

# Probabilistic observables, conditional correlations, and quantum physics

C. Wetterich

*Institut für Theoretische Physik  
Universität Heidelberg  
Philosophenweg 16, D-69120 Heidelberg*

We discuss the classical statistics of probabilistic observables. For two-level probabilistic observables only a probability for finding the values one or minus one can be given for any micro-state of the statistical ensemble. They can be realized as classical observables with sharp values on a substate level. For a continuous family of micro-states parameterized by a sphere all the quantum mechanics for a two-state system follows under the assumption that the purity of the ensemble is conserved by the time evolution. The non-commutative correlation functions of quantum mechanics correspond to the use of conditional correlation functions in classical statistics. Quantum mechanics can be derived from a classical statistical setting with infinitely many micro-states.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum statistics is often believed to be fundamentally different from classical statistics. In quantum statistics, the complex probability amplitudes and transition amplitudes play a key role. Probabilities only obtain as squares of the amplitude, and this gives rise to spectacular phenomena as interference and entanglement. In contrast, classical statistics is directly formulated in terms of positive probabilities. Furthermore, unitarity is the most characteristic feature of the time evolution in quantum mechanics. This aspect is not easily visible in the time evolution of classical probabilities. Finally, the quantum mechanical uncertainty principle is based on the non-commutativity of the operator product, while the pointwise product of observables in classical statistics is obviously commutative.

We argue that the difference between quantum statistics and classical statistics is only apparent. We demonstrate that quantum mechanics can be described as a classical statistical system with infinitely many micro-states. In this paper we concentrate on a system that is equivalent to a two-state quantum system. We consider discrete observables that can only take values  $\pm 1$ . They correspond to the spin operators of the equivalent quantum system. We will obtain the characteristic features of non-commuting spin operators in a classical setting. All the usual uncertainty relations of quantum mechanics are directly implemented. Interference can be described in a classical statistical system with simple discrete observables.

We formulate the condition for the time evolution of a classical ensemble that leads to the unitarity characteristic for the quantum evolution. It involves the concept of purity of a statistical ensemble. A purity conserving time evolution in classical statistics is equivalent to the unitary time evolution in quantum mechanics. Pure classical states are those where one of the discrete observables takes a sharp value, say  $+1$ . This means that the probability vanishes for all states where the value of the observable takes a value different from one. Pure classical states correspond to pure quantum states and can be described by a wave function. We derive the von Neumann and Schrödinger equations for these states.

The reader may cast strong doubts about these state-

ments from the beginning. The big conceptual puzzles of quantum mechanics, as the Einstein-Rosen-Podolski paradoxon [1], have triggered a lot of attempts to replace quantum mechanics by a more fundamental deterministic theory. Based on Bells inequalities [2] for correlators of entangled states it was argued that such attempts cannot succeed. However, Bells inequalities assume implicitly that two measurements are appropriately described by the classical correlation function for observables. We stress that the classical correlations should only be used if two measurements are independent of each other, in the sense that the second measurement is not influenced by the first.

For the measurements characteristic for quantum systems such a “classical measurement situation” is not given. In general, the first measurement changes the state of the system, and the second measurement is performed with new conditions, depending on the outcome of the first measurement. The idealized situation where the effect of the first measurement on the state of the system can be neglected is realized for many large systems, but not for systems with only a few effective degrees of freedom, as often characteristic for those described by quantum theory. If the outcome of the first measurement matters for the second, conditional probabilities should be used. We define within classical statistics a “conditional product” of two observables, and the associated “conditional correlations”. We show how to express the conditional correlation functions in terms of quantum mechanical operator products. They equal the appropriate conditional correlations defined in quantum mechanics. If the correct conditional correlations are used for a description of two consecutive measurements we obtain the same results for the classical statistics and the quantum description. No conflict with Bells inequalities arises for the classical statistics implementation of quantum mechanics.

In this paper we present a rather detailed account of the classical statistics description of a quantum mechanical two-state system. We investigate discrete observables which can only take the values  $\pm 1$ . A useful notion is the concept of “probabilistic observables” which are characterized by a probability to find the value  $+1$  or  $-1$  in every micro-state. Probabilistic observables can be implemented as classical observables if the micro-state consists of sev-

eral or even infinitely many substates. In other words, once part of the degrees of freedom of a classical statistical system - the substates - are “integrated out”, a classical observable on the substate level becomes a probabilistic observable on the level of the remaining micro-states. The quantum mechanical pure and mixed states will be associated with particular micro-states. A typical observable may have a sharp value for particular micro-states, but typically a probability distribution of different values in the other micro-states. Therefore no contradiction to the Kochen-Specker-theorem [3] arises, even if all observables have sharp values on the substate level. The implementation on the level of substates is actually not necessary and we will treat the probabilistic observables as genuine objects of a classical statistical description of reality.

In this paper we do not address the question if a deterministic “hidden variable theory” of quantum mechanics is possible in a setting with infinitely many classical states describing a two-state quantum system. We rather take the attitude that a realistic description of the world is genuinely probabilistic. Our aim is a demonstration that the conceptual foundations of quantum mechanics do not need to go beyond the standard concepts of classical statistics.

The classical statistical description of quantum mechanics can be generalized to systems with more than two quantum states. In a four-state system we have described the phenomenon of entanglement between two two-state subsystems [4]. Entanglement is often believed to be the center piece of quantum statistics. It is a central issue of many theoretical discussions about the foundations of quantum mechanics, as decoherence [5] or the measurement process [6], and it underlies the idea of quantum computing[7]. Spectacular experiments on teleportation [8] rely on it. A classical statistics description of entanglement may find useful practical applications and influence the conceptual and philosophical discussion based on this phenomenon.

The author has made earlier attempts to describe quantum features in a classical statistical setting, based on the postulate that the basic description of reality should be of a classical statistical nature [9]. The time evolution of classical many body systems of non-relativistic bosons reveals quantum features [10]. The concepts of quantum states and quantum correlations have been discussed in a setting of “incomplete statistics” [11], where only part of the information contained in the probability distribution is actually needed for expectation values of observables that are localized in a given time or space interval. However, no complete realization of quantum mechanics as a classical statistical system has been achieved previously.

This paper is organized as follows. In sect. II we discuss the notion of probabilistic observables, with particular emphasis on two-level observables that may also be called spins. Sect. III compares the realization of rotations in the classical and quantum statistical setting. The classical system needs an infinity of micro-states if a continuous rotation is to be realized. At least one “classical pure state” must exist for every rotation-angle. In sect. IV we reduce the infinity of classical micro-states to a finite number of effective states. All expectation values of the spin observ-

ables can be computed in the effective state description. The prize of the reduction is, however, that the “effective probabilities” are not necessarily positive anymore. In sect. V we construct the density matrix  $\rho$  of quantum mechanics from the effective probabilities. We establish for our classical statistical ensemble the quantum mechanical rule for the computation of expectation values of observables,  $\langle A \rangle = \text{tr}(A\rho)$ .

Sect. VI turns to the issue of correlation functions and introduces the conditional product of two observables and the conditional correlation. The conditional product is not commutative since the order of two consecutive measurements matters. Nevertheless, the conditional two point function is commutative. This does not hold for the higher conditional correlation functions - the three point function is not commutative. Sect. VII completes the mapping between classical statistics and quantum statistics. We introduce the wave function for pure states and relate conditional probabilities to squares of quantum mechanical transition amplitudes. We then derive the expression of the conditional correlations in terms of quantum mechanical operator products. The non-commutativity of the conditional three point function can be directly traced to non-vanishing commutators of operators. The derivation of these results demonstrates the use of quantum mechanical transition amplitudes.

Sect. VIII turns to the time evolution. We define the purity  $P$  of a statistical ensemble - in our case

$$P = 2\text{tr}\rho^2 - 1. \quad (1)$$

A purity conserving time evolution amounts to the unitary time transformation of quantum mechanics. Furthermore, a more general time evolution of the classical ensemble can describe decoherence for decreasing purity, as well as “syncoherence” for increasing purity. We argue that the quantum mechanical pure states correspond to partial fixed points of the more general time evolution in classical statistics. In sect. IX we briefly discuss classical systems with a finite number of states  $N$ , which may be used to obtain quantum mechanics in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Sect. X discusses the possible realizations of probabilistic observables, and our conclusions are presented in sect. XI.

## II. PROBABILISTIC OBSERVABLES

*Expectation values.* Consider a probabilistic system with  $N$  classical micro-states, labeled by  $\alpha = 1\dots N$ , and characterized by probabilities  $p_\alpha \geq 0$ ,  $\sum_\alpha p_\alpha = 1$ . A classical observable  $A^{(cl)}$  is specified by  $N$  real numbers  $\bar{A}_\alpha$ , such that the expectation value reads

$$\langle A \rangle = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \bar{A}_\alpha p_\alpha. \quad (2)$$

This means that in a given micro-state  $\alpha$  the classical observable has a *fixed* value, namely  $\bar{A}_\alpha$ . The probabilistic

nature of the system arises only from the probabilities to find a given micro-state  $\alpha$ .

We generalize this concept by introducing probabilistic observables, for which we can only give probabilities to find a certain value in a given micro-state  $\alpha$ . A probabilistic observable is characterized by a set of real functions  $w_\alpha(x) \geq 0$ , normalized according to  $\int dx w_\alpha(x) = 1$ . The expectation values of powers of the probabilistic observables in a *given* micro-state  $\alpha$  obey

$$A_\alpha^Q = \int dx x^Q w_\alpha(x), \quad \bar{A}_\alpha = \int dx x w_\alpha(x). \quad (3)$$

Correspondingly, the expectation values in a macro-state of the probabilistic system reads

$$\langle A^Q \rangle = \sum_\alpha A_\alpha^Q p_\alpha, \quad \langle A \rangle = \sum_\alpha \bar{A}_\alpha p_\alpha. \quad (4)$$

Classical observables correspond to the special case

$$w_\alpha(x) = \delta(x - \bar{A}_\alpha), \quad A_\alpha^Q = (\bar{A}_\alpha)^Q. \quad (5)$$

In this case all moments  $A_\alpha^Q$  are fixed in terms of the mean value in the micro-state  $\alpha$ , i.e. the moment for  $Q = 1$ ,  $\bar{A}_\alpha = \int dx x w_\alpha(x)$ . In contrast, for the most general probabilistic observables the infinite set of moments  $A_\alpha^Q$  may be used in order to parameterize the distribution  $w_\alpha(x)$ . For the most general probabilistic observable much more information is therefore needed for its precise specification, namely infinitely many real numbers  $A_\alpha^Q$  instead of the  $N$  real numbers  $\bar{A}_\alpha$  for a classical observable. The probabilistic nature of the system is now twofold. It arises from the probability distribution  $w_\alpha(x)$  to find the value  $x$  of the observable in the micro-state  $\alpha$ , and from the probability distribution for the micro-states,  $\{p_\alpha\}$ , characterizing a given macro-state or ensemble. The relation (2) for the expectation value of  $A$  remains valid for probabilistic observables. However, the expectation values of higher powers  $A^Q$ ,  $Q \geq 2$ , as given by eq. (4), may differ from classical observables (cf. eq. (5)).

*Two-level observables.* As a specific example for a probabilistic observable we concentrate in this paper on the bi-modal distribution

$$\begin{aligned} w_\alpha(x) &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + \bar{A}_\alpha)\delta(x - 1) + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \bar{A}_\alpha)\delta(x + 1), \\ -1 \leq \bar{A}_\alpha \leq 1, \quad \bar{A}_\alpha &= \int dx x w_\alpha(x), \\ A_\alpha^2 &= \int dx x^2 w_\alpha(x) = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In any micro-state  $\alpha$  the observable can only take the values  $+1$  or  $-1$ . In other words, for a given micro-state  $\alpha$  the observable is specified by the relative probabilities  $w_{\alpha+} = (1 + \bar{A}_\alpha)/2$  and  $w_{\alpha-} = (1 - \bar{A}_\alpha)/2$ . Thus  $N$  real numbers  $\bar{A}_\alpha$  are again sufficient to specify the “two-level observables” obeying eq. (6). The moments are given by

$$A_\alpha^Q = \begin{cases} \bar{A}_\alpha & \text{for } Q \text{ odd} \\ 1 & \text{for } Q \text{ even} \end{cases}, \quad (7)$$

implying for the macro-state

$$\langle A^Q \rangle = \begin{cases} \sum_\alpha \bar{A}_\alpha p_\alpha & \text{for } Q \text{ odd} \\ 1 & \text{for } Q \text{ even} \end{cases}. \quad (8)$$

We may realize the ensemble or the macro-state by an infinite set of measurements with identical conditions. Each measurement realizes a particular microstate, and the  $p_\alpha$  give the relative numbers how often a given micro-state  $\alpha$  is encountered in the ensemble. Since for any given micro-state the two-level observable can only take the values  $+1$  or  $-1$ , the series of measurements of  $A$  will produce a series of values  $+1$  or  $-1$ , with relative probabilities  $w_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \langle A \rangle)$ . This is an easy way to understand why  $\langle A^2 \rangle = 1$  for arbitrary  $\{p_\alpha\}$ . The situation amounts exactly to a quantum mechanical spin  $1/2$ -system, with an appropriate normalization of the spin operator, say in the  $z$ -direction,  $\hat{s}_z = (\hbar/2)\hat{S}_z$ : each measurement will give one of the eigenvalues  $\pm 1$  of the operator  $\hat{S}_z$ . We will see that the association of the probabilistic two-level observable  $A$  with a quantum-mechanical spin can be pushed much further than the possible outcome of a series of measurements. We will therefore often denote the two-level observables by “spins”, but the reader should keep in mind that we treat here with purely classical probabilistic objects.

