

NON-EQUILIBRIUM STATISTICAL MECHANICS OF CLASSICAL AND QUANTUM SYSTEMS

Dimitri Kusnezov^{1*}, Eric Lutz^{1†}, Kenichiro Aoki^{2‡}

¹*Center for Theoretical Physics, Sloane Physics Lab, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520-8120*

²*Dept. of Physics, Keio University, 4-1-1 Hiyoshi, Kouhoku-ku, Yokohama 223-8521, Japan*

We study the statistical mechanics of classical and quantum systems in non-equilibrium steady states. Emphasis is placed on systems in strong thermal gradients. Various measures and functional forms of observables are presented. The quantum problem is set up using random matrix techniques, which allows for the construction of the master equation. Special solutions are discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

The efforts to develop statistical mechanics of non-equilibrium systems are easily traced back to the foundations of the subject. As statistical mechanics was developed, it was a natural step to consider how to extend the theory. One can see this in the handwritten notes of J.W. Gibbs [1], in which he formulated the theory of statistical mechanics. Gibbs certainly expended some effort to understand how he might characterize the non-equilibrium steady-state. Gibbs certainly puzzled over how to define entropy for systems in non-equilibrium steady states, as well as how to define the statistical mechanics of a gas in a pressure or temperature gradient. However, no solutions were found. The field has remained active since that time. In the past ten to fifteen years, the emergence of results in classical chaos has led to renewed interest and many new ideas have come about [2].

Non-equilibrium statistical mechanics is replete with unanswered questions. While many theoretical techniques have been suggested to treat transport, a general understanding of the statistical mechanics is still lacking. In these lectures we survey some recent results on non-equilibrium steady states in classical and quantum systems using dynamical boundary conditions.

II. SOME RESULTS FROM CLASSICAL NON-EQUILIBRIUM STATISTICAL MECHANICS

We examine model systems in which a Hamiltonian is coupled to heat reservoirs at two endpoints, as shown in Fig. 1.

*E-mail: dimitri@mirage.physics.yale.edu

† E-mail: eric.lutz@yale.edu

‡ E-mail: ken@phys-h.keio.ac.jp




FIG. 1. Model system of a Hamiltonian H coupled to two thermal reservoirs, at temperatures $T_{cold} = T_1^0$ and $T_{hot} = T_2^0$, separated by a distance L in the x -direction.

The dynamics will be that of the given Hamiltonian, except at the boundaries where it is coupled to the reservoirs. The boundary conditions can be implemented in a variety of ways [3]. Before we discuss quantum systems, we present some results for classical systems, which summarizes results in Refs. [3]- [8] and references there in.

Thermal Conductivity.

The transport coefficient in this case is the thermal conductivity κ . There are two approaches that are used to compute κ . The first is the Green-Kubo approach, where the non-equilibrium transport is computed in terms of equilibrium auto-correlation functions. In this case:

$$\kappa(T) = \frac{1}{T^2} \int_0^\infty dt \int dx \langle J(x, t) J(x_0, 0) \rangle_{EQ}. \quad (1)$$

The heat flow J can be readily computed from the energy-momentum tensor, $J = \mathcal{T}^{01}$, for heat flow in the x -direction. Alternately, one can compute the conductivity directly in a non-equilibrium steady state using Fourier's Law. Measuring the local heat flow J inside the system, and the local temperature $T(x)$, leads to

$$\kappa(T) = -\frac{\langle J \rangle_{NE}}{\nabla T(x)}. \quad (2)$$

For many systems $\kappa(T)$ behaves as a power law, or can be approximated by a power law in temperature ranges of interest:

$$\kappa(T) = \frac{A}{T^\gamma}. \quad (3)$$

We should make a few notes concerning Fourier's law.

- A constant gradient inside a system does not guarantee that Fourier's law holds. When γ is very small, as in the 1-d Fermi-Pasta-Ulam (FPU) β -model around $T \sim 1$, the system can already be too far from equilibrium for Fourier's law to hold, yet the nearly constant κ still provides a near constant gradient and the illusion that the law holds. In the case of the FPU model one finds that Fourier's law is not valid even locally when the system has a near constant temperature gradient.
- A strongly-curved temperature profile $T(x)$ (as in Fig. 2) does not mean that Fourier's law is not valid. It has been shown that even strongly curved profiles can be derived analytically if Fourier's law is satisfied locally. So to contrast with the previous point, the curvature of $T(x)$ does in itself provide no information on whether Fourier's law is valid.
- A system does not need to have a bulk limit to satisfy Fourier's law. In the 1-d FPU model, there is no bulk limit, and κ depends on the system size L . Never the less, Fourier's law is valid even for reasonably strong thermal gradients.
- Fourier's law (2) and the Green-Kubo result (1) have been seen to agree and describe the properties of systems even very far from equilibrium, for cases where $T(x)$ is strongly curved. Hence linear response theory predictions are quite robust and can be expected to hold in strong non-equilibrium environments.

Temperature Profile.

When we discuss the temperature profile inside, $T(x)$, we must distinguish the temperatures of the heat reservoirs, denoted T_1^0 and T_2^0 , and the temperatures just inside the system T_1 and T_2 . This is indicated in Fig. 2. The boundary jumps δT can be quantitatively understood, as we mention below. The temperature inside $T(x)$ is given most directly in terms of the extrapolated temperatures $T_{1,2}$.




FIG. 2. Temperature profile of a system such as that depicted in Fig. 1. The boundary conditions impose temperatures $T_{cold} = T_1^0$ and $T_{hot} = T_2^0$ on the edges, $x = 0, L$. Just inside the system, there is a boundary jump δT . Extrapolating the smooth temperature profile $T(x)$ to the edges defines the temperatures T_1 and T_2 .

We can understand the curvature in the temperature profile using Fourier's law. When the thermal conductivity can be described by a power law in the temperature range of interest (T_1, T_2), such as $\kappa(T) = AT^{-\gamma}$, we can integrate Fourier's law and re-express the result in terms of extrapolated temperatures (T_1, T_2):

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} T_1 \left[1 - \left(1 - \left(\frac{T_2}{T_1} \right)^{1-\gamma} \right) \frac{x}{L} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}, & \gamma \neq 1 \\ T_1 \left(\frac{T_2}{T_1} \right)^{x/L}, & \gamma = 1 \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Note that $\kappa(T)$ need not have a bulk behavior, nor does it need to behave globally as a power law to describe $T(x)$ in non-equilibrium systems. These formulas are quite robust.

Boundary Jumps.

An interesting and often overlooked property of non-equilibrium steady states is the presence of boundary jumps. In fluids which are sheared by moving walls, one observes that the velocity just inside the fluid can be different from the velocity of the wall. For systems in a thermal gradient, there is an analogous jump in the value of the temperature just inside the system. This jump, δT , is illustrated in Fig. 2.

The jump arises due to a mismatch of the mean free path with the edge of the system. It has the general form

$$\delta T_i = T_i^0 - T_i = \eta \left. \frac{\partial T}{\partial n} \right|_{boundary}, \quad (5)$$

where η is a parameter on the order of the mean free path ℓ and n denotes the normal to the boundary [10]. This relation has been verified in two independent manners.

In the first, the boundary jumps δT have been shown to be linearly related to the normal derivative of the temperature profile $T(x)$, extrapolated to the edges of the system. The coefficient η can then be extracted. This relation has been verified in several systems. In the ϕ^4 model in 1-d, for example,

$$\eta(T) = (6.1 \pm 0.5)T^{-1.5 \pm 0.1}. \quad (6)$$

To check if we have the correct understanding, we can make an estimate of η from kinetic theory. Recall that the thermal conductivity is related to the mean free path by $\kappa \simeq C_V c \ell$ by a standard kinetic theory argument. For systems where C_V and c are largely temperature independent, such as in various lattice models, we expect $\kappa \sim \ell$.

Dimensionally, the coefficient η should be on order of the mean free path ℓ , so that $\eta \sim \kappa$. Both the magnitude and power law behavior are consistent with the thermal conductivity obtained in the ϕ^4 model in 1-3 D as well as the FPU model.

An independent verification of the behavior of the jumps can be made by studying how the jumps depend on the heat flux. We let $\eta = \alpha\kappa$, where α is a constant to be determined. From Eq. (5), we can then associate the heat flux with the right side of Eq. (5):

$$T_i - T_i^0 \simeq \alpha \langle J \rangle_{NE} \sim \alpha (T_2^0 - T_1^0) \frac{\kappa(T_{av})}{L} + \dots \quad (7)$$

α is a coefficient which measures the efficacy of the boundary conditions. The linear relation between δT and $\langle J \rangle_{NE}$ has been verified. α has been extracted for a variety of boundary thermostats, and can show strong dependence on those boundary conditions. The understanding of these jumps together with the temperature profile (4) provides a complete description of $T(x)$ in terms of the boundary temperatures, (T_1^0, T_2^0) .

Observables.

