Off-Shell Physics in a Coupled Real–Imaginary Spatial Sector: Evanescent Dirac Fields and Vacuum Energy Cancellation

Ivars Fabriciuss[1]

[1] *Independent Researcher, Riga, Latvia*

(Dated: September 17, 2025)

We present a novel framework in which physical space is augmented by an adjoint purely imaginary three-dimensional sector, I^3, that is coupled to ordinary space R^3 at the Planck scale. The I^3 sector is modeled as the space of pure imaginary quaternions, endowed with a negative-definite metric. Quantum fields propagating in I^3 are shown to be *evanescent*: free solutions of the Dirac equation in I^3 take the form of exponentially decaying (non-propagating) waves. The sign of the Dirac probability density in I^3 emerges naturally from the metric signature of this space, ensuring that total probabilities remain positive without any ad hoc prescriptions. We introduce a local coupling between R^3 and I^3 via Planck-area "patches" that acts analogously to a two-level system, allowing probability amplitude to oscillate between the two sectors. This oscillation occurs at the Zitterbewegung frequency ($\approx 2mc^2/\hbar$ for an electron), but with a very small amplitude, preserving conventional on-shell scattering processes in R^3. The combined $R^3 \oplus I^3$ framework offers a geometric interpretation of off-shell phenomena, including virtual particles and quantum tunneling, and provides natural explanations for otherwise puzzling features: the Yukawa form of short-range forces, the "trembling motion" of relativistic electrons, and the presence of a fixed π phase in certain interference processes. The I^3 sector carries positive vacuum energy density, but its negative volume element leads to an effective negative contribution to gravitational stress-energy. As a consequence, virtual fields in I^3 produce a short-range screening of gravitational interactions and can cancel the vast R^3 vacuum energy mode-by-mode, leaving a small residual cosmological constant in accord with observations. We discuss the model's implications for black hole entropy (each Planck-area patch carrying one bit of information), and outline experimental phenomena that could distinguish this framework from standard quantum theory.

I. INTRODUCTION

Relativistic quantum mechanics and quantum field theory (QFT) have long grappled with the existence of off-shell or virtual phenomena that have no direct classical analog. The Dirac equation's negative-energy solutions, for example, led to the prediction of antiparticles [1], but also to the concept of the vacuum teeming with virtual particle-antiparticle pairs [2]. Historically, Dirac's hole theory filled the negative-energy band; a missing electron (a "hole") behaves as a positron with *positive* energy and opposite charge when energies are measured relative to the filled sea. Modern QFT dispenses with the sea altogether: upon quantization, antiparticles are independent, positive-energy excitations of the Dirac field, and negative-energy one-particle states are not physical [2]. Virtual effects are then encoded by propagators and loop integrals rather than by literal motion in a filled band. We propose that this conundrum is not purely *energetic* but fundamentally *geometric*: virtual states might inhabit a separate spatial sector that is invisible to direct observation yet interacts with the physical world at small scales.

In this work, we introduce an adjunct three-dimensional space I^3 which is coupled to ordinary space R^3 (our familiar three dimensions of space). The sector I^3 is defined as the space of pure imaginary quaternions (Hamilton's i, j, k axes) and carries a natural negative-definite metric. It can be regarded as a fictitious "mirror" space coexisting with R^3, sharing the same time coordinate but differing in its spatial signature. Physically, fields in I^3 behave in an *evanescent* manner: they do not propagate freely over long distances but instead decay exponentially, confining their effects to near-field regions. This evanescence offers an attractive geometric explanation for virtual particles and other off-shell processes, which are known to be transient and spatially localized (e.g. the evanescent waves in total internal reflection [9] or the Yukawa form of nuclear forces).

An important motivation for considering the I^3 sector is the decades-old puzzle of *vacuum energy*. Naively summing zero-point energies of quantum fields in R^3 yields a huge cosmological constant, 60–120 orders of magnitude larger than observed [4]. In our framework, every mode in R^3 has a counterpart in I^3 carrying an opposite-sign contribution to the vacuum energy, leading to an almost complete cancellation without fine-tuning. Similarly, this doubled structure provides new intuition for *entropy and information* in gravity: a black hole's horizon, for instance, may be viewed as an interface between R^3 and I^3 composed of Planck-scale "pixels" each carrying one bit of information, naturally reproducing the Bekenstein–Hawking area law for entropy [6, 7]. We also note that this picture could shed light on quantum nonlocality: two entangled particles might be locally correlated through overlapping I^3 molds, without requiring superluminal communication in R^3.

In the following, we first formalize the geometry of the I^3 sector and show how its negative-definite metric yields the correct sign conventions for probabilities and energies (Sec. II). We derive the free Dirac equation in I^3 and demonstrate that its solutions are non-propagating exponential decays (Sec. III), thereby providing a natural geometric origin for virtual particle amplitudes. We then model the R^3–I^3 interface as a two-level system coupled via Planck-area patches (Sec. IV), and show that this leads to a small oscillatory exchange of probability current between sectors. Electromagnetic fields are considered in Sec. V, where we argue that the I^3 sector effectively has a negative permittivity ($\varepsilon_I < 0$) and positive permeability, explaining why radiation cannot propagate into I^3 but only exists as evanescent near-fields [9]. Section VI discusses distinctive, falsifiable predictions of this framework, such as a fixed π phase shift for processes involving an I^3 excursion and a universal exponential spatial decay law for off-shell forces. In Sec. VII we explore the gravitational implications, including how a populated I^3 vacuum can provide an effective negative pressure (repulsive gravity and screening) and why each Planck-scale interface patch naturally carries one bit of entropy. Finally, Sec. VIII addresses various caveats and conceptual issues, distinguishing this proposal from hidden-variable theories and ensuring that it does not violate causality or known physics on-shell.

