

Generalizing Gibbsian Statistical Ensemble Theory for Strongly Coupled Heterogeneous Systems

Yu-Chen Cheng^{1,*}, Wenning Wang^{2,†} and Hong Qian^{1,‡}

¹*Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, U.S.A.*

²*Department of Chemistry, Fudan University, Shanghai 200438, P.R.C.*

We use the theory of probability to show that, as the fraction $X_n/Y \rightarrow 0$, the conditional probability for X_n , given $X_n + Y \in h_\delta := [h, h + \delta]$, has a limit law $f_{X_n}(x)e^{-\psi_n(h_\delta)x}$, where $\psi_n(h_\delta)$ equals to $[\partial \ln P(Y \in y_\delta)/\partial y]_{y=h}$ plus an additional term, contributed from the strong correlation between X_n and bath Y . Since δ is infinitesimal, the theory shows a logic equivalence between the conditional probability setup and traditional energy conservation in dynamics. We obtain the state space density for a system strongly coupled to a heat bath. A discrete version of the theorem yields the grand canonical distribution without the Gibbs paradox. In terms of certain invariant criteria with respect to h_δ , the concept of a thermodynamic reservoir is given.

INTRODUCTION

Gibbs' theory proper concerns with finite size systems that are in contact with a *temperature bath*. It reproduces the classical thermodynamic results as the limiting behavior when the size tending to infinity, e.g., *thermodynamic limit*. The Laplace transform of partition functions becomes the Legendre transform of thermodynamic potentials in the limit. The theory has been widely checked against experiments on finite and even small systems of liquids, solutions, and macromolecules. In biophysical chemistry, it has been used as a natural law for understanding molecular interactions [1].

Through a rigorous mathematical analysis, we recently argued [2] that not only the macroscopic thermodynamics is an emergent phenomenon, the very Gibbs' formalism itself is a result of a limit law according to the theory of *conditional probability*. The limit law is to the canonical distribution what the central limit theorem is to the Gaussian fluctuation theory developed by Einstein and Landau [3]. And as in the theories of phase transition [4] and the passing from quantum mechanics to quantum chemistry via Born-Oppenheimer approximation, the mathematical limit involves subtleties that have fundamental importance [5].

The aim of this paper is to generalize the Gibbs' theory to strongly coupled, heterogeneous systems: Consider a system \mathfrak{S} coupled to its bath \mathfrak{W} with a setup: (i) interactions between \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{W} might not be negligible; (ii) \mathfrak{S} can be distinct to \mathfrak{W} with respect to the physical properties, e.g., water with ice floating, or the chemical composition, e.g., side-chain conformational variations in protein structure [6] and a RNA molecule immersed in aqueous solution [7].

However, current mathematical theories, *the equivalence of ensembles* [8–12] and *the Gibbs conditioning principle* [13–16], are not sufficient to justify the state space density of \mathfrak{S} for the following reasons: Both theories require the heat bath \mathfrak{W} as a large number of identical copies of \mathfrak{S} , and the theory of equivalence of ensembles fails in certain circumstance when the system has critical phenomena [9, 17, 18].

To logically solve this issue, a new result is presented in this work: Let U_1 and U_2 be the bare energy of \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{W} , respectively, and U_{12} be the interaction energy. Now, the distribution of U_1 , given a conserved total energy $U_t =$

$U_1 + U_{12} + U_2$, can be expressed by the conditional probability $f_{U_1|U_t}$. As $U_1/U_t \rightarrow 0$, $f_{U_1|U_t}$ is asymptotic to f_{U_1} weighted by an exponential factor whose exponent is determined by both of the fluctuations of U_2 and the correlation caused by U_{12} . This new result is based on the key lemma provided in the next section. Under the assumption of the *principle of equal a priori probabilities* [19], we further apply that lemma to derive the state space density of \mathfrak{S} .

In addition, having that key lemma also provides a lens for helping us look through the grand canonical ensemble from a different perspective: Consider a group of particles distributed randomly in a space. Let K and L be the particle numbers in two adjacent regions of the space, and the region of K be infinitesimal in comparison to the region of L . Then the lemma implies that conditional distribution $P_{K|K+L}$ is asymptotic to P_K weighted by an exponential factor whose exponent is solely determined by the fluctuations of L . From this perspective, undetermined P_K yields the freedom of choosing a prior distribution, which echoes the “subjectivity” in the informatic view of resolving the Gibbs paradox [20].

