

Intrinsic and extrinsic properties of quantum systems

P. Hájíček

Institute for Theoretical Physics
University of Bern
Sidlerstrasse 5, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland
hajicek@itp.unibe.ch

and

J. Tolar

Department of Physics
Faculty of Nuclear Sciences and Physical Engineering
Czech Technical University
Břehová 7, CZ-11519 Prague, Czech Republic
jiri.tolar@fjfi.cvut.cz

January 21, 2008

PACS number: 03.65.Ta

Abstract

The paper attempts to convince that the orthodox interpretation of quantum mechanics does not contradict philosophical realism by throwing light onto certain properties of quantum systems that seem to have escaped attention as yet. The exposition starts with the philosophical notions of realism. Then, the quantum mechanics as it is usually taught is demoted to a mere part of the theory called phenomenology of observations, and the common impression about its contradiction to realism is explained. The main idea of the paper, the physical notion of intrinsic properties, is introduced and many examples thereof are given. It replaces the irritating dichotomy of quantum and classical worlds by a much softer difference between intrinsic and extrinsic properties, which concern equally microscopic and macroscopic systems. Finally, the classicality and the quantum measurement are analyzed and found to present some still unsolved problems. A possible way of dealing with the Schrödinger cat is suggested that is based on the intrinsic properties. A simple quantum model of one classical property illustrates how our philosophy may work.

1 Introduction

Quantum mechanics does not seem to be fully understood even after about eighty years of very successful existence and there is a lot of work being done on its interpretation today (e.g., [1, 2]). The present paper describes an approach to its conceptual foundation from a new point of view. After some clarification of relevant philosophical notions, it gives a short review of quantum mechanics as it is usually understood. We propose that this constitutes only a part of the whole theory and call it phenomenology of observation. The other part is based on the concept of intrinsic properties. This may be quite crucial for understanding of quantum mechanics. It seems that it has never been explicitly mentioned and explained, probably because those who use quantum mechanics in their everyday work view it as obvious while those who are engaged in philosophy have not noticed it. We give many examples of the intrinsic properties and try to build some systematic picture. The paper sketches the basic lines of a project dealing with the only important unsolved problems in the conceptual foundations, that of the origin of classical properties and that of quantum measurement. A simple quantum model of a classical property, the length of a solid body, is constructed in the Appendix. The technical knowledge of quantum mechanics in the extent of, say, [3] will be assumed.

2 Realism

The *realism* seems to be the main apple of discord and the open or hidden subject of most discussions on quantum mechanics (e.g., [4, 5]). Let us explain what the realism will mean in the present paper.

Realism is an important hypothesis. It claims that Nature really exists and is observer independent. It is not just a construct of human mind but people are themselves a part of Nature and their thinking is based on natural physico-chemical processes in their brain. Realism explains a lot of coincidences in different observations or observations done by different people that would else appear very strange. Nature is the object of study for sciences.

To discriminate the scientific realism from its naive variant, we distinguish our knowledge of reality from the reality itself. A very important part of our realism hypothesis is the assent that *any* knowledge that we may have about reality is incomplete and approximative. Still, it may be successful in leading us to valid predictions within certain accuracy limits. We do interpret this success by saying that the knowledge truly captures some aspect of reality. From this point of view, questions such as whether quantum mechanics is incomplete or not or whether a quantum state describes reality or only some knowledge about it are incorrectly for-

modelled ones. The incompleteness of our knowledge has even a practical, methodical feature. We usually isolate some aspect of Nature and construct a model of it. The model can be a 'simplified' one, i.e., it may disregard a lot of things that usually accompany the modelled aspect. Still, it can be true in revealing a real property of Nature in the above pragmatical sense.

3 Phenomenology of observation

We maintain that the ultimate aim of quantum mechanics is to study real properties of real quantum systems.

The word 'property' is introduced here to have a general notion of observable properties concerning quantum systems. For instance, the values of the quantities that are called *observables* in quantum mechanics are properties. Our main idea is that the values of the observables form only a subset of properties of quantum systems. Let us call these properties *extrinsic*¹.

Quantum mechanics is usually understood as an abstract theory of the extrinsic properties, consisting of the usual stuff about Hilbert spaces, states and observables. The theory is abstract in the sense that it does not work with any specific system. In most presentations of quantum mechanics, the greatest attention is dedicated to this part so that a wrong impression arises that quantum mechanics does not contain anything else. The consequence of the impression are many utterances such as Bohr's, "There is no quantum concept." We consider this to be grossly exaggerated or even wrong. To prevent such confusion, let us call the abstract theory of the extrinsic properties the *phenomenology of observation*.

The existence of the phenomenology is a conspicuous feature because in none of the older physical theories do similar parts play such a fundamental role as it does in quantum mechanics. The subjectivistic, operationalistic or positivistic flavour of this part of quantum mechanics is of course due to its being a theory of human observation and does not imply anything like non existence of observer-independent reality.

¹More generally, extrinsic properties can be described as linear subspaces in the Hilbert space of the system. They represent the mathematical counterpart of the so-called YES-NO experiments [6]. The set of linear subspaces admits the usual operations on conjunction (linear hull), disjunction (intersection) and negation (orthogonal complement), but the resulting orthocomplemented lattice is not a Boolean lattice [7]. As it is well known, the set of 'classical' properties of a single system forms a Boolean lattice (of subsets of classical phase space). If we pretend that the extrinsic properties of a quantum system are properties of a well-defined single system, then we are lead to abandon the ordinary logic and introduce the so-called *quantum logic*. But this pretention is against all logic because the extrinsic properties are properties of many different systems each consisting of the quantum system plus some apparatus.