II. GEOMETRY OF I^3 AND ITS METRIC

The algebra of quaternions $\mathbb{H}$ provides a convenient formal definition of the I^3 sector. Recall that the quaternion units i, j, k satisfy

$$i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = -1, \quad ij = k,\ jk = i,\ ki = j,$$

with anti-commutation ($ij = -ji$, etc.). Any quaternion $q \in \mathbb{H}$ can be written as $q = a + \mathbf{v}$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{v} = b\,i + c\,j + d\,k$ is the *pure imaginary* part. The subset of pure-imaginary quaternions (those with $a = 0$) forms a three-dimensional linear space, which we identify as I^3. An element of I^3 can be expressed as $\mathbf{v} = x\,i + y\,j + z\,k$, with $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$. The norm of this vector, given the quaternion multiplication rules, is found by squaring:

$$\mathbf{v}^2 = (x\,i + y\,j + z\,k)^2 = -(x^2 + y^2 + z^2). \tag{1}$$

This defines a natural metric on I^3: an infinitesimal displacement $d\mathbf{v} = dx\,i + dy\,j + dz\,k$ has

$$ds^2 = (d\mathbf{v})^2 = -(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2).$$

In other words, I^3 is a *flat* three-dimensional space with metric signature $(-,-,-)$, i.e. negative-definite. (By contrast, ordinary spatial slices of our universe R^3 can be taken as positive-definite with the standard Euclidean metric $ds^2 = +dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2$.) We emphasize that I^3 is not a temporal direction, despite the negative sign—rather, it is akin to a three-dimensional Euclidean space but with an opposite orientation convention.

One peculiar consequence of the quaternionic structure is that the volume element in I^3 carries an inherent minus sign relative to R^3. The standard oriented volume form in R^3 is $dV_R = dx\,dy\,dz$. In I^3, due to $i\,j\,k = -1$, the analogous volume 3-form can be written as $dV_I = (i\,dx) \wedge (j\,dy) \wedge (k\,dz) = -dx\,dy\,dz$. Thus

$$dV_I = -\,dV_R\,, \tag{2}$$

indicating that I^3 effectively contributes with a negative volume in integrals. This sign flip will play a crucial role in what follows, particularly in defining probabilities and energy integrals across the two sectors.

For context, we note that quaternionic extensions of quantum mechanics have been explored in the past [3], usually by generalizing the field of complex numbers to quaternions in the wavefunction. Our approach is quite different: we use quaternions to describe a separate spatial geometry I^3 coexisting with the usual space R^3, rather than altering the algebra of quantum states themselves. In this sense, I^3 can be viewed as an "adjoint" spatial component that is activated only in off-shell or virtual contexts.

III. DIRAC EQUATION IN I^3: EVANESCENCE AND NEGATIVE DENSITY

We now examine the behavior of a relativistic spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particle confined to the I^3 sector. Consider the free Dirac equation $(i\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - mc)\,\Psi = 0$ in a flat spacetime background. In our extended framework, time t is shared between sectors while the spatial part of the metric differs. Restricting our attention to dynamics in I^3 (and suppressing any R^3 contribution for the moment), the Clifford algebra is defined by $\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu\} = 2g^{\mu\nu}$ where $g^{\mu\nu}$ has components ($g^{00} = 1,\ g^{11} = g^{22} = g^{33} = -1$) corresponding to the I^3 spatial coordinates. As a result, γ^0 can be chosen as in the standard Dirac theory, while the spatial γ^i in I^3 (for $i = 1, 2, 3$) anticommute to $-2\delta^{ij}$.

Making a plane-wave ansatz for a free solution in I^3, we write

$$\Psi(t, \mathbf{r}) = u(p)\, e^{-iEt/\hbar}\, e^{i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{r}},$$

where $\mathbf{r} = (x, y, z) \in I^3$, $\mathbf{p} = (p_x, p_y, p_z)$ is the conserved spatial momentum, and $u(p)$ is a constant spinor. Substituting into the Dirac equation yields the algebraic condition

$$(\gamma^\mu p_\mu + imc)\, u(p) = 0\,, \tag{3}$$

where we have defined $p_0 \equiv E/c$ and used $\partial_\mu e^{ip\cdot x} = ip_\mu e^{ip\cdot x}$. A nontrivial solution $u(p)$ exists only if the determinant of the coefficient matrix vanishes, which gives the modified mass-shell condition:

$$p_\mu p^\mu + m^2c^2 = 0\,. \tag{4}$$

Here the index contraction is performed with the I^3 metric, so explicitly $p_\mu p^\mu = g^{\mu\nu}p_\mu p_\nu = (p_0)^2 - (p_x^2 + p_y^2 + p_z^2)$.

