

# Quantum mechanics: introduction

Christian Wüthrich


<http://www.wuthrich.net/>

**Introduction to Philosophy of Physics**  
USI, Spring 2018


## Quantum superposition: Setting things up

David Z Albert, *Quantum Mechanics and Experience*, Harvard University Press (1992), Ch. 1.

- electrons with two properties: 'color' (black, white), 'hardness' (soft, hard)
- **color box**: measuring device with three apertures such that incoming  $e^-$  are sorted according to their color



- **hardness box**: similar device sorting  $e^-$  into hard and soft ones



- measurements **repeatable**: if after measurement,  $e^-$  is fed into same type of box without tampering, then same measurement outcome will be observed

- Q: Are properties related, i.e. are there correlations between values of hardness and color of  $e^-$ ?
- ⇒ combine boxes to measure correlations
- precisely half of  $e^-$  coming out of one aperture of first box come out of each aperture of second box
- ⇒ no correlations, color (hardness) of  $e^-$  entails nothing about its hardness (color)


## Three-box experiments

- suppose we have three boxes aligned for subsequent measurement, s.t. the first and third box are of same type as one another, but of different type from second box
  - no tampering with  $e^-$  between boxes
  - $e^-$  going into third box is presumably known to have a particular pair of color and hardness properties (e.g. white and soft)
- ⇒ it seems as if we can predict the outcome of the third measurement
- It turns out that we can't: precisely half of the  $e^-$  will come out of each aperture of third box.
  - Apparently, **presence of middle box itself constitutes some sort of tampering**: middle box seems responsible for changing half of  $e^-$  since we know that two identical boxes in sequence show a different behaviour.

- Can boxes be built less crudely, can intermediate measurements be refined such as to avoid this? No, we can't even "move the statistics of [...] of disruption even so much as one millionth of one percentage point away from fifty-fifty" (5f), i.e. every device that qualifies as e.g. hardness box will randomize color.
- What is it that determines precisely **which**  $e^-$  have their properties changed by second box and which don't? Let's look for correlations between measurable properties of incoming  $e^-$  and their final measurement outcome. But there is absolutely no such correlation...  
⇒ this question has no answer

## Color-and-hardness boxes

- boxes with five apertures, including one for each pair of measurement outcomes



- box like that would have to consist of a color box and a hardness box
- ⇒ Problem: the second device will randomize  $e^-$  with respect to the first measurement
- Albert: “So the task of putting ourselves in a position to say ‘the color of this electron is now such-and-such and the hardness of this electron is now such-and-such’ seems to be fundamentally beyond our means.” (7)
- ⇒ example of **uncertainty principle**, since measurements of one of the two incompatible properties disrupts the measurement of the other



# Stern-Gerlach experiment





Figure: Stern-Gerlach experiment with 'mixture' (d) and 'superposition' (e) (Sklar, Fig. 4.4)


## Two-path experiments

- Consider a more complicated device as in Figure 1.4 in Albert:



- Suppose that white  $e^-$  is fed into device and we measure its hardness at  $h$  and  $s$ . Expectation: we find half hard and half soft  $e^-$ . And this is what we find.
- Suppose that hard  $e^-$  is fed into device and then measure its color at  $h$  and  $s$ . Expectation: find half of  $e^-$  to be white and half black. And this is what we find.
- Suppose we feed white  $e^-$  into device and measure their color at  $h$  and  $s$ . Expectation: half should be found to be white, half black. But this is not at all what we find: all  $e^-$  are found to be white!

- Add a sliding wall as in the following figure (Fig. 1.5):



- What happens if we slide wall in?
- Expectation: overall output goes down 50%; given that all  $e^-$  were just found to be white, they should still be so, right?
- But they are not: only half of the  $e^-$  are now white, the other half black.

## Considering routes of electrons: superposition

Which route does an electron take when wall is out?

- Can it have taken *h*? Apparently not, since these  $e^-$  are known to randomize color.
- Can it have taken *s*? No, same reason.
- Can it somehow have taken *both* routes? Apparently not, since whenever we stop experiment and look to see where the  $e^-$  is, we find it either on *h* or on *s*.
- Can it have taken *neither* route? No, since if we wall up both routes, nothing goes through.

