

experimental verdict and wrote to Fowler that “there is nothing else to do than to give our revolutionary efforts as honourable a funeral as possible.”

In spite of its short lifetime, the BKS theory was singularly important. For one thing, its radically new approach paved the way for a greater understanding that methods and concepts of classical physics could not be carried over in a future quantum mechanics. For another thing, the theory provided the point of departure of Kramers’ theory of dispersion of 1924 and its further development into the Kramers–Heisenberg dispersion theory of 1925, the final step before Heisenberg’s formulation of quantum or ► matrix mechanics.

Primary Literature

1. J. C. Slater: Radiation and Atoms. *Nature* **113**, 307–308 (1924)
2. N. Bohr, H. A. Kramers, J. C. Slater: The Quantum Theory of Radiation. *Philosophical Magazine* **47**, 785–802 (1924)
3. W. Bothe, H. Geiger: Über das Wesen des Comptoneffekts; ein experimenteller Beitrag zur Theorie der Strahlung. *Zeitschrift für Physik* **32**, 639–663 (1925)

Secondary Literature

4. J. Hendry: Bohr-Kramers-Slater: A Virtual Theory of Virtual Oscillators and its Role in the History of Quantum Mechanics. *Centaurus* **25**, 189–221 (1981)
5. K. Stolzenburg ed.: *Niels Bohr. Collected Works*. Volume 5 (North-Holland, Amsterdam 1984, 3–218)
6. O. Darrigol: *From c-Numbers to q-Numbers: The Classical Analogy in the History of Quantum Theory* (University of California Press, Berkeley 1992, 214–224)

Born Rule and its Interpretation

N.P. Landsman

The *Born rule* provides a link between the mathematical formalism of quantum theory and experiment, and as such is almost single-handedly responsible for practically all predictions of quantum physics. In the history of science, on a par with the ► Heisenberg uncertainty relations, the ► Born rule is often seen as a turning point where ► indeterminism entered fundamental physics. For these two reasons, its importance for the practice and philosophy of science cannot be overestimated.

The Born rule was first stated by Max Born (1882–1970) in the context of scattering theory [1], following a slightly earlier paper in which he famously omitted

the absolute value squared signs (though he corrected this in a footnote added in proof). The application to the position operator (cf. (5) below) is due to Pauli, who mentioned it to Heisenberg and Jordan, the latter publishing Pauli's suggestion with acknowledgment [6] even before Pauli himself spent a footnote on it [8]. The general formulation (6) below is due to von Neumann (see §III.1 of [7]), following earlier contributions by Dirac [2] and Jordan [5, 6].

Both Born and Heisenberg acknowledge the profound influence of Einstein on the probabilistic formulation of quantum mechanics. However, Born and Heisenberg as well as Bohr, Dirac, Jordan, Pauli and von Neumann differed with Einstein about the (allegedly) fundamental nature of the Born probabilities and hence on the issue of determinism. Indeed, whereas Born and the others just listed after him believed the outcome of any individual quantum measurement to be unpredictable in principle, Einstein felt this unpredictability was just caused by the incompleteness of quantum mechanics (as he saw it). See, for example, the invaluable source [3]. Mehra & Rechenberg [20] provide a very detailed reconstruction of the historical origin of the Born rule within the context of quantum mechanics, whereas von Plato [22] embeds a briefer historical treatment of it into the more general setting of the emergence of modern probability theory and probabilistic thinking.

Let a be a quantum-mechanical ► observable, mathematically represented by a ► self-adjoint operator on a ► Hilbert space H with inner product denoted by (\cdot, \cdot) . For the simplest formulation of the Born rule, assume that a has non-degenerate discrete spectrum: this means that a has an ► orthonormal basis of eigenvectors (e_i) with corresponding eigenvalues λ_i , i.e. $ae_i = \lambda_i e_i$. A fundamental assumption underlying the Born rule is that a ► measurement of the observable a will produce one of its eigenvalues λ_i as a result. In what follows, $\Psi \in H$ is a unit vector and hence a (pure) state in the usual sense. Then the Born rule states:

If the system is in a state Ψ , then the probability $P(a = \lambda_i | \Psi)$ that the eigenvalue λ_i of a is found when a is measured is

$$P(a = \lambda_i | \Psi) = |(e_i, \Psi)|^2. \quad (1)$$

In other words, if $\Psi = \sum_i c_i e_i$ (with $\sum_i |c_i|^2 = 1$), then $P(a = \lambda_i | \Psi) = |c_i|^2$.

