

# Intrinsic 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

June 2008

PACS number: 03.65.Ta

## Abstract

A new realist interpretation of quantum mechanics is introduced. It is shown that quantum systems have two different kinds of properties: the usual ones described by values of quantum observables, which are called extrinsic and the real ones, which are called intrinsic. The existence of intrinsic properties, usually denied by textbooks, is suggested by everyday praxis of quantum mechanics. They do form a sufficiently large set and can be classified into structural and modal. The new approach contributes to the foundations of statistical physics and to the problems of classical properties and quantum measurement. Classical properties are some intrinsic properties of the underlying quantum systems. A general self-consistent framework for quantum theory of classical properties is proposed and illustrated by an example. All existing theoretical models of measuring apparatuses are shown to be incompatible with our approach. New principles according to which better models could be constructed are illustrated by another example.

# 1 Introduction

Quantum mechanics does not seem to be fully understood even after about eighty years of its very successful existence and a lot of work is being done on its interpretation or modification today (e.g., [1, 2]). The present paper describes an approach to its conceptual foundation from a new point of view.

The *realism* seems to be the main apple of discord and the open or hidden subject of most discussions on quantum mechanics (e.g., [3, 4]). In the present paper, the realism is understood as in Chap. 10 of [5]. Just two points ought to be added because they play an important role in the paper.

First, we distinguish our knowledge of reality from the reality itself. An important part of our realism hypothesis is that our knowledge is incomplete and approximative (but improving). 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. 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 often accompany the modelled aspect. Still, it can be true in revealing a real property of nature in the above sense.

Second, realism includes the so-called *ontological hypotheses*: assumptions about real existence of what has been theoretically constructed. Only those ontological hypotheses that have some relation to observation are considered as meaningful. An ontological hypothesis is allowed if its consequences are not disproved by existing evidence and if it is logically compatible with other physical theories.

Sec. 2 describes briefly what we understand as the orthodox interpretation of quantum mechanics. What is usually taught as quantum mechanics is then demoted to a mere part of the whole story and is called *phenomenology of observation*. The other part is based on the concept of intrinsic properties, which are introduced in Sec. 3. A concise definition reads as follows.

Let  $S$  be a quantum system and  $P$  a property that can be directly ascribed to  $S$  alone so that the assumption of  $S$  really possessing  $P$  does not lead to contradiction with any measurements that can in principle be done on  $S$ .

It is shown that there are two kinds thereof: the structural and modal. A strange fact is that serious textbooks of quantum mechanics more or less explicitly deny the existence of intrinsic properties [6]. Of course, if quantum systems would really exist, they had to possess some real properties.

A structural property of any quantum system is, e.g., the form of its Hamiltonian operator. Clearly, it is a specific feature different from system to system and it is amenable to an exact mathematical description even if not by a quantity that takes

on numerical values. According to our opinion, the ultimate aim of all quantum measurements (such as the scattering experiments in CERN) is to determine the structural properties of real quantum systems (such as parameters of the standard model). Modal are those properties that can be given to quantum systems by preparations. From those, some are summarized and mathematically expressed by state operators, others exist independently of quantum states. Existence of state-independent properties has been established by our previous paper [7].

Sec. 4 interprets classical properties of a macroscopic body as some intrinsic properties of the underlying quantum system though not all intrinsic properties of the system are classical. A quantum model of a classical property is given in Appendix A. In this way, the dichotomy of quantum and classical worlds that plays such an important role in many considerations on quantum mechanics could be removed. Instead of it there remains mere difference between extrinsic and intrinsic properties of quantum systems. We re-interpret quantum measurements as follows.

Let  $S$  be a quantum system and  $A$  an apparatus. Let a measurement by  $A$  finds a property  $O$  of  $S$  in such a way that property  $P$  of  $A$  appears as a result of the measurement. Then  $P$  must be an intrinsic property of  $A$ .

The assumption that measuring apparatuses are exclusively classical (that is non quantum) could thus be abandoned. Similarly, von Neumann model of measuring apparatus is not compatible with our interpretation. Appendix B presents a rough model of some measuring process that works according to our ideas.

Our main achievement is the formulation of real existence of quantum systems that does not lead to well-known logical problems. With it, quantum mechanics is as realistic as any other theory of physics (albeit in a way that is rather different from what is often struggled for). Further, a self-consistent framework for quantum models of classical properties is described. We cannot yet model all classical properties of a given macroscopic system, but our approach to this problem is well-defined and promising. Similarly, we cannot yet give a completely satisfactory model of quantum measurement but the ideas on intrinsic properties open a new approach to it.

The technical knowledge of quantum mechanics in the extent of, say, [6] will be assumed.

## 2 Phenomenology of observation

Let us first introduce the word 'property' in order to have a general notion of observable characteristics concerning quantum systems. For instance, the values of the

quantities that are called *observables* in quantum mechanics are properties. Let us call these properties *extrinsic*<sup>1</sup>.

Quantum mechanics is usually understood as a general theory of the extrinsic properties, consisting of the usual stuff about Hilbert spaces, states and observables. In most presentations of quantum mechanics, the greatest attention is dedicated to this part. An important assumption that is, tacit or out-spoken, more or less generally made can be called *exclusivity of extrinsic properties*: quantum systems have no other but extrinsic properties. In the present section, we would like to let this question open and call the general theory of the extrinsic properties the *phenomenology of observation*.

