IPP-QM-16: Wavefunction realism

James Read[1]

[1] Faculty of Philosophy, University of Oxford, UK, OX2 6GG

MT25

The course

1. Basic quantum formalism
2. Density operators and entanglement
3. Decoherence
4. The measurement problem
5. Dynamical collapse theories
6. Bohmian mechanics
7. Everettian structure
8. Everettian probability
9. EPR and Bell's theorem
10. The Bell-CHSH inequalities and possible responses
11. Contextuality
12. The PBR theorem
13. Quantum logic
14. QBism
15. Pragmatism and relational quantum mechanics
16. Wavefunction realism

Today

Quantum state ontology

Wavefunction realism

State vector realism

Spacetime state realism

Wrapping up

Today

Quantum state ontology

Wavefunction realism

State vector realism

Spacetime state realism

Wrapping up

Wavefunction ontology and spacetime structure

I want to close these lectures by asking the following questions: *What is the ontology of the quantum state? On which space does it live?*

Wavefunction ontology and spacetime structure

I want to close these lectures by asking the following questions: *What is the ontology of the quantum state? On which space does it live?*

These questions are (broadly) *distinct* from solutions to the measurement problem. E.g., all of the three major realist approaches to quantum mechanics (dynamical collapse, Bohmian mechanics, Everett) will have to contend with them.

Quantum state ontology

"What is the ontology of the quantum state? On which space does it live?"

Quantum state ontology

“What is the ontology of the quantum state? On which space does it live?”

Here, I’ll explore three options for answering these questions:

Quantum state ontology

"What is the ontology of the quantum state? On which space does it live?"

Here, I'll explore three options for answering these questions:

1. Wavefunction realism.
2. Hilbert space realism.
3. Spacetime state realism.

Quantum state ontology

> *"What is the ontology of the quantum state? On which space does it live?"*

Here, I'll explore three options for answering these questions:

1. Wavefunction realism.
2. Hilbert space realism.
3. Spacetime state realism.

(There are others, e.g. that of Deutsch & Hayden (2000), which I won't consider here.)

Today

Quantum state ontology

Wavefunction realism

State vector realism

Spacetime state realism

Wrapping up

Wavefunction realism

Wavefunction realism

- Often (albeit not always, of course), the quantum state is represented by a complex-valued field on $3N$-dimensional configuration space.

Wavefunction realism

- Often (albeit not always, of course), the quantum state is represented by a complex-valued field on $3N$-dimensional configuration space.
- *Wavefunction realism*, associated in particular with Ney (2020), proposes to take this seriously as the basic ontological commitment of quantum mechanics.

Wavefunction realism

- Often (albeit not always, of course), the quantum state is represented by a complex-valued field on $3N$-dimensional configuration space.
- *Wavefunction realism*, associated in particular with Ney (2020), proposes to take this seriously as the basic ontological commitment of quantum mechanics.
- Note that

Wavefunction realism

- Often (albeit not always, of course), the quantum state is represented by a complex-valued field on $3N$-dimensional configuration space.
- *Wavefunction realism*, associated in particular with Ney (2020), proposes to take this seriously as the basic ontological commitment of quantum mechanics.
- Note that
    1. this is orthogonal to the question of which (if any) of the realist approaches to quantum mechanics solves the measurement problem, and

Wavefunction realism

- Often (albeit not always, of course), the quantum state is represented by a complex-valued field on $3N$-dimensional configuration space.
- *Wavefunction realism*, associated in particular with Ney (2020), proposes to take this seriously as the basic ontological commitment of quantum mechanics.
- Note that
  1. this is orthogonal to the question of which (if any) of the realist approaches to quantum mechanics solves the measurement problem, and
  2. the name of the view is somewhat confusing since *all* the views we'll look at are realist about the quantum state.

Ney on wavefunction realism

According to wave function realism, [...] although we may seem to occupy a three-dimensional space of the kind described by classical physics, the more fundamental spatial framework of quantum worlds like ours is instead quite different, one of very many dimensions, with no three of these dimensions corresponding to the heights, widths, and depths of our ordinary experience. (Ney 2020, pp. ix–x)

Cue incredulous states?

This is a fantastical thesis. So why believe it?

Cue incredulous states?

This is a fantastical thesis. So why believe it?

Ney claims that wavefunction realism offers a clear ontology which is both *local* and *separable*.

The separability claim

It [the wave function, according to wavefunction realism] is separable because all states of the wave function, including the entangled states we have been considering, are completely determined by localized assignments of amplitude and phase to each point in the higher-dimensional space of the wave function. (Ney 2020, p. 87)

The locality claim

That wavefunction realism affords an ontology satisfying the principle of locality again appears to be immediate, since there indeed appears to be 'no action at a distance' on *configuration space*.