The general formulation of the Born rule (which is necessary, for example, to discuss ► observables with continuous spectrum such as the position operator x on $H = L^2(\mathbb{R})$ for a particle moving in one dimension) relies on the spectral theorem for self-adjoint operators on Hilbert space (see, e.g., [21]). According to this theorem, a self-adjoint operator a defines a so-called spectral measure (alternatively called a projection-valued measure or PVM) $B \mapsto p^{(a)}(B)$ on \mathbb{R} . Here B is a (Borel) subset of \mathbb{R} and $p^{(a)}(B)$ is a projection on H . (Recall that a projection on a Hilbert space H is a bounded operator $p : H \rightarrow H$ satisfying $p^2 = p^* = p$; such operators correspond bijectively to their images pH , which are closed subspaces of H .) The spectral measure $p^{(a)}$ turns out to be concentrated on the spectrum $\sigma(a) \subset \mathbb{R}$ of a in the sense that if $B \cap \sigma(a) = \emptyset$, then $p^{(a)}(B) = 0$ (hence $p^{(a)}$ is often defined on $\sigma(a)$ instead of \mathbb{R}). The map $B \mapsto p^{(a)}(B)$ satisfies properties such as

$p^{(a)}(A \cup B) = p^{(a)}(A) + p^{(a)}(B)$ when $A \cap B = \emptyset$ (and a similar property for a countable family of disjoint sets) and $p^{(a)}(\mathbb{R}) = 1$ (i.e. the unit operator on H). Consequently, a self-adjoint operator a and a unit vector $\Psi \in H$ jointly define a probability measure $P_{\Psi}^{(a)}$ on \mathbb{R} by

$$P_{\Psi}^{(a)}(B) := (\Psi, p^{(a)}(B)\Psi) = \|p^{(a)}(B)\Psi\|^2, \quad (2)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the norm derived from the inner product on H . The properties of $p^{(a)}$ just mentioned then guarantee that $P_{\Psi}^{(a)}$ indeed has the properties of a probability measure, such as $P_{\Psi}^{(a)}(A \cup B) = P_{\Psi}^{(a)}(A) + P_{\Psi}^{(a)}(B)$ when $A \cap B = \emptyset$ (and a similar property for a countable family of disjoint sets) and $P_{\Psi}^{(a)}(\mathbb{R}) = 1$. Again, the probability measure $P_{\Psi}^{(a)}$ is concentrated on $\sigma(a)$.

For example, if a has discrete spectrum, then $\sigma(a) = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots\}$ and $p^{(a)}(B)$ projects onto the space spanned by all eigenvectors whose eigenvalues lie in B . In particular, if $\Psi = \sum_i c_i e_i$ as above, then $P_{\Psi}^{(a)}(\{\lambda_i\}) = |c_i|^2$. In the case of the position operator x as above, $\sigma(x) = \mathbb{R}$ and $p^{(x)}(B)$ equals the characteristic function χ_B , seen as a multiplication operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. The image of $p^{(x)}(B)$ consists of functions vanishing (almost everywhere) outside B , and the measure $P_{\Psi}^{(x)}$ is given by

$$P_{\Psi}^{(x)}(B) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx \chi_B(x) |\Psi(x)|^2 = \int_B dx |\Psi(x)|^2. \quad (3)$$

The general statement of the Born rule, then, is as follows:

If the system is in a state $\Psi \in H$, then the probability $P(a \in B \mid \Psi)$ that a result in $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ is found when a is measured equals

$$P(a \in B \mid \Psi) = P_{\Psi}^{(a)}(B). \quad (4)$$

For discrete non-degenerate spectrum this reduces to (1). For the position operator in one dimension, (4) yields

$$P(x \in B \mid \Psi) = \int_B dx |\Psi(x)|^2 \quad (5)$$

for the probability that the particle is found in the region B .

