

**Zeitschrift:** Helvetica Physica Acta  
**Band:** 50 (1977)  
**Heft:** 6

**Artikel:** Indefinite metric, quantum axiomatics, and the Markov property  
**Autor:** Brownell, F.H.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-114888>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 07.08.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

# Indefinite metric, quantum axiomatics, and the Markov property

by **F. H. Brownell**

Department of Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195, U.S.A.

(27. VI. 1977)

*Abstract.* In answer to a remark of Jauch, a set of axioms for an 'indefinite metric' formulation of quantum electro-dynamics is presented, and the connection with orthocomplementation noted. Here a strict version of the Markov property apparently fails, leading to a novel interpretation.

## 0. Introduction

This rather amorphous note grew out of the challenge afforded by the brief remark of Jauch in his book ([4] end. sect. 8–4, p. 131) to the effect that the use of an 'indefinite metric' in attempts at a workable precise formulation of quantum electro-dynamics must be superfluous, in the sense that it should be possible to replace such a 'metric' by a definite one as far as physical results are concerned. Jauch draws this conclusion from the well-known elaboration of the striking von Neumann–Birkhoff theorem yielding an essentially unique definite symmetric bilinear functional from an orthocomplementation on a linear vector space. However, we consider this superfluity conclusion invalid or at least misleading, not through any fault in this von Neumann–Birkhoff theorem or its elaboration, but because the usual 'indefinite metric' formulations implicitly violate Jauch's prior assumptions, in particular not having an orthocomplementation defined for the whole linear vector space in question.

In view of the growing interest in quantum axiomatics (see [5], [6], [3], [7]), and in fairness to the possibilities of 'indefinite metric' formulations, a tentative examination of these hypotheses seems desirable. We have no theorems to prove; instead the above implicit violation is made explicit by stating a collection of axioms for an 'indefinite metric' formulation, adding a few physically motivating remarks. These axioms are noted satisfied for a few interesting models, and we also note a few obvious consequences, particularly concerning the Markov property.

## 1. Axioms and motivation

As explained in Heitler's classic ([2], II sect. 10.2, pp. 90–92), Gupta and Bleuler introduce an 'indefinite metric' (not a mathematical sense metric but an indefinite symmetric bilinear functional) to obtain positive energies for scalar photons; in this

exposition ([2] p. 95, 102) scalar and longitudinal photons are not considered directly observable physically, but correspond to different Lorentz gauge choices. The further extension of such an 'indefinite metric' formulation by the author ([1], sect. 8 and 9) is used to describe consistently certain well-known vacuum effects associated with electron-positron pairs; here the added limbotic component spaces are certainly thought to have no direct physical reality. These considerations are thus formalized by the following axioms (see also [8], 1.9–13).

*Axiom (1.A) (state space)*

There exists a complex Hilbert space  $X_0$ , for which a nonnull vector  $u \in X_0$  corresponds to a directly physically observed situation or state; thus  $X_0$  is called the state Hilbert space, and a state vector is a  $u \in X_0$  having  $1 = \|u\| = \sqrt{(u, u)}$  with  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  the  $X_0$  inner product.

*Axiom (1.B) (including spaces)*

The complex Hilbert spaces  $X_1$  and  $Z$  satisfy with  $X_0$  of axiom (1.A) the subspace inclusions  $X_0 \subseteq X_1 \subseteq Z$  (i.e., for each inclusion the included space is a closed linear manifold of the including space with coincident inner product), and there exists a bounded linear transformation  $D$  from  $X_0$  into  $X_1$  satisfying over all  $u \in X_0$

$$P_0 Du = u, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $P_0$  is the  $Z$  space orthogonal projection operator whose image space is  $X_0$ ; thus  $Q_0 = I - P_0$  and  $Y = Q_0 Z$  have  $Z = X_0 \oplus Y$ , this  $Y$  being called the fictitious component space with all  $v \in Z$  having  $P_0 v = u$  corresponding to the same physical state as  $u \in X_0$ .

