

On the Significance of a Recent Experiment Demonstrating Quantum Interference in Time

Lawrence P. Horwitz*

School of Physics, University of Tel Aviv, Ramat Aviv 69978, Israel

and

Department of Physics, College of Judea and Samaria, Ariel, Israel

Abstract

I discuss the interpretation of a recent experiment showing quantum interference in time. It is pointed out that the standard nonrelativistic quantum theory, used by the authors in their analysis, cannot account for the results found, and therefore that this experiment has fundamental importance beyond the technical advances it represents. In particular, the manifestly covariant quantum theory of Stueckelberg accounts for the results in a simple and consistent way.

The recent experiment of Lindner, *et al*¹, clearly shows the effect of quantum interference in time for the wave function of a particle. The results are discussed in that paper in terms of a very precise solution of the time-dependent nonrelativistic Schrödinger equation. In this note, I wish to point out that the nonrelativistic Schrödinger theory cannot be used to predict interference phenomena in time, and therefore the very striking results of this beautiful experiment have a fundamental importance which goes beyond the technical advances which they represent. They imply, in fact, that the time variable t must be adjoined to the set of standard quantum variables so that the standard ket $|x, t\rangle$ for the representation of the quantum state (in Dirac's terminology²) can be constructed. It is this structure for the wave function $\psi(x, t) \equiv \langle x, t | \psi \rangle$, where x and t are the spectra of self-adjoint operators, that provides the possibility of coherence in t , and therefore, interference phenomena. If the quantum theory is to remain symplectic in form, the variable E must also be adjoined. I discuss two ways, somewhat related, in which this can be done.

The standard nonrelativistic quantum theory does not have this property, *i.e.*, it cannot predict interference in time. For example, Ludwig³ has pointed out that the time variable cannot be a quantum observable, since there is no imprimitivity system (*i.e.*, no operator exists that does not commute with t in the nonrelativistic theory) involving this variable. Dirac² has argued that if t were an operator, then the resulting t, E commutation relation would imply that the energy of the system is unbounded below, from which he concluded that the time cannot be an observable in the nonrelativistic quantum theory (note, however, that in a relativistic theory, negative energies correspond to antiparticle states, and are not excluded). Moreover, as the axiomatic treatment of Piron⁴ (see also, Jauch⁵) shows, the Hilbert space of the quantum theory is constructed of a set of wave functions satisfying a normalization condition based on integration over all space, *e.g.*, for

* e-mail:larry@post.tau.ac.il.

a single particle, $\int |\psi_t(x)|^2 d^3x \leq \infty$, for each value of the parameter t . There is therefore a distinct Hilbert space for each value of the parameter t .

Moreover, as pointed out by Wick, Wightmann and Wigner⁶, a Hilbert space decomposes into incoherent sectors if there is no observable that connects these sectors; hence, if there were a larger Hilbert space containing a representation for t , the absence of any observable that connects different values of t in the standard nonrelativistic physics would induce a decomposition of the the Hilbert space into a (continuous) direct sum of superselection sectors⁴. Therefore, no superposition of vectors for different values of t would be admissible. This would exclude the interpretation of the experiment of ref. 1 forming the basis of the analysis carried out by the authors involving the linear superposition of two parts of a particle wave function arriving at the detector simultaneously, but originating at two different times, in the framework of the standard nonrelativistic quantum theory.

The situation for particles, in this respect, is very different from that of electromagnetic waves, for which the second order equations imply coherence in time as well as space (the coherence time for light waves is a commonly measured characteristic of light sources). It is clear from the double slit interference of light, which travels at a fixed velocity, that the sections of a wave front passing through the two slits must pass at different times if they are to arrive simultaneously at the detection plane off-center.

The significance of the experiment of ref. 1 is therefore that the standard nonrelativistic quantum theory is not adequate to describe at least one class of phenomena actually seen to occur in nature at low energies (but high frequency), and this fact demands the development of some new theoretical tools which are a proper generalization of the standard theory.

Moshinsky⁷, in 1952, raised the question of interference in time. His calculation, however, was concerned with the evolution of a single wave packet, passed through a spatial slit opened at time $t = 0$. The transient form of the wave function was then calculated; it has the appearance of a Fresnel interference pattern. Using semiclassical time of flight arguments, it was deduced that this behavior could be thought of as an interference in time. The actual superposition of wave functions at two different times was not considered.

In 1976, Horwitz and Rabin⁸ pointed out that the relativistic quantum theory of Stueckelberg predicts interference in time. In this theory, t is treated as a quantum observable, since the Einstein variables x, t are considered, in relativity, as the nontrivial outcome of experiments measuring the place and time of occurrence of events. Their calculation will be briefly redone below for the parameters of the experiment of ref.1.