## In David Albert's words:



*Electrons passing through this apparatus... do not take route h and do not take route s and do not take both of those routes and do not take neither of those routes; and the trouble is that those four possibilities are simply all of the logical possibilities that we have any notion to entertain... The name of that new mode (which is just a name for something we don't understand) is **superposition**. (11)*

## Electrons in superposition states

We can write these superposition states as follows (for later reference):

$$|\text{black}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{hard}\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{soft}\rangle,$$

$$|\text{white}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{hard}\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{soft}\rangle,$$

$$|\text{hard}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{black}\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{white}\rangle,$$

$$|\text{soft}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{black}\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{white}\rangle.$$

## Double-slit experiment




Figure: Interference pattern found in double-slit experiments.



# Vectors and vector spaces

Albert, *Quantum Mechanics and Experience*, Ch. 2

*“Vectors, in quantum mechanics, are going to represent physical states of affairs. The **addition** of vectors will turn out to have something to do with the **superposition** of physical states of affairs.” (20)*




Figure: Figure 2.5 in Albert (1992)





Figure: Figure 2.6 in Albert (1992)

# Operators

## Definition (Operator)

An *operator*  $\hat{O}$  defined on a vector space  $V$  is a map or a prescription for taking every vector in  $V$  into some other vector in  $V$ .

**Some examples:** unit operator  $\hat{1}$  transforming every vector into itself; 'multiply every vector by the number 7'; 'rotate every vector clockwise by  $90^\circ$  about some particular  $|C\rangle$ ' (depicted below for a  $|C\rangle$  pointing out of the page); 'map every vector into some particular  $|A\rangle$ '; etc.



# Eigenvectors and eigenvalues

## Definition (Eigenvectors and eigenvalues)

In case that for some particular operator  $\hat{O}$  and some particular vector  $|X\rangle$

$$\hat{O}|X\rangle = x|X\rangle$$

for some number  $x$ , then  $|X\rangle$  is an *eigenvector* of  $\hat{O}$ , with *eigenvalue*  $x$ .

- certain vectors will in general be eigenvectors of some operators and not of others
- certain operators will in general have some vectors, and not others, as eigenvectors
- other operators will have *other* vectors as eigenvectors.
- The operator-eigenvector relation depends only on the vector and the operator in question, but not on the basis chosen.
- Look at the examples in the textbook.

# Quantum mechanics: the five basic principles

## Principle (A: Physical states)

*Every physical system, composite or simple, is associated with some particular vector space. Every unit vector in this space (the 'state vectors') represents a possible physical state of the system. The states picked out by these vectors are taken to comprise all of the physically possible situations, although the correspondence is not one-to-one.*

## Principle (B: Observables)

*Measurable properties of physical systems ('observables') are represented by (linear) operators on the vector spaces associated with those systems. The rule connecting the operators and the vectors states that if the vector happens to be an eigenvector (with eigenvalue, say,  $a$ ) of an operator in question, then the state corresponding to the vector has the value  $a$  of that particular measurable property associated with the operator.*

## Back to the hardness and color example

Construct a vector space in which the states of being hard and being soft can be represented:

$$|\text{hard}\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad |\text{soft}\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

which implies  $\langle \text{hard} | \text{soft} \rangle = 1 \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 1 = 0$ . In fact the two vectors in (1) form a basis of the vector space. Which operator should represent the observable 'hardness'?

$$\text{hardness operator} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

where it is stipulated that eigenvalue  $+1$  means 'hard' and  $-1$  'soft' (vectors in (1) are eigenvectors of operator in (2)).

'Black' and 'white' states 'superpositions' of both the 'hard' and the 'soft' states, which means, since superposition states are states in the same vector space, that 'black' and 'white' ought to be representable in the same vector space. This plays out as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\text{black}\rangle &= \begin{bmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} \\ 1/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix}, & |\text{white}\rangle &= \begin{bmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} \\ -1/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix}, & (3) \\
 \text{color operator} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},
 \end{aligned}$$

where 'color = +1' means 'black' and 'color = -1' means 'white'. Also,  $\langle \text{black} | \text{white} \rangle = 0$ , and  $|\text{black}\rangle$  and  $|\text{white}\rangle$  constitute another basis of the same space.



Recall that if  $|A\rangle = (a_1, a_2)$  and  $|B\rangle = (b_1, b_2)$  then

$$|A\rangle + |B\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} (a_1 + b_1) \\ (a_2 + b_2) \end{bmatrix}.$$

One can then see from (1), (2), and (3) how superposition and incompatibility is encoded in formalism:

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{black}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{hard}\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{soft}\rangle, \\ |\text{white}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{hard}\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{soft}\rangle, \\ |\text{hard}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{black}\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{white}\rangle, \\ |\text{soft}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{black}\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{white}\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

*Exercise for the reader:* convince yourself that  $|\text{black}\rangle$  and  $|\text{hard}\rangle$  are not eigenvectors of the color operator (and vice versa, mutatis mutandis).