THREE MATHEMATICAL THEOREMS

In the following lemma, X is indexed by n to represent an infinitesimal system and no assumption of independence between “system of interest” X and “heat bath” Y is made. Thm 1. shows however the importance of X, Y independence in defining a unambiguous equilibrium temperature for all X s that are in contact with a given Y . Thm 2. is an extension of the lemma to integer random variables. Thm 3. further clarifies the condition under which the temperature is uniquely defined for a heat bath irrespective of the details of the “contact”. We state the key results without the proofs, see [2] for the full mathematical details.

New result of applying the Lemma to strongly coupled systems is presented in a later section.

Lemma, a limit law for a sequence of conditional probabilities: Consider a sequence of non-negative random variable $X_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and another non-negative random variable $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ which needs not to be independent of X_n , on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) . Denoting $H_n = X_n + Y$ and

$\mathbb{E}[X_n^2] = a_n^2$, where $a_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then the sequence of conditional probability density functions has an asymptotic expression [28]:

$$f_{X_n|H_n}(x; h_\delta) \simeq Z_n^{-1}(h_\delta) f_{X_n}(x) e^{-\psi_n(h_\delta)x}, \quad (1a)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $h_\delta := [h, h + \delta] \in \mathbb{R}$, $f_{X_n}(x)$ is the marginal distribution of the correlated pair (X_n, Y) , Z_n is the normalization factor, and

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_n(h_\delta) &= \left. \frac{\partial \ln P(Y \in y_\delta)}{\partial y} \right|_{y=h} \\ &+ \left[\frac{\partial \ln C_n(y_\delta; x)}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial \ln C_n(y_\delta; x)}{\partial x} \right]_{x=0, y=h}, \end{aligned} \quad (1b)$$

where $y_\delta := [y, y + \delta]$ and

$$C_n(y_\delta; x) = \frac{P(Y \in y_\delta | X_n = x)}{P(Y \in y_\delta)}. \quad (1d)$$

If Y is independent from X_n , $C_n = 1$ and $\psi_n(h_\delta)$ is independent of n ; it is solely determined by the property of $P(Y \in [y, y + \delta])$ near $y = h$. In the following theorems, $(\partial \ln P(Y \in y_\delta) / \partial y)_{y=h}$ is denoted by $\beta^*(h_\delta)$.

Theorem 1, canonical Gibbs distribution on phase space. Consider a compact continuous phase space $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n_1+2n_2}$ with state variable $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)$, $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n_1}$, $\mathbf{w}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n_2}$. Furthermore \mathbf{w}_1 and \mathbf{w}_2 are independent w.r.t. P . Assume three non-negative continuous functions that satisfy $U_t(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) = U_1(\mathbf{w}_1) + U_2(\mathbf{w}_2)$ and $U_1(\mathbf{w}_1) \ll U_2(\mathbf{w}_2)$. Let $Y := U_2(\mathbf{w}_2)$, then the limit distribution in (1a) implies

$$\begin{aligned} P(U_1(\mathbf{w}_1) \leq a | U_t(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) \in h_\delta) \\ \simeq \int_{U_1(\mathbf{w}_1) \in [0, a]} Z^{-1}(\beta^*) e^{-\beta^* U_1(\mathbf{w}_1)} \mu_1(d\mathbf{w}_1), \end{aligned} \quad (2a)$$

in which μ_1 is the induced measure of P by the projection from $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)$ to \mathbf{w}_1 . Under the assumption of the principle of equal a priori probabilities for all \mathbf{w}_1 in each set $U_1(\mathbf{w}_1) \in [a, a + da]$, then the conditional density of \mathbf{w}_1 w.r.t. μ_1 follows

$$f(\mathbf{w}_1 | U_t \in h_\delta) \simeq Z^{-1}(\beta^*) e^{-\beta^* U_1(\mathbf{w}_1)}. \quad (2b)$$