If we probe an observable somewhere in the system in the non-equilibrium steady state, can we understand generically how we expect these to behave? It is a natural idea that a physical observable \mathcal{A} will deviate from its value in local equilibrium as we move further away from equilibrium. In our case, a temperature gradient ∇T provides a measure of how far we are from equilibrium. The deviation of an observable $\delta\mathcal{A}$ from its local equilibrium value is expected to behave as

$$\delta\mathcal{A} \equiv \frac{\delta\mathcal{A}}{\mathcal{A}} = C_{\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{\nabla T}{T} \right)^2 + C'_{\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{\nabla T}{T} \right)^4 + \dots \quad (8)$$

This expansion is in even powers since the result should be insensitive to which side of the box is taken as the hot side and which is cold. (Using Fourier's law, we can equally well expand in terms of the current J .) While this seems natural, there has been some contention on analogous expansions in sheared fluids. There non-analytic dependencies on the shear rate have been observed in some numerical simulations, but the situation has not been entirely clarified [11]. The expansion coefficients $C_{\mathcal{A}}, C'_{\mathcal{A}}, \dots$ are in principle dependent on physical quantities, such as T and L , the size of the lattice in the direction of the gradient. If the departures from local equilibrium are local, then the coefficients would be expected to be independent of L . It has been shown that even in systems with bulk transport behavior, the coefficients do indeed depend on the system size.

Far from Equilibrium Spatial Dependence.

The expansion in (8) has the advantage that we can combine it with (4) and obtain the spatial information on how observables vary from local equilibrium values within a system:

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{A}}{\mathcal{A}} = C_{\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{J}{\kappa T} \right)^2 = C_{\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{1}{a + bx} \right)^2 \quad (9)$$

where

$$a = \frac{T_1^{1-\gamma} \mathcal{A}}{\langle J \rangle_{NE}}, \quad b = \gamma - 1. \quad (10)$$

So knowing $C_{\mathcal{A}}$, we can also predict the spatial variation of the non-equilibrium observable \mathcal{A} . This has been tested and verified in classical lattice models in $d = 1 - 3$ dimensions.

The form of (9) brings to light an interesting relation to coarse graining. Let us assume we have an observable which is locally non-equilibrium, so that $\delta\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{A}$ at some point x' is non-zero. Using traditional arguments, we would take a larger box containing x' and assume that on the larger scale, the behavior is closer to local equilibrium. In examining (9) we see that it is a positive definite function of position (up to the overall sign of $C_{\mathcal{A}}$). So any averaging over a larger box will not necessarily converge to $\delta\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{A} = 0$, required for local equilibrium.

Breaking of Local Equilibrium.

Local equilibrium is a property which is usually invoked to allow application of equilibrium physics to a problem of interest. It is seldom quantified. Using the expansion (8), it is possible to quantify the 'quality' of the local equilibrium

assumption. The local temperature at position \mathbf{x} in the model of Fig. 1 is given by $T_k = \langle p_k^2 \rangle$. A natural measure for the deviations from local equilibrium is the deviation of the momentum distribution from the Maxwellian distribution. Consider

$$\mathcal{A} = \langle p^4 \rangle. \quad (11)$$

In local equilibrium, we expect a Gaussian distribution of momenta, thermalized at the local temperature $T(x)$ (or T_k), so that

$$\mathcal{A}_{eq} = \langle p^4 \rangle_{eq} = 3\langle p^2 \rangle^2 = 3T(x)^2. \quad (12)$$

Hence a measure of local equilibrium is given by

$$\delta \langle p_k^4 \rangle = \langle p_k^4 \rangle - 3\langle p_k^2 \rangle^2 = \langle \langle p_k^4 \rangle \rangle, \quad (13)$$

where $\langle \langle p_k^4 \rangle \rangle$ is the cumulant at location k . In principle, we can examine the behavior of other cumulants as measures of the breaking of local equilibrium, such as $\langle \langle p_k^6 \rangle \rangle = \langle p_k^6 \rangle - 15\langle p_k^4 \rangle \langle p_k^2 \rangle + 30\langle p_k^2 \rangle^3$. It is convenient to normalize the cumulants by the local temperature, $\langle \langle p^n \rangle \rangle / T^{n/2}$. These provide a quantitative measure on how far we are from local equilibrium. In local equilibrium, $\langle \langle p^n \rangle \rangle = 0$ ($n > 2$).

Here a few properties which have been observed in lattice models:

- Contrary to naive intuition, the steepest gradient in Fig. 2 does *not* lead to the system being furthest from local equilibrium. In fact, the converse is true — the system is furthest from equilibrium in the flattest region.
- It has been found that $\nabla T / T$ provides a good measure of how far we are from equilibrium and that the cumulants behave as

$$\delta_{LE} = \frac{\langle \langle p^4 \rangle \rangle}{3T^2} = C_{LE} \left(\frac{\nabla T}{T} \right)^2. \quad (14)$$

In the ϕ^4 and FPU models, $C_{LE}^\phi = 1.1(8)L^{0.9(2)}$ ($T = 1$) and $C_{LE}^{FPU} = 4.3(4)L^{0.99(2)}$ ($T = 8.8$). There seems to be a weak T dependence for C_{LE} which is difficult to establish.

- These results are consistent with $d > 1$ in lattice models at the same temperatures.
- Using C_{LE}^ϕ , C_{LE}^{FPU} , one can predict the shape of $\langle \langle p^4 \rangle \rangle / T^2$ in the system using (9), which has been verified numerically.
- As the system moves away from equilibrium by increasing the difference in the boundary temperatures, each point in the interior deviates from local equilibrium in a predictable manner, *without* any threshold. Away from equilibrium, local equilibrium is an approximation that is quite good for small gradients since the deviations from it only vary as $(\nabla T)^2$.
- Similar results hold for higher momentum cumulants.

There are many open questions here that related to measurements in lattice models. The naive expectation would be that since the gradients and the cumulants are local, their relationship should not depend on the system size L . There does seem to be size dependence, even in systems with bulk transport, many mean free paths away from the boundaries.

Corrections to Linear Response.

There is an interesting relation between linear response predictions for transport coefficients and the notion of local equilibrium. For instance, if there is a departure of a predicted transport coefficient from a measured value for a system far from equilibrium, is this an indication that (a) corrections to linear response are needed or (b) local equilibrium is no longer a valid assumption. If the latter is true, temperature can no longer be unambiguously defined. Near global equilibrium, Fourier's law is satisfied *globally* so that there is a constant thermal gradient:

$$J_0 = -\kappa(T)(T_2 - T_1)/L \simeq -\kappa(T)(T_2^0 - T_1^0)/L. \quad (15)$$

As the temperature difference increases, curvature in $T(x)$ usually develops, and Fourier's law is satisfied locally. For $\kappa \sim T^{-\gamma}$, Fourier's law can be integrated to obtain the next leading order correction to J_0 , due to curvature in $T(x)$. Denote this heat flow, J_{LR} , which includes the curvature correction. It behaves as:

$$J_{LR} = J_0 \left[1 + \frac{\gamma(\gamma+1)}{24} L^2 \left(\frac{\nabla T}{T} \right)^2 + \dots \right]. \quad (16)$$

Notice that the curvature correction to J_0 behaves as L^2 .

Using numerical simulations on lattice models, one can push the system very far from equilibrium and examine how J behaves. It is found that as the gradient increases, the energy that can be pumped through the system becomes less than that predicted by linear response theory *even when it is applied locally*. The 'violation' of linear response is defined as δ_{LR} and is found to behave as

$$\delta_{LR} = \frac{J - J_{LR}}{J_{LR}} = C_{LR} \left(\frac{\nabla T}{T} \right)^2. \quad (17)$$

In the ϕ^4 and FPU models, it is found that $C_{LR}^\phi = -4(3)L^{1.0(2)}$ ($T = 1$) and $C_{LR}^{FPU} = -6.6(8)L^{0.9(1)}$ ($T = 8.8$). Notice that this will naively give rise to decreasing current J with increasing gradient. However, when the gradient is this large, the higher order terms in $(\nabla T/T)$ becomes as important. It is believed that the current will eventually saturate under extremely large gradients.

A very interesting picture emerges. Within error, the violation of linear response and local equilibrium are closely connected, occurring in the same manner:

$$\delta_{LE} \sim \delta_{LR}. \quad (18)$$

Further, local equilibrium and linear response have no threshold, and break down in a similar manner as the system moves away from global thermal equilibrium.

Non-Equilibrium Equation of State.