The extrinsic properties are in general not real properties of quantum systems in the following sense: the assumption that an extrinsic property  $P$  of a quantum system  $S$  as measured by an apparatus  $A$  is possessed by  $S$  independently of, or already before, the measurement, leads in most cases to contradictions with other possible measurements on  $S$ . An example is the well-known double slit experiment.

In fact, the values of observables do not directly refer to  $S$  alone but to the composite system of  $S$  and  $A$  in interaction. As such, even they are real (observer independent): they are the 'beables' of John Bell [10]. 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. This is why we call them extrinsic properties.

Our further analysis will need the general features of a quantum measurement. At the beginning of any measurement stands what is usually called *preparation*. The name is somewhat misleading. What is meant is a set of classical conditions which the quantum system to be observed has been 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 recognizable or reproducible. Thus, a series of repeated experiments may be feasible, and the set of quantum systems obtained by repeating

---

<sup>1</sup>More 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 [8]. 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 [9]. 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 pretence is against all logic because the extrinsic properties are properties of many different systems each consisting of the quantum system plus some apparatus.

the experiment is called *ensemble*. Clearly, the notion of ensemble is in many aspects closely connected to that of preparation.

A specific preparation defines a state of the quantum system. Thus, 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 gained from its preparation. This knowledge can have different degrees of completeness, that is, different entropies<sup>2</sup>.

At the end of any quantum measurement there is what is often called a *registration*. It is an interaction of an individual quantum system in a specific state with a classical system, the *measuring apparatus*. Each measuring apparatus is mathematically represented by an observable, a self-adjoint operator in the Hilbert space of the system<sup>3</sup>. The state that is defined by a given preparation  $P$  can be experimentally determined by a suitable set of registrations that can be performed after repeated preparations  $P$ .

In the above description, the words "classical conditions" and "classical system" occur several times. Indeed, the crucial assumption of the phenomenology is the existence of *classical systems*. These are arrangements of bodies and fields to which classical mechanics, electrodynamics, thermodynamics and classical chemistry of material properties are applicable as very good approximations. Moreover, to describe numerous properties of these systems, quantum mechanics itself is not needed. These are classical properties.

The role of classical systems and classical properties in quantum mechanics is twofold. First, an experimentalist can directly manipulate only classical systems and directly observe only their classical properties. All knowledge about the nature and the state of the quantum system one is working with is entailed in the classical conditions of the preparation. The measured value can be read from a classical property of the registration apparatus  $A$ , say, because classical properties seem to exist or not to exist without any further measurement. Second, if  $A$  were a quantum system, that could exhibit only the external properties, then the whole measuring process were just a preparation of  $A$  according to the basic rules of the phenomenology. The property that we need would not therefore exist yet and had to be brought into being by the interaction of  $A$  with another apparatus,  $B$ , say. If

---

<sup>2</sup>The term 'entropy' always means the von Neumann entropy in this paper. It is clearly some characteristic of the preparation.

<sup>3</sup>A more general mathematical object can be mentioned as representing registrations, the *positive operator valued measure* (POVM). However, any registration represented by a POVM of a system  $S$  is nothing but a registration associated with a suitable observable of an extended system,  $S + A$ ,  $A$  being the so-called ancilla [6]. Thus, conceptually, POVM belong to extrinsic properties because of both measuring apparatus and ancilla.

$B$  were not classical either, then still another apparatus would be necessary, etc.

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. The *classicality* of the macroscopic bodies is even crucial for the statistical interpretation of quantum mechanics. The classicality of a measuring apparatus entails 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 the phenomenology of observation. A good textbook explaining it is [6]. In fact, the phenomenology has been formulated in a rigorous mathematical way by Ludwig [11] and by Kraus [12] and has evolved into a broadly used theory today. We call this interpretation, which works without the assumption of existence of quantum systems, *orthodox*. Of course, it goes back to Niels Bohr and can also be called Copenhagen interpretation.

In spite of its practical success, the orthodox interpretation is unsatisfactory. It would be much better if we could assume that quantum systems do really exist. Really existing systems must of course have some really existing properties. However, this is incompatible with the exclusivity of extrinsic properties. The exclusivity is the source of well-known difficulties with the reality of quantum systems: Either there must be two separate worlds, classical and quantum, which is strange. Or the classical properties must be explained as some kind of extrinsic properties, which is impossible. The present paper rejects the exclusivity of extrinsic properties for quantum systems.

### 3 The intrinsic properties of quantum systems

A property  $P$  can be ascribed directly to a quantum system  $S$  if  $S$  possessing  $P$  does not contradict results of any measurement that can be carried out on  $S$  (even very difficult measurements so as to be practically unfeasible). That's why we call such properties *intrinsic*.

#### 3.1 Structural properties

First, we turn to those intrinsic properties that are easy: nobody would seriously deny that they can be ascribed to quantum systems. They are also the most im-

portant properties of quantum systems in the sense that the ultimate aim of experimentalists is to determine them. We call them *structural*.

The first among the structural properties is the *composition of a quantum system*. Quantum mechanics contains well-defined rules about what can such a composition be. For example, in the non-relativistic case, there must be a definite number<sup>4</sup> of some 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.

For example, the non-relativistic 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 helps 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 structural property. This information is different from that about the values of these observables<sup>5</sup>.

The composition 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<sup>6</sup>.

Using the Hamiltonian or the action, we can write down the dynamical laws—

---

<sup>4</sup>There are non-relativistic systems, in which some particle numbers are variable, such as those 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 but extrinsic properties in our conception.

