

Versatility of translational quantum dynamics

Ovidiu Cristinel Stoica

Dept. of Theoretical Physics, NIPNE—HH, Bucharest, Romania.

Email: cristi.stoica@theory.nipne.ro, holotronix@gmail.com

(Dated: June 1, 2022)

Is the Schrödinger equation with the Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = -i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}$ too simple for real-world systems?

I show that the following quantum systems are governed by this Hamiltonian, and at any time they are in an eigenstate of its canonical conjugate $\hat{\tau}$, which plays the role of a time operator:

1. the measuring device and the observed system in the standard model of ideal measurements,
2. any quantum world which contains an isolated subsystem with the Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = -i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}$, for example an ideal isolated clock or a sterile massless fermion in a certain eigenstate,
3. the quantum representation of any deterministic time-reversible dynamical system without time loops. All properties of the dynamical system are faithfully encoded as quantum observables.

The energy spectrum of these systems is \mathbb{R} , yet I show that there is no decay to infinite negative energy nor the possibility to extract infinite amounts of free energy, contrary to well-known claims.

Two such quantum systems may be unitarily equivalent, but the physical content of their observables may be very different, allowing unlimited diversity and complexity. This gives concrete counterexamples to the “Hilbert space fundamentalism” thesis.

Keywords: Schrödinger equation; time operator; quantum measurements; dynamical systems

I. INTRODUCTION

Unlike the Theory of Relativity, Quantum Mechanics seems to treat space and time completely differently. While the position operator \hat{x} is the canonical conjugate of the momentum operator \hat{p}_x , a generic Hamiltonian operator \hat{H} does not admit a self-adjoint canonically conjugate operator $\hat{\tau}$ to represent time as a dynamical variable or observable. According to Pauli ([10], p. 63),

We, therefore, conclude that the introduction of an operator t is basically forbidden and the time t must necessarily be considered as an ordinary number [...] in Quantum Mechanics.

We will explore this “basically forbidden” territory:

Definition TQS. A *translational quantum system* is a closed quantum system with the Hamiltonian operator

$$\hat{H} = -i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}. \quad (1)$$

The *time operator* is $\hat{\tau}$, the canonical conjugate of \hat{H} . The evolution of the state vectors $|\psi(t)\rangle$ in the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is given by the Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar\frac{d}{dt}|\psi(t)\rangle = \hat{H}|\psi(t)\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Its solutions for $|\psi(0)\rangle = |\psi_0\rangle$ are $|\psi(t)\rangle = \hat{U}(t)|\psi_0\rangle$, where $\hat{U}(t) := e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}t\hat{H}}$ is the evolution operator. When $\hat{U}(\tau)$ acts on an eigenstate of $\hat{\tau}$, it changes it into another eigenstate and translates its eigenvalue with τ .

I will analyze two well-known objections against TQS:

Objection 1. The energy spectrum of (1) is \mathbb{R} , so the system decays towards infinite negative energy states. One can imagine using such systems to generate free energy, for example by charging infinitely many batteries.

Objection 2. The Hamiltonian (1) is too simple, and it is different from what we encounter in Quantum Mechanics, so it is unable to describe realistic physical situations.

We will see that there are TQS of any desired complexity, which do not decay to infinite negative energy states. I will prove that the following are TQS:

- Any closed quantum system consisting of a measuring device and an observed system realizing the *standard model of ideal measurements* (Sec. §II). The two systems are assumed to not have free evolution, and the result holds during the time interval when they interact.
- Any closed quantum system having an isolated subsystem which is translational. In particular the subsystem may be an ideal clock (Sec. §III) or a sterile massless fermion in a certain state (Sec. §IV).

• The Koopman quantum representation of any deterministic time-reversible dynamical system without time loops (Sec. §V). We will also see that all properties of the original dynamical system and its evolution equations are faithfully encoded as quantum observables.

These quantum systems provide countless counterexamples of unlimited complexity to Objections 1 and 2. In addition, they are concrete counterexamples to the “Hilbert space fundamentalism” thesis (HSF) that the Hamiltonian and the state vector are sufficient to recover the 3D-space, the tensor product structure, the preferred basis, or any other physical property (Sec. §VI).

