

3.1.3 How does one obtain 4-D space-time surfaces?

If one poses no restrictions, the solutions of the conditions are 7-D complex mass shells $r^2 = r_{n,1}$ as roots of $P_1(r) = 0$ or $r^2 = r_{n,2}$ of $P_2(r) = 0$. A solution of both conditions requires that P_1 and P_2 have a common root but the solution remains a 7-D complex mass shell! This is one of the many cold showers during the development of the ideas about $M^8 - H$ duality! It seems that the adopted interpretation is somehow badly wrong. Here zero energy ontology (ZEO) and holography come to the rescue.

1. Could the roots of P_1 or P_2 define only complex mass shells of the 4-D complex momentum space identifiable as M^4_c? ZEO inspires the question whether a proper interpretation of mass shells could be as pre-images of boundaries of cd:s (intersections of future and past directed light-cones) as pairs of mass shells with opposite energies. If this is the case, the challenge would be to understand how X^4_c is determined if P does not determine it.

   Here holography, considered already earlier, suggests itself: the complex 3-D mass shells belonging to X^4_c would only define the 3-D boundary conditions for holography and the real mass shells would be mapped to the boundaries of cds. This holography can be restricted to X^4_R. Bohr orbit property at the level of H suggests that the polynomial P defines the 4-surface almost uniquely.

2. Let us take the holographic interpretation as a starting point. In order to obtain an X^4_c mass shell from a complex 7-D light-cone, 4 complex degrees of freedom must be eliminated. $M^8 - H$ duality requires that X^4_c allows M^4_c coordinates.

   Note that if one has $X^4_c = M^4_c$, the solution is trivial since the normal space is the same for all points and the H image under $M^8 - H$ duality has constant $CP_2 = SU(3)/U(2)$ coordinates. X^4_c should have interpretation as a non-trivial deformation of M^4_c in M^8.

3. By M^8-H duality, the normal spaces should be labelled by $CP_2 = SU(3)/U(2)$ coordinates. $M^8 - H$ duality suggests that the image $g(p)$ of a momentum $p \in M^4_c$ is determined essentially by a point $s(p)$ of the coset space $SU(3)/U(2)$. This is achieved if M^4_c is deformed by a local $SU(3)$ transformation $p \to g(p)$ in such a manner that each image point is invariant under $U(2)$ and the mass value remains the same: $g(p)^2 = p^2$ so that the point represents a root of P_1 or P_2.

   Remark: I have earlier considered the possibility of G_2 and even $G_{2,c}$ local gauge transformation. It however seems that that local $SU(3)$ transformation is the only possibility since G_2 and $G_{2,c}$ would not respect $M^8 - H$ duality. One can also argue that only real $SU(3)$ maps the real and imaginary parts of the normal space in the same manner: this is indeed an essential element of $M^8 - H$ duality.

4. This option defines automatically M^8-H duality and also defines causal diamonds as images of mass shells $m^2 = r_n$. The real mass shells in H correspond to the real parts of r_n. The local $SU(3)$ transformation g would have interpretation as an analog of a color gauge field. Since the H image depends on g, it does not correspond physically to a local gauge transformation but is more akin to an element of Kac-Moody algebra or Yangian algebra which is in well-defined half-algebra of Kac-Moody with non-negative conformal weights.

The following summarizes the still somewhat puzzling situation as it is now.

1. The most elegant interpretation achieved hitherto is that the polynomial P defines only the mass shells so that mass quantization would reduce to number theory. Amusingly, I started to think about particle physics with a short lived idea that the d'Alembert equation for a scalar field could somehow give the mass spectrum of elementary particles so that the issue comes full circle!

2. Holography assigns to the complex mass shells complex 4-surfaces for which $M^8 - H$ duality is well-defined even if these surfaces would fail to be 4-D co-associative. These surfaces are expected to be highly non-unique unless holography makes them unique. The Bohr orbit property of their images in H indeed suggests this apart from a finite non-determinism [L24]. Bohr orbit property could therefore mean extremely powerful number theoretical duality for which the roots of the polynomial determine the space-time surface almost uniquely. $SU(3)$ as color symmetry emerges at the level of M^8. By $M^8 - H$ duality, the mass shells are mapped to the boundaries of CDs in H.

3. Do we really know that X^4_r co-associative and has distribution of 2-D commuting subspaces of normal space making possible $M^8 - H$ duality? The intuitive expectation is that the answer is affirmative [A1]. In any case, $M^8 - H$ duality is well-defined even without this condition.

4. The special solutions to $P = 0$, discovered already earlier, are restricted to the boundary of CD_8 and correspond to the values of energy (rather than mass or mass squared) coming as roots of the real polynomial P. These mass values are mapped by inversion to "very special moments in the life of self" (a misleading term) at the level of H as special values of light-cone proper time rather than linear Minkowski time as in the earlier interpretation [**?**] The new picture is Lorenz invariant.

5. The experience with the octonionic Dirac equation [L15] reducing to mass shell condition - to be discussed in the sequel in detail - forces the interpretation $m \cdot m$ as mass squared. M^8 would be the analog of momentum space.

   Non vanishing mass squared values for octonionic spinors correspond to common roots of P_{even} and P_{odd}. The special solutions to $P = 0$, discovered already earlier, are restricted to the boundary of CD_8 and correspond to the values of energy (rather than mass squared) coming as roots of the real polynomial P. These mass values are mapped by inversion to "very special moments in the life of self" at the level of H as special values of light-cone proper time rather than linear Minkowski time as in the earlier interpretation [L8]. The new picture is Lorenz invariant.

Non-vanishing mass squared values for octonionic spinors correspond to a common root of P_{even} and P_{odd} implying that the complex mass shells are identical. The restriction of the momenta to the base space produces a 4-D set of momenta.

3.1.4 What about string world sheets and partonic 2-surfaces?

One can apply the above arguments also to the identification of 2-D string world sheets and partonic 2-surfaces.

1. One has two kinds of solutions: M^2 and 3-D surfaces of X^4 as analogs of 6-brane. The interpretation for 3-D *resp.* 2-D branes as a light-like 3-surface associated with the octonionic Dirac equation representing mass shell condition *resp.* string world sheet is attractive.

2. M^2 would be replaced with an integrable distribution of $M^2(x)$ in local tangent space $M^4(x)$. The space for the choices of $M^2(x)$ would be S^3 corresponding to the selection of a preferred quaternion imaginary unit equal to the choices of preferred octonion imaginary unit.

   The choices of the preferred complex subspace $M^2(x)$ at a given point would be characterized by its normal vector and parameterized by sphere S^2: the interpretation as a quantization axis of angular momentum is suggestive. One would have space $S^3 \times S^2$. Also now the integrability conditions $de_A = 0$ would hold true.

3. String world sheets could be regarded as analogs of superstrings connecting 3-D brane like entities defined by the light-like partonic orbits. The partonic 2-surfaces at the ends of light-like orbits defining also vertices could correspond to the 3-surfaces at which quaternionic 4-surfaces intersect 6-branes.

3.2 Is (co-)associativity possible?

The number theoretic vision relying on the assumption that space-time surfaces are 8-D complex 4-surfaces in o_c^8 determined as algebraic surfaces for octonionic continuations of real polynomials, which for adelic physics would have coefficients which are rational or belong to an extension of rationals. The projections to subspaces Re^8 of o_c^8 defined as space for which given coordinate is purely real or imaginary so that complexified octonionic norm is real would give rise to real 4-D space-time surfaces. $M^8 - H$ duality would map these surfaces to geometric objects in $M^4 \times CP_2$. This vision involves several poorly understood aspects and it is good to start by analyzing them.

3.2.1 Challenging the notions of associativity and co-associativity

Consider first the notions of associativity *resp.* co-associativity equivalent with quaternionicity *resp.* co-quaternionicity. The original hope was that both options are possible for surfaces of real sub-spaces of O_c ("real" means here that complexified octonionic metric is real).

1. The original idea was that the associativity of the tangent space or normal space of a real space-time surface X^4 reduces the classical physics at the level of M^8 to associativity. Associativity/co-associativity of the space-time surface states that at each point of the tangent-/normal space of the real space-time surface in O is quaternionic. The notion generalizes also to $X_c^4 \subset O_c^8$. (Co-)associativity makes sense also for the real subspaces space of O with Minkowskian signature.

2. It has been however unclear whether (co-)associativity is possible. The cold shower came as I learned that associativity allows only for geodesic sub-manifolds of quaternionic spaces about which octonions provide an example [A1]. The good news was that the distribution of co-associative tangent spaces always defines an integrable distribution in the sense that one can find sub-manifold for which the associative normal space at a given point has tangent space as an orthogonal complement. Should the number theoretic dynamics rely on co-associativity rather than associativity?

3. Minkowskian space-time regions have been assumed to be associative and to correspond to the projection to the standard choice for basis as $\{1, iI_1, iI_2, iI_3\}$. The octonionic units $\{1, I_1, I_2, I_3\}$ define quaternionic units and associative subspace and their products with unit I_4 define the orthogonal co-associative subspace as $\{I_4, I_5 = I4I_1, I_6 = I_4I_2, I_7 = I_4I_3\}$. This result forces either to weaken the notion of associativity or to consider alternative identifications of Minkowskian regions, which can be co-associative: fortunately, there exists a large number of candidates.