The argument from locality and separability

- Ney (pp. 128–9) claims that a metaphysics which is local and separable is simpler, and more congenial to intuitions.

The argument from locality and separability

- Ney (pp. 128–9) claims that a metaphysics which is local and separable is simpler, and more congenial to intuitions.
- But to what extent should we place importance upon these desiderata?

The argument from locality and separability

- Ney (pp. 128–9) claims that a metaphysics which is local and separable is simpler, and more congenial to intuitions.
- But to what extent should we place importance upon these desiderata?
  - Different notions of simplicity and associated virtues.

The argument from locality and separability

- Ney (pp. 128–9) claims that a metaphysics which is local and separable is simpler, and more congenial to intuitions.
- But to what extent should we place importance upon these desiderata?
  - Different notions of simplicity and associated virtues.
  - Significance of intuitions in physical theorising?

Objections to wavefunction realism

This all seems reasonably nice—but there are a number of objections which one can levy against wavefunction realism:

Objections to wavefunction realism

This all seems reasonably nice—but there are a number of objections which one can levy against wavefunction realism:

1. Wavefunction realism misrepresents the structure of quantum mechanics by singling out the position basis for special treatment.

Objections to wavefunction realism

This all seems reasonably nice—but there are a number of objections which one can levy against wavefunction realism:

1. Wavefunction realism misrepresents the structure of quantum mechanics by singling out the position basis for special treatment.
2. It is difficult to extend this to quantum field theory, where no single basis seems to have the preferred status which the position basis might arguably be said to have in non-relativistic quantum mechanics.

Objections to wavefunction realism

This all seems reasonably nice—but there are a number of objections which one can levy against wavefunction realism:

1. Wavefunction realism misrepresents the structure of quantum mechanics by singling out the position basis for special treatment.
2. It is difficult to extend this to quantum field theory, where no single basis seems to have the preferred status which the position basis might arguably be said to have in non-relativistic quantum mechanics.
3. The ontological picture, indeed, becomes extremely extravagant in QFT.

Objections to wavefunction realism

This all seems reasonably nice—but there are a number of objections which one can levy against wavefunction realism:

1. Wavefunction realism misrepresents the structure of quantum mechanics by singling out the position basis for special treatment.
2. It is difficult to extend this to quantum field theory, where no single basis seems to have the preferred status which the position basis might arguably be said to have in non-relativistic quantum mechanics.
3. The ontological picture, indeed, becomes extremely extravagant in QFT.
4. Difficult to recover ordinary three-dimensional spacetime ontology.

Objections to wavefunction realism

This all seems reasonably nice—but there are a number of objections which one can levy against wavefunction realism:

1. Wavefunction realism misrepresents the structure of quantum mechanics by singling out the position basis for special treatment.
2. It is difficult to extend this to quantum field theory, where no single basis seems to have the preferred status which the position basis might arguably be said to have in non-relativistic quantum mechanics.
3. The ontological picture, indeed, becomes extremely extravagant in QFT.
4. Difficult to recover ordinary three-dimensional spacetime ontology.

Objection 1: basis-relativity

- Ney objects to the claim that wavefunction realism always privileges the position basis:

Objection 1: basis-relativity

- Ney objects to the claim that wavefunction realism always privileges the position basis:

  In the absence of a Lorentz covariant position representation for a quantum field theory, the wave function realist will construct her higher-dimensional representation using a different kind of basis. The example above used a momentum basis. (Ney 2020, p. 159)

Objection 1: basis-relativity

- Ney objects to the claim that wavefunction realism always privileges the position basis:

  In the absence of a Lorentz covariant position representation for a quantum field theory, the wave function realist will construct her higher-dimensional representation using a different kind of basis. The example above used a momentum basis. (Ney 2020, p. 159)

- But this equivocates between (i) non-relativistic quantum mechanics (where wavefunction realism indeed privileges the position basis), and (ii) relativistic QFT (where wavefunction realists have to do something else).

Objection 1: basis-relativity

- Ney objects to the claim that wavefunction realism always privileges the position basis:

  In the absence of a Lorentz covariant position representation for a quantum field theory, the wave function realist will construct her higher-dimensional representation using a different kind of basis. The example above used a momentum basis. (Ney 2020, p. 159)

- But this equivocates between (i) non-relativistic quantum mechanics (where wavefunction realism indeed privileges the position basis), and (ii) relativistic QFT (where wavefunction realists have to do something else).
- And in any case, even granting this, Ney must contend with the apparent basis-dependence of wavefunction realism *in general*: *some* basis always has to be preferred.

Objections to wavefunction realism

This all seems reasonably nice—but there are a number of objections which one can levy against wavefunction realism:

1. Wavefunction realism misrepresents the structure of quantum mechanics by singling out the position basis for special treatment.
2. It is difficult to extend this to quantum field theory, where no single basis seems to have the preferred status which the position basis might arguably be said to have in non-relativistic quantum mechanics.
3. The ontological picture, indeed, becomes extremely extravagant in QFT.
4. Difficult to recover ordinary three-dimensional spacetime ontology.

