

# Truly chaotic fully quantum systems exist: A simple proof

Maciej Kuna

Wydział Fizyki Technicznej i Matematyki Stosowanej  
Politechnika Gdańska, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland

Chaotic behavior, understood in the classical meaning of this term, can be found at the level of Heisenberg-picture quantum dynamics, even for time-independent Hamiltonians. The example of the Lorenz system shows that sets of observables  $x_k(t)$ ,  $[x_k(t), x_l(t')] = 0$ , can satisfy Heisenberg equations that are identical to their classical counterparts, and thus various standard tests of chaos applied at the level of observables will reveal chaotic behavior. Still, what one observes in experiments are averages of observables evaluated in states and not observables themselves. Exactly chaotic classical behavior of averages can be found in the limiting case of exact eigenstates of  $x_k(0)$ .

PACS numbers: 05.45.Mt, 05.45.-a

Speaking of quantum chaos [1] one typically does not mean the “true chaos” in the sense of hypersensitivity to initial conditions, existence of strange attractors, and the like [2]. The effort of theorists is focused on identifying quantum signatures of chaos, all those fingerprints of chaos that could allow to recognize when a given quantum model might have a chaotic classical limit. But almost nobody believes that a truly chaotic behavior, known from classical dynamical systems, could be found at a fully quantum level, with no semiclassical approximation involved. Various variants of the statement that “there is no quantum chaos” can be found in practically all papers and textbooks written on the subject during the past 30 years. Even the entry 05.45.Mt of 2008 Physics and Astronomy Classification Scheme (PACS) reads: Semiclassical chaos (“quantum chaos”).

The goal of this paper is to give a simple argument showing that there is, in fact, no contradiction between unitarity of quantum evolution and chaotic evolution of some *quantum* physical quantities. The main technical trick I will employ can be traced back to the old paper by Chirikov, Izrailev, and Shepelyansky (CIS) [3]. However, my reasoning is more straightforward and, first of all, allows to use the standard classical criteria for chaos, whereas the CIS construction requires criteria designed especially for quantum systems, whose precise characterization is still open. My conclusions also agree with the analysis of Weigert who arrived at chaotic behavior of a quantum system by a quantum analogue of Arnold’s cat map [4, 5, 6]. Let me stress that the notion of chaos I will use is the most traditional one: Certain physical quantities associated with the quantum system evolve in way that involves hypersensitivity, strange attractors, and all the other characteristics of *classical* chaotic systems. We will discuss in more detail the important example of the Lorenz model.

Let us begin with the set of classical first-order ordinary differential equations for some variables  $x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t)$ ,

$$\dot{x}_k = V_k(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad k = 1, \dots, n. \quad (1)$$

There exists a simple trick that allows to turn (1) into a Hamiltonian system. Let us take the set of new variables  $p_1(t), \dots, p_n(t)$ , and define

$$H(x_1, \dots, x_n, p_1, \dots, p_n) = \sum_k p_k V_k(x_1, \dots, x_n). \quad (2)$$

Then

$$\dot{x}_k = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_k} = V_k, \quad (3)$$

$$\dot{p}_k = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x_k}, \quad (4)$$

defines a set of Hamilton equations containing the dynamical system (1) as its closed subset. Having solved (3) we are left with the set of linear equations with time dependent coefficients, whose solution always exists. From the point of view of classical dynamical systems the trick is probably too trivial to produce anything interesting. However, when applied in the quantum context, it equally trivially leads to Hamiltonians that imply a chaotic behavior.

To see this, let us assume that  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , are some commuting “position” operators. We define the associated momentum operators in the standard way by  $[x_k, p_l] = i\hbar\delta_{kl}$  (say, in the Schrödinger representation  $p_l = -i\hbar\nabla_l$ ). The CIS Hamiltonian reads

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \left( p_k V_k(x_1, \dots, x_n) + V_k(x_1, \dots, x_n) p_k \right) \quad (5)$$

In the Heisenberg picture we have  $x_k(t) = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}Ht} x_k e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}Ht}$ , and

$$\dot{x}_k = \frac{1}{i\hbar} [x_k, H] = V_k(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad k = 1, \dots, n. \quad (6)$$

We can complicate the system a little by adding to (5) some free Hamiltonian  $H_0$ , but then (6) will hold in the interaction picture.