Note that it follows from the general Born rule (4) that with probability one a measurement of a will lead to a result contained in its spectrum, since $P_{\Psi}^{(a)}(B) = 0$ whenever $B \cap \sigma(a) = \emptyset$. Curiously, however, the probability $P(a = \lambda \mid \Psi)$ of finding any specific number λ in the continuous spectrum of a is zero! As a case in point, the probability $P(x = x_0 \mid \Psi)$ of finding the particle at any given point x_0 vanishes. Of course, this phenomenon also occurs in classical probability theory (e.g., the probability of any given infinite sequence of results of a coin flip is zero).

The rule (4) is easily extended to n commuting self-adjoint operators a_1, \dots, a_n [7]:

The probability that the observables a_1, \dots, a_n simultaneously take some value in a subset $B_1 \times \dots \times B_n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ upon measurement in a state Ψ is

$$P_\Psi(a_1 \in B_1, \dots, a_n \in B_n) = \|p^{(a_1)}(B_1) \cdots p^{(a_n)}(B_n)\Psi\|^2. \quad (6)$$

This version of the Born rule is needed, for example, in order to generalize (5) to three dimensions. Indeed, the ensuing formula is practically the same, this time with $B \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and x replaced by (x, y, z) .

The statement that the expectation value of an observable a in a state Ψ equals $(\Psi, a\Psi)$ is equivalent to the Born rule. To see this, we identify projections with yes-no questions [7], identifying the answer ‘yes’ with eigenvalue 1 and ‘no’ with eigenvalue 0. The expectation value $(\Psi, p\Psi) = \|p\Psi\|^2$ of a projection then simply becomes the probability of the answer ‘yes’. Taking $p = p^{(a)}(B)$ then reproduces (4), since the probability of ‘yes’ to the question $p^{(a)}(B)$ is nothing but $P(a \in B | \Psi)$. In this fashion, the Born rule may be generalized from pure states to mixed ones (i.e. ► *density matrices* in the standard formalism we are considering here), by stipulating that the expectation value of a in a state ρ (i.e. a positive trace-class operator with ► *trace one*) is $\text{Tr}(\rho a)$. For a further generalization in this direction see ► *Algebraic quantum mechanics*.

Finally, another formulation of the Born rule is as follows:

The transition probability $P(\Psi, \Phi)$ from a state Ψ to a state Φ , or, in other words, the probability of a ‘quantum jump’ from Ψ to Φ , is

$$P(\Psi, \Phi) = |(\Psi, \Phi)|^2. \quad (7)$$

This related to the first formulation above, in that in standard measurement theory one assumes a ► ‘*wave function collapse*’ in the sense that Ψ changes to e_i after a measurement of a yielding λ_i . The transition probability $P(\Psi, e_i)$ is then precisely equal to $P(a = \lambda_i | \Psi)$ as stated above.

The *Born interpretation* of quantum mechanics is usually taken to be the statement that the empirical content of the theory (and particularly of the quantum state) is given by the Born rule. However, this is not really an interpretation at all until it is specified what the notions of measurement and probability mean. The pragmatic attitude taken by most physicists is that measurements are what experimentalists perform in the laboratory and that probability is given the frequency interpretation [15, 17] (which is neutral with respect to the issue whether the probabilities are fundamental or due to ignorance). Given that firstly the notion of a quantum measurement is quite subtle and hard to define, and that secondly the frequency interpretation is held in rather low regard in the philosophy of probability [17, 18], it is amazing how successful this attitude has been! Going beyond pragmatism requires a mature interpretation of quantum mechanics, however. Each such interpretation hinges on some interpretation of probability and will contain its own

perspective on the Born rule. See Ignorance interpretation, Ithaca Interpretation, Many Worlds Interpretation, Modal Interpretation, Orthodox Interpretation, Transactional Interpretation.