Two-level observables are the simplest non-classical probabilistic observables. By simple shifts they can be easily generalized to any situation where an observable can only take two values (two “levels”) in any given micro-state, like occupied / empty. One bit is enough for the possible values of the observable in a micro-state  $\alpha$ , say  $0$  for  $x = -1$  and  $1$  for  $x = 1$ . Nevertheless, the specification of the probabilistic observable needs the real numbers  $\bar{A}_\alpha$ . Instead of a continuous distribution  $w_\alpha(x)$  we can replace eq. (3) by a discrete sum

$$A_\alpha^Q = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x=\pm 1} x^Q (1 + x \bar{A}_\alpha). \quad (9)$$

A single two-level observable can be represented as a classical observable in an extended statistical system. It is sufficient to assume that each micro-state  $\alpha$  consists of the substates  $\alpha+$  and  $\alpha-$ , in which the observable has either the sharp value  $+1$  (for  $\alpha+$ ) or  $-1$  (for  $\alpha-$ ). The probabilities for the substates are then given by  $p_{\alpha+} = p_\alpha(1 + \bar{A}_\alpha)/2$ ,  $p_{\alpha-} = p_\alpha(1 - \bar{A}_\alpha)/2$ .

### III. SPIN ROTATIONS IN CLASSICAL STATISTICS

We may start with a single two-level observable or spin and a system with only two micro-states, i.e. the states  $(+)(\alpha = 1)$  and  $(-)(\alpha = 2)$ , with  $\bar{A}_1 = 1$ ,  $\bar{A}_2 = -1$ . The expectation value reads  $\langle A \rangle = p_1 - p_2$ . Since for all  $\alpha$  one has  $|\bar{A}_\alpha| = 1$ , this special case corresponds actually to a classical observable. The distribution (6) involves only one  $\delta$ -function,  $w_1(x) = \delta(x - 1)$ ,  $w_2(x) = \delta(x + 1)$ . If we assign instead the values  $\bar{A}_1 = \bar{A}_2 = 0$  we encounter

a genuinely probabilistic variable, leading in this case to a random distribution of  $+1$  and  $-1$  measurements.

An interesting case with two spin observables involves four classical micro-states, that we denote by  $(+1)$  or  $(\pi)(\alpha = 1)$ ,  $(-1)$  or  $(-\pi)(\alpha = 2)$ ,  $(+2)$  or  $(\frac{\pi}{2})(\alpha = 3)$  and  $(-2)$  or  $(-\frac{\pi}{2})(\alpha = 4)$ , according to the full dots in Fig. 1. The corresponding values of  $\bar{A}^{(1)}$  and  $\bar{A}^{(2)}$  are shown in




FIG. 1: Location of micro-states and expectation values of spins

the left half of Table I. The expectation values of the two

	(0)	$(\pi)$	$(\frac{\pi}{2})$	$(-\frac{\pi}{2})$	$(\frac{\pi}{4})$	$(-\frac{\pi}{4})$	$(\frac{3\pi}{4})$	$(-\frac{3\pi}{4})$
$\bar{A}_\alpha^{(1)}$	1	-1	0	0	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$
$\bar{A}_\alpha^{(2)}$	0	0	1	-1	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

TABLE I: Mean values of spin observables in different micro-states

spins obey

$$\langle A^{(1)} \rangle = p_1 - p_2, \quad \langle A^{(2)} \rangle = p_3 - p_4. \quad (10)$$

We note that both  $A^{(1)}$  and  $A^{(2)}$  are truly probabilistic observables since in some micro-states they have a zero mean value and thus equal probability for  $+1$  and  $-1$  values. We could also include observables with opposite mean values. Since they are obviously just a multiplication of  $A^{(k)}$  by  $-1$ , we will not discuss them separately.

On this level the probabilistic observables could again be expressed in terms of classical observables for a system with a higher number of states. We may assume that each micro-state consists of four subsets with fixed values for  $A^{(1)}$  and  $A^{(2)}$ , i.e.  $++$ ,  $+-$ ,  $-+$  and  $--$ , such that we have a total of sixteen classical substates. Their probabilities can be denoted by  $p_{\alpha++}, p_{\alpha+-}$  etc., with  $p_{1++} = \frac{1}{2}p_1$ ,  $p_{1+-} = \frac{1}{2}p_1$ ,  $p_{1-+} = p_{1--} = 0$  and similar for the other  $\alpha$ . On the level of the substates the observables  $A^{(1)}$  and  $A^{(2)}$  are classical observables, with  $\bar{A}_\alpha^{(1)} = p_{\alpha++} + p_{\alpha+-} - p_{\alpha-+} - p_{\alpha--}$ ,  $\bar{A}_\alpha^{(2)} = p_{\alpha++} - p_{\alpha+-} + p_{\alpha-+} - p_{\alpha--}$ . When we will later

discuss the time evolution of the ensemble, we will keep the relative probabilities for the substates, i.e. the ratios  $p_{1++}/p_1$ ,  $p_{2+-}/p_2$  etc. fixed, according to the fixed entries in table I. This defines the notion of fixed probabilistic observables. Again, this discussion demonstrates how probabilistic observables can be implemented in standard classical statistics with classical observables. We emphasize, however, that such an implementation is not necessary and we will consider the probabilistic observables as genuine statistical objects.

For probabilistic observables we encounter features well known from quantum mechanics. There are states where a given observable cannot have a sharp value. For example, the spin  $A^{(2)}$  has a mean value zero in the states  $(0)$  and  $(\pi)$ . For  $p_1 \equiv p_{(0)} = 1$ ,  $p_2 = p_3 = p_4 = 0$ , we find a maximum variance for  $A^{(2)}$ , namely  $\langle (A^{(2)})^2 \rangle - \langle A^{(2)} \rangle^2 = 1$ . On the other hand, for the state  $(\pi/2)$ , i.e.  $p_1 = p_2 = p_4 = 0$ ,  $p_3 \equiv p_{(\pi/2)} = 1$ , the variance vanishes and  $A^{(2)}$  has a sharp value. In analogy to quantum mechanics we will denote the states where some observable has zero variance, i.e.  $\langle A \rangle^2 = 1$ , as “classical eigenstates” for this observable. We call the value of the observable in such a classical eigenstate the “classical eigenvalue”. For the spin  $A^{(2)}$  we have two eigenstates,  $(\pi/2)$  and  $(-\pi/2)$ , with respective eigenvalues  $+1$  and  $-1$ . The setting of table 1 is analogous to two orthogonal spins in the quantum mechanics of a spin  $1/2$  system. If one observable has a sharp value, the other has maximal uncertainty.

We want to push the analogy with quantum mechanics even further and describe rotations in the plane spanned by the two spins within our setting of classical statistics. At this stage we encounter a major problem. Rotating the pure state  $(0)$  by an angle  $\pi/4$ , we should arrive at expectation values  $\langle A^{(1)} \rangle = \langle A^{(2)} \rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}$ . This can not be realized in our system of four micro-states. Indeed, the sum of the components should be  $\langle A^{(1)} \rangle + \langle A^{(2)} \rangle = \sqrt{2}$ , while for an arbitrary probability distribution  $\{p_\alpha\}$  we find the inequality

$$\langle A^{(1)} \rangle + \langle A^{(2)} \rangle = p_1 - p_2 + p_3 - p_4 \leq 1. \quad (11)$$

While the rotations of the state  $(0)$  should lie on the circle in Fig. 1, the allowed macro-states of our four-state system are inside the square enclosed by the dashed lines. Only the four particular “pure states”, where one of the  $p_\alpha$  equals one, obey  $\langle A^{(1)} \rangle^2 + \langle A^{(2)} \rangle^2 = 1$ . For  $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $p_2 = p_4 = 0$  one has  $\langle A^{(1)} \rangle = \langle A^{(2)} \rangle = 1/2$  and therefore  $\langle A^{(1)} \rangle^2 + \langle A^{(2)} \rangle^2 = 1/2$ .

One may improve the situation by considering a classical system with eight microstates. For this purpose we add four more states denoted by  $(\pi/4)$ ,  $(-\pi/4)$ ,  $(3\pi/4)$ ,  $(-3\pi/4)$  - cf. the open circles in Fig. 1. The mean values of the spins  $A^{(1)}$  and  $A^{(2)}$  in each of these four additional states are shown in the second part of Table I. The average values in an arbitrary macro-state

are given by the eight probabilities  $p_\alpha$  according to

$$\begin{aligned}\langle A^{(1)} \rangle &= p_{(0)} - p_{(\pi)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})} + p_{(-\frac{\pi}{4})} - p_{(\frac{3\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{3\pi}{4})} \right), \\ \langle A^{(2)} \rangle &= p_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} - p_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{\pi}{4})} + p_{(\frac{3\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{3\pi}{4})} \right).\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

A rotation by  $\pi/4$  is now described by a change from the state (0) to the state  $(\pi/4)$ . We define as ‘‘classical pure states’’ the ones which have one probability  $p_\alpha$  exactly equal to one and the others vanishing,  $p_{\alpha \neq \bar{\alpha}} = 0$ . We have now eight pure states, and for all of them one observes  $\langle A^{(1)} \rangle^2 + \langle A^{(2)} \rangle^2 = 1$ . The rotation of a pure state switches to another pure state. It is *not* realized by ‘‘mixed states’’ for which  $\sum_\alpha p_\alpha^2 < 1$ . (Note that rotations for mixed states with  $\langle A^{(1)} \rangle^2 + \langle A^{(2)} \rangle^2 \leq 1/2$  could, in principle, be realized by a suitable trajectory in the space of probability distributions  $\{p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4\}$ .)

For the system with eight states we can also define two further two-level observables, namely  $A^{(\pi/4)}$  and  $A^{(-\pi/4)}$ . These ‘‘diagonal spins’’ are specified by their mean values in the eight micro-states, as given by the entries in Table II. At this stage they are not obviously related to linear combinations of  $A^{(1)}$  and  $A^{(2)}$  - in fact, linear combinations are a priori not defined for the two-level observables that can only take values +1 and -1 for any measurement. We will only later introduce a concept of linear combinations such that the diagonal spins correspond to a rotation of the spins  $A^{(1)}$  and  $A^{(2)}$ , similar to quantum mechanics.

	(0)	( $\pi$ )	( $\frac{\pi}{2}$ )	( $-\frac{\pi}{2}$ )	( $\frac{\pi}{4}$ )	( $-\frac{\pi}{4}$ )	( $\frac{3\pi}{4}$ )	( $-\frac{3\pi}{4}$ )
$\bar{A}_\alpha^{(\pi/4)}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	1	0	0	-1
$\bar{A}_\alpha^{(-\pi/4)}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	0	1	-1	0

TABLE II: Mean values for ‘‘diagonal spins’’ in different micro-states.

By suitable mixed states we can realize in the eight-state-system all expectation values of  $A^{(1)}$  and  $A^{(2)}$  within the dotted octogone in Fig. 1. Rotations for mixed states could now be achieved by appropriate  $\{p_\alpha\}$  if  $\langle A^{(1)} \rangle^2 + \langle A^{(2)} \rangle^2 \leq (2 + \sqrt{2})/4$ . For example,  $p_{(0)} = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})} = \frac{1}{2}$  yields  $\langle A^{(1)} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right)$ ,  $\langle A^{(2)} \rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$ . For pure states, however, we still cannot realize the continuous rotations on the circle of Fig. 1, but only a discrete subset of rotations in units of  $\pi/4$ , corresponding to the  $Z_8$ -subgroup of the  $SO(2)$  rotation group.