For a simple one-component theory, the equation of state will have a simple form such as $P_{eq}(T)$ or $E_{eq}(T)$, where P and E are the equilibrium pressure and energy density. In the non-equilibrium steady state, one expects new variables to emerge. For thermal gradients, ∇T will become an independent variable. What is surprising, is that even in systems with bulk behavior, there can develop a system size dependence for the non-equilibrium 'equation of state'. For ϕ^4 and FPU lattice models, it is found that

$$P(T, \nabla T, L) = P_{eq}(T) \left[1 + C_P \left(\frac{\nabla T}{T} \right)^2 \right] \quad (19)$$

where $C_P^\phi = 1.5(1.2)L^{0.9(2)}$ ($T = 1$), $C_P^{FPU} = 4.1(6)L^{0.30(4)}$ ($T = 8.8$). Notice that the L dependence makes the equation of state *non-local* even though it is measured locally, in a system with bulk behavior. If we study the energy density, we have a similar result:

$$E(T, \nabla T, L) = E_{eq}(T) \left[1 + C_E \left(\frac{\nabla T}{T} \right)^2 \right] \quad (20)$$

where $C_E^\phi = 0.5(3)L^{0.9(2)}$ ($T = 1$), $C_E^{FPU} = 1.7(7)L^{0.3(1)}$ ($T = 8.8$). In contrast, Extended Irreversible Thermodynamics (EIT), predicts a local behavior for $P - P_{eq}$ in contrast to our observations.

Dimensional Loss.

A consistent picture that emerges from classical simulations of non-equilibrium steady states is that the accessible volume of phase space contracts onto a fractal set. The dimensionality is obtained from the Kaplan-Yorke estimate, which involves calculating the full spectrum of Lyapunov exponents. There is a corresponding loss of dimension ΔD . An important question that arises in non-equilibrium systems is whether the dimensional loss is extensive, and persists in the bulk, or simply a manifestation of low dimensionality. In systems *with bulk behavior*, we expect ΔD to behave

“extensively”. That is, ΔD should remain relatively the same under the same local non-equilibrium conditions when we change the size of the system. Extensivity has been shown in the following form:

$$\frac{\Delta D}{V_{in}} = C_D J^2 \quad (21)$$

where V_{in} is the volume of the system inside, excluding the thermostatted degrees of freedom, while D includes all degrees of freedom. The coefficient is given by

$$C_D = \frac{1}{\kappa \lambda_{max}^{eq} T^2} \left(1 + \frac{2\alpha\kappa}{V_{in}} \right) \xrightarrow{V_{in} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\kappa \lambda_{max}^{eq} T^2} \quad (22)$$

Here λ_{max}^{eq} is the maximum Lyapunov exponent of the full system plus bath, in thermal equilibrium. Some results are

- Extensivity is explicitly related to the macroscopic transport properties through entropy production, which leads to (22). The first systematic study of the role of dynamical thermostats on dimensional loss was also shown in [8].
- While it was emphasized that the extensivity of ΔD is not compatible with local equilibrium so that it is questionable [12]. As was mentioned above, violations of local equilibrium appear in the same manner as dimensional loss. Hence there is no conflict.
- An estimate of dimensional loss in an ideal gas gives an idea of the magnitude of the effect. Using the standard estimates of λ_{max} [2] yields $C_D \simeq [9\rho v^2 \ln(4l/d)/2]^{-1}$, where ρ is the density, v is the average particle velocity, l is the mean free path and d is the particle diameter. For $\nabla T/T \sim 0.01 \text{ m}^{-1}$, $\Delta D \sim 10^9 \text{ m}^{-3}$ at room temperature — quite large, yet far smaller than the total number of degrees of freedom.
- The results are satisfying from the physics point of view. ΔD pertains to the whole system, it includes the temperature profile which is curved in general, boundary temperature jumps and the various types of thermostats. Yet, ΔD can be related to macroscopic transport with the thermostat dependence cleanly separated into λ_{max} . Furthermore, ΔD has extensive behavior with respect to the internal volume wherein the the system is manifestly in non-equilibrium. We have seen that ΔD and λ_{max}^{eq} both depend strongly on the thermostat used, while their product $\Delta D \lambda_{max}^{eq}$ is thermostat *independent* and related to macroscopic quantities.
- λ_{max}^{eq} is *not* unique: In global thermal equilibrium, different choices of heat-baths can lead to very different values. The result is that dimensional loss is not unique either, only the product behaves macroscopically and can be related to thermodynamic quantities

Non-Equilibrium Temperature Renormalization.

In expansions such as (8), it is natural to consider whether other powers are important, such as $(\nabla^n T)/T$. In the region where the temperature dependence of the thermal conductivity can be described by a power law, $\kappa = AT^{-\gamma}$, one can show, using Fourier’s law, that

$$\frac{\nabla^n T}{T} = \frac{(\nabla T)^n}{T^n} (n-1)! \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(\gamma - \frac{k-1}{k} \right). \quad (23)$$

While Fourier’s law holds only close to local equilibrium, the deviations from it is of order $(\nabla T/T)^2$ so that the difference is a higher order correction in the expansion in $(\nabla T/T)$. Hence the expansion in (8) is sufficiently general.

When local equilibrium is broken, the definition of T is no longer unique. For the observables discussed above, it is possible see that certain redefinitions of T leave the observables invariant to leading order. For the generic redefinition

$$T = T' + \nu \left(\frac{\nabla T}{T} \right)^2, \quad C'_A = C_A + \nu \left(\frac{dA}{dT} \right), \quad (24)$$

the non-equilibrium deviations of J , P , E are affected covariantly. Further, the local equilibrium violations seen in $\langle\langle p^n \rangle\rangle/T^{n/2}$ are *invariant* under such redefinitions, up to the order we consider. The physics, of course, is invariant under any redefinition in temperature.

Summary of Classical Results.

We have seen that we can begin to understand the behavior of systems both near and far from equilibrium. Certainly many questions remain, including the behavior of phase transitions in strongly non-equilibrium steady-state environments, which seem to display interesting differences with the equilibrium understanding of phase transitions[7]. But we would now like to turn to the treatment of the quantum analogs of the above results.

III. DYNAMICAL QUANTUM HEAT BATHS

Before we explore the quantum analog of Fig. 1 and the results for classical non-equilibrium steady states, let us first consider how to formulate a Hamiltonian description of a heat bath. We would like to use chaos in a similar manner; the (chaotic) interaction with the baths should cause the system of interest to thermalize. We decompose the system+heat bath problem as:

$$\begin{aligned} H(XP, xp) &= H_S(XP) + H_1(X; xp) \\ &= H_S(XP) + \overbrace{H_B(xp) + W(X; xp)}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The system, $H_S(XP)$, and the bath, $H_B(xp)$, Hamiltonians are coupled through the interaction $W(X; xp)$. In this formulation, for simplicity, the interaction does not include any system momentum dependence. The density of states of the bath+interaction is defined by H_1 through

$$\rho(E) = \overline{\text{Tr}\delta(H_1 - E)}. \quad (26)$$

In order to use chaotic methods, we should make a few remarks concerning Random Matrix Theory (RMT), which has arisen as the quantum counterpart to classical chaos.

What is a random matrix? A matrix with random matrix elements [13,14], often taken as Gaussian random numbers. This is convenience rather than necessity, as the Gaussian model is far more tractable and well developed than other choices. The motivation is simple. The Schrödinger equation, $H|\psi_i\rangle = E_i|\psi_i\rangle$, cannot be solved for complex many-body systems. This lead Wigner (1951) to adopt a stochastic description instead of a dynamical description and to replace the Hamilton operator by a random operator.

How are the matrix elements of a random matrix H_{ij} distributed? Assume that

- H is invariant under “rotation” (no preferred basis in Hilbert space),
- the matrix elements H_{ij} ($1 \leq j \leq N$) are independent.

It can then be shown that H_{ij} are Gaussian random variables. Depending on the symmetries of the problem, there are only three possible “rotations” in Hilbert space: orthogonal, unitary and symplectic transformations. Accordingly, there are only three Gaussian random matrix ensembles denoted GOE, GUE and GSE (note that generalizations exist, for example chiral ensembles in QCD). For GOE, $P(\{H_{ij}\}) = K \exp[-\sum_{ij} H_{ij}^2 / \langle H_{ij}H_{ji} \rangle]$. In general the variance $\langle H_{ij}H_{ji} \rangle$ depends on i, j .

The classical analogy is the velocity distribution in the kinetic theory of gases. Newton’s equations describing the (large number of) molecules of an ideal gas cannot be solved. This motivated Maxwell (1859) to use, for the first time in physics, a statistical approach to treat a dynamical problem (\rightarrow random vector). He assumed that

- space is isotropic (no preferred direction in velocity space),
- the components v_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) of the velocity vector are independent.

He then found that the velocities are Gaussian distributed (the well-known Maxwell distribution), $P(\{v_i\}) = K \exp[-\sum_i v_i^2 / \langle v_i^2 \rangle]$, with $\langle v_i^2 \rangle = 2kT/M$.

Heat Bath Model.