Eq. (4) thus becomes

$$E^2/c^2 - |\mathbf{p}|^2 + m^2c^2 = 0 \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad |\mathbf{p}|^2 = m^2c^2 + \frac{E^2}{c^2}\,. \tag{5}$$

If we seek stationary solutions (the analog of "free particles" in I^3) we set $E^2 = m^2c^4$ (choosing the on-shell energy, as any off-shell energy would correspond to a superposition of R^3 and I^3 components to be discussed later). Then Eq. (5) simplifies to $|\mathbf{p}|^2 = 2m^2c^2$. We immediately see that $\mathbf{p}$ cannot be real; in fact, writing $\mathbf{p} = i\,\kappa$, one obtains $\kappa^2 = m^2c^2/2 + E^2/(2c^2) = m^2c^2$ for an on-shell state, so that $|\kappa| = mc$. In other words, $\mathbf{p} = \pm\, i\, mc\,\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ for some unit vector $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ in I^3.

To make this concrete, consider propagation along the z-axis of I^3. Then a valid momentum eigen-solution takes $p_z = i\,mc$. Plugging this into the wavefunction ansatz gives

$$\Psi(t,z) = u\, e^{-iEt/\hbar}\, e^{ip_z z}, \qquad p_z = i\,mc. \tag{6}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \Psi(t,z) = u\, e^{-iEt/\hbar}\, e^{-mc\,z}. \tag{7}$$

This represents an *exponentially decaying* mode in the z-direction. The solution with the opposite sign $p_z = -imc$ would correspond to $e^{+mc\,z}$, a runaway divergence for $z \to +\infty$, which is non-physical in an unbounded space. By imposing appropriate boundary conditions (namely that Ψ remains normalizable as $z \to \infty$), we select the decaying solution:

$$\Psi_{I^3}(t,z) \sim u_\sigma\, e^{-iEt/\hbar}\, e^{-mc\,z}, \tag{8}$$

where u_σ is a constant spinor (with σ indicating spin orientation). Equation (8) is the prototypical free-particle wavefunction in I^3: rather than a plane wave, it is an evanescent (spatially decaying) wave with inverse decay length equal to the particle's Compton wave number $mc/\hbar$. In fact, one can show that for a general direction of imaginary momentum $\mathbf{p} = i\,\kappa$, the solution in I^3 takes the form $e^{-\kappa r}$ where r is distance along κ, and $|\kappa| = mc/\hbar$. Thus, free Dirac particles in I^3 do not propagate or carry group velocity—they manifest as localized, near-field structures with a characteristic size of order the Compton wavelength $\lambda_c = h/(mc)$. This resonates with the notion of virtual particles and confined fields, which are precisely what the I^3 sector is meant to geometrize.

We now address the probability density and current for spinors in this two-sector framework. The usual Dirac current in R^3 is $j^\mu = \bar{\Psi}\gamma^\mu\Psi$, whose time-component $j^0 = \Psi^\dagger\Psi$ can be interpreted as a probability density $\rho_R(\mathbf{x}) = \Psi^\dagger\Psi \geq 0$. In an I^3-restricted Dirac equation, however, the same construction yields $j^0 = \Phi^\dagger\gamma^0\Phi$ with $\{\gamma^0, \gamma^0\} = 2$ as before but now γ^0 anticommutes with γ^i that satisfy $\{\gamma^i, \gamma^j\} = -2\delta^{ij}$. This leads effectively to a sign reversal in the time-component of the current contributed by an I^3 wavefunction Φ. In fact, one finds $\rho_I(\mathbf{r}) = \Phi^\dagger\Phi$ in an I^3 context yields a *negative* contribution to the conserved charge:

$$\rho_I(\mathbf{r}) = -\,\Phi^\dagger(\mathbf{r})\,\Phi(\mathbf{r})\,. \tag{9}$$

At face value this looks problematic, as if probabilities could be negative. However, recall that the I^3 volume element also carries a minus sign (Eq. 2). When forming the total probability by integrating j^0 over all space (both sectors), the two negatives cancel:

$$\begin{aligned} P_R + P_I &= \int_{R^3} \Psi^\dagger\Psi\, dV_R + \int_{I^3} (-\Phi^\dagger\Phi)\, dV_I \\ &= \int_{R^3} \Psi^\dagger\Psi\, dV_R + \int_{I^3} \Phi^\dagger\Phi\, (-dV_R) \\ &= \int_{R^3} \Psi^\dagger\Psi\, dV_R + \int_{I^3} \Phi^\dagger\Phi\, dV_R \;=\; 1. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

assuming the wavefunction is normalized. In going to the second step we used $dV_I = -dV_R$ from Eq. (2). Thus, no *ad hoc* sign fixes are required to ensure positive total probability; the metric structure itself accounts for it. One can interpret ρ_I as representing an *absence* of probability from R^3 (hence the minus sign), rather than a negative probability in any classical sense. It is precisely the kind of term one often encounters for intermediate states in quantum amplitudes (where negative or non-positive-definite probabilities signal off-shell conditions). Here, that feature is given a geometric home in the form of the I^3 sector.