The hardness and color operators are incompatible with one another, in the sense that states of definite hardness have no assignable color value, and vice versa.

## Principle (C: Dynamics)

*Given the state of any physical system at any 'initial' time, and given the forces and constraints to which the system is subject, the **Schrödinger equation** gives a prescription whereby the state of that system at any other time is uniquely determined. This dynamics of the state vector is thus **deterministic**.*

The dynamical laws are **linear**: if any state  $|A\rangle$  at  $t_1$  is evolved into another state  $|A'\rangle$  at  $t_2$  and any  $|B\rangle$  at  $t_1$  is evolved into  $|B'\rangle$  at  $t_2$ , then  $\alpha|A\rangle + \beta|B\rangle$  at  $t_1$  is evolved into  $\alpha|A'\rangle + \beta|B'\rangle$ .

We know what happens if we measure a state with respect to a particular property when that state is in an eigenstate of the operator corresponding the measurable property in question (what?). But what happens if it isn't?

## Principle (D: Connection with experiment, 'Born's rule')

*A measurement of the observable  $\hat{A}$  is performed on a system in state  $|b\rangle$ , where the eigenvectors of  $\hat{A}$  are  $|a_i\rangle$  with eigenvalues  $a_i$ , i.e.  $\hat{A}|a_i\rangle = a_i|a_i\rangle$  for all  $i$ . The probability that the outcome of such a measurement will be  $a_i$  is equal to*

$$|\langle b|a_i\rangle|^2.$$

Remarks:

- The number  $|\langle b|a_i\rangle|^2$  is in the interval  $[0, 1]$ .
- In the special case when the system is in an eigenstate of the operator corresponding to the measurement, we get with probability 1 that the outcome is the eigenvalue associated with the eigenstate.
- Probability that black electron is found to be hard is  $1/2$ , as it should be.

## Principle (E: Collapse)

*Whatever the state vector of a system  $S$  was just prior to a measurement of an observable  $O$ , the state vector of  $S$  just after the measurement must be an eigenvector of  $O$  with an eigenvalue corresponding to the outcome of that measurement.*

Remarks:

- Which eigenvector the system jump into is determined by the outcome of the measurement; and this outcome, by Principle D, is a matter of probability.
- ⇒ element of chance, indeterminism, enters into the evolution of the state vector

- Notice that Principle C was supposed to be a completely general account of how the state vector evolves under any circumstances, while Principle E seems to be a special case of C, but can't obviously be deduced it...
- Measurement in QM is (according to the standard view) a very active process that invariably **changes** the measured system
- Albert: "That's what's at the heart of the standard view. The rest... is details." (38)

## Definition (Commutator)

The *commutator* of two matrices  $A$  and  $B$ , denoted by  $[A, B]$ , is defined to be the object  $AB - BA$ .

- If  $[A, B] = 0$ , then  $A$  and  $B$  share at least one set of eigenvectors which form a basis of the space.
  - In other words, the commutators of incompatible observable matrices are nonzero.
- ⇒ property of commutativity is convenient mathematical test for compatibility

## Application: coordinate space

- **Principle of correspondence:** requirement that ‘classical limit’ is Newtonian mechanics
  - Albert: requirement can be “parlayed” into a prescription of constructing a quantum theory from a classical theory such that the quantum operators correspond to measurable properties of classical theory
- ⇒ momentum and position of a particle are incompatible:  $[\hat{X}, \hat{P}] = i\hbar$
- basis of position eigenvectors:  $|x\rangle$ , position operator  $\hat{X}$
  - Note: possible eigenvalues form a continuum from  $-\infty$  to  $+\infty$
  - eigenvectors of  $\hat{X}$  form a basis of the state space of the particle, but there are infinitely many different eigenvalues, and thus eigenvectors, and these eigenvectors are orthogonal
- ⇒ state space of the particle is  $\infty$ -dimensional



- Any vector  $|\Psi\rangle$  in that  $\infty$ -dimensional space can be expressed as expansion in terms of eigenstates  $|x\rangle$ , with expansion coefficients as function of  $x$

$$a_x = \langle \Psi | x \rangle = \Psi(x)$$

Just as a vector in an  $n$ -dimensional vector space is fully determined by the  $N$  numbers in the column, in a given basis, the function  $\Psi(x)$  (an infinite list) determines the unique vector  $|\Psi\rangle$  in the  $\infty$ -dimensional space (in the  $\hat{X}$  basis implicit here).