I first wish to discuss, however, the possibility that the calculations reported in ref.1 could be thought of in another way, i.e., in the framework of the mathematical structure of Floquet theory; this constitutes a well-known way of extending the standard nonrelativistic quantum theory to incorporate t as a dynamical variable.

Floquet theory⁹ was originally intended for the treatment of differential equations with periodic coefficients. It entered physics in an important way in solid state theory where the potential in a crystal is periodic in space. Utilizing the translation operator $U(\mathbf{a}) = e^{i\mathbf{P}\cdot\mathbf{a}}$, where \mathbf{a} is a crystal lattice vector, one can show that the solutions of the Schrödinger equation, as a representation of this translation group, take on the Bloch form.

The idea then arose that for a Hamiltonian periodic in time, the same method could be used. However, since the Hamiltonian commutes with t , to make the group action explicit, it was necessary to introduce a new variable E (the generator of translations in t). The evolution operator was then defined as

$$K = E + H,$$

where $E \equiv -i\hbar\partial_t$. Then, clearly,for

$$U(T) = e^{-iKT}$$

the operator $U(T)$ carries $t \rightarrow t - T$, translating functions of t to the right by T .

The introduction of this modification of the Hamiltonian was also suggested by Howland¹⁰ for both the classical and quantum theories for treating problems in which the Hamiltonian depends on time. For the classical theory, introducing a new parameter of evolution, say s , the Hamilton equations would then include the relations

$$\frac{dt}{ds} = \frac{\partial K}{\partial E}$$

and

$$\frac{dE}{ds} = -\frac{\partial K}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial t},$$

thus providing some interpretation for E . Since then $\frac{dt}{ds} = 1$, by a change of variables, this formulation becomes completely equivalent to the standard form. However, in the quantum theory, the Hamilton equations, as operator equations, imply conditions on expectation values; the variables t and s are then no longer equivalent. In this case, s is the parameter of the motion, and t is a quantum operator, an observable. The wave functions are then coherent in t , making possible interference phenomena in t .

The resulting theory is very different from the standard Schrödinger theory. To see this, let us write the corresponding evolution equation in what I shall call “Floquet theory”, since it has the same structure for the Hilbert space, but I will not insist that H be periodic in t . The mathematical framework is independent of this periodicity (clearly the consequences of the theory, and the results one may obtain are very strong, when H is periodic in t).

The evolution equation has the form

$$\begin{aligned} i\frac{\partial\psi_s}{\partial s} &= K\psi_s \\ &= (-i\hbar\partial_t + H)\psi_s \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where ψ_s is a function of x, t . The functions ψ_s have the property that

$$\|\psi_s\|^2 = \int d^3x dt |\psi_s(x, t)|^2 < \infty, \tag{2}$$

the condition that ψ_s belongs to a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_s (now labelled by s). As pointed out by Kulander and Lewenstein¹¹, if H (or K) is periodic over some hundreds of cycles, it would be a good approximation to assume a “stationary state” in which the s derivative of ψ_s is replaced by an eigenvalue (their equation (72.31)). Such a state would be stationary in s , not t ; the idea is that the spacetime function $\psi_s(x, t)$ reaches a steady form and no longer changes, on the spacetime manifold, as a function of s (up to a phase determined by the eigenvalue). In this case, the solution of eq.(1) amounts formally to an integration of the time dependent Schrödinger equation over t , as carried out in the analysis of ref. 1, with the Hamiltonian shifted by the Floquet eigenvalue (possibly zero). The theory would then predict coherence in t for such a solution. This is not, however, a valid procedure for the conditions of the experiment of ref. 1, since this experiment involves essentially just one and a half cycles.

In the following I calculate the propagator for the Floquet equation (1) for the case of a *free* particle, and compare it with the propagator for the standard Schrödinger equation. This will make the physical differences in the two frameworks more apparent. I will show that even though interference in t is, in principle, possible in the Floquet framework, two narrow pulses of a particle wave function will not interfere unless (a) the pulses initially overlap, or (b) there is a nontrivial t -dependence (but not necessarily periodic) in H , the latter certainly providing an interesting possibility for the application to the experiment we are discussing.

To obtain the form of the propagator, let us consider the x, t matrix elements of the unitary evolution $U(s)$ of ψ_s :

$$\langle x, t|U(s)|x', t'\rangle = \int dE' dE dp' dp'' \langle x, t|E'p'\rangle \langle E'p'|e^{-i(H-E)s}|E''p''\rangle \langle E''p''|x't'\rangle \quad (3)$$

Here, the momenta and coordinates are three dimensional (the differentials are also $dp \equiv d^3p$).