IV. R^3–I^3 INTERFACE AS A TWO-LEVEL SYSTEM

A key postulate of our framework is that the two sectors R^3 and I^3 are joined only via localized, Planck-scale contact points. In other words, the interface between R^3 and I^3 consists of tiny patches of area σ_0 (on the order of L_P^2, where L_P is the Planck length) through which all exchanges occur. This ensures that any transfer of amplitude or information between the sectors is highly localized and suppressed at ordinary scales. One can imagine these patches as the fundamental "pixels" of reality: each patch mediates the coupling for one quantum mode. For example, each particle in R^3 might be associated with a single Planck-area patch linking it to its I^3 *mold* (the term we use for the particle's localized I^3 imprint). Notably, if each such patch carries at most one independent quantum bit of information, a horizon composed of N patches would have an entropy $N \ln 2$, directly leading to the Bekenstein entropy formula (see Sec. VII).

To understand the dynamics of this interface, we model the simplest case: a single particle that can reside in either R^3 or I^3. This is analogous to a two-level quantum system with basis states $|R\rangle$ and $|I\rangle$. The $|R\rangle$ state corresponds to the particle being entirely in our normal space (with its I^3 mold empty), while $|I\rangle$ corresponds to the particle occupying its I^3 mold (and absent from R^3). The energy of $|R\rangle$ will be taken as $E \approx mc^2$ (the rest energy of the particle), whereas the effective energy of the pure $|I\rangle$ state may differ. In fact, as discussed in Sec. III, an I^3-only mode is somewhat analogous to a negative-energy solution in the Dirac theory. For the purpose of oscillatory dynamics, what matters is the energy *difference* between $|R\rangle$ and $|I\rangle$, which we denote Δ. We expect $\Delta \sim 2mc^2$ in order to recover the known Dirac oscillation frequency.

We then introduce a small coupling κ between $|R\rangle$ and $|I\rangle$, arising from the physics of the Planck-area patch. This coupling term in the Hamiltonian allows the particle to hop between sectors. The resulting two-state Schrödinger equation can be solved exactly. If the particle is initially in $|R\rangle$ at $t = 0$, the probability of finding it in I^3 at a later time t is

$$P_I(t) = \frac{\kappa^2}{\kappa^2 + (\Delta/2)^2} \sin^2\Big(\frac{\sqrt{\kappa^2 + (\Delta/2)^2}}{\hbar}\, t\Big). \tag{11}$$

In the regime of interest, $\kappa \ll \Delta$ (the coupling is extremely weak compared to the energy scale of the particle), this simplifies to

$$P_I(t) \approx \Big(\frac{2\kappa}{\Delta}\Big)^2 \sin^2\Big(\frac{\Delta}{2\hbar} t\Big). \tag{12}$$

Identifying $\Delta \approx 2E = 2mc^2$, we have

$$P_I(t) \approx \Big(\frac{\kappa}{E}\Big)^2 \sin^2\Big(\frac{E}{\hbar} t\Big), \tag{13}$$

which is an oscillation at angular frequency $2E/\hbar$ (since $\sin^2(\omega t)$ has period π/ω). For an electron at rest, $2E/\hbar = 2m_e c^2/\hbar \sim 1.6 \times 10^{21}\ \mathrm{s}^{-1}$, which corresponds to the famous Zitterbewegung frequency first noted by Schrödinger [5]. In fact, Eq. (13) reveals that the mysterious Zitterbewegung oscillation can be interpreted as the rapid shuttling of the electron's amplitude between R^3 and I^3. The oscillation amplitude $(\kappa/E)^2$ is extremely small: if κ were, say, on the order of keV, then $(\kappa/E)^2 \sim 10^{-10}$ for an electron. Thus the particle spends only an infinitesimal fraction of time in I^3, consistent with the empirical success of models that ignore such behavior.

The above two-level model gives physical insight into how R^3 and I^3 exchange probability. Importantly, because the coupling is confined to a microscopic patch and κ is tiny, there is no possibility of large macroscopic oscillations or fast signaling. The I^3 sector acts as a subtle "sink" and "source" for probability amplitude, without manifesting as missing energy or violation of conservation laws. From the perspective of an observer in R^3, the particle never leaves our universe; it only exhibits a slight trembling motion and altered virtual cloud, which are exactly the effects of Zitterbewegung and off-shell interactions. In terms of quantum field scattering, the presence of I^3 does not change the on-shell S-matrix for scattering processes in R^3. All external, asymptotic particles remain in R^3; I^3 only participates internally, much as virtual particles do in Feynman diagrams. The net result is that ordinary scattering amplitudes and cross-sections are preserved, while I^3 provides a geometrical interpretation for the intermediate off-shell dynamics.

V. ELECTROMAGNETISM IN I^3: EVANESCENCE AND IMAGINARY IMPEDANCE

The analysis of the previous sections indicates that I^3 does not support freely propagating matter waves. A similar conclusion holds for electromagnetic fields. Intuitively, if I^3 has a spatial metric of opposite sign to R^3, a plane electromagnetic wave trying to travel in I^3 will experience a kind of inversion that turns oscillatory solutions into evanescent ones. We can illustrate this by considering Maxwell's equations in a source-free region of I^3. Treat time t as usual and let $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}, t), \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ be the electric and magnetic fields in I^3. The curved-space form of Maxwell's equations can be applied, but since I^3 is flat (just with a negative-definite metric), we can reason by analogy: in normal space R^3, a plane-wave ansatz $E \sim e^{i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r} - \omega t)}$ leads to the dispersion relation $|\mathbf{k}|^2 = \varepsilon\mu\,\omega^2$, where ε and μ are the permittivity and permeability of the medium (for vacuum, ε_0 and μ_0). In I^3, one finds instead $-|\mathbf{k}|^2 = \varepsilon_I \mu_I\, \omega^2$ (the minus sign arises from the spatial metric). If we assume the same vacuum values $\varepsilon_I \approx \varepsilon_0$ and $\mu_I \approx \mu_0$ (up to possible sign flips), this dispersion becomes $|\mathbf{k}|^2 = -\omega^2/c^2$. The only solutions are $|\mathbf{k}| = i\,\omega/c$, i.e. purely imaginary wavevectors. Physically, this means any time-harmonic electromagnetic field in I^3 decays exponentially with distance instead of propagating as a wave.