The crucial point of the phenomenology is the existence of *classical systems*. These are arrangements of bodies and fields to which classical mechanics, electrodynamics and thermodynamics are applicable as very good approximations. Moreover, to describe the properties of these systems that are relevant for the quantum observations, quantum mechanics itself is not needed. Their corresponding classical properties are directly observable and amenable to manipulations by people. Specifying and bringing into being classical properties is possible for us so that it can be said that we control the classical conditions of the experiment.

At the beginning of any quantum experiment or observation stands what is usually called a *preparation*. The name is somewhat misleading. What is meant is a set of classical conditions which the quantum system to be observed is subject to before the observation. This can, but need not, include some human activity in laboratory. For example, we can know that a quantum system inside the Sun is the plasma with a given composition and that its classical conditions are certain temperature and pressure. Sufficiently precise description of the classical conditions must be given so that the same preparation is in principle reproducible. Thus, a series of repeated experiments is possible, and the set of quantum systems obtained by repeating the experiment is called *ensemble*. Clearly, the notion of ensemble is in many aspects closely connected to that of preparation.

With a specific preparation, a state of the quantum system is associated. More precisely, if we repeat the experiment so that all classical conditions remain the same, the quantum state is always the same by definition. The state is mathematically described by a *state operator* in the Hilbert space. In this sense, the state generally represents our knowledge on the system. This knowledge can have different degrees of certainty, that is, different entropies. Maximal certainty with entropy zero is represented by a projector to a one-dimensional subspace of the Hilbert space and the state is called *pure*. The minimal certainty state is proportional to unity and the state is called *completely chaotic*. Better, it expresses our complete ignorance about the classical conditions. Its entropy is $\ln N$, where N is the dimension of the Hilbert space. Even the completely chaotic state of a given system does still contain non-trivial information, namely that about some intrinsic properties of the system.

At the end of any quantum experiment there is what is often called a *registration*. It is an interaction of a individual quantum system in a specific state with a classical system, the *measuring apparatus*. Ideally, each measuring apparatus is mathematically represented by an observable, a self-adjoint operator in the Hilbert space of the system.

We are free to choose an observable from the set determined by the structure of the system and carry out the corresponding registration on any state ρ that has been prepared. These choices form the first set of alternative possibilities. The

measurement leads to the observable acquiring a definite value. All possible values of the observable that can be obtained are the eigenvalues of the corresponding operator; they form the second set of alternative possibilities. These cannot however be chosen freely and we know only the probabilities of these possible results. That is, if the state ρ is prepared many times, then the same measurement will in general not give the same result each time. The probabilities are mathematically determined by the state operator together with the operator of the observable. Thus, a state contains many different kinds of information.

Generally, the values of observables do not directly refer to the quantum system alone but to the composite system of the quantum and classical systems in interaction. As such, even they are real (observer independent): they are the 'beables' of John Bell [13]. The idea that they refer to the composite system and not the quantum system alone suggests why the information about results of measurements need not exist before the measurements.

Thus, the phenomenology of observation describes directly only processes and properties concerning classical bodies; it is even not necessary to assume that any quantum systems exist. There is nothing mysterious about this. We cannot observe a quantum system directly. We have to use the classical traces that the quantum systems leave on classical systems which they are interacting with. Moreover, the *classicality* of the macroscopic bodies is crucial for the statistical interpretation of quantum mechanics. The classicality of a measuring apparatus means among others that it yields a definite value for each individual measurement and that all possible values form mutually exclusive alternatives. Only then it is sensible to speak about probabilities.

It is a miracle that a systematic and beautiful mathematical theory exists describing these phenomena. In fact, the phenomenology has been formulated in a rigorous mathematical way by Ludwig [8] and by Kraus [9] and has evolved into a broadly used theory today.

4 The intrinsic properties of quantum systems

Our point of view is that there are properties of quantum systems that are not quantum-mechanical observables. They can be ascribed directly to quantum systems and assumed to be real (observer independent) without the danger of paradoxes. That's why we call these *intrinsic* properties.

The first among the intrinsic properties is the *structure of a quantum system*. Quantum mechanics contains well-defined rules about what can such a structure be. For example, in the non relativistic case, there must be a definite number² of some

²There are non-relativistic systems, in which some particle numbers are variable, such as those

particles with definite masses and spins. The particles interact with each other by a definite potential function. There are important further rules about symmetries, etc. For a relativistic case, there are analogous rules: we have fields of certain (bare) masses and spins interacting by means of suitable interaction Lagrangians involving (bare) coupling constants.

In the previous paragraph, we have distinguished non-relativistic and relativistic systems not only to avoid the problem of how the non-relativistic systems are to be defined as some special cases (approximations) of the relativistic ones. More important reason has been to show that the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic properties can be model dependent. The model itself, in turn, is constructed according to the situation to be considered. What is relevant is that every quantum model exhibits each of the two kinds of properties, both intrinsic and extrinsic.

For example, the model of hydrogen atom consists of two particles, proton and electron, that have certain masses and spins. These constituents interact with each other by means of the Coulomb potential that is determined by their charges.

