

Quantum correlations in classical statistics

C. Wetterich¹

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

November 1, 2018

Abstract

Quantum correlations can be naturally formulated in a classical statistical system of infinitely many degrees of freedom. This realizes the underlying non-commutative structure in a classical statistical setting. We argue that the quantum correlations offer a more robust description with respect to the precise definition of observables.

¹e-mail: C.Wetterich@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de

1 Quantum structures in classical statistics

Classical observables commute, quantum mechanical operators do not - this basic difference reflects itself in a different behavior of classical correlation functions and quantum correlations. We will argue here that these different properties are connected to the formulation of the concept of correlation functions rather than to the “classical” or “quantum” character of the system itself. Quantum correlations can be formulated in classical statistics just as well as classical correlation functions may be defined in a quantum system.

In a quantum system it is well known that a commuting operator product can be defined via the time ordering of operators. A definition of a correlation function based on the time ordered product of two operators has the same commutative properties as the classical correlation function. The reason why practical quantum mechanics uses noncommuting products like $\hat{Q}(t_1)\hat{P}(t_2)$ rather than the time ordered product $T(\hat{Q}(t_1)\hat{P}(t_2))$ is rooted in the subtleties of the definition of the latter when $t_2 = t_1$. Operators for continuous time are defined by a limit process starting from discrete time steps. The expectation value of the quantum product $\langle\hat{Q}(t_1)\hat{P}(t_2)\rangle$ is insensitive to the precise definition of the limiting procedure whereas $\langle T(\hat{Q}(t_1)\hat{P}(t_2))\rangle$ is not. The “quantum correlation” is therefore more “robust” than the “classical correlation” $\langle T(\hat{Q}(t_1)\hat{P}(t_2))\rangle$. We will see that a similar issue of a robust definition of correlation functions is actually present in classical statistics as well. An investigation of the question of relevant information in the classical probability distribution will lead us to the proposal of a robust quantum correlation for a classical statistical system.

The formulation of the basic partition function for classical statistical systems with infinitely many degrees of freedom uses implicitly an assumption of “completeness of the statistical information”. This means that we assign a probability to everyone of the infinitely many configurations. The specification of the probability distribution contains therefore an “infinite amount of information”. This contrasts with the simple observation that only a finite amount of information is available in practice for the computation of the outcome of any physical measurement. A concentration on measurable quantities suggests that the assumption of completeness of the statistical information may have to be abandoned. In this note we explore consequences of “incomplete statistics” which deals with situations where only partial information about the probability distribution is available. In particular, we consider extended systems for which only local information about the probability distribution is given. From another point of view we ask which part of the information contained in the standard classical probability distribution is actually relevant for the computation of expectation values of local observables. We will see that the quantum mechanical concepts of states, operators and evolution also emerge naturally in this setting [1].

As an example, let us consider a classical statistical system where the infinitely

many degrees of freedom φ_n ($n \in Z$) are ordered in an infinite chain. We concentrate on a “local region” $|\tilde{n}| < \bar{n}$ and assume that the probability distribution $p[\varphi]$ has a “locality property” in the sense that the relative probabilities for any two configurations of the “local variables” $\varphi_{\tilde{n}}$ are independent of the values that take the “external variables” φ_m with $|m| > \bar{n}$. Furthermore, we assume that the probability distribution for the $\varphi_{\tilde{n}}$ is known for given values of the variables $\varphi_{\bar{n}}, \varphi_{-\bar{n}}$ at the border of the local interval. As an example, we may consider a probability distribution

$$\begin{aligned}
p[\varphi] &= p_{>}[\varphi_{m \geq \bar{n}}] p_0[\varphi_{-\bar{n} \leq \tilde{n} \leq \bar{n}}] p_{<}[\varphi_{m \leq -\bar{n}}] \\
p_0[\varphi] &= \exp \left\{ - \sum_{|\tilde{n}| < \bar{n}} \left[\frac{\epsilon}{2} \mu^2 \varphi_{\tilde{n}}^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{8} \lambda \varphi_{\tilde{n}}^4 + \frac{M}{2\epsilon} (\varphi_{\tilde{n}} - \varphi_{\tilde{n}-1})^2 \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{M}{2\epsilon} (\varphi_{\tilde{n}} - \varphi_{\tilde{n}-1})^2 \right\} \tag{1.1}
\end{aligned}$$

where $p_{>}$ and $p_{<}$ are only constrained by the overall normalization of $p[\varphi]$ and we will consider the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. This statistical system cannot be reduced to a system with a finite number of degrees of freedom since the probability for the occurrence of specific values of the “border variables” $\varphi_{\bar{n}}, \varphi_{-\bar{n}}$ depends on the values of the external variables φ_m and their probability distribution. The statistical information about this system is incomplete, if we do not specify the probability distribution $p_{>} p_{<}$ for the external variables φ_m completely.

Local observables are constructed from the local variables $\varphi_{\tilde{n}}$. As usual, their expectation values are computed by “functional integrals” where the probability distribution $p[\varphi]$ appears as a weight factor. We will ask the question what is the minimal amount of information about the probability distribution for the external variables φ_m which is necessary for a computation of expectation values of local observables. One finds that this information can be summarized in “states” $|\psi\rangle, \{\psi|$ that can be represented as ordinary functions $\{\psi(\varphi_{\bar{n}})|, |\psi(\varphi_{-\bar{n}})\}$. Since these functions depend each only on one variable, the specification of the states contains much less information than the full probability distribution $p_{>} p_{<}$ which depends on infinitely many variables $\varphi_{m \geq \bar{n}}, \varphi_{m \leq -\bar{n}}$. The states contain the minimal information for “local questions” and are therefore the appropriate quantities for our formulation of incomplete statistics. We will see in sect. 6 that any further information about the probability distributions $p_{>}[\varphi_m], p_{<}[\varphi_m]$ beyond the one contained in the state vectors is actually irrelevant for the computation of expectation values of local observables.

