

Positive-Operator-Valued Time Observable in Quantum Mechanics

R. Giannitrapani

Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Trento

I.N.F.N. gruppo collegato di Trento

February 5, 2022

Abstract

We examine the longstanding problem of introducing a time observable in Quantum Mechanics; using the formalism of positive-operator-valued measures we show how to define such an observable in a natural way and we discuss some consequences.

Pacs: 03.65.Bz – Quantum theory;
 UTF-390.

1 Introduction

Since the very beginning of Quantum Mechanics it has been clear that it is not so easy to define time at a quantum level; in the ordinary theory, in fact, it is not an observable, but an external parameter or, that is the same, time is classical. In trying to change this situation promoting time to be an observable, one has to face a theorem by Pauli (Pauli 1958) that states, essentially, that such an operator cannot be self-adjoint; since in the usual Quantum Mechanics observables are postulated to be self-adjoint operators (see, for example, Von Neumann 1955 and Pugovecki 1971) this theorem constitutes a problem.

e-mail: riccardo@science.unitn.it

One of the consequences of this is, for example, that one cannot deduce the Heisenberg uncertainty relation for time and energy from a kinematical point of view because time does not belong to the algebra of observables. In spite of this the relation $\Delta T \Delta H \geq \hbar/2$ is commonly accepted as true and it is derived in some way with dynamical considerations.

The situation is quite unsatisfactory both from a physical point of view and from an epistemological point of view and although it has been investigated in a good number of works (see, for example, Aharonov et al. 1961, Rosenbaum 1969, O'Kehovsky et al. 1974, Blanchard et al. 1996, Grot et al. 1996, Leon 1997), it is still an interesting open problem.

The "problem of time" has some consequences also in the realm of Quantum Gravity i.e. in the struggle to give a quantum description of spacetime in order to solve some divergences problems in both General Relativity (singularity theorems) and in Quantum Fields Theory (renormalization problem). A quantum "spacetime" with zero spatial dimensions and one time dimension (that is the quantization of time) is the simplest model and we think it is preliminary to any other attempt.

If one adopts the operational point of view (Bridgman 1927) then defining the concept of time at a quantum level is equivalent to specify a set of operations useful for the measurement of time; in this context the problem of time is the problem of building "quantum clocks". In this note we shall analyze a simple model for such a quantum clock and try to draw some general conclusions on the problem.

2 Mathematical preliminaries

Our starting point is a generalized formulation of standard quantum mechanics that extends the usual observable concept. A justification of such formulation is given by Gleason's theorem (Bush et al. 1991) that guarantees that this structure is the most general one compatible with the probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics (Copenhagen interpretation); other justifications come from works by Ludwig and Giles (Ludwig 1968, Giles 1970), but they are beyond the scopes of this note. In this section we summarize, in a very concise and incomplete way, the mathematical tools that we shall use later; for a good review of the subject, along with a very complete bibliography, see Bush et al. 1991, Giles 1970, Davies 1976.

A given quantum system S is described by an Hilbert space H ; we call $L(H)$ the algebra of bounded operators on H , $L(H)^+$ the cone of positive ones and $T(H)$ the subalgebra of the trace class operators. The states of the system S are the positive operators with trace one on H that form a convex set $T(H)_1^+$ in $T(H)$.

Given a measurable space $(\Omega; \mathcal{F})$, where Ω is a nonempty set and \mathcal{F} a σ -algebra of subsets of Ω , a normalized positive operator valued measure (a POVM) is a map

$$\mu: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow L(H)^+$$

such that:

1. $\mu(\Omega) = I$
2. $\mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(X_i)$ where $\{X_i\}$ is a countable collection of disjoint elements of \mathcal{F} and the convergence is in the weak topology
3. $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$

If $\mu(X)^2 = \mu(X)$ then μ is a projection valued measure (PVM) and it can be demonstrated that this property is equivalent to

$$\mu(X \cap Y) = \mu(X) \mu(Y):$$

If Ω is the real Borel space $(\mathbb{R}; \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ and μ is a PVM, then it is a spectral representation of a unique selfadjoint operator A

$$A = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda d\mu(\lambda) \quad (1)$$

A generalized observable is a POVM on a particular measurable space, while a PVM, via the relation (1), represents an ordinary observable of quantum mechanics. This generalization of the concept of an observable is possible in view of the probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics (for more details see Bush 1991). Given an observable A and a state ρ we have a probability measure μ_ρ on $(\mathbb{R}; \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$

$$\mu_\rho: \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow [0;1]$$

$$\mu_\rho(X) = \text{Tr}[\rho \mu(X)]:$$

This can be interpreted as the probability that the measure of the observable on the state ψ lies in the set X .