The article [A1] indeed kills the idea about the associativity of the space-time surface. The article starts from a rather disappointing observation that associative sub-manifolds are geodesic sub-manifolds and therefore trivial. Co-associative quaternion sub-manifolds are however possible. With a motivation coming from this observation, the article discusses what the author calls RC quaternionic sub-manifolds of quaternion manifolds. For a quaternion manifold the tangent space allows a realization of quaternionic units as antisymmetric tensors. These manifolds are constant curvature spaces and typically homogeneous spaces.

1. Quaternion sub-manifold allows a 4-D integrable distribution of quaternion units. The normal complement of this distribution is expressible in terms of the second fundamental form and the condition that it is trivial implies that the second fundamental form is vanishing so that one has a geodesic submanifold. Quaternionic sub-manifolds are thus too trivial to be interesting. As a diametric opposite, one can also define totally real submanifolds for which the normal space contains a distribution of quaternion units. In this case the distribution is always integrable. This case is much more interesting from the TGD point of view.

2. Author introduces the notion of CR quaternion sub-manifold $N \subset M$, where M is quaternion manifold with constant sectional curvatures. N has quaternion distribution D in its tangent spaces if the action of quaternion units takes D to itself. $D^\perp$ is the co-quaternionic orthogonal complement D in the normal space N. D would take also $D^\perp$ to itself. $D^\perp$ can be expressed in terms of the components of the second fundamental form and vanishes for quaternion sub-manifolds.

3. Author deduces results about CR quaternion sub-manifolds, which are very interesting from the TGD point of view.

   (a) Sub-manifold is CR quaternion sub-manifold only if the curvature tensor of R_M of the imbedding space satisfies $R_M(D, D, D^\perp, D\ \ ) = 0$. The condition is trivial if the quaternion manifold is flat. In the case of octonions this would be the case.

   (b) D is integrable only if the second fundamental form restricted to it vanishes meaning that one has a geodesic manifold. Totally real distribution $D^\perp$ is always integrable to a co-associative surface.

   (c) If $D^\perp$ integrates to a minimal surface then N itself is a minimal surface.

Could one consider RC quaternion sub-manifolds in TGD framework? Both octonions and their complexifixation can be regarded as quaternionic spaces. Consider the real case.

1. If the entire D is quaternionic then N is a geodesic sub-manifold. This would leave only E^4 and its Minkowskian variants with various signatures. One could have however 4-D totally real (co-associative) space-time surfaces. Simple arguments will show that the intersections of the conjectured quaternionic and co-quaternionic 4-surfaces have 2- and 3-D intersections with 6-branes.

   Should one replace associative space-time surfaces with CR sub-manifolds with $d \leq 3$ integrable distribution D whereas the co-quaternionic surfaces would be completely real having 4-D integrable $D^\perp$? Could one have 4-D co-associative surfaces for which $D^\perp$ integrates to $n \geq 1$-dimensional minimal surface (geodesic line) and the X^4 itself is a minimal surface?

   Partially associative CR manifold do not allow M^8H duality. Only co-associative surfaces allow it and also their signature must be Minkowskian: the original idea [L10, L2, L3, L4] about Euclidian (Minkowskian) signature for co-associative (associative) surfaces was wrong.

2. The integrable 2-D sub-distributions D defining a distribution of normal planes could define foliations of the X^4 by 2-D surfaces. What springs to mind is foliations by string world sheets and partonic 2 surfaces orthogonal to them and light-like 3-surfaces and strings transversal to them. This expectation is realized.

3.2.2 How to identify the Minkowskian sub-space of O_c?

There are several identifications of subspaces of O_c with Minkowskian signature. What is the correct choice has been far from obvious. Here symmetries come in rescue.

1. Any subspace of O^c with 3 (1) imaginary coordinates and 1 (3) real coordinates has Minkowskian signature in octonionic norm algebraically continued to O_c (complex valued continuation of real octonion norm instead of real valued Hilbert space norm for O_c). Minkowskian regions should have local tangent space basis consisting of octonion units which in the canonical case would be $\{I_1, iI_3, iI_5, iI_7\}$, where i is commutative imaginary unit. This particular basis is co-associative having whereas its complement $\{iI_0, I_2, I_4, I_6\}$ is associative and has also Minkowskian signature.

2. The size of the isometry group of the subspace of M^8_c depends on whether the tangent basis contains real octonion unit 1 or not. The isometry group for the basis containing I_0 is $SO(3)$ acting as automorphisms of quaternions and $SO(k, 3-k)$ when $3-k$ units are proportional to i. The reason is that G_2 (and its complexification $G_{2,c}$) and its subgroups do not affect I_0. For the tangent spaces built from 4 imaginary units I_k and iI_l the isometry group is $SO(k, 4-k) \subset G_{2,c}$.

   The choice therefore allows larger isometry groups and also co-associativity is possible for a suitable choice of the basis. The choice $\{I_1, iI_3, iI_5, iI_7\}$ is a representative example, which will be called canonical basis. For these options the isometry group is the desired $SO(1, 3)$ as an algebraic continuation of $SO(4) \subset G_2$ acting in $\{I_1, I_3, I_5, I_7\}$, to $SO(1, 3) \subset G_{2,c}$.

   Also Minkowskian signature - for instance for the original canonical choice $\{I_0, iI_1, iI_2, iI_3\}$ - can have only $SO(k, 3-k)$ as isometries. This is the basic objection against the original choice $\{I_0, iI_1, iI_2, iI_3\}$. This identification would force the realization of $SO(1, 3)$ as a subgroup of $SO(1, 7)$. Different states of motion for a particle require different octonion structure with different direction of the octonion real axis in M^8. The introduction of the notion of moduli space for octonion structures does not look elegant. For the option $\{I_1, iI_3, iI_5, iI_7\}$ only a single octonion structure is needed and $G_{2,c}$ contains $SO(1, 3)$.

   Note that also the signatures $(4, 0)$, $(0, 4)$ and $(2, 2)$ are possible and the challenge is to understand why only the signature (1,3) is realized physically.

Co-associative option is definitely the only physical alternative. The original proposal for the interpretation of the Minkowski space in terms of an associative real sub-space of M^4 had a serious problem. Since time axis was identified as octonionic real axis, one had to assign different octonion structure to particles with non-parallel moment: $SO(1, 7)$ would relate these structures: how to glue the space-time surfaces with different octonion structures together was the problem. This problem disappears now. One can simply assign to particles with different state of motion real space-time surface defined related to each other by a transformation in $SO(1, 3) \subset G_{2,c}$.

3.2.3 The condition that $M^8 - H$ duality makes sense

The condition that $M^8 - H$ duality makes sense poses strong conditions on the choice of the real sub-space of M^8_c.

1. The condition that tangent space of O_c has a complexified basis allowing a decomposition to representations of $SU(3) \subset G_2$ is essential for the map to $M^8 \to H$ although it is not enough. The standard representation of this kind has basis $\{\pm iI_0 + I_1\}$ behaving like $SU(3)$ singlets $\{I_2 + \epsilon iI_3, I_4 + \epsilon iI_5, \epsilon I_6 \pm iI_7\}$ behaves like SU(3) triplet 3 for $\epsilon = 1$ and its conjugate $\overline{3}$ for $\epsilon = -1$. $G_{2,c}$ provides new choices of the tangent space basis consistent with this choice. $SU(3)$ leaves the direction I_1 unaffected but more general transformations act as Lorentz

transformation changing its direction but not leaving the M^4 plane. Even more general $G_{2,c}$ transformations changing M^4 itself are in principle possible.

Interestingly, for the canonical choice the co-associative choice has $SO(1,3)$ as isometry group whereas the complementary choice failing to be associative correspond to a smaller isometry group $SO(3)$. The choice with M^4 signature and co-associativity would provide the highest symmetries. For the real projections with signature $(2,2)$ neither consistent with color structure, neither full associativity nor co-associativity is possible.

2. The second essential prerequisite of M^8-H duality is that the tangent space is not only (co-)associative but contains also (co-)complex - and thus (co-)commutative - plane. A more general assumption would be that a co-associative space-time surface contains an integrable distribution of planes $M^2(x)$, which could as a special case reduce to M^2.

   The proposal has been that this integrable distribution of $M^2(x)$ could correspond to string sheets and possibly also integrable orthogonal distribution of their co-complex orthogonal complements as tangent spaces of partonic 2-surfaces defining a slicings of the space-time surface. It is now clear that this dream cannot be realized since the space-time surface cannot be even associative unless it is just E^4 or its Minkowskian variants.

3. As already noticed, any distribution of the associative normal spaces integrates to a co-associative space-time surface. Could the normal spaces also contain an integrable distribution of co-complex planes defined by octonionic real unit 1 and real unit $I_k(x)$, most naturally I_1 in the canonical example? This would give co-commutative string world sheet. Commutativity would be realized at the 2-D level and associativity at space-time level. The signature of this plane could be Minkowskian or Euclidian. For the canonical example $\{I_1, iI_3, iI_5, iI_7\}$ the 2-D complex plane in quaternionic sense would correspond to $(a\times 1, +n_2I_2+n_4I_6+n_6I_6$, where the unit vector n_i has real components and one has $a=1$ or $a=i$ is forced by the complexification as in the canonical example.