Objection 2: Privileged bases in QFT

- As we just saw, Ney concedes that one will have to choose some non-position basis in QFT.

Objection 2: Privileged bases in QFT

- As we just saw, Ney concedes that one will have to choose some non-position basis in QFT.
- ...but then why stress so much configuration space in the presentation of the view?

Objections to wavefunction realism

This all seems reasonably nice—but there are a number of objections which one can levy against wavefunction realism:

1. Wavefunction realism misrepresents the structure of quantum mechanics by singling out the position basis for special treatment.
2. It is difficult to extend this to quantum field theory, where no single basis seems to have the preferred status which the position basis might arguably be said to have in non-relativistic quantum mechanics.
3. The ontological picture, indeed, becomes extremely extravagant in QFT.
4. Difficult to recover ordinary three-dimensional spacetime ontology.

Objection 3: Applicability to QFT

One can also worry more generally about the applicability of wavefunction realism to QFT.

Objection 3: Applicability to QFT

One can also worry more generally about the applicability of wavefunction realism to QFT.

Before I present those worries, let's look at a general move which Ney tries to make to anticipate and block them:

Objection 3: Applicability to QFT

One can also worry more generally about the applicability of wavefunction realism to QFT.

Before I present those worries, let's look at a general move which Ney tries to make to anticipate and block them:

> *It is an interesting question whether wave function realism must, to be viable as a framework for interpreting quantum theories, have application beyond the domain of nonrelativistic quantum mechanics. Must a framework for the ontological interpretation of a quantum theory be workable as an interpretation for all quantum theories? I do not see why it must.* (Ney 2020, p. 134)

Objection 3: Applicability to QFT

One can also worry more generally about the applicability of wavefunction realism to QFT.

Before I present those worries, let's look at a general move which Ney tries to make to anticipate and block them:

> *It is an interesting question whether wave function realism must, to be viable as a framework for interpreting quantum theories, have application beyond the domain of nonrelativistic quantum mechanics. Must a framework for the ontological interpretation of a quantum theory be workable as an interpretation for all quantum theories? I do not see why it must.* (Ney 2020, p. 134)

Answer: If it's suppose to be offering a fundamental metaphysics of the world, it seems inadequate to restrict attention to non-relativistic quantum mechanics.

Applicability of QFT?

Ney also suggests that relativistic QFT does not have broad application and so can be set aside:

Applicability of QFT?

Ney also suggests that relativistic QFT does not have broad application and so can be set aside:

> *It can be questioned whether quantum field theories are more general than nonrelativistic quantum mechanics. This comes down to which kinds of theories are applicable to the most phenomena in nature. It may be argued that actually in physics, nonrelativistic quantum mechanics gets applied to more phenomena; however, I won't engage in this bean-counting exercise.* (Ney 2020, p. 134)

Applicability of QFT?

Ney also suggests that relativistic QFT does not have broad application and so can be set aside:

> *It can be questioned whether quantum field theories are more general than nonrelativistic quantum mechanics. This comes down to which kinds of theories are applicable to the most phenomena in nature. It may be argued that actually in physics, nonrelativistic quantum mechanics gets applied to more phenomena; however, I won't engage in this bean-counting exercise.* (Ney 2020, p. 134)

But, on the contrary, *overwhelmingly* more empirical results require recourse to QFT for their explanation than to non-relativistic QM alone—see (Wallace 2022).

Problems from relativistic QFT

So what are the problems for wavefunction realism presented by relativistic QFT?

Problems from relativistic QFT

So what are the problems for wavefunction realism presented by relativistic QFT? Here I'll focus on two:

1. The problem of fermions.
2. The problem of particle non-conservation.

The problem of fermions

[O]nly bosonic field theories can be represented as wavefunctions on configuration space. Others—the 'fermionic' field theories that represent electrons and quarks (and so are central to our quantum-mechanical descriptions of ordinary matter)—possess no such representation. (Wallace 2021, p. 6)

The problem of fermions

> *[O]nly bosonic field theories can be represented as wavefunctions on configuration space. Others—the 'fermionic' field theories that represent electrons and quarks (and so are central to our quantum-mechanical descriptions of ordinary matter)—possess no such representation.* (Wallace 2021, p. 6)

Ney's response:

> *The consideration of quantum field theories for fermionic particles, or those with charge or spin, would not affect the general ontological points that follow.* (Ney 2020, p. 144)

The problem of fermions

> *[O]nly bosonic field theories can be represented as wavefunctions on configuration space. Others—the 'fermionic' field theories that represent electrons and quarks (and so are central to our quantum-mechanical descriptions of ordinary matter)—possess no such representation.* (Wallace 2021, p. 6)

Ney's response:

> *The consideration of quantum field theories for fermionic particles, or those with charge or spin, would not affect the general ontological points that follow.* (Ney 2020, p. 144)

Question: Do you find this convincing? (Why would it not change the points that follow?)