- Probabilities can also be read off the expansion coefficients: if wave function is  $\Psi(x)$  and a position measurement is performed, then the probability that the particle will be found at position  $x = x_1$  is given by  $|\Psi(x_1)|^2$

## Application: bipartite systems

- state of bipartite system of particle 1 in state  $|\Psi_a\rangle$  and particle 2 in state  $|\Psi_b\rangle$  given by  $|\Psi_a\rangle_1|\Psi_b\rangle_2$  or by  $|{}^1\Psi_a, {}^2\Psi_b\rangle$
- If the two particles don't interact the **joint** probability that the outcome of measurement of  $\hat{A}$  on particle 1 is  $a$  and that the outcome of measurement of  $\hat{B}$  on particle 2 is  $b$  is the probability of the former outcome **times** the probability of the latter outcome
- Rule for multiplying vectors representing bipartite states:

$$\langle {}^1\Psi_i, {}^2\Psi_j | {}^1\Psi_k, {}^2\Psi_l \rangle = \langle {}^1\Psi_i | {}^1\Psi_k \rangle \cdot \langle {}^2\Psi_j | {}^2\Psi_l \rangle$$

(= 0 unless  $i = k$  and  $j = l$ ).

- dimensionality of two-particle state space is the product of the dimensionalities of the state spaces for the individual particles (e.g.  $N^2$  if both single-particle state spaces have dimension  $N$ , with  $N^2$  orthogonal vectors  $|{}^1\Psi_i, {}^2\Psi_j\rangle$  as basis for bipartite state space)

## Non-separable state

$$|Q\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|{}^1\psi_1, {}^2\psi_1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|{}^1\psi_2, {}^2\psi_2\rangle \quad (5)$$

is a **non-separable** or **entangled state** because it cannot be recast in the form  $|{}^1f, {}^2g\rangle$ , i.e., it cannot be decomposed into a well-defined state of particle 1 and a well-defined state of particle 2.

Example:

$$|Q'\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|{}^1\hat{X} = 5, {}^2\hat{X} = 7\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|{}^1\hat{X} = 9, {}^2\hat{X} = 11\rangle$$

Anything about either of the particles has any definite value here, but the difference in their position does:

$$({}^2\hat{X} - {}^1\hat{X})|Q'\rangle = 2|Q'\rangle.$$

**Homework:** study how Principles D and E pan out for the bipartite system in general

## Examples for collapsing bipartite systems

### Separable states

Separable states: measurement only affects state of measured particle;  
 example: state prior to measurement is

$$|S\rangle = |{}^1\hat{M} = m, {}^2\hat{N} = n\rangle$$

and then  ${}^1\hat{A}$  is measured, with outcome  $a_7$ . What is the post-measurement state? Expand  $|S\rangle$  in the basis of eigenstates of  ${}^1\hat{A}$  and  ${}^2\hat{N}$  and delete all the terms with  ${}^2\hat{N} \neq n$ :

$$|S\rangle = s_1 |{}^1\hat{A} = a_1, {}^2\hat{N} = n\rangle + s_2 |{}^1\hat{A} = a_2, {}^2\hat{N} = n\rangle + \dots$$

with

$$s_i = \langle {}^1\hat{A} = a_i, {}^2\hat{N} = n | {}^1\hat{M} = m, {}^2\hat{N} = n \rangle = \langle {}^1\hat{A} = a_i | {}^1\hat{M} = m \rangle.$$

Post-measurement state:

$$|S'\rangle = |{}^1\hat{A} = a_7, {}^2\hat{N} = n\rangle.$$

## Examples for collapsing bipartite systems

### Non-separable states

Non-separable states: measurement also brings about changes in the description of the unmeasured particle; example: pre-measurement state is

$$|NS\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |^1\hat{A} = a_4, ^2\hat{K} = k_9\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |^1\hat{A} = a_5, ^2\hat{K} = k_{17}\rangle$$

where, again,  $^1\hat{A}$  is measured, yielding the result  $a_5$ . The formula above is already written down in terms of eigenstates of  $^1\hat{A}$  and  $^2\hat{K}$ , so can directly proceed to delete all the terms other than the ones for which  $^1\hat{A} = a_5$ . We obtain:

$$|NS'\rangle = |^1\hat{A} = a_5, ^2\hat{K} = k_{17}\rangle.$$

# Degrees of freedom

- Bipartite systems are important because any system with multiple degrees of freedom is essentially described analogously in QM.
  - degrees of freedom (DOFs): moving in one spatial dimension, moving in another spatial dimension, the having of color-hardness properties, etc
  - Quantum Field Theory (QFT): Principles A-D still valid, but particle ontology replaced by field ontology, which conceives of world as consisting of infinite arrays of infinitely small physical systems at every point of space, interacting with one another in particular ways
- ⇒ infinitely many DOFs