II. QUANTUM MEASUREMENTS

In this Section I show that the Hamiltonian of a well known model of ideal measurements, named the *standard model of measurements* in [4] §II.3.4, is a TQS.

Let M be the measuring device, S an observed system, and \mathcal{H}_M and \mathcal{H}_S their Hilbert spaces. Suppose that a

property of the system S is measured, represented by the Hermitian operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ on \mathcal{H}_S whose spectrum is $\sigma(\hat{\mathcal{O}})$ with eigenstates $|\lambda, a\rangle_S$, $0 \neq \lambda \in \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{O}})$, where a is a degeneracy index.

We assume that the pointer observable is a Hermitian operator $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ on \mathcal{H}_M , with nondegenerate spectrum $\sigma(\hat{\mathcal{M}})$, and eigenstates $|\zeta\rangle_M$ labeled by $\zeta \in \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{M}})$. Since the pointer states have to represent the eigenstates of the operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$, we assume that an injective function $\zeta : \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{O}}) \rightarrow \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{M}}) \setminus \{0\}$ associates the eigenvalue $\zeta = \zeta(\lambda)$ to each $\lambda \in \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{O}})$. We reserved $0 \in \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{M}}) \setminus \zeta(\sigma(\hat{\mathcal{O}}))$ to represent the “ready” pointer state.

Suppose that the measurement starts at $t = 0$ and ends at $t = T > 0$. Let \hat{U} be the unitary evolution operator of the total system. For each $\lambda \in \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{O}})$, we assume that

$$\hat{U}(T)|\lambda, a\rangle_S |\text{ready}\rangle_M = |\lambda, a\rangle_S |\zeta(\lambda)\rangle_M. \quad (3)$$

For any initial state of the observed system, the total system evolves into a superposition of states (3). Then, the Projection Postulate is invoked to explain that only one term in the superposition remains. Assuming that the pointer’s final state is $|\zeta(\lambda)\rangle_M$, the result of the measurement is the eigenvalue λ of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$.

In the standard model of quantum measurements (see e.g. [8] §2.2(b) and [4] §II.3.4), condition (3) is ensured by the following Hamiltonian, which ignores the free Hamiltonians of the two systems or assumes them to vanish,

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_{\text{int}} = g\hat{\mathcal{O}} \otimes \hat{p}_M, \quad (4)$$

where g is constant in the interval $[0, T]$ and negligible outside and \hat{p}_M is the canonical conjugate of the pointer operator $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\sigma(\hat{\mathcal{M}}) = \mathbb{R}$. Then, for any λ and a ,

$$\hat{U}(T)|\lambda, a\rangle_S |\text{ready}\rangle_M = |\lambda, a\rangle_S e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}gT\lambda\hat{p}_M} |\text{ready}\rangle_M. \quad (5)$$

Since $[\hat{\mathcal{M}}, \hat{p}_M] = i\hbar$, we get for any λ

$$e^{igT\hbar^{-1}\lambda\hat{p}_M}\hat{\mathcal{M}}e^{-igT\hbar^{-1}\lambda\hat{p}_M} = \hat{\mathcal{M}} + gT\hbar^{-1}\lambda\hat{1}_M. \quad (6)$$

From (3) and (5), the pointer eigenstates are

$$|\zeta(\lambda)\rangle_M = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}gT\lambda\hat{p}_M} |\text{ready}\rangle_M. \quad (7)$$

From (6) and $\zeta_{\text{ready}} = 0$ the pointer eigenvalues are

$$\zeta(\lambda) = gT\hbar^{-1}\lambda. \quad (8)$$

Now I prove the main result of this Section.

Theorem 1. *There is a basis of the total Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_M \otimes \mathcal{H}_S$ in which, when g is constant, the Hamiltonian from eq. (4) has the form $\hat{H} = -i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}$.*

Proof. The representation of the pointer observable $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ is $\langle\zeta|\hat{\mathcal{M}}|\psi\rangle_M = \zeta\langle\zeta|\psi\rangle_M$, and that of \hat{p}_M is $\hat{p}_M = -i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta}$. The Hamiltonian (4) becomes

$$\hat{H} = -g \sum_{\lambda, a} \lambda |\lambda, a\rangle \langle \lambda, a| \otimes i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta}. \quad (9)$$