The next set of rules allows us to determine the quantum observables that can be measured on the system. For example, each particle contributes to the observables by three coordinates and three momenta. Thus, in the hydrogen case, there will be (in addition to other observables) six coordinates and six components of momenta. The *set of observables that can be measured on a given system* is its intrinsic property and this information is different from that about the values of these observables³. An important point is that many intrinsic properties are not accessible by direct measurements but are only determined via measurement of the extrinsic ones. We can see here also that the theories of the intrinsic and extrinsic properties cannot be separated from each other.

The structure and the observables of a system are used to set up the Hamiltonian of non-relativistic or the action functional for relativistic systems according to further basic rules. The *form of the Hamiltonian or the action* are mathematical expressions of the structure and thus intrinsic properties. Using the Hamiltonian

of quasi-particles in solid state physics. Of course, these particle numbers do not belong to the structure of the systems and they are not intrinsic properties but extrinsic properties in our conception.

³More precisely, the set of observables can be embedded in a structure of the so-called C^* -algebra that represents a part of the physical structure of the system [12]. Thus, it is an intrinsic property of it. Moreover, such algebras have a representation on a Hilbert space—the Hilbert space of the system. Of course, for systems with finite number of degrees of freedom, the Hilbert space representation is uniquely defined (up to unitary equivalence) by the algebra, so it does not contain any further information on an independent structure of the system, but the algebras of relativistic fields possess many inequivalent representations of which only few are physical, corresponding to different phases of the system. A physical representation is clearly an independent intrinsic property of the field.

or the action, we can write down the dynamical laws—the Schrödinger equation or the path-integral formula—from which other important intrinsic properties can be calculated, for example the spectrum of the hydrogen atom. The spectrum is clearly an intrinsic property of the hydrogen atom that can be ascribed to the system itself independently of any measurement. This will not lead to any contradictions with other measurements or ideas of quantum mechanics. We can recognize the system with the help of its intrinsic properties. For example, if we detect light from somewhere deep in the Universe and find the Balmer series in its spectrum, then we know that there is hydrogen there. The numbers such as cross sections, branching ratios etc. are further examples of intrinsic properties

These rules form a part of basic principles of quantum mechanics. It is important to realize that they are not directly derivable from evidence; they are the basic hypotheses of the theory. The role of these principles is to define a specific class of models for quantum systems. For each system, we can attempt different possible models, calculate the extrinsic properties of each and compare with the experimental evidence gained in a number of quantum experiments. In this way, the models can be confirmed or disproved.

Thus, the intrinsic properties of a given quantum system are assumed to exist independently of observers or observations. Still, such an observer-independent information about an individual quantum system is not complete in the sense that intrinsic properties do not determine everything that can be ascertained about it; the extrinsic properties that had to be added are observer dependent, or better, measurement dependent. However, this seems to be a general property of modern physics that does not contradict realism.

For instance in the special relativity, there are invariants that are independent of the choice of inertial frames, which, in turn, depend on, or represent observers. More precisely, a relativistic system defines a set of invariants that are formed from the variables of the system alone ('intrinsic' invariants). For example, such variables are the components P^μ of the four-momentum of a free particle \mathcal{S} and the Poincaré invariant is the squared length $P^\mu P_\mu$. Then, there is another set of invariants describing relations of the system with other systems ('extrinsic' invariants) and which can replace the inertial frame coordinates or components. For example, one can consider the inertial frame as a physical system \mathcal{F} consisting of a radar station, three gyroscopes and a clock; then the coordinates of the particle with respect to this frame can be calculated as Poincaré invariants formed from the variables of the two systems \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{F} . For a complete description of a relativistic system, the intrinsic invariants do not suffice and coordinates with respect to a frame (or extrinsic invariants) are needed.

Another important point to keep in mind is the *dependence of the notion of*

intrinsic property on the notion of quantum system. The existence of a hypothetical quantum system need not itself be, under some conditions, an intrinsic property. As an example, consider a quantum system consisting of an electron and a proton. Let us prepare the electron and the proton in pure states that are spatially well separated and let the total energy in their center-of-mass frame be lower than the binding energy of hydrogen atoms. Such a system is not a hydrogen atom, because a hydrogen atom in this energy state would be bound. Now suppose that our initial state evolves. Then, there is a probability that the electron will be captured and a bound state will form. In general, the final state after the evolution will be a linear superposition of states, some of them representing the electron and proton well separated (no hydrogen atom), others being states of a (bound) hydrogen atom. Thus, the existence of hydrogen atom is not an intrinsic property of our original quantum system. In general, it follows that the existence of composite quantum systems is relative and approximative: under some conditions (that is what is ‘relative’), the assumption of the existence of a quantum system can be successful in giving valid predictions in certain accuracy limits (that is what is ‘approximative’).

Now, let us turn to the macroscopic, ‘classical’, world. This paper is going to propose that

all variables describing classical (i.e., geometrical, mechanical and thermodynamical) state of macroscopic systems can be obtained from quantum mechanics as intrinsic properties.

Indeed, they can be ascribed to the systems themselves and the assumption that they exist independently of observation does not lead to any paradoxes. The (implicit) idea that at least some properties of macroscopic systems are their intrinsic properties that can be calculated by the usual methods of quantum mechanics has been very fruitful in the past. For example, the solid state physics explains the rich physical properties of solids (such as electrical conductivity), which are of course intrinsic.