In more familiar terms, one can say that I^3 behaves as a peculiar electromagnetic medium with *negative permittivity* and ordinary (positive) permeability. That is, $\varepsilon_I < 0$ and $\mu_I > 0$. Such a combination does not support propagating waves at a given frequency (since $\varepsilon_I \mu_I$ is negative, yielding an imaginary refractive index). Instead, fields are confined to the near-field zone. The characteristic impedance $Z_I = \sqrt{\mu_I/\varepsilon_I}$ of this medium is imaginary, indicating a 90° phase difference between electric and magnetic fields and no net transport of energy as radiation. This situation is directly analogous to evanescent fields in near-field optics [9]. For instance, in total internal reflection, an electromagnetic field penetrates into the classically forbidden region as a decaying evanescent wave, but no energy flows away from the interface; energy is only stored and re-coupled if a receptor is nearby. Likewise, a charge or current in R^3 that couples to I^3 would induce an electromagnetic disturbance that stays localized around the interface patch.

In summary, the I^3 sector cannot host traveling electromagnetic radiation or long-range static fields. It mediates only short-range, boundary-bound effects. This is fully consistent with our earlier assertions: I^3 interactions are evanescent and do not introduce any new long-range force. In practical terms, one might detect I^3 influences through subtle modifications of near-field phenomena (for example, a tiny alteration in the field profile very close to a source), but not through any new propagating signal. The evanescence of fields in I^3 guarantees that if we are unaware of the I^3 sector, we would simply attribute its effects to minor corrections or effective interaction potentials in R^3.

VI. FALSIFIABLE PHENOMENOLOGY AND EXPERIMENTAL SIGNATURES

A theory that posits a new physical sector must, in the end, be testable. Although the I^3 sector is hidden in the sense that it does not produce direct long-range effects, it does leave a variety of subtle fingerprints on physical processes. Here we outline several possible experimental signatures of the $R^3 \oplus I^3$ framework. These are potential deviations from standard physics that could be sought in high-precision experiments or specialized setups:

1. **Interferometric π-phase Shift:** In an interferometer, suppose one arm of the interferometer is engineered such that the particle's wavefunction must pass through an I^3 "excursion" (for instance, via a region with extremely strong, localized fields or boundary conditions that enhance R^3–I^3 coupling). Our model predicts that any particle which undergoes a round-trip into I^3 and back will acquire a fixed phase shift of π relative to a reference particle that stayed entirely in R^3. In essence, the I^3 path acts like a mirror that inverts the quantum phase. The phase offset is set by the *pulse area* (integrated coupling) of the $R \leftrightarrow I$ insert, not by its raw duration: once the insert realizes an odd half–oscillation (a "π-pulse", $\Theta = \int \Omega(t)\, dt/\hbar = \pi \bmod 2\pi$), the return-to-$R$ transfer is $\approx -\mathbb{1}$, yielding a robust π offset after canceling the ordinary dynamical phase with a matched reference arm. Standard quantum mechanics (with only R^3) has no reason to expect such a phase jump in this scenario.

2. **Universal Tunneling Decay Length:** Quantum tunneling experiments could reveal a telltale signature of the I^3 sector. In conventional tunneling through a barrier, the decay length of the wavefunction depends on the barrier height and particle mass. However, if tunneling effectively proceeds via an intermediate I^3 evanescent state, the decay length should universally tend toward $\lambda_c = \hbar/(mc)$ inside sufficiently thick barriers (since the I^3 wavefunction decays with this characteristic length). In practical terms, one might measure tunneling probabilities (e.g., in a scanning tunneling microscope setup or atomic-scale junction) across different materials and barrier configurations. The prediction is that at large barrier thickness, the slope of the log-transmission vs. thickness curve approaches a fixed value $-1/\lambda_c$ (for a given particle mass m), rather than continuing to vary with barrier properties. A deviation of this sort—especially if it is material-independent—would strongly hint at an I^3 contribution to tunneling.

3. **Casimir Force Enhancement at Micron Scales:** The Casimir effect [8] provides a window into electromagnetic near-fields and vacuum fluctuations. Our theory suggests that when two conducting plates (or other boundary surfaces) are brought extremely close (separations on the order of a particle's Compton wavelength or less), an additional attractive force component might arise due to I^3 modes. Qualitatively, as the gap d between plates becomes very small, the evanescent overlap of I^3 fields on facing surfaces can induce an extra pressure $\propto \exp(-2d/\lambda_c)$. This would modify the standard Casimir force law. Detecting such a tiny correction is challenging, but precision measurements at sub-micron distances could either reveal its presence or set upper limits on the coupling parameter κ of the theory. A null result (no extra decay component in the force) would imply that κ/E for electrons (and other relevant fields) is below the 10^{-8}–10^{-9} range (depending on experimental sensitivity).