The expectation values of all local observables can be computed from the knowledge of the local probability distribution and the states $|\psi\rangle$ and $\{\psi|$. For this computation one associates to every local observable $A[\varphi]$ an appropriate operator \hat{A} and finds the prescription familiar from quantum mechanics

$$\langle A[\varphi] \rangle = \{\psi| \hat{A} |\psi\rangle \tag{1.2}$$

There is a unique mapping $A[\varphi] \rightarrow \hat{A}$ for every local observable which can be expressed in terms of an appropriate functional integral. We find that for simple observables $A[\varphi]$ the operators \hat{A} correspond precisely to familiar operators in quantum mechanics. For example, the observable $\varphi(\tilde{n})$ can be associated to the operator $\hat{Q}(\tau)$ in the Heisenberg picture where time is analytically continued, $\tau = it$, and $\tilde{n} = \tau/\epsilon$.

Local correlation functions involving derivatives may be ambiguous in the continuum limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. This problem is well known in functional integral formulations of quantum field theories. We show how to avoid this problem by defining correlations in terms of equivalence classes of observables. In fact, two observables $A_1[\varphi], A_2[\varphi]$ can sometimes be represented by the same operator \hat{A} . In this case $A_1[\varphi]$ and $A_2[\varphi]$ are equivalent since they cannot be distinguished by their expectation values for arbitrary states. They have the same expectation values for all possible probability distributions. We argue that the concept of correlation functions should be based on the equivalence classes of observables rather than on specific implementations. Equivalent observables should lead to equivalent correlations. For this purpose we define a product between equivalence classes of observables which can be associated to the product of operators. For example, we associate a non-commutative product $\varphi(\tilde{n}_1) \circ \varphi(\tilde{n}_2)$ to the operator product $\hat{Q}(\tau_1)\hat{Q}(\tau_2)$. It is striking how the non-commutativity of quantum mechanics arises directly from the question what are meaningful correlation functions. We find that the “quantum correlation” based on $\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2$ has better “robustness properties” as compared to the usual classical correlation. We hope that these considerations shed new light on the question if quantum mechanics can find a formulation in terms of classical statistics [2] or general statistics [3].

2 States and operators

Consider a discrete ordered set of continuous variables $\varphi_n \equiv \varphi(\tau)$, $\tau = \epsilon n$, $n \in Z$ and a normalized probability distribution $p(\{\varphi_n\}) \equiv p[\varphi] = \exp(-S[\varphi])$ with $\int D\varphi e^{-S[\varphi]} \equiv \prod_n (\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varphi_n) p[\varphi] = 1$. We will assume that the action S is local in a range $-\bar{\tau} < \tau < \bar{\tau}$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= -\ln p = \int_{-\bar{\tau}}^{\bar{\tau}} d\tau' \mathcal{L}(\tau') + S_>(\bar{\tau}) + S_<(-\bar{\tau}) \\
\mathcal{L}(\tau') &= V(\varphi(\tau'), \tau') + \frac{1}{2} Z(\tau') (\partial_{\tau'} \varphi(\tau'))^2
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Here we have used a continuum notation ($n_{1,2} = \tau_{1,2}/\epsilon$) which can be translated into a discrete language by

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} d\tau' \mathcal{L}(\tau') &= \epsilon \sum_{n=n_1+1}^{n_2-1} \mathcal{L}_n + \frac{\epsilon}{2} [V_{n_2}(\varphi_{n_2}) + V_{n_1}(\varphi_{n_1})] \\ &+ \frac{\epsilon}{4} \left[Z_{n_2} \left(\frac{\varphi_{n_2} - \varphi_{n_2-1}}{\epsilon} \right)^2 + Z_{n_1} \left(\frac{\varphi_{n_1+1} - \varphi_{n_1}}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

with

$$\mathcal{L}_n = V_n(\varphi_n) + \frac{Z_n}{4\epsilon^2} \{(\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n)^2 + (\varphi_n - \varphi_{n-1})^2\} \quad (2.3)$$

This corresponds to a discrete derivative

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_\tau \varphi(\tau))^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left(\frac{\varphi(\tau + \epsilon) - \varphi(\tau)}{\epsilon} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\varphi(\tau) - \varphi(\tau - \epsilon)}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} \{(\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n)^2 + (\varphi_n - \varphi_{n-1})^2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

The boundary terms in (2.2) are chosen such that $S_>(\bar{\tau})$ is independent of all $\varphi(\tau')$ with $\tau' < \bar{\tau}$ whereas $S_<(-\bar{\tau})$ only depends on $\varphi(\tau' \leq -\bar{\tau})$. Except for the overall normalization of p no additional assumptions about the form of $S_>(\bar{\tau})$ and $S_<(-\bar{\tau})$ will be made. In case of S being local also at $\bar{\tau}$ we note that $S_>(\bar{\tau})$ contains a term $\frac{\epsilon}{2} [V(\varphi(\bar{\tau}), \bar{\tau}) + V(\varphi(\bar{\tau} + \epsilon), \bar{\tau} + \epsilon)] + \frac{\epsilon}{4} (Z(\bar{\tau}) + Z(\bar{\tau} + \epsilon)) \left(\frac{\varphi(\bar{\tau} + \epsilon) - \varphi(\bar{\tau})}{\epsilon} \right)^2$, which involves a product $\varphi(\bar{\tau} + \epsilon)\varphi(\bar{\tau})$ and therefore links the variables with $\tau > \bar{\tau}$ to the ones with $\tau \leq \bar{\tau}$.

We are interested in local observables $A[\varphi; \tau]$ which depend only on those $\varphi(\tau')$ where $\tau - \frac{\delta}{2} \leq \tau' \leq \tau + \frac{\delta}{2}$. (We assume $-\bar{\tau} < \tau - \frac{\delta}{2}$, $\bar{\tau} > \tau + \frac{\delta}{2}$.) As usual, the expectation value of A is

$$\langle A(\tau) \rangle = \int D\varphi A[\varphi; \tau] e^{-S[\varphi]} \quad (2.5)$$

As mentioned in the introduction, our investigation concerns the question what we can learn about expectation values of local observables and suitable products thereof in a situation where we have no or only partial information about $S_>(\bar{\tau})$ and $S_<(-\bar{\tau})$. It seems obvious that the full information contained in S is not needed if only expectation values of local observables of the type (2.5) are to be computed. On the other hand, $\langle A(\tau) \rangle$ cannot be completely independent of $S_>(\bar{\tau})$ and $S_<(-\bar{\tau})$ since the next neighbor interactions (2.2) relate ‘‘local variables’’ $\varphi(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2} < \tau' < \tau + \frac{\delta}{2})$ to the ‘‘exterior variables’’ $\varphi(\tau' > \bar{\tau})$ and $\varphi(\tau' < -\bar{\tau})$.