It is clear how to improve further by adding additional micro-states which interpolate closer and closer to the circle. The rotation problem for two spins can be solved by considering *infinitely many* different micro-states, each corresponding to a particular angle on the circle. With a finite number of  $N$  micro-states we can come arbitrarily close to the continuous rotations by realizing a  $Z_N$ -subgroup. The full rotation group obtains in a well defined limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

The need of infinitely many micro-states for describing the rotation of a pure state in classical statistics should come as no surprise. By definition a pure state in classical statistics has zero variance for all *classical* observables. It is realized for probability distributions where one  $p_\alpha$  equals one, while all others are zero. For classical pure states the statistical character of the probability distribution  $\{p_\alpha\}$  is lost and each macro-state corresponds to one particular micro-state. The continuous rotation of a spin variable therefore requires a continuous family of micro-states. In other words, the continuous rotation of a planet is not described by different mixed states in a probability distribution, but just by different values of the angle which denotes the (deterministic) classical states which are pure states in a statistical sense. (Of course, pure states are only a very good approximation to the real statistical character of the planet.) The only thing that we have done in this section is a generalization of this situation from classical observables to the probabilistic two level observables. Nevertheless, this has a far reaching consequence: infinitely many classical states are needed for the description of a two-state quantum system.

#### IV. REDUCTION OF DEGREES OF FREEDOM

In contrast to the infinitely many micro-states in classical statistics, it is impressive how quantum mechanics solves the rotation problem very economically: only two quantum states are needed, described by a two-component complex wave function. In fact, the classical solution to the rotation problem seems to be characterized by a huge redundancy. An infinite set of continuous probabilities  $p_\alpha$  is employed to describe the expectation value of a spin observable, which can be characterized by only two continuous variables, the angle and the length  $(\langle A^{(1)} \rangle^2 + \langle A^{(2)} \rangle^2)^{1/2}$ . One may be tempted to reduce the number of degrees of freedom by ‘‘integrating out’’ some of the micro-states, and assigning new ‘‘effective probabilities’’  $\tilde{p}_\alpha$  to the remaining micro-states. This can indeed be done - but the price is that the effective  $\tilde{p}_\alpha$  can also take negative values, or the sum of them may become larger than one. The effective probabilities can therefore no longer be considered as true probabilities.

We may demonstrate this by considering the system with eight classical states,  $(0), (\pi), (\frac{\pi}{2}), (-\frac{\pi}{2}), (\frac{\pi}{4}), (-\frac{\pi}{4}), (\frac{3\pi}{4}), (-\frac{3\pi}{4})$ , and ‘‘integrate out’’ the states  $(\frac{\pi}{4}), (-\frac{\pi}{4}), (\frac{3\pi}{4}), (-\frac{3\pi}{4})$  in favor of new ‘‘effective probabilities’’  $\tilde{p}_{(0)}, \tilde{p}_{(\pi)}, \tilde{p}_{(\frac{\pi}{2})}$  and  $\tilde{p}_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})}$  for the remaining four states. Let us first integrate out only the state  $(\frac{\pi}{4})$ . In order to keep the same expectation values for  $A^{(1)}$  and  $A^{(2)}$  according to eq. (12), we need

$$\begin{aligned}p'_{(0)} - p'_{(\pi)} &= p_{(0)} - p_{(\pi)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})}, \\ p'_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} - p'_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} &= p_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} - p_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})},\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} p'_{(0)} &= p_{(0)} + \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2}}p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})}, \quad p'_{(\pi)} = \frac{\alpha-1}{\sqrt{2}}p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})}, \\ p'_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} &= p_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} + \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}}p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})}, \quad p'_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} = p_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} + \frac{\beta-1}{\sqrt{2}}p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

For the sum this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum &= p'_{(0)} + p'_{(\pi)} + p'_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} + p'_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} \\ &= p_{(0)} + p_{(\pi)} + p_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} + p_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} + \sqrt{2}(\alpha + \beta - 1)p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Consider now the pure microstate  $p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})} = 1$ ,  $p_{(0)} = p_{(\pi)} = p_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} = p_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} = 0$ . If we want  $p'_{(\pi)}$  and  $p'_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})}$  to be positive, we need  $\alpha \geq 1$ ,  $\beta \geq 1$ . However, in this case we obtain  $\sum \geq \sqrt{2}$ . We can therefore not keep simultaneously  $\sum \leq 1$  and all  $p'_\alpha$  positive!

We may fix the coefficients  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  as  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ . Integrating out also the states  $(-\frac{\pi}{4})$ ,  $(\frac{3\pi}{4})$  and  $(-\frac{3\pi}{4})$  we can express the effective probabilities  $\tilde{p}_\alpha$  for the four-state system in terms of the probabilities  $p_\alpha$  of the eight-state system as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{(0)} &= p_{(0)} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left( p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})} + p_{(-\frac{\pi}{4})} - p_{(\frac{3\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{3\pi}{4})} \right), \\ \tilde{p}_{(\pi)} &= p_{(\pi)} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left( p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})} + p_{(-\frac{\pi}{4})} - p_{(\frac{3\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{3\pi}{4})} \right), \\ \tilde{p}_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} &= p_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left( p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{\pi}{4})} + p_{(\frac{3\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{3\pi}{4})} \right), \\ \tilde{p}_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} &= p_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left( p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{\pi}{4})} + p_{(\frac{3\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{3\pi}{4})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

It is easy to verify that also the observables  $A^{(\pi/4)}$  and  $A^{(-\pi/4)}$  keep the same expectation values after the reduction of degrees of freedom. We can now compute the expectation values of all four two-level observables by using eq. (2), with  $\bar{A}_\alpha$  given by the left half of Tables I and II, and  $p_\alpha$  replaced by  $\tilde{p}_\alpha$ . The only memory that we have started from a system with eight microstates is the modified range for the effective probabilities  $\tilde{p}_\alpha$ . Since only the combinations  $\tilde{p}_{(0)} - \tilde{p}_{(\pi)}$  and  $\tilde{p}_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} - \tilde{p}_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})}$  appear in the expectation values, all these statements hold actually for an arbitrary choice of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in eq. (14). The actual range for  $\tilde{p}_\alpha$  depends on the choice of  $\alpha, \beta$  - for the choice (16) we have  $\tilde{p}_\alpha \geq -1/(2\sqrt{2})$  and  $\sum_\alpha \tilde{p}_\alpha \leq 1$ .

We may proceed one step further and also integrate out the states  $(\pi)$  and  $(-\frac{\pi}{2})$ . We denote the resulting effective probabilities by  $\rho_1$  for the state (0) and  $\rho_2$  for the state  $(\frac{\pi}{2})$ . They are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &= \tilde{p}_{(0)} - \tilde{p}_{(\pi)} = p_{(0)} - p_{(\pi)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})} + p_{(-\frac{\pi}{4})} - p_{(\frac{3\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{3\pi}{4})} \right), \\ \rho_2 &= \tilde{p}_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} - \tilde{p}_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} = p_{(\frac{\pi}{2})} - p_{(-\frac{\pi}{2})} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( p_{(\frac{\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{\pi}{4})} + p_{(\frac{3\pi}{4})} - p_{(-\frac{3\pi}{4})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

In the reduced two-state-system the expectation values for the spins simply read

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A^{(1)} \rangle &= \rho_1, \quad \langle A^{(2)} \rangle = \rho_2, \\ \langle A^{(\pi/4)} \rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\rho_1 + \rho_2), \quad \langle A^{(-\pi/4)} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\rho_1 - \rho_2). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The ambiguity associated to the choice of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in the previous step has now disappeared and the  $\rho_k$  are fixed uniquely in terms of the eight original  $p_\alpha$ . This uniqueness follows directly from eq. (18), since the  $\rho_k$  are associated to expectation values which do not change in the course of the reduction of degrees of freedom. One finds for the range of the effective probabilities  $\rho_k$  for the reduced two classical states

$$-1 \leq \rho_k \leq 1, \quad \sum_k \rho_k^2 \leq 1, \quad (19)$$

with  $\sum_k \rho_k^2 = 1$  precisely for the eight original pure classical states. The two state system is the minimal system which can describe the two spins  $A^{(k)}$ .

We could have started our reduction procedure with some other classical system with  $2^M$  micro-states. Proceeding stepwise by reducing  $M$  consecutively by one unit, one finally arrives again at the two state system, with effective probabilities  $\rho_k$  obeying the constraints (19) and expectation values  $\langle A^{(k)} \rangle = \rho_k$ . Starting with infinitely many micro-states,  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , one finds that arbitrary values of  $\rho_k$  obeying  $\sum_k \rho_k^2 \leq 1$  can be realized. This follows directly from the observation that the expectation values of  $A^{(k)}$  can take arbitrary values within the unit circle,  $\sum_k \langle A^{(k)} \rangle^2 \leq 1$ , and eq. (18). Starting with a statistical system with finite  $M$  leads to further restrictions on the allowed range of  $\rho_k$ . This range simply coincides with the allowed range for  $\langle A^{(k)} \rangle$ . For  $M = 3$  it is given by the dotted octogone in Fig. 1.

We may also investigate systems with a third independent two level observable  $A^{(3)}$ . The first step of our construction involves now six micro-states with mean values of the bi-modal observables shown in Table III.

	(+1) (-1)	(+2) (-2)	(+3) (-3)
$\bar{A}_\alpha^{(1)}$	+1 -1	0 0	0 0
$\bar{A}_\alpha^{(2)}$	0 0	+1 -1	0 0
$\bar{A}_\alpha^{(3)}$	0 0	0 0	+1 -1

TABLE III: Microscopic mean values for three ‘‘orthogonal’’ two-level observables

The solution of the three-dimensional rotation problem by infinitely many micro-states proceeds in complete analogy to the discussion above, with an interpolation of the pure states towards the unit sphere  $S^2$ . Also the reduction to a smaller number of states by ‘‘integrating out’’ some of the micro-states is analogous to the two-dimensional case. The minimal system has three effective states, with effective probabilities  $\rho_k, k = 1, 2, 3$ , obeying again the restrictions (19) and  $\langle A^{(k)} \rangle = \rho_k$ .

For a system with infinitely many micro-states we can also define infinitely many two-level observables. A given spin may be denoted by a three-vector  $\vec{A}$ , which can take an arbitrary direction in the cartesian system defined by the orthogonal “directions” corresponding to  $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3$ . We may characterize the direction of the spin  $\vec{A}$  by the cartesian coordinates of a three dimensional unit vector  $e_k, \sum_k e_k^2 = 1$ . A more accurate notation for  $\vec{A}$  would be  $A(e_k)$ , since the measurements of  $\vec{A}$  will not yield three real numbers, but only one with values  $+1$  and  $-1$ . The expectation value of  $\vec{A}$  obeys then the intuitive simple rule (cf. eq. (18))

$$\langle \vec{A} \rangle \equiv \langle A(e_k) \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^3 e_k \rho_k. \quad (20)$$

This key ingredient of our formalism will be addressed more formally later.

## V. DENSITY MATRIX

The expression (20) can be brought into a form familiar from quantum mechanics. We associate to each two-level observable  $A(e_k)$  a  $2 \times 2$  matrix

$$\hat{A}(e_k) = \sum_k e_k \tau_k, \quad (21)$$

with  $\tau_k$  the three Pauli matrices obeying the anticommutation relation  $\{\tau_k, \tau_l\} = 2\delta_{kl}$ . Similarly, we may group the effective probabilities  $\rho_k$  into a “density matrix”  $\rho$ ,

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \sum_k \rho_k \tau_k \right). \quad (22)$$

In terms of these matrices the expectation values obey the quantum mechanical rule

$$\langle A(e_k) \rangle = \text{tr}(\hat{A}(e_k) \rho). \quad (23)$$

In a quantum mechanical language the “operator”  $\hat{A}$  is precisely the (unit-)spin operator  $\hat{S}$  in the direction of  $\vec{e}$ . For the infinite system we may therefore switch to the familiar spin-notation  $\vec{A} \rightarrow \vec{S}$ . In conclusion, we have established that the classical system with infinitely many degrees of freedom precisely obeys all quantum mechanical relations for the expectation values as given by

$$\langle \vec{S} \rangle = \text{tr}(\hat{S} \rho). \quad (24)$$

In particular, all relations following from the uncertainty principle are implemented directly. For a quantum mechanical two state system all information about the statistical state of the system is encoded in the density matrix, which obeys the usual relations  $\text{tr} \rho = 1$ ,  $\rho_{11} \geq 0$ ,  $\rho_{22} \geq 0$ ,  $\text{tr} \rho^2 \leq 1$ , and  $\text{tr} \rho^2 = 1$  for pure states. For our classical statistical system these relations follow from the definition (22) and the range for  $\rho_k$  in eq. (19). The spin

operators  $\hat{S}$  are the most general hermitean operators for the quantum mechanical two-state system. On the level of expectation values of operators we have constructed a one to one mapping between the quantum mechanical two-state system and a classical system with infinitely many micro-states.