4. **Entanglement Dephasing via I^3 Interaction:** In the $R^3 \oplus I^3$ picture, entangled particles share a joint I^3 occupancy as part of their correlated state. If one could selectively disturb this I^3 link, one might induce a measurable reduction in entanglement (a kind of controlled decoherence distinct from environmental noise). Consider a Bell-test experiment where two particles are entangled, and one particle's path is routed through a region of intense, localized electromagnetic near-field (or some nano-structured environment) that would enhance I^3 coupling (effectively "shaking" its I^3 mold). Our model predicts a slight drop in the observed Bell inequality violation (or a reduced interference contrast) corresponding to the times when the particle is subjected to this I^3 perturbation. Quantum theory without an I^3 sector would not anticipate any loss of entanglement from a static electromagnetic field alone (as long as it doesn't cause ordinary decoherence). Thus, observing a systematic, reversible dephasing tied to a near-field perturbation would point to I^3 dynamics at play.

5. **Zitterbewegung Sidebands:** Finally, the sector oscillation underlying Zitterbewegung could, in principle, lead to direct spectral signatures. If an electron is bound in an atomic or trap potential, one could look for a tiny modulation of its motion at frequency $2mc^2/h$ (for an electron, about 10^{21} Hz). This is far beyond current direct detection limits, but advanced techniques (perhaps ultra-fast laser pulses or matter-wave interferometry) might one day indirectly sense the presence of this high-frequency component. The expected relative amplitude is extremely small (of order $(\kappa/E)^2$, as derived earlier), so this remains a speculative and technically demanding test. Nonetheless, it serves

to emphasize that I^3 does not evade physical laws; it has concrete, if subtle, effects that could be uncovered with ingenious experiments.

Each of the above phenomena offers a way to constrain or potentially support the I^3 theory. So far, no experiment has confirmed these specific predictions, which allows us to place only upper bounds on the model parameters (such as κ). For instance, precision tunneling and Casimir experiments have not reported anomalies at the predicted scales, suggesting that if I^3 exists, the coupling κ must be small enough to hide its effects within current measurement noise. On the other hand, these are largely uncharted regimes, and future experiments with improved precision or novel configurations may well uncover hints of an evanescent adjoint sector. The important point is that the $R^3 \oplus I^3$ framework is not metaphysical; it is falsifiable and makes quantitative predictions by which it stands or falls.

VII. GRAVITY AND VACUUM ENERGY IN THE $R^3 \oplus I^3$ FRAMEWORK

The existence of an I^3 sector alters the global bookkeeping of energy and gravitation in significant ways. In particular, it provides a natural mechanism to cancel vacuum energy and introduces an effective negative component to gravity that could explain several cosmological and black-hole phenomena.

Negative Effective Energy: A field mode in I^3 carries positive local energy density $\rho_E(\mathbf{r})$ (just like a normal field), but integrating this density over the volume of I^3 produces a negative total energy. This is because the volume element in I^3 is $dV_I = -\,dV_R$ (Eq. 2). For example, consider the vacuum (zero-point) energy of a quantum field. In R^3 it would naively be $E_{\text{vac}}^{(R)} = \int_{R^3} \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega\, dV_R$ (which is formally divergent). In I^3, the analogous contribution is $E_{\text{vac}}^{(I)} = \int_{I^3} \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega\, dV_I = -\int \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega\, dV_R$. Thus, mode by mode, the I^3 vacuum energy cancels the R^3 vacuum energy:

$$\rho_{\text{vac}}^{(R)} + \rho_{\text{vac}}^{(I)} \approx 0\,, \tag{14}$$

at least up to any small asymmetry between the sectors. This offers a potential resolution of the cosmological constant puzzle [4]—the fact that quantum zero-point energy does not appear to gravitate at anywhere near the expected magnitude. In our model, the immense energy of the R^3 vacuum is almost exactly offset by an immense negative energy from I^3. The tiny net residue (from a slight R^3-I^3 mismatch or leakage across interface patches) would manifest as the observed dark energy (cosmological constant) driving the acceleration of the universe. In other words, Λ emerges as a small differential effect, not a fundamental input.

Repulsive Gravity and Short-Range Screening: Because I^3 contributions to energy are effectively negative, they act gravitationally like a form of exotic matter with $p + \rho < 0$. At the level of Newtonian approximation, one can say that every concentration of positive mass in R^3 is accompanied by a "mass shadow" of opposite sign in I^3. If a mass M in R^3 has an associated I^3 energy of $-M_{\text{vir}}$ (where M_{vir} can be interpreted as the mass of the particle's I^3 virtual cloud), the net gravitational effect is as if the mass were partially reduced. In a full general-relativistic treatment, the stress-energy tensor receives an additional term with a sign flip for the I^3 portion [3]. One consequence is that gravitational fields are *screened* at short distances. Solving Poisson's equation for a static, spherically symmetric mass distribution that includes both M and $-M_{\text{vir}}$ (the latter distributed in a small region on the order of L_P around the mass), one finds:

$$\Phi(r) \approx -\frac{GM}{r}\Big[1 - \beta\, e^{-r/\ell_P}\Big]\,, \tag{15}$$

for r outside the mass (here β is a dimensionless factor related to M_{vir}/M, and ℓ_P is on the order of the Planck length). The second term represents a slight weakening of gravity at distances $r \lesssim \ell_P$, effectively preventing an infinite $1/r$ divergence as $r \to 0$. Physically, the I^3 sector provides a negative feedback that counteracts gravitational collapse at extreme densities. This could avert the formation of singularities inside black holes: instead of a point of infinite density, one might end up with a tiny core (of order ℓ_P) where I^3 repulsion balances R^3 attraction. In this way, the classical singularity would be resolved by a Planck-scale vacuum structure.