<sup>5</sup>More precisely, the set of observables can be embedded in a so-called  $C^*$ -algebra that represents a part of the physical structure of the system [13], Vol. 3. 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 then clearly an independent structural intrinsic property of the field.

<sup>6</sup>The energy of a system  $S$  that can be measured by suitable apparatus  $A$  is an observable. The value of energy obtained on  $S$  by  $A$  is a beable, it is not an intrinsic property of  $S$  but that of the composite system  $S + A$ . The three notions of measured energy value, energy measurements and the form of Hamiltonian are related to each other but they are clearly not identical.

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 a structural 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 structural intrinsic properties.

Next, it seems that many-particle systems may have structural properties that are not found in small quantum systems. An example is provided by molecules of the deoxyribonucleic acid. The number of their structures grows (roughly) exponentially with the number of the four kinds of constituents because possible orderings of the constituents define different structures. It is clearly wrong to say that we know all kinds of structural properties of macroscopic systems and investigations in this direction might be useful. For example, rich intrinsic properties of large systems might enable a new approach to quantum cosmology without the 'wave function of the Universe'.

These rules form the everyday praxis of quantum mechanics. They are the basic hypotheses of the theory. An application of quantum mechanics starts with a proposal of a model for the quantum system under study. This is done by specifying its intrinsic properties. 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 measurements. In this way, the models can be confirmed or disproved. The sets of intrinsic and extrinsic properties are model dependent. What is relevant is that every quantum model exhibits both intrinsic and extrinsic properties.

## 3.2 Modal properties

Encouraged by the triviality of the assumption that structural properties are intrinsic, we turn to some less easy stuff in the present section. Let us analyse the process of preparation and try to find some intrinsic aspects there.

Suppose that a system  $S$  has been prepared in the eigenstate  $|o\rangle$  of an observable  $O$  with the eigenvalue  $o$ . Now, think: could any conceivable registration made on  $S$  prepared in  $|o\rangle$  contradict the assumption that  $S$  possess the value  $o$  of  $O$ ? The standard rules of quantum mechanics clearly say no. More generally, any state  $\rho$  that has been prepared for the system  $S$  is a property of  $S$  that cannot be disproved by any subsequent registration. Property  $\rho$  can in any case be directly attributed to



the ensemble defined by the preparation and, via the ensemble, it concerns equally or less directly the individual systems. We call such intrinsic properties *modal*: they are more detailed than, or auxiliary to, the structural ones.

Consider for example a particle  $S$  with spin  $1/2$ . The state with spin projection to the  $z$ -axis equal to  $\hbar/2$  can be prepared. Then, no contradictions can result from the assumption that  $S$  with this value of  $\sigma_z$  really exists. Thus, the value  $\hbar/2$  of  $\sigma_z$  is one example of a modal property. Of course,  $S$  does not possess any value of  $\sigma_x$  now; this would only be defined after a corresponding measurement and is an extrinsic property. On the other hand, the average (expectation, mean) value of  $\sigma_x$  in the prepared state has a well-known value defined by the state and hence it is another example of a modal property. What is a modal property and what is not depends on the preparation. Any preparation process of quantum mechanics can be analysed in this way classifying the properties of the prepared systems into structural, modal and purely extrinsic.

One could try to object that there has been the preparation, this is a kind of measurement and the property depends on this measurement. Moreover, the preparation has used an apparatus  $A$ , say, and the property seems therefore to be a property of the system  $S + A$  and not  $S$  alone. However, these objections concern clearly also the structural properties: an apparatus that prepares a beam of electrons is different from that for a beam of protons. Moreover, they could be also raised in Newton mechanics: giving a snooker ball momentum  $p$  requires a careful action of the cue. Still, nobody questions the existence of the momentum  $p$  on the ball after the poke.

In Sec. 2, we have defined the extrinsic properties as values of observables. In the first example above, the value  $o$  of the observable  $O$  is an intrinsic property of  $S$ . Thus, our notions of extrinsic and intrinsic properties are not mutually exclusive. Further examples can help. Consider a system  $S$  on which the observables of momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  and position  $\mathbf{x}$  can be measured. Suppose that  $S$  is prepared by an apparatus  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$  in the eigenstate  $|p\rangle$  with the eigenvalue  $p$  of  $\mathbf{p}$ . Then, the value  $p$  is a modal intrinsic property of  $S$ . But  $S$  does not possess any value of  $\mathbf{x}$ . Only if  $\mathbf{x}$  is measured by the corresponding apparatus  $A_{\mathbf{x}}$ , one specific eigenvalue  $x$  of  $\mathbf{x}$  will result. Thus, value of position is an extrinsic property which exists only as a property of the composed system  $S + A$  and cannot be ascribed to  $S$  alone after the preparation by  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$ . It is an example of an extrinsic property that is not intrinsic.

More advanced examples of modal properties concern proper and improper mixtures (for definitions, see [3]). Suppose that a physicist prepares states  $|1\rangle, \dots, |n\rangle$  of a quantum system  $S$  and mixes them with frequencies  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  so that the resulting

state of  $S$  can be described by state operator

$$\rho = \sum_{k=1}^n c_k |k\rangle\langle k|. \quad (1)$$

Now, in [7], we have shown that, in some cases,  $\rho$  does not contain all information available by registrations concerning the prepared ensemble. This encourages us to stipulate that the particular decomposition (1) of  $\rho$  is a modal property, that is a real property of the prepared ensemble. In particular, we can assume that the system *really is* always in *either* of the states  $|1\rangle, \dots, |n\rangle$  with respective probabilities  $c_1, \dots, c_n$ . Sometimes, this assumption might have no measurable consequences but this represents no embarrassment for us: we do not adhere to the positivist maxim that there is only what is measured. It is also clear that any time evolution of such a proper mixture is the proper mixture of the evolved states with the same probabilities. On the other hand, a system in an improper-mixture state  $\sigma$  cannot in general be assumed to *really be* in any of the component states of some decomposition of  $\sigma$ .