We will use the eigenbasis of $H_B(xp)$ to define the matrix elements of W . If we take the interaction to be chaotic, it is reasonable to choose the statistical ensemble to be defined through W according to the GOE ensemble. As the Gaussian ensemble is entirely characterized by its first two moments, this is taken to be in the form:

$$\overline{[W(X)]_{kl}} = 0, \quad \overline{[W(X)]_{kl}[W(Y)]_{mn}} = [\delta_{km}\delta_{nl} + \delta_{kn}\delta_{lm}]\mathcal{G}_{kl}(X - Y). \quad (27)$$

The physics is put into the properties of the correlations. We use the form:

$$\mathcal{G}_{ij}(X) = \frac{\Gamma^\downarrow}{2\pi\sqrt{\rho(\varepsilon_i)\rho(\varepsilon_j)}} e^{-(\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j)^2/2\kappa_0^2} G\left(\frac{X}{X_0}\right) \quad (28)$$

$$\equiv V_{ij}^2 G(X/X_0). \quad (29)$$

This type of parameterization was introduced some time ago in the study of heavy ion collisions [15] and widely used afterwards [16–19]. The physical motivation is:

- The interaction is expected to couple only neighboring energy states $\rightarrow W =$ random band–matrix with band-width $\kappa_0 \ll N$. For an ordinary random matrix (not banded), $\overline{\mathcal{G}_{ab}^2} = \text{constant}$.
- With increasing energy, the states $|a\rangle$ and $|b\rangle$ become more and more complex. Consequently, their overlap is expected to decrease. This is the physical origin of the factor containing the density of states of the bath.
- It is possible that correlations exists between W at different values of position X . This information is included in the correlation function $G(X/X_0)$, where X_0 is the characteristic length scale.

We emphasize that the coupling to the random matrix bath is fully determined by the variance. The parameters that enter are: Γ^\downarrow – the spreading width; X_0 – correlation length measuring how rapidly the system decorrelates due to the bath; κ_0 – band width of the random matrix W ; $\rho = \rho_0 \exp[\beta\varepsilon]$ – density of states of the bath used to define the thermodynamic temperature through $\beta = 1/T = d \log \rho / d\varepsilon$.

Influence Functional Approach.

The interaction of the system H_S with a chaotic bath $H_B + W$ can act to thermalize the system. The evolution equation for the system can be obtained by integrating over the bath. This is most readily achieved using the influence functional [20]. The density matrix of the system+bath evolves according to

$$\rho(t) = \mathcal{J}(t, t')\rho(t'). \quad (30)$$

The evolution operator \mathcal{J} has a simple path integral representation which is the squared amplitude:

$$\mathcal{J}(X, x, X', x', t|Y, y, Y', y', t') = K(X, x, t|Y, y, 0)K^*(X', x', t'|Y', y', 0) \quad (31)$$

$$= \int_y^x Dx \int_Y^X DX \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}S(X, x)\right] \quad (32)$$

$$\times \int_{y'}^{x'} Dx' \int_{Y'}^{X'} DX' \exp\left[-\frac{i}{\hbar}S(X', x')\right].$$

S is the action for the system+bath. The density matrix can be expressed in terms of this path integral averaged over the bath degrees of freedom [20]

$$\rho(X, X', t) = \int dX_0 dY_0 \rho_0(X_0, X'_0) \int_{X(0)=X_0}^{X(t)=X} \mathcal{D}X(t) \int_{X'(0)=X'_0}^{X'(t)=X'} \mathcal{D}X'(t)$$

$$\times \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}[S_0(X(t)) - S_0(X'(t))]\right] \mathcal{L}(X(t), X'(t), t). \quad (33)$$

with the influence functional given by:

$$\mathcal{L}(X(t), X'(t), t) = \overline{\left\langle i \left\{ T_a \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^t dt'' H_1(X'(t''))\right] \right\} \left\{ T \exp\left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^t dt' H_1(X(t'))\right] \right\} |i \right\rangle}. \quad (34)$$

Here T (T_a) is the (anti) time ordering operator. At this point we can expand the propagators in the influence function, and use the statistical properties of the matrix elements. This allows a systematic approach to include finite temperature effects into the quantum dynamics. To first order in $\beta = 1/T$ one finds

$$\mathcal{L}(X, X') = \exp\left\{\frac{\Gamma^\downarrow}{\hbar} \int_0^t ds \left[G\left(\frac{X(s) - X'(s)}{X_0}\right) - 1\right]\right\}$$

$$\times \exp\left\{\frac{i\beta\Gamma^\downarrow}{4X_0} \int_0^t ds [\dot{X}(s) + \dot{X}'(s)] G'\left(\frac{X(s) - X'(s)}{X_0}\right)\right\}, \quad (35)$$

where $G'(x) = dG(x)/dx$. From this one can derive the effective time evolution of the density matrix for the system:

$$i\hbar\partial_t\rho(X, X', t) = \left\{ \frac{P_X^2}{2M} - \frac{P_{X'}^2}{2M} + U(X) - U(X') - \frac{\beta\Gamma^\downarrow\hbar}{4X_0M}G' \left(\frac{X - X'}{X_0} \right) (P_X - P_{X'}) \right. \\ \left. + i\Gamma^\downarrow \left[G \left(\frac{X - X'}{X_0} \right) - 1 \right] \right\} \rho(X, X', t), \quad (36)$$

with an arbitrary initial condition $\rho(X, X', 0) = \rho_0(X, X')$. This equation provides the quantum dynamics of the system at finite temperature [20]. The initial conditions can be taken as gaussian, $\psi_0(X) = \exp[-X^2/4\sigma^2]/[2\pi\sigma^2]^{1/4}$, so that the initial density matrix is

$$\rho_0(X, X') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-(X^2+X'^2)/4\sigma^2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-(4r^2+s^2)/8\sigma^2}, \quad (37)$$

where

$$r = \frac{X + X'}{2}, \quad s = X - X'. \quad (38)$$

In order to learn about the transport behavior, it is convenient to define the characteristic function $d(s, k, t)$, whose moments give the transport coefficients:

$$\rho(r, s, t) = \int \frac{dk}{2\pi\hbar} \exp\left(\frac{ikr}{\hbar}\right) d(s, k, t). \quad (39)$$

Then the cumulants are extracted as follows:

$$\ln d(s, k, t)|_{s=0} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{ik}{\hbar}\right)^n \langle\langle X^n \rangle\rangle, \quad \ln d(s, k, t)|_{k=0} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{s}{i\hbar}\right)^n \langle\langle P^n \rangle\rangle. \quad (40)$$

The first cumulant is just the average, $\langle\langle r \rangle\rangle = \langle r \rangle$, the second is $\langle\langle r^2 \rangle\rangle = \langle r^2 \rangle - \langle r \rangle^2$, the third is usually referred to as kurtosis, and so forth. The cumulants are closely related to transport coefficients.

IV. FREE PARTICLE STRONGLY COUPLED TO THE RESERVOIR

The master equation can be solved in many limits. To see the effects of the bath, we take the potential $U(X) = 0$. Then density matrix is expressed as:

$$\rho(r, s) = e^{ikr/\hbar} \Psi(s). \quad (41)$$

This leads to the simplified master equation:

$$\left\{ \frac{i\hbar k}{M} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} - i\gamma\hbar X_0 G' \left(\frac{s}{X_0} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial s} - i\Gamma^\downarrow \left[G \left(\frac{s}{X_0} \right) - 1 \right] \right\} \Psi(s) = 0 \quad (42)$$

which can be solved through direct integration. For a general correlation function G :

$$\rho(r, s) = \exp \left\{ \frac{ikr}{\hbar} - \frac{M\Gamma^\downarrow}{\hbar k} \int_0^s ds' \frac{1 - G}{1 - (\gamma X_0 M/k) G'} \right\}. \quad (43)$$

Consider some examples.

Exponential Correlator: $G(x) = \exp(-|x|)$ Defining $a = \gamma X_0 M/k$ and $b = M\Gamma^\downarrow/\hbar k$

$$\Psi(s) = \left(\frac{1 + a}{a + \exp(s)} \right)^{-(1+a)b/a} e^{sb/a}. \quad (44)$$

Cosine Correlator: $G(x) = \cos(x)$ In this case, the solution is of the form

$$\Psi(s) = \left(\frac{1 + (a + \sqrt{a^2 - 1} \tan s/2)}{1 + (a - \sqrt{a^2 - 1} \tan s/2)} \right)^b. \quad (45)$$

From these explicit solutions to the strongly coupled master equation, one can compute the coordinate and momentum cumulants and demonstrate how the quantum system evolves in time in the presence of this type of bath. As our interest is in the weak coupling limit where the bath looks closer to an idealized heat bath, we will not pursue this here.

V. RANDOM MATRIX THEORY MASTER EQUATION: WEAK COUPLING PLUS ONE BATH

A. Hamiltonian

We consider a system S coupled to a heat bath B . The corresponding Hamiltonian is given by

$$H = H_S + H_B + W, \quad (46)$$

where $H_S = P^2/2M + U(X)$ describes the system [a particle moving in a potential $U(x)$], H_B describes the bath and $W = X \otimes V$ is the coupling between the system and the bath. The coupling Hamiltonian W is taken linear in the position x of the system and V is an operator acting on the bath. We denote by ε_a the energy eigenstates of the bath, $H_B|a\rangle = \varepsilon_a|a\rangle$, and assume that the heat bath is complex (chaotic). It is then justifiable to model V by a random matrix: For a complex system, the states $|a\rangle$ are expected to be highly complex and to display random features; it is thus reasonable to assume that V_{ab} is a stochastic function of a and b .