Theorem 2, counting statistics and grand canonical distribution. Consider a sequence of non-negative integer random variables $L_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and another non-negative integer random variable $K \in \mathbb{Z}$ which is independent to L_n . Denoting $M_n = K + L_n$. There exists $b_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $c_n \geq 0$ such that $\tilde{L}_n := (L_n - c_n)/b_n$ converges to a continuous random variable \tilde{Y} in distribution. Then the sequence of conditional probability mass functions has an asymptotic expression [29]:

$$p_{K|M_n}(k; b_n h_\delta + c_n) \simeq Q_n^{-1}(h_\delta) p_K(k) e^{\mu(h_\delta)k/b_n}, \quad (3a)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $p_K(k)$ is the marginal distribution of K , Q_n is the normalization factor, and

$$\mu(h_\delta) = - \left. \frac{\partial \ln P(\tilde{Y} \in y_\delta)}{\partial y} \right|_{y=h}. \quad (3b)$$

Furthermore, the product of (2b) and (3a) yields the joint probability of \mathbf{w}_1 and K conditioned on both U_t and M_n for the grand canonical distribution.

The interval $h_\delta := [h, h + \delta]$ plays an essential role in the forementioned theorems; it determines the exponent for the exponential (or geometric) factor. Thm. 3 illustrates that the above results become minimally dependent upon the choice of h_δ if the $P(Y \in h_\delta)$ satisfies certain invariance criteria.

Theorem 3, invariance w.r.t. choosing h_δ : Under the same setup as Lemma with Y independent of X_n , let us consider subinterval $h'_{\delta'} := [h', h' + \delta'] \subset h_\delta$. The following three statements are equivalent:

1. Invariance w.r.t. subintervals: For all subintervals $h'_{\delta'}$, the distance in terms of the total variation between $f_{X_n|H_n}(x; h'_{\delta'})$ and $f_{X_n|H_n}(x; h_\delta)$ converges to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
2. Equal exponent: For all subintervals $h'_{\delta'}$,

$$\left. \frac{\partial \ln P(Y \in y_{\delta'})}{\partial y} \right|_{y=h'} \equiv \beta^*(h_\delta). \quad (4a)$$

3. The heat-bath property: The conditional probability density for Y at $y \in [h, h + \delta]$ is itself exponentially distributed as:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{Y|\{Y \in h_\delta\}}(y) &= \lim_{\delta' \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta'} P(Y \in y_{\delta'} | Y \in h_\delta) \\ &= \frac{\beta^* e^{\beta^* y}}{e^{\beta^*(h+\delta)} - e^{\beta^* h}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4b)$$

NEW INSIGHTS FROM THE THEOREMS

Dynamic conservation vs. conditional probability — Let us consider a *Gedankenexperiment* on a very large mechanical system $\mathfrak{S} \cup \mathfrak{W}$ in which the small part \mathfrak{S} has mechanical energy fluctuations. If one only measures the *static statistics* of the energy of \mathfrak{S} , should the resulting statistics be different between (a) $\mathfrak{S} \cup \mathfrak{W}$ has a conserved total mechanical energy $E_{\mathfrak{S} \cup \mathfrak{W}} \in [h, h + \delta]$, with infinitesimal δ , for all time determined by the initial condition for the dynamics; and (b) $\mathfrak{S} \cup \mathfrak{W}$ has a fluctuating total mechanical energy $E_{\mathfrak{S} \cup \mathfrak{W}}(t)$ as a function of time, but one selects only those measurements on \mathfrak{S} that simultaneously has $E_{\mathfrak{S} \cup \mathfrak{W}} \in [h, h + \delta]$?

If one installs an equivalent principle between (a) and (b), the lemma can be interpreted as follows: First, the fixed Y with varying X indexed by n implies that the system of interest is relatively small to its heat bath, and it is called the *heat-bath limit* as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Second, the total energy $X + Y = h$ is conserved, subjected to small fluctuations δ . This is understood as the *microcanonical ensemble*. Third, in particular, if the system is asymptotically uncorrelated with its heat bath in the heat-bath limit: This is reflected in the correlation-related term (1d) converging to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then it arises as a universal parameter $\beta^*(h_\delta) = \partial \ln P(Y \in$

$h_\delta)/\partial y$ which is solely determined by the fluctuations of the heat bath.