## VI. CONDITIONAL CORRELATION FUNCTIONS

There are several ways to define correlation functions in a statistical system. The basic issue is the definition of a product between two observables  $A$  and  $B$ . The product  $AB$  should again be an observable. The (two-point-) correlation function is then the expectation value of this product,  $\langle AB \rangle$ . The choice of the product is, however, not unique. We have already demonstrated earlier how a quantum correlation function can arise from a classical statistical system [11].

One possibility for probabilistic observables is the “pointwise product” that we denote with a dot,  $A \cdot B$ . It is defined by the multiplication of the mean values of  $A$  and  $B$  in every micro-state

$$(\overline{A \cdot B})_\alpha = \bar{A}_\alpha \bar{B}_\alpha. \quad (25)$$

In other words, one multiplies the probability to find a value  $x_A$  for  $A$  with the probability to find  $x_B$  for  $B$ ,

$$(\overline{A \cdot B})_\alpha = \int dx_A dx_B x_A x_B w_\alpha^{(A)}(x_A) w_\alpha^{(B)}(x_B). \quad (26)$$

Using the discrete formulation (9) for the two-level observables one has

$$(\overline{A \cdot B})_\alpha = w_{+, \alpha}^{AB} - w_{-, \alpha}^{AB}, \quad (27)$$

with  $w_{+, \alpha}^{AB}$  the combined probability to find for the micro-state  $\alpha$  a value  $+1$  for  $A$  and  $+1$  for  $B$ , or  $-1$  for  $A$  and  $-1$  for  $B$ , such that the sign of the product of values of  $A$  and  $B$  is positive. Similarly,  $w_{-, \alpha}^{AB}$  obtains from the situations where the respective signs are opposite

$$\begin{aligned} w_{+, \alpha}^{AB} &= w_{+, \alpha}^A w_{+, \alpha}^B + w_{-, \alpha}^A w_{-, \alpha}^B, \\ w_{-, \alpha}^{AB} &= w_{+, \alpha}^A w_{-, \alpha}^B + w_{-, \alpha}^A w_{+, \alpha}^B. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The pointwise product is commutative, and the corresponding pointwise correlation function equals the standard correlation function in classical statistics if  $A$  and  $B$  are classical observables. However, the pointwise product is not the product that leads to our definition of  $A^2$  for the two-level observables, where  $\langle A^2 \rangle = 1$  independently of  $\langle A \rangle$ . For the pointwise product one finds instead

$$\langle A \cdot A \rangle = \sum_\alpha p_\alpha \bar{A}_\alpha^2 \leq 1. \quad (29)$$

The saturation of the bound obtains only for the two pure classical states which correspond to the particular micro-states  $\bar{\alpha}$  for which  $\bar{A} = \pm 1$ .

The reason for this discrepancy is the implicit assumption that in eq. (28) the probabilities  $w_{\pm}^A$  and  $w_{\pm}^B$  are independent of each other. This does not reflect a situation where the product  $AB$  describes consecutive measurements of first  $B$  and subsequently  $A$ . Once the first measurement of  $A$  has found a value  $+1$ , a subsequent measurement of the same variable should find a value  $+1$  with probability one. Then  $(\bar{A}^2)_{\alpha} = 1$  follows independently of the value  $\bar{A}_{\alpha}$  if the only allowed values are  $\pm 1$ , as for our spin variables. We therefore define a different product  $A \circ B$  which involves *conditional* probabilities. Eq. (28) is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} w_{+, \alpha}^{AB} &= (w_{+}^A)_+ w_{+, \alpha}^B + (w_{-}^A)_- w_{-, \alpha}^B, \\ w_{-, \alpha}^{AB} &= (w_{+}^A)_- w_{-, \alpha}^B + (w_{-}^A)_+ w_{+, \alpha}^B. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Here  $(w_{+}^A)_+$  denotes the conditional probability to find a value  $+1$  for the measurement of  $A$  under the condition that a previous measurement of  $B$  has yielded a value  $+1$ . With  $(w_{+}^A)_+ = 1$ ,  $(w_{-}^A)_- = 1$ ,  $(w_{+}^A)_- = 0$ ,  $(w_{-}^A)_+ = 0$  one now has  $w_{+, \alpha}^{AA} = w_{+, \alpha}^A + w_{-, \alpha}^A = 1$ ,  $w_{-, \alpha}^{AA} = 0$ , such that  $(\overline{A \circ A})_{\alpha} = 1$ , according to

$$(\overline{A \circ B})_{\alpha} = w_{+, \alpha}^{AB} - w_{-, \alpha}^{AB}, \quad (31)$$

with the new definition (30). The ‘‘conditional product’’  $A \circ B$  underlies our definition of  $A^2$ ,  $\langle A^2 \rangle = \langle A \circ A \rangle = 1$ .

The definition of the conditional product  $A \circ B$  requires a specification of the conditional probabilities  $(w_{+}^A)_+$  etc.. After the measurement of  $B$  we know for sure that  $B$  has the measured value, say  $+1$ . The probability of finding again  $+1$  in a repetition of the measurement must be one. This is the property of a classical eigenstate of  $B$ , that we denote by  $(+)_B$ . We therefore take for the conditional probabilities

$$\begin{aligned} (w_{\pm}^A)_+ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \langle A \rangle_{+B}), \\ (w_{\pm}^A)_- &= \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \langle A \rangle_{-B}), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

with  $\langle A \rangle_{\pm B}$  the expectation value of  $A$  in the pure classical states  $(\pm)_B$ , and  $(-)_B$  the eigenstate of  $B$  with eigenvalue  $-1$ . For our particular system corresponding to two-state quantum mechanics the conditional probabilities are actually independent of the micro-state  $\alpha$ . They depend only on properties of the states  $(+)_B$  or  $(-)_B$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\overline{A \circ B})_{\alpha} &= w_{+, \alpha}^{AB} - w_{-, \alpha}^{AB} = \langle A \rangle_{+B} w_{+, \alpha}^B - \langle A \rangle_{-B} w_{-, \alpha}^B \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + \bar{B}_{\alpha}) \langle A \rangle_{+B} - \frac{1}{2}(1 - \bar{B}_{\alpha}) \langle A \rangle_{-B}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

At this stage the conditional product is not necessarily commutative.

The ‘‘conditional correlation’’ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A \circ B \rangle &= \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} (\overline{A \circ B})_{\alpha} = \langle A \rangle_{+B} w_{+, s}^B - \langle A \rangle_{-B} w_{-, s}^B \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + \langle B \rangle) \langle A \rangle_{+B} - \frac{1}{2}(1 - \langle B \rangle) \langle A \rangle_{-B}, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

with  $w_{\pm, s}^B = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} w_{\pm, \alpha}^B$  and  $\langle B \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \bar{B}_{\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} (w_{+, \alpha}^B - w_{-, \alpha}^B) = w_{+, s}^B - w_{-, s}^B$ . For our orthogonal spin observables  $A^{(k)}$  it has the simple property

$$\langle A^{(k)} \circ A^{(l)} \rangle = \delta^{kl}, \quad (35)$$

since  $\langle A^{(k)} \rangle_{\pm A^{(l)}} = 0$  for  $k \neq l$ . The conditional correlation reflects the properties of two consecutive measurements. It may therefore be more appropriate for a description of real measurements than the pointwise correlation which implicitly assumes that the measurement of  $A$  and  $B$  are done ‘‘simultaneously’’, without influencing each other. A priori, the order of the measurements may matter, i.e.  $\langle B \circ A \rangle$  may differ from  $\langle A \circ B \rangle$ .

We will show later that the (two-point) correlation is actually commutative

$$\langle A \circ B \rangle = \langle B \circ A \rangle. \quad (36)$$

For this purpose we will use in the next section the mapping to quantum mechanics and express  $\langle A \circ B \rangle$  in terms of the anticommutator of the associated operators  $\hat{A}, \hat{B}$ ,

$$\langle A \circ B \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\} \rho). \quad (37)$$

Furthermore, we note that whenever

$$\langle A \rangle_{-B} = -\langle A \rangle_{+B} \quad (38)$$

holds, as in our case, one simply finds from eq. (33)

$$\begin{aligned} (\overline{A \circ B})_{\alpha} &= \langle A \rangle_{+B} = \text{tr}(\hat{A} \rho_{B+}), \\ (\overline{B \circ A})_{\alpha} &= \langle B \rangle_{+A} = \text{tr}(\hat{B} \rho_{A+}), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

independently of the micro-state  $\alpha$ . For our two state system the pure state density matrices are easily found

$$\rho_{B\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \hat{B}), \quad \rho_{A\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \hat{A}) \quad (40)$$

such that

$$\langle A \rangle_{B+} = \langle B \rangle_{A+} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\hat{A} \hat{B}). \quad (41)$$

The commutativity of the conditional two point correlation does not extend to the conditional three point correlation

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A \circ B \circ C \rangle &= (w_{+}^A)_+ (w_{+}^B)_+ w_{+, s}^C - (w_{+}^A)_+ (w_{+}^B)_- w_{-, s}^C \\ &\quad - (w_{+}^A)_- (w_{-}^B)_+ w_{+, s}^C + (w_{+}^A)_- (w_{-}^B)_- w_{-, s}^C \\ &\quad - (w_{-}^A)_+ (w_{+}^B)_+ w_{+, s}^C + (w_{-}^A)_+ (w_{+}^B)_- w_{-, s}^C \\ &\quad + (w_{-}^A)_- (w_{-}^B)_+ w_{+, s}^C - (w_{-}^A)_- (w_{-}^B)_- w_{-, s}^C. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

It is constructed in analogy to the conditional two point function and involves in an intuitive way the probabilities of finding for the measurements of  $A, B, C$  the sequences  $(+, +, +), (+, +, -), (+, -, +) \dots (-, -, -)$ , weighted with the appropriate product of the measured values. After a



measurement of  $\pm 1$  of  $C$  the observable  $B$  is measured in the  $(\pm_C)$  eigenstate of  $C$ , and after a second measurement of  $\pm 1$  for  $B$  the observable  $A$  is measured in the  $(\pm_B)$  eigenstate of  $B$ . Similarly to eq. (34), the conditional three point function can be expressed as a product of expectation values

$$\langle A \circ B \circ C \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \langle A \rangle_{+B} \right. \\ \left. [(1 + \langle B \rangle_{+C})(1 + \langle C \rangle) - (1 + \langle B \rangle_{-C})(1 - \langle C \rangle)] \right. \\ \left. + \langle A \rangle_{-B} \right. \\ \left. [(1 - \langle B \rangle_{-C})(1 - \langle C \rangle) - [(1 - \langle B \rangle_{+C})(1 + \langle C \rangle)] \right\}. \quad (43)$$

The quantum mechanical computation in the next section shows that the conditional three point correlation can also be expressed as

$$\langle A \circ B \circ C \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \text{tr} \left( \{ \{ \hat{A}, \hat{B} \}, \hat{C} \} \rho \right). \quad (44)$$

It is therefore invariant under the exchange of  $A$  and  $B$ , but not with respect to a change of the positions of  $B$  and  $C$  or  $A$  and  $C$ . For the orthogonal spin observables one has

$$\langle A^{(k)} \circ A^{(l)} \circ A^{(m)} \rangle = \delta^{kl} \langle A^{(m)} \rangle. \quad (45)$$

We recall that all expectation values in eq. (43) are well defined in our setting with infinitely many micro-states, such that the computation of  $\langle A \circ B \circ C \rangle$  can be done entirely within classical statistics. The non-commutativity is a consequence of the definition of the conditional product, which is adapted to a sequence of measurements in a given order.

For our two-state quantum system the density matrix for an eigenstate of the observable  $A$  or  $B$  is unique, given by eq. (40), and describing always a pure state. (This does not hold for more than two states.) We can describe the measurement process by a series of “classical operations”. The first measurement of  $C$  operates a mapping  $\tilde{C}$

$$\tilde{C} : \rho \rightarrow w_{+,s}^C \rho_{C+} - w_{-,s}^C \rho_{C-} = \tilde{\rho}_C, \quad (46)$$

where  $\tilde{\rho}_C$  is a weighted sum of density matrices, but not a density matrix itself. If this is the only measurement, the expectation value of  $C$  obtains by taking a trace of  $\tilde{\rho}_C$ ,

$$\langle C \rangle = \text{tr} \tilde{\rho}_C = w_{+,s}^C - w_{-,s}^C. \quad (47)$$

A second measurement of  $B$  induces a mapping  $\tilde{B}$

$$\tilde{B} : \begin{aligned} \rho_{C+} &\rightarrow (w_+^B)^C \rho_{B+} - (w_-^B)^C \rho_{B-}, \\ \rho_{C-} &\rightarrow (w_+^B)^C \rho_{B+} - (w_-^B)^C \rho_{B-}, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

such that the sequence of two operations reads

$$\tilde{B}\tilde{C} : \rho \rightarrow \tilde{\rho}_{BC} = [(w_+^B)^C w_{+,s}^C - (w_+^B)^C w_{-,s}^C] \rho_{B+} \\ + [(w_-^B)^C w_{-,s}^C - (w_-^B)^C w_{+,s}^C] \rho_{B-}. \quad (49)$$

Again, if the measurement chain is finished one takes the trace of  $\tilde{\rho}_{BC}$  for the evaluation of the expectation value

of the products  $B \circ C$ , reproducing eq. (34). The non-commutativity of the classical operations is now manifest. For example, after the second step  $\tilde{\rho}_{BC}$  is a linear combination of  $\rho_{B+}$  and  $\rho_{B-}$ , while  $\tilde{\rho}_{CB}$  involves a linear combination of  $\rho_{C+}$  and  $\rho_{C-}$ .