B. Master equation

Our aim in this section is to provide an alternate derivation of a quantum master equation which gives the time evolution of the (ensemble averaged) reduced density operator of the system, $\rho_S(t) = \text{tr}_B \rho(t)$, when the coupling is weak. Here $\rho(t)$ is the total density operator for system plus bath. We shall employ a method well-known in quantum optics (see for instance [21]). Starting point of the derivation is the von Neumann equation for $\rho(t)$ written in the Interaction Picture,

$$\frac{d\tilde{\rho}(t)}{dt} = -i [\tilde{W}(t), \tilde{\rho}(t)], \quad (47)$$

with $\tilde{A}(t) = \exp(iH_0t)A\exp(-iH_0t)$ and $H_0 = H_S + H_B$. Equation (47) can be formally integrated to give

$$\tilde{\rho}(t) = \tilde{\rho}(0) - i \int_0^t dt' [\tilde{W}(t'), \tilde{\rho}(t')]. \quad (48)$$

We now substitute this expression for $\tilde{\rho}(t)$ inside the commutator of (47) and obtain

$$\frac{d\tilde{\rho}(t)}{dt} = -i [\tilde{W}(t), \tilde{\rho}(0)] - \int_0^t dt' [\tilde{W}(t), [\tilde{W}(t'), \tilde{\rho}(t')]]. \quad (49)$$

This equation is still exact. We next assume that initially the system and the bath are not correlated and that the latter is in thermal equilibrium, i.e., $\rho(0) = \rho_s(0) \otimes \rho_B(0)$ with $\rho_B(0) = Z_B^{-1} \exp(-\beta H_B)$. We also assume (Born approximation) that the bath remains in equilibrium at all times so that we can write $\tilde{\rho}(t') = \tilde{\rho}_S(t') \otimes \tilde{\rho}_B(0)$. Clearly, this approximation is true provided the coupling between the system and the bath is weak. We now take the trace over the bath and note that $\text{tr}_B \tilde{\rho}(t) = \exp(iH_S t) \text{tr}_B \rho(t) \exp(-iH_S t) = \tilde{\rho}_S(t)$. After ensemble averaging we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{\rho}_S(t)}{dt} = & - \int_0^t d\tau \bar{K}(\tau) \left\{ \tilde{x}(t)\tilde{x}(t-\tau)\bar{\rho}_S(t-\tau) - \tilde{x}(t-\tau)\bar{\rho}_S(t-\tau)\tilde{x}(t) \right\} \\ & + \int_0^t d\tau \bar{K}(-\tau) \left\{ \bar{\rho}_S(t-\tau)\tilde{x}(t-\tau)\tilde{x}(t) - \tilde{x}(t)\bar{\rho}_S(t-\tau)\tilde{x}(t-\tau) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where we have used $\widetilde{W}(t) = \widetilde{x}(t) \otimes \widetilde{V}(t)$ and introduced the bath correlation function $K(t) = K'(t) + iK''(t) = \text{tr}_B[\widetilde{V}(t)\widetilde{V}(0)\rho_B(0)]$. Its ensemble average is given by the Fourier transform of $\overline{V_{ab}^2}$ with respect to ε_b [22],

$$\overline{K}(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\varepsilon_b \rho(\varepsilon_b) \overline{V_{ab}^2} e^{i(\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b)t} . \quad (51)$$

Transforming Eq. (49) back into the Schrödinger Picture yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\overline{\rho}_S(t)}{dt} = & -i [H_S, \overline{\rho}_S(t)] - \int_0^\infty d\tau [x, [\widetilde{x}(-\tau), \overline{\rho}_S(t)]] \overline{K}'(\tau) \\ & - i \int_0^\infty d\tau [x, \{\widetilde{x}(-\tau), \overline{\rho}_S(t)\}] \overline{K}''(\tau) . \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Equation (52) is the ensemble averaged master equation we were looking for. Let us consider the limit of large bandwidth and high temperature, $1 \ll \kappa_0 \ll T$. Using Eq. (27) we find

$$\overline{K}(\tau) = \frac{\Gamma}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \kappa_0 \exp \left[-\frac{\kappa_0^2}{2} \left(\tau + i\frac{\beta}{2} \right)^2 \right] \xrightarrow{\kappa_0 \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma \delta(\tau + i\frac{\beta}{2}) \xrightarrow{\beta \rightarrow 0} \Gamma \delta(\tau) + i\Gamma \frac{\beta}{2} \delta'(\tau) , \quad (53)$$

so that $\overline{K}'(\tau) = \Gamma \delta(\tau)$ and $\overline{K}''(\tau) = \Gamma\beta \delta'(\tau)/2$. We have accordingly,

$$\int_0^\infty d\tau \widetilde{x}(-\tau) \overline{K}'(\tau) = \frac{\Gamma}{2} x = Dx \quad (54)$$

where we have defined the diffusion coefficient $D = \Gamma/2$, and

$$\int_0^\infty d\tau \widetilde{x}(-\tau) \overline{K}''(\tau) = -\Gamma \frac{\beta}{4} \frac{d\widetilde{x}(-\tau)}{d\tau} \Big|_{\tau=0} = i\Gamma \frac{\beta}{4} [H_S, x] = \gamma p . \quad (55)$$

Here we have used $[H_S, x] = [p^2, x]/2M = -ip/M$ and defined the friction coefficient $\gamma = \Gamma\beta/4M$. Collecting everything, we finally obtain

$$\frac{d\overline{\rho}_S(t)}{dt} = -i [H_S, \overline{\rho}_S(t)] - D[x, [x, \overline{\rho}_S(t)]] - i\gamma [x, \{p, \overline{\rho}_S(t)\}] . \quad (56)$$

The master equation (56) is often referred to as the Caldeira–Leggett master equation [23,24]. It consists of three parts: a von Neumann part which describes the free motion without the coupling to the environment, a diffusive part and a dissipative part. Note that the diffusion and friction coefficients satisfy the Einstein relation, $D = 2MT\gamma$, which expresses the fact that diffusion of the particle and damping of its energy have a common physical origin, namely the coupling with the heat bath. The Einstein relation is an example of the more general fluctuation–dissipation theorem. We also mention that Eq. (56) is often derived from an oscillator bath model where the system is coupled to a set of independent harmonic oscillators (thus an integrable system). It is quite remarkable that the coupling to a complex random matrix environment leads to the same equation. This shows that in the limit considered here (weak coupling, high temperature), the master equation (56) is independent of the specific structure of the bath as well as of the specific form of the coupling and therefore universal [19].

- Coordinate representation and semiclassical limit

The coordinate representation of the master equation (56) reads

$$\frac{\partial \overline{\rho}_S(x, x', t)}{\partial t} = \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} (H_S(x) - H_S(x')) - \frac{D}{\hbar^2} (x - x')^2 - \frac{i}{\hbar} \gamma (x - x')(p_x - p_{x'}) \right] \overline{\rho}_S(x, x', t) , \quad (57)$$

where for convenience we have reintroduced the constant \hbar . This corresponds to the master equation derived from the influence functional in the limit

$$G(x) \sim 1 - \frac{1}{2}x^2 . \quad (58)$$

The corresponding classical transport equation is obtained by taking the Wigner transform of the density matrix

$$f(q, p, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dr \exp \left[-\frac{ipr}{\hbar} \right] \rho \left(q + \frac{r}{2}, q - \frac{r}{2}, t \right). \quad (59)$$

Keeping only terms in leading orders of \hbar , this leads to

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = -\frac{p}{M} \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} + U'(q) \frac{\partial f}{\partial p} + 2\gamma \frac{\partial}{\partial p} (pf) + D \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial p^2}. \quad (60)$$

This is the usual Klein–Kramers equation.