On the total Hilbert space we define an operator $\hat{\tau}$ whose restriction on each subspace $|\lambda, a\rangle_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_M$ is

$$\hat{\tau}|_{|\lambda, a\rangle_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_M} = (g\lambda)^{-1}\hat{\mathcal{M}}. \quad (10)$$

On each subspace $|\lambda, a\rangle_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_M$, its eigenvalue τ satisfies

$$\zeta = g\lambda\tau. \quad (11)$$

Then, on each subspace $|\lambda, a\rangle_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_M$,

$$-g\lambda i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta} = -g\lambda i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial(g\lambda\tau)} = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}. \quad (12)$$

Therefore, $\hat{H} = -i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}$ on the total Hilbert space. \square

Remark 1. The unitary transformation from the proof of Theorem 1 does not preserve the factorization into subsystems $\mathcal{H}_M \otimes \mathcal{H}_S$. It is just a change of basis of the total Hilbert space, as it was claimed in the statement of Theorem 1.

Remark 2. In practice, the coupling g from eq. (4) vanishes or it is negligible outside the time interval $[0, T]$ when the measuring device and the observed system interact. Theorem 1 applies only to this interval, and only if the system $S+M$ is isolated. Whether the Hamiltonian can be put in the form (1) for all times, including before and after the measurement, depends on the mechanism of turning the interaction on and off. In most practical cases this is achieved by having g depend on the distance between S and M . This can happen if the position of the observed system changes in time, so its free Hamiltonian is not zero. Alternatively, g can depend on an external system responsible with turning the coupling on and off, which would make the total Hamiltonian time dependent. Theorem 1 does not cover these cases.

Remark 3. The standard model of quantum measurements described in [4] §II.3.4 applies both to ideal (projective) and generalized (POVM) measurements. There are many concrete realizations of this model, including for the Stern-Gerlach experiment and various experiments with photons ([4] §VII). But in general these measurements are unsharp in practice, hence the necessity of POVM, while Theorem 1 applies only to ideal measurements.

III. SYSTEMS CONTAINING IDEAL CLOCKS

In this Section I show that any quantum system containing an ideal clock, or, more generally, a translational subsystem, has the Hamiltonian (1).

Consider a quantum system composed of two closed subsystems: a generic system R with state vectors $|\psi(t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_R$ and Hamiltonian \hat{H}_R , and a TQS C with state vectors $|\eta(t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_C$ and Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_C = -i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_C}$. Let $\hat{\tau}_C$ be the canonical conjugate of $-i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_C}$.

At $t = 0$, and therefore at any time t , $|\eta(t)\rangle$ is assumed to be an eigenstate of $\hat{\tau}_C$. The total Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H}_{C+R} = \hat{H}_C \otimes \hat{I}_R + \hat{I}_C \otimes \hat{H}_R. \quad (13)$$

Theorem 2. *There is a basis of the total Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{C+R} , consisting of eigenstates of $\hat{\tau} := \hat{\tau}_C \otimes \hat{I}_R$, in which $\hat{H}_{C+R} = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}$. The total Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{C+R} is the canonical conjugate of the operator $\hat{\tau}$.*

Proof. Let $\hat{U}_X(t) := e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} t \hat{H}_X}$, where $X \in \{C, R, C+R\}$. Let $(|b\rangle)_{b \in \mathcal{B}}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H}_R .

Then, for any $\tau_1 \neq \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, any eigenstate $|\eta(\tau_1)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_C$ of $\hat{\tau}_C$, and any $b \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\hat{U}_{C+R}(\tau_2 - \tau_1)|\eta(\tau_1)\rangle|b\rangle = |\eta(\tau_2)\rangle\hat{U}_R(\tau_2 - \tau_1)|b\rangle. \quad (14)$$

Since $\langle\eta(\tau_2)|\eta(\tau_1)\rangle = 0$, from eq. (14) it follows that $\hat{U}_{C+R}(\tau_1)|\eta(0)\rangle|b\rangle$ and $\hat{U}_{C+R}(\tau_2)|\eta(0)\rangle|b\rangle$ are orthogonal for any $\tau_1 \neq \tau_2$. Therefore, the system of vectors $\{\hat{U}_{C+R}(\tau)|\eta(0)\rangle|b\rangle | \tau \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is orthogonal, and the one-parameter unitary group $(\hat{U}_{C+R}(\tau))_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}}$ acts on it like a translation group. From the Stone theorem [12] we obtain that the restriction of \hat{H}_{C+R} to the subspace

$$\mathcal{V}_b := \text{span}\{\hat{U}_{C+R}(\tau)|\eta(0)\rangle|b\rangle | \tau \in \mathbb{R}\} \quad (15)$$

is unique, and therefore it is $-i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}$.