For example, for the Lorenz system

$$\dot{x} = \sigma(y - x), \quad (7)$$

$$\dot{y} = x(\tau - z) - y, \quad (8)$$

$$\dot{z} = xy - \beta z, \quad (9)$$

we find

$$H = \sigma(y p_x - \frac{1}{2}(x p_x + p_x x)) + x(\tau - z)p_y - \frac{1}{2}(y p_y + p_y y) + x y p_z - \frac{\beta}{2}(z p_z + p_z z). \quad (10)$$

It is an invariant of the dynamics, but not of the same type as the Kuś invariants occurring for some choices of  $\beta$ ,  $\sigma$ , and  $\tau$  [7]. The Heisenberg equations for canonical variables,

$$\dot{x} = \frac{1}{i\hbar}[x, H] = \sigma(y - x), \quad (11)$$

$$\dot{y} = \frac{1}{i\hbar}[y, H] = x(\tau - z) - y, \quad (12)$$

$$\dot{z} = \frac{1}{i\hbar}[z, H] = xy - \beta z, \quad (13)$$

$$\dot{p}_x = \frac{1}{i\hbar}[p_x, H] = \sigma p_x - (\tau - z)p_y - y p_z, \quad (14)$$

$$\dot{p}_y = \frac{1}{i\hbar}[p_y, H] = -\sigma p_x + p_y - x p_z, \quad (15)$$

$$\dot{p}_z = \frac{1}{i\hbar}[p_z, H] = x p_y + \beta p_z, \quad (16)$$

are identical to the set of Hamilton equations we would

have found in the classical case. The first three equations give us the Lorenz system for the *observables*  $x(t)$ ,  $y(t)$ , and  $z(t)$ . Let us stress that the operators  $x(t)$ ,  $y(t')$ ,  $z(t'')$ , form an Abelian algebra for all  $t$ ,  $t'$ , and  $t''$ . It is known that in such a case the standard criteria for chaos (such as positivity of the Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy) would give the same results as in the purely classical case.

The above model can be translated into quantum optical terms by introducing creation and annihilation operators corresponding to  $x$ ,  $y$ ,  $z$ , and adding a free-field Hamiltonian  $H_0$ . The resulting three-mode Hamiltonian will involve three squeezing terms plus a three-photon three-mode interaction.

If  $x_k$  is the Schrödinger-picture form of position operators in position representation of canonical commutation relations, then

$$x_k(t)\psi(a_1, \dots, a_k, \dots, a_n) = f_k(t, a_1, \dots, a_k, \dots, a_n)\psi(a_1, \dots, a_k, \dots, a_n), \quad (17)$$

where  $f_k(t, a_1, \dots, a_k, \dots, a_n)$  is a solution of the classical dynamical problem (1) with initial conditions  $f_k(0, a_1, \dots, a_n) = a_k$ , and  $\psi(a_1, \dots, a_k, \dots, a_n)$  is the wave function at  $t = 0$ . The average value of the evolving observable thus reads

$$\langle \psi | x_k(t) | \psi \rangle = \int da_1 \dots da_n f_k(t, a_1, \dots, a_n) |\psi(a_1, \dots, a_n)|^2. \quad (18)$$

The latter formula suggestively explains the kind of chaos one can find in the quantum system. First of all, the right-hand-side of (18) is indistinguishable from the classical average position

$$\langle x_k(t) \rangle = \int da_1 \dots da_n f_k(t, a_1, \dots, a_n) \rho(a_1, \dots, a_n) \quad (19)$$

obtained by averaging with respect to some probability density  $\rho(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  of initial conditions. In particular, the average (18) is not in any sense related to the Planck constant which is absent both in the evolution equation (which is just the Lorenz system) and in the initial probability density, which is arbitrary. So the standard argument that the absence of quantum chaos is implied by uncertainty principles is inapplicable here.