The nature of the Born rule comes out particularly well in the Copenhagen interpretation, ► Consistent Histories; Metaphysics in Quantum Mechanics; Non-locality; Orthodox Interpretation; Schrödinger's Cat; Transactional Interpretation, especially if this approach is combined with ► Algebraic quantum mechanics. In the algebraic approach, a quantum system is modeled by a non-commutative C^* -algebra of observables. The simplest illustration of this is the algebra M_n of all complex $n \times n$ matrices. This contains the commutative C^* -algebra D_n of all diagonal matrices as a subalgebra. A unit vector $\Psi \in \mathbb{C}^n$ determines a pure state ψ on M_n in the algebraic sense by $\psi(a) = (\Psi, a\Psi)$. The latter may be restricted to a state $\psi|_{D_n}$ on D_n , which turns out to be mixed: if $\Psi = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i e_i$ and $d_\lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ is the diagonal matrix with entries $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, then

$$\psi|_{D_n}(d_\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n |c_i|^2 \lambda_i \quad (8)$$

yields the expectation value of d_λ in the state ψ . In particular, if $p_i \in D_n$ is the projection $p_i = \text{diag}(0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$ having 1 on the i 'th diagonal entry and zeros elsewhere, then $\psi|_{D_n}(p_i) = |c_i|^2$ yields the Born probability of obtaining λ_i upon measuring D_λ .

Similarly, one may regard a ► wave function $\Psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ as an algebraic state ψ on the C^* -algebra $B(L^2(\mathbb{R}))$ of all bounded operators on the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. This C^* -algebra contains the commutative subalgebra $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ given by all multiplication operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ defined by continuous functions of $x \in \mathbb{R}$ that vanish at infinity (roughly speaking, this is the C^* -algebra generated by the position operator). The restriction $\psi|_{C_0(\mathbb{R})}$ of ψ to $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ is given by

$$\psi|_{C_0(\mathbb{R})}(f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx |\Psi(x)|^2 f(x). \quad (9)$$

The probability measure $P_{\psi|_{C_0(\mathbb{R})}}$ on \mathbb{R} associated to the functional $\psi|_{C_0(\mathbb{R})}$ by the Riesz representation theorem [21] is just $P_{\psi|_{C_0(\mathbb{R})}} = P_{\Psi}^{(x)}$, cf. (3). Hence the restricted state $\psi|_{C_0(\mathbb{R})}$ precisely yields the Born–Pauli probability (5).

Finally, to recover (4) (assuming for simplicity that the operator $a : H \rightarrow H$ is bounded), one considers the commutative C^* -algebra $C^*(a)$ of $B(H)$ generated by a and the unit operator. It can be shown [21] that $C^*(a) \cong C(\sigma(a))$. Hence a unit vector $\Psi \in H$ defines a state ψ on $B(H)$, whose restriction $\psi|_{C^*(a)}$ to $C^*(a)$ yields a probability measure $P_{\psi|_{C^*(a)}}$ on the spectrum $\sigma(a)$ of a . It easily follows that

$$P_{\psi|_{C^*(a)}} = P_{\Psi}^{(a)}, \quad (10)$$

which reproduces (2).

The physical relevance of these constructions derives from Bohr's doctrine of classical concepts, which is an essential ingredient of the Copenhagen interpretation [24]. In particular, if it is to serve its function, a measurement apparatus has to be described as if it were classical. This implies that if it is used as a measuring device, the apparatus (which a priori is quantum mechanical) has to be described by a commutative subalgebra D of its full non-commutative algebra A of quantum-mechanical observables. Upon the identifications explained above, the Born probability measure then comes out to be just the restriction of the total state on A to the 'classical' subalgebra D thereof that Bohr calls for.

This account does not provide a derivation of the Born rule from first principles, but it does clarify its mathematical and physical origin. In particular, in the Copenhagen interpretation probabilities arise because we look at the quantum world through classical glasses:

“One may call these uncertainties [i.e. the Born probabilities] objective, in that they are simply a consequence of the fact that we describe the experiment in terms of classical physics; they do not depend in detail on the observer. One may call them subjective, in that they reflect our incomplete knowledge of the world.” (Heisenberg [4], pp. 53–54)

In other words, one cannot say that the Born probabilities are either subjective (i.e. Bayesian, or due to ignorance) or objective (i.e. fundamentally ingrained in nature and independent of the observer). Instead, the situation is more subtle and has no counterpart in classical physics or probability theory: the choice of a particular classical description is subjective, but once it has been made the ensuing probabilities are objective and the particular outcome of an experiment compatible with the chosen classical context is unpredictable. Or so Bohr and Heisenberg say...