An important modal property of any ensemble is its entropy. It is a measure of how restrictive and special the preparation process is. Thus, any other definite modal property of an ensemble with very large entropy will be very general.

All examples that have been listed show that the intrinsic and extrinsic properties are physically inseparably entangled with each other. Even the definition of intrinsic properties uses the notion of registration of extrinsic properties: an intrinsic property can be ascribed to the system alone without giving rise to contradictions with the results of all possible registrations. Similarly, extrinsic properties cannot be defined without the notion of a measuring apparatus with its classical properties, which are a kind of intrinsic properties in our point of view (cf. the next section). Thus, the notion is clearly untenable that the intrinsic properties can be explained purely in terms of the extrinsic ones. Sometimes, there are even properties that are simultaneously intrinsic and extrinsic, such as eigenvalue of an observable in an eigenstate. Still, both kinds of properties are logically clearly distinguished, and we conjecture that the physical in-and-extrinsic tangle does not lead to any logical contradictions.

## 4 Quantum theory of classical properties

An important piece of our interpretation is the existence of classical macroscopic apparatuses that are needed for the phenomenology of observation. It seems that there are certain necessary conditions such apparatuses must satisfy not only in order that the phenomenology works but also that our realistic interpretation has a reliable

basis. The principle of the so-called *macroscopic realism* [14] goes in this direction, but as formulated by Leggett it is not compatible with quantum mechanics. Let us modify the principle as follows:

1. A macroscopic system which has available to it two or more distinct macroscopic 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).

Here, we have just replaced Leggett's 'macroscopically distinct (quantum) states' by 'macroscopic states.' Of course, if the macroscopic states include pure quantum states, the macroscopic realism violates the principle of superposition. Then, one has to assume that some as yet unknown phenomena exist at the macroscopic level which are not described by quantum mechanics (see, e.g., [14] and the references there). This assumption is not incompatible with our interpretation of quantum mechanics. However, no such phenomena have been observed. We ought therefore to suggest how the modified macroscopic realism could be derived from quantum mechanics, at least in principle.

Observe that the modified macroscopic realism as it stands cannot be obtained from the decoherence theory. For that e.g. the word 'is' in the first point had to be replaced by 'seems to be.' The 'seems' would undermine our quantum realism, at least in the form it is exposed in the present paper. Hence we must try to suggest how the derivation could work without the ideas of decoherence theory. We are optimistic because it seems that our interpretation provides some new tools. Of course, this does not mean that the argument is circular but only that the output does not contradict the input.

Hence, let us assume that all physical systems are quantum systems. More precisely, there is one level of description (approximative model of some aspects of a real system) of a classical system  $S_c$  and of its classical properties for which quantum theory is not needed, namely the classical one, and for which the modified principle of macroscopic realism is valid. In addition, every classical system  $S_c$  can also be understood as a quantum system  $S_q$  underlying  $S_c$  such that the classical properties of  $S_c$  are intrinsic properties of  $S_q$ . This follows from our definition of intrinsic properties and from the modified macroscopic realism.

The quantum description of  $S_q$  consists of the following points. 1) The composition of  $S_q$  must be defined. 2) The algebra of observables that can be measured on  $S_q$  is to be determined. As any observable is measurable only by a classical apparatus,

the existence of such apparatuses must also be assumed from the very beginning. Quantum description of  $S_q$  will thus always contain some classical elements. 3) A Hamiltonian operator or an action functional of the system must be written down. Finally, the known classical properties  $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_K$  of  $S_c$  must be listed and each derived as an intrinsic property of  $S_q$  from the three sets of assumptions above. This is a self-consistent framework for a non-trivial problem.

There are intrinsic properties of  $S_q$  that are not classical properties of  $S_c$ , e.g., the set of all quantum observables measurable on  $S_q$ . Hence, classical properties must be some specific intrinsic properties and the question is, which.

To begin with, let us consider the so-called semi-classical (or WKB) approximation. This is based on the observation that, for a number of systems, the average values in special states of a number of quantum observables follow classical (say, Newton mechanics) trajectories. This is surely a good start because, as we have seen in Sec. 3.2, such average values can be considered as modal properties. Moreover, everything what we can measure on classical systems has a form of average value and its variance. This is evident from the description of any classical experiment. How are these averages and variances related first to the relevant classical theory and, second, to the averages and variances of quantum ensembles?

As the first question is concerned, it is often assumed that improvements in measuring techniques will in principle, in some limit, lead to zero variance. This is in agreement with the classical theory such as Newton 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 (it is originally due to Exner [15], p. 669, and Born [16]): some part of the variances can never be removed and the classical theories are only approximative models.

The second question is justified. For example, if we measure several times the position of the Moon on its trajectory around the Earth, then the variance in the results does not result from our preparing the system of Earth and Moon these many times to get the desired ensemble. But the classical systems are robust in the sense that most classical measurements practically do not disturb them (point 2 of macroscopic realism). Thus, one can assume that the values we obtain by several measurements on one and the same system could equivalently be obtained if the measurements were performed on several identically prepared systems. The hypothesis is therefore plausible that the intrinsic properties we are looking for are averages with small variances concerning ensembles in general. If the variance of a given average value is sufficiently small, it can be and is usually viewed as a property of each individual element of the ensemble. We conjecture that this is the way classical systems come to possessing their properties.