In the limiting case of the eigenstate of position operators, where the wave packet shrinks to the Dirac delta centered at  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ , the average follows the trajectory  $X_k(t) = f_k(t, X_1, \dots, X_n)$ . This is exactly the same

behavior one would have found for the classical probability density  $\rho(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \delta(a_1 - X_1) \dots \delta(a_n - X_n)$ . If the dynamics is chaotic, the system that starts from an eigenstate also evolves in a chaotic way. However, the eigenstates are not normalizable since  $x_k$  have, by assumption, continuous spectrum. Therefore realistic systems will exist in *superpositions* of localizations on different, perhaps chaotic trajectories. In other words, in realistic quantum systems

$$|\psi(a_1, \dots, a_n)|^2 \neq \delta(a_1 - X_1) \dots \delta(a_n - X_n), \quad (20)$$

but nevertheless the initial state  $|\psi(a_1, \dots, a_n)|^2$  can be arbitrarily sharply peaked. It is obvious that this is not an indication of the lack of chaos, since an identical problem occurs in realistic classical chaotic systems. The quantum system is simply as unpredictable as its classical counterpart, if one does not *exactly* know the initial condition..

Let me try to put all of this in a wider context. How is it possible that in spite of linearity of quantum mechanics we have systems evolving chaotically? The answer is very simple: Heisenberg-picture equations are typically nonlinear — this is anyway why one can speak of nonlinear quantum optics. Quantum chaos can exist because operator equations for observables can be chaotic. Actually, this is the point of view we tried to advocate a long time ago with Adam Majewski in our papers on quantum Lyapunov exponents. The first definition of a Lyapunov exponent at the level of Heisenberg-picture equations was discussed in [8] (for further developments cf. [9]; the relations between [8] and [9] were discussed in detail in [10]), but at that time we could not find a convincing example of a chaotic Heisenberg equation, although systems with instabilities were known [11]. The Hamiltonian (10) solves the problem in a trivial way.

The issues require further studies. For example it is interesting to investigate numerically what happens to the averages (18) if we compare two different wave packets of compact and disjoint supports. They will involve superpositions of disjoint families of trajectories and thus their centers of mass may escape from one another in an exponential way, at least in principle. Another question is to qualitatively investigate the behavior of  $f_k(t, X_1, \dots, X_n) - \langle \psi | x_k(t) | \psi \rangle$  as we shrink  $|\psi(a_1, \dots, a_n)|^2$  towards  $\delta(a_1 - X_1) \dots \delta(a_n - X_n)$ . One expects that the sharper the wave packet the longer the average will follow the classical trajectory, but simple intuitions may be misleading.

I'm indebted to Marek Czachor, Adam Majewski, and Stefan Weigert for discussions that helped to improve the argument and its presentation.

- 
- [1] F. Haake, *Quantum Signatures of Chaos* (Springer, Berlin, 2001).
- [2] M. Berry, Introductory remarks, in *Adriatico Research Conference and Miniworkshop on Quantum Chaos*, H. A. Cerdeira, R. Ramaswamy, M. C. Gutzwiller and G. Casati (eds.) (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991), pp. vii-viii.
- [3] B. V. Chirikov, F. M. Izrailev, and D. L. Shepelyansky, Quantum chaos: Localization vs. ergodicity, *Physica D* **33**, 77 (1988).
- [4] S. Weigert, The configurational quantum cat map *Z. Phys. B* **80**, 3 (1990).
- [5] S. Weigert, Chaos and quantum-nondemolition measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **43** 6597 (1991).
- [6] S. Weigert, Quantum chaos in the configurational quantum cat map, *Phys. Rev. A* **48**, 1780 (1993).
- [7] M. Kuś, Integrals of motion for the Lorenz system, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **16**, L689 (1983)
- [8] W. A. Majewski and M. Kuna, On quantum characteristic exponents, *J. Math. Phys.* **34**, 5007 (1993).
- [9] G. G. Emch, H. Narhofer, W. Thirring, and G. L. Sewell, Anosov actions on noncommutative algebras, *J. Math. Phys.* **35**, 5582 (1994).
- [10] W. A. Majewski and M. Marciniak, On quantum Lyapunov exponents, *J. Phys. A* **39**, L523 (2006).
- [11] M. Kuna and W. A. Majewski, Quantum dynamical system with hyperbolic instabilities, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **34**, 2205 (1995).