## Application: Two-path experiment




Figure: The two-path experiment reconsidered (Albert, Fig. 2.8)

At  $t_1$ , before entering hardness box, the state of the electron is

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\text{white}, \hat{X} = x_1, \hat{Y} = y_1\rangle &= \begin{bmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} \\ -1/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix} |\hat{X} = x_1, \hat{Y} = y_1\rangle \\
 &= \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) |\hat{X} = x_1, \hat{Y} = y_1\rangle \\
 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\text{hard}, \hat{X} = x_1, \hat{Y} = y_1\rangle \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\text{soft}, \hat{X} = x_1, \hat{Y} = y_1\rangle \\
 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |a\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |b\rangle.
 \end{aligned}$$

What if the state at  $t_1$  had only been one of these (normalized) terms (and the hardness box is still a hardness box)?



If at  $t_1$  it had just been  $|a\rangle$ , then, at  $t_2$ , it would simply have been  $|\text{hard}, \hat{X} = x_2, \hat{Y} = y_2\rangle$ . If it had been  $|b\rangle$  at  $t_1$ , then it would have been  $|\text{soft}, \hat{X} = x_3, \hat{Y} = y_1\rangle$  at  $t_2$ .

It follows from this and from the linearity of the dynamics (cf. Principle D) that the state at  $t_2$  is really

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{hard}, \hat{X} = x_2, \hat{Y} = y_2\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{soft}, \hat{X} = x_3, \hat{Y} = y_1\rangle$$

But now we can no longer factor out the position and the spin properties part of the eigenstate, which means it's non-separable, i.e. there are non-separable correlations between spin and coordinate-space properties of the  $e^-$ . This means that neither any spin property, nor any coordinate-space property of the  $e^-$  has any definite value here. The only definite properties at  $t_2$  involve combinations of spin-space **and** coordinate-space variables of the particle. According to the standard view, it just doesn't make sense to talk of any spin or coordinate-space properties of the  $e^-$  at  $t_2$ .

Similarly, the state of the  $e^-$  at  $t_3$  is

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{hard}, \hat{X} = x_3, \hat{Y} = y_3\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{soft}, \hat{X} = x_4, \hat{Y} = y_2\rangle$$

and at  $t_4$ , it is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{hard}, \hat{X} = x_5, \hat{Y} = y_4\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{soft}, \hat{X} = x_5, \hat{Y} = y_4\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\text{hard}\rangle - |\text{soft}\rangle)|\hat{X} = x_5, \hat{Y} = y_4\rangle \\ &= |\text{white}, \hat{X} = x_5, \hat{Y} = y_4\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This state is separable again, has definite position and spin/color properties.

Now suppose that the experiment were stopped at  $t_3$  by measuring the electron's position. Then a collapse would occur, and the state just after the measurement would be

$$|\text{hard}, \hat{X} = x_3, \hat{Y} = y_3\rangle \text{ or } |\text{soft}, \hat{X} = x_4, \hat{Y} = y_2\rangle$$

each with probability 0.5. If the measurement were performed at  $t_4$ , then the state would be

$$|\text{hard}, \hat{X} = x_5, \hat{Y} = y_4\rangle \text{ or } |\text{soft}, \hat{X} = x_5, \hat{Y} = y_4\rangle.$$

What if we were to put a wall into the soft path at  $(x_3, y_1)$ ? Then the state at  $t_4$  would be

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{hard}, \hat{X} = x_5, \hat{Y} = y_4\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\text{soft}, \hat{X} = x_3, \hat{Y} = y_1\rangle.$$

- In other words, the state would remain entangled between spin and coordinate-space properties even at  $t_4$ .
- If a position measurement would then be performed at  $t_4$ , the  $e^-$  would be found at  $(x_5, y_4)$  with probability 0.5 (in which case it would be hard), or at  $(x_3, y_1)$  with probability 0.5 (in which case it's soft).
- But it's a QM-state, and thus a vector in the state space of this  $e^-$ . In virtue of fact (5) about Hermitian operators, then, it must be an eigenstate of **some** operator, i.e. it must be associated with definite values of **some** measurable properties.
- To bring out part of what these properties might be, study Albert's introduction of the operators 'where' and 'zap' (pp. 57f)