In order to establish the necessary amount of information needed from $S_>(\bar{\tau})$ and $S_<(-\bar{\tau})$ we first extend $S_>$ and $S_<$ to values $|\tau| < \bar{\tau}$

$$S_<(\tau_1) = S_<(-\bar{\tau}) + \int_{-\bar{\tau}}^{\tau_1} d\tau' \mathcal{L}(\tau'), \quad S_>(\tau_2) = S_>(\bar{\tau}) + \int_{\bar{\tau}}^{\tau_2} d\tau' \mathcal{L}(\tau') \quad (2.6)$$

where we note the general identity

$$S_>(\tau) + S_<(\tau) = S \quad (2.7)$$

The expectation value (2.5) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A(\tau) \rangle &= \int d\varphi(\tau + \frac{\delta}{2}) \int d\varphi(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2}) \int D\varphi_{(\tau' > \tau + \frac{\delta}{2})} e^{-S_>(\tau + \frac{\delta}{2})} \\ &\quad \int D\varphi_{(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2} < \tau' < \tau + \frac{\delta}{2})} A[\varphi; \tau] \exp\left\{-\int_{\tau - \frac{\delta}{2}}^{\tau + \frac{\delta}{2}} d\tau'' \mathcal{L}(\tau'')\right\} \\ &\quad \int D\varphi_{(\tau' < \tau - \frac{\delta}{2})} e^{-S_<(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2})} \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

This suggests the introduction of the “states”

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(\varphi(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2}); \tau - \frac{\delta}{2})\rangle &= \int D\varphi_{(\tau' < \tau - \frac{\delta}{2})} e^{-S_<(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2})} \\ \langle \psi(\varphi(\tau + \frac{\delta}{2}); \tau + \frac{\delta}{2})| &= \int D\varphi_{(\tau' > \tau + \frac{\delta}{2})} e^{-S_>(\tau + \frac{\delta}{2})} \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

and the operator

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_\delta(\varphi(\tau + \frac{\delta}{2}), \varphi(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2}); \tau) \\ = \int D\varphi_{(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2} < \tau' < \tau + \frac{\delta}{2})} A[\varphi; \tau] \exp\left\{-\int_{\tau - \frac{\delta}{2}}^{\tau + \frac{\delta}{2}} d\tau'' \mathcal{L}(\tau'')\right\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

We note that $|\psi\rangle$ is a function of $\varphi(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2})$ since the latter appears in $S_<(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2})$ and is not included in the (“functional”) integration (2.9). Similarly, $\langle\psi|$ depends on $\varphi(\tau + \frac{\delta}{2})$ whereas \hat{A} is a function of the two variables $\varphi(\tau + \frac{\delta}{2})$ and $\varphi(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2})$. Using a notation where $|\psi\rangle$ and $\langle\psi|$ are interpreted as (infinite dimensional) vectors and \hat{A} as a matrix, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A(\tau) \rangle &= \langle \psi(\tau + \frac{\delta}{2}) | \hat{A}_\delta(\tau) | \psi(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2}) \rangle \\ &\equiv \int d\varphi_2 \int d\varphi_1 \langle \psi(\varphi_2; \tau + \frac{\delta}{2}) | \hat{A}_\delta(\varphi_2, \varphi_1; \tau) | \psi(\varphi_1; \tau - \frac{\delta}{2}) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

This form resembles already the well-known prescription for expectation values of operators in quantum mechanics. In contrast to quantum mechanics (2.11) still involves, however, two different state vectors.

The mapping $A[\varphi; \tau] \rightarrow \hat{A}_\delta(\tau)$ can be computed (cf. (2.10)) if $\mathcal{L}(\tau')$ is known for $|\tau'| < \bar{\tau}$. The only information needed from $S_>(\bar{\tau})$ and $S_<(-\bar{\tau})$ is therefore contained in the two functions $\langle\psi(\varphi)|$ and $|\psi(\varphi)\rangle$! The specification of these states (wave

functions) at $\bar{\tau}$ and $-\bar{\tau}$ and of $\mathcal{L}(|\tau| < \bar{\tau})$ completely determines the expectation values of *all* local observables!

We will see below the close connection to the states in quantum mechanics. In our context we emphasize that for any given S these states can be computed as well defined functional integrals (2.9). Due to (2.7) they obey the normalization

$$\{\psi(\tau)\psi(\tau)\} \equiv \int d\varphi \{\psi(\varphi; \tau) | \psi(\varphi; \tau)\} = 1 \quad (2.12)$$

Incomplete statistics explores statements that can be made for local observables and appropriate products thereof without using information about $S_>$ or $S_<$ beyond the one contained in the states $|\psi\rangle$ and $\{\psi\}$.

3 Evolution in Euclidean time

For a “locality interval” $\delta > 0$ the expression (2.11) involves states at different locations or “Euclidean times” $\tau + \frac{\delta}{2}$ and $\tau - \frac{\delta}{2}$. We aim for a formulation where only states at the same τ appear. We therefore need the explicit mapping from $|\psi(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2})\rangle$ to a reference point $|\psi(\tau)\rangle$ and similar for $\{\psi(\tau + \frac{\delta}{2})\}$. This mapping should also map \hat{A}_δ to a suitable operator such that the structure (2.11) remains preserved. The dependence of states and operators on the Euclidean time τ is described by evolution operators ($\tau_2 > \tau_1$, $\tau_2 > \tau_f$, $\tau_i > \tau_1$, $\tau_f = \tau + \frac{\delta}{2}$, $\tau_i = \tau - \frac{\delta}{2}$)

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(\tau_2)\rangle &= \hat{U}(\tau_2, \tau_1) |\psi(\tau_1)\rangle \\ \{\psi(\tau_1)\} &= \{\psi(\tau_2)\} \hat{U}(\tau_2, \tau_1) \\ \hat{A}(\tau_2, \tau_1) &= \hat{U}(\tau_2, \tau_f) \hat{A}(\tau_f, \tau_i) \hat{U}(\tau_i, \tau_1) \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

or differential operator equations ($\epsilon \rightarrow 0$)

$$\partial_\tau |\psi(\tau)\rangle = -\hat{H}(\tau) |\psi(\tau)\rangle \quad (3.2)$$