I now assume that H has the free particle form $p^2/2m$ and therefore commutes with E . Then, (3) becomes

$$\langle x, t|U(s)|x', t'\rangle = \delta(t' - t + s) \left(\frac{m}{2\pi i s}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{i\frac{m}{2s}(x-x')^2}. \quad (4)$$

Let us now call the coefficient of the δ function $G(x - x', s)$. The propagation of $\psi_{s'}(x', t')$ to $\psi_s(x, t)$ is given by

$$\psi_s(x, t) = \int dx' dt' \delta(t' - t + (s - s')) G(x - x', s - s') \psi_{s'}(x', t') \quad (5),$$

clearly displaying the possibility of interference in t , i.e., there may be contributions at several different values of t' corresponding to the opening of time gates. However, there is no spreading, in this propagation, of the width of the time pulses, independently of the form of the wave packet $\psi_{s'}(x', t')$.

Consider the contribution of two gates at t_1 and t'_1 . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_s(x, t) = & \int dx' G(x - x', s - s') \\ & \{\delta((s - s') - (t - t_1)) \psi_{s'}(x', t_1) \Delta t_1 + \delta((s - s') - (t - t'_1)) \psi_{s'}(x', t'_1) \Delta t'_1\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where Δt_1 and $\Delta t'_1$ are the (narrow) widths of the gates.

One can evaluate $s - s'$ approximately through the Hamilton equations. Since $dx/ds = p/M$, it follows that $\Delta s \cong ML/p$, where L is the distance from source to detector. Since $dt/ds = 1$, the expectation value of $t(s)$ goes with s , so that $s - s' \cong t - t'$, the latter giving the time from the source gate to the time on the detector when the measurement is made. Due to the delta function constraint, we see that there can be no interference if the source pulses do not overlap. Alternatively, the delta functions would not appear if the Hamiltonian had an explicit t -dependence, and the result would depend on the particular model. Interference in the framework of the Floquet structure, therefore, although in principle possible, would not occur for narrow source pulses in the absence of explicit time dependence in the Hamiltonian.

To compare with the standard Schrödinger treatment, recall that the propagator in that theory is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x|U(t)|x' \rangle &= \left(\frac{m}{2\pi i t}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{i\frac{m}{2t}(x-x')^2} \\ &= G(x - x', t), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where x is here a three dimensional variable. The action of the propagation is

$$\psi_t(x) = \int dx' G(x - x', t - t') \psi_{t'}(x'), \quad (12)$$

where there is no integration over t' , and therefore no mechanism for interference in time. This result, obvious from the form of (12), is a reflection of the arguments of Ludwig³ cited above, and is fundamental to the standard nonrelativistic quantum theory.

The Floquet theory is, in fact, a nonrelativistic limit of Stueckelberg's relativistic quantum theory⁸, the second way of introducing coherence in time which I wish to discuss here. In this theory, interference does not require initial overlap or an explicitly time dependent Hamiltonian. The estimate given below shows that the interference criteria are satisfied with numbers very close to the conditions of the experiment under discussion; the high frequencies required are due in this case to the large value of the velocity of light. In the nonrelativistic limit $c \rightarrow \infty$, the required frequencies go to infinity, i.e., the effect disappears. The Stueckelberg theory⁸ is intrinsically off mass shell; in the limit $c \rightarrow \infty$, it goes on-shell (to a Galilean target mass).

The Stueckelberg theory for the free particle introduces an equation quite similar to that of the Floquet equation, but with an evolution operator that is Lorentz invariant:

$$i \frac{\partial \psi_s}{\partial s} = \frac{p^2 - (\frac{E}{c})^2}{2M} \psi_s, \quad (9)$$

where $\psi_s(x, t)$ satisfies the same normalization condition as for the Floquet theory, on space and time, i.e., $\int |\psi_s(x, t)|^2 d^3x c dt \leq \infty$, and M is the Galilean target mass (the so-called mass shell value for $m^2 c^2 = (E/c)^2 - \mathbf{p}^2$). The propagator has a similar form to that of the Floquet propagator, but is Gaussian in all four variables:

$$\langle x|U(s)|x' \rangle = \left(\frac{M}{2\pi i s}\right)^2 e^{i\frac{M}{2s}(x-x')^2}, \quad (10)$$

where now $(x - x')^2$ is the invariant $(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')^2 - c^2(t - t')^2$; we write x for (x, t) . It is the quadratic term in $t - t'$ in the exponent which leads directly to interference in the same way as the double slit in space. Using the Hamilton equations to estimate $s - s'$ as before, where now (note that this relation allows for two pulses emitted at different times to arrive at a detector at the same time due to the spread in the spectrum of E)

$$\frac{dt}{ds} = \frac{E}{Mc^2}. \quad (11)$$

For 850 nm light, as utilized in the experiment under discussion, $\hbar\omega$ is about $1.46eV$. Using the on-shell value for the electron mass, cp (for p in the beam direction) then has a value of $1.21 \times 10^3 eV$.