However, there is a restriction on quantum models of classical properties: they cannot be averages with small variance that are defined by pure states such as coherent ones. Not only are pure states readily linearly superposed but any quantum registration (a generalized measurement: positive operator valued measure) that were to find the parameters of a coherent state would strongly change the state. The only available hint of what classical properties may be comes from thermodynamics. Indeed, statistical physics is a successful method of deriving macroscopic properties from microscopic ones. Moreover, as we shall see, the notions of structural and modal properties enable cleaner understanding of quantum statistical physics. The following is a brief sketch.

Let  $S$  be a (non-relativistic) quantum system with number of particles comparable to Avogadro number. We call such systems macroscopic<sup>7</sup>. Let its structure be described by a Hamiltonian  $H$ . Imagine that  $S$  is prepared in all possible quantum states (in practice, only few of these states can be prepared). Consider only those of these states that have a fixed average value  $\bar{E}$  of total energy. A well-defined average value of total energy is a modal property that exists for each of the prepared states and hence the imaginary selection is legitimate. Let us call this subset of prepared states  $\bar{E}$ -ensemble.  $\bar{E}$ -ensemble does not seem to be a quantum ensemble because no preparation process for it has been specified, it has been selected just in mind. We can still study statistical properties of the  $\bar{E}$ -ensemble.

Next, let the state  $|\bar{E}\rangle$  be defined by the requirement that it maximizes the entropy under the condition that the average energy has the value  $\bar{E}$ . This is known as the Gibbs state of  $S$ . The state is purely mathematical because no preparation process for it has been specified. The central conjecture of statistical physics reads: for macroscopic systems, important statistical properties of  $\bar{E}$ -ensemble coincide to a very good approximation with the corresponding statistical properties of  $|\bar{E}\rangle$ . Claims, equivalent to this conjecture can to a large extent be derived from quantum mechanics ([13], Vol. 4), in the thermodynamic limit. Bayesian approach [18] to probability and entropy is also helpful. (The thermodynamic limit is, of course, not a physical condition but a mathematical method of how the structural property of being macroscopic can be brought into play.)

What are the 'important' statistical properties above? Some of them are average values and variances of a very small but definite subset  $\mathcal{T}_S$  of the algebra of all quantum observables of  $S$ . Clearly, these are modal properties because they are determined by the prepared states from  $\bar{E}$ -ensemble. The observables from  $\mathcal{T}_S$  are extensive quantities associated with some of the ordinary thermodynamic variables. For instance, consider a gas in a vessel of volume  $V$ . The total energy  $\mathbf{E}$  of the gas

---

<sup>7</sup>We distinguish between macroscopic systems and macroscopic states. For example, a coherent state of a laser is a non-macroscopic state of a possibly macroscopic system.

belongs to  $\mathcal{T}_S$ . We can also choose some small but macroscopic partial volume  $\Delta V$  at a specific position within  $V$  and consider the particle number  $\Delta \mathbf{N}$  inside  $\Delta V$ . Operator  $\Delta \mathbf{N}$  can be constructed from the projectors on the position eigenstates of all particles in  $S$ . The energy  $\Delta \mathbf{E}$  inside  $\Delta V$  can be constructed as a coarse-grained operator (see [17]) because the exact energy operator does not commute with operators of particle positions. It seems that all quantum observables from  $\mathcal{T}_S$  are macroscopic in the sense that they have a coarse-grained character or concern many particles.

Other thermodynamic variables are not average values of quantum observables. For example, the maximal value of entropy and the corresponding temperature (the Lagrange multiplier that appears naturally in the problem of conditional maximization of entropy).

The average values of observables from  $\mathcal{T}_S$  determine a thermodynamic state of the system. Let us call such a state a macroscopic state of the quantum system  $S$ . For example, the internal energy and the volume determine the state of a simple gas. Thus, one macroscopic state is compatible with a huge number of microscopic (quantum) states of  $S$ . It is very important to understand that a macroscopic state of  $S$  is conceptually different from any microscopic state of it, and that there are no linear superpositions of macroscopic states. The sets of average values of operators from  $\mathcal{T}_S$  do not form a linear space pertinent to a fixed system: an addition of some extensive quantities includes addition of the corresponding systems.

It can be shown that the observables from  $\mathcal{T}_S$  have negligible relative variances in the Gibbs state. (The property that they are extensive plays an important role.) Thus, the average values of the observables can be given individual meaning: each individual system from  $\bar{E}$ -ensemble *possesses* a value of the observables within certain limits. Is such an average already a classical property satisfying the requirements of the macroscopic realism? Points 1. and 3. are satisfied by construction. Point 2. is just plausible as yet: the influence of measurement can still be large as concerns the microstate but it can change it to another microstate that is compatible with the original macrostate and so it need not change the macrostate. Clearly, statistical physics in our interpretation is the quantum theory of at least some macroscopic properties. More detail of how this works is given the Appendix A.

Finally, a few words must be said about the processes of preparation and registration that are used above. They seem to be misused for preparation of classical ensembles and for registration that is interpreted as a classical measurement. There need not be any contradiction, however, because the essential feature of both procedures is the use of classical apparatuses.