The evolution operator has an explicit representation as a functional integral

$$\hat{U}(\varphi(\tau_2), \varphi(\tau_1); \tau_2, \tau_1) = \int D\varphi_{(\tau_1 < \tau' < \tau_2)} \exp \left\{ - \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} d\tau'' \mathcal{L}(\tau'') \right\} \quad (3.3)$$

and obeys the composition property ($\tau_3 > \tau_2 > \tau_1$)

$$\hat{U}(\tau_3, \tau_2) \hat{U}(\tau_2, \tau_1) = \hat{U}(\tau_3, \tau_1) \quad (3.4)$$

with

$$\hat{U}(\varphi_2, \varphi_1; \tau, \tau) = \delta(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) \quad (3.5)$$

It can therefore be composed as a product of transfer matrices or “infinitesimal” evolution operators

$$\hat{U}(\tau + \epsilon, \tau) = e^{-\epsilon \hat{H}(\tau + \frac{\epsilon}{2})} \quad (3.6)$$

In case of translation symmetry for the local part of the probability distribution, i. e. for V and Z independent of τ , we note the symmetry in $\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2$

$$\hat{U}(\tau + \epsilon, \tau) = \hat{U}^T(\tau + \epsilon, \tau), \quad \hat{H}(\tau + \frac{\epsilon}{2}) = \hat{H}^T(\tau + \frac{\epsilon}{2}) = \hat{H} \quad (3.7)$$

In this case the real symmetric matrix \hat{H} has real eigenvalues E_n . Then the general solution of the differential equation (3.2) may be written in the form

$$|\psi(\tau)\rangle = \sum_n \psi_0^{(n)} e^{-E_n \tau}, \quad \langle \psi(\tau) | = \sum_n \bar{\psi}_0^{(n)} e^{E_n \tau} \quad (3.8)$$

where $\psi_0^{(n)}$ and $\bar{\psi}_0^{(n)}$ are eigenvectors of \hat{H} with eigenvalues E_n . Here we recall that the construction (2.9) implies that $|\psi\rangle$ and $\langle \psi|$ are real positive functions of φ for every τ . This restricts the allowed values of the coefficients $\psi_0^{(n)}, \bar{\psi}_0^{(n)}$.

We next want to compute the explicit form of the Hamilton operator \hat{H} . It is fixed uniquely by the functional integral representation (3.3) for \hat{U} . In order to obey the defining equation (3.6), the Hamilton operator \hat{H} must fulfill for arbitrary $|\psi(\varphi)\rangle$ the relation (with $Z = Z(\tau + \frac{\epsilon}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}(Z(\tau + \epsilon) + Z(\tau))$)

$$\int d\varphi_1 \hat{H}(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) |\psi(\varphi_1)\rangle = -\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left\{ \int d\varphi_1 \exp \left[-\frac{\epsilon}{2} (V(\varphi_2) + V(\varphi_1)) - \frac{Z}{2\epsilon} (\varphi_2 - \varphi_1)^2 \right] |\psi(\varphi_1)\rangle - |\psi(\varphi_2)\rangle \right\} \quad (3.9)$$

The solution of this equation can be expressed in terms of the operators

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) &= \varphi_1 \delta(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) \\ \hat{P}^2(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) &= -\delta(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varphi_1^2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

as

$$\hat{H}(\tau) = V(\hat{Q}, \tau) + \frac{1}{2Z(\tau)} \hat{P}^2 \quad (3.11)$$

This can be established by using under the φ_1 -integral the replacement

$$e^{-\frac{Z}{2\epsilon}(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1)^2} \rightarrow \left(\frac{2\pi\epsilon}{Z} \right)^{1/2} \delta(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) \exp \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2Z} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varphi_1^2} \right) \quad (3.12)$$

which is valid by partial integration if the integrand decays fast enough for $|\varphi_1| \rightarrow \infty$. We note that the operators \hat{Q} and \hat{P}^2 do not commute, e.g.

$$[\hat{P}^2, \hat{Q}](\varphi_2, \varphi_1) = -2\delta(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi_1} \quad (3.13)$$

The Hamilton operator can be used in order to establish the existence of the inverse of the “infinitesimal” evolution operator, $\hat{U}^{-1}(\tau + \epsilon, \tau) = e^{\epsilon \hat{H}(\tau + \frac{\epsilon}{2})}$. Then the inverse $\hat{U}^{-1}(\tau_2, \tau_1)$ is defined by the multiplication of “infinitesimal” inverse evolution operators, and we can extend the composition property (3.4) to arbitrary τ be defining for $\tau_2 < \tau_1$

$$\hat{U}(\tau_2, \tau_1) = \hat{U}^{-1}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \quad (3.14)$$

(For a given dependence of \hat{U} on the variables τ_2 and τ_1 the matrix $\hat{U}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ obtains from $\hat{U}(\tau_2, \tau_1)$ by a simple exchange of the arguments τ_1 and τ_2 .) Using (3.1), this allows us to write the expectation value of a local observable in a form involving states at the same τ -variable

$$\langle A(\tau) \rangle = \{\psi(\tau) \hat{U}(\tau, \tau + \frac{\delta}{2}) \hat{A}_\delta(\tau) \hat{U}(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2}, \tau) \psi(\tau)\} \quad (3.15)$$

4 Schrödinger and Heisenberg operators

In this section we want to exploit further the mapping between incomplete statistics and quantum mechanics for situations where expectation values like $\langle \varphi(\tau) \rangle$ may depend on τ . A typical question one may ask within incomplete classical statistics is the following: Given a large set of measurements of observables with support at a given value $\tau = 0$, like $\langle \varphi^p(0) \rangle$, $\langle (\partial_\tau \varphi(0))^{p'} \rangle$, etc., what can one predict for the expectation values of similar observables at some other location $\tau \neq 0$? It is obvious that the evolution operator \hat{U} is the appropriate tool to tackle this type of questions.