The problem of particle non-conservation

Since in relativistic QFT particle number is not conserved,

> *the wave function realist should instead postulate an infinite number of (non-normalized) wave functions: a single-particle wave function living on a three-dimensional space; a two-particle wave function living on a six-dimensional space, and so on. However, [...] the wave function realist will not prefer to adopt such an ontologically profligate metaphysics'.* (Ney 2020, pp. 135–6)

The problem of particle non-conservation

Since in relativistic QFT particle number is not conserved,

> *the wave function realist should instead postulate an infinite number of (non-normalized) wave functions: a single-particle wave function living on a three-dimensional space; a two-particle wave function living on a six-dimensional space, and so on. However, [...] the wave function realist will not prefer to adopt such an ontologically profligate metaphysics'.* (Ney 2020, pp. 135–6)

(This objection is raised by, for example, Wallace & Timpson (2010).)

Ney on this problem

> *[A]ssuming that the spacetime representation from which we began is continuous, the higher-dimensional space will be continuously infinite-dimensional with each point corresponding to an assignment of field operators to all spacetime points or, assuming discreteness, to the smallest regions in the low-dimensional representation.*
>
> *At this stage, we may note that we are no longer considering wave functions on a space with the structure of a classical configuration space as the central elements in the wave function realist's basic ontology. What we have instead is a field defined on another kind of high-dimensional space, one for which locations are correlated with assignments of field operators to regions in a four-dimensional ontology.* (Ney 2020, p. 149)

Wallace in response

> *My immediate feeling about this move is: if what is really intended is a wavefunction on field configuration space, shouldn't we be discussing that metaphysics rather than being distracted by the red herring of wavefunctions on N-particle configuration space? Granted, the latter has the virtue of being simpler to talk about, but it has the vice of being inconsistent with our current best quantum theories, which seems more serious.* (Wallace 2021, pp. 4–5)

Wallace in response

> *My immediate feeling about this move is: if what is really intended is a wavefunction on field configuration space, shouldn't we be discussing that metaphysics rather than being distracted by the red herring of wavefunctions on N-particle configuration space? Granted, the latter has the virtue of being simpler to talk about, but it has the vice of being inconsistent with our current best quantum theories, which seems more serious.* (Wallace 2021, pp. 4–5)

...and might the wavefunction-on-field-configuration-space view be too much ontology to swallow?

Objections to wavefunction realism

This all seems reasonably nice—but there are a number of objections which one can levy against wavefunction realism:

1. Wavefunction realism misrepresents the structure of quantum mechanics by singling out the position basis for special treatment.
2. It is difficult to extend this to quantum field theory, where no single basis seems to have the preferred status which the position basis might arguably be said to have in non-relativistic quantum mechanics.
3. The ontological picture, indeed, becomes extremely extravagant in QFT.
4. Difficult to recover ordinary three-dimensional spacetime ontology.

Objection 4: Recovery of a spatial ontology

- How to recover an ontology of events in 3-dimensional space from this picture?

Objection 4: Recovery of a spatial ontology

- How to recover an ontology of events in 3-dimensional space from this picture?
- Perhaps such concerns miss the point—for (in the spirit of functionalism) all that is needed is that we recover high-level ontology at a structural level.

Objection 4: Recovery of a spatial ontology

- How to recover an ontology of events in 3-dimensional space from this picture?
- Perhaps such concerns miss the point—for (in the spirit of functionalism) all that is needed is that we recover high-level ontology at a structural level.
- This, indeed, is in line with the functionalism invoked by Albert (2013):

> *[I]f we can characterize* what it is for there to be *a three-dimensional object in terms of the playing of some functional role, and the wave function plays that role, then the wave function will* ipso facto *be capable of constituting three-dimensional objects.* (Ney 2020, p. 211)

Objection 4: Recovery of a spatial ontology

- How to recover an ontology of events in 3-dimensional space from this picture?
- Perhaps such concerns miss the point—for (in the spirit of functionalism) all that is needed is that we recover high-level ontology at a structural level.
- This, indeed, is in line with the functionalism invoked by Albert (2013):

> *[I]f we can characterize* what it is for there to be *a three-dimensional object in terms of the playing of some functional role, and the wave function plays that role, then the wave function will* ipso facto *be capable of constituting three-dimensional objects.* (Ney 2020, p. 211)

- Note: Ney (2020, ch. 7) prefers an alternative story here, invoking the metaphysics of grounding/mereology.