The mean value of the observable A on the state ψ is then

$$\text{mean}(A; \psi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x d\mu_{\psi}^A(x) \quad (d)$$

while the variance is given by

$$\text{var}(A; \psi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^2 d\mu_{\psi}^A(x) - (\text{mean}(A; \psi))^2$$

Let G be a locally compact group, $(\mathbb{R}; F)$ a measurable G -space and U a unitary representation of G on an Hilbert space H ; if μ is a POVM-measure on $(\mathbb{R}; F)$ with values in $L(H)^+$, then we say that μ is covariant with respect to U if

$$U_g(X)U_g^* = \mu(Xg)$$

for every $X \in F$ and every $g \in G$. The pair $(\mu; U)$ is called a system of covariance (Davies 1976); if μ is a PV-measure then $(\mu; U)$ is a system of inprimitivity (Mackey 1963, Varadarajan 1984).

The condition of covariance means that

$$(U_g(X)U_g^*) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} U_g(x)U_g^*(x) d\mu(X):$$

As it is stated in the introduction, due to an argument by Pauli (Pauli 1958) it is not possible to have a self-adjoint operator for a time observable in quantum mechanics;

Theorem 1 (Pauli) Given an observable (time) T with the following commutation relation with the hamiltonian

$$[H; T] = i$$

then T cannot be a self-adjoint operator.

In the language of POVM-measures the theorem means that a time observable cannot form a system of inprimitivity with the time translations, but it can still form a system of covariance with them. In fact Pauli's Theorem is a consequence of the following general proposition:

Proposition 1 If μ is a POVM measure on \mathbb{R} and it is covariant with respect to the one parameter group of translation, then

$$\int_{(a;b]} \mu(j) > 0 \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{M}_H$$

for every interval $(a;b]$; this means that μ cannot be a PV measures.

Proof.

For the demonstration of the proposition we can proceed in the following way: suppose that we have a POVM measure μ for the observable time and that it forms a system of covariance with $U = \exp(-iH)$, where H is the generator of the translations. Suppose that for a given pure state ψ and a certain interval of the real line $(a;b]$ we have

$$\int_{(a;b]} \mu(j) \psi = 0:$$

Then

$$\int_{(a+c;b+c]} \mu(j) \psi = 0 \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{M}_H;$$

and, for the covariance property,

$$\int_{(a;b+c]} \mu(j) e^{iH} \psi = 0$$

and so

$$\int_{(a;b+c]} \mu(j) e^{iH} \psi = 0 \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{M}_H;$$

for the positivity of μ . At the end we have

$$F(\lambda) = \int_{(a;b+c]} \mu(j) e^{iH} \psi = 0 \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R};$$

But $F(\lambda)$ is an analytic vector valued function in the upper half of the complex plane that is zero on the interval $[0;c]$; using the Riemann-Schwarz reflection principle (Titchmarsh 1939) one can prove that such a function, being zero on an interval, it is zero everywhere. This means that $\int_{(a+c;b+c]} \mu(j) \psi$ is zero for all the values of λ i.e. $\int_{(a;b]} \mu(j) \psi$ is zero on all the intervals of \mathbb{R} and this is impossible if μ has to be a normalized POVM measure.

Q.E.D.

3 A model for a Quantum Clock

In this section we analyze a particular simple model for a quantum clock (see Rosenbaum 1969, Toller 1996) using the mathematical formalism of the preceding section.

Let us consider a one dimensional system represented by the Hilbert space

$$H = L^2(\mathbb{R}):$$

We have, as usual, a coordinate q observable along with its momentum p (in this case ordinary observables) such that

$$[q; p] = i:$$

Moreover this "clock" has an hamiltonian equal to

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2}:$$

We can interpret q as the time displayed by the clock and p as the rate of the clock itself. In a classical model the real time would be

$$T = \frac{q}{p};$$

but in the quantum case we have to take care of the ordering of the operators. We have to perform an arbitrary choice and we follow (Toller 1996) putting

$$T = (2p)^{-1} q + q (2p)^{-1}:$$

This operator can be defined on the domain (in the p -representation) of infinitely differentiable functions over the compact subsets of \mathbb{R} (0), that is dense in H (it is also possible to use as the domain the set of infinitely differentiable functions over the compact subsets of \mathbb{R} and then imposing the condition of hermiticity that gives $\lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \frac{(p)}{p} = 0 \in D(T)$).

It is easy to see that T is hermitean and the expected commutation relation

$$[H; T] = i$$

is satisfied on $D(T)$. Now, for the Pauli theorem, we know that T cannot be an ordinary observable, but we can still see if it can be interpreted in the

generalized framework of the preceding section. To do so we have to find a POVM-measure on \mathcal{R} such that

$$\langle \psi | T | \psi \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{R}} \langle \psi | (d\mu) | \psi \rangle \int \delta(\mu - \mu(T)) d\mu : \quad (1)$$

Moreover $(\mu; U)$ has to be a covariance system with $U = \exp(-iH)$ a representation of the time-translation group G .