Strongly coupled systems — When X and Y are not independent, in addition to the β^* from the bath, there is an additional force acting on the system exerted by the environment: The force is not uniform on different $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n_1}$. Applying the Lemma and modifying the setup of Thm. 2 with energy function $U_t(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) = U_1(\mathbf{w}_1) + U_{12}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) + U_2(\mathbf{w}_2)$, in which $U_{12}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)$ is a non-negligible interaction energy. We group $U_{12}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)$ and $U_2(\mathbf{w}_2)$ together into a new observable $Y := U_{12}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) + U_2(\mathbf{w}_2)$. Now $X := U_1(\mathbf{w}_1)$ and Y are no longer independent. Then parallel to Thm. 1, the lemma shows that the conditional density for the state variable \mathbf{w}_1 is proportional to $e^{-\psi_n(h_\delta)U_1(\mathbf{w}_1)}$ given in Eq. (1a). Let us rewrite it as

$$f^{(m)}(\mathbf{w}_1|U_t \in h_\delta) \propto e^{-\beta^*U_1(\mathbf{w}_1) + \phi^{(m)}(\mathbf{w}_1; h_\delta)}, \quad (5a)$$

$$\phi^{(m)}(\mathbf{w}_1; h_\delta) = \ln \frac{C([h - U_1(\mathbf{w}_1)]_\delta; U_1(\mathbf{w}_1))}{C(h_\delta; 0)}. \quad (5b)$$

The superscript m indicates the conditional density as a result of the assumption that the isolated total system obeys the microcanonical ensembles. And recall that function $C(y_\delta; x) = P(Y \in y_\delta | X = x) / P(Y \in y_\delta)$ is defined in Eq. (1d) regarding the correlation of the system and its bath.

Recently, Jarzynski [7], Talkner and Hänggi [21] have discussed strongly coupled systems within a total system that is canonically distributed: $f^{(c)}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) \propto \exp\{-\gamma[U_1(\mathbf{w}_1) + U_{12}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) + U_2(\mathbf{w}_2)]\}$. The marginal density then

$$f^{(c)}(\mathbf{w}_1) \propto e^{-\gamma U_1(\mathbf{w}_1) + \phi^{(c)}(\mathbf{w}_1; \gamma)}, \quad (6a)$$

$$\phi^{(c)}(\mathbf{w}_1; \gamma) = \ln \frac{\int d\mathbf{w}_2 \exp[-\gamma(U_{12}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) + U_2(\mathbf{w}_2))]}{\int d\mathbf{w}_2 \exp[-\gamma U_2(\mathbf{w}_2)]}. \quad (6b)$$

If the function of interactions U_{12} depends only on the positions, given $V_0(\mathbf{w}_1)$ as the potential of the small system not in contact with a heat bath, then

$$V^{(c)}(\mathbf{w}_1) = V_0(\mathbf{w}_1) + \phi^{(c)}(\mathbf{w}_1; \gamma) \quad (7)$$

matches Kirkwood's potential of mean force [22]; the force is acting on \mathbf{w}_1 and averaged over all the $\mathbf{w}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n_2}$.

Given the conditions for equivalence of ensembles [9, 11, 17] and choose $\gamma = \beta^*(h_\delta)$, in the thermodynamic limit, $f^{(m)}$ in (5a) and $f^{(c)}$ in (6a) should be the same - hence $\phi^{(m)}(\mathbf{w}_1; h_\delta)$ in (5b) and $\phi^{(c)}(\mathbf{w}_1; \beta^*(h_\delta))$ in (6b) only off by a \mathbf{w}_1 -independent constant [30]. This result shows that

$$V^{(m)}(\mathbf{w}_1) = V_0(\mathbf{w}_1) + \phi^{(m)}(\mathbf{w}_1; h_\delta) \quad (8)$$

can be considered as another representation for the potential of mean force on \mathbf{w}_1 by using the correlation of the pair (X, Y) . In comparison to $V^{(c)}(\mathbf{w}_1)$, even without having the equations of functions U_1, U_{12}, U_2 , the representation

by $V^{(m)}(\mathbf{w}_1)$ still works once the statistics are given by experiments.

We shall emphasize that the equivalence of ensembles is not always satisfied when a system has critical phenomena. In this situation, $f^{(c)}$ obtained under the assumption of a canonically distributed total system is no longer valid to represent the state space density of a small system contained in a large isolated system. The significance of the present work is that the state space density given by $f^{(m)}$ is generally true for a small system strongly coupled to its bath with total energy conservation, even if equivalence of ensembles is invalid.

