

Lax-Phillips evolution as an evolution of Gell-Mann-Hartle-Griffiths histories and emergence of the Schrödinger equation for a stable history

D.Bar^a and L.P.Horwitz^{a,b}

^aDepartment of Physics, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel.

^bRaymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Science, School of Physics, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv, Israel.

Abstract

Using the Gell-Mann-Hartle-Griffiths formalism in the framework of the Flesia-Piron form of the Lax-Phillips theory we show that the Schrödinger equation may be derived as a condition of stability of histories. This mechanism is realized in a mathematical structure closely related to the Zeno effect.

PACS number(s): 03.65.-w, 03.65.Xp, 03.65.Db, 03.65.Bz.

Keywords: Schrödinger equation, Zeno effect, Functional analysis.

The possibility of obtaining physical effects due to a large number of repetitions of the same measurement and interaction has been discussed both at

the theoretical [1, 2, 3] and experimental [4] levels. Moreover, it has been argued [5] that these repetitions not only produce quantum effects, which is the reason for calling them quantum Zeno effect [1, 2], but they may also be a source of macroscopic and classical effects [6].

We show here, using the functional Lax-Phillips (LP) [7] generalization of quantum mechanics [8, 9] and the histories formalism of Gell-Mann, Hartle [10, 11] and Griffiths [12] (GMHG) that for a special choice of evolution of histories one obtains stability of the GMHG state by a mechanism that appears to be the limit of a large number of repetitive measurements in a finite total time. The stability of the GMHG state is associated with the Schrödinger relation on the structure of the histories, and hence characterizes the consistent subset.

The theory of Lax-Phillips [7] which was originally formulated to describe resonances and semigroup evolutions (i.e., irreversible processes) for the classical scattering of electromagnetic waves on a finite target has been generalized to the quantum level by Flesia and Piron [8], and Horwitz and Piron [8] (see also [9]). The appropriate space is the "direct integral Hilbert space" [8, 14]

$$\tilde{H} = \int_t \oplus H_t d\mu(t), \quad (1)$$

where we take the measure $d\mu(t)$ to be of Stieljes-Lebesgue type, and t corresponds to a foliation parameter playing the role of the time observable. An

element of \tilde{H} is the sequence [9, 14] (which we represent here as countable)

$$\phi = (h_{t_1}, h_{t_2}, h_{t_3} \dots), \quad (2)$$

so that $\phi_{t_i} = h_{t_i}$ and $h_{t_i} \subset \mathcal{H}_i$ where the sequence \mathcal{H}_i corresponds to a set of isomorphic *auxiliary* Hilbert spaces [9, 14] at the times t_i . Thus, we see that ϕ corresponds to a virtual history [9]. The evolution operator $U(\tau)$ on \tilde{H} is defined (for convenience here, on the continuum)

$$(U(\tau)\phi)_{t+\tau} = \phi_{t+\tau}^\tau = V_t(\tau)\phi_t, \quad (3)$$

where $V_t(\tau)$ is an operator which is unitary on \mathcal{H}_t . The superscript τ on ϕ is the laboratory time which is a parameter, while t is a dynamical variable. The subscript $(t+\tau)$ signifies that the original element from Eq (2) has been translated along the t axis by τ . That is, the action of the operator $U(\tau)$ has produced a (auxiliary) Hilbert space unitary evolution combined with translation along the t axis by the amount τ . Note that the operator $U(\tau)$ forms a one-parameter group [8], that is,

$$(U(\tau_2)U(\tau_1)\phi)_{t+\tau_1+\tau_2} = (U(\tau_1 + \tau_2)\phi)_{t+\tau_1+\tau_2}$$