   Since the distribution of normal planes integrates to a 4-surface, one expects that its sub-distribution consting of commutative planes integrates to 2-D surface inside space-time surface and defines the counterpart of string worlds sheet. Also its normal complement could integrate to a counterpart of partonic 2-surface and a slicing of space-time surface by these surfaces would be obtained.

4. The simplest option is that the commutative space does not depend on position at X^4. This means a choice of a fixed octonionic imaginary unit, most naturally I_1 for the canonical option. This would make $SU(3)$ and its sub-group $U(2)$ independent of position. In this case the identification of the point of $CP_2 = SU(3)/U(2)$ labelling the normal space at a given point is unique.

   For a position dependent choice $SU(3)(x)$ it is not clear how to make the specification of $U(2)(x)$ unique: it would seem that one must specify a unique element of $G_2(x)$ relating $SU(3)(x)$ to a choice at special point x_0 and defining the conjugation of both $SU(3)(x)$ and $U(2)(x)$. Otherwise one can have problems. This would also mean a unique choice for the direction of time axis in O and fixing of $SO(1,3)$ as a subgroup of $G_{2,c}$. Also this distribution of associative normal spaces is integrable. Physically this option is attractive but an open question is whether it is consistent with the identification of space-time surfaces as roots $Re_Q(P)=0$ of P.

3.2.4 Co-associativity from octonion analyticity or/and from G_2 holography?

Candidates for co-associative space-time surfaces X^4_r are defined as restrictions X^4_r for the roots X^4_c of the octonionic polynomials such that the O_c coordinates in the complement of a real co-associative sub-space of O_c vanish or are constant. Could the surfaces X^4_r or even X^4_c be co-associative?

1. X^4_r is analogous to the image of real or imaginary axis under a holomorphic map and defines a curve in complex plane preserving angles. The tangent vectors of X^4_r and X^4_c involve gradients of all coordinates of O_c and are expressible in terms of all octonionic unit vectors. It is not

obvious that their products would belong to the normal space of X^4_r a strong condition would be that this is the case for X^4_c.

2. Could octonion analyticity in the proposed sense guarantee this? The products of octonion units also in the tangent space of the image would be orthogonal to the tangent space. Ordinary complex functions preserve angles, in particular, the angle between x- and y-axis is preserved since the images of coordinate curves are orthogonal. Octonion analyticity would preserve the orthogonality between tangent space vectors and their products.

3. This idea could be killed if one could apply the same approach to associative case but this is not possible! The point is that when the real tangent space of O_c contains the real octonion unit, the candidate for the 4-D space-time surface is a complex surface X^2_c. The number theoretic metric is real only for 2-D X^2_r so that one obtains string theory with co-associativity replaced with co-commutativity and $M^4 \times CP_2$ with $M^2 \times S^2$. One could of course ask whether this option could be regarded as a "sub-theory" of the full theory.

My luck was that I did not realize the meaning of the difference between the two cases first and realized that one can imagine an alternative approach.

1. G_2 as an automorphism group of octonions preserves co-associativity. Could the image of a co-associative sub-space of O_c defined by an octonion analytic map be regarded as an image under a local G_2 gauge transformation. $SU(3) \subset G_2$ is an especially interesting subgroup since it could have a physical interpretation as a color gauge group. This would also give a direct connection with $M^8 - H$ duality since $SU(3)$ corresponds to the gauge group of the color gauge field in H.

2. One can counter-argue that an analog of pure gauge field configuration is in question at the level of M^8. But is a pure gauge configuration for $G_{2,c}$ a pure gauge configuration for G_2? The point is that the $G_{2,c}$ connection $g^{-1}\partial_\mu g$ trivial for $G_{2,c}$ contains by non-linearity cross terms from $g_2g, c = g_{2,1} + ig_{2,2}$, which are of type $Re = X[g_{2,1}, g_{2,1}] - X[g_{2,2}, g_{2,2}] = 0$ and $Im = iZ[g_{2,1}, g_{2,2}] = 0$. If one puts $g_{2,2}$ contributions to zero, one obtains $Re = X[g_{2,1}, g_{2,1}]$, which does not vanish so that $SU(3)$ gauge field is non-trivial.

3. X^4_r could be also obtained as a map of the co-associative M^4 plane by a local $G_{2,c}$ element. It will turn out that $G_{2,c}$ could give rise to the speculated Yangian symmetry [L1] at string world sheets analogous to Kac-Moody symmetry and gauge symmetry and crucial for the construction of scattering amplitudes in $M8$.

4. The decomposition of the co-associative real plane of O_c should contain a preferred complex plane for $M^8 - H$ duality to make sense. $G_{2,c}$ transformation should trivially preserve this property so that SH would not be necessary at H side anymore.

There is a strong motivation to guess that the two options are equivalent so that $G_{2,c}$ holography would be equivalent with octonion analyticity. The original dream was that octonion analyticity would realize both associative and co-associative dynamics but was exaggeration!

3.2.5 Does one obtain partonic 2-surfaces and strings at boundaries of ΔCD_8?

It is interesting to look for the dimensions of the intersections of the light-like branes at the boundary of CD_8 giving rise to the boundary of CD_4 in M^4 to see whether it gives justification for the existing phenomenological picture involving light-like orbits of partonic 2-surfaces connected by string world sheets.

1. Complex light-cone boundary has dimension $D = 14$. $P = 0$ as an additional condition at δCD_8 gives 2 complex conditions and defines a 10-D surface having 5-D real projections.

2. The condition $Im_Q(P) = 0$ gives 8 conditions and gives a 2-D complex surface with 1-D real projection. The condition $Re_Q(P) = 0$ gives 3 complex conditions since $X = 0$ is already satisfied and the solution is a 4-D surface having 2-D real projection. Could the interpretation be in terms of the intersection of the orbit of a light-like partonic surface with the boundary of CD_8?

3. Associativity is however not a working option. If only co-associative Minkowskian surfaces allowing mapping to H without SH are present then only 4-D space-time surfaces with Minkowskian signature, only partonic 2-surfaces and their light-like orbits would emerge from co-associativity.

   This option would not allow string world sheets for which there is a strong intuitive support. What could a co-complex 2-surface of a co-associative manifold mean? In the co-associative case the products of octonion imaginary units are in the normal space of space-time surface. Could co-complex surface $X^2_c \subset X^4_c$ be defined by an integrable co-complex sub-distribution of co-associative distribution. The 4-D distribution of normal planes is always integrable.

   Could the 2-D sub-distributions of co-associative distribution integrate trivially and define slicings by string world sheets or partonic 2-surfaces. Could the distribution of string distributions and its orthogonal complement be both integrable and provide orthogonal slicings by string world sheets and partonic 2-surfaces? String world sheets with Minkowskian signature should intersect the partonic orbits with Euclidian signature along light-like lines. This brings in mind the orthogonal grid of flow lines defined by the $Re(f) = 0$ and $Im(f) = 0$ lines of an analytic function in plane.

4. In this picture the partonic 2-surfaces associated with light-like 3-surface would be physically unique and could serve as boundary values for the distributions of partonic 2-surfaces. But what about string world sheets connecting them? Why would some string world sheets be exceptional? String world sheets would have a light-like curve as an intersection with the partonic orbit but this is not enough.

   Could the physically special string world sheets connect two partonic surfaces? Could the string associated with a generic string world sheet be like a flow line in a hydrodynamic flow past an obstacle - the partonic 2-surface? The string as a flowline would go around the obstacle along either side but there would be one line which ends up to the object.

Interactions would correspond geometrically to the intersections of co-associative space-time surfaces X^4_r associated with particles and corresponding to different real sub-spaces of O_c related by Lorentz boost in $SO(1,3) \subset G_{2,c}$. In the generic case the intersection would be discrete. In the case that X and Y have a common root the real surfaces $X^4_r \subset X^6_r$ associated with quarks and depending on their state of motion would reside inside the same 6-D surface X^6_r and have a 2-D surface X^2_r as intersection. Could this surface be interpreted as a partonic 2-surface? One must however bear in mind that partonic 2-surfaces as topological vertices are assumed to be non-generic in the sense that the light-like partonic orbits meet at them. At the level of H, the intersections would be partonic 2-surfaces X^2 at which the four 3-D partonic orbits would meet along their ends. Does this hold true at the level of M^8? Or can it hold true even at the level H?

The simplest situation corresponds to 4 external quarks. There are 6 different intersections. Not all of them are realized since a given quark can belong only to a single intersection. One must have two disjoint pairs -say 12 and 34. Most naturally positive *resp.* negative energy quarks form a pair. These pairs are located in different half-cones. The intersections would give two partonic 2-surfaces and this situation would be generic. This suggests a modification of the description of particle reaction in M^8 . $M^8 - H$ duality suggests a similar description in H.