Everything what we can measure on classical systems has a form of average value (we adopt this point of view, which is originally due to Exner [10], p. 669, and Born [11]) and its dispersion (mean quadratic deviation). Such a property is associated with a whole ensemble of systems rather than with an individual one. We can, however, generalize the notion of systems to include such ensembles. They are defined by the conditions under which the individual systems are accepted as their elements. Thus, average values can be considered as intrinsic properties, too. In many cases, the associated dispersions are small in comparison with the average values themselves. Then, one usually speaks of values that concern the individual

systems of the ensemble. It seems that all values in the classical physics that are pertinent to individual systems have this character.

An interesting question is that about the origin of the dispersion of classical quantities. It is often assumed that improvements in measuring techniques will in principle, in some limit, lead to zero dispersion. This is in agreement with the classical theory such as mechanics. It predicts that the trajectories are completely sharp if the initial data are so, and does not put any limit on the accuracy with which the initial state can be prepared. The point of view adopted here is different: some part of the dispersions cannot ever be removed and the classical theories are only approximative models.

The macroscopic systems are highly complicated from the quantum point of view. It seems that this may be a source of intrinsic properties that do not make sense for small quantum systems. Indeed, an example is provided by molecules of the deoxyribonucleic acid. Their structures become richer with their length, their number grows (roughly) exponentially with the number of the four constituents because all the possible orderings of the constituents define different structures. The rich intrinsic properties of large systems might also enable a new approach to quantum cosmology without the 'wave function of the Universe'.

Another kind of intrinsic properties possessed exclusively by macroscopic systems are the thermodynamical ones. They include average values (expectation values, mean values) of several quantum-mechanical observables, such as energies or particle numbers of subsystems. For macroscopic subsystems, these observables form, on the one hand, only a very small subset of the whole observable algebra of the system and, on the other, define its macroscopic state by their average values. Moreover, they have negligible relative dispersions (variances, mean square deviations) in states that are close to thermodynamic equilibrium. The existence of the equilibrium state and the fact that it evolves spontaneously from overwhelmingly large set of initial microstates is a further intrinsic property of the macroscopic systems.

Thermodynamic properties can to a large extent be derived from quantum mechanics [12] in the limit of infinite particle number. The equilibrium state is clearly compatible with very many microscopic quantum states and so it gives a very incomplete information from the quantum point of view. The equilibrium can be defined as a maximum entropy⁴ state under specific macroscopic conditions. For example, the Gibbs state is defined by the maximum of entropy at a given average energy. This property makes it to a very good approximation to what can mostly be observed. A simplified model showing in some detail how these ideas on macroscopic systems could work is presented in the Appendix.

To summarize, quantum mechanics comprises the knowledge gained by long ex-

⁴The term 'entropy' always means the von Neumann entropy in this paper.

perience and concerning the possible structures of quantum systems. Using this knowledge, we can construct quantum models of newly observed systems. It further specifies how the ideas about the structure can be used to write down quantitative laws relating different intrinsic properties. Finally, it determines what are the extrinsic properties of the system that can be measured. It also includes the specific structures of the menagerie of known quantum systems: nuclei, atoms, molecules, solid bodies, relativistic field systems and many more.

5 Classical properties and the quantum theory of measurement

Our general philosophy will work satisfactorily only if the classical systems can be considered as some special kind of quantum systems and their classical properties can be derived from quantum mechanics. This is known as the hypothesis of *universality of quantum mechanics*.

To begin the discussion, let us consider the so-called semiclassical (or WKB) approximation. This is based on the observation that, for a number of systems, the dynamics of the average values of a number of quantum observables follows classical (say, Newton mechanics) trajectories. This is surely a good start because, as we have seen, such average values can be considered as intrinsic properties. However, the classical systems do possess an additional crucial property: each observation of a classical quantity gives approximately the same value equal to the average one. Thus, we also need a negligible dispersion of these observables in most states of macroscopical systems that can be observed.

In quantum mechanics, a general method to construct states with large dispersion is provided by the superposition principle. Indeed, if my chair were a quantum system, then its average position can of course be in my room, but nothing seems to prevent it to be in a linear superposition of states each of them representing a position in another room. Such a chair cannot be considered to be in any of the rooms; rather, it is in all of them simultaneously. This interpretation of the linear superposition follows from observations such as the well-known two-slit experiment. Then, even if the average position of the chair is correct, the mean quadratic deviation is of the order of the apartment size. Long ago, Schrödinger invented a paradox that is well-known under the name Schrödinger cat to help visualising the problem.

It turns out that what one needs is the validity of *macroscopic realism* [14] and we are faced with the problem to derive it from quantum mechanics. It has been defined as follows.

1. A macroscopic object which has available to it two or more macroscopically

distinct states is at any given time in a definite one of those states.

2. It is possible in principle to determine which of these states the system is in without any effect on the state itself or on the subsequent system dynamics.
3. The properties of ensembles are determined exclusively by initial conditions (and in particular not by final conditions).

This property of macroscopic systems is necessary for the quantum phenomenology of observation itself to make sense. Indeed, suppose that a measurement is being done. Suppose that the apparatus is a quantum system and that it is in a linear superposition of different eigenstates of its pointer after the measurement. This superposition state is physically different from a proper mixture of states, each being a definite eigenstate of the pointer. Hence, we cannot just read off the unique value that is to result in each case of the repeated measurement. To bring the apparatus into such a proper mixture state, we had to make an additional measurement on the apparatus by an additional apparatus. And so on.