According to Eq (3)

$$U(\tau)\phi = (V_{t_1}(\tau)h_{t_1}, V_{t_2}(\tau)h_{t_2} \dots) = (h'_{t_1+\tau}, h'_{t_2+\tau} \dots), \quad (4)$$

where the primes indicate that the evolution constitutes a translation along the t axis as well as a unitary evolution on the auxiliary Hilbert spaces. We may think that the elements on the right hand side of the preceding equation have undergone a specific dynamical evolution which is only one of a great number of possible alternatives which may be distinguished by appropriate projections. In that case we can represent each such element by projection operators in the auxiliary space at specific times. Let us assume that the initial state ϕ_α corresponds to a projected chain (denoted as $C_\alpha\phi$), i.e.,

$$\phi_\alpha = (P_{\alpha_1}(t_1)h_{t_1}, P_{\alpha_2}(t_2)h_{t_2} \dots) \quad (5)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} U(\tau)\phi_\alpha &= (V_{t_1}(\tau)P_{\alpha_1}(t_1)h_{t_1}, V_{t_2}(\tau)P_{\alpha_2}(t_2)h_{t_2} \dots) = \\ &= (P_{\alpha_1}(t_1 + \tau)h_{t_1 + \tau}, P_{\alpha_2}(t_2 + \tau)h_{t_2 + \tau} \dots), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where

$$P_{\alpha_i}(t_i + \tau) = V_{t_i}(\tau)P_{\alpha_i}(t_i)V_{t_i}^{-1}(\tau) \quad (7)$$

The unitary evolution of the projected history remains a projected history, i.e.,

$$U(\tau)C_\alpha\phi = C_\alpha(\tau)U(\tau)\phi, \quad (8)$$

where one may write

$$C_\alpha(\tau) = U(\tau)C_\alpha U^{-1}(\tau) \quad (9)$$

Thus, the Flesia-Piron generalized state of Eq (2) may be considered as a GMHG history developing dynamically under a *unitary evolution of histories*.

In the GMHG histories formalism [10, 11, 12] one deals with a set of alternative histories [10], which are defined in the most simple example by giving sequences of projections at definite moments of time $t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots, t_n$. The sequences are denoted [10] by $P_{\alpha_1}^1(t_1), P_{\alpha_2}^2(t_2), P_{\alpha_3}^3(t_3), \dots, P_{\alpha_n}^n(t_n)$. The projections may be different at different times, for example, in the two slit experiment [13] $P_{\alpha_2}^2(t_2)$ could distinguish whether the electron went through the upper slit or the lower one at time t_2 , while $P_{\alpha_3}^3(t_3)$ might distinguish various places of arrival at the final screen at time t_3 . In general, α_i corresponds to eigenstates of a set of observables at t_i . Each set of P 's satisfies [10]

$$\sum_{\alpha_K} P_{\alpha_K}^K(t_K) = I, \quad P_{\alpha_K}^K(t_K) P_{\alpha'_K}^K(t_K) = \delta_{\alpha_K \alpha'_K} P_{\alpha_K}^K(t_K), \quad (10)$$

indicating that the α 's represent an exhaustive set of exclusive alternatives. An individual history corresponds to a particular sequence: $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ and for each history there is a corresponding chain of time ordered projection operators [10] $C_\alpha = P_{\alpha_n}^n(t_n), \dots, P_{\alpha_1}^1(t_1)$. Such histories are termed coarse grained [10] when the P 's are not projections onto a basis (a complete set of states), and when there is not a set of P 's at each and every time, otherwise, they are fine grained. When the initial state is pure one can resolve it, by using the previous equations, into branches corresponding to the individual members of any set of alternative histories. That is, denoting in the

Heisenberg picture the initial state by $|\Psi\rangle$ one obtains [10]

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} C_{\alpha} |\Psi_{\alpha}\rangle = \sum_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} P_{\alpha_n}^n(t_n) \dots P_{\alpha_1}^1(t_1) |\Psi\rangle \quad (11)$$

The vector $C_{\alpha} |\Psi_{\alpha}\rangle$ is the branch of $|\Psi\rangle$ that corresponds to the individual history α .

If ϕ, ξ correspond to the GMHG histories ϕ_k, ξ_k respectively, the scalar product between them is given by [10, 11] (we shall use this definition below)

$$(\phi, \xi) = \prod_k (\phi_k, \xi_k)_{\mathcal{H}_{t_k}} \quad (12)$$

If the set $\alpha, \hat{\alpha}$ differ by one projection P_{α_k} in the sequence for which $P_{\alpha_k}^k(t_k) P_{\hat{\alpha}_k}^k(t_k) = 0$, then $\langle \Psi_{\alpha} | \Psi_{\hat{\alpha}} \rangle = 0$ where $|\Psi_{\hat{\alpha}}\rangle$ is the branch of $|\Psi\rangle$ that corresponds to the history $\hat{\alpha}$ (see Eq. 11). Following the definition given by Isham [11], embedding the space of history filters in the orthocomplemented lattice of history propositions, we may define a density matrix ρ in term of *a priori* probabilities over the arbitrary histories that form, in this space, a complete set. The density operator associated with such a state is