The most difficult problem of quantum theory of classical properties is to construct a model of registration process. All existing work on this problem seems to

be based on the quantum models of measuring apparatus that has been proposed by von Neumann and by Jauch [19, 20]. The crucial assumption of the model is that the values shown by the apparatus are some of its extrinsic properties. For example, the pointer states are eigenstates of some quantum operator. Of course, this follows directly from the assumption that the apparatus is a quantum system and that all properties of quantum systems must be extrinsic.

There is much activity in this field. Let us mention the quantum decoherence theory [21, 22], the Coleman-Hepp theory [23, 24, 25] and its modifications [26] and theories based on coarse grained operators [6, 27, 28]. At the present time, the problem of measurement does not seem to be solved in a completely satisfactory way [3, 29, 30].

In our point of view, the origin of difficulties is (at least) twofold. The first error is to adopt the von-Neumann model of the measuring apparatus. According to our interpretation of quantum mechanics, this is clearly wrong: the relevant properties of the apparatus must be intrinsic. In Appendix B, a construction of an apparatus is sketched that reveals an extrinsic property of a quantum system by showing a value of its own intrinsic property.

The second error is to ask a meaningless question such as: what is the origin of classical properties in a 'pure' quantum mechanics, where the 'pure' means quantum mechanics without classical properties. If an explanation of quantum aspects of a classical property is proposed, purists find that somewhere in it an assumption of classical properties of something else has been made and say: classicality has been smuggled in! The requirement of purity is meaningless because quantum mechanics involves inseparable entanglement of intrinsic and extrinsic properties, as we have seen in Sec. 3.

To summarize: Our interpretation suggests a completely new approach to quantum theory of classical properties and of measurement because it allows quantum systems to have also properties that are not extrinsic. We are not yet able to model every classical property and give a satisfactory account of registration process. For that, new models had to be constructed, but nothing proves a principal impossibility of such a project.

## A A quantum model of classical property

The purpose of Appendix A is to construct a quantum model of a classical property, the length of a body, as an intrinsic property. No original calculation is to be expected, but simple and well known things are carefully interpreted according to the lines described in Sec. 4. 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.

## A.1 The structure and the Hamiltonian

We shall consider a linear chain of  $N$  identical particles of mass  $\mu$  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,  $\kappa$  the oscillator strength and  $\xi$  the equilibrium inter-particle distance. The parameters  $\mu$ ,  $\kappa$  and  $\xi$  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 [31, 32].

## A.2 The modes

After the transformation

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

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  $Y_n$ ,

$$Y_{n+1} + Y_{n-1} = \left(2 - \frac{\mu}{\kappa^2} \omega^2\right) Y_n, \quad \forall \quad 1 \leq n \leq N, \quad (3)$$

with boundary conditions [32]

$$Y_0 = Y_1, \quad Y_{N+1} = Y_N. \quad (4)$$

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 (3), (4) 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 (3), (4): for even modes,

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

and for the odd ones,

$$Y_n = A^-(k) \sin \left[ kn - \frac{k(N+1)}{2} \right], \quad (6)$$

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

$$\omega(k) = \frac{2\kappa}{\sqrt{\mu}} \sin \frac{k}{2}. \quad (7)$$

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  $N$ ,

$$k_m = \frac{m}{N}\pi, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (8)$$

and

$$\omega_m = \omega(k_m) = \frac{2\kappa}{\sqrt{\mu}} \sin \frac{m\pi}{2}, \quad (9)$$

where even (odd)  $m$ 's correspond to the even (odd) modes and Eqs. (5) ((6)) 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. (8): for any  $N$  and  $m = 0$

$$A^+(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}; \quad (10)$$

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

$$[A^\pm(k_m)]^{-2} = \frac{N}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sin m\pi}{\sin \frac{m\pi}{N}} = \frac{N}{2}, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad A^\pm(k_m) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{N}}. \quad (11)$$

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  $q_m$ ,

$$y_n = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} Y_n^m u_m, \quad p_n = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} Y_n^m q_m. \quad (12)$$

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  $\omega_m$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ . The phonon excitation energy spectrum of the body is built from the eigenfrequencies by the formula

$$E = \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \nu_m \hbar \omega_m, \quad (13)$$

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 mimic 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  $2 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ m}$  [31] 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  $\alpha$  the fine structure constant.

The dispersion relation (7) can be estimated from the neutron scattering measurement: e.g., for  $Na$  at  $90 \text{ K}$  [31] the maximal frequency was found to be of the order of  $5 \text{ THz}$ . Thus,  $\omega_{max} \approx 2\pi \cdot 5 \cdot 10^{12} \text{ Hz}$ , and

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

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 thermodynamic equilibrium at about 300  $K$ . Then,  $k_B T \approx 5.10^{-21} J \approx 2.10^{-2} eV$  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 [31], leading to the same order of oscillation frequency, e.g. 4,8  $THz$  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 variance. Let us define the length operator by

$$L = x_N - x_1. \quad (14)$$

It can be expressed in terms of normal coordinates  $u_m$  using Eqs. (2), (12),

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

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. (6), (8) and (11):

$$L = (N - 1)\xi - \sqrt{\frac{8}{N}} \sum_{m=1}^{[N/2]} (-1)^m \cos\left(\frac{2m-1}{N} \frac{\pi}{2}\right) u_{2m-1}. \quad (15)$$

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

$$\langle \nu_m | u_m | \nu_m \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \nu_m | u_m^2 | \nu_m \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_m} (2\nu_m + 1). \quad (16)$$