The existence of the inverse evolution operator allows us to associate to an observable $A(\tau)$ the operator $\hat{A}_S(\tau)$ in the Schrödinger representation (cf. (3.15))

$$\hat{A}_S(\tau) = \hat{U}(\tau, \tau + \frac{\delta}{2}) \hat{A}_\delta(\tau) \hat{U}(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2}, \tau) \quad (4.1)$$

The expectation value of the observable A can be expressed by the expectation value of the operator \hat{A}_S in a way analogous to quantum mechanics

$$\langle A(\tau) \rangle = \{\psi(\tau) | \hat{A}_S(\tau) | \psi(\tau)\} = \text{Tr} \rho(\tau) \hat{A}_S(\tau) \quad (4.2)$$

For the second identity we have introduced the “density matrix”

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \tau) &= |\psi(\varphi_1, \tau)\rangle \langle \psi(\varphi_2, \tau)| = \int D\varphi_{(\tau' \neq \tau)} e^{-S(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)} \\ \text{Tr} \rho(\tau) &= 1 \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where $S(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$ obtains from S by replacing $\varphi(\tau) \rightarrow \varphi_1$ for all “kinetic” terms involving $\varphi(\tau' < \tau)$ and $\varphi(\tau) \rightarrow \varphi_2$ for those involving $\varphi(\tau' > \tau)$, whereas for potential terms $e^{-\epsilon V(\varphi(\tau))} \rightarrow e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}(V(\varphi_1) + V(\varphi_2))}$.

In order to make the transition to the Heisenberg picture, we may select a reference point $\tau = 0$ and define

$$\hat{U}(\tau) \equiv \hat{U}(\tau, 0) , \quad \rho \equiv \rho(\tau = 0) , \quad \rho(\tau) = \hat{U}(\tau)\rho\hat{U}^{-1}(\tau) \quad (4.4)$$

This specifies the Heisenberg picture for the τ -dependent operators

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_H(\tau) &= \hat{U}^{-1}(\tau)\hat{A}_S(\tau)\hat{U}(\tau) \\ \langle A(\tau) \rangle &= \text{Tr}\rho\hat{A}_H(\tau) \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

We note that for two local observables A_1, A_2 the linear combinations $A = \alpha_1 A_1 + \alpha_2 A_2$ are also local observables. The associated operators obey the same linear relations $\hat{A} = \alpha_1 \hat{A}_1 + \alpha_2 \hat{A}_2$, where \hat{A} stands for $\hat{A}_\delta, \hat{A}_S$ or \hat{A}_H . The relation (4.5) is the appropriate formula to answer the question at the beginning of this section. One may use the set of measurements of expectation values at $\tau = 0$ to gather information about ρ . Once ρ is determined with sufficient accuracy, the expectation values $\langle A(\tau) \rangle$ can be computed. Of course, this needs a computation of the explicit form of the Heisenberg operator $\hat{A}_H(\tau)$.

It is instructive to observe that some simple local observables have a τ -independent operator representation in the Schrödinger picture. This is easily seen for observables $A(\tau)$ which depend only on the variable $\varphi(\tau)$. The mapping reads

$$A(\tau) = f(\varphi(\tau)) \rightarrow \hat{A}_S(\tau) = f(\hat{Q}) \quad (4.6)$$

Observables depending only on one variable $\varphi(\tau)$ therefore have the Heisenberg representation (cf. (4.6))

$$A(\tau) = f(\varphi(\tau)) \rightarrow \hat{A}_H(\tau) = f(\hat{Q}(\tau)) \quad (4.7)$$

Here we have used the definition

$$\hat{Q}(\tau) = \hat{U}^{-1}(\tau)\hat{Q}\hat{U}(\tau) \quad (4.8)$$

More generally, one finds for products of functions depending on the variables $\varphi(\tau_1), \varphi(\tau_2) \dots \varphi(\tau_n)$ with $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots \tau_n$ the Heisenberg operator

$$\begin{aligned} A(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) &= f_1(\varphi(\tau_1))f_2(\varphi(\tau_2))\dots f_n(\varphi(\tau_n)) \longrightarrow \\ \hat{A}_H(\tau) &= \hat{U}^{-1}(\tau_n)f_n(\hat{Q})\hat{U}(\tau_n, \tau_{n-1})\dots\hat{U}(\tau_2, \tau_1)f_1(\hat{Q})\hat{U}(\tau_1) \\ &= f_n(\hat{Q}(\tau_n))\dots f_2(\hat{Q}(\tau_2))f_1(\hat{Q}(\tau_1)) \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

This important relation follows directly from the definitions (2.10), (4.1), (4.5). We observe that \hat{A}_H depends on the variables τ_i which are the arguments of A but shows no dependence on the reference point τ . (Only \hat{A}_δ and \hat{A}_S depend on τ .)

We can use (4.9) to find easily the Heisenberg operators for observables involving “derivatives”, e.g.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= \tilde{\partial}_\tau \varphi(\tau_1) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon}(\varphi(\tau_1 + \epsilon) - \varphi(\tau_1 - \epsilon)) \\
\hat{A}_H &= \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \{ \hat{U}^{-1}(\tau_1 + \epsilon) \hat{Q} \hat{U}(\tau_1 + \epsilon) - \hat{U}^{-1}(\tau_1 - \epsilon) \hat{Q} \hat{U}(\tau_1 - \epsilon) \} \\
&= -\frac{1}{Z(\tau_1)} \hat{R}(\tau_1) + O(\epsilon)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where we have assumed that \hat{H} is a smooth function of τ . Here \hat{R} is defined by

$$\hat{R}(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) = \delta(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi_1}, \quad \hat{R}^2 = -\hat{P}^2 \tag{4.11}$$

and we use, similar to (4.8), the definitions

$$\hat{R}(\tau) = \hat{U}^{-1}(\tau) \hat{R} \hat{U}(\tau), \quad \hat{P}^2(\tau) = \hat{U}^{-1}(\tau) \hat{P}^2 \hat{U}(\tau) \tag{4.12}$$

Two different definitions of derivatives can lead to the same operator \hat{A}_H . An example is the observable

$$A = \partial_\tau^> \varphi(\tau_1) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}(\varphi(\tau_1 + \epsilon) - \varphi(\tau_1)) \tag{4.13}$$