For any $b_1 \neq b_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, the state vectors $\hat{U}_{C+R}(\tau_1)|\eta(0)\rangle|b_1\rangle$ and $\hat{U}_{C+R}(\tau_2)|\eta(0)\rangle|b_2\rangle$ are orthogonal, because at equal times $\hat{U}_R(t)|b_1\rangle$ and $\hat{U}_R(t)|b_2\rangle$ are orthogonal and $\langle\eta(\tau_1)|\eta(\tau_2)\rangle = \delta_{\tau_1\tau_2}$. Therefore, for any $b_1 \neq b_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{V}_{b_1} \perp \mathcal{V}_{b_2}$. It follows that the total Hilbert space is the direct sum of the subspaces \mathcal{V}_b , $\mathcal{H}_{C+R} = \bigoplus_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{V}_b$, and \hat{H}_{C+R} has the form $-i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}$. Its canonical conjugate is the operator $\hat{\tau} = \hat{\tau}_C \otimes \hat{I}_R$. \square

In particular, the system C may be an ideal clock.

Remark 4. Theorem 2 shows that any closed quantum system combined with a TQS has the Hamiltonian (1). But the dynamics of the original system does not change.

Curiously, by its mere existence, a translational system makes any other quantum system R translational. However, in general, the Hamiltonian (1) does not require the existence of a subsystem that acts like a clock.

Remark 5. For any state vector $|\psi(0)\rangle_R$, we can represent the orbit $\{|t\rangle_C |\psi(t)\rangle_R | t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ of $|0\rangle_C |\psi(0)\rangle_R$ under the action of the group $(\hat{U}_{C+R}(t, 0))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ as a vector

$$|\Psi\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\tau\rangle_C |\psi(\tau)\rangle_R d\tau, \quad (16)$$

which is not normalizable. Since the orbit is invariant under the action of the group $(\hat{U}_{C+R}(t, 0))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, so is $|\Psi\rangle$, and $\hat{U}_{C+R}(t, 0)|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore,

$$\hat{H}_{C+R}|\Psi\rangle = 0. \quad (17)$$

This connects Theorem 2 and *canonical quantum gravity* [6], where the Wheeler-DeWitt *constraint equation* has the form (17). Its solutions are “timeless”, but Page and Wootters [9] proposed that the dynamics is encoded in $|\Psi\rangle$ as correlations between the system R and the clock C , as in equation (16). As we can see from Theorem 2, not only the clock’s Hamiltonian, but the total Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{C+R} as well has the form from eq. (1). \square

IV. WORLDS CONTAINING A STERILE MASSLESS FERMION

Consider a Dirac fermion φ which is massless and sterile, *i.e.* it does not interact at all. Since its chiral components are mixed only by the mass term, which is absent, $\varphi(t)$ decouples into two independent Weyl spinor fields $\varphi_{\pm}(t) : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$, where \mathbb{R}^3 is the Euclidean space. In the Weyl representation, the Hamiltonian operators for the chiral components are

$$\hat{H}_{\pm} = \pm c\hbar \left(-\sigma^x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \sigma^y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - \sigma^z \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right), \quad (18)$$

where $\sigma^x, \sigma^y, \sigma^z$ are the Pauli matrices.

Let $\varphi = \varphi_+$ (or $\varphi = \varphi_-$) be a chiral planar wave. The basis of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^3 can be chosen so that φ is independent of x and y . Since the space coordinates decouple from the spin degrees of freedom, for φ ,

$$\hat{H}_+ \varphi = -c\sigma^z \otimes \hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \varphi. \quad (19)$$

This is a particular case of eq. (9), so the system is a TQS. If the planar wave $\varphi(t)$ is an eigenstate of \hat{z} at $t = 0$, it remains an eigenstate of \hat{z} at all times t .