3.2.6 What could be the counterparts of wormhole contacts at the level of M^8?

The experience with H, in particular the presence of extremals with Euclidian signature of the induced metric and identified as building bricks of elementary particles, suggest that also the light-like 3-surfaces in M^8_c could have a continuation with an Euclidian signature of the number theoretic metric with norm having real values only for the projections to planes allowing real coordinates.

The earlier picture has been that the wormhole contacts as CP_2 type extremals correspond to co-associative regions and their exteriors to associative regions. If one wants $M^8 - H$ duality in strong form and thus without need for SH, one should assume that both these regions are co-associative.

1. The simplest option is that the real Minkowskian time coordinate becomes imaginary. Instead of the canonical (I_1, iI_3, iI_5, iI_7) the basis would be (iI_1, iI_3, iI_5, iI_7) having Euclidian

signature and SO(4) as isometry group. The signature would naturally change at light-like 3-surface the time coordinate along light-like curves becomes zero - proper time for photon vanishes - and can ransforms continuously from real to imaginary.

2. Wormhole contacts in H behave like pairs of magnetic monopoles with monopole charges at throats. If one does not allow point-like singularity, the monopole flux must go to a parallel Minkowskian space-time sheet through the opposite wormhole throat. Wormhole contact with effective magnetic charge would correspond in M^8_c to a distribution of normal 4-planes at the partonic 2-surfaces analogous to the radial magnetic field of monopole at a sphere surrounding it. To avoid singularity of the distribution, there must be another light-like 3-surface M^8 such that its partonic throat has a topologically similar distribution of normal planes.

In the case of X^3_c dimension does not allow co-quaternion structure: could they allow 4-D co-associative sub-manifolds? It will be found that this option is not included since co-associative tangent space distributions in a quaternion manifold (now O) are always integrable.

3.3 Octonionic Dirac equation and co-associativity

Also the role of associativity concerning octonionic Dirac equation in M^8 must be understood. It is found that co-associativity allows very elegant formulation and suggests the identification of the points appearing as the ends of quark propagator lines in H as points of boundary of CD representing light-like momenta of quarks. Partonic vertices would involve sub-CDs and momentum conservation would have purely geometric meaning bringing strongly in mind twistor Grassmannian approach [B2, B1, B3]. I have discussed the twistor lift of TGD replacing twistors as fields with surfaces in twistor space having induced twistor structure in [K8, K6, K9] [L12, L13].

3.3.1 Octonionic Dirac equation

The following arguments lead to the understanding of co-associativity in the case of octonion spinors. The constant spinor basis includes all spinors but the gamma matrices appearing in the octonionic Dirac equation correspond to co-associative octonion units.

1. At the level of O_c the idea about massless Dirac equation as partial differential equation does not make sense. Dirac equation must be algebraic and the obvious idea is that it corresponds to the on mass shell condition for a mode of ordinary Dirac equation with well-define momentum: $p^k\gamma_k\Psi = 0$ satisfying $p^kp_k = 0$. This suggests that octonionic polynomial P defines the counterpart of $p^k\gamma_k$ so that gamma matrices γ_k would be represented as octonion components. Does this make sense?

2. Can one construct octonionic counterparts of gamma matrices? The imaginary octonion units I_k indeed define the analogs of gamma matrices as $\gamma_k \equiv iI_k$ satisfying the conditions $\{\gamma_k, \gamma_l\} = 2\delta_{kl}$ defining Euclidian gamma matrices. The problem is that one has $I_0I_lk + I_kI_0 = 2I_k$. One manner to solve the problem would be to consider tensor products $I_0\sigma_3$ and $I_k\sigma_2$ where σ_3 and $sigma_2$ are Pauli's sigma matrices with anti-commutation relations $\{\sigma_i, \sigma_j\} = \delta_{i,j}$. Note that I_k do not allow a matrix representation.

   Co-associativity condition suggests an alternative solution. The restriction of momenta to be co-associative and therefore vanishing component p^0 as octonion, would selects a sub-space spanned by say the canonical choice $\{I_2, iI3, iI_5, iI_7\}$ satisfying the anticommutation relations of Minkowskian gamma matrices. Octonion units do not allow a matrix representation because they are not associative. The products for a co-associative subset of octonion units are however associative $(a(bc) = (ab)c$ so that they can be mapped to standard gamma matrices in Minkowski space. Co-associativity would allow the representation of 4-D gamma matrices as a maximal associative subset of octonion units.

3. What about octonionic spinors. The modes of the ordinary Dirac equation with a well-defined momentum are obtained by applying the Dirac operator to an orthogonal basis of constant spinors u_i to give $\Psi = p^k\gamma_k u_i$. Now the counterparts of constant spinors u_i would naturally

be octonion units $\{I_0, I_k\}$: this would give the needed number 8 of real spinor components as one has for quark spinors.

Dirac equation reduces to light-likeness conditions $p^k p_k = 0$ and p_k must be chosen to be real - if pk are complex, the real and imaginary parts of momentum are parallel. One would obtain an entire 3-D mass shell of solution and a single mode of Dirac equation would correspond to a point of this mass shell.

Remark: Octonionic Dirac equation is associative since one has a product of form $(p_k\gamma_k)^2 u_i$ and octonion products of type x^2y are associative.

4. p^k would correspond to the restriction of $P(o_c)$ to M^4 as sub-space of octonions. Since co-associativity implies $P(o_c) = Y(o_c)o_c$ restricted to counterpart of M^4 (say subspace spanned by $\{I_2, iI3, iI_5, iI_7\}$), Dirac equation reduces to the condition $o^k o_k = 0$ in M^4 defining a light-cone of M^4. This light-cone is mapped to a curved light-like 3-surface X^3 in o_c as $o_c \to P(o_c) = Y o_c$. $M^8 - H$ duality maps points of space-time surface on M^8 H and therefore the light-cone of M^4 corresponds to either light-like boundary of CD. It seems that the image of X^3 in H has M^4 projection to the light-like boundary of CD.

   Co-associative space-time surfaces have 3-D intersections X^3 with the surface $P = 0$: the conjecture is that X^3 corresponds to a light-like orbit of partonic 2-surfaces in H at which the induced metric signature changes. At X^3 one has besides $X = 0$ also $Y = 0$ so that octonionic Dirac equation $P(o_c)\Psi = P^k I_k\Psi = Yp^k I_k\Psi = 0$ is trivially satisfied for all momenta $p^k = o^k$ defined by the M^4 projections of points of X^3 and one would have $P^k = Yp^k = 0$ so that the identification of P^k as 4-momentum would not allow to assign non-vanishing momenta to X^3. The direction of p^k is constrained only by the condition of belonging to X^3 and the momentum would be in general time-like since X^3 is inside future light-cone.

   $Y = 0$ condition conforms with the proposal that X^3 defines a boundary of Minkowskian and Euclidian region: Euclidian mass shell condition for real P^k requires $P^k = 0$. The general complex solution to $P^2 = 0$ condition is $P = P_1 + iP_2$ with $P_1^2 = P_2^2$.

A single mode of Dirac equation with a well-defined value of p^k as the analog of 4-momentum would correspond to a selection of single time-like point at X^3 or light-like point at the light-like boundary of CD. X^3 intersects light-cone boundary as part of boundary of 7-D light-cone. The picture about scattering amplitudes - consistent with the view about cognitive representations as a unique discretization of space-time surface - is that quarks are located at discrete points of partonic 2-surfaces representing the ends of fermionic propagator lines in H and that one can assign to them light-like momenta.

3.3.2 Challenging the form of $M^8 - H$ duality for the map $M^4 \subset M^8$ to $M^4 \subset H$

The assumption that the map $M^4 \subset M^8$ to $M^4 \subset H$ in $M^8 - H$ duality is a simple identification map has not been challenged hitherto.

1. Octonionic Dirac equation forces the identification of M^8 as analog of 8-D momentum space and the earlier simple identification is in conflict with Uncertainty Principle. Inversion allowed by conformal invariance is highly suggestive: what comes first in mind is a map $m^k \to \hbar_{eff} m^k/m^k m_k$.

   At the light-cone boundary the map is ill-defined. Here on must take as coordinate the linear time coordinate m^0 or equivalently radial coordinate $r_M = m^0$. In this case the map would be of fporm $t \to \hbar_{eff}/m^0$: m^0 has interpretation as energy of massless particle.

   The map would give a surprisingly precise mathematical realization for the intuitive arguments assigning to mass a length scale by Uncertainty Principle.

2. Additional constraints on $M^8 - H$ duality in M^4 degrees of freedom comes from the following argument. The two half-cones of CD contain space-time surfaces in M^8 as roots of polynomials $P_1(o)$ and $P_2(2T - o)$ which need not be identical. The simplest solution is $P_2(o) = P_1(2T - o)$: the space-time surfaces at half-cones would be mirror images of each other. This gives $P_1(T, Im_R(o)) = P_1(T - Im_R(o))$ Since P_1 depends on $t^2 - \overline{o}^2$ only, the condition is identically satisfied for both options.

There are two options for the identification of the coordinate t.

Option a): t is identified as octonionic real coordinate o_R identified and also time coordinate as in the original option. In the recent option octonion o_R would correspond to the Euclidian analog of time coordinate. The breaking of symmetry from $SO(4)$ to $SO(3)$ would distinguish t as a Newtonian time.