$$\rho = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \prod_{k=1}^{k=n} P_{\alpha_k}^k(t_k), \quad (13)$$

where the sum is taken over all histories and p_{α} is the probability for the occurrence of the history α . Such histories do not necessarily satisfy the GMHG consistency requirement. Thus, defining the trace as the diagonal

sum of expectations over all histories (which are conventionally denoted inside the tensor product as ϕ^α), in the sense of Isham's completeness,

$$\text{tr}(\rho) = \sum_{\hat{\alpha}} (\phi^{\hat{\alpha}}, \rho \phi^{\hat{\alpha}})$$

If we take a subset of histories $\hat{\alpha}$ to correspond to the α 's that occur in ρ , and the remainder orthogonal to these, we see that

$$\text{tr}(\rho) = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \prod_i |(\phi^{\alpha_i}, \phi^{\alpha_i})|^2 = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} = 1 \quad (14)$$

Such a density operator is consistent with the notion of the Lax-Phillips state, since in this theory each pure state corresponds to a quantum mechanical history. A decoherence functional for such state defined by $d(\alpha, \hat{\alpha}') = \text{tr}(C_{\alpha} \rho C_{\hat{\alpha}'}^{\dagger})$ satisfies the consistency conditions for any pair of histories satisfying the condition 10, i.e.,

$$\text{tr}(C_{\alpha} \rho C_{\hat{\alpha}'}^{\dagger}) = \sum_{\beta} \sum_{\alpha''} p_{\alpha''} \prod_i (\phi^{\beta_i}, P_{\alpha_i} P_{\alpha''_i} P_{\hat{\alpha}'_i} \phi^{\beta_i}) \quad (15)$$

Choosing a subset of histories β to coincide with α , and the remainder orthogonal to these, we see that

$$\text{tr}(C_{\alpha} \rho C_{\hat{\alpha}'}^{\dagger}) = \sum_{\alpha''} p_{\alpha''} \prod_i \delta_{\alpha_i \alpha''_i} \delta_{\alpha''_i \hat{\alpha}'_i} = p_{\alpha} \delta_{\alpha \hat{\alpha}'}$$

i.e., the analog of the GMHG condition for consistent histories is formally

satisfied with these definitions. Furthermore, for an observable A defined on the space of histories (as for operators on the Lax-Phillips space \hat{H})

$$\text{tr}(A\rho) = \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{\dot{\alpha}} p_{\dot{\alpha}} \prod_i (\phi^{\alpha_i}, AP_{\dot{\alpha}_i} \phi^{\alpha_i}), \quad (16)$$

and again taking a subset of histories α to coincide with the set occurring in ρ , and the remainder orthogonal to these, one finds

$$\text{tr}(A\rho) = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \prod_i (\phi^{\alpha_i}, A\phi^{\alpha_i}) \quad (17)$$

We remark that the Lax-Phillips Hilbert space contains elements that represent resonances, and which evolve according to exact semigroup laws (and hence correspond to irreversible processes). This property cannot be achieved in the framework of the usual quantum theory using the Wigner-Weisskopf formulation [15] of the description of an unstable system.

The projection operators C_{α} are proper projection operators in \hat{H} . With suitable conditions, identifying incoming and outgoing subspaces in \hat{H} which are stable under the action of $U(\tau)$ for τ positive and negative, respectively, the quantum Lax-Phillips theory [7] provides a rigorous framework for describing irreversible processes (semigroup evolution of a subspace of \hat{H}) here seen as an evolution of the GMHG histories

The action of $U(\tau)$ is generated by a self adjoint generator

$$K = s - \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} (U(\tau) - I) \quad (18)$$

For example, the Flesia-Piron model [8] is

$$K = H - i\partial_t, \quad (19)$$

where H is a (possibly t -dependent) Hamiltonian operator defined on the auxiliary spaces. This generalized generator $K(q, p, t, E)$ (which may depend on the variable t but not on the laboratory parameter time τ ; E is represented by $i\partial_t$) satisfies the following generalized equation [8]