In order to build let us start to search the eigenstates of T ; it is convenient to work in momentum representation instead of the usual coordinate representation (in such a way it is simpler to define the operator p^{-1}). In such a representation we have

$$T = i(2p)^{-1} \frac{d}{dp} + i \frac{d}{dp} (2p)^{-1} :$$

The eigenvector problem reads as

$$T | \mu \rangle = t | \mu \rangle$$

and defining the wavefunction $\mu_t(p)$ as

$$\mu_t(p) = \langle p | \mu \rangle$$

we have

$$T \mu_t(p) = t \mu_t(p) :$$

This equation admits as solutions a double family of eigenfunctions:

$$\langle p | \mu_{\pm} \rangle = \mu_{\pm}(p) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (p)^{\pm \frac{1}{2}} \exp \left(\pm i \frac{p^2}{2} \right)$$

with $\mu_{\pm} = \mu_{\pm}^{-1}$. They do not lie in \mathcal{H} and so they have to be regarded as weak eigenfunctions:

$$\langle \mu_{\pm} | (T - t) | \mu_{\pm} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{D}(T) :$$

We can also see easily that the eigenvectors of T are not orthogonal

$$\langle \mu_{\pm}^0 | \mu_{\pm}^0 \rangle = 0 \quad \text{with } \mu_{\pm}^0 \in \mathcal{H}^0$$

$$\langle \mu_{\pm}^0 | \mu_{\pm}^0 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (t - t^0) + \frac{i}{2} \frac{1}{(t - t^0)} :$$

Anyway the following relation still holds (in the weak sense):

$$\int_1^{Z+1} dt \, j; i h t; j = 1:$$

At this point we can state the following propositions:

Proposition 2 $\int_1^Z dt \, j; i h t; j$ gives a POVM measure

$$(X) = \int_X dt \, j; i h t; j$$

with X a Borel set of the real line.

Proposition 3 The system $(\cdot; U)$, where $U = \exp(-iH)$ is a representation of the one parameter group G of time translations, is a covariance system.

Proof.

Let us start from the first one; obviously (X) is a positive operator, moreover it is bounded

$$(X) \leq \int_1^{Z+1} dt \, j; i h t; j = 1$$

so that $(X) \in L^+(H)$. The σ -additivity follows from the additivity of integrals and \int_1^1 is normalized to 1.

For the second proposition one can see that

$$e^{iH} j; i = j; i$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h | e^{iH} (X) e^{iH} | j \rangle &= \int_X dt \, \langle h | e^{iH} j; i h t; j | j \rangle = \\ &= \int_X dt \, \langle h | j; i h t; j | j \rangle = \\ &= \int_X dt \, j; i h t; j = \\ &= \langle h | j (X) | j \rangle \end{aligned}$$

that is the relation of covariance of the POVM measure.

Q.E.D.

In conclusion we can say that T is a generalized observable for the time of our quantum clock; it can be checked that T is not a PV-measure (essentially this is a consequence of the non orthogonality of the eigenvectors of T) and so there is no contradiction with the Pauli Theorem.

We have studied a particular POV-measure for a time observable obtained by choosing a very particular time operator; the next step is to study POV-measures for time regardless of any operator. The interesting object is the space of POV-measures that form a system of covariance with a representation of time translations; the task is to find out in such a space the "best" measures to be used for quantum clocks. This will be the argument of a future note.

4 Uncertainty Relations

We now can examine the uncertainty relations for time and energy from a kinematical point of view, as stated in the introduction.

If we define, for an hermitean operator A , the quantity

$$(\Delta_A)^2 = \langle A^2 \rangle - (\langle A \rangle)^2 \quad \text{with } \langle A \rangle = 1$$

then one can prove (Von Neumann 1955) that for the operators T and H of the preceding section (they are hermitean) the following relation is true on a certain domain of H

$$\Delta_T \Delta_H \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

This relation is commonly accepted as the equivalent for time and energy of the famous Heisenberg relation for position and momentum; the fact is that the quantity Δ_T is not, in general, the variance of the observable time T because T is a generalized observable and it is not a selfadjoint operator. But in our simple model the two quantities coincide; in fact we can write

$$\Delta_T^2 = \int_1^{\infty} \alpha^2 d\mu(\alpha) = \langle T^2 \rangle - \langle T \rangle^2 = \Delta_H^2$$

for the property of μ exposed in the preceding section; since ψ is a weak eigenvector of T we have

$$T_{ji} = \int_1^{X_{Z+1}} dt \, t_{ji}(t)$$

From this relation one sees that the mean of T , as defined in the second section, is the usual one

$$\langle T_{ji} \rangle = \int_1^{X_{Z+1}} dt \, t_{ji}(t) = \int_1^{Z+1} t \, h_j(t) dt = \text{mean}(j)$$