At the level of M^8, The M^4 projection of CD_8 is a union of future and past directed light-cones with a common tip rather than CD_4. Both incoming and outgoing momenta have the same origin automatically. This identification is the natural one at the level of M^8.

Option b): t is identified as a Minkowski time coordinate associated with the imaginary unit I_1 in the canonical decomposition $\{I_1, iI_3, iI_5, iI_7\}$. The half-cone at $o = 0$ would be shifted to $O = (0, 2T, 0...0)$ and reverted. M^4 projection would give CD_4 so that this option is consistent with ZEO. This option is natural at the level of Hbut not at the level of M^8.

If **Option a)** is realized at the level of M^8 and **Option b)** at the level of H, as seems natural, a time translation $m^0 \to m^0 + 2T$ of the past directed light-cone in $M^4 \subset H$ is required in order to to give upper half-cone of CD_4.

3. The map of the momenta to imbedding space points does not prevent the interpretation of the points of M^8 as momenta also at the level of H since this information is not lost. One cannot identify p^k as such as four-momentum neither at the level of M^8 nor H as suggested by the naïve identification of the Cartesian factors M^4 for M^8 and H. This problem is circumvented by a conjugation in M_c^8 changing the sign of 3-momentum. The light-like momenta along the light-cone boundary are non-physical but transform to light-like momenta arriving into light-cone as the physical intuition requires.

   Therefore the map would have in the interior of light-cone roughly the above form but there is still a question about the precise form of the map. Does one perform inversion for the M^4 projection or does one take M^4 projection for the inversion of complex octonion. The inversion of M^4 projection seems to be the more plausible option. Denoting by $P(o_c)$ the real M^4 projection of X^4 point one therefore has:

$$P(o_c) \to \hbar_{eff} \frac{\overline{P(o_c)}}{P(o_c) \cdot P(o_c)} \quad . \tag{3.7}$$

   Note that the conjugation changes the direction of 3-momentum.

   At the light-cone boundary the inversion is ill-defined but Uncertainty Principle comes in rescue, and one can invert the M^4 time coordinate:

$$Re(m^0) = t \to \hbar_{eff} \frac{1}{t} \quad . \tag{3.8}$$

A couple of remarks are in order.

1. The presence of $\hbar_{eff}$ instead of $\hbar$ is required by the vision about dark matter. The value of $\hbar_{eff}/h_0$ is given by the dimension of extension of rationals identifiable as the degree of P.

2. The image points $\overline{p}^k$ in H would naturally correspond to the ends of the propagator lines in the space-time representation of scattering amplitudes.

The information about momenta is not lost in the map. What could be the interpretation of the momenta $\overline{p}^k$ at the level of H?

1. Super-symplectic generators at the partonic vertices in H do not involve momenta as labels. The modes of the imbedding space spinor field assignable to the ground states of super-symplectic representations at the boundaries of CD have 4-momentum and color as labels.

The identification of $\overline{p}^k$ as this momentum label would provide a connection with the classical picture about scattering events.

At the partonic 2-surfaces appearing as vertices, one would have a sum over the ground states (spinor harmonics). This would give integral over momenta but $M^8 - H$ duality and number theoretic discretization would select a finite subset and the momentum integral would reduce to a discrete sum. The number of M^8 points with coordinates in a given extension of rationals is indeed finite.

2. $M^4 \subset M^8$ could be interpreted as the space of 4-momenta labeling the spinor harmonics of M^8. Same would apply at the level of H: spinor harmonics would correspond to the ground states of super-symplectic representations.

3. The interpretation of the points of M^4_c as complex 4-momenta inspires the question whether the interpretation of the imaginary part of the momentum squared in terms of decay decay width so that M^8 picture would code even information about the dynamics of the particles.

4 How to achieve periodic dynamics at the level of $M^4 \times CP_2$?

Assuming $M^8 - H$ duality, how could one achieve typical periodic dynamics at the level of H - at least effectively?

It seems that one cannot have an "easy" solution to the problem?

1. Irreducible polynomials which are products of monomials corresponding to roots r_n which are in good approximation evenly spaced $r_n = r_0 + nr_1\Delta r_n$ would give "very special moments in the life of self" as values of M^4 time which are evenly spaced [L10, L8]. This could give rise to an effective periodicity but it would be at the level of M^8, not H, where it is required.

2. Is it enough that the periodic functions are *only* associated with the spinor harmonics of H involved with the construction of scattering amplitudes in H [L17]? For the modified Dirac equation [K3] the periodic behavior is possible. Note also that the induced spinors defining ground states of super-symplectic representations are restrictions of second quantized spinors of H proportional to plane waves in M^4. These solutions do not guarantee quantum classical correspondence.

4.1 The unique aspects of Neper number and number theoretical universality of Fourier analysis

Could one assume more general functions than polynomials at the level of H? Discrete Fourier basis is certainly an excellent candidate in this respect but does it allow number theoretical universality?

1. Discrete Fourier analysis involves in the Euclidian geometry periodic functions $exp(2\pi x)$, n integer and in hyperbolic geometry exponential functions $exp(kx)$.

Roots of unity $exp(i2\pi/n)$ allow to generalize Fourier analysis. The p-adic variants of $exp(ix)$ exist for rational values of $x = k2\pi/n$ for $n = K$ if $exp(i2\pi/K)$ belongs to the extension of rationals. $x = k = 2pi/n$ does not exist as a p-adic number but $exp(x) = exp(i2\pi/n)$ can exist as phase replacing x as coordinate in extension of p-adics. One can therefore define Fourier basis $\{exp(inx)|n \in Z\}$ which exist at discrete set of rational points $x = k/n$

Neper number e is also p-adically exceptional in that e^p exists as a p-adic number for all primes p. One has a hierarchy of finite-D extensions of p-adic numbers spanned by the roots $e^{1/n}$. Finiteness of cognition might allow them. Hyperbolic functions $exp(nx)$, $n = 1, 2...$ would have values in extension of p-adic number field containing $exp(1/N)$ in a discrete set of points $\{x = k/N|k \in Z\}$.

2. (Complex) rationality guarantees number theoretical universality and is natural since CP_2 geometry is complex. This would correspond to the replacement $x \to exp(ix)$ or $x \to exp(x)$ for powers x^n. The change of the signature by replacing real coordinate x with ix would automatically induce this change.

3. Exponential functions are in a preferred position also group theoretically. Exponential map maps $g \rightarrow exp(itg)$ the points of Lie algebra to the points of the Lie group so that the tangent space of the Lie algebra defines local coordinates for the Lie group. One can say that tangent space is mapped to space itself. M^4 defines an Abelian group and the exponential map would mean replacing of the M^4 coordinates with their exponential, which are p-adically more natural. Ordinary Minkowski coordinates have both signs so that they would correspond to the Lie algebra level.

4. CP_2 is a coset space and its points are obtained as selected points of $SU(3)$ using exponentiation of a commutative subalgebra t in the decomposition $g = h + t + \bar{t}$ in the Lie-algebra of $SU(3)$. One could interpret the CP_2 points as exponentials and the emergence of exponential basis as a basis satisfying number theoretical universality.

4.2 Are CP_2 coordinates as functions of M^4 coordinates expressible as Fourier expansion

Exponential basis is not natural at the level of M^8. Exponential functions belong to dynamics, not algebraic geometry, and the level H represents dynamics.

It is the dependence of CP_2 coordinates on M^4 coordinates, where the periodicity is needed. The map of the tangent spaces of $X^4 \subset M^8$ to points of CP_2 is slightly local since it depends on the first derivatives crucial for dynamics. Could this bring in dynamics and exponential functions at the level of H?

These observations inspire the working hypothesis that CP_2 points as functions of M^4 coordinates are expressible as polynomials of hyperbolic and trigonometric exponentials of M^4 coordinates.

Consider now the situation in more detail.

1. The basis for roots of e would be characterized by integer K in $e^{1/K}$. This brings in a new parameter characterizing the extension of rationals inducing finite extensions of p-adic numbers. K is analogous to the dimension of extension of rationals: the p-adic extension has dimension $d = Kp$ depending on the p-adic prime explicitly.

2. If CD size T is given, $e^{-T/K}$ defines temporal and spatial resolution in H. K or possibly Kp could naturally correspond to the gravitational Planck constant [L7] [K5] [?] $K = n_{gr} = \hbar_{gr}/h_0$.

3. In [L19] many-sheetedness with respect to CP_2 was proposed to correspond to flux tubebundles in M^4 forming quantum coherent structures. A given CP_2 point corresponds to several M^4 points with the same tangent space and their number would correspond to the number of the flux tubes in the bundle.

   Does the number of these points relate to K or Kp? p-Adic extension would have finite dimension $d = Kp$. Could $d = Kp$ be analogous to a degree of polynomial defining the dimension of extension of rationals? Could this be true in p-adic length scale resolution $O(p^2) = 0$ The number of points would be Kp and very large. For electron one has $p = M_{127} = 2^{127} - 1$.

4. The dimension n_A Abelian extension associated with EQ would naturally satisfy $n_A = K$ since the trigonometric and hyperbolic exponentials are obtained from each other by replacing a real coordinate with an imaginary one.