Two interpretations can be given for the use of conditional probabilities. One refers to the change of knowledge of the observer after the first measurement. The second one assumes that the physical state of the system has been changed after the first measurement through interaction with the apparatus. This does not involve an observer and is perhaps the more interesting interpretation. From the mathematical point of view both interpretations are described by the same conditional probability. In a quantum mechanical language this corresponds to the famous “reduction of the wave function” after the first measurement.

Both the pointwise correlations and the conditional correlations describe idealized measurements. The pointwise correlation assumes that two measurements are without any influence on each other, whereas the conditional correlation idealizes that one has exactly an eigenstate of the measured observable after the first measurement. In a real measurement situation there will always be some uncertainty in the measured value and there are possible physical influences between the first and second measurement. This would result after the first measurement in a state that is not precisely an eigenstate. In principle, one could define modified correlation functions in order to account for such effects. Obviously, the process of performing a sequence of  $n$  measurements and multiplying the measured numbers, and then averaging over many such sequences under identical conditions, has the necessary product properties for the definition of an  $n$ -point correlation.

Our close association of the correlation functions with sequences of measurements underlines that the definition of the correlation function is not unique. The most appropriate choice may actually depend on the detailed physical circumstances.

## VII. QUANTUM STATISTICS FROM CLASSICAL STATISTICS

So far we have shown important analogies between the quantum mechanics of a two state system and classical statistics with infinitely many micro-states. In this section we will argue that all aspects of quantum statistics can be described by the classical system. Quantum statistics appears therefore as a special setting within classical statistics, where a particular class of probabilistic observables is investigated and a particular correlation is used. Inversely, the formalism of quantum mechanics is a powerful tool for the computation of properties in classical statistical systems, as the conditional correlation functions.

A first basic ingredient of quantum mechanics is a description of the rule for the computation of expectation values of observables. As before, we restrict the discussion to two quantum states. At any given time the information about the state of the system is encoded in the density

matrix  $\rho$ , which is a hermitean  $2 \times 2$  matrix,  $\rho = \rho^\dagger$  with  $0 \leq \rho_{11} \leq 1, 0 \leq \rho_{22} \leq 1, \text{tr } \rho = 1, \text{tr } \rho^2 \leq 1$ . (Quantum mechanics provides also a law for the time evolution of  $\rho$ , to which we will turn in the next section.) Quantum mechanics makes probabilistic statements about the outcome of measurements. They are predicted by the expectation values for hermitean operators  $\hat{A}$ , according to  $\langle A \rangle = \text{tr}(\hat{A}\rho)$ . For the two state system, the only hermitean operators are the (unit) spin operators  $\hat{S}$  up to an overall multiplicative factor. We have already shown, eq. (24), that the law  $\langle \hat{S} \rangle = \text{tr}(\hat{S}\rho)$  is obeyed by the classical system with infinitely many micro-states. Also the density matrix with the required properties can be computed from the classical probability distribution  $\{p_\alpha\}$ , using the method of reduction of degrees of freedom. For the continuous family of classical spin observables we therefore have already established that the expectation values obey the quantum mechanical law.

A second basic concept in quantum statistics is the Hilbert space of states  $|\psi\rangle$ . They describe pure quantum states by complex two-component normalized vectors,  $|\psi\rangle = \psi$ ,  $\langle\psi| = \psi^\dagger$ , with  $\langle\psi|\psi\rangle = \psi^\dagger\psi = 1$ . Pure quantum states have a density matrix obeying  $\text{tr } \rho^2 = 1$  or  $\sum_k \rho_k^2 = 1$ . (As we have seen, they correspond to the pure classical states where  $\{p_\alpha\}$  has one value one and only zeros otherwise.) The overall phase of  $|\psi\rangle$  is unobservable and therefore irrelevant. Only two real numbers are needed in order to describe the physical properties of  $|\psi\rangle$ , in correspondence to the two independent real numbers  $\rho_k$  which remain under the condition  $\sum_k \rho_k^2 = 1$ . One can therefore construct a mapping between a pure density matrix  $\rho$  and the associated state  $|\psi\rangle$  up to an arbitrary phase  $e^{i\varphi}$ . The mapping is straightforward for diagonal  $\rho$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \leftrightarrow |\psi\rangle = e^{i\varphi} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}; \\ \rho &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \leftrightarrow \psi = e^{i\varphi} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Any hermitean  $\rho$  can be diagonalized by a unitary  $SU(2)$  transformation,  $UU^\dagger = 1$ ,  $\rho_d$  diagonal,

$$\rho = U\rho_d U^\dagger, \quad |\psi\rangle = U|\psi_d\rangle. \quad (51)$$

The second equation (51) defines the state  $|\psi\rangle$  associated to  $\rho$  with  $|\psi_d\rangle$  associated to  $\rho_d$  according to eq. (50).

This definition implies that expectation values of arbitrary operators can be computed in pure states as (we use  $\langle\psi_d| = (1, 0)$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A \rangle &= \langle\psi|\hat{A}|\psi\rangle = \psi^\dagger \hat{A} \psi \\ &= \psi_d^\dagger U^\dagger \hat{A} U \psi_d = (U^\dagger \hat{A} U)_{11} \\ &= \text{tr}(U\rho_d U^\dagger \hat{A}) = \text{tr}(\rho \hat{A}). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

We recover the standard quantum mechanics law for the computation of expectation values of observables in terms of ‘‘probabilistic amplitudes’’  $\psi$ . To every two component

complex vector  $\psi$  we can associate a pure state density matrix by a two step procedure: (i) normalize  $\psi$  by a rescaling with a constant such that  $\psi^\dagger\psi = 1$ , (ii) construct  $\rho_{\alpha\beta} = \psi_\alpha\psi_\beta^*$ . In particular, an associated density matrix exists for arbitrary linear combinations  $\beta_1\psi_1 + \beta_2\psi_2$ . An explicit example for a classical probability distribution which corresponds to an entangled state within four-state quantum mechanics can be found in [4].

In quantum mechanics the transition amplitude  $M_{\alpha\beta}$  between two pure states  $|\psi_\alpha\rangle$  and  $|\psi_\beta\rangle$  is defined as  $M_{\alpha\beta} = \langle\psi_\alpha|\psi_\beta\rangle$ , and the transition probability obeys  $w_{\alpha\beta} = |M_{\alpha\beta}|^2$ . We will next establish that the transition probability is precisely the conditional probability discussed in the preceding section

$$(w_{\pm}^A)_+^B = |\langle\pm_A|+B\rangle|^2, \quad (w_{\pm}^A)_-^B = |\langle\pm_A|-B\rangle|^2. \quad (53)$$

Here the quantum states  $|\pm_A\rangle$  are the eigenstates of the operator  $\hat{A}$  with eigenvalues  $\pm 1$ ,

$$\hat{A}|+A\rangle = |+A\rangle, \quad \hat{A}|-A\rangle = -|-A\rangle. \quad (54)$$

In order to show eq. (53) we use the completeness of the Hilbert space which allows the insertion of a complete set of states

$$1 = \langle+B|+B\rangle = \langle+B|+A\rangle\langle+A|+B\rangle + \langle+B|-A\rangle\langle-A|+B\rangle, \quad (55)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle+B|\hat{A}|+B\rangle &= \langle+B|\hat{A}|+A\rangle\langle+A|+B\rangle + \langle+B|\hat{A}|-A\rangle\langle-A|+B\rangle \\ &= |\langle+A|+B\rangle|^2 - |\langle-A|+B\rangle|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

From the definition of the conditional probability and eq. (55) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} (w_+^A)_+^B &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + \langle A \rangle_{+B}) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \langle+B|\hat{A}|+B\rangle) \\ &= |\langle+A|+B\rangle|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

and similar for the other anticombinations in eq. (53).

A third crucial ingredient for quantum statistics is the definition of an operator product  $\hat{A}\hat{B}$  and the determination of quantum correlations, as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}(\langle AB \rangle) &= \text{Re}(\text{tr}(\hat{A}\hat{B}\rho)) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\}\rho), \\ \text{Re}(\langle ABC \rangle) &= \text{Re}(\text{tr}(\hat{A}\hat{B}\hat{C}\rho)) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}((\hat{A}\hat{B}\hat{C} + \hat{C}\hat{B}\hat{A})\rho) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}(\left(\{\{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\}, \hat{C}\} + [[\hat{A}, \hat{B}], \hat{C}]\right)) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}\left(\left(\{\{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\}, \hat{C}\} + \{\hat{A}, \{\hat{B}, \hat{C}\}\} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \{\hat{B}, \{\hat{A}, \hat{C}\}\}\right)\rho\right). \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Since we have defined for the classical system the spin operators as  $2 \times 2$  matrices, we can, of course, define the matrix product and compute the quantum correlations (58)

for  $\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}$  corresponding to arbitrary spin observables. Beyond this formal definition of the quantum correlations (58) we want to establish their close connection to the conditional correlations discussed in the preceding section.

For this purpose we compute the expectation value of the anti-commutator of two operators in an arbitrary pure state  $|s\rangle$ . With

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s|\hat{A}\hat{B}|s\rangle &= \langle s|\hat{A}|_{+B}\rangle\langle_{+B}|\hat{B}|s\rangle + \langle s|\hat{A}|_{-B}\rangle\langle_{-B}|\hat{B}|s\rangle \\ &= |_{+B}\langle s|s\rangle|^2\langle_{+B}|\hat{A}|_{+B}\rangle - |_{-B}\langle s|s\rangle|^2\langle_{-B}|\hat{A}|_{-B}\rangle \\ &\quad + (\langle_{+B}\langle s|s\rangle\langle_{-B}\rangle\langle_{-B}|\hat{A}|_{+B}\rangle - c.c.), \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

one finds the conditional correlation (34)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\langle s|\{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\}|s\rangle &= Re(\langle s|\hat{A}\hat{B}|s\rangle) \\ &= \langle A\rangle_{+B}w_{+,s}^B - \langle A\rangle_{-B}w_{-,s}^B \\ &= \langle A \circ B\rangle_s, \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where  $w_{\pm,s}^B = |_{\pm B}\langle s|s\rangle|^2$ . This establishes the relation (37) for any pure state density matrix. The extension to arbitrary  $\rho$  uses the fact that  $\rho$  can always be written as  $\rho = w_1\rho_1 + w_2\rho_2$  with  $\rho_{1,2}$  pure state density matrices and real  $w_{1,2} \geq 0, w_1 + w_2 = 1$ . With  $|s_1\rangle, |s_2\rangle$  the pure states corresponding to  $\rho_1, \rho_2$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\}\rho) &= \frac{w_1}{2}\langle s_1|\{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\}|s_1\rangle + \frac{w_2}{2}\langle s_2|\{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\}|s_2\rangle \\ &= \langle A\rangle_{+B}(w_1|_{+B}\langle s_1|s_1\rangle|^2 + w_2|_{+B}\langle s_2|s_2\rangle|^2) \\ &\quad - \langle A\rangle_{-B}(w_1|_{-B}\langle s_1|s_1\rangle|^2 + w_2|_{-B}\langle s_2|s_2\rangle|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Using

$$\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \text{tr}(\rho\hat{B})) = w_1|_{\pm B}\langle s_1|s_1\rangle|^2 + w_2|_{\pm B}\langle s_2|s_2\rangle|^2 \quad (62)$$

this shows that the r.h.s. of eq. (61) coincides with the last eq. (34). An analogous, but somewhat more lengthy computation establishes eq. (44) for the conditional three point correlation, and can also be used for higher correlation functions.

A fourth corner stone of quantum mechanics is a rule how to express the possible outcome of measurements in terms of expectation values of observables. Such a rule is needed for every theory. For our classical statistical system we employ a rule based on conditional probabilities for consecutive measurements. It is the same as in quantum mechanics. We have shown how the conditional correlation functions in classical statistics can be expressed in terms of quantum correlation functions. Inversely, our computation provides a physical interpretation of quantum correlations in terms of the outcome of a sequence of measurements. Only the real part of the expectation values of products of operators can be measurable quantities. From eq. (58) we see how they can be related directly to conditional correlations. We note that the three point functions  $Re(\langle ABC\rangle)$  does not simply correspond to one order of measurements (say first  $C$ , then  $B$ , last  $A$ ), but rather to a linear combination of sequences in different orders, as given by the

last equation in (58). This is closely related to the term involving commutators in eq. (58). The one to one correspondence between quantum correlations and conditional correlations closes the proof of equivalence between quantum statistics and classical statistics with infinitely many micro-states. All measurable quantities can be computed in either approach.