The diffraction formula, obtained from (10), using the Hamilton relation

$$\frac{dx}{ds} = \frac{p}{M}, \quad (12)$$

is

$$\varepsilon T \cong \frac{2\pi\hbar L}{\langle p \rangle c^2}, \quad (13)$$

where ε is the gate spacing in time, and T is the time between diffraction peaks at a distance L , which I assume to be about 1 cm. for this experiment. With these values, one finds that

$$\varepsilon T \cong 1.14 \times 10^{-28} sec^2, \quad (14)$$

so that for $\varepsilon \sim T$, $T \sim 10^{-14} sec$. This result, for the pulse rate and the observed diffraction pattern, is in good agreement with the results obtained in the experiment.

More precise estimates can be obtained by taking into account more details of the interaction, and the dependence on L can be used as a parameter to test the reliability of (13). The relativistic model therefore seems to provide a simple description of the experimental results. At very low energies, the Stueckelberg theory, which carries a clear interpretation of t as an observable, reduces approximately to the Floquet form¹¹. The estimate made above therefore includes the result that would be obtained in a low energy Floquet limit.

I thank C. Piron for communications on the question of coherence, and Gerhard Paulus, one of the authors of ref. 1, for discussions of this experiment and the analyses applied. I would also like to thank Igal Aharonovich for bringing the initial announcement of this experiment to my attention.

References

1. F. Lindner, M.G. Schätzel, H. Walther, A. Baltuska, E. Goulielmakis, F. Krausz, D.B. Milošević, D. Bauer, W. Becker and G.G. Paulus, quant-ph/0503165 [to be published, Phys. Rev. Lett.]. See also, Pascal Szriftgiser, David Guéry-Odelin, Markus Arndt and Jean Dalibard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** 0031-9007 (1996); M. Wollenhaupt, A. Assion, D. Liese, Ch. Sarpe-Tudoran, T. Baumert, S. Zamith, M.A. Bouchene, B. Girard, A. Flettner, U. Weichmann and G. Gerber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 0031-9007 (2002).

2. P.A.M. Dirac, *Quantum Mechanics*, First edition, pp.34,36, Oxford Univ. Press, London (1930); *Lectures on Quantum Field Theory*, Academic Press, New York (1966). See also W. Pauli, *General Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, p.63, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg (1980); E. Schrödinger Berl. Ber., p. 238 (1931); P. Carruthers and M.M. Nieto, Rev. Mod. Phys. **40**,411 (1968), and references therein.
3. G. Ludwig, *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics I*, p.295, Springer-Verlag, New York (1983).
4. C.P. Piron, *Foundations of Quantum Physics*, W.A. Benjamin, Reading (1976). See also, C. Piron, physics/0204083 29 Apr. 2002; *Trends in Quantum Mechanics*, eds. H.-D. Doebner *et al*, p.270, World Scientific, Singapore (2000).
5. J.M. Jauch, *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Addison-Wesley, Reading (1968).
6. G.C. Wick, A.S. Wightmann and E. Wigner, Phys. Rev. **88**, 101 (1952). See also C. Piron, Helv. Phys. Acta **42**, 330 (1969).
7. M. Moshinsky, Phys. Rev. **88** 625(1952).
8. L.P. Horwitz and Y. Rabin, Lett. Nuovo Cimento **17**, 501 (1976). The results given here were worked out as a straightforward consequence of L.P. Horwitz and C. Piron, Helv. Phys. Acta **46**, 316 (1973) and E.C.G. Stueckelberg, Hel. Phys. Acta **14**, 372,585 (1941); **15**, 23 (1942).
9. For example, H.L. Cycon, R.G. Froese, W. Kirsch and B. Simon, *Schrödinger Operators with Application to Quantum Mechanics and Global Symmetry*, p. 146, Springer-Verlag, New York (1987); see also, R.M. Potvliege and R. Shakeshaft, *Atoms in Intense Laser Fields*, ed. M. Gavrilla, Academic Press, San Diego (1992); S.I. Chu, Adv. Chem. Phys. **73**,739 (1989). Note that the definition of $H - i\hbar\partial_t$ as a self-adjoint operator is sufficient to define the structure of the Hilbert space and imply Eq. (5).
10. J.S. Howland, Indiana Math. Jour. **28**, 471 (1979).
11. K.C. Kulander and M. Lewenstein, *Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics Handbook* (G.W. Drake, ed.), p. 828, American Institute of Physics Press, Woodbury, N.Y. (1996).
12. L.P. Horwitz, W.C. Schieve and C. Piron, Ann. Phys. **137**, 306(1981); L.P. Horwitz and F. Rotbart, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 2127 (1981).