5. There would be two effective Planck constants. $h_{eff} = nh_0$ would be defined by the degree n of the polynomial P defining $X^4 \subset M^8$. $\hbar_{gr} = n_{gr}h_0$ would define infra-red cutoff in M^4 as the size scale of CD in $H = M^4 \times CP_2$. n *resp.* $n_{gr} = Kp$ would characterize many-sheetedness in M^4 *resp.* CP_2 degrees of freedom.

4.3 Connection with cognitive measurements as analogs of particle reactions

There is an interesting connection to the notion of cognitive measurement [L19, L20, L21].

1. The dimension n of the extension of rationals as the degree of the polynomial $P = P_{n_1} \circ P_{n_2} \circ ...$ is the product of degrees of degrees n_i: $n = \prod_i n_i$ and one has a hierarchy of Galois groups G_i associated with $P_{n_i} \circ ....$ G_{i+1} is a normal subgroup of G_i so that the coset space $H_i = G_i/G_{i+1}$ is a group of order n_i. The groups H_i are simple and do not have this kind of decomposition: simple finite groups appearing as building bricks of finite groups are classified. Simple groups are primes for finite groups.

2. The wave function in group algebra $L(G)$ of Galois group G of P has a representation as an entangled state in the product of simple group algebras $L(H_i)$. Since the Galois groups act on the space-time surfaces in M^8 they do so also in H. One obtains wave functions in the space of space-time surfaces. G has decomposition to a product (not Cartesian in general) of simple groups. In the same manner, $L(G)$ has a representation of entangled states assignable to $L(H_i)$ [L19, L21].

This picture leads to a model of analysis as a cognitive process identified as a cascade of "small state function reductions" (SSFRs) analogous to "weak" measurements.

1. Cognitive measurement would reduce the entanglement between $L(H_1)$ and $L(H_2)$, the between $L(H_2)$ and $L(H_3)$ and so on. The outcome would be an unentangled product of wave functions in $L(H_i)$ in the product $L(H_1) \times L(H_2) \times ....$ This cascade of cognitive measurements has an interpretation as a quantum correlate for analysis as factorization of a Galois group to its prime factors. Similar interpretation applies in M^4 degrees of freedom.

2. This decomposition could correspond to a replacement of P with a product $\prod_i P_i$ of polynomials with degrees $n = n_1 n_2 ...$, which is irreducible and defines a union of separate surfaces without any correlations. This process is indeed analogous to analysis.

3. The analysis cannot occur for simple Galois groups associated with extensions having no decomposition to simpler extensions. They could be regarded as correlates for irreducible primal ideas. In Eastern philosophies the notion of state empty of thoughts could correspondto these cognitive states in which SSFRs cannot occur.

4. An analogous process should make sense also in the gravitational sector and would mean the splitting of $K = n_A$ appearing as a factor $n_{gr} = Kp$ to prime factors so that the sizes of CDs involved with the resulting structure would be reduced. This process would reduce to a simultaneous measurement cascade in hyperbolic and trigonometric Abelian extensions. The IR cutoffs having interpretation as coherence lengths would decrease in the process as expected. Nature would be performing ordinary prime factorization in the gravitational degrees of freedom.

Cognitive process would also have a geometric description.

1. For the algebraic EQs, the geometric description would be as a decay of n-sheeted 4-surface with respect to M^4 to a union of n_i-sheeted 4-surfaces by SSFRs. This would take place for flux tubes mediating all kinds of interactions.

   In gravitational degrees of freedom, that is for trascendental EQs, the states with $n_{gr} = Kp$ having bundles of Kp flux tubes would deca to flux tubes bundles of $n_{gr,i} = K_i p$, where K_i is a prime dividing K. The quantity $log(K)$ would be conserved in the process and is analogous to the corresponding conserved quantity in arithmetic quantum field theories (QFTs) and relates to the notion of infinite prime inspired by TGD [K7].

2. This picture leads to ask whether one could speak of cognitive analogs of particle reactions representing interactions of "thought bubbles" i.e. space-time surfaces as correlates of cognition. The incoming and outgoing states would correspond to a Cartesian product of simple subgroups: $G = \prod_i^{\times} H_i$. In this composition the order of factors does not matter and the situation is analogous to a many particle system without interactions. The non-commutativity in general case leads to ask whether quantum groups might provide a natural description of the situation.

3. Interestingly, Equivalence Principle is consistent with the splitting of gravitational flux tube structures to smaller ones since gravitational binding energies given by Bohr model in $1/r$ gravitational potential do not depend on the value of $\hbar_{gr}$ if given by Nottale formula $\hbar_{gr} = GMm/v_0$ [L23]. The interpretation would be in terms of spontaneous quantum decoherence taking place as a decay of gravitational flux tube bundles as the distance from the source increases.

4.4 Still some questions about $M^8 - H$ duality

There are still on questions to be answered.

1. The map $p^k \rightarrow m^k = \hbar_{eff} p^k/p \cdot p$ defining $M^8 - H$ duality is consistent with Uncertainty Principle but this is not quite enough. Momenta in M^8 should correspond to plane waves in H.

   Should one demand that the momentum eigenstate as a point of cognitive representation associated with $X^4 \subset M^8$ carrying quark number should correspond to a plane wave with momentum at the level of $H = M^4 \times CP_2$? This does not make sense since $X^4 \subset CD$ contains a large number of momenta assignable to fundamental fermions and one does not know which of them to select.

2. One can however weaken the condition by assigning to CD a 4-momentum, call it P. Could one identify P as

   (a) the total momentum assignable to either half-cone of CD

   (b) or the sum of the total momenta assignable to the half-cones?

The first option does not seem to be realistic. The problem with the latter option is that the sum of total momenta is assumed to vanish in ZEO. One would have automatically zero momentum planewave. What goes wrong?

1. Momentum conservation for a single CD is an ad hoc assumption in conflict with Uncertainty Principle, and does not follow from Poincare invariance. However, the sum of momenta vanishes for non-vanishing planewave when defined in the entire M^4 as in QFT, not for planewaves inside finite CDs. Number theoretic discretization allows vanishing in finite volumes but this involves finite measurement resolution.

2. Zero energy states represent scattering amplitudes and at the limit of infinite size for the large CD zero energy state is proportional to momentum conserving delta function just as S-matrix elements are in QFT. If the planewave is restricted within a large CD defining the measurement volume of observer, four-momentum is conserved in resolution defined by the large CD in accordance with Uncertainty Principle.

3. Note that the momenta of fundamental fermions inside half-cones of CD in H should be determined at the level of H by the state of a super-symplectic representation as a sum of the momenta of fundamental fermions assignable to discrete images of momenta in $X^4 \subset H$.

4.4.1 $M^8 - H$-duality as a generalized Fourier transform

This picture provides an interpretation for $M^8 - H$ duality as a generalization of Fourier transform.

1. The map would be essentially Fourier transform mapping momenta of zero energy as points of $X^4 \subset CD \subset M^8$ to plane waves in H with position interpreted as position of CD in H. CD and the superposition of space-time surfaces inside it would generalize the ordinary Fourier transform . A wave function localized to a point would be replaced with a superposition of space-time surfaces inside the CD having interpretation as a perceptive field of a conscious entity.

2. $M^8 - H$ duality would realize momentum-position duality of wave mechanics. In QFT this duality is lost since space-time coordinates become parameters and quantum fields replace position and momentum as fundamental observables. Momentum-position duality would have much deeper content than believed since its realization in TGD would bring number theory to physics.

4.4.2 How to describe interactions of CDs?

Any quantum coherent system corresponds to a CD. How can one describe the interactions of CDs? The overlap of CDs is a natural candidate for the interaction region.

1. CD represents the perceptive field of a conscious entity and CDs form a kind of conscious atlas for M^8 and H. CDs can have CDs within CDs and CDs can also intersect. CDs can have shared sub-CDs identifiable as shared mental images.

2. The intuitive guess is that the interactions occur only when the CDs intersect. A milder assumption is that interactions are observed only when CDs intersect.

3. How to describe the interactions between overlapping CDs? The fact the quark fields are induced from second quantized spinor fields in in H *resp.* M^8 solves this problem. At the level of H, the propagators between the points of space-time surfaces belonging to different CDs are well defined and the systems associated with overlapping CDs have well-defined quark interactions in the intersection region. At the level of M^8 the momenta as discrete quark carrying points in the intersection of CDs can interact.

4.4.3 Zero energy states as scattering amplitudes and subjective time evolution as sequence of SSFRs

This is not yet the whole story. Zero energy states code for the ordinary time evolution in the QFT sense described by the S-matrix. What about subjective time evolution defined by a sequence of "small" state function reductions (SSFRs) as analogs of "weak" measurements followed now and then by BSFRs? How does the subjective time evolution fit with the QFT picture in which single particle zero energy states are planewaves associated with a fixed CD.

1. The size of CD increases at least in statistical sense during the sequence of SSFRs. This increase cannot correspond to M^4 time translation in the sense of QFTs. Single unitary step followed by SSFR can be identified as a scaling of CD leaving the passive boundary of the CD invariant. One can assume a formation of an intermediate state which is quantum superposition over different size scales of CD: SSFR means localization selecting single size for CD. The subjective time evolution would correspond to a sequence of scalings of CD.