The quantum pure states and the classical pure states are in one to one correspondence. Both can be parameterized by the coordinates on the sphere  $S^2$ , as given by the condition  $\text{Tr}\rho^2 = 1$  or  $\sum_k \rho_k^2 = 1$ . From the point of view of the classical probability distribution  $\{p_\alpha\}$  the classical pure states are sharp states with one  $p_{\bar{\alpha}}$  equal to one - namely the one in the direction specified by the location of the state on  $S^2$ , and all other probabilities vanishing,  $p_{\alpha \neq \bar{\alpha}} = 0$ . There is no statistical distribution on the level of  $\{p_\alpha\}$ . For the pure states the statistical character of the system arises therefore only from the notion of probabilistic observables. Only one spin has a sharp value in a given pure state, namely  $\bar{A}_{\bar{\alpha}} = 1$ . It is the one which points in the direction corresponding to the location of the state on the sphere. All other spins have  $(\bar{A}_{\bar{\alpha}})^2 < 1$  and therefore correspond to measurements with a statistical distribution of values  $+1$  and  $-1$ . (For this counting the directions of the spin variables cover only half of the sphere,  $S^2/Z_2$ , and we have omitted the trivial extension  $\bar{A}_{\bar{\alpha}} = -1$  for the spin opposite to the direction of the state.) In this setting the statistical character of quantum mechanics is genuinely linked to the notion of probabilistic observables. We also note that the notions of classical eigenstates and classical eigenvalues are in direct correspondence to the quantum mechanical definition of eigenstates and eigenvalues.

Finally, quantum mechanics has the useful structure of linear combinations of operators,  $\lambda_1\hat{A} + \lambda_2\hat{B}$ . It is compatible with the rule for expectation values

$$\langle \lambda_1 A + \lambda_2 B \rangle = \lambda_1 \langle A \rangle + \lambda_2 \langle B \rangle. \quad (63)$$

We can take this construction over to the two-level observables  $A, B$  in the classical system with infinitely many degrees of freedom. For real  $\lambda_{1,2}$  obeying  $\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 = 1$  the combination  $\lambda_1 A + \lambda_2 B$  is again a two-level observable - the linear combination remains a map in the space of two-level observables. We can define rotated spins in this way. (Obviously, this is no longer possible for a finite number of micro-states, where the linear combination with arbitrary  $\lambda_i, \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 = 1$ , is no longer defined. For finite  $N$  the allowed  $\lambda_i$  have to be restricted such that allowed spins are reached by the rotation - in our example with two spins the rotations have to be restricted to discrete  $Z_N$ -transformations.) We may relax the condition  $\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 = 1$  by defining formally the multiplication of an observable by a complex number  $\lambda$  using the replacement  $\bar{A}_\alpha \rightarrow \lambda \bar{A}_\alpha$ , such that  $\langle \lambda A \rangle = \lambda \langle A \rangle$ . For real  $\lambda > 0$  this amounts to a change of units for the observables, replacing in eq. (6)  $\delta(x \pm 1) \rightarrow \delta(x \pm \lambda)$ . Multiplication with  $-1$  corresponds to a map of the spin to the spin with opposite direction on the sphere. For real  $\lambda$  all observables remain two-level observables with  $\bar{A}_\alpha^2 = \lambda^2$ . The multiplication with  $i$ , or generally complex  $\lambda$ , remains formal and is not

related to the outcome of possible measurements. It is, nevertheless, a useful computational tool since it gives to the space of observables the structure of a complex vector space. This is analogous to the multiplication of quantum states  $|\psi\rangle$  by arbitrary complex numbers. It is needed in order to implement the vector-space structure of Hilbert space, even though physical states should be normalized,  $\psi^\dagger\psi = 1$ .

By a combination of rotations in the space of two-level observables with  $\langle A^2 \rangle = 1$  and scalings we have defined arbitrary linear combinations of classical observables  $A = \sum_k e_k A^{(k)}$ . They are represented by a complex three-component vector  $\vec{e} = (e_1 \dots e_3)$ . The expectation values are defined in the classical ensemble and obey  $\langle A \rangle = \rho_k e_k$ ,  $\langle A^2 \rangle = e_k e_k$ . This is in one to one correspondence with the operators  $\hat{A} = e_k \tau_k$ ,  $\hat{A}^2 = e_k e_k$ . The hermitean conjugation of a classical observable  $A^\dagger$  is defined as  $e_k \rightarrow e_k^*$ . Measurements must yield real values such that measurable observables are  $(A + A^\dagger)/2$ . The most general operator in the Hilbert space of two-state quantum mechanics reads  $\hat{A} = e_k \tau_k + e_0$ . Using the unit observable every operator has its corresponding classical two-level observable  $A = e_k A^{(k)} + e_0$ . The possible outcomes of individual measurements of  $A$  in the classical ensemble are given by the eigenvalues of the  $2 \times 2$ -matrix  $\hat{A}$ .

The quantum mechanical operator product  $\hat{A}\hat{B}$  can be mapped onto a ‘‘quantum product’’ of classical observables  $AB$ , as defined by the associated vector  $\vec{e}$  and  $e_0$ .

$$e_0^{(AB)} = e_l^{(A)} e_l^{(B)}, \quad e_k^{(AB)} = i \epsilon_{klm} e_l^{(A)} e_m^{(B)}. \quad (64)$$

With this product we can define an algebra of classical observables that is isomorphic to the algebra of quantum operators. On the level of the classical observables one may at first sight wonder why one should introduce the particular product (64). However, we have seen already how to employ the quantum product for classical observables for the computation of the outcome of a sequence of measurements in terms of conditional correlations. The quantum product  $AB$  is closely related to the conditional product  $A \circ B$ . Another important use of the quantum product  $AB$  is the discussion of the minimal value of the product of the dispersions for two observables. It can be expressed in terms of the commutator  $AB - BA$  by the Heisenberg uncertainty relation.

## VIII. TIME EVOLUTION

In this section we discuss the time evolution in the classical statistical system. Assume that at some time  $t_1$  the probability distribution is  $\{p_\alpha\}$ , and at some later time  $t_2$  it has changed to a different distribution  $\{p'_\alpha\}$ . The observables are kept fixed and we want to study how their expectation values change. We may define ‘‘transition probabilities’’  $\tilde{S}_{\alpha\beta}$  such that (with summation over repeated indices)

$$p_\alpha(t_2) = \tilde{S}_{\alpha\beta}(t_2, t_1) p_\beta(t_1). \quad (65)$$

The transition matrix  $\tilde{S}_{\alpha\beta}$  should conserve the unit sum,  $\sum_\alpha p_\alpha(t_2) = 1$ . By the process of reduction of degrees of freedom we can associate effective probabilities for an effective three-state classical system to  $\{p_\alpha\}$  and  $\{p'_\alpha\}$ , i.e.  $\rho_k(t_1)$  and  $\rho_k(t_2)$ ,  $k = 1 \dots 3$ . The transition matrix  $\tilde{S}_{\alpha\beta}$  induces a reduced transition matrix  $S_{kl}$  for the density matrix,

$$\rho_k(t_2) = S_{kl}(t_2, t_1) \rho_l(t_1). \quad (66)$$

The condition  $\sum_k \rho_k^2(t) \leq 1$  is preserved by the transformation (66) by construction. For the computation of expectation values for the spin observables and their conditional correlations at any given time  $t$  one needs only to know  $\rho(t)$ . The reduced transition matrix  $S_{kl}(t_2, t_1)$  is then sufficient for a description of the time evolution. We observe that many different transition matrices  $\tilde{S}_{\alpha\beta}$  are mapped onto the same  $S_{kl}$ , such that actually only a limited amount of information about  $\tilde{S}_{\alpha\beta}$  is needed. We can consider equivalence classes for  $\tilde{S}_{\alpha\beta}$ , where two transition matrices leading to the same  $S_{kl}$  are considered to be equivalent. Similarly, equivalence classes for probability distributions  $\{p_\alpha\}$  are characterized by  $\rho_k$ .

Let us introduce the concept of purity, using  $P = \sum_k \rho_k^2$ . Then  $P = 1$  corresponds to pure states,  $P < 1$  to mixed states and  $P = 0$  to equipartition, where all  $\rho_k = 0$ . (The equivalence class of equipartition contains the classical equipartition state  $p_\alpha = 1/N$ .) The most general time evolution of the classical system can change the purity. We will concentrate first on the case where the purity is conserved. The unitary time evolution for two-state quantum mechanics will follow from this simple assumption.

In fact, the conservation of the length of the vector  $\rho_k$  implies that  $S_{kl}$  is an orthogonal  $O(3)$ -matrix,  $S_{kl} = \hat{S}_{kl}$ ,  $\sum_l \hat{S}_{kl} \hat{S}_{ml} = \delta_{km}$ . Arbitrary  $O(3)$ -transformations acting on the  $\rho_k$  can be represented as unitary transformations acting on the density matrix  $\rho$  (cf. eq. (22)) as

$$\rho(t_2) = U(t_2, t_1) \rho(t_1) U^\dagger(t_2, t_1). \quad (67)$$

This follows from the equivalence of  $SU(2)$  and  $SO(3)$  (up to a factor  $Z_2$ , with  $\rho$  invariant under the  $Z_2$  transformation). Parameterizing

$$U = e^{i\alpha_0} e^{i\alpha_m \tau_m} \quad (68)$$

one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{S}_{kl} &= (1 - 2 \sin^2 \gamma) \delta_{kl} + 2 \sin^2 \gamma \beta_k \beta_l \\ &\quad + 2 \sin \gamma \cos \gamma \epsilon_{klm} \beta_m, \\ \gamma^2 &= \vec{\alpha}^2, \quad \beta_m = \frac{\alpha_m}{\gamma}. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

From eq. (67) the time evolution in two-state-quantum mechanics follows in a standard way. We may consider infinitesimal changes of time, for which we find the von-Neumann equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -i[\hat{H}, \rho], \quad \hat{H} = i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} U(t_2, t_1) U^\dagger(t_2, t_1) = \hat{H}^\dagger. \quad (70)$$

Pure states obey then the Schrödinger equation with a hermitean Hamilton operator  $\hat{H}$

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\psi\rangle = \hat{H}|\psi\rangle. \quad (71)$$

With  $\hat{H} = H_k\tau_k$  we can write eq. (70) as

$$\frac{\partial\rho_k}{\partial t} = 2H_l\rho_m\epsilon_{lmk} \quad (72)$$

and compare with the general formula

$$\frac{\partial\rho_k}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial S_{kl}}{\partial t}S_{lm}^{-1}\rho_m. \quad (73)$$

For  $S = \hat{S}$  we extract

$$H_k = -\frac{1}{4}\frac{\partial\hat{S}_{jl}}{\partial t}\hat{S}_{lm}^{-1}\epsilon_{jmk}, \quad (74)$$

which yields  $\hat{H}$  in terms of  $\hat{S}$ .

We observe that eq. (72) is consistent with eq. (73) only for orthogonal matrices  $S$  - otherwise the r.h.s. of eq. (73) is not antisymmetric under the exchange of the indices  $k$  and  $m$  in the matrix multiplying  $\rho_m$ , as is the r.h.s. of eq. (72).

More generally, an arbitrary change of the vector  $\rho_k$  can be written as a combination of an orthogonal transformation and a scaling,  $S_{kl} = \hat{S}_{kl}d$ . This adds to eq. (70) a scaling part

$$\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} = -i[\hat{H}, \rho] + D\left(\rho - \frac{1}{2}\right), \quad D = \frac{\partial \ln d}{\partial t}. \quad (75)$$

For negative  $D$  the density matrix will approach equipartition,  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\rho_k = 0$ , as time increases. This describes decoherence of a quantum system. For positive  $D$  the purity tends to increase

$$\partial_t P = 2DP. \quad (76)$$

For any arbitrary distribution  $\{p_\alpha\}$  a classical pure state has the maximum possible purity,  $\text{tr}\rho^2 = 1$ . For positive  $D$  the system has therefore a tendency to reach a pure state for large time.