C. Relation with the oscillator bath model

We now turn to a direct comparison of the oscillator bath model and the random matrix model [22]. We still place ourselves in the weak coupling limit. The oscillator bath model consists of a particle coupled to a large number of independent harmonic oscillators (mass m_i and frequency ω_i). The Hamiltonian of the composite system is then (see [24] and references therein)

$$H = H_S + \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{p_i^2}{2m_i} + \frac{m_i \omega_i^2}{2} \left[x_i - \frac{c_i}{m_i \omega_i^2} \right]^2 \right). \quad (61)$$

In this model, the coupling Hamiltonian $W = x \sum_i c_i x_i$ is bilinear in the position of the system and the the positions of the harmonic oscillators. Here c_i are coupling constants. The coupling to the harmonic bath is fully characterized by the spectral density function,

$$I(\omega) = \pi \sum_i \frac{c_i^2}{2m_i \omega_i} \delta(\omega - \omega_i). \quad (62)$$

In the following we shall relate $I(\omega)$ and the variance $\overline{V_{ab}^2}$. To this end it is useful to rewrite Eq. (29) in the form

$$\overline{V_{ab}^2} = [\rho(\varepsilon_a) \rho(\varepsilon_b)]^{-\frac{1}{2}} f(\omega_{ab} = \varepsilon_b - \varepsilon_a), \quad (63)$$

where we have introduced the band form factor $f(\omega)$. It can be shown that with the form (63) the bath correlation function satisfies the KMS condition $\overline{K}(-t) = \overline{K}(t - i\beta)$ which defines the thermal equilibrium state of the bath. The bath correlation function can further be expressed in terms of the spectral density function as

$$K(t) = \int_0^\infty \frac{d\omega}{\pi} I(\omega) \left(\coth \left(\frac{\beta\omega}{2} \right) \cos(\omega t) - i \sin(\omega t) \right) \quad (64)$$

We see from Eq. (64) that the imaginary part $K''(t)$ of the correlation function is simply the Fourier sine transform of the spectral density $I(\omega)$. Comparing the imaginary parts of Eqs. (52) and (64), we find,

$$I(\omega) = 2\pi \sinh \left(\frac{\beta\omega}{2} \right) f(\omega). \quad (65)$$

This equation provides the desired link between the two models. It shows that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the density function $I(\omega)$ of the oscillator bath model and the variance $\overline{V_{ab}^2}$ of the random band–matrix model. It is important to note that both the oscillator bath model and the random matrix model, in the limit of weak coupling we consider here, are Gaussian. This means that in these two models the dynamics of the bath is entirely characterized by the two–point correlation function $K(t)$ and it is therefore not necessary to consider higher–order correlation functions.

A straightforward application of Eq. (65) using the variance Eq. (29) leads to

$$I(\omega) = \Gamma \sinh \left(\frac{\beta\omega}{2} \right) \exp \left[-\frac{\omega^2}{2\kappa_0^2} \right]. \quad (66)$$

In the limit $\omega \rightarrow 0$, Eq. (66) reduces to $I(\omega) \sim M\gamma\omega$ which defines the so–called Ohmic regime. In this regime, as we already saw in the derivation of the master equation above, the bath correlation function is delta–correlated in time,

$\overline{K}'(t) = \Gamma\delta(t)$, which means there are no memory effects. The process is thus Markovian. We can further easily check that the band form factor

$$f(\omega) = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi} |\omega|^{\alpha-1} \exp\left[-\frac{\omega^2}{2\kappa_0^2}\right], \quad (67)$$

yields $I(\omega) \sim \pi\beta\omega f(\omega) \sim \omega^\alpha$ as $\omega \rightarrow 0$. This corresponds to fractal (non-Ohmic) environment. Here, contrary to the Ohmic case, the bath correlation is given by an inverse power law,

$$\overline{K}'(t) = \frac{\Gamma}{\pi} \Gamma(\alpha) \cos\left(\frac{\alpha\pi}{2}\right) t^{-\alpha}, \quad \overline{K}''(t) = \frac{\beta}{2} \frac{d\overline{K}'}{dt}, \quad (68)$$

in the limit $1 \ll \kappa_0 \ll T$. As a result, there are long-time (memory) effects (the process is now non-Markovian) and the dynamics of the particle becomes anomalous. We shall develop that point in more detail in the next section. But before we would like to show that the band form factor $f(\omega)$ can be directly related to the velocity autocorrelation function (VACF) $\langle v(0)v(t) \rangle$ of the system. This is done by using the first fluctuation-dissipation theorem

$$C_v[z] = \left(z + \gamma[z]\right)^{-1} \quad (69)$$

which relates the Laplace transform $C_v[z]$ of the normalized VACF $C_v(t) = \langle v(0)v(t) \rangle / \langle v(0)^2 \rangle$ to the Laplace transform of the damping kernel $\gamma(t) = \overline{K}'(t)/MT$ (see below). From Eq. (51), we have

$$\gamma[z] = \frac{\beta}{M} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega e^{-\beta\omega} f(\omega) \frac{z}{z^2 + \omega^2}. \quad (70)$$

In the limit $z \rightarrow 0$, the last factor in Eq. (70) reduces to a delta function and we obtain

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \gamma[z] = \frac{\pi\beta}{M} \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} f(z), \quad (71)$$

The final value theorem of the theory of Laplace Transform tells us that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} C_v(t) = \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} z C_v[z] \quad (72)$$

and we can therefore write

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} C_v(t) = \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \left(1 + \frac{\pi\beta}{M} z^{-1} f(z)\right)^{-1}. \quad (73)$$

We thus see that the long-time behavior of the VACF is determined by the shape of the band form factor of the origin.

D. Langevin equation

Consider a system operator P (for instance the momentum operator p of the particle). Our aim in the present section is to derive a quantum Langevin equation for this operator in the limit of weak coupling. The time evolution of the operator P is given by $P(t) = \exp(iHt) P \exp(-iHt)$ (Heisenberg representation). Accordingly,

$$\dot{P}(t) = i[H_S(t), P(t)] + i[x(t), P(t)]V(t). \quad (74)$$

This equation is exact. We shall now look for an approximate expression for $[x(t), P(t)] = \exp(iHt) [x, P] \exp(-iHt)$ and $V(t) = \exp(iHt) V \exp(-iHt)$. In the limit of weak coupling, the time evolution operator $\exp(-iHt)$ can be written in a Dyson series as,

$$\exp(-iHt) \simeq \exp(-iH_0t) - i \int_0^t d\tau \exp(-iH_0(t-\tau)) W \exp(-iH_0\tau). \quad (75)$$

In lowest order in V , this leads to

$$[x(t), P(t)] = [\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{P}(t)] + i \int_0^t d\tau [\tilde{x}(t-\tau), [\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{P}(t)]] \tilde{V}(t) , \quad (76)$$

and

$$V(t) = \tilde{V}(t) + i \int_0^t d\tau \tilde{x}(t) \left(\tilde{V}(t-\tau) \tilde{V}(t) - \tilde{V}(t) \tilde{V}(t-\tau) \right) . \quad (77)$$

Inserting Eqs. (76) and (77) into Eq. (74) we then obtain up to second order in V ,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}(t) &= i[H_S(t), P(t)] - \int_0^t d\tau [\tilde{x}(t-\tau), [\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{P}(t)]] \text{Re}[\tilde{V}(t-\tau) \tilde{V}(t)] \\ &\quad - i \int_0^t d\tau \{ \tilde{x}(t-\tau), [\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{P}(t)] \} \text{Im}[\tilde{V}(t-\tau) \tilde{V}(t)] + i[\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{P}(t)] \tilde{V}(t) . \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

This equation is valid for any system operator P . We now consider the case where $P = p$ the momentum operator of the particle. Using the commutation relation, $[x, p] = i$, we can rewrite Eq. (77) in the form

$$\dot{p}(t) = -U'(x(t)) + 2 \int_0^t d\tau \text{Im}[\tilde{V}(t-\tau) \tilde{V}(t)] \tilde{x}(t-\tau) - \tilde{V}(t) . \quad (79)$$

Equation (79) is almost a Langevin equation. We further note that $\tilde{V}(t)$ depends on the (thermal) initial conditions of the heat bath. This makes the force operator $\xi(t) = -\tilde{V}(t)$ a fluctuating quantity. Introducing first the thermal average over the bath and then the average over the random matrix ensemble, we get

$$\overline{\langle \xi(t) \rangle} = 0, \quad \overline{\langle \xi(t) \xi(0) \rangle} = \overline{\langle \tilde{V}(t) \tilde{V}(0) \rangle} = \overline{K}(t) . \quad (80)$$