2. The view about subjective time evolution conforms with the picture of string models in which the Lorentz invariant scaling generator L_0 takes the role of Hamiltonian identifiable in terms of mass squared operator allowing to overcome the problems with Poincare invariance. This view about subjective time evolution also conforms with super-symplectic and Kac-Moody symmetries of TGD.

   One could perhaps say that the Minkowski time T as distance between the tips of CDs corresponds to exponentiated scaling: $T = exp(L_0 t)$. If t has constant ticks, the ticks of T increase exponentially.

The precise dynamics of the unitary time evolutions preceding SSFRs has remained open.

1. The intuitive picture that the scalings of CDs gradually reveal the entire 4-surface determined by polynomial P in M^8: the roots of P as "very special moments in the life of self" would correspond to the values of time coordinate for which SSFRs occur as one new root emerges. These moments as roots of the polynomial defining the space-time surface would correspond to scalings of the size of both half-cones for which the space-time surfaces are mirror images. Only the upper half-cone would be dynamical in the sense that mental images as sub-CDs appear at "geometric now" and drift to the geometric future.

2. The scaling for the size of CD does *not* affect the momenta associated with fermions at the points of cognitive representation in $X^4 \subset M^8$ so that the scaling is not a genuine scaling of M^4 coordinates which does not commute with momenta. Also the fact that L_0 for super symplectic representations corresponds to mass squared operator means that it commutes with Poincare algebra so that M^4 scaling cannot be in question.

3. The Hamiltonian defining the time evolution preceding SSFR could correspond to an exponentiation of the sum of the generators L_0 for super-symplectic and super-Kac Moody representations and the parameter t in exponential corresponds to the scaling of CD assignable to the replaced of root r_n with root r_{n+1} as value of M^4 linear time (or energy in M^8). L_0 has a natural representation at light cone boundaries of CD as scalings of light-like radial coordinate.

4. Does the unitary evolution create a superposition over all over all scalings of CD and does SSFR measure the scale parameter and select just a single CD?

   Or does the time evolution correspond to scaling? Is it perhaps determined by the increase of CD from the size determined by the root r_n as "geometric now" to the root r_{n+1} so that one would have a complete analogy with Hamiltonian evolution? The scaling would be the ratio r_{n+1}/r_n which is an algebraic number.

   Hamiltonian time evolution is certainly the simplest option and predicts a fixed arrow of time during SSFR sequence. L_0 identifiable essentially as a mass squared operator acts like conjugate for the logarithm of the logarithm of light-cone proper time for a given half-cone.

   One can assume that L_0 as the sum of generators associated with upper and lower half-cones if the fixed state at the lower half-cone is eigenstate of L_0.

How does this picture relate to p-adic thermodynamics in which thermodynamics isdetermined by partition function which would in real sector be regarded as a vacuum expectation value of an exponential $exp(iL_0t)$ of a Hamiltonian for imaginary time $t = i\beta$ $\beta = 1/T$ defined by temperature. L_0 is proportional to mass squared operator.

1. In p-adic thermodynamics temperature T is dimensionless parameter and $\beta = 1/T$ is integer valued. The partition function as exponential $exp(-H/T)$ is replaced with $p^{\beta L_0)}$, $\beta = n$, which has the desired behavior if L_0 has integer spectrum. The exponential form $e^{L_0/T_R)}$, $\beta_R = nlog(p)$ equivalent in the real sector does not make sense p-adically since the p-adic exponential function has p-adic norm 1 if it exists p-adically.

2. The time evolution operator $exp(-iL_0t)$ for SSFRs (t would be the scaling parameter) makes sense for the extensions of p-adic numbers if the phase factors for eigenstates are roots of unity belonging to the extension. $t = 2\pi k/n$ since L_0 has integer spectrum. SSFRs would define a clock. The scaling $exp(t) = exp(2\pi k/n)$ is however not consistent with the scaling by r_{n-1}/r_n.

   Both the temperature and scaling parameter for time evolution by SSFRs would be quantized by number theoretical universality. p-Adic thermodynamics could have its origins in the subjective time evolution by SSFRs.

3. In the standard thermodynamics it is possible to unify temperature and time by introducing a complex time variable $\tau = t + i\beta$, where $\beta = 1/T$ is inverse temperature. For the space-time surface in complexified M^8, M^4 time is complex and the real projection defines the 4-surface mapped to H. Could thermodynamics correspond to the imaginary part of the time coordinate?

   Could one unify thermodynamics and quantum theory as I have indeed proposed: this proposal states that quantum TGD can be seen as a "complex square root" of thermodynamics. The exponentials $U = exp(\tau L_0/2)$ would define this complex square root and thermo-dynamical partition function would be given by $UU^\dagger = exp(-\beta L_0)$.

5 Conclusions

$M^8 - H$ duality plays a crucial role in quantum TGD and this motivated a critical study of the basic assumptions involved.

5.1 Co-associativity is the only viable option

The notion of associativity of the tangent or normal space as a number theoretical counterpart of a variational principle. This is not enough in order to have $M^8 - H$ duality. The first guess was that the tangent space is associative and contains a commutative 2-D sub-manifold to guarantee $M^8 - H$ duality.

1. The cold shower came as I learned that 4-D associative sub-manifolds of quaternion spaces are geodesic manifolds and thus trivial. Co-associativity is however possible since any distribution of associative normal spaces integrates to a sub-manifold. Typically these sub-manifolds are minimal surfaces, which conforms with the physical intuitions. Therefore the surface X^4_r given by holography should be co-associative. By the same argument space-time surface contains string world sheets and partonic 2-surfaces as co-complex surfaces.

2. $X = Re_Q(o) = 0$ and $Y = Im_Q(P) = 0$ allow M^4 and its complement as associative/co-associative subspaces of O_c. The roots $P = 0$ for the complexified octonionic polynomials satisfy two conditions $X = 0$ and $Y = 0$.

   Surprisingly, universal solutions are obtained as brane-like entities X^6_c with real dimension 12, having real projection X^6_r ("real" means that the number theoretic complex valued octonion norm squared is real valued).

   Equally surprisingly, the non-universal solutions to the conditions to $X = 0$ correspond complex mass shells with real dimension 6 rather than 8. The solutions to $X = Y = 0$ correspond to common roots of the two polynomials involved and are also 6-D complex mass shells.

   The reason for the completely unexpected behavior is that the equations $X = 0$ and $Y = 0$ are reduced by Lorentz invariance to equations for the ordinary roots of polynomials for the complexified mass squared type variable. The intersection is empty unless X and Y have a common root and X^4_r belongs to X^6_r for a common root.

How to associate to the 6-D complex mass shell a real 4-surface satisfying the conditions making $M8 - H$-duality? One can consider two approaches.

1. Physical considerations suggest that 4-D space-time surfaces are obtained by posing the additional condition that either M^2_c or E^2_c ($M^4_c = M^2_c \times E^2_c$) coordinates are real. Physical intuition suggests that it is possible to replace fixed M^2 (E^2) with an integrable distribution $M^2(x)$ ($E^2(x)$) giving rise to Hamilton-Jacobi structure. The intuitive expectation, which might be wrong, is that there is a large number of Hamilton-Jacobi structures serving as a moduli space for self-dual Kähler forms in M^4.

   The H images of $X^4 \subset X^6$ would depend on this distribution. P would fix complex mass shells in terms of its roots but not the 4-surfaces, contrary to the original expectations predicting extremely powerful number theoretical holography.

2. The key observation is that G_2 as the automorphism group of octonions respects the co-associativity of the 4-D real sub-basis of octonions. Therefore a local G_2 (or even $G_{2,c}$) gauge transformation applied to a 4-D co-associative sub-space O_c gives a co-associative four-surface as a real projection. Octonion analyticity would correspond to G_2 gauge transformation: this would realize the original idea about octonion analyticity.

   Remarkably, the group $SU(3)_c \subset G_{2,c}$ has interpretation as a complexified color group and the map defining space-time surface defines a trivial gauge field in $SU(3)_c$ whereas the connection in $SU(3)$ is non-trivial. Color confinement could mean geometrically that $SU(3)_c$ reduces to $SU(3)$ at large distances. This picture conforms with the H-picture in which gluon gauge potentials are identified as color gauge potentials. Note that at QFT limit the gauge potentials are replaced by their sums over parallel space-time sheets to give gauge fields as the space-time sheets are approximated with a single region of Minkowski space.

Both approaches involve a formal analog for the choice of a gauge. The image of X^4 under $M^8 - H$ duality however depends on this choice and corresponds to different physics. A physically motivated conjecture is that the two views are equivalent. The plausible interpretation in case of $G_{2,c}$ is in terms of Yangian symmetry, possibly restricted to $SU(3)$.

Minkowski signature turns out to be the only possible option for X^4_r. Also the phenomenological picture based on co-associative space-time sheets, light-like 3-surfaces, string world sheets and partonic 2-surfaces, and wormhole contacts carrying monopole flux emerges.