In general,  $S_{kl}$  may depend on  $\rho_k$ , and this also holds for  $\hat{H}$  and  $D$ . The standard linear time evolution of quantum mechanics obtains only in the limit where  $\hat{H}$  is independent of  $\rho$  and  $D$  vanishes. If  $D$  depends on  $\rho_k$ , it will itself depend on time and we may write on effective evolution equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}D = \beta_D(\rho_k, D). \quad (77)$$

For  $\text{tr}\rho^2 = 1$  a positive value of  $D$  is forbidden by the general properties of the probability distribution. If  $D$  is positive for ensembles with  $P = \rho_k\rho_k < 1$ , we conclude that  $\beta_D$  must have a zero for  $D = 0$  and  $P = 1$ . If this fixed point is attractive for increasing  $t$ , a pure state will be approached asymptotically. Unitarity of the time evolution

is then a simple consequence of the system approaching this fixed point for large  $t$ .

The existence of fixed points for  $P = 0$  and  $P = 1$  is quite generic. The precise form of approach depends, of course, on the system. If  $\beta_D$  admits a Taylor expansion for the fixed point at  $P = 1$  and  $D = 0$ , the lowest order terms are

$$\beta_D = -aD + b(1 - P), \quad (78)$$

where the coefficients may depend on  $\rho_k/\sqrt{\text{Tr}\rho^2}$  and  $H_k$ . In the vicinity of the fixed point and for approximately constant  $a$  and  $b$  eq. (78) implies an exponential approach to the pure state,

$$1 - P = x_1e^{-\epsilon_1 t} + x_2e^{-\epsilon_2 t}, \quad (79)$$

$$D = \epsilon_1 x_1 e^{-\epsilon_1 t} + \epsilon_2 x_2 e^{-\epsilon_2 t}, \quad (79)$$

$$\epsilon_{1,2} = \frac{1}{2}(a \pm \sqrt{a^2 - 4b}), \quad (80)$$

provided  $a > 0$ ,  $0 < b < a^2/4$ .

If the fixed point with  $D = 0$  is approached for a sufficiently large time, we will encounter the standard linear unitary time evolution of quantum mechanics if  $\hat{H}$  becomes independent of  $\rho_k$  at the fixed point. Otherwise, the system would be attracted to a unitary, but non-linear extended version of quantum mechanics - a possibility that is highly interesting in its own right. We should note, however, that symmetries may enforce linear quantum mechanics. For example, if  $SO(3)$  symmetry is realized at the fixed point, the Hamiltonian can depend on  $\rho_k$  only via the invariant  $\rho_k\rho_k$ . This approaches a constant, and therefore the fixed point value of  $\hat{H}$  has to be independent of  $\rho_k$ .

In conclusion of this section, we find that the quantum mechanical time evolution can emerge naturally from a large class of time evolving probabilities  $p_\alpha(t)$  (65). The reduction to the time evolution of the density matrix (75) is always possible. Generic time evolutions may be attracted either to quantum mechanical equipartition,  $\rho_k = 0$ , or to a pure quantum state. The asymptotic approach to the pure quantum state fixed point could provide an explanation why we can observe so many quantum systems in nature. Indeed, if we consider our system as a subsystem of a much larger system, the time evolution of the subsystem may allow for dissipation of energy into the larger system. Quite often, the lowest energy state is a pure state which may be approached for large time. A mixed state of atoms in various energy levels will after some time be found in the pure ground state if energy can be dissipated by radiation.

## IX. PSEUDO QUANTUM SYSTEMS

We have seen how quantum mechanics arises from classical statistics in the limit of infinitely many micro-states, if probabilistic observables and conditional correlations are considered and the time evolution conserves purity. It is interesting to ask if “approximate quantum behavior” can be observed if the number  $N$  of micro-states remains finite.

The investigation of systems with finite  $N$  may also be relevant for practical computations of quantum systems, in the sense that one may consider a series with increasing  $N$  and take the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  for which all quantities should converge to the quantities in the quantum system. We will call a classical statistical system with finite  $N$  a “pseudo quantum system” if it fulfills the following criteria:

- (i) There are  $N$  micro-states labeled by unit vectors  $(f_k), k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, \sum_k f_k^2 = 1$ , with probabilities  $p_\alpha \equiv p(f_k)$ .
- (ii) A group of discrete symmetry transformations  $G_N$  acts in the space of  $f_k$ . It is a subgroup of  $SO(3)$  and converges to  $SO(3)$  in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . (For the concrete example in sect. 3 this subgroup is  $Z_N$ , but we consider here more general cases and three dimensional discrete rotations.)
- (iii) One considers  $N$  two-level probabilistic observables, labeled by unit vectors  $(e_k), \sum_k e_k^2 = 1$ , i.e.  $A(e_k)$ . The symmetry group  $G_N$  also acts on  $e_k$ , such that the scalar product  $\sum_k e_k f_k$  is invariant. The mean values in the micro-states  $\alpha = f_k$  are given by

$$\bar{A}(e_k) = \sum_k f_k e_k, \quad (81)$$

and the expectation values read

$$\langle A(e_k) \rangle = \sum_{\{f_k\}} p(f_k) \sum_k (f_k e_k). \quad (82)$$

If we consider conditional correlations, these pseudo-quantum systems will converge to two-state quantum mechanics for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . (Generalizations for quantum mechanics with more than two states are possible, but will not be considered in this section.)

We want to understand the differences between the pseudo quantum systems and quantum mechanics. For this purpose we first perform the reduction of the degrees of freedom to three effective micro-states, with effective probabilities  $\rho_k$ . This reduction should keep the expectation values of all observables  $\langle A(e_k) \rangle$  unchanged. It can be achieved by

$$\rho_k = \sum_{\{f_k\}} p(f_k) f_k, \quad (83)$$

where the sum is over all micro-states. This guarantees that the expectation values of all spins can indeed be written as

$$\langle A(e_k) \rangle = \sum_k \rho_k e_k, \quad (84)$$

verifying eq. (20). We observe that the expression (84) has no ambiguity and does not depend on which effective micro-state is selected while the others are integrated out.

At this point the only difference to quantum mechanics is the restricted range of  $f_k$ , which results in a restricted range

of  $\rho_k$ . This range has the geometry of a (three-dimensional) polygone with  $N$  corners, where the corners are given by the vectors  $f_k$  and correspond to the classical pure states. It approaches the sphere in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  as a result of  $SO(3)$ -symmetry. Thus the limiting  $SO(3)$ -symmetry guarantees that quantum mechanics is reached in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . The conditional correlations are defined for the pseudo quantum system just as for the quantum system. (The only difference may be a restricted number of observables  $A(e_k)$ .) The formalism of quantum mechanics can be applied to pseudo quantum systems, with the only restriction that the range of  $\rho_k$  and therefore the number of pure states  $|\psi\rangle$  is restricted - there are precisely  $N$  different pure states  $|\psi\rangle$  instead of a continuum. Also the number of observables may change from the continuous family of spins to a finite number  $A(e_k)$ , but this is not necessary.

These differences are necessarily reflected in the time evolution. For pure states, a unitary evolution is only possible for discrete steps  $\tau_i$ , corresponding to the allowed discrete symmetry transformations of the group  $G_N$ . Then the Hamilton operator becomes the transfer matrix. Alternatively, one may consider a continuous time evolution which does not respect the conservation of purity, such that  $P = \sum_k \rho_k^2 < 1$  for times in the interval between the discrete time steps for which a pure state is transformed into another pure state,  $\tau_i \leq t \leq \tau_{i+1}$ . Unitarity is violated for these intermediate times, but restored whenever  $t$  reaches  $\tau_i$ . It is therefore maintained in the average for long enough time in units of  $\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i$ .

Pseudo quantum systems can only occur if the continuous symmetry  $SO(3)$  is violated and reduced to a discrete subgroup  $G_N$ . Inversely, a classical statistical system with  $SO(3)$ -symmetry has necessarily infinitely many micro-states. Quantum mechanics arises whenever the time evolution of classical probabilities can be described by  $SO(3)$ -rotations, provided the appropriate two-level operators and conditional correlations are considered. In this sense it is not a very special situation within classical statistics. We emphasize that the  $SO(3)$  rotations do not necessarily reflect the rotations in physical space, but may be more abstract isospin-type rotations. It is not necessary that the system is  $SO(3)$ -symmetric. Rather it is sufficient that the time evolution describes a *continuous* trajectory on  $S^2$ . For example, the trajectories may be  $U(1)$ -rotations, as for the quantum mechanics of a spin in a homogeneous magnetic field. Continuous rotations can also arise if the Hamiltonian has no continuous symmetry at all.

## X. REALIZATIONS OF A PROBABILISTIC OBSERVABLES

Probabilistic observables play a central role in the derivation of the laws of quantum mechanics from classical statistics presented in this paper. Two attitudes towards this concept are possible. Our favorite one is that the description of reality is genuinely probabilistic. If the state of the world can only be described by probabilistic concepts, it seems natural that the basic notion of an observable should

also be probabilistic. Taking this attitude, the probabilistic character of an observable is the genuine situation. Classical observables that take a sharp value in all micro-states of the system are then a special case, corresponding to an idealization.

As an alternative, one may also follow an approach where classical observables are the basic objects. Probabilistic observables are then an effective concept that arises if several states are grouped together into a new intermediate state, which may then be treated as a micro-state on a higher level. This approach resembles the familiar concept of block spins. In this section we compare both concepts in our setting where quantum physics arises from classical statistics. We emphasize that our description of the two-state quantum system does not depend on how the probabilistic observables are implemented - either as “fundamental” or a “composite” objects.

We start with the implementation in terms of classical observables where the probabilistic observables appear as composite objects. In this case the micro-states of this paper correspond to the intermediate states. They are composed of substates, i.e. the “true micro-states” for which the observables take fixed values. We have already briefly alluded to this concept in sect. III. Consider the spin observable  $A^{(1)}$  or  $A(e_k) = A(1, 0, 0)$ . Since in every micro-state ( $f_k$ ) it is characterized by relative probabilities for values  $\pm 1$ , one needs a classical observable which can only take either the values  $+1$  or  $-1$  for any substate. One therefore needs at least two substates for any micro-state with  $\bar{A}_{f_k}(1, 0, 0) \neq \pm 1$ . The mean value in the micro-state ( $f_k$ ),  $\bar{A}_{f_k}(1, 0, 0)$ , is then given by the relative probabilities of the two substates. For a given  $f_k$  these relative probabilities are fixed “once and forever”. Our setting and the quantum mechanical time evolution do not describe situations where these relative probabilities between the substates change.

At this point we have derived the composite probabilistic observable  $A(1, 0, 0)$  from a classical observable  $B(1, 0, 0)$  which takes respectively the values  $B = +1$  in one of the substates, and  $B = -1$  in the other one. Denoting the relative probabilities of the two substates of the state ( $f_k$ ) with  $w_+(f_k), w_-(f_k) = 1 - w_+(f_k)$ , the probabilities of the substates are given by  $p_+(f_k) = p(f_k)w_+(f_k)$  and  $p_-(f_k) = p(f_k)w_-(f_k)$ , and the mean value of  $A(1, 0, 0)$  in the micro-state ( $f_k$ ) reads  $\bar{A}_{f_k}(1, 0, 0) = w_+(f_k) - w_-(f_k)$ . For the opposite spin,  $A(-1, 0, 0)$ , one finds  $\bar{A}_{f_k}(-1, 0, 0) = w_-(f_k) - w_+(f_k)$ .

We next add a second two-level observable  $A^{(2)} = A(0, 1, 0)$ . Since the relative probabilities  $w_{\pm}(f_k)$  are already fixed by the mean values  $\bar{A}_{f_k}(1, 0, 0)$ , we need a further classical observable  $B'$  that again takes values  $+1$  or  $-1$ . Each substate needed for a description of  $A(1, 0, 0)$  has to be divided again into two further substates, such that each state ( $f_k$ ) has now four substates. This process continues if we add the “diagonal spins”  $A\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0\right)$  etc.. For  $N$  two-level-observables (counting  $A(1, 0, 0)$  and  $A(-1, 0, 0)$  separately) one needs  $N/2$  classical observables  $B_N$  and  $2^{N/2}$  substates for every state ( $f_k$ ).

More formally, the possible states of the ensemble can be characterized by  $(f_k; \{\gamma(g_k)\})$ , where  $f_k \in S^2$ ,  $g_k \in S^2/Z_2$  (using  $\gamma(-g_k) = -\gamma(g_k)$ ) and  $\gamma(g_k) = \pm 1$  associates to every direction  $g_k$  a separate discrete variable. The probabilities of these states read (in a discrete notation for finite  $N$ )

$$p(f_k; \{\gamma(g_k)\}) = \prod_{\{g_k\}} \left[ \frac{1}{2} (1 + \gamma(g_k) f_k g_k) \right] p(f_k). \quad (85)$$

All observables  $A(e_k)$  have a fixed value  $+1$  or  $-1$  in every state, given by  $\gamma(e_k)$ . (In other words, the observable  $A(e_k)$  picks out a specific  $\gamma(g_k = e_k)$  and is independent of all  $\gamma(g_k \neq e_k)$ .) Integrating out the substates yields

$$\sum_{\{\gamma(k)\}} p(f_k; \{\gamma(g_k)\}) = p(f_k) \quad (86)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A}_{f_k}(e_k) &= \sum_{\{\gamma(g_k)\}} p(f_k; \{\gamma(g_k)\}) \gamma(e_k) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma(e_k)=\pm 1} \left[ \frac{1}{2} (1 + \gamma(e_k) f_k e_k) \right] \gamma(e_k) = f_k e_k, \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

such that one recovers the micro-states  $f_k$  and the probabilistic observables at an intermediate level. In principle, one could try to realize this situation by a “hidden variable theory”. For  $N \rightarrow \infty$  this would involve infinitely many discrete variables  $\gamma(g_k)$  plus two continuous angular variables which take values on  $S^2$  (i.e.  $f_k$ ). Some law (deterministic or not) would have to reproduce the probability distribution (85) for finding the values  $(f_k; \gamma(g_k))$  of the hidden variables.