Moreover, after partial integration, we have

$$2 \int_0^t d\tau \overline{K}''(-\tau) \overline{x}(t-\tau) \simeq -\beta \int_0^t d\tau \overline{K}'(t-\tau) \dot{\overline{x}}(\tau) , \quad (81)$$

where we have used Eq. (68). In the limit of weak coupling and high temperature, the Langevin equation can therefore be written as

$$M \ddot{\overline{x}}(t) + M \int_0^t d\tau \gamma(t-\tau) \dot{\overline{x}}(\tau) + U'(\overline{x}(t)) = \overline{\xi}(t) , \quad (82)$$

where we have introduced the damping kernel $\gamma(t)$ which obeys $MT\gamma(t) = \overline{K}'(t)$. This last relation is often referred to as the second fluctuation–dissipation theorem. We note that the Langevin equation is completely determined by the real part $\overline{K}'(t)$ of the bath correlation function. Introducing the Riemann–Liouville fractional derivative ($-1 < \lambda < 0$) [26],

$$\frac{\partial^\lambda f(t)}{\partial t^\lambda} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(-\lambda)} \int_0^t \frac{f(\tau) d\tau}{(t-\tau)^{\lambda+1}} , \quad (83)$$

we can rewrite (82) in the form of a fractional Langevin equation [25]

$$M \ddot{x}(t) + M \gamma_\alpha \frac{\partial^{\alpha-1}}{\partial t^{\alpha-1}} \dot{x}(t) + U'(x(t)) = \xi(t) , \quad (84)$$

where we have defined $\gamma_\alpha = \Gamma\beta/(2M \sin(\alpha\pi/2))$ and dropped the overline. The fractional Langevin equation (83) can be easily solved for the case of a free particle $U(x) = 0$ by making use of the Laplace transform. We find

$$x(t) = x_0 + v_0 B_v(t) + \int_0^t d\tau B_v(t-\tau) \xi(\tau) , \quad (85)$$

where (x_0, v_0) are the initial coordinates of the particle and $B_v(t) = \int_0^t C_v(t') dt'$ is the integral of the (normalized) velocity autocorrelation function $C_v(t)$. Since $\gamma[z] = \gamma_\alpha z^{\alpha-1}$, the Laplace of the VACF is given by

$$C_v[z] = \frac{1}{z + \gamma_\alpha z^{\alpha-1}}, \quad (86)$$

By taking the inverse Laplace transform, the velocity autocorrelation function can be written as

$$C_v(t) = E_{2-\alpha}(-\gamma_\alpha t^{2-\alpha}). \quad (87)$$

Here we have introduced the Mittag–Leffler function $E_\alpha(t)$, which is defined by the series expansion [27]

$$E_\alpha(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^n}{\Gamma(\alpha n + 1)}. \quad (88)$$

The function $E_\alpha(t)$ reduces to the exponential when $\alpha = 1$. The asymptotic behavior of the Mittag–Leffler function (88) for short and long times is respectively given by $\sim \exp(t)$ and $\sim -(t \Gamma(1 - \alpha))^{-1}$, $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $1 < \alpha < 2$. For the velocity autocorrelation function (87) this yields a typical stretched exponential behavior at short times

$$C_v(t) \sim \exp \frac{-\gamma_\alpha t^{2-\alpha}}{\Gamma(3-\alpha)}, \quad t \ll \frac{1}{(\gamma_\alpha)^{1/\alpha}}, \quad (89)$$

and an inverse power–law tail at long times

$$C_v(t) \sim \frac{t^{\alpha-2}}{\gamma_\alpha \Gamma(\alpha-1)}, \quad t \gg \frac{1}{(\gamma_\alpha)^{1/\alpha}}. \quad (90)$$

After time integration, we finally get from Eq. (87)

$$B_v(t) = t E_{2-\alpha,2}(-\gamma_\alpha t^{2-\alpha}), \quad (91)$$

where we have used the generalized Mittag–Leffler function $E_{\alpha,\beta}(t)$ defined as [27]

$$E_{\alpha,\beta}(t) = \sum_n^{\infty} \frac{t^n}{\Gamma(\alpha n + \beta)}. \quad (92)$$

In the long–time limit, the generalized Mittag–Leffler function satisfies $E_{\alpha,\beta}(t) \sim -(t \Gamma(\beta - \alpha))^{-1}$. Accordingly, $B_v(t)$ exhibits a decay of the form

$$B_v(t) \sim \frac{t^{\alpha-1}}{\gamma_\alpha \Gamma(\alpha)}, \quad \text{when } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (93)$$

We emphasize that the solution (85) of the fractional Langevin equation in the force free case is completely specified by the knowledge of the function $B_v(t)$.

The mean displacement and the mean–square displacement are readily deduced from Eq. (85). We find

$$\langle x \rangle = x_0 + v_0 t E_{2-\alpha,2}(-\gamma_\alpha t^{2-\alpha}) \underset{t \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{v_0}{\gamma_\alpha} \frac{t^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \quad (94)$$

and

$$\langle x^2 \rangle = \frac{2T}{M} t^2 E_{2-\alpha,3}(-\gamma_\alpha t^{2-\alpha}) \underset{t \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{2T}{\gamma_\alpha M} \frac{t^\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)}. \quad (95)$$

In the last equation, thermal initial conditions have been assumed ($x_0 = 0$, $v_0^2 = T/M$). Equation (95) shows that the coupling to a fractal heat bath leads in general to anomalous diffusion, $\langle x^2 \rangle \sim t^\alpha$, $\alpha \neq 1$. The band form factor (67) gives rise to subdiffusion when $\alpha < 1$ and to superdiffusion when $1 < \alpha < 2$. In general a wide range of anomalous transport behaviors can be realized through RMT (quantum chaotic) environments, with the character of the diffusion related to the microscopic properties of the quantum environment[20].

VI. RANDOM MATRIX THEORY MASTER EQUATION: WEAK COUPLING PLUS TWO BATHS

We are now in a position to formulate the master equation for the quantum analog of Fig. 1, a system coupled to two heat baths B_1 and B_2 . The corresponding Hamiltonian is given by

$$H = H_S + H_{B_1} + H_{B_2} + Q_1(x) \otimes V_1 + Q_2(x) \otimes V_2, \quad (96)$$

where $H_S = \sum_i p_i^2/2m_i + U(x_i, x_j)$ is a N -particle system Hamiltonian, $Q_1(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ and $Q_2(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ are two (arbitrary) system operators and V_1 and V_2 are two random matrix bath operators. The variance of these two random operators is given by Eq. (29) with the respective parameters of the two baths given by T_k, Γ_k and $\kappa_{0k}, k = 1, 2$. A quantum master equation for the system can now be derived using the method described in section VB. This leads to the ensemble averaged equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{\rho}_S(t)}{dt} = & -i [H_S, \bar{\rho}_S(t)] \\ & - \int_0^\infty d\tau [Q_1, [\widetilde{Q}_1(-\tau), \bar{\rho}_S(t)]] \bar{K}'_1(\tau) - i \int_0^\infty d\tau [Q_1, \{\widetilde{Q}_1(-\tau), \bar{\rho}_S(t)\}] \bar{K}''_1(\tau) \\ & - \int_0^\infty d\tau [Q_2, [\widetilde{Q}_2(-\tau), \bar{\rho}_S(t)]] \bar{K}'_2(\tau) - i \int_0^\infty d\tau [Q_2, \{\widetilde{Q}_2(-\tau), \bar{\rho}_S(t)\}] \bar{K}''_2(\tau) \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

In the following we take for the system a 1D harmonic crystal of unit masses and frequency ω . We attach the two heat baths at both ends, x_1 and x_N , of the linear chain. We thus have $H_S = \sum_i p_i^2 + \omega^2/2 \sum_{i,j} G_{ij} x_i x_j$, where the matrix \mathbf{G} is defined as $G_{ij} = 2\delta_{ij} - \delta_{i+1,j} - \delta_{i-1,j}$. The system operators are respectively given by $Q_1(x_1, \dots, x_N) = x_1$ and $Q_2(x_1, \dots, x_N) = x_N$. In the Ohmic regime, the corresponding master equation can be easily written in coordinate representation in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \bar{\rho}_S(x_i, x'_i, t) = & \left\{ \frac{i}{2} \sum_i \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x'_i{}^2} \right) - \frac{i}{2} \omega^2 \sum_{ij} G_{ij} (x_i x_j - x'_i x'_j) \right. \\ & - D_1 (x_1 - x'_1)^2 - \gamma_1 (x_1 - x'_1) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x'_1} \right) \\ & \left. - D_2 (x_N - x'_N)^2 - \gamma_2 (x_N - x'_N) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_N} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x'_N} \right) \right\} \bar{\rho}_S(x, x', t), \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

with $D_k = 2T_k \gamma_k$. Taking the Wigner transform (59) we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(q_i, p_i, t) = & - \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial q_i} + \sum_{i,j=1}^N \frac{\partial U}{\partial q_i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_j} + 2\gamma_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_1} (p_1 f) + 2\gamma_1 T_1 \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial p_1^2} \\ & + 2\gamma_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_N} (p_N f) + 2\gamma_2 T_2 \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial p_N^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

Introducing the notation, $x_i = q_i, x_{i+N} = p_i, i = 1, \dots, N$, Eq. (99) can be rewritten in the compact form