The usual models of measuring apparatus [15, 16] assume that the states of its pointer are eigenstates of some operator—that is, they are extrinsic properties of the apparatus. Then, what one had to achieve is that the state of the apparatus after a measurement would be a proper mixture of the pointer states. The property of a state operator to be a proper mixture and the set of states that form the corresponding real alternatives can be e.g. created during the preparation or it follows from some kind of superselection rules that forbid linear superposition of the pointer states. The information about such properties is never contained in the form of the state operator itself.⁵ For example, if a state operator is diagonalized in an orthonormal basis of states, then it does not follow that it is a proper mixture of the states. Such an assumption leads to contradictions: the simplest counterexample is a proper mixture of two non-orthogonal states.

There is much activity in this field. Let us mention the quantum decoherence theory [19, 20], the Coleman-Hepp theory [21, 22, 23] and its modifications [24] and theories based on some coarse graining [3, 25, 26]. At the present time, the above problem does not seem to be solved in a completely satisfactory way, see also [4, 18].

The difficulties may come from having a wrong quantum model of the measurement process. The essential feature of this model is to view the classical properties of macroscopic quantum systems as their extrinsic properties. Thus, a proposal

⁵This seems to contradict the claim (that can be found in any textbook) that the state operator contains all information about measurable properties of the state. The contradiction is only apparent because the word measurable used by the claim means obtainable through quantum measurement performed on the prepared state. What we need is, however, a property existing before such measurement. More about our interpretation of state operators, see [17].

seems to be natural that the model of the measuring process must be modified, so that the classical properties of macroscopic quantum systems will be their intrinsic properties. In fact, this follows directly from the principle of macroscopic realism.

To summarize: We have found that the current quantum models of macroscopic body, of the quantum measurement and of the measuring apparatus are not completely satisfactory. Indeed, a real apparatus does yield definite values of measured observables while the quantum model of the apparatus fails to do so. Of course, the problem does not prevent us from using quantum mechanics successfully. We have been always having the provisional way of how to do it, provided by the old Born formula and the splitting of the world into its classical and quantum parts. However, our theory of intrinsic properties needs a solution to this problem and can help to obtain one. More work is necessary.

A Quantum model of classical body

We are going to construct a simplified quantum model of an ordinary classical body. In accordance with our previously stated project, we ought to obtain all of its ordinary classical properties, geometrical, mechanical and thermodynamical, as intrinsic properties of the corresponding quantum system. This entails that, first, the quantum structure of the system must be defined, second, the basic intrinsic properties such as the spectrum calculated, and, third, further intrinsic properties derived. As yet, we can define, e.g., the length of the body.

A.1 The structure and the Hamiltonian

We shall consider a linear chain of N identical particles of mass μ distributed along the x -axis with the Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{2\mu} \sum_{n=1}^N p_n^2 + \frac{\kappa^2}{2} \sum_{n=2}^N (x_n - x_{n-1} - \xi)^2,$$

involving only nearest neighbour elastic forces. Here x_n is the position, p_n the momentum of the n -th particle, κ the oscillator strength and ξ the equilibrium interparticle distance. The parameters μ , κ and ξ are intrinsic properties (the last two defining the potential function).

This kind of chain seems to be different from most that are studied in literature: the positions of the chain particles are dynamical variables so that the chain can move as a whole. However, the chain can still be solved by methods that are described in [27, 28].

A.2 The modes

After the transformation

$$x_n = y_n + \left(n - \frac{N+1}{2} \right) \xi, \quad (1)$$

the potential becomes a quadratic form

$$V = \frac{\kappa^2}{2} \sum_{n=2}^N (y_n - y_{n-1})^2.$$

and the equations of motion read

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \ddot{y}_n &= \kappa^2 (y_{n+1} - 2y_n + y_{n-1}) \quad \forall \quad 1 < n < N, \\ \mu \ddot{y}_1 &= \kappa^2 (y_2 - y_1), \\ \mu \ddot{y}_N &= \kappa^2 (-y_N + y_{N-1}). \end{aligned}$$

To simplify the equations, we add fictitious points 0 and $N+1$ to the chain and require the additional variables y_0 and y_{N+1} to satisfy the boundary conditions of free ends,

$$y_0 = y_1, \quad y_{N+1} = y_N.$$

Then, the equations of motion can be written as

$$\mu \ddot{y}_n = \kappa^2 (y_{n+1} - 2y_n + y_{n-1}) \quad \forall \quad 1 \leq n \leq N.$$

By the standard method of modes, we substitute $y_n = Y_n \cos \omega t$ and obtain the linear system for the mode amplitudes Y_n ,

$$Y_{n+1} + Y_{n-1} = \left(2 - \frac{\mu}{\kappa^2} \omega^2 \right) Y_n, \quad \forall \quad 1 \leq n \leq N, \quad (2)$$

with boundary conditions [28]

$$Y_0 = Y_1, \quad Y_{N+1} = Y_N. \quad (3)$$

Some general properties of this system can be obtained as follows. Introducing the shorthand notation

$$V_{ij} := \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} (0, \dots, 0),$$

the equations of motion and the linear system take the form

$$\ddot{y}_i = -\frac{\kappa^2}{\mu} \sum_{j=1}^N V_{ij} y_j, \quad \sum_{j=1}^N V_{ij} Y_j = \frac{\mu \omega^2}{\kappa^2} Y_i.$$

Hence, there must be N modes with amplitudes $\{Y_i\}$ that diagonalize the symmetric matrix V_{ij} and they can be chosen to be orthonormal with respect to the scalar product $\sum_{j=1}^N Y_j Y'_j$.