5.2 The input from octonionic Dirac equation

Octonionic Dirac equation allows a second perspective on associativity. For the co-associative option the co-associate octonions can represent gamma matrix algebra and it also allows a matrix representation. The octonionic Dirac equation is an analog of the momentum space variant of ordinary Dirac equation and forces the interpretation of M^8 as momentum space. The original wrong belief was that mass shell condition implies a localization of the octonionic spinor to a light-like 3 surface, which actually corresponds to light-cone boundary.

In the intersection of the space-time surface with 6-D brane-like surface Dirac equation is trivially satisfied and does not pose a condition on the mass of the quark. This intersection is either empty or the space-time surface is in the interior of this 6-D surface so that quarks can propagate in the entire X^4_r. This conforms with the fact that in H picture quark spinors can exist both in the interior of X^4 and at light-like 3-D partonic orbits and 2-D string world sheets. In the first case only massless quarks arriving at the boundary of CD are possible. The interpretation is as a number theoretic counterpart for a transitions from massless phase to massive phase. This applies at all levels of dark matter hierarchy. It seems also that the cognitive representations for both light-like boundary and X^4_r are not generic consisting of a finite set of points but infinite due to the Lorentz symmetry: a kind of cognitive explosion would happen when massivation occurs.

5.3 How the new picture differs from the earlier one?

The new view about $M^8 - H$ duality differs from the earlier one rather dramatically so that an explicit summary of the differences is in order to minimize confusions.

1. Octonionic Dirac equation as counterpart of Dirac equation in momentum space forced the interpretation of M^8 as the analog of momentum space so that space-time surfaces in M^8 would be the analogs of Fermi ball and mass shells would correspond to Fermi surfaces. The earlier solutions of the octonionic Dirac equation consisted of only massless solutions located to light-like surfaces (actually the boundary CD rather than inverse images of light-like partonic orbits).

   Co-associativity also allows massive quarks for which this localization does not occur: this conforms with the view that in H the induced spinor fields are possible also in the space-time interior. The transition from massless to massive phase for quarks has a number theoretic interpretation as the appearance of a common root of P_{odd} and P_{even}.

2. M^4 must be identified as co-associative rather than associative sub-space of octonions - earlier Minkowskian *resp.* Euclidian regions were proposed to be associative *resp.* associative. All space-time surfaces in M^8 would be co-associative surfaces and would contain string world sheets as co-complex sub-manifolds. Slicing by partonic 2-surfaces and string world sheets is suggestive.

   The earlier view was that $M^8 - H$ duality allows to map only string world sheets, partonic 2-surfaces, and possibly also their light-like orbits to H so that SH would be needed at the level of H. In the new picture one can map the entire co-associative space-time 4-surfaces in M^8 to 4-surfaces in H by $M^8 - H$ duality.

Acknowledgements: I am grateful for Reza Rastmanesh for a generous help in the preparation of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Mathematics

[A1] Urbano F Barros MM, Chen B-Y. Quaternion CR-submanifolds of quaternion manifolds. *Kodai Mathematical Journal*, 4(3):399–417, 2020. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/38325032_Quaternion_CR-submanifolds_of_quaternion_manifolds.

Theoretical Physics

[B1] Huang Y-T Elvang H. Scattering amplitudes, 2013. Available at: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1308.1697v1.pdf.

[B2] Arkani-Hamed N et al. A duality for the S-matrix, 2009. Available at: http://arxiv.org/abs/0907.5418.

[B3] Arkani-Hamed N et al. The S-Matrix in Twistor Space, 2009. Available at:https://arxiv.org/abs/0903.2110.

Books related to TGD

[K1] Pitkänen M. Construction of WCW Kähler Geometry from Symmetry Principles. In *Quantum Physics as Infinite-Dimensional Geometry*. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/pdfpool/compl1.pdf, 2006.

[K2] Pitkänen M. Identification of the WCW Kähler Function. In *Quantum Physics as Infinite-Dimensional Geometry*. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/pdfpool/kahler.pdf., 2006.

[K3] Pitkänen M. WCW Spinor Structure. In *Quantum Physics as Infinite-Dimensional Geometry*. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/pdfpool/cspin.pdf, 2006.

[K4] Pitkänen M. Recent View about Kähler Geometry and Spin Structure of WCW . In *Quantum Physics as Infinite-Dimensional Geometry*. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/pdfpool/wcwnew.pdf, 2014.

[K5] Pitkänen M. About the Nottale's formula for h_{gr} and the possibility that Planck length l_P and CP_2 length R are related. In *Hyper-finite Factors and Dark Matter Hierarchy: Part I*. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/pdfpool/vzerovariableG.pdf, 2019.

[K6] Pitkänen M. Some questions related to the twistor lift of TGD. In *Towards M-Matrix: Part II*. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/pdfpool/twistquestions.pdf, 2019.

[K7] Pitkänen M. TGD as a Generalized Number Theory: Infinite Primes. In *TGD as a Generalized Number Theory: Part I*. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/pdfpool/visionc.pdf, 2019.

[K8] Pitkänen M. The classical part of the twistor story. In *Towards M-Matrix: Part II*. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/pdfpool/twistorstory.pdf, 2019.

[K9] Pitkänen M. The Recent View about Twistorialization in TGD Framework. In *Towards M-Matrix: Part II*. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/pdfpool/smatrix.pdf, 2019.

[K10] Pitkänen M. Zero energy ontology, hierarchy of Planck constants, and Kähler metric replacing unitary S-matrix: three pillars of new quantum theory (short version). Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/pdfpool/kahlersm.pdf., 2020.

Articles about TGD

[L1] Pitkänen M. Could categories, tensor networks, and Yangians provide the tools for handling the complexity of TGD? Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/Yangianagain.pdf., 2017.

[L2] Pitkänen M. Does $M^8 - H$ duality reduce classical TGD to octonionic algebraic geometry?: part I. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/ratpoints1.pdf., 2017.

[L3] Pitkänen M. Does $M^8 - H$ duality reduce classical TGD to octonionic algebraic geometry?: part II. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/ratpoints2.pdf., 2017.

[L4] Pitkänen M. Does $M^8 - H$ duality reduce classical TGD to octonionic algebraic geometry?: part III. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/ratpoints3.pdf., 2017.

[L5] Pitkänen M. Philosophy of Adelic Physics. In *Trends and Mathematical Methods in Interdisciplinary Mathematical Sciences*, pages 241–319. Springer.Available at: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-55612-3_11, 2017.

[L6] Pitkänen M. Philosophy of Adelic Physics. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/adelephysics.pdf., 2017.

[L7] Pitkänen M. About the physical interpretation of the velocity parameter in the formula for the gravitational Planck constant . Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/vzero.pdf., 2018.

[L8] Pitkänen M. $M^8 - H$ duality and consciousness. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/M8Hconsc.pdf., 2019.

[L9] Pitkänen M. $M^8 - H$ duality and the two manners to describe particles. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/susysupertwistor.pdf., 2019.

[L10] Pitkänen M. New results related to $M^8 - H$ duality. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/M8Hduality.pdf., 2019.

[L11] Pitkänen M. Some comments related to Zero Energy Ontology (ZEO). Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/zeoquestions.pdf., 2019.

[L12] Pitkänen M. Twistor lift of TGD and WCW geometry. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/wcwnewest.pdf., 2019.

[L13] Pitkänen M. Twistors in TGD. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/twistorTGD.pdf., 2019.

[L14] Pitkänen M. Could ZEO provide a new approach to the quantization of fermions? Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/secondquant.pdf., 2020.

[L15] Pitkänen M. Fermionic variant of $M^8 - H$ duality. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/M8Hfermion.pdf., 2020.

[L16] Pitkänen M. Summary of Topological Geometrodynamics. Research Gate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343601105_Summary_of_Topological_Geometrodynamics., 2020.

[L17] Pitkänen M. Zero energy ontology, hierarchy of Planck constants, and Kähler metric replacing unitary S-matrix: three pillars of new quantum theory. Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/kahlersmhort.pdf., 2020.

[L18] Pitkänen M. Zero energy ontology, hierarchy of Planck constants, and Kähler metric replacing unitary S-matrix: three pillars of new quantum theory (short version). Available at: http://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/kahlersm.pdf., 2020.

[L19] Pitkänen M. Can TGD Predict the Value of Newton's Constant? *Pre-Space-Time Journal*, 11(5), 2020. See also http://tgtheory.fi/public_html/articles/Gagain.pdf.

[L20] Pitkänen M. The Dynamics of State Function Reductions as Quantum Measurement Cascades. *Pre-Space-Time Journal*, 11(2), 2020. See also http://tgtheory.fi/public_html/articles/SSFRGalois.pdf.

[L21] Pitkänen M. Negentropy Maximization Principle and Second Law. Available at: https://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/nmpsecondlaw.pdf., 2021.

[L22] Pitkänen M. TGD as it is towards the end of 2021. https://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/TGD2021.pdf., 2021.

[L23] Pitkänen M. Time reversal and the anomalies of rotating magnetic systems. Available at: https://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/freereverse.pdf., 2021.

[L24] Pitkänen M. What could 2-D minimal surfaces teach about TGD? https://tgdtheory.fi/public_html/articles/minimal.pdf., 2021.