Heterogeneous systems — In our mathematical framework, Ω represents the compact, continuous phase space of the total system with microstate variable $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)$. Let Ω_1 be the phase space for \mathbf{w}_1 and Ω_2 be the phase space for \mathbf{w}_2 . Then the structure of Thm. 1 is as follows:

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega), P) \xrightarrow{\pi_1} (\Omega_1, \mathcal{B}(\Omega_1), \mu_1) \xrightarrow{U_1} (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), F_{U_1}),$$

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega), P) \xrightarrow{\pi_2} (\Omega_2, \mathcal{B}(\Omega_2), \mu_2) \xrightarrow{U_2} (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), F_{U_2}),$$

in which π_1, π_2 are the projection maps with the corresponding induced measures μ_1, μ_2 , and U_1, U_2 are the functions for observables with the distributions F_{U_1}, F_{U_2} . To begin with the lemma, we have $F_{U_1|U_1+U_2}(x; h_\delta)$ at the level of observables; furthermore, by the principle of equal a priori probabilities for all \mathbf{w}_1 in each thin shell of U_1 , we then obtain $f(\mathbf{w}_1|U_1 + U_2 \in h_\delta)$ w.r.t. μ_1 at the level of microstates.

The strength of this approach can be seen when it is applied to heterogeneous systems: Let us consider the example for a RNA molecule immersed in an aqueous solution [7]. Now, \mathbf{w}_1 represents the microstate of the RNA and \mathbf{w}_2 represents the microstate of the solution. In this case, since the molecule is distinct to the aqueous solution, so a justification of the distribution of \mathbf{w}_1 was missing in the previous mathematical theories based on a homogeneous total system. On the other hand, by applying the lemma, one only need to check $U_1(\mathbf{w}_1) \ll U_2(\mathbf{w}_2)$ to obtain the distribution of $U_1(\mathbf{w}_1)$ in Eq. (2a); Furthermore, given the principle of equal a priori probabilities for \mathbf{w}_1 [31], the density of \mathbf{w}_1 in Eq. (2b) can be further justified. As discussed above, by introducing the interaction term $U_{12} : (\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, this approach can also be extended to finding the density in Eq. (5a) when the molecule has strong interactions with the solution.

Grand canonical ensemble and Gibbs paradox — Gibbs introduced the notion of a *grand canonical ensemble* for a system that has fluctuating particle numbers due to exchanges with a single material reservoir. Here, Legendre transform inherited from thermodynamics has met with difficulties as a unifying mathematical device for the ensemble theory. The existence of the Gibbs paradox is an indication that a more unified, rigorous treatment is desirable. A recent such attempt based on the principle of maximum relative entropy can be found in [23, 24]. Our probabilistic theory provides a different perspective to understand the Gibbs paradox as follows:

In Thm. 3, if the integer random variables K and L_n are

the number of particles *uniformly distributed* in a space within regions \mathcal{B} and $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{D}$, and we assume the size of \mathcal{B} is infinitesimal in comparison to the whole space, then prior distribution $P_K(k)$ should follow a Poisson distribution [24]. We see clearly that the $1/k!$ arises through the distribution of K *a priori* for counting particles distributed in space, which is known as spatial Poisson point processes. Changing representation from Lagrangian tracking to Eulerian counting of particles gives rise to the notion of entropy of assimilation [25]: For Lagrangian particles the $k!$ is absent; the freedom of choosing priors corresponds to the “subjective observer” discussed in [20].

Idealized heat bath — Our mathematical theory is based on two elements: (i) a small system that is coupled to a much larger one, and (ii) the total system has an observable, an “energy” function, that is restricted within an interval of infinitesimal fluctuations. A question naturally arises: What are the conditions under which the larger system can be idealized as a heat bath that gives the small system of interest a “unique temperature” that is independent of the details of h and δ ? This question is answered by Thm. 3: The heat bath itself has an exponentially distributed energy fluctuation, conditioned on the interval h_δ ; the single parameter on the exponent defines the temperature.

It is highly instructive to note that such an exponential behavior can be justified in terms of the large deviations theory for systems with extensive, Eulerian-homogeneous thermodynamic variables [26]. In this case, one identifies the U_t , a thermodynamic potential, with Y having a probability proportional to e^{-ny} , in which $n \rightarrow \infty$ indicates the thermodynamic limit. Then the normalized density of Y satisfies Eq. (4b). The Y as a bath provides a small system X that is in contact a temperature.