Objection 4: Recovery of a spatial ontology

- How to recover an ontology of events in 3-dimensional space from this picture?
- Perhaps such concerns miss the point—for (in the spirit of functionalism) all that is needed is that we recover high-level ontology at a structural level.
- This, indeed, is in line with the functionalism invoked by Albert (2013):

> *[I]f we can characterize* what it is for there to be *a three-dimensional object in terms of the playing of some functional role, and the wave function plays that role, then the wave function will* ipso facto *be capable of constituting three-dimensional objects.* (Ney 2020, p. 211)

- Note: Ney (2020, ch. 7) prefers an alternative story here, invoking the metaphysics of grounding/mereology.
- **Question:** What do you make of this invocation of functionalism?

Summary so far

We've seen that wavefunction realism faces a number of challenges—to do with, *inter alia*,

Summary so far

We've seen that wavefunction realism faces a number of challenges—to do with, *inter alia*,

1. privileging a particular basis,
2. extensions to QFT, and
3. recovery of a 3D spatial ontology.

Summary so far

We've seen that wavefunction realism faces a number of challenges—to do with, *inter alia*,

1. privileging a particular basis,
2. extensions to QFT, and
3. recovery of a 3D spatial ontology.

Let's now move on to consider—briefly—a possible alternative to wavefunction realism: *state vector realism*.

Today

Quantum state ontology

Wavefunction realism

State vector realism

Spacetime state realism

Wrapping up

State vector realism

- In response to the apparent basis-dependence of wavefunction realism, one suggestion would be to represent the world by a state vector in Hilbert space, and have this representation guide one's fundamental ontology.

State vector realism

- In response to the apparent basis-dependence of wavefunction realism, one suggestion would be to represent the world by a state vector in Hilbert space, and have this representation guide one's fundamental ontology.
- This is a view which Carroll and Singh (2019)—unhelpfully (because as I already mentioned, these debates are orthogonal to the measurement problem)—dub 'Mad-Dog Everettianism'.

State vector realism

- In response to the apparent basis-dependence of wavefunction realism, one suggestion would be to represent the world by a state vector in Hilbert space, and have this representation guide one's fundamental ontology.
- This is a view which Carroll and Singh (2019)—unhelpfully (because as I already mentioned, these debates are orthogonal to the measurement problem)—dub 'Mad-Dog Everettianism'.
- This position would avoid the basis-relativity charge; however, it's not clear that it would avoid (some of) the other issues with QFT (e.g., rebarbatively infinite-dimensional spaces).

State vector realism

- In response to the apparent basis-dependence of wavefunction realism, one suggestion would be to represent the world by a state vector in Hilbert space, and have this representation guide one's fundamental ontology.
- This is a view which Carroll and Singh (2019)—unhelpfully (because as I already mentioned, these debates are orthogonal to the measurement problem)—dub 'Mad-Dog Everettianism'.
- This position would avoid the basis-relativity charge; however, it's not clear that it would avoid (some of) the other issues with QFT (e.g., rebarbatively infinite-dimensional spaces).
- Ney (2022) also has a couple of objections to state vector realism which are worth looking at...

Ney on state vector realism

First objection: “The ray-in-Hilbert space view fails to be separable because it lacks in the first place an ontology of distinct objects occupying nonoverlapping regions.”

Ney on state vector realism

First objection: “The ray-in-Hilbert space view fails to be separable because it lacks in the first place an ontology of distinct objects occupying nonoverlapping regions.”

- The claim appears incorrect, for whether there is ‘an ontology of distinct objects’ should surely not depend upon the basis which one chooses.

Ney on state vector realism

First objection: "The ray-in-Hilbert space view fails to be separable because it lacks in the first place an ontology of distinct objects occupying nonoverlapping regions."

- The claim appears incorrect, for whether there is 'an ontology of distinct objects' should surely not depend upon the basis which one chooses.
- In any case, perhaps separability is, in the end, not the be-all and end-all of physical interpretation.

Ney on state vector realism

First objection: “The ray-in-Hilbert space view fails to be separable because it lacks in the first place an ontology of distinct objects occupying nonoverlapping regions.”

- The claim appears incorrect, for whether there is ‘an ontology of distinct objects’ should surely not depend upon the basis which one chooses.
- In any case, perhaps separability is, in the end, not the be-all and end-all of physical interpretation.

Second objection: “If we are going to take seriously a fundamental ontology for quantum theories, we must find some way of demonstrating how that ontology may ultimately constitute the macroscopic objects that we already know exist.”

Ney on state vector realism

First objection: “The ray-in-Hilbert space view fails to be separable because it lacks in the first place an ontology of distinct objects occupying nonoverlapping regions.”

- The claim appears incorrect, for whether there is ‘an ontology of distinct objects’ should surely not depend upon the basis which one chooses.
- In any case, perhaps separability is, in the end, not the be-all and end-all of physical interpretation.