*Axiom (1.C) ('indefinite metric')*

Additionally to the  $Z$  inner product there exists another symmetric bilinear functional on  $Z$  denoted  $(\cdot : \cdot)$  (i.e.  $g(u, v) = (u : v)$  defines  $g$  as a complex valued function on  $Z \otimes Z$  which is linear in the first place and conjugate linear in the second and has  $(u : v) = \overline{(v : u)}$  and  $|(u : v)| \leq M \|u\| \|v\|$  over  $u, v \in Z$  for some constant  $M \in (0, +\infty)$ ), which is indefinite (i.e. real  $(u : u)$  takes over  $u \in Z$  both positive and negative values) and on  $X_1$  coincides with the  $Z$  inner product (i.e. over  $u, v \in X_1$

$$(u : v) = (u, v) \quad (1.2)$$

holds); here  $(\cdot : \cdot)$  is called the physical product, and analogous to state vectors in axiom (1.A) a condition vector is a  $u \in Z$  having  $(u : u) = 1$ .

*Axiom (1.D) (dynamical observables)*

A set  $\Gamma$  of linear operators in  $Z$  has each  $B \in \Gamma$  be densely defined and physically symmetric,

$$(Bu : v) = (u : Bv) \quad (1.3)$$

over all  $u, v$  in the  $B$  domain  $D_B$  with  $\bar{D}_B = Z$ ; this  $\Gamma$  is called the set of dynamical observables.

### Axiom (1.E) (Hamiltonian)

There exists  $H \in \Gamma$  of axiom (1.D) such that

$$V_t = e^{-itH} \quad (1.4)$$

suitably defined (see below) over  $t$  real has for each  $u \in X_0$  with  $w_0 = Du \in X_1$  of axiom (1.B) satisfying  $(w_0, w_0) = 1$  that

$$w_t = V_t w_0 \quad (1.5)$$

describes the time evolution of the system starting with  $w_0$ , in which for  $B \in \Gamma$  whenever  $w_t \in D_B$  then

$$(Bw_t : w_t) \quad (1.6)$$

is real and is taken to be the expectation value at time  $t$  of the dynamical observable denoted by  $B$ ; of course  $H$  is called the Hamiltonian.

To comment on the  $V_t$  definition in equation (1.3), if (as in the usual atomic quantum mechanics with no field quantization)  $Z = X_1$  and so  $(u : v) = (u, v)$  on  $Z$  by equation (1.2) (contradicting the (1.C) indefiniteness), then equation (1.3) would make  $H$  be symmetric and hence to be taken self-adjoint, and  $V_t$  in equation (1.4) could then be defined unitary by the usual spectral integral. However,  $Z \neq X_1$  here under axiom (1.C) and the definition of  $V_t$  in equation (1.4) is not clear in general; fortunately in our above formulation [1], there  $H$  becomes bounded on  $Z$  due to momentum cutoffs, and for such of course we define  $e^{-itH} = I + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} (p!)^{-1} (-it)^p H^p$  convergent in operator norm. Thus for  $V_t$  in equation (1.4) we can expect in equation (1.6) by equation (1.3) for  $H$

$$\frac{d}{dt} (Bw_t : w_t) = -i([BH - HB]w_t : w_t) \quad (1.7)$$

as usual, showing by taking  $B = I$  that equation (1.5) has by equation (1.2)

$$(w_t : w_t) = (w_0 : w_0) = (w_0, w_0) = 1 \quad (1.8)$$

over all real  $t$  (making  $w_t$  a condition vector (1.C)) and confirming the expectation value interpretation of equation (1.6).

## 2. Orthocomplementation

As in axiom (1.A),  $X_0$  is considered to contain all the directly physically observable data concerning our system. Thus as in [4], propositions concerning the physically real systems are identified with subspaces (i.e. closed linear manifolds) of  $X_0$ , intuitively the proposition being considered certainly true for the situation described by a state vector in the subspace. Since propositions here are concerned only with physical reality, and likewise for their negatives, they apparently must correspond to objects in  $X_0$  rather than the including  $Z$ . Hence we now take the

negative of a proposition to correspond to the orthogonal complement in  $X_0$  (not in  $Z$ ) of the  $X_0$  subspace corresponding to the original proposition. This of course defines an orthocomplementation on  $X_0$ , but not on  $Z$ , so explaining the breakdown of Jauch's remark mentioned in the introduction.