DISCUSSION

Legendre transform in thermodynamics — With one additional assumption, the result in Eq. (1a) gives rise to the Legendre transform in thermodynamics. If one assumes the existence of a thermodynamic limit, with thermodynamic energies and entropies being “extensive quantities” [32], i.e., $S(x) \equiv \ln f_X(x)$ and $\beta^* x$ are both $\propto V$, where $V \rightarrow \infty$ representing the size of the system, then the normalization factor in (1a)

$$\begin{aligned} F(\beta^*) &\equiv -(\beta^*)^{-1} \ln Z = -(\beta^*)^{-1} \ln \int_0^{h+\delta} e^{S(x) - \beta^* x} dx \\ &\simeq \left[E - (\beta^*)^{-1} S(E) \right]_{dS(E)/dE = \beta^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (10a)$$

We note that the thermodynamic equation (10a) is for the system of interest, in addition to being small relative to its heat bath, is itself tending a thermodynamic limit with its size $V \rightarrow \infty$. In contradistinction to the latter, the $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the lemma represents the heat-bath limit: the heat bath is infinitely large in relative to the system. Therefore, if the system and its

heat bath are not independent, in both of the thermodynamic and heat-bath limits, the Eq. (10a) becomes

$$F(\psi^*) \simeq \left[E - (\psi^*)^{-1} S(E) \right]_{dS(E)/dE = \psi^*}, \quad (10b)$$

$$\psi^* = \beta^* + \gamma^*, \quad (10c)$$

where

$$\gamma^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{\partial \ln C_n(y_\delta; x)}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial \ln C_n(y_\delta; x)}{\partial x} \right]_{x=0, y=h}. \quad (10d)$$

In Eqs. (10a) and (10b), let E_β be the solution of $dS(E)/dE = \beta^*$ and E_ψ be the solution of $dS(E)/dE = \psi^*$, then $E_\psi - E_\beta$ is the change in the macroscopic energy due to the interaction effect. This change is a consequence of the non-zero γ^* in Eq. (10d), which means the system and its heat bath are infinitely strongly correlated in the limits. One can hypothesize that correlations as such are due to long-range interactions. Further mechanistic investigations are required in the future.

Prior knowledge of systems — As shown in Thm. 2, our theory provides the freedom of choosing prior distributions for the grand canonical ensemble. Similarly, the prior distributions are also undetermined in Thm. 1 for the generalized canonical ensemble. In particular, if one chooses the uniform prior distribution for the system of interest, i.e., $\mu_1(d\mathbf{w}_1) = d\mathbf{w}_1 / \int_{\Omega_1} d\mathbf{w}_1$, then Eq. (2b) becomes the density of \mathbf{w}_1 w.r.t. the *Lebesgue measure*, which is precisely as the canonical ensemble in standard textbooks [3, 19, 27]. Additionally, if one also chooses the uniform prior distribution for the heat bath, i.e., $\mu_2(d\mathbf{w}_2) = d\mathbf{w}_2 / \int_{\Omega_2} d\mathbf{w}_2$, then the parameter of the exponential factor becomes

$$\beta^* = \frac{\partial \ln P(Y \in y_\delta)}{\partial y} \Big|_{y=h} = \frac{\partial \ln \Gamma(y)}{\partial y} \Big|_{y=h}, \quad (11a)$$

where Γ is the volume of a set of phase points

$$\Gamma(y) = \int_{U_2(\mathbf{w}_2) \in [y, y+\delta]} d\mathbf{w}_2, \quad (11b)$$

and $\ln \Gamma$ is corresponding to the Boltzmann’s entropy. The reciprocal of (11a) is known as the *absolute temperature* in the textbooks. Furthermore, by adding the correlation-related term (1c) to Eq. (11a), we then show that a strongly coupled heterogeneous system, assumed each part has its own natural structure obeying the uniform priori, has a temperature T^*

$$\frac{1}{T^*} = \frac{\partial \ln \Gamma(y)}{\partial y} \Big|_{y=h} + \gamma^*. \quad (12)$$

This emergent temperature is contributed by the absolute temperature and a correction term due to infinitely strong correlations in the heat-bath limit.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank Michael V. Berry, Chris Burdzy, Hao Ge, Yao Li, Matt Lorig, Lowell Thompson, Hugo Touchette, Angelo Vulpiani, and Ying-Jen Yang for discussions and comments.