Second objection: “If we are going to take seriously a fundamental ontology for quantum theories, we must find some way of demonstrating how that ontology may ultimately constitute the macroscopic objects that we already know exist.”

- But all of the structure encoded in the wave function is still present in the ray-in-Hilbert-space approach: indeed, it *must* be, since one can move from the latter to the former by simply choosing a basis.

Summarising again

- So state vector realism avoids the basis-relativity charge, but still faces some of the other worries which were a problem for wavefunction realism.

Summarising again

- So state vector realism avoids the basis-relativity charge, but still faces some of the other worries which were a problem for wavefunction realism.
- Moreover, it's not obvious that Ney's critiques of state vector realism find their mark.

Summarising again

- So state vector realism avoids the basis-relativity charge, but still faces some of the other worries which were a problem for wavefunction realism.
- Moreover, it's not obvious that Ney's critiques of state vector realism find their mark.
- Let's now look at a third very different option for cashing out wavefunction ontology: *spacetime state realism* (Wallace & Timpson 2010).

Today

Our heroes

Spacetime state realism

According to spacetime state realism (SSR), the fundamental ontology of a quantum mechanical world consists of a state-valued field evolving in four-dimensional spacetime. Each spacetime region is associated with a local Hilbert space whose density operators represent the possible values of the field in that region. Much as in classical field theories, these field values are interpreted as characterizing the intrinsic, local properties of the region. (Swanson 2020, p. 934)

Spacetime state realism vs. wavefunction realism

Essentially, the tradeoff between spacetime state realism and wavefunction realism is this:

Spacetime state realism vs. wavefunction realism

Essentially, the tradeoff between spacetime state realism and wavefunction realism is this:

1. Spacetime state realism has a *complicated* (density matrix valued) field on a *simple* (3D) spacetime.
2. Wavefunction realism has a *simple* (complex scalar valued) field on a *complicated* (3N-D) spacetime.

Spacetime state realism vs. wavefunction realism

Essentially, the tradeoff between spacetime state realism and wavefunction realism is this:

1. Spacetime state realism has a *complicated* (density matrix valued) field on a *simple* (3D) spacetime.
2. Wavefunction realism has a *simple* (complex scalar valued) field on a *complicated* (3N-D) spacetime.

Let's now see how spacetime state realism works in a little more detail...

Spacetime state realism

- Suppose that the universe can be divided into subsystems, so that

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigotimes_{A_i} \mathcal{H}_{A_i}.$$

Spacetime state realism

- Suppose that the universe can be divided into subsystems, so that
$$\mathcal{H} = \bigotimes_{A_i} \mathcal{H}_{A_i}.$$
- If the state of the universe is $|\psi\rangle$, then the state of some subsystem A is the partial trace of $|\psi\rangle$ over all components of the above equation except the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$ corresponding to A itself.

Spacetime state realism

- Suppose that the universe can be divided into subsystems, so that
$$\mathcal{H} = \bigotimes_{A_i} \mathcal{H}_{A_i}.$$
- If the state of the universe is $|\psi\rangle$, then the state of some subsystem A is the partial trace of $|\psi\rangle$ over all components of the above equation except the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$ corresponding to A itself.
- According to spacetime state realism, the density operator of each subsystem represents the intrinsic properties which the subsystem instantiates.

Spacetime state realism

- Suppose that the universe can be divided into subsystems, so that
$$\mathcal{H} = \bigotimes_{A_i} \mathcal{H}_{A_i}.$$
- If the state of the universe is $|\psi\rangle$, then the state of some subsystem A is the partial trace of $|\psi\rangle$ over all components of the above equation except the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$ corresponding to A itself.
- According to spacetime state realism, the density operator of each subsystem represents the intrinsic properties which the subsystem instantiates.
- Cf. the fact that the field values associated to each spacetime point in electromagnetism represent the intrinsic (electromagnetic) properties of that point.

Spacetime state realism

- Suppose that the universe can be divided into subsystems, so that
$$\mathcal{H} = \bigotimes_{A_i} \mathcal{H}_{A_i}.$$
- If the state of the universe is $|\psi\rangle$, then the state of some subsystem A is the partial trace of $|\psi\rangle$ over all components of the above equation except the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$ corresponding to A itself.
- According to spacetime state realism, the density operator of each subsystem represents the intrinsic properties which the subsystem instantiates.
- Cf. the fact that the field values associated to each spacetime point in electromagnetism represent the intrinsic (electromagnetic) properties of that point.
- (Of course, the properties here won't be scalars or vectors, but in general more complicated things.)