From Theorem 2, any world which contains such a sterile massless fermion is a TQS as well.

V. QUANTUM REPRESENTATION OF DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

In this Section I show that the quantum representation of any deterministic time-reversible dynamical system without time loops has the Hamiltonian (1).

A *deterministic time-reversible dynamical system* [3] $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{S}, \alpha)$ is an action $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ of the additive group $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ on a set \mathcal{S} . The set \mathcal{S} is endowed with a σ -algebra \mathcal{B} and a *measure* $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, and its elements are the *states* of the system. The action α is *measure-preserving*, and represents the *evolution law*. Its orbits are the *histories* of the system. A periodic orbit will be called *time loop*.

The *quantum representation* (Koopman [7]) of $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{S}, \alpha)$ is obtained by associating a quantum system on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}} := L^2(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{C})$ of square μ -integrable complex functions on (\mathcal{S}, μ) , with Hermitian scalar product $\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle := \int_{\mathcal{S}} \psi_1^*(s) \psi_2(s) d\mu$, $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in L^2(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{C})$, and a

one-parameter unitary group $(\widehat{U}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ acting as evolution operators on any $\psi \in L^2(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{C})$ by

$$\widehat{U}(t)\psi := \psi \circ \alpha_t. \quad (20)$$

The Dirac distributions on \mathcal{S} form a canonical basis

$$(|s\rangle)_{s \in \mathcal{S}}. \quad (21)$$

For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\widehat{U}(t)|s\rangle = |\alpha(t, s)\rangle. \quad (22)$$

The one-parameter unitary group (20) is generated by a Hermitian operator \widehat{H} , $\widehat{U}(t) := e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}t\widehat{H}}$. The histories $|\alpha(s, t)\rangle$ satisfy the Schrödinger equation (2).

Theorem 3. *Let $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{S}, \alpha)$ be a deterministic time-reversible dynamical system without time loops. Then, the Hamiltonian operator is $\widehat{H} = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}$, and at all times the states are eigenstates of its canonical conjugate $\widehat{\tau}$.*

Proof. The representation (20) associates to each non-periodic orbit of the action α a history $(\widehat{U}(t)|s_0\rangle)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ consisting of mutually orthogonal states. Then, the one-parameter unitary group $(\widehat{U}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ acts like a translation group on the mutually orthogonal vectors $\{\widehat{U}(t)|s_0\rangle | t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. From the Stone theorem, the restriction of \widehat{H} to the subspace spanned by $(\widehat{U}(t)|s_0\rangle)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ has the form $-i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}$. At all times, the states of the system are eigenstates of the canonical conjugate $\widehat{\tau}$ of $-i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}$. Since in the absence of time loops \mathcal{S} is partitioned into non-periodic orbits, the result extends to the entire Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . \square

A property of the original dynamical system is a function $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Any property can be uniquely represented by a Hermitian operator

$$\widehat{f} = \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(s) |s\rangle \langle s| d\mu. \quad (23)$$

Remark 6. If the original dynamical system is a classical Hamiltonian system, the state space \mathcal{S} is a classical phase space. The regular multiplication of the phase space coordinates $(p_a, q^a) \in \mathcal{S}$ commutes, $p_a q^a = q^a p_a$. The corresponding operators in the quantum representation also commute, $[\widehat{q}^a, \widehat{p}_a] = 0$. In fact, any two properties $f_1, f_2 : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ commute, being just real functions, and the operators representing them also commute. However, $\widehat{p}_a \neq -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial q^a}$, and $[\widehat{q}^a, -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial q^a}] = i\hbar$, so they satisfy the canonical commutation relations. When applied to states from the basis $(|s\rangle)_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$, these operators result in superpositions of such states, while the operators of the form \widehat{f} for properties $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ only permute this basis.

VI. DISCUSSION

We have seen that very rich and diverse classes of quantum systems are TQS. Now I address the objections.

Reply 1 (to Objection 1). Unitary evolution conserves the energy, so decay to lower energy requires violation of unitarity, *e.g.* by the wavefunction collapse or by assuming decoherence into branches and selecting one of the branches. The following argument is independent of the mechanism by which the apparent collapse is obtained.