Up to terms of order ϵ the associated Heisenberg operator is again given by $\hat{A}_H = -Z(\tau_1)^{-1} \hat{U}^{-1}(\tau_1) \hat{R} \hat{U}(\tau_1)$ and therefore the same as for $\tilde{\partial}_\tau \varphi(\tau_1)$ (4.10). Applying the same procedure to the squared derivative observable (2.4) yields

$$A = (\partial_\tau \varphi)^2(\tau_1) \longrightarrow \hat{A}_H = \frac{1}{\epsilon Z} - \frac{1}{Z^2} \hat{P}^2(\tau_1) \tag{4.14}$$

where we have assumed for simplicity a τ -independent Hamiltonian \hat{H} . It is remarkable that this operator differs from the square of the Heisenberg operator associated to $\tilde{\partial}_\tau \varphi(\tau_1)$ by a constant which diverges for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= (\tilde{\partial}_\tau \varphi(\tau_1))^2 \rightarrow \hat{A}_H = \frac{1}{2\epsilon Z} - \frac{1}{Z^2} \hat{P}^2(\tau_1) \\
A &= (\partial_\tau^> \varphi(\tau_1))^2 \rightarrow \hat{A}_H = \frac{1}{\epsilon Z} - \frac{1}{Z^2} \hat{P}^2(\tau_1)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Equation (4.15) teaches us that the product of derivative observables with other observables can be ambiguous in the sense that the associated operator and expectation value depends very sensitively on the precise definition of the derivative. This ambiguity of the derivative observables in the continuum limit is an unpleasant feature for the formulation of correlation functions. It survives when the discussion is extended to observables that are smoothed over a certain interval instead of being strictly local [1].

In the next sections we will see how this problem is connected with the concept of quantum correlations. We will argue that the ambiguity in the classical correlation may be the basic ingredient why a description of our world in terms of quantum statistics is superior to the use of classical correlation functions.

5 Correlation functions

A basic concept for any statistical description are correlation functions for a number of observables $A_1[\varphi], A_2[\varphi], \dots$. In particular, a two-point function is given by the expectation value of an associative product of two observables $A_1[\varphi]$ and $A_2[\varphi]$. For local observables A_1, A_2 the product should again be a local observable which must be defined uniquely in terms of the definitions of A_1 and A_2 . This requirement, however, does not fix the definition of the correlation uniquely. The standard “classical product”, i.e. the simple multiplication of the functionals $A_1[\varphi] \cdot A_2[\varphi]$ (in the same sense as the “pointwise” multiplication of functions) fulfills the general requirements² for a correlation function. Other definitions can be conceived as well. In this section we will introduce a quantum correlation which equals the classical (“pointwise”) correlation only for τ -ordered non-overlapping observables. In contrast, for two local observables with overlapping support we will find important differences between the quantum and classical correlation. In particular, we will discover the effects of the non-commutativity characteristic for quantum mechanics.

Incomplete statistics draws our attention to an important issue in the formulation of meaningful correlation functions. Consider the two versions of the derivative observable $\tilde{\partial}_\tau \varphi$ and $\partial_\tau^> \varphi$ defined by eqs. (4.10) and (4.11), respectively. In the continuum limit ($\epsilon \rightarrow 0$) they are represented by the same operator \hat{A}_H . In consequence, both definitions lead to the same expectation value for any state $|\psi\rangle, \{\psi\}$. The two versions of derivative observables cannot be distinguished by any measurement and should therefore be identified. On the other hand, the classical products $\tilde{\partial}_\tau \varphi(\tau_1) \cdot \tilde{\partial}_\tau \varphi(\tau_2)$ and $\partial_\tau^> \varphi(\tau_1) \cdot \partial_\tau^> \varphi(\tau_2)$ are represented by different operators for $\tau_1 = \tau_2$, as can be seen from (4.15). This means that the two versions of derivative observables lead to different classical correlation functions! Obviously, this situation is unsatisfactory since for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ no difference between the two versions could be “measured” for the observables themselves. We find this disease unacceptable for a meaningful correlation and require as a criterion for a meaningful correlation function that two observables which have the same expectation values for all (arbitrary) probability distributions should also have identical correlation functions. We have shown that two observables which are represented by the same Heisenberg operator have indeed the same expectation values for all possible probability distributions and should therefore be considered as equivalent. They should therefore lead to indistinguishable correlation functions.

²This holds provided that the product results in a meaningful observable with finite expectation value.

As we have already established, the two derivative observables $A_1 = \tilde{\partial}_\tau \varphi(\tau)$ and $A_2 = \partial_\tau^> \varphi(\tau)$ are indistinguishable in the continuum limit, whereas their classical correlations are not. We may therefore conclude that the classical correlation $A_1 \cdot A_2$ is not a meaningful correlation function. In this section we propose the use of a different correlation based on a quantum product $A_1 \circ A_2$. By construction, this correlation will always obey our criterion of “robustness” with respect to the precise choice of the observables. It should therefore be considered as an interesting alternative to the classical correlation. At this place we only note that the “robustness problem” is not necessarily connected to the continuum limit. The mismatch between indistinguishable observables and distinguishable “classical” correlations can appear quite generally also for $\epsilon > 0$.

Our formulation of a quantum correlation will be based on the concepts of equivalent observables and products defined for equivalence classes. In fact, the mapping $A(\tau) \rightarrow \hat{A}_H(\tau)$ is not necessarily invertible on the space of all observables $A(\tau)$. This follows from the simple observation that already the map (2.10) contains integrations. Two different integrands (observables) could lead to the same value of the integral (operator) for arbitrary fixed boundary values $\varphi(\tau - \frac{\delta}{2})$, $\varphi(\tau + \frac{\delta}{2})$. It is therefore possible that two different observables $A_a(\tau)$ and $A_b(\tau)$ can be mapped into the same Heisenberg operator $\hat{A}_H(\tau)$. Since the expectation values can be computed from $\hat{A}_H(\tau)$ and ρ only, no distinction between $\langle A_a \rangle$ and $\langle A_b \rangle$ can then be made for arbitrary ρ . All local observables $A(\tau)$ which correspond to the same operator $\hat{A}_H(\tau)$ are equivalent.

We are interested in structures that only depend on the equivalence classes of observables. Addition of two observables and multiplication with a scalar can simply be carried over to the operators. This is not necessarily the case, however, for the (pointwise) multiplication of two observables. If $A_a(\tau)$ and $A_b(\tau)$ are both mapped into $\hat{A}_H(\tau)$ and a third observable $B(\tau)$ corresponds to $\hat{B}_H(\tau)$, the products $A_a \cdot B$ and $A_b \cdot B$ may nevertheless be represented by different operators. It is then easy to construct states where $\langle A_a B \rangle \neq \langle A_b B \rangle$ and the pointwise product does not depend only on the equivalence class.