We can observe further that the system (2), (3) is invariant with respect to the inversion of the chain order,

$$Y'_n = Y_{N+1-n},$$

so that the modes can be separated into even and odd ones. The next step are the harmonic solutions of (2), (3): for even modes,

$$Y_n = A^+(k) \cos \left[kn - \frac{k(N+1)}{2} \right], \quad (4)$$

and for the odd ones,

$$Y_n = A^-(k) \sin \left[kn - \frac{k(N+1)}{2} \right], \quad (5)$$

where $A^\pm(k)$ are normalization factors. In both cases, we obtain the dispersion relation

$$\omega(k) = \frac{2\kappa}{\sqrt{\mu}} \sin \frac{k}{2}. \quad (6)$$

From the two boundary conditions, only one is now independent. For the even modes, equation $Y_0 = Y_1$ becomes

$$\cos \left[\frac{k(N+1)}{2} \right] = \cos \left[\frac{k(N-1)}{2} \right],$$

which is equivalent to

$$\sin \frac{kN}{2} \sin \frac{k}{2} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad k = \frac{2m}{N} \pi,$$

where m is any integer. Similarly, for the odd modes we obtain

$$k = \frac{2m-1}{N} \pi.$$

Altogether there are N modes: we obtain finally, for each N ,

$$k_m = \frac{m}{N} \pi, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (7)$$

and

$$\omega_m = \omega(k_m) = \frac{2\kappa}{\sqrt{\mu}} \sin \frac{m\pi}{2}, \quad (8)$$

where even (odd) m 's correspond to the even (odd) modes and Eqs. (4) ((5)) must be used for the Y 's. We can see that the spectrum is non-degenerate and lies in the

interval $\omega \in [0, 2\kappa/\sqrt{\mu}]$. The normalization factors $A^\pm(m)$ are obtained easily using Eq. (7): for any N and $m = 0$

$$A^+(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}; \quad (9)$$

for $m = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ a longer calculation gives

$$[A^\pm(k_m)]^{-2} = \frac{N}{2} \pm \frac{1 \sin m\pi}{2 \sin \frac{m\pi}{N}} = \frac{N}{2}, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad A^\pm(k_m) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{N}}. \quad (10)$$

The results that have been obtained can be used to transform the Hamiltonian to a diagonal form. Let us denote the mode amplitudes that correspond to the parameter value m by Y_n^m . Then, we can transform the original variables y_n and p_n to normal mode variables u_m and q_m ,

$$y_n = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} Y_n^m u_m, \quad p_n = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} Y_n^m q_m. \quad (11)$$

As the transformation of both y 's and p 's is orthogonal, the new variables are canonically conjugate and the Hamiltonian becomes

$$H = \frac{1}{2\mu} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} q_m^2 + \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \omega_m^2 u_m^2.$$

Consider the terms with $m = 0$. We have $k_0 = 0$, $\omega_0 = 0$, and $Y_n^0 = 1/\sqrt{N}$. Hence,

$$u_0 = \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} y_n, \quad q_0 = \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} p_n,$$

so that

$$u_0 = \sqrt{N} X, \quad q_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} P,$$

where X is the center-of-mass coordinate of the chain and P is its total momentum. The 'zero' terms in the Hamiltonian then reduce to

$$\frac{1}{2M} P^2$$

with $M = N\mu$ being the total mass. Thus, the 'zero mode' describes a straight, uniform motion of the chain as a whole. The other modes are 'phonons' with eigenfrequencies ω_m , $m = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$. The phonon excitation energy spectrum of the body is built from the eigenfrequencies by the formula

$$E = \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \nu_m \hbar \omega_m, \quad (12)$$

where $\{\nu_m\}$ is an $(N - 1)$ -tuple of non-negative integers—phonon occupation numbers.

A.3 Numerical values

Here, we choose the order of magnitude of the parameters to mimick real bodies. The distances of neighbouring atoms typically are

$$\xi \approx 5 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ m}$$

to be compared with atomic radii of the order $2 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ m}$ [27] or with the Bohr radius

$$a_0 \approx \frac{\hbar}{m_e c \alpha} \approx 5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ m},$$

where \hbar is the Planck constant, m_e the electron mass, c the speed of light and α the fine structure constant.

The dispersion relation (6) can be estimated from the neutron scattering measurement: e.g., for Na at 90 K [27] the maximal frequency was found to be of the order of 5 THz . Thus, $\omega_{max} \approx 2\pi \cdot 5 \cdot 10^{12} \text{ Hz}$, and

$$\omega_m = \omega_{max} \sin\left(\frac{m\pi}{2N}\right) = \frac{2\kappa}{\sqrt{\mu}} \sin\left(\frac{m\pi}{2N}\right) \approx 3 \cdot 10^{13} \sin\left(\frac{m\pi}{2N}\right) \text{ s}^{-1};$$

the corresponding energies are

$$\hbar\omega_m \approx 3 \cdot 10^{-21} \sin\left(\frac{m\pi}{2N}\right) \text{ J} \approx 2 \cdot 10^{-2} \sin\left(\frac{m\pi}{2N}\right) \text{ eV}.$$

Next, let us assume that the body is in the thermodynamical equilibrium at about 300 K . Then, $k_B T \approx 5 \cdot 10^{-21} \text{ J} \approx 2 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ eV}$ which corresponds to $\sin\frac{m\pi}{2N} \approx 1$.

Note that a rough estimate of the force acting on an atom displaced from its equilibrium position in the body can also be obtained from the known compressibility [27], leading to the same order of oscillation frequency, e.g. $4, 8 \text{ THz}$ for copper at room temperature.