Using the relation

$$\langle T^2_{ji} \rangle = \int_0^X \int_1^{Z+1} dt \, t_{ji}^0(t) \, t_{ji}(t) = \int_0^X \int_1^{Z+1} dt \, t_{ji}^0(t) \, t_{ji}(t)$$

we obtain

$$\langle T^2_{ji} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \int_1^{Z+1} t^2 h_j(t) dt +$$

where

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_1^{X_{Z+1}} dt \, t_{ji}^0(t) \, t_{ji}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_1^{Z+1} dt \, t_{ji}^0(t) \, t_{ji}(t)$$

with $t_{ji}(t) = h_j(t)$. One can check that

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_1^{Z+1} t^2 h_j(t) dt$$

and then

$$\langle T^2_{ji} \rangle = \int_1^{Z+1} t^2 h_j(t) dt$$

In the end we have for the generalized observable

$$\sigma_T^2 = \text{var}(j)$$

and so the uncertainty relation for time and energy variances is obtainable in a rigorous way within the POV-measures formalism.

5 Conclusions

In this note we have shown how it is possible to give a well defined meaning to the concept of time observable at a quantum level using the POVM measures formalism; in particular we have studied a simple quantum clock model giving a precise mathematical derivation of the Heisenberg uncertainty relation for time and energy. Since clocks are fundamental in the operational definition of spacetime, in our mind this is a preliminary step toward an analysis of spacetime concepts at a quantum level, analysis that we hope to present in future works.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to M. Toller for his encouragement and for suggestions without which this work would not have been completed. I wish also to thank V. Moretti for the help in solving some technical problems and for useful discussions. I would like to thank H. Atmanspacher and W. M. de Muynck for having pointed out to me, after the acceptance of this paper, a work of Busch et al. (1994) and of Holevo (1982) concerning the same topic.

R e f e r e n c e s

- Aharonov, Y., and Bohm, D. (1961). Time in the Quantum Theory and the Uncertainty Relation for Time and Energy, *Physical Review*, 122 1649.
- Blanchard, Ph., and Jadczyk, A. (1996). Time of Events in Quantum Theory, preprint quant-ph/9602010.
- Bridgman, P W. (1927). The Logic of Modern Physics, The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Busch, P., Lahti, P J., and Mittelstaedt, P. (1991). The Quantum Theory of Measurement. *Lectures Notes in Physics m 2*, Springer Verlag, Berlin.
- Busch, P., Grabowski, M., and Lahti, P J. (1994). Time Observables in Quantum Theory, *Physics Letters A*, 191, 357.
- Davies, E B. (1976). Quantum Theory of Open Systems, Academic Press, London.
- Giles, R. (1970). Foundations for Quantum Mechanics, *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 11 2139.
- Grot, N., Rovelli, C., and Tate, R S. (1996). Time-of-arrival in quantum mechanics, preprint quant-ph/9603021.
- Holevo, A S. (1982). Probabilistic and statistical aspects of quantum theory, North-Holland Publ, Amsterdam.
- Leon, J. (1997). Time-of-arrival formalism for the relativistic particle. *Journal of Physics A* 30, 4791.
- Ludwig, G. (1968). Attempt of an Axiomatic Foundation of Quantum Mechanics and More General Theories III. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 9 1.
- Mackey, G W. (1963). Infinite Dimensional group representations, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 69, 628.

- O lkhovsky, V .S., Recam i, E ., and G erasim chuk, A .J. (1974). T im e O perator in Q uantum M echanics. I: N onrelativistic C ase, N uovo C im ento, 22 263.
- Pauli, W . (1958). D ie allgem einen P rinzipien der W ellenm echanik, H an-
buck der Physik, edited by S F lugge, vol. V /1, p.60, Springer Verlag,
Berlin.
- P rugovecki, E. (1971). Q uantum M echanics in H ilbert Space, A cadem ic
P ress, N ew York and London.
- Rosenbaum , D M . (1969). Super H ilbert Space and the Q uantum M echan-
ical T im e O perators, Journal of M athem atical Physics, 10 1127.
- T itchm arsh, E .C . (1939). The Theory of Functions, O xford U niversity
P ress, O xford.
- Toller, M . (1996). Q uantum References and Q uantum Transform ations,
preprint gr-qc/9605052.
- Varadara jan, V .S. (1984). Geom etry of Q uantum Theory (Second Edition),
Springer Verlag, Berlin.
- Von Neum ann, J. (1955). M athem atical Foundations of Q uantum M echan-
ics, P rinceton U niversity P ress, P rinceton.