Illustration from Wallace

To provide a simple model, imagine a Universe consisting of a great many interacting qubits whose space-time trajectories we approximate as classical [...] The qubits each bear the property or properties represented by their two-dimensional density operator; pairings of qubits bear properties represented by a four-dimensional operator; and so on. There need be no reason to blanch at an ontology merely because the basic properties are represented by such objects: we know of no rule of segregation which states that, for example, only those mathematical items to which one is introduced sufficiently early on in the schoolroom get to count as possible representatives of physical quantities! (Wallace 2012, p. 299)

Illustration from Wallace

To provide a simple model, imagine a Universe consisting of a great many interacting qubits whose spacetime trajectories we approximate as classical [...] The qubits each bear the property or properties represented by their two-dimensional density operator; pairings of qubits bear properties represented by a four-dimensional operator; and so on. There need be no reason to blanch at an ontology merely because the basic properties are represented by such objects: we know of no rule of segregation which states that, for example, only those mathematical items to which one is introduced sufficiently early on in the schoolroom get to count as possible representatives of physical quantities! (Wallace 2012, p. 299)

Features of spacetime state realism

- Spacetime state realism gives the ontology which we saw in the context of Everett on EPR in Lecture 10: local but non-separable physics.

Features of spacetime state realism

- Spacetime state realism gives the ontology which we saw in the context of Everett on EPR in Lecture 10: local but non-separable physics.
- Ney does not like this non-separability which is baked into spacetime state realism.

Features of spacetime state realism

- Spacetime state realism gives the ontology which we saw in the context of Everett on EPR in Lecture 10: local but non-separable physics.
- Ney does not like this non-separability which is baked into spacetime state realism.
- However, one can ask: (a) what is so bad about this? (b) isn't this a price worth paying for compatibility with QFT? Etc.

Features of spacetime state realism

- Spacetime state realism gives the ontology which we saw in the context of Everett on EPR in Lecture 10: local but non-separable physics.
- Ney does not like this non-separability which is baked into spacetime state realism.
- However, one can ask: (a) what is so bad about this? (b) isn't this a price worth paying for compatibility with QFT? Etc.
- Swanson (2020) has a number of technical worries about spacetime state realism—let's look into them briefly.

von Neumann algebras

More general than our states-in-a-Hilbert space picture of quantum mechanics is the *algebraic* framework.

von Neumann algebras

More general than our states-in-a-Hilbert space picture of quantum mechanics is the *algebraic* framework.

Different so-called ‘types’ of von Neumann algebras encode different amounts of structure:

von Neumann algebras

More general than our states-in-a-Hilbert space picture of quantum mechanics is the *algebraic* framework.

Different so-called ‘types’ of von Neumann algebras encode different amounts of structure:

- Type I: Admit pure states. (So vectors in Hilbert spaces.)
- Type II: Admit only mixed states. (So density matrices, but not vectors in Hilbert spaces.)
- Type III: No density matrices at all.

von Neumann algebras

More general than our states-in-a-Hilbert space picture of quantum mechanics is the *algebraic* framework.

Different so-called ‘types’ of von Neumann algebras encode different amounts of structure:

- Type I: Admit pure states. (So vectors in Hilbert spaces.)
- Type II: Admit only mixed states. (So density matrices, but not vectors in Hilbert spaces.)
- Type III: No density matrices at all.

The algebras associated with quantum field theories are generically Type III!

Swanson's challenge

I argue that the original density operator formulation of SSR cannot be extended to QFTs where the local observables form type III von Neumann algebras. (Swanson 2020, p. 933)

Wallace's anticipated reply

> *Wallace ([2006], [2011]) forcefully argues that when interpreting QFT we should be cautious of drawing metaphysical conclusions from the short-distance/high-energy aspects of the theory. He contends that QFTs like the standard model are best viewed as effective field theories, low-energy approximations of some unknown, underlying theory of quantum gravity. [...] Consequently, Wallace and Timpson urge that for all practical purposes we can ignore the complications created by non-type I algebras.* (Swanson 2020, p. 943)

Swanson's rejoinder

SSR has the potential to be a highly general ontology for quantum theories of all shapes and sizes. We have many reasons to explore the metaphysics of exact, non-approximate QFTs. [...] All things considered, it would be far better to have a version of SSR that can be applied both to effective and exact models of QFT regardless of what type the local algebras turn out to be. (Swanson 2020, pp. 943–44)

Swanson's rejoinder

> *SSR has the potential to be a highly general ontology for quantum theories of all shapes and sizes. We have many reasons to explore the metaphysics of exact, non-approximate QFTs. [...] All things considered, it would be far better to have a version of SSR that can be applied both to effective and exact models of QFT regardless of what type the local algebras turn out to be.* (Swanson 2020, pp. 943–44)

Swanson thinks that SSR can be patched up to be compatible with Type III algebras, but his proposal (in terms of presheaves etc.) is very technically involved!

The tradeoff

Let's step back:

The tradeoff

Let's step back:

- Wavefunction realism seems to have the advantage of offering an ontology which is local and separable.