On the other hand, the (matrix) product of two operators $\hat{A}_H \hat{B}_H$ obviously refers only to the equivalence class. It can be implemented on the level of observables by defining a unique “standard representative” of the equivalence class as

$$\bar{A}[\varphi, \tau] = F[\hat{A}_H(\tau)] \quad (5.1)$$

Using the mapping $A[\tau] \rightarrow \hat{A}_H(\tau)$ (2.10), (4.1), (4.5), we define the quantum product of two observables as

$$A(\varphi, \tau) \circ B(\varphi, \tau) = F[\hat{A}_H(\tau) \hat{B}_H(\tau)] \equiv (A \circ B)[\varphi, \tau] \quad (5.2)$$

This product is associative, but not commutative. (By definition, the operator associated to the observable $(A \circ B)(\varphi, \tau)$ is $\hat{A}_H(\tau) \hat{B}_H(\tau)$ and the product $A \circ B$ is isomorphic to the “matrix multiplication” $\hat{A} \hat{B}$ if restricted to the subspace of

operators $\bar{A} = F[\hat{A}]$, $\bar{B} = F[\hat{B}]$.) The correlations (e.g. expectation values of products of observables) formed with the product \circ reflect the non-commutative structure of quantum mechanics. This justifies the name “quantum correlations”. Nevertheless, we emphasize that the “quantum product” \circ can also be viewed as just a particular structure among “classical observables”.

The definition of the quantum product is unique on the level of operators. On the level of the classical observables, it is, however, not yet fixed uniquely by (5.2). The precise definition obviously depends on the choice of a standard representation $F[\hat{A}_H(\tau)]$ for the equivalence class of observables represented by \hat{A}_H . We will choose a linear map $F[\alpha_1\hat{A}_{H,1} + \alpha_2\hat{A}_{H,2}] = \alpha_1F[\hat{A}_{H,1}] + \alpha_2F[\hat{A}_{H,2}]$ with the property that it inverts the relation (4.9). For “time-ordered” $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots\tau_n$ the map F should then obey

$$F[f_n(\hat{Q}(\tau_n))\dots f_2(\hat{Q}(\tau_2))f_1(\hat{Q}(\tau_1))] = f_1(\varphi(\tau_1))f_2(\varphi(\tau_2))\dots f_n(\varphi(\tau_n)). \quad (5.3)$$

It is easy to see how this choice exhibits directly the noncommutative property of the quantum product between two observables. As an example let us consider the two observables $\varphi(\tau_1)$ and $\varphi(\tau_2)$ with $\tau_1 < \tau_2$. The quantum product or quantum correlation depends on the ordering

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\tau_2) \circ \varphi(\tau_1) &= \varphi(\tau_2)\varphi(\tau_1) \\ \varphi(\tau_1) \circ \varphi(\tau_2) &= \varphi(\tau_2)\varphi(\tau_1) + F[[\hat{Q}(\tau_1), \hat{Q}(\tau_2)]] \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

The noncommutative property of the quantum product for these operators is directly related to the commutator

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{Q}(\tau_1), \hat{Q}(\tau_2)] &= \hat{U}^{-1}(\tau_1)\hat{Q}\hat{U}(\tau_1, \tau_2)\hat{Q}\hat{U}(\tau_2) \\ &\quad - \hat{U}^{-1}(\tau_2)\hat{Q}\hat{U}(\tau_2, \tau_1)\hat{Q}\hat{U}(\tau_1) \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Only for time-ordered arguments the quantum correlation coincides with the classical correlation.

The map F can easily be extended to operators involving derivatives of φ . We concentrate here for simplicity on a translation invariant probability distribution in the local region with constant $Z(\tau) = Z$. The mappings (with $\tau_2 \geq \tau_1 + \epsilon$)

$$\begin{aligned} F(\hat{R}(\tau)) &= -Z\partial_\tau^>\varphi(\tau) \\ F(\hat{R}(\tau)\hat{Q}(\tau)) &= -Z\varphi(\tau)\partial_\tau^>\varphi(\tau) \\ F(\hat{R}(\tau_2)\hat{R}(\tau_1)) &= Z^2\partial_\tau^>\varphi(\tau_2)\partial_\tau^>\varphi(\tau_1) \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

are compatible with (5.3). This can be seen by noting that the τ -evolution of $\hat{Q}(\tau)$ according to (4.8) implies for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ the simple relation

$$\partial_\tau\hat{Q}(\tau) = [\hat{H}, \hat{Q}(\tau)] = -Z^{-1}\hat{R}(\tau) \quad (5.7)$$

A similar construction (note $[\hat{Q}(\tau + \epsilon), \hat{Q}(\tau)] = -\epsilon/Z$) leads to

$$F(\hat{R}^2(\tau)) = Z^2(\partial_\tau^>\varphi(\tau))^2 - Z/\epsilon \quad (5.8)$$

and we infer that the quantum product of derivative observables at equal sites differs from the pointwise product

$$\partial_\tau^>\varphi(\tau) \circ \partial_\tau^>\varphi(\tau) = (\partial_\tau^>\varphi(\tau))^2 - 1/(\epsilon Z) \quad (5.9)$$

From the relations (5.4) and (5.9) it has become clear that the difference between the quantum product and the “pointwise” classical product of two observables is related to their τ -ordering and “overlap”. Let us define that two observables $A_1[\varphi]$ and $A_2[\varphi]$ overlap if they depend on variables $\varphi(\tau)$ lying in two overlapping τ -ranges \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 . (Here two ranges do not overlap if all τ in \mathcal{R}_1 obey $\tau \leq \tau_0$ whereas for \mathcal{R}_2 one has $\tau \geq \tau_0$, or vice versa. This implies that non-overlapping observables can depend on at most one common variable $\varphi(\tau_0)$.) With this definition the quantum product is equal to the classical product if the observables do not overlap and are τ -ordered (in the sense that larger τ are on the left side).