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(x_i, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{2N} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\xi_i f) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2N} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} (d_{ij} f), \quad (100)$$

with $\xi_i = \sum_{ij} a_{ij} x_j$. The two $2N \times 2N$ matrices \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{d} are given by

$$\mathbf{a} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\mathbf{I} \\ \omega^2 \mathbf{G} & \mathbf{R} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{d} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon \end{pmatrix}, \quad (101)$$

where 0 and I denote the null and unit $N \times N$ matrices, and the two $N \times N$ matrices \mathbf{R} and ε obey $R_{ij} = (2\gamma_1 \delta_{1i} + 2\gamma_2 \delta_{Ni}) \delta_{ij}$ and $\varepsilon_{ij} = 2T_i R_{ij}$. The classical generalized Klein-Kramers equation (100) has been studied by Rieder, Lebowitz and Lieb [28] (the quantum problem has been treated using a Langevin approach in [29]). Of interest

here is the stationary non-equilibrium solution $\partial f_s(x_i)/\partial t = 0$ for a small temperature difference, $T_1 = T + \Delta T/2$, $T_2 = T - \Delta T/2$, $\Delta T \ll T$. It is given by

$$f_s(\mathbf{x}) = (2\pi)^{-N} \text{Det}[\mathbf{b}^{-\frac{1}{2}}] \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2N} b_{ij}^{-1} x_i x_j \right], \quad (102)$$

where \mathbf{b} is the $2N \times 2N$ covariance matrix, $b_{ij} = \langle x_i x_j \rangle = \int f_s(\mathbf{x}) x_i x_j d\mathbf{x}$. It is useful to write the covariance matrix in the form

$$\mathbf{b} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{z} \\ \mathbf{z}^\dagger & \mathbf{y} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (103)$$

where the $N \times N$ matrices \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{z} give, respectively, the correlations between the coordinates, the momenta and between the coordinates and momenta, $x_{ij} = \langle q_i q_j \rangle$, $y_{ij} = \langle p_i p_j \rangle$, $z_{ij} = \langle q_i p_j \rangle$. In the limit of large N and small coupling $\gamma = \gamma_1 = \gamma_2$, one finds

$$\mathbf{x} = \frac{T}{\omega^2} \mathbf{G}^{-1}, \mathbf{y} = \begin{pmatrix} T(1) & & & \\ & T(2) & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & T(N) \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{z} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\gamma \Delta T}{\omega^2} & & \\ -\frac{\gamma \Delta T}{\omega^2} & 0 & \frac{\gamma \Delta T}{\omega^2} & \\ & -\frac{\gamma \Delta T}{\omega^2} & \ddots & \frac{\gamma \Delta T}{\omega^2} \\ & & -\frac{\gamma \Delta T}{\omega^2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (104)$$

Here $T(1) = T + \Delta T/2$, $T(N) = T - \Delta T/2$ and $T(i) = T$ otherwise. We see that the temperature profile is constant in the bulk and presents a discontinuity at the edges. By inverting the covariance matrix \mathbf{b} we eventually arrive at

$$f_s(q_i, p_i) \sim \exp \left[-\sum_i \frac{p_i^2}{2T(i)} - \frac{U}{2T} - \frac{\gamma \Delta T}{2T} \sum_i \frac{p_i}{\omega^2 T(i)} \left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial q_{i-1}} - \frac{\partial U}{\partial q_{i+1}} \right) \right]. \quad (105)$$

This equation is valid in the limit $\Delta T, \gamma \rightarrow 0$. We note that Eq. (105) reduces to the equilibrium Boltzmann distribution when $\Delta T = 0$. The last term in (105) is proportional to the heat flux $J = \gamma \Delta T/2$ (note that J is not proportional to the temperature gradient). Taking the inverse Wigner transform we obtain the stationary density operator in the form

$$\bar{\rho}_S(q_i + \frac{r_i}{2}, q_i - \frac{r_i}{2}) = \prod_i \exp \left[\frac{1}{2T(i)} \left(\frac{\gamma \Delta T}{2T} \frac{1}{\omega^2} \left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial q_{i-1}} - \frac{\partial U}{\partial q_{i+1}} \right) - iT(i)r_i \right)^2 \right] \exp \left[-\frac{U}{2T} \right]. \quad (106)$$

This form of the solution gives us a guide on how to better solve the general problem of Fig. 1 using a general quantum master equation.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The transport properties of classical and quantum systems in non-equilibrium steady states was formulated and discussed. While the situation for classical non-equilibrium systems does not seem very well understood yet, it is clearly far better understood than the quantum counterpart. At the moment one can formulate a master equation for the non-equilibrium density matrix, however, aside from the trivial harmonic case discussed above, very little is known. It would be very desirable to see if one can derive Fourier's law or the temperature profile from Random Matrix models, and generally how far one can push the matrix models which seem to provide a tractable approach to quantum thermalization.

This work was supported by the Office of Naval Research under contract # N00014-01-1-0594. DK thanks R. Olkiewicz and P. Garbaczewski, the organizers of the 38th Winter School of Theoretical Physics.

[1] Gibbs-Van Name Papers. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

- [2] W.G. Hoover, *Computational Statistical Mechanics* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1991); P. Gaspard, *Chaos, Scattering and Statistical Mechanics*, (Cambridge, New York, 1998); J.R. Dorfman, *An Introduction to Chaos in Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics*, Cambridge Univ. Press (1999); W.G. Hoover, *Time Reversibility, Computer Simulation, and Chaos*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1999).
- [3] K. Aoki, D. Kusnezov, *Ann. Phys.* **295** (2002) 50.
- [4] K. Aoki, D. Kusnezov, *Phys. Lett.* **B477** (2000) 348.
- [5] K. Aoki, D. Kusnezov, "On the Violations of Local Equilibrium and Linear Response" [nlin.CD/0105063](#).
- [6] K. Aoki, D. Kusnezov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** (2001) 4029.
- [7] D.Kusnezov, K. Aoki, "Statistical Mechanics of Non-Equilibrium Field Theory: From Transport to Phase Transitions", in *Dynamics of Gauge Fields*, Frontiers Science Series No. 33, (Universal Academy Press, Tokyo, 2001).
- [8] K. Aoki, D. Kusnezov, "Lyapunov Exponents, Transport and the Extensivity of Dimensional Loss", [nlin.CD/0204015](#); Wm. G. Hoover, H. A. Posch, K. Aoki, D. Kusnezov, "Remarks on NonHamiltonian Statistical Mechanics: Lyapunov Exponents and Phase-Space Dimensionality Loss", [nlin.CD/0205040](#).
- [9] K. Aoki, D. Kusnezov, *Phys. Lett.* **A265** (2000) 250.
- [10] E. M. Lifshits, L.P. Pitaevskii, *Physical Kinetics*, (Pergamon Press, New York, 1981).
- [11] G. Marcelli, B.D.Todd, R. Sadus, *Phys. Rev.* **E63** (2001) 021204; J.P.Ryckaert, A.Bellemans, G.Ciccotti, G.V.Paolini, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60** (1988) 128; S. Rastogi, N. Wagner, S. Lustig, *J. Chem. Phys.* **104** (1996) 9234; D.Evans, H.J.M.Hanley, *Phys. Lett.* **80A** (1980) 175.
- [12] N.I. Chernov, G.L. Eyink, J.L. Lebowitz, Ya.G. Sinai, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70** (1993) 2209.
- [13] M.L. Mehta, *Random Matrices*, (Academic, New York, 1991).
- [14] T. Guhr, A. Mueller-Groeling, H.A. Weidenmüller, *Phys. Rep.* **299**, 189 (1998).
- [15] C.M. Ko, H.J. Pirner, H.A. Weidenmüller, *Phys. Lett.* **B62**, 248 (1976).
- [16] H.A. Weidenmüller, in *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics* Vol.3 (Pergamon, Oxford, 1980).
- [17] P.A. Mello, P. Peyrera, N. Kumar, *J. Stat. Phys.* **51**, 77 (1988); P. Pereyra, *J. Stat. Phys.* **65**, 773 (1990).
- [18] A. Bulgac, G. Do Dang, D. Kusnezov, *Phys. Rev.* **E54**, 3468 (1996).
- [19] E. Lutz, H.A. Weidenmüller, *Physica A* **267**, 354 (1999).
- [20] D. Kusnezov, A. Bulgac, G. DoDang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** (1999) 1136; D. Kusnezov, *Czech. J. Phys.*, **49** (1999) pp.35-87; A. Bulgac, G.DoDang, D.Kusnezov, *Phys. Rev.* **E58** 196 (1998); D.Kusnezov, A.Bulgac, G. DoDang, *Phys. Lett.* **234A** (1997) 103.
- [21] H. Carmichael, *An Open System Approach to Quantum Optics*, Lectures Notes in Physics 18, (Springer, Berlin, 1993).
- [22] E. Lutz, *Europhys. Lett.* **54**, 293 (2001).
- [23] A.O. Caldeira, A.J. Leggett, *Physica A* **121**, 587 (1983).
- [24] U. Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative Systems*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1999).
- [25] E. Lutz, *Phys. Rev.* **E64**, 51106 (2001).
- [26] A.I Saichev, G.M. Zaslavsky, *Chaos* **7**, 753 (1997). S.G Samko, A.A. Kilbas, O.I. Marichev, *Fractional Integrals and Derivatives, Theory and Applications* (Gordon Breach, Amsterdam, 1993).
- [27] A. Erdélyi, *Higher Transcendental Functions. Vol. 3.* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1955).
- [28] Z. Rieder, J.L. Lebowitz, E. Lieb, *J. Math. Phys.* **8**, 1073 (1967).
- [29] U. Zürcher, P. Talkner, *Phys. Rev.* **A42**, 3267 (1990); *ibid* 3278 (1990).