The tradeoff

Let's step back:

- Wavefunction realism seems to have the advantage of offering an ontology which is local and separable.
- However, it has both technical and conceptual issues, which might sway one to prefer something else, e.g. spacetime state realism...

The tradeoff

Let's step back:

- Wavefunction realism seems to have the advantage of offering an ontology which is local and separable.
- However, it has both technical and conceptual issues, which might sway one to prefer something else, e.g. spacetime state realism...
- ...but those alternatives also have unresolved issues of their own.

Today

Quantum state ontology

Wavefunction realism

State vector realism

Spacetime state realism

Wrapping up

Wrapping up

Over the course of these lectures, I've:

Wrapping up

Over the course of these lectures, I've:

1. Reviewed the formalism of quantum mechanics.

Wrapping up

Over the course of these lectures, I've:

1. Reviewed the formalism of quantum mechanics.
2. Introduced the measurement problem.

Wrapping up

Over the course of these lectures, I've:

1. Reviewed the formalism of quantum mechanics.
2. Introduced the measurement problem.
3. Presented the three main realist approaches to QM: GRW, Bohm, and Everett.

Wrapping up

Over the course of these lectures, I've:

1. Reviewed the formalism of quantum mechanics.
2. Introduced the measurement problem.
3. Presented the three main realist approaches to QM: GRW, Bohm, and Everett.
4. Discussed the main no-go theorems (Bell, BKS, PBR).

Wrapping up

Over the course of these lectures, I've:

1. Reviewed the formalism of quantum mechanics.
2. Introduced the measurement problem.
3. Presented the three main realist approaches to QM: GRW, Bohm, and Everett.
4. Discussed the main no-go theorems (Bell, BKS, PBR).
5. Seen some more niche approaches to QM (quantum logic, QBism, pragmatism, relational quantum mechanics).

Wrapping up

Over the course of these lectures, I've:

1. Reviewed the formalism of quantum mechanics.
2. Introduced the measurement problem.
3. Presented the three main realist approaches to QM: GRW, Bohm, and Everett.
4. Discussed the main no-go theorems (Bell, BKS, PBR).
5. Seen some more niche approaches to QM (quantum logic, QBism, pragmatism, relational quantum mechanics).
6. Considered possible ways of understanding the ontology of the quantum state.

Wrapping up

Over the course of these lectures, I've:

1. Reviewed the formalism of quantum mechanics.
2. Introduced the measurement problem.
3. Presented the three main realist approaches to QM: GRW, Bohm, and Everett.
4. Discussed the main no-go theorems (Bell, BKS, PBR).
5. Seen some more niche approaches to QM (quantum logic, QBism, pragmatism, relational quantum mechanics).
6. Considered possible ways of understanding the ontology of the quantum state.

This should leave you well equipped for further philosophical investigations into the foundations of quantum theory!

Wrapping up

Over the course of these lectures, I've:

1. Reviewed the formalism of quantum mechanics.
2. Introduced the measurement problem.
3. Presented the three main realist approaches to QM: GRW, Bohm, and Everett.
4. Discussed the main no-go theorems (Bell, BKS, PBR).
5. Seen some more niche approaches to QM (quantum logic, QBism, pragmatism, relational quantum mechanics).
6. Considered possible ways of understanding the ontology of the quantum state.

This should leave you well equipped for further philosophical investigations into the foundations of quantum theory!

Question: On the basis of everything you've seen, which response to the measurement problem do *you* prefer?

References

David Z. Albert, “Wave Function Realism”, in D. Albert and A. Ney (eds.), *The Wave Function: Essays in the Metaphysics of Quantum Mechanics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Sean Carroll and Ashmeet Singh, “Mad-Dog Everettianism: Quantum Mechanics at Its Most Minimal”, in A. Aguirre, B. Foster, and Z. Merali (eds.), *What Is Fundamental?*, pp. 95–104. Cham: Springer, 2019.

D. Deutsch and P. Hayden, “Information Flow in Entangled Quantum Systems”, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A456, pp. 1759–74, 2000.

Alyssa Ney, *The World in the Wave Function*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Noel Swanson, “How to Be a Relativistic Spacetime State Realist”, British Journal for the Philosophy of Science 71, pp. 933–957, 2020.

David Wallace, “Against Wavefunction Realism”, in B. Weslake and S. Dasgupta (eds.), *Current Controversies in the Philosophy of Science*, London: Routledge, 2021.

David Wallace, “The Sky is Blue, and Other Reasons Quantum Mechanics is Not Underdetermined by Evidence”, European Journal for Philosophy of Science, 2022.

David Wallace and Christopher Timpson, “Quantum Mechanics on Spacetime I: Spacetime State Realism”, British Journal for the Philosophy of Science 61(4), pp. 697-727, 2010.