A.4 The length of the body

Classical properties that can be defined and calculated in our quantum model are the average length of the body and the corresponding dispersion. Let us define the length operator by

$$L = x_N - x_1. \tag{13}$$

It can be expressed in terms of normal coordinates u_m using Eqs. (1), (11),

$$L = (N - 1)\xi + \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} (Y_N^m - Y_1^m) u_m.$$

The differences on the right-hand side are non-zero only for odd values of m , and equal then to $-2Y_1^m$. We easily find, using Eqs. (5), (7) and (10):

$$L = (N - 1)\xi - \sqrt{\frac{8}{N}} \sum_{m=1}^{[N/2]} (-1)^m \cos\left(\frac{2m-1}{N} \frac{\pi}{2}\right) u_{2m-1}. \quad (14)$$

The phonons of one species are excitation levels of a harmonic oscillator, so we have

$$u_m = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_m}}(a_m + a_m^\dagger),$$

where a_m is the annihilation operator for the m -th species. The diagonal matrix elements between the energy eigenstates $|\nu_m\rangle$ that we shall need then are

$$\langle \nu_m | u_m | \nu_m \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \nu_m | u_m^2 | \nu_m \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_m}(2\nu_m + 1). \quad (15)$$

We assume that the phonons of each species form statistically independent subsystems, hence the average of an operator concerning only one species in the Gibbs state of the total system equals the average in the Gibbs state for the one species. Such a Gibbs state operator for the m -th species has the form

$$\rho_m = \sum_{\nu_m=0}^{\infty} |\nu_m\rangle p_{\nu_m}^{(m)} \langle \nu_m|,$$

where

$$p_{\nu_m}^{(m)} = Z_m^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\hbar\omega_m}{k_B T} \nu_m\right)$$

and Z_m is the partition function for the m -th species

$$Z_m(\beta) = \sum_{\nu_m=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta\hbar\omega_m\nu_m} = \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\beta\hbar\omega_m}}, \quad (16)$$

where $\beta = 1/k_B T$. The thermodynamic average value of ν_m is then given by

$$\langle \nu_m \rangle_T = -\frac{1}{\hbar\omega_m} \left(\frac{1}{Z_m} \frac{\partial Z_m}{\partial \beta} \right)_{\beta=(k_B T)^{-1}}$$

and Eq. (16) yields

$$\langle \nu_m \rangle_T = \frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{\hbar\omega_m}{k_B T}\right) - 1}. \quad (17)$$

Returning to Eq. (14), the average length is obtained using (15),

$$\langle L \rangle_T = (N - 1)\xi. \quad (18)$$

Now the measure of thermodynamic fluctuations of quantity L is

$$\frac{\Delta L}{\langle L \rangle_T} = \frac{\sqrt{\langle L^2 \rangle_T - \langle L \rangle_T^2}}{\langle L \rangle_T}.$$

To estimate the dispersion ΔL to leading order for large N , we start with

$$\langle L^2 \rangle_T = (N-1)^2 \xi^2 + \frac{8}{N} \sum_{m=1}^{[N/2]} \sum_{n=1}^{[N/2]} (-1)^{m+n} \cos\left(\frac{2m-1}{N} \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{2n-1}{N} \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \langle u_{2m-1} u_{2n-1} \rangle_T.$$

Since

$$\langle u_{2m-1} u_{2n-1} \rangle_T = \delta_{mn} \langle u_{2m-1}^2 \rangle_T,$$

the above formula leads to

$$\langle L^2 \rangle_T - \langle L \rangle_T^2 = \frac{8}{N} \sum_{m=1}^{[N/2]} \cos^2\left(\frac{2m-1}{N} \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \langle u_{2m-1}^2 \rangle_T,$$

where

$$\langle u_{2m-1}^2 \rangle_T = \frac{1}{Z_{2m-1}} \sum_{\nu_{2m-1}=0}^{\infty} \frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_{2m-1}} (2\nu_{2m-1} + 1) \exp(-\beta\hbar\omega_{2m-1}\nu_{2m-1}).$$

Introducing dimensionless quantities

$$x_m = \sin\left(\frac{2m-1}{N} \frac{\pi}{2}\right), \quad \gamma = \frac{2\hbar\kappa}{k_B T \sqrt{\mu}},$$

we can substitute $\omega_{2m-1} = (2\kappa/\sqrt{\mu})x_m$ and obtain the intermediate result

$$\langle L^2 \rangle_T - \langle L \rangle_T^2 = \frac{2}{N} \frac{\hbar}{\kappa\sqrt{\mu}} \sum_{m=1}^{[N/2]} \frac{1-x_m^2}{x_m} \frac{1+e^{-\gamma x_m}}{1-e^{-\gamma x_m}}.$$

In order to extract the leading term for large N , we note that

$$x_m - x_{m-1} = \frac{\pi}{N} \cos\frac{2m-1}{N} \frac{\pi}{2} + O(N^{-2}).$$

Then we can write

$$\langle L^2 \rangle_T - \langle L \rangle_T^2 \approx \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\hbar}{\kappa\sqrt{\mu}} \sum_{m=1}^{[N/2]} (x_m - x_{m-1}) f(x_m),$$

where

$$f(x) = \frac{\sqrt{1-x^2}}{x} \frac{1+e^{-\gamma x}}{1-e^{-\gamma x}}.$$

By inspection, f is a decreasing function of x in the interval $(0, 1)$ diverging to plus infinity at $x \rightarrow 0+$ and going through zero at $x = 1$. The leading term at $x \rightarrow 0+$ is

$$f(x) = \frac{2}{\gamma x^2}[1 + O(x)].$$

The block diagram of the sum now shows that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{[N/2]} (x_m - x_{m-1})f(x_m) < 2x_1 f(x_1) + \int_{x_1}^1 dx f(x).$$