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

$$Z_m(\beta) = \sum_{\nu_m=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta\hbar\omega_m\nu_m} = \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\beta\hbar\omega_m}}, \quad (17)$$

where  $\beta = 1/k_B T$ . The thermodynamic average value of  $\nu_m$  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. (17) yields

$$\langle \nu_m \rangle_T = \frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{\hbar\omega_m}{k_B T}\right) - 1}. \quad (18)$$

Returning to Eq. (15), the average length is obtained using (16),

$$\langle L \rangle_T = (N - 1)\xi. \quad (19)$$

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 variance  $\Delta L$  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  $N$

$$\frac{\Delta L}{\langle L \rangle_T} \approx \frac{\sqrt{12k_B T}}{\pi \kappa \xi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (20)$$

Thus, the variance 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 variance are intrinsic properties of our model body because the conditions that define them are of the intrinsic character. Similar results could be obtained for the average value of the internal energy. 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 of all prepared states has a fixed 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. In fact, the calculation had to go in the opposite direction: from the assumption of given average value of energy to the temperature and length. But of course the existence of temperature as a Lagrange multiplier and the relation between energy average and temperature would result and it could then be used to carry out the calculation in the way of Appendix A.

Some comment is in order. First, the thermodynamic 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. This may be just a specific property of our model. Indeed, the position of a body  $B$  is not an internal business of  $B$  because it makes sense only in relation to other bodies. One can ask if a different quantum model including a number of other bodies in a weak interaction with a body  $B$  might exhibit an approximate classical dynamics of  $B$ . Work on this problem is in progress.

## **B A model of a kind of measuring process**

This appendix is to show how the ideas of Sec.'s 3 and 4 can be utilized for modelling measuring processes. Let measuring apparatus  $\mathcal{A}$  be quantum system with quantum (microscopic) states and observables on the one hand and macroscopic states on the other. For the purposes of the model, it will be assumed that the macroscopic states of  $\mathcal{A}$  can be uniquely characterized by average values of observable  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$  and that  $\mathbf{A}$  must have sufficiently small variance in them in order that they are accepted as macroscopic. Each two microscopic states that yield the same average of  $\mathbf{A}$ , and satisfy the condition on variances, define thus the same macroscopic state of  $\mathcal{A}$ . In this way, there will never be a linear superposition of macroscopic states. In the following, we assume that the variance condition is satisfied for any state that is considered as macroscopic.

The second element of our model is a microscopic system  $\mathcal{S}$  with quantum states and quantum observables.  $\mathcal{S}$  will interact with  $\mathcal{A}$  and this interaction will transform

$\mathcal{A}$  from its initial into its final macroscopic state. From the final macroscopic states of  $\mathcal{A}$ , we shall read some information about the initial quantum states of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

As the basis of initial states we choose two normalized orthogonal states  $|\psi_1\rangle$  and  $|\psi_2\rangle$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  and two normalized orthogonal quantum states  $|\Psi_1\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_2\rangle$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  such that

$$\langle\Psi_1|\mathbf{A}|\Psi_1\rangle = \langle\Psi_2|\mathbf{A}|\Psi_2\rangle = A_0.$$

Hence, the two microstates define the same macrostate. Let the initial quantum state of the apparatus be a *proper mixture*

$$\frac{1}{2}|\Psi_1\rangle\langle\Psi_1| + \frac{1}{2}|\Psi_2\rangle\langle\Psi_2| \quad (21)$$

Hence,  $A_0$  is the initial value shown by  $A$ .

Suppose now that  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  are brought into interaction that is described by a unitary operator  $\mathbf{U}$ . We define  $\mathbf{U}$  by its action on the basis states:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}|\Psi_1\rangle|\psi_1\rangle &= |\Phi_1\rangle|\phi_1\rangle, \\ \mathbf{U}|\Psi_2\rangle|\psi_1\rangle &= |0\rangle|\phi'_1\rangle, \\ \mathbf{U}|\Psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle &= |0\rangle|\phi'_2\rangle, \\ \mathbf{U}|\Psi_2\rangle|\psi_2\rangle &= |\Phi_2\rangle|\phi_2\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the states  $|\phi_1\rangle$ ,  $|\phi'_1\rangle$ ,  $|\phi_2\rangle$  and  $|\phi'_2\rangle$  are normalized mutually orthogonal states of  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $|\Phi_1\rangle$  and  $|\Phi_2\rangle$  two normalized quantum states of  $\mathcal{A}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\Phi_1|\mathbf{A}|\Phi_1\rangle &= A_1, \\ \langle\Phi_2|\mathbf{A}|\Phi_2\rangle &= A_2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbf{A}|0\rangle = 0.$$

It is clear that the four initial states as well as the four final ones are normalized and mutually orthogonal and that the evolution operator  $\mathbf{U}$  is unitary, at least if restricted to the subspace of interest.