While such a description of probabilistic observables in terms of classical observables is possible, it needs for large  $N$  a very high number of substates. In consequence, one encounters a very high degree of redundancy of the description by unobservable quantities. In addition, the fact that the relative probabilities for the substates do not change in the course of the time evolution may need some explanation.

This redundancy is absent if we consider the notion of probabilistic observables as fundamental. We may still formulate the probabilistic observables in terms of a “basic observable” which takes values  $B = \pm 1$ . However, one such observable will now be sufficient for a description of all  $A(e_k)$ . As a fundamental object, a probabilistic observable is *defined* by the relative probabilities  $w_{\pm}(f_k)$  to observe  $B = 1$  or  $B = -1$  in a given state ( $f_k$ ). Different probabilities  $w_{\pm}(f_k)$  simply define different probabilistic observables. Instead of considering one fixed value of  $w_{\pm}(f_k)$ , a change of the relative probability for a given ( $f_k$ ) describes now the change from one observable to another.

The required relative probabilities  $w_+(f_k)$  are easily computed for all two level observables  $A(e_k)$  as

$$w_+(f_k; e_k) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \bar{A}_{f_k}(e_k)) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \sum_k f_k e_k). \quad (88)$$

We may still introduce two substates ( $f_k^+$ ) and  $f_k^-$ ) for each micro-state ( $f_k$ ), and consider  $B$  as a classical observable that takes the value  $B = 1$  for all substates ( $f_k^+$ ) and  $B = -1$  for all substates ( $f_k^-$ ). However, the relative probability with which the substates are counted depends now on the observable  $A(e_k)$  according to eq. (88). This dependence on  $e_k$  appears manifestly in the expectation values

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A(e_k) \rangle &= \sum_{\{f_k\}} \sum_{\gamma=\pm 1} \gamma \hat{p}_{e_k}(f_k, \gamma), \\ \hat{p}_{e_k}(f_k, \gamma) &= \frac{1}{2} (1 + \gamma \sum_k f_k e_k) p(f_k). \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

Here  $\hat{p}_{e_k}(f_k, \gamma)$  is the effective probability with which the possible values of  $B$ , namely  $\gamma = \pm 1$ , are counted for every substate. It obeys  $\hat{p}(f_k, \gamma) \geq 0$  and  $\sum_{\{f_k\}} \sum_{\gamma} \hat{p}(f_k, \gamma) = 1$ . However,  $\hat{p}$  depends now on the observable, i.e. on  $e_k$ . This is a major difference from the usual setting in classical statistics. It reflects the probabilistic nature of the observables, where part of the probability information is used for the definition of the observable - in our case the relative substate probability (88). We note in this context that eqs. (88), (89) define positive semidefinite probabilities for  $\sum_k e_k^2 = 1$ . The scaling of observables is achieved in this formulation by a scaling of  $B$ , i.e. by a multiplication of the first eq. (88) by  $\lambda$ .

For fundamental probabilistic observables the correspondence between classical statistics entities and quantum mechanical objects becomes quite close. The basic variable  $B$  in classical statistics can only take the values  $\pm 1$ , corresponding to the eigenvalues of the normalized spin operators in quantum mechanics and therefore to the possible outcome of a single measurement of the observables. The continuum of classical pure states on  $S^2$  corresponds to the continuum of quantum mechanical pure states. The continuum of classical spin observables  $A(e_k)$  corresponds to the continuum of normalized spin operators in two-state quantum mechanics. In the classical statistics setting the mixed states are described at this stage by infinitely many probabilities  $p(f_k)$ , while the density matrix  $\rho$  in quantum mechanics needs only one probability  $w$  to decompose  $\rho = w\rho^{(1)} + (1-w)\rho^{(2)}$  into two pure state density matrices  $\rho^{(1)}$  and  $\rho^{(2)}$ . In this respect, classical statistics remains redundant. It describes quantities  $p(f_k)$  that cannot be determined by measurements of the two-level observables  $A(e_k)$ . The redundancy can be removed by integrating over the micro-states using eq. (83)

$$\hat{p}_{e_k}(\rho_k, \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \gamma \sum_k \rho_k e_k). \quad (90)$$

The formula (90) permits also a different interpretation. One may consider  $B$  as the true observable of the system, with discrete values  $+1$  or  $-1$  in the two “basic states”. The basic states are further characterized by “external properties”, namely the “state of the atom” labeled by  $\rho_k = \sqrt{P} f_k$ , and the “measurement orientation”, labeled by  $e_k$ . Thus a basic state can be parameterized by four angles, the purity and one discrete variable ( $f_k, e_k, P; \gamma$ ), with

$f_k \in S^2, e_k \in S^2/Z_2, P \in [0, 1], \gamma \in Z_2$ . The probabilities for the two basic states obey

$$p(f_k, e_k, P; \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \gamma \sqrt{P} \sum_k f_k e_k) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \gamma \sum_k \rho_k e_k), \quad (91)$$

such that actually only the relative angle  $\varphi$  between the atom-polarization and the apparatus orientation matters, i.e.  $f_k e_k = \cos \varphi$ . One has obviously

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\gamma=\pm 1} p(f_k, e_k, P; \gamma) &= 1, \quad 0 \leq p(f_k, e_k, P; \gamma) \leq 1, \quad (92) \\ \langle B \rangle &= \sum_{\gamma=\pm 1} \gamma p(f_k, e_k, P; \gamma) = \sqrt{P} \sum_k f_k e_k = \sum_k \rho_k e_k. \end{aligned}$$

This point of view reflects precisely the setting of the Stern-Gerlach experiment, which splits an incoming polarized atom beam into two beams with different directions, corresponding to  $B = \pm 1$ . The probability of finding an atom in the  $B = 1$  direction only depends on the angle between the polarization and the homogeneous magnetic field of the apparatus, as given by  $\sum_k f_k e_k$ , and on the degree of polarization, as given by  $P$ . It obtains from eq. (91) with  $\gamma = 1$ . In this setting the time evolution of the “atom state” is described by the deterministic evolution equation for the “external parameters”  $\rho_k$ . The shift in the point of view as compared to the probabilistic observables  $A(e_k)$  consists in attributing the information contained in  $e_k$  to the basic state, rather than to the observable. The price for the simplicity of this picture is, of course, the explicit appearance of the “measurement orientation” in the relative probability for the  $B = 1$  and  $B = -1$  states. The probability of finding  $B = 1$  or  $B = -1$  not only depends on the state of the atom, but also on the state of the apparatus used for the measurements.

In the formulation with substates, a given substate ( $f_k, \{\gamma(e_k)\}$ ) contains simultaneously the information about the values of *infinitely* many observables  $A(e_k)$ . The orientation of the measurement apparatus then decides which one of the  $A(e_k)$  measured. In contrast, the picture with basis states has only *one* “basis observable”  $B$ . One has to specify the condition under which it can be measured through the measurement orientation  $e_k$ . No apparatus must actually be present - eq. (91) defines the outcome for all possible measurement directions. For an actual measurement, the orientation of the apparatus then decides which one of the  $e_k$  applies for the given measurement situation.

## XI. CONCLUSIONS

We have discussed a classical statistical ensemble that exhibits all features of a two-state quantum system. The quantum mechanical density matrix obtains by reduction of an infinity of classical micro-states to a few effective states. The minimal number of effective states depends on the observables which can describe an isolated (or approximately isolated) partial system as, for example, an atom in



its environment. The expectation values of all observables of the partial system can be computed from the “effective probabilities” of the effective states or the associated density matrix  $\rho$  as  $\langle A \rangle = \text{tr}(\hat{A}\rho)$ , precisely the law of quantum mechanics. We have explicitly constructed the quantum mechanical operators  $\hat{A}$  associated to classical spin observables  $A$ . They do not commute.

For pure states with  $\text{tr}\rho^2 = 1$  one can “take the root” of the density matrix by introducing the quantum mechanical wave function  $\psi$  in the usual way, with  $\langle A \rangle = \psi^\dagger \hat{A}\psi$ . The formalism of quantum mechanics, with probability amplitudes, superposition of states and interference is recovered. The quantum mechanical wave function appears here as a derived quantity rather than the fundamental object in quantum mechanics.

The time evolution of the classical probability distribution is equivalent to the unitary time evolution of the density matrix only if the purity of the ensemble is conserved. Conservation of purity should be interpreted as a perfect isolation of the partial system described by the observables. A purity conserving evolution is described by a Hamilton operator  $\hat{H}$ . Since  $\hat{H}$  is the generator of time translations it should correspond to the energy of the isolated partial system by virtue of the Noether theorem. A unitary time evolution of a pure state is described by the Schrödinger equation for  $\psi$ .

Our construction can be extended beyond the two-state quantum system. For  $M$  quantum states the manifold of micro-states parameterized by  $f_k$  corresponds to the homogeneous space  $SU(M)/SU(M-1) \times U(1)$ , while the discussion of this paper was restricted to  $M = 2$  where  $SU(2)/U(1)$  parameterizes the sphere  $S^2$ . An explicit discussion of the phenomena of entanglement, superposition and interference within classical statistics is given for  $M = 4$  in ref. [4]. For identical “particles” this also accounts for the difference between fermions and bosons. We observe that the restriction to a manifold of micro-states  $SU(M)/SU(M-1) \times U(1)$  is not necessary. The latter is simply the minimal manifold needed in order to implement an unitary continuous time evolution. One may embed this manifold into a larger manifold of classical states. Then it appears as a projection of the larger ensemble on the “micro-states”. Their probability distribution carries all the information needed for the expectation values of the observables of the “isolated system”, plus irrelevant additional information if the state is mixed.

The unitary time evolution of quantum mechanics appears as a special case of a wider class of time evolutions of the classical ensemble. We argue that the special case of the unitary evolution of pure states corresponds to a partial fixed point of the more general evolution equations. The general time evolution of the classical ensemble can also account for the phenomenon of decoherence, corresponding to decreasing purity, and “syncoherence” for the increase of purity as the pure state fixed point is approached. This shows that the classical ensemble can describe an incompletely isolated quantum system embedded in its environment, with quantum mechanics as an idealization where the isolation becomes perfect.

In our picture, an atom and its environment are described by a classical statistical ensemble with infinitely many degrees of freedom. If a gas of atoms is dilute enough the picture of an isolated atom becomes a good approximation. Such an isolated atom can be described by a few observables out of the infinitely many possible observables of the whole system. The expectation values and correlations of these observables can be computed by a reduction to effective states, with “effective probabilities” mirrored in the density matrix. The limit of perfect isolation is described by a unitary time evolution - this is quantum mechanics.

- 
- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolski, N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47** (1935) 777
- [2] J. S. Bell, Physica 1 (1964) 195
- [3] S. Kochen, E. P. Specker, Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics **17** (1967), 59;  
N. D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** (1990) 3373;  
A. Peres, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **24** (1991) L175
- [4] C. Wetterich, arXiv: 0809.2671 [quant-ph]
- [5] H. D. Zeh, Found. Phys. **1** (1970) 69;  
E. Joos, H. D. Zeh, Z. Phys. **B59** (1985) 273;  
E. Joos, H. D. Zeh, C. Kiefer, D. Giulini, J. Kupsch, I.-O. Stamatescu, "Decoherence and the appearance of the classical world", Springer 2003;
- W. Zurek, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75** (2003) 715
- [6] W. Zurek, arXiv: 0707.2832
- [7] J. I. Cirac, P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** (1995) 4091
- [8] D. Bouwmeester, J. W. Pan, K. Mattle, M. Eibl, H. Weinfurter, A. Zeilinger, Nature **390** (1997) 575
- [9] C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B314** (1989) 40; Nucl. Phys. **B397** (1993) 299
- [10] C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. **B399**(1997) 123
- [11] C. Wetterich, in "Decoherence and Entropy in Complex Systems", ed. T. Elze, p. 180, Springer Verlag 2004, arXiv: quant-ph/0212031