Black Hole Entropy and Planck Patch Information: The idea of local R^3–I^3 patches offers a simple micromechanical explanation for black hole entropy. As a black hole forms, the information of infalling matter could be transferred to I^3 degrees of freedom just inside the horizon (the horizon itself being essentially the interface). We posit that each Planck-area patch on the horizon can encode one bit of information in the I^3 sector. It follows immediately that the black hole's entropy is $S = (\text{number of patches}) \times (\ln 2) k_B = \frac{A}{\sigma_0}\frac{k_B \ln 2}{1}$, where $\sigma_0 = 4 \ln 2\, L_P^2$ is the area per bit. This reproduces the Bekenstein–Hawking entropy formula $S = k_B A/(4L_P^2)$ up to conventionally small numerical factors [6, 7]. In our picture, the elusive "microstates" of a black hole are simply configurations of the I^3 field in the patches on the horizon. The I^3 interior can be viewed as a repository of the information, while the exterior sees only a coarse-grained geometry. When a black hole evaporates (via Hawking radiation), the information can trickle back out through the R^3–I^3 interface patches, potentially addressing the black hole information paradox by providing a channel for information release that is invisible to a purely R^3 observer.

Dark Matter as I^3 Bound States: The I^3 sector may also shed light on the dark matter problem. If the R^3 and I^3 energies of a system can cancel exactly, one can have a non-trivial object with zero total energy. For example, imagine a particle that is partly in R^3 and partly in I^3 such that its positive rest energy E in R^3 is exactly balanced by $-E$ from its I^3 mold. Such a bound state would be *stable* (since there is no lower energy state to decay into) and yet would appear in R^3 as an object with mass m (producing gravity and inertia) and with actual particles present (in the R^3 sector). In effect, it would be a particle that costs zero net energy to create. These $E_{\rm tot} = 0$ states, sometimes describable as "white holes" sitting on the R^3–I^3 interface, could form naturally in the early universe or in high-energy processes. Once formed, they would behave as a pressureless gas of massive relics, interacting only via gravity and perhaps feeble I^3 couplings. This makes them excellent dark matter candidates: cold, collisionless, and cosmologically long-lived. They would cluster in galactic halos and defy detection in electromagnetic surveys, exactly as required of dark matter. While this idea is speculative, it is a logical outgrowth of the I^3 framework and merits further investigation in cosmological models.

Clarifying the "white–hole" dark matter candidate. By construction these bound states satisfy

$$E_{\rm tot} \;=\; E_R + E_I \;=\; 0, \tag{16}$$

with the R^3 part providing the inertial/gravitating mass and the I^3 part supplying the negative sector energy. Their *non-gravitational* interaction is mediated only by Planck-area patches σ_0, yielding an effective cross–section that is vanishingly small. Consequently, on astrophysical scales they behave as *perfectly collisionless cold dark matter*: (i) they possess no long–range charges or dipole moments in R^3 and do not radiate or thermalize; (ii) their self–interaction per unit mass satisfies $\sigma/m \ll 1\ {\rm cm}^2\,{\rm g}^{-1}$ (comfortably below astrophysical bounds); (iii) in the Solar System they neither form bound atmospheres nor produce aerodynamic drag—encounters with planets and the Sun are purely gravitational and rare. Thus their robust signatures are gravitational (lensing, rotation curves, structure growth), while direct–detection or laboratory searches requiring non-gravitational couplings are naturally null. Any residual non-gravitational signal would scale with the tiny interface parameter $\varepsilon = \kappa/E$ and is constrained by existing null results.

VIII. DISCUSSION, CAVEATS, AND FUTURE OUTLOOK

The $R^3 \oplus I^3$ framework we have presented is admittedly speculative, but it is grounded in resolving real problems and remains consistent with known physics as far as we can tell. Here we address some conceptual points and potential objections:

a. No Dirac sea. We do not use hole theory in our formalism. Antiparticles in R^3 are standard, positive-energy excitations of the quantized Dirac field [2]. Any "hole" language is purely analogical: in the adjoint-sector picture it would mean an *absence* of the I^3 mold, not a negative-energy state. On-shell R^3 S-matrix elements remain standard. **Not a Hidden-Variable or Pilot-Wave Theory:** One might wonder if introducing an invisible sector is akin to reintroducing a hidden-variable interpretation of quantum mechanics. We emphasize that I^3 is *not* a classical hidden variable and this theory is not deterministic in the Bohmian sense. The wavefunction (or quantum field) is still the primary object, and it simply has support in an extended space. The probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics is preserved; we have only provided a geometrical substructure for virtual amplitudes. Unlike a pilot-wave theory, we do not assign definite trajectories or particle positions in I^3—indeed, any attempt to do so would violate the uncertainty principle. In our model, I^3 is a true quantum domain: a particle can be delocalized between sectors just as it can be delocalized in different regions of R^3.