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be in initial state  $\alpha_1|\psi_1\rangle + \alpha_2|\psi_2\rangle$ , where  $|\alpha_1|^2 + |\alpha_2|^2 = 1$ , and let it interact with the apparatus that starts in its initial state (21). Hence, the initial state of whole system  $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{A}$  is a *proper mixture*,

$$\rho_0 = \frac{1}{2}|\chi_1\rangle\langle\chi_1| + \frac{1}{2}|\chi_2\rangle\langle\chi_2|,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi_1\rangle &= |\Psi_1\rangle(\alpha_1|\psi_1\rangle + \alpha_2|\psi_2\rangle) \\ |\chi_2\rangle &= |\Psi_2\rangle(\alpha_1|\psi_1\rangle + \alpha_2|\psi_2\rangle). \end{aligned}$$



The evolution of  $\rho_0$  is again a *proper mixture*,

$$\mathbf{U}\rho_0\mathbf{U}^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}|\chi'_1\rangle\langle\chi'_1| + \frac{1}{2}|\chi'_2\rangle\langle\chi'_2|,$$

where

$$|\chi'_1\rangle = \alpha_1|\Phi_1\rangle|\phi_1\rangle + \alpha_2|0\rangle|\phi'_2\rangle, \quad (22)$$

$$|\chi'_2\rangle = \alpha_1|0\rangle|\phi'_1\rangle + \alpha_2|\Phi_2\rangle|\phi_2\rangle. \quad (23)$$

It follows that, after the measurement that can be considered as a preparation process for  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  will be in *either* of the two states with probabilities 1/2 that depend on the coefficients  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  in the way given in the following table.

	$\alpha_1 \neq 0, \alpha_2 \neq 0$	$\alpha_1 = 0$	$\alpha_2 = 0$
$\langle\chi'_1 \mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{1}_S \chi'_1\rangle =$	$ \alpha_1 ^2 A_1$	0	$A_1$
$\langle\chi'_2 \mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{1}_S \chi'_2\rangle =$	$ \alpha_2 ^2 A_2$	$A_2$	0

The values  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  being known, the coefficients  $|\alpha_1|$  and  $|\alpha_2|$  can be read from the macroscopic states of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

State  $|\chi'_1\rangle$  is defined, as a microstate, by a linear superposition of two microstates, cf. Eq. (22). As a macrostate, however, it is defined by the average value of  $\mathbf{A}$ , and it is therefore identical to  $|\Phi_1\rangle$ . Although each of the microstates on the right-hand side of Eq. (22) defines itself a macrostate, the right-hand side of Eq. (22) does not represent a linear superposition of macrostates. Notion of linear superposition does not make any sense for macrostates as we have defined them.

Clearly, our contraption does not work in the way usual measuring processes do. One cannot however exclude that some model based on similar ideas about modal properties exists which looks better in this respect. Also, the model is rather rough and sketchy. For example, instead of the Hamiltonian of the system  $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{S}$  we just write down a few matrix elements of the evolution operator. A more detailed analysis is planned.

## Acknowledgements

P.H. is indebted to Juerg Gasser and Uwe-Jens Wiese for reading the first version of the manuscript and suggesting many improvements in the text. Important remarks have been sent by Jim Hartle. Anonymous referees have also contributed by their criticisms to better understanding. 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] B. d'Espagnat, *Veiled Reality*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1995.
- [4] C. J. Isham, *Lectures on Quantum Theory. Mathematical and Structural Foundations*, Imperial College Press, London 1995.
- [5] J. R. Searle, *Mind. A brief Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (Ma), 2004.
- [6] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1995.
- [7] J. Tolar and P. Hájíček, Phys. Letters A **353** (2006) 19.
- [8] C. Piron, *Foundations of Quantum Physics*, Benjamin, Reading 1976; C. Piron, Found. Phys. **2** (1972) 287.
- [9] G. Birkhoff and J. von Neumann, The Logic of Quantum Mechanics, Ann. of Math. **37** (1936) 823.
- [10] J. S. Bell, The theory of local beables in *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (England), 1987.
- [11] G. Ludwig, *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Springer, Berlin, 1983.
- [12] K. Kraus, *States, Effects, and Operations*, Springer Lecture Notes in Physics 190, Berlin, 1983.
- [13] W. Thirring, *Lehrbuch der Mathematischen Physik*, Springer, Berlin, 1980.
- [14] A. J. Leggett, J. Phys.: Cond. Mat. **14** (2002) R415.
- [15] F. Exner, *Vorlesungen über die physikalischen Grundlagen der Naturwissenschaften*, Deuticke, Leipzig, 1922.
- [16] M. Born, Phys. Blätter **11** (1955) 49.
- [17] N. G. van Kampen, Physica A **194** (1993) 542.
- [18] E. T. Jaynes, *Probability Theory. The Logic of Science*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (UK) 2003.

- [19] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundation of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ, 1983 .
- [20] J. M. Jauch, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **37** (1964) 293.
- [21] W. H. Zurek, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **75** (2003) 715.
- [22] 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.
- [23] K. Hepp, *Helvetica Phys. Acta*, **45** (1972) 237.
- [24] J. S. Bell, *Helv. Phys. Acta*, **48** (1975) 93.
- [25] P. Bóna, *Acta Phys. Slov.*, **23** (1973) 149, **25** (1975) 3, **27** (1977) 101.
- [26] G. L. Sewell, *Quantum Mechanics and its Emergent Macrophysics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2002.
- [27] D. Poulin, *Phys. Rev. A* **71** (2005) 022102.
- [28] J. Kofler and Č. Brukner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** (2007) 180403.
- [29] J. S. Bell, Against 'measurement' in *Sixty Two Years of Uncertainty*, A. I. Miller (Ed.), Plenum, New York, 1990.
- [30] D. Wallace, The Quantum Measurement Problem: State of Play, arXiv:0712.0149v1 [quant-ph] 3 Dec 2007.
- [31] C. Kittel, *Introduction to Solid State Physics*, Wiley, New York 1976.
- [32] D. E. Rutherford, *Proc. Roy. Soc. (Edinburgh)*, Ser. A, **62** (1947), 229; **63** (1951), 232.