* yuchen@u.washington.edu

† wnwang@fudan.edu.cn

‡ hqian@u.washington.edu

- [1] J. A. Schellman, *Biophys. Chem.* **64**, 7 (1997).
- [2] Y. C. Cheng, H. Qian, and Y. Zhu, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **22**, 1561 (2021).
- [3] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics* (Pergamon Press, Oxford 1958).
- [4] P. W. Anderson, *Science* **177**, 393 (1971).
- [5] S. Chibbaro, L. Rondoni, and A. Vulpiani, *Reductionism, Emergence and Levels of Reality* (Springer, New York, 2014).
- [6] Z. Xiang, P.J. Steinbach, M.P. Jacobson, R.A. Friesner, and B. Honig, *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics* **66**, 814 (2007).
- [7] C. Jarzynski, *Physical Review X*, **7**, 011008 (2017).
- [8] A. Ya. Khinchin, *Mathematical Foundations of Statistical Mechanics*, Gamow, G. transl. (Dover, New York, 1949).
- [9] A. Martin-Löf, *J. Stat. Phys.* **20** 557 (1979).
- [10] J. D. Deuschel, D. W. Stroock, and H. Zessin, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **139**, 83 (1991).
- [11] J. T. Lewis, C. E. Pfister, and W. G. Sullivan, *J. Stat. Phys.* **77**, 397 (1994).
- [12] H. O. Georgii, *J. Stat. Phys.* **80**, 31241 (1995).
- [13] Z. L. Zabell, *Ann. Probab.* **8**, 928 (1980).
- [14] J. M. van Campenhout and T. M. Cover, *IEEE Trans. Info. Th.* **IT-27**, 483 (1981).
- [15] D. W. Stroock and O. Zeitouni, In *Random walks, Brownian motion, and interacting particle systems*, pp. 399-424 (Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 1991).
- [16] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni, *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications. Applications of Mathematics* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2010).
- [17] H. Touchette, *J. Stat. Phys.* **159** 987 (2015).
- [18] A. Friedli and Y. Velenik, *Statistical Mechanics of Lattice Systems: A Concrete Mathematical introduction* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2017).
- [19] K. Huang, : *Statistical Mechanics* (Wiley, New York 1975).
- [20] M. E. Cates and V. N. Manoharan, *Soft Matter* **11**, 6538 (2015).
- [21] P. Talkner and P. Hänggi, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **92**, 041002 (2020).
- [22] J. G. Kirkwood, *J. Chem. Phys.* **3**, 300 (1935).
- [23] J. R. Banavar, A. Maritan, and I. Volkov, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matt.* **22**, 063101 (2010).
- [24] H. Ge and H. Qian, arXiv:1105.4118 (2011).
- [25] A. Ben-Naim, *Am. J. Phys.* **55**, 1105 (1987).
- [26] Z. Lu and H. Qian, arXiv:2009.12644 (2020).
- [27] R. K. Pathria, P. D. Beale, *Statistical mechanics* (Academic Press 2011)
- [28] The two probability density functions on lhs and rhs, in term of their KL divergence, has the order of $O(a_n)$.
- [29] The two probability functions on lhs and rhs, in term of their KL divergence, has the order of $O(b_n^{-1})$.
- [30] In the thermodynamic limit, via the Legendre transform, $\phi^{(c)}$ becomes $-\beta^* u_\delta^* + \ln P(Y \in u_\delta^* | X = U_1(\mathbf{w}_1))$, where $u_\delta^* = h_\delta - U_1(\mathbf{w}_1)$ is the most probable energy for Y conditioned on \mathbf{w}_1 . This explains a constant $\phi^{(m)} - \phi^{(c)}$. Rigorous proofs can be found in [9, 11] by showing that equivalence of ensembles is true at the level of states whenever it holds at the level of thermodynamics, even if the systems are non-additive
- [31] For a RNA molecule, if all the potential and kinetic energy are considered, then this is a mechanical system. By the ergodic theory, all microstates \mathbf{w}_1 of the RNA confined to each thin energy shell should be equally probable.
- [32] This is closely related to the large deviations principle in the theory of probability, and the widely cited “maximum term method” in standard textbook.