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}(U(\tau)\phi)_t = (U(\tau)K\phi)_t = V_{t-\tau}(\tau)(K\phi)_{t-\tau} = V_{t-\tau}(\tau)(H_{t-\tau}\phi_{t-\tau} - i\partial_t\phi_{t-\tau}) \quad (20)$$

Using Equations (3)-(6) we write the left hand side of Eq (20) as

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}(U(\tau)C_\alpha\phi) = i\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}(V_{t_1}(\tau)P_{\alpha_1}(t_1)h_{t_1}, V_{t_2}(\tau)P_{\alpha_2}(t_2)h_{t_2} \dots) \quad (21)$$

In the case that the state $C_\alpha\phi$ is stationary under the evolution $U(\tau)$, so that

$$V_{t_i}(\tau)P_{\alpha_i}(t_i)h_{t_i} = P_{\alpha_i}(t_i)h_{t_i}, \quad (22)$$

one obtains, in the special case of Eq (19), the Schrödinger equation

$$H_{t_i}\phi_{t_i} = i\partial_{t_i}\phi_{t_i} \quad (23)$$

at every t_i . We now show that for a special choice of evolution relating

successive sequences

$$h_{t_k+\delta\tau} = V_{t_k}(\delta\tau)h_{t_k} = h_{t_k}(\delta\tau), \quad (24)$$

with $\delta\tau = \frac{T}{n}$, T is the total span t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n , we obtain the stability of the corresponding $C_\alpha\phi$ by a mechanism analogous to the dynamical Zeno effect [2, 3]. Since $V_{t_k}(\delta\tau)$ is generated on the auxiliary space \mathcal{H}_{t_k} by a self adjoint operator H_{t_k} , for n large Eq (24) may be written to second order in $\delta\tau$ as

$$(1 - i\delta\tau H_{t_k} - \frac{\delta\tau^2}{2} H_{t_k}^2)h_{t_k} = \dot{h}_{t_k+\delta\tau}, \quad (25)$$

so that for $\delta\tau \rightarrow 0$ the Schrödinger equation (23) is satisfied (here we take $\delta\tau = \delta t$). Applying the definition (12) of the tensor product we see that, identifying $\dot{h}_{t_k+\delta\tau} \equiv h_{t_k}(\delta\tau)$ as associated with the component t_k ,

$$\langle U(\delta\tau)\phi, \phi \rangle = \prod_k \langle (1 - i\delta\tau H_{t_k} - \frac{\delta\tau^2}{2} H_{t_k}^2)h_{t_k}, h_{t_k} \rangle \quad (26)$$

It then follows that

$$|\langle U(\delta\tau)\phi, \phi \rangle|^2 = \prod_k \|h_{t_k}\|^4 (1 - \delta\tau^2 \Delta H_{t_k}^2), \quad (27)$$

where,

$$\Delta H_{t_k}^2 = \frac{\langle h_{t_k}, H_{t_k}^2 h_{t_k} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{t_k}}}{\|h_{t_k}\|^2} - \frac{\langle h_{t_k}, H_{t_k} h_{t_k} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{t_k}}^2}{\|h_{t_k}\|^4} \quad (28)$$

The product to second order is

$$| \langle U(\delta\tau)\phi, \phi \rangle |^2 = \left(\prod_k \|h_{t_k}\|^4 \right) \left(1 + \frac{T^2}{n^2} \sum_k \Delta H_{t_k}^2 \right) \quad (29)$$

The second term vanishes in the limit of $n \rightarrow \infty$ if the dispersions ΔH_{t_k} are finite at each k . The GMHG scalar product for this evolution constructs the sequence corresponding to the well-known Zeno phenomenon in the stabilization of states by successive measurement. Moreover, this result demonstrates that the set of consistent histories constructed by successive measurement is associated with the Schrödinger relation between successive states in the Lax-Phillips foliation.

In this calculation we have concluded that the GMHG evolution is stationary if the sequence h_{t_k} is determined by Schrödinger evolution in the Flesia-Piron model [8]. However, if we choose an *arbitrary* sequence h_{t_k} and $U(\delta\tau)$ induces Schrödinger evolution at each step $\delta\tau$, the relation (26) remains valid, independently of whether the sequence h_{t_k} itself corresponds to a Schrödinger sequence. The conclusion (29) remains, and we see the resulting GMHG stability corresponds to the dynamic Aharonov-Vardi [2] Zeno effect. The static Zeno effect follows if the sequence h_{t_k} is chosen to be a set of identical states, i.e., $h_{t_k} = h_{t_0}$.