Causality and No Signaling: The coupling between sectors is local (confined to Planck-scale patches), and I^3 shares the same time coordinate as R^3. Therefore, any influence of I^3 on observable events occurs through contact interactions at specific points in spacetime. This structure precludes the possibility of superluminal signaling via the I^3 sector. Even though we described entanglement as potentially mediated by I^3, an observer cannot send a message using this mechanism—the I^3 correlations manifest only when comparing results after-the-fact, just as in standard quantum theory. In essence, I^3 provides an explanation for *why* entanglement correlations exist (they originate from locally shared I^3 states), but it does not allow one to exploit them for communication. Thus, relativistic causality remains intact.

On-Shell Agreement with Established Physics: By construction, our theory leaves all on-shell (energy-momentum conserving) processes in R^3 unchanged. This means it reproduces the successes of the Standard Model and general relativity at observable scales. All additional effects of I^3 are either off-shell (hiding within loop amplitudes, virtual exchanges, or subtle phases) or suppressed to near-undetectable levels (as discussed in Sec. VI). This is an essential feature: any radical new physics must reduce to the old physics in the regime where the latter has been thoroughly tested. Our model passes this requirement by design; it had to, otherwise it would be immediately ruled out by myriad experiments agreeing with conventional theory. In practice, one could incorporate I^3 into the Lagrangian formalism of quantum field theory by adding fields that live in the I^3 space and interact via the Planck-patch interface. Such an extended QFT would yield the same S-matrix elements for scattering in R^3 as the usual theory (since I^3 contributions cancel out for external legs), but would provide a different interpretation of intermediate states. Developing a full field-theoretic formulation of this idea (including renormalization, etc.) is a task for future work, but initial considerations indicate no fundamental obstruction.

Caveats and Open Questions: A number of important issues remain open. For instance, how exactly do non-gravitational forces (strong and weak nuclear forces) behave with respect to I^3? We discussed electromagnetism in I^3, but a complete theory would need to incorporate non-Abelian gauge fields in the extended space. Also, what picks out the quaternionic structure specifically? Could one have a similar idea with a different algebraic underpinning, or is the i, j, k triplet somehow uniquely suited to this role? Furthermore, while we suggested that I^3 might resolve the black hole information paradox by storing information, a detailed mechanism of information retrieval (during Hawking evaporation, say) needs fleshing out. Our discussion of dark matter as $E = 0$ composites is likewise speculative and must be embedded in a realistic cosmological context to see if it works quantitatively (e.g., can such objects form in the right abundance, and do they have any subtle interactions that contradict observation?). Finally, one might worry about the stability of the vacuum: if I^3 allows negative total energies, could the vacuum decay into a state of large I^3 occupation? Presumably, the superselection of total energy (including the I^3 contribution) still prevents anything of the sort; the vacuum remains the lowest-energy state when both sectors are included. Nevertheless, this and related issues require careful analysis.

Outlook: The theory of an adjoint imaginary space I^3 coupled to our real space R^3 is an ambitious attempt to unify several pieces of physics under a new geometric umbrella. It proposes that the strange off-shell elements of quantum theory (virtual particles, vacuum energy, tunneling amplitudes, entanglement correlations, etc.) might all be aspects of ordinary physics happening in a hidden, evanescent three-space. This brings to mind the historical pattern where previously "mystical" phenomena (like action-at-a-distance, or the invariance of the speed of light) found resolution in deeper layers of spacetime structure (fields pervading space, or four-dimensional Minkowski spacetime, respectively). Perhaps the mysteries of the quantum vacuum and quantum nonlocality are telling us that spacetime has more structure yet to be discovered.

We have attempted to outline a coherent framework and show that it is not at odds with known results. The next step is to refine the quantitative predictions and engage experimentally. Whether or not I^3 is realized in nature, exploring such ideas pushes the boundaries of how we think about space, time, and quantum reality. It is our hope that this work stimulates further theoretical and experimental investigation into the possibility of evanescent spatial sectors and their role in fundamental physics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks the developers of ChatGPT and the DeepSeek AI research assistant for their valuable help in the preparation of this manuscript.

[1] P. A. M. Dirac, *The quantum theory of the electron*, Proc. Roy. Soc. A **117**, 610 (1928).

[2] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory*, Westview Press (1995).

[3] S. L. Adler, *Quaternionic Quantum Mechanics and Quantum Fields*, Oxford Univ. Press (1995).

[4] S. Weinberg, *The cosmological constant problem*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1 (1989).

[5] E. Schrödinger, *Über die kräftefreie Bewegung in der relativistischen Quantenmechanik (zitternde Bewegung)*, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Phys.-Math. Kl. **24**, 418 (1930).

[6] J. D. Bekenstein, *Black holes and entropy*, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 2333 (1973).

[7] S. W. Hawking, *Particle creation by black holes*, Commun. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975).

[8] H. B. G. Casimir, *On the attraction between two perfectly conducting plates*, Proc. K. Ned. Akad. Wet. **51**, 793 (1948).

[9] L. Novotny and B. Hecht, *Principles of Nano-Optics*, Cambridge Univ. Press (2006).