In conclusion, we have established a one-to-one correspondence between classical correlations $\varphi(\tau_2)\varphi(\tau_1)$ and the product of Heisenberg operators $\hat{Q}(\tau_2)\hat{Q}(\tau_1)$ provided that the τ -ordering $\tau_2 \geq \tau_1$ is respected. This extends to observables that can be written as sums or integrals over $\varphi(\tau)$ (as, for example, derivative observables) provided the τ -ordering and non-overlapping properties are respected. For well separated observables no distinction between a quantum and classical τ -ordered correlation function would be needed. In particular, this holds also for “smoothened” observables A_i that involve (weighted) averages over $\varphi(\tau)$ in a range \mathcal{R}_i around τ_i . Decreasing the distance between τ_2 and τ_1 , the new features of the quantum product $A_1(\tau_2) \circ A_1(\tau_1)$ show up only once the distance becomes small enough so that the two ranges \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 start to overlap. In an extreme form the difference between quantum and classical correlations becomes apparent for derivative observables at the same location. Quite generally, the difference between the quantum and classical product is seen most easily on the level of the associated operators

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 \circ A_2 &\rightarrow \hat{A}_1 \hat{A}_2 \\ A_1 \cdot A_2 &\rightarrow T(\hat{A}_1 \hat{A}_2) \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

Here T denotes the operation of τ -ordering. The τ -ordered operator product is commutative $T(\hat{A}_1 \hat{A}_2) = T(\hat{A}_2 \hat{A}_1)$ and associative $T(T(\hat{A}_1 \hat{A}_2) \hat{A}_3) = T(\hat{A}_1 T(\hat{A}_2 \hat{A}_3)) \equiv T(\hat{A}_1 \hat{A}_2 \hat{A}_3)$. As we have seen in the discussion of the derivative observables, it lacks, however, the general property of robustness with respect to the precise definition of the observables. This contrasts with the non-commutative product $\hat{A}_1 \hat{A}_2$. This discussion opens an interesting perspective: The difference between classical and quantum statistics seems to be a question of the appropriate definition of the correlation function. Simple arguments of robustness favor the choice of the quantum correlation! This remark remains valid if we consider averaged or smoothened observables instead of “pointlike” observables [1]. In a sense, the successful description of nature by quantum-mechanical operators and their products gives an “experimental indication” that quantum correlations should be used!

6 Incomplete classical statistics, irrelevant and inaccessible information

Our discussion of incomplete classical statistics may perhaps have led to the impression that the quantum mechanical properties are somehow related to the missing information. This is by no means the case! In fact, our investigation of the consequences of incomplete information about the probability distribution was useful in order to focus the attention on the question which information is really necessary to compute the expectation values of local observables. We can now turn back to standard “complete” classical statistics where the full probability distribution $p[\varphi(\tau)]$ is assumed to be known. We concentrate here on a general class of probability distributions which can be factorized in the form $p = p_>p_0p_<$ according to (1.1) – it may be called “factorizable” or “ F -statistics”. For example, all systems which have only local and next-neighbor interactions are of this form. Within F -statistics the states remain defined according to (2.9).

We emphasize that any additional information contained in $p[\varphi]$ which goes beyond the local distribution $p_0[\varphi]$ and the states $|\psi\rangle$ and $\{\psi\}$ does not change a iota in the expectation values of local observables and their correlations! The additional information is simply *irrelevant* for the computation of local expectation values. A given probability distribution specifies $p_<$ and $p_>$ uniquely. This determines $|\psi\rangle$ and $\{\psi\}$ and we can then continue with the preceding discussion in order to calculate the expectation values of local observables. The precise form of $p_<$ and $p_>$ which has led to the given states plays no role in this computation.

Since all information contained in $p_<$ and $p_>$ beyond the states $|\psi\rangle$ and $\{\psi\}$ is irrelevant for local expectation values, it is also *inaccessible* by any local measurements. In fact, even the most precise measurements of expectation values and correlation functions for arbitrarily many local observables could at best lead to a reconstruction of the states $|\psi\rangle$ and $\{\psi\}$. This sheds new light on the notion of “incompleteness” of the statistical information discussed in this note. In fact, within F -statistics the “incomplete” information contained in the states $|\psi\rangle$ and $\{\psi\}$ constitutes the most complete information that can possibly be gathered by local measurements! Since any real measurement is local in time and space all assumptions about information beyond the states concern irrelevant and inaccessible information and cannot be verified by observation!

7 Conclusions and discussion

Within a simple example of classical statistics for coupled unharmonic oscillators on a chain we have formulated a description in terms of states and operators in analogy to quantum mechanics. The state vectors and the operators can be expressed in terms of classical functional integrals. Expectation values of classical

observables can be evaluated as “quantum mechanical” expectation values of appropriate operators in appropriate states. Typical quantum mechanical results like the relations between the expectation values in stationary states or the uncertainty relation can be taken over to the classical system [1]. The simple fact that quantum-mechanical information can be used in practice to establish properties of expectation values in a standard classical statistical system demonstrates in a simple way that quantum-mechanical features are indeed genuine properties of classical statistical systems. Our procedure inverts the construction of the Euclidean path integral for a quantum mechanical system in the ground state or thermal state [4] [5], with a generalization to a wider class of states.

The introduction of “quantum mechanical” operators associated to every local classical observable allows us to define equivalence classes of observables which cannot be distinguished by any measurement of their expectation values. We argue that the definition of the correlation function should be consistent with this equivalence structure. We require that indistinguishable observables must lead to the same correlation function. This leads to the introduction of a quantum correlation within the classical statistical setting. We point out that the quantum correlation constitutes a more robust definition of the correlation function with respect to the precise details of the definition of observables, both for classical and quantum statistical systems. The basic conceptual distinction between quantum statistics and classical statistics disappears in this respect. The similarity can be extended to the emergence of typical characteristics of quantum statistics like the superposition of states and interference for classical statistical systems [1]. This raises the question [2] if it could be possible to understand the mysteries of the basics of quantum mechanics within a formulation of a classical statistical problem with infinitely many degrees of freedom.

References

- [1] C. Wetterich, hep-th/0104074
- [2] A. Einstein, B. Podolski, N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47** (1935) 777;
 J. S. Bell, Physical **1** (1964) 195;
 S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989) 485;
 G. 't Hooft, gr-qc/9903084
- [3] C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B314** (1989) 40;
 C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B397** (1993) 299
- [4] R. P. Feynman, Rev. Mod. Phys. **367** (1948) 20; Phys. Rev. **80** (1950) 440
- [5] J. Zinn-Justin, *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*, (Oxford University Press 1996); S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields*, (Cambridge University Press 1995)