We remark here that, except for  $P_0$  in equation (1.1) and the resulting  $Z = X_0 \oplus Y$ , the  $Z$  inner product outside  $X_0$  and thus on  $Y$  is not supposed to have any direct physical significance, being merely a mathematical convenience yielding the topology for the operators there. Thus no physically reasonable orthocomplementation on  $Z$  is to be expected.

### 3. Remarks and Markov failure

In axioms (1.A) and (1.B),  $X_0$  is supposed to be the subspace of  $Z$  where no longitudinal or scalar photons are present, and also no limbotic components as in [1];  $X_1$  enlarges over  $X_0$  by allowing the addition of only longitudinal photons, the absence of scalar photons yielding no values  $-1$  for the Gupta-Bleuler factor and thus yielding equation (1.2) on  $X_1$ . Also  $D$  in equation (1.1) is to determine from  $u \in X_0$  a solution  $Du \in X_1$  of the Lorentz condition satisfying equation (1.1).

Also for the time evolution equation (1.5), note from axiom (1.B) that at time  $t = t_1 > 0$  then  $\tilde{u} = P_0 w_{t_1}$  apparently describes our physically real state at time  $t_1$ , and accordingly starting again in equation (1.5) from  $\tilde{w}_0 = \|D\tilde{u}\|^{-1} D\tilde{u}$  (assuming  $\|\tilde{u}\| > 0$  and thus  $\|D\tilde{u}\| \geq \|\tilde{u}\| > 0$  by (1.1)) we generally expect that  $P_0 \tilde{w}_s \neq P_0 w_{s+t_1}$ , equivalently

$$\|DP_0 V_{t_1} w_0\|^{-1} P_0 V_s DP_0 V_{t_1} w_0 \neq P_0 V_{s+t_1} w_0 \quad (3.1)$$

generally over  $w_0 \in DX_0 \subseteq X_1$  having  $\|w_c\| = 1$ , and indeed

$$P_0 V_s DP_0 V_{t_1} w \neq \lambda P_0 V_{s+t_1} w \quad (3.2)$$

for any scalar  $\lambda$  generally over  $w \in DX_0$ . This amounts to the failure of the intuitive Markov property in time, the physical state vector  $\|P_0 w_{t_1}\|^{-1} P_0 w_{t_1}$  at time  $t_1$  apparently not containing all the future determining data entering the unstopped time flow  $w_t = V_t w_0$  at  $t = t_1$ .

To accept this situation we must apparently adopt the following view of quantum mechanics under these section 1 axioms. The flow  $V_t$  in equation (1.5) yields the following prediction statement: if at time  $t = 0$  the initial physical situation is described by the state vector  $u_0 \in X_0$ , then at a time  $t_1 > 0$  the evolved situation is described by the state vector  $\|P_0 V_{t_1} Du_0\|^{-1} P_0 V_{t_1} Du_0$ . But we are not allowed to ask two questions at once generally and so cannot additionally enquire about the situation  $t_2 > t_1$  as well, like the usual failure of independence and disturbance of a state by measurement in quantum mechanics. However, expectation values for  $B \in \Gamma$  (perhaps a very restricted set) are given by equation (1.6) over all time  $t$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] F. H. BROWNELL, *A Limbotic Reformulation of Quantum Electrodynamics and the Lamb Shift Basis*, LDOOO12 (University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1973).
- [2] W. HEITLER, *The Quantum Theory of Radiation*, 3rd ed. (Oxford Univ. Press, 1954).
- [3] C. A. HOOKER (ed), *The Logico-Algebraic Approach to Quantum Mechanics*, vols. I and II (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1975, 1976).
- [4] J. M. JAUCH, *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley, 1968).
- [5] G. W. MACKEY, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Benjamin, 1963).
- [6] V. S. VARADARAJAN, *Geometry of Quantum Theory*, vols 1 and 2 (Van Nostrand, 1968, 1970).
- [7] A. S. WIGHTMAN, *Hilbert's Sixth Problem: Mathematical Treatment of the Axioms of Physics*, pp. 147–240, *Mathematical Developments Arising from Hilbert Problems*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 28, A.M.S., (1976).
- [8] A. S. WIGHTMAN and F. STROCHI, *J. Math. Phys.* 15, 2198 (1974).