References

- [1] B. Misra and E. C. Sudarshan, *J. Math. Phys.*, **18**, 756 (1977); R. A. Harris and L. Stodolsky, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **74**, 4, 2145 (1981); Mordechai Bixon, *Chem. Phys.*, **70**, 199-206, (1982); Saverio Pascazio and Mikio Namiki, *Phys. Rev A* **50**, 6, 4582, (1994); R. J. Cook, *Physica Scripta T* **21**, 49-51 (1988); A. Peres, *Phys. Rev D* **39**, 10, 2943, (1989), A. Peres and Amiram Ron, *Phys. Rev A* **42**, 9, 5720 (1990)
- [2] Y. Aharonov and M. Vardi, *Phys.Rev D* **21** , 2235, (1980)
- [3] P. Facchi, A. G. Klein, S. Pascazio and L. Schulman, *Phys.Lett A* **257**, 232-240, (1999)
- [4] W. M. Itano, D. J. Heinzen, J. J. Bollinger, and D. J. Wineland, *Phys. Rev A*, **41**, 2295-2300, (1990); A. G. Kofman and G. Kurizki, *Phys. Rev A*, **54**, 3750-3753, (1996); G. Kurizki, A. G. Kofman and V. Yudson, *Phys. Rev A*, **53**, R35, (1995); S. R. Wilkinson, C. F. Bharucha, M. C. Madison, P. R. Morrow, Q. Niu, B. Sundaram and M. G. Raizen, *Nature*, **387**, 575-577, (1997).
- [5] Marcus Simonius, *Phys. Rev. Lett*, **40**, 15, 980 (1978); “Decoherence and the appearance of a classical world in quantum theory”, D. Giulini, E. Joos, C. Kiefer, J. Kusch, I. O. Stamatescu and H. D. Zeh, Springer-Verlag, (1996).

- [6] D. Bar, Phys. Rev E, **64**, 026108/1-10, (2001).
- [7] “Scattering Theory”, P. D. Lax and R. S. Phillips, Academic Press, New York (1967)
- [8] L. P. Horwitz and C. Piron, Helv. Phys. Acta **66**, 693-711 (1993); C. Flesia and C. Piron, Helv. Phys. Acta **57**, 697, (1984).
- [9] Y. Strauss, E. Eisenberg and L. P. Horwitz, Jour. Math. Phys. **41**, 8050 (2000); Y. Strauss and L. P. Horwitz, hep-ph/0102034, to be published in J. Math. Phys; E. Eisenberg and L. P. Horwitz, Advances in Chemical Physics XCIX, 245-297 (1997);
- [10] “Space time quantum mechanics and the quantum mechanics of space-time”, James. B. Hartle in “Gravitation and quantization”, edited by B. Julia and Zinn-Justin, N. H. Elsevier Science B. J, (1995), lectures given at the 1992 Les Houches Ecole dete session LVII; M. Gell-Mann and J. Jartle, Phys. Rev D, **47**, 3345-3382, (1993); J. Hartle, Phys. Rev D, **44**, 3173-3195, (1991).
- [11] C. J. Isham, J. Math. Phys **35**, 2157, (1994); C. J. Isham and N. Linden, J. Math. Phys, **35**, 5452, (1994).
- [12] R. B. Griffiths and R. Omnes, Physics Today, 26, (1999); R. B. Griffiths, Phys. Rev A, **54** (4), 2759, (1996); “Consistent quantum theory” by R. B. Griffiths, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

- [13] R. P. Feynman, Rev. Mod. Phys, **20**, 2, 367 (1948); “Quantum Mechanics and path integrals”, R. P. Feynman and A. R. Hibbs, McGraw-Hill Book Company (1965)
- [14] “Generalized functions”, volume 4, I. M. Gelfand and N. Ya. Vilenkin, Academic Press, 1964
- [15] V.F. Weisskopf and E.P. Wigner, Zeits. f. Phys. **63**, (1930); **65**, 18, (1930)