The dependence of the integral on its lower bound can be approximated by

$$\int_{x_1}^1 dx f(x) = \text{const} + \frac{2}{\gamma x_1}[1 + O(x_1)].$$

Thus, the leading term in the sum is $6/\gamma x_1 \approx 12N/\gamma\pi$. So the leading term in $\langle L^2 \rangle_T - \langle L \rangle_T^2$ is $(12k_B T/\pi^2 \kappa^2)N$, and we obtain the final result valid for large N

$$\frac{\Delta L}{\langle L \rangle_T} \approx \frac{\sqrt{12k_B T}}{\pi \kappa \xi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (19)$$

Thus, the dispersion of L is relatively small for large N . In the sense explained in Section 4, the length is a classical property of our model body.

Clearly, this length and its dispersion are intrinsic properties of our model body because the conditions that define them are of the intrinsic character. We have specified the structure in terms of a Hamiltonian, and we have asked about the average values of some quantity under the assumptions that the average energy has some value and that the state is the most probable state satisfying such a condition (maximal entropy). The state is then the Gibbs state with certain temperature. The probability to find the body in such a state is very close to unity under the given conditions, hence the state is a good approximation to what can be observed.

Some comment is in order. First, the thermodynamical equilibrium can settle down starting from an arbitrary state only if some weak but non-zero interaction exists between the phonons. Second, the bulk motion of the chain is decoupled from all other degrees of freedom and has a character of a closed subsystem with just one degree of freedom (it is not a macroscopic property, at least of our model). A different model (including, may be, also other bodies) is needed to show that any properties of large systems can lead to the classicality of the bulk motion. Work on this problem is in progress.

Acknowledgements

P.H. is indebted to Juerg Gasser and Uwe-Jens Wiese for reading the manuscript and suggesting many improvements in the text. Thanks go to the Institute of

Theoretical Physics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics of the Charles University, Prague for hospitality and discussion. J.T. gratefully acknowledges partial support by the Ministry of Education of Czech Republic (projects MSM6840770039 and LC06002).

References

- [1] R. B. Griffiths, *Consistent Quantum Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2002.
- [2] H. Nikolic, *Quantum Mechanics: Myths and Facts*. ArXiv: quant-phys/0609163.
- [3] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1995.
- [4] B. d’Espagnat, *Veiled Reality*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1995.
- [5] C. J. Isham, *Lectures on Quantum Theory. Mathematical and Structural Foundations*, Imperial College Press, London 1995.
- [6] C. Piron, *Foundations of Quantum Physics*, Benjamin, Reading 1976; C. Piron, *Found. Phys.* **2** (1972) 287.
- [7] G. Birkhoff and J. von Neumann, *The Logic of Quantum Mechanics*, *Ann. of Math.* **37** (1936) 823.
- [8] G. Ludwig, *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Springer, Berlin, 1983.
- [9] K. Kraus, *States, Effects, and Operations*, Springer Lecture Notes in Physics 190, Berlin, 1983.
- [10] F. Exner, *Vorlesungen über die physikalischen Grundlagen der Naturwissenschaften*, Deuticke, Leipzig, 1922.
- [11] M. Born, *Phys. Blätter* **11** (1955) 49.
- [12] W. Thirring, *Lehrbuch der Mathematischen Physik. 4. Quantenmechanik grosser Systeme*, Springer, Berlin, 1980.
- [13] J. S. Bell, *The theory of local beables in Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (England), 1987.
- [14] A. J. Leggett and A. Garg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54** (1985) 857; A. J. Leggett, *J. Phys.: Cond. Mat.* **14** (2002) R415.

- [15] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundation of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ, 1983.
- [16] J. M. Jauch, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **37** (1964) 293.
- [17] J. Tolar and P. Hájíček, *Phys. Letters A* **353** (2006) 19.
- [18] J. S. Bell, *Against ‘measurement’ in Sixty Two Years of Uncertainty*, A. I. Miller (Ed.), Plenum, New York, 1990.
- [19] W. H. Zurek, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **75** (2003) 715.
- [20] D. Giulini, E. Joos, C. Kiefer, J. Kupsch, I.-O. Stamatescu, H. D. Zeh, *Decoherence and the Appearance of Classical World in Quantum Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 1996.
- [21] K. Hepp, *Helvetica Phys. Acta*, **45** (1972) 237.
- [22] J. S. Bell, *Helv. Phys. Acta*, **48** (1975) 93.
- [23] P. Bóna, *Acta Phys. Slov.*, **23** (1973) 149, **25** (1975) 3, **27** (1977) 101.
- [24] G. L. Sewell, *Quantum Mechanics and its Emergent Macrophysics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2002.
- [25] D. Poulin, *Phys. Rev. A* **71** (2005) 022102.
- [26] J. Kofler and Č. Brukner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** (2007) 180403.
- [27] C. Kittel, *Introduction to Solid State Physics*, Wiley, New York 1976.
- [28] D. E. Rutherford, *Proc. Roy. Soc. (Edinburgh)*, Ser. A, **62** (1947), 229; **63** (1951), 232.