Consider a deterministic time-reversible dynamical system without time loops as in Sec. §V. If it does not exhibit indefinite decay to lower energies, neither will its quantum representation for the states $(|s\rangle)_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$, even though its Hamiltonian is (1). Also, if one could extract infinite amounts of free energy, then one could do the same for deterministic time-reversible dynamical systems without time loops, but we know this is not possible.

Similarly, if the quantum system R from Sec. §III has a ground state and it does not interact with the clock C , it does not decay indefinitely and cannot be used to extract infinite amounts of free energy. Therefore, this is also true for the total system $R + C$, even if its total Hamiltonian is (1). The same argument applies to the world containing a sterile massless fermion.

Therefore, the nonexistence of a ground state does not lead to the problems from Objection 1. \square

Reply 2 (to Objection 2). The translational systems discussed in this article include ideal quantum measurements (Sec. §II), and can be as diverse as the deterministic time-reversible dynamical systems without time loops are (Sec. §V). Moreover, any quantum system becomes a TQS by the mere presence of an ideal clock (Sec. §V), or of a massless sterile fermion as in Sec. §IV. This proves the versatility of the Hamiltonian (1). \square

Let us consider two TQS specified by the triples, $(\mathcal{H}_1, \widehat{H}_1, |\psi_1(t)\rangle)$ and $(\mathcal{H}_2, \widehat{H}_2, |\psi_2(t)\rangle)$, with the time operators $\widehat{\tau}_1$ and respectively $\widehat{\tau}_2$. Due to the τ translation symmetry, all eigenspaces of the time operator $\widehat{\tau}$ for a TQS have the same dimension $d(\widehat{H})$, equal to the multiplicity of the energy eigenspaces. If $d(\widehat{H}_1) = d(\widehat{H}_2)$, there is a unitary map $M : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$, so that $\widehat{H}_1 = M^{-1} \widehat{H}_2 M$. We can even choose M so that $M|\psi_1(t_1)\rangle = |\psi_2(t_2)\rangle$ for any fixed $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, so even their histories are equivalent.

This suggests the following objection to the versatility of translational quantum dynamics:

Objection 3. Two quantum systems specified by the triples $(\mathcal{H}_1, \widehat{H}_1, |\psi_1(t)\rangle)$ and $(\mathcal{H}_2, \widehat{H}_2, |\psi_2(t)\rangle)$ with the same multiplicity of the eigenspaces of \widehat{H} are the same. Therefore, there is no difference between the various examples from this article.

Reply 3 (to Objection 3). I will prove the following:

Corollary 1. *There are infinitely many quantum systems with the same triple $(\mathcal{H}, \widehat{H}, |\psi(t)\rangle)$ but with completely different physical content.*

Proof. We will apply Theorem 3 to classical Hamiltonian systems. A Hamiltonian function $H(p_a, q^a)$ is a function $H : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the phase space coordinates

$(p_a, q^a) \in \mathcal{S}$. Consider two classical Hamiltonian systems with Hamiltonian functions $H_1(p_{1a}, q_1^a) \neq H_2(p_{2a}, q_2^a)$. Let $(\mathcal{H}_1, \hat{H}_1, |\psi_1(t)\rangle)$ and $(\mathcal{H}_2, \hat{H}_2, |\psi_2(t)\rangle)$ be their quantum representations. Then, a unitary transformation M that maps \hat{H}_1 into \hat{H}_2 will not, in general, also map $(\hat{p}_{1a}, \hat{q}_1^a)$ into $(\hat{p}_{2a}, \hat{q}_2^a)$. In general, if two dynamical systems are inequivalent by canonical transformations, their quantum representations are inequivalent by unitary transformations, even if the triples $(\mathcal{H}_1, \hat{H}_1, |\psi_1(t)\rangle)$ and $(\mathcal{H}_2, \hat{H}_2, |\psi_2(t)\rangle)$ are unitarily equivalent. Therefore, even if the quantum representation of different dynamical systems have the same quantum Hamiltonian, nothing from the original dynamical system is lost, unless we ignore the physical content of the observables.

In particular, the two classical Hamiltonian systems can have different dimensions of space and factorize differently into subsystems. To see this, consider two systems with different space dimensions. If they are systems of classical particles, we can choose the number of particles so that the dimensions of the two phase spaces are equal. If they are systems of classical fields, the dimensions of their phase spaces are infinite, so they are equal regardless of their space dimensions. In both cases, our choice ensured that $d(\hat{H}_1) = d(\hat{H}_2)$, so the triples $(\mathcal{H}_1, \hat{H}_1, |\psi_1(t)\rangle)$ and $(\mathcal{H}_2, \hat{H}_2, |\psi_2(t)\rangle)$ are unitarily equivalent. But the phase space dynamics is not equivalent for the two systems. This means that, if there is a procedure by which space emerges in the first system, it has to be different for the second system, so it is not unique. That the dimension of space is not uniquely recovered is more evident if we choose it to be different for the two dynamical systems. If the dimension of space is different for the two systems, the factorization into subsystems is also different. \square

This shows that the physical content of a quantum system is almost entirely missed by the triple $(\mathcal{H}, \hat{H}, |\psi(t)\rangle)$.

Objection 3 is based on an assumption called the

Hilbert space fundamentalism Thesis (HSF) [1, 5]:

Thesis HSF. Everything about a physical system, including the 3D-space, a preferred basis, a preferred factorization of the Hilbert space (needed to represent subsystems, *e.g.* particles), emerge uniquely from the triple

$$(\mathcal{H}, \hat{H}, |\psi(t)\rangle). \quad (24)$$

It was already shown in [11] that if the Hamiltonian and the state vector alone allow the recovery of any such structure which can be interpreted as the 3D-space, a preferred basis, or a preferred factorization of the Hilbert space, there are infinitely many physically distinct but unitarily equivalent such structures. The proofs from [11] are general, but they may seem too abstract. Here we saw that the examples from this article provide infinitely many concrete counterexamples to the HSF Thesis, because the physical content of the operators representing observables in the two systems can be inequivalent.

Remark 7. The *clock ambiguity* problem [2] in the Page-Wootters formalism [9] can be seen as an instance of the more general ambiguity from Corollary 1 and [11], for the particular case from Sec. §III.

In this article, I showed that the Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}$ is sufficiently versatile to describe the dynamics of worlds of unlimited complexity and extreme diversity. Whether it applies to our world remains to be seen. In case it does, this would not make it a “theory of everything”, because, as seen in Corollary 1, the additional equations involving the observables will still be needed.

Acknowledgement The author thanks Basil Altaie, Almut Beige, Eliahu Cohen, Ismael Paiva, Ashmeet Singh, and Michael Suleymanou, for their valuable comments and suggestions offered to a previous version of the manuscript. Nevertheless, the author bears full responsibility for the article.

-
- [1] S. Aaronson. The Zen anti-interpretation of Quantum Mechanics. www.scottaaronson.com/blog/?p=5359, 2021.
 - [2] A. Albrecht and A. Iglesias. Clock ambiguity and the emergence of physical laws. *Phys. Rev. D*, 77(6):063506, 2008.
 - [3] M. Brin and G. Stuck. *Introduction to dynamical systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
 - [4] P. Busch, M. Grabowski, and P. Lahti. *Operational quantum physics*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995.
 - [5] S. Carroll. Reality as a vector in Hilbert space. Technical Report CALT-TH-2021-010, Cal-Tech, 2021.
 - [6] B.S. DeWitt. Quantum theory of gravity. I. The canonical theory. *Phys. Rev.*, 160(5):1113, 1967.
 - [7] B.O. Koopman. Hamiltonian systems and transformation in Hilbert space. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 17(5):315, 1931.
 - [8] P. Mittelstaedt. *The interpretation of quantum mechanics and the measurement process*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2004.
 - [9] D.N. Page and W.K. Wootters. Evolution without evolution: Dynamics described by stationary observables. *Phys. Rev. D*, 27(12):2885, 1983.
 - [10] W. Pauli. *General principles of quantum mechanics*. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1990.
 - [11] O.C. Stoica. 3d-space and the preferred basis cannot uniquely emerge from the quantum structure. *Preprint arXiv:2102.08620*, pages 1–18, 2021.
 - [12] M.H. Stone. On one-parameter unitary groups in Hilbert space. *Ann. Math.*, pages 643–648, 1932.