In most interpretations of quantum mechanics, some version of the Born rule is simply *postulated*. This is the case, for example, in the ► Consistent histories interpretation, the ► Modal interpretation and the ► Orthodox interpretation. Attempts to *derive* the Born rule from more basic postulates of quantum theory go back to Finkelstein [16] and Hartle [19], whose work was corrected and extended in [14]. These authors study infinite sequences of measurements and prove that the ensuing relative frequencies automatically satisfy the Born rule. It is controversial, however, to what extent this argument really derives the Born rule or is eventually circular [11, 12]. In the version of the ► Many worlds interpretation developed by Deutsch [13] and his followers [23, 26], the authors claim to derive the Born rule using arguments from decision theory, but once again the charge of circularity has been raised [9, 10]. See also [27, 25] for a similar debate in the context of ► decoherence. The conclusion seems to be that no generally accepted derivation of the Born rule has been given to date, but this does not imply that such a derivation is impossible in principle.

Primary Literature

1. M. Born: Quantenmechanik der Stoßvorgänge. Z. Phys. **38**, 803–827 (1926).
2. P. Dirac: The physical interpretation of the quantum dynamics. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. **A113**, 621–641 (1926).

3. A. Einstein & M. Born: *Briefwechsel 1916–1955* (Langen Müller, München 2005).
4. W. Heisenberg: *Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science*. (Allen & Unwin, London 1958).
5. P. Jordan: Über quantenmechanische Darstellung von Quantensprüngen. *Z. Phys.* **40**, 661–666 (1927).
6. P. Jordan: Über eine neue Begründung der Quantenmechanik. *Z. Phys.* **40**, 809–838 (1927).
7. J. von Neumann: *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik* (Springer, Berlin 1932). English translation: *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton University Press, Berlin 1955).
8. W. Pauli: Über Gasentartung und Paramagnetismus. *Z. Phys.* **41**, 81–102 (1927).

Secondary Literature

9. D.J. Baker: Measurement outcomes and probability in Everettian quantum mechanics. *Stud. Hist. Philos. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 153–169 (2007).
10. H. Barnum, C. M. Caves, J. Finkelstein, C. A. Fuchs, R. Schack: Quantum probability from decision theory? *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond.* **A456**, 1175–1182 (2000).
11. A. Cassinello & J.L. Sánchez-Gómez: On the probabilistic postulate of quantum mechanics. *Found. Phys.* **26**, 1357–1374 (1996).
12. C. Caves & R. Schack: Properties of the frequency operator do not imply the quantum probability postulate. *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **315**, 123–146 (2005).
13. D. Deutsch: Quantum theory of probability and decisions. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* **A455**, 3129–3137 (1999).
14. E. Farhi, J. Goldstone & S. Gutmann: How probability arises in quantum mechanics. *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **192**, 368–382 (1989).
15. T.L. Fine: *Theories of Probability* (Academic, New York, 1978).
16. D. Finkelstein: The logic of quantum physics. *Trans. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **25**, 621–637 (1965).
17. D. Gillies: *Philosophical Theories of Probability* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000).
18. A. Hájek: Interpretations of probability. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, <http://www.science.uva.nl/seop/entries/probability-interpret/>.
19. J.B. Hartle: Quantum mechanics of individual systems. *Am. J. Phys.* **36**, 704–712 (1968).
20. J. Mehra & H. Rechenberg: *The Historical Development of Quantum Theory. Vol. 6: The Completion of Quantum Mechanics 1926–1941. Part 1: The Probabilistic Interpretation and the Empirical and Mathematical Foundation of Quantum Mechanics, 1926–1936* (Springer, New York 2000).
21. G.K. Pedersen: *Analysis Now* (Springer, New York 1989).
22. J. von Plato: *Creating Modern Probability* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994).
23. S. Saunders: Derivation of the Born rule from operational assumptions. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* **A460**, 1771–1788 (2004).
24. E. Scheibe: *The Logical Analysis of Quantum Mechanics* (Pergamon Press, Oxford 1973).
25. M. Schlosshauer & A. Fine: On Zurek's derivation of the Born rule. *Found. Phys.* **35**, 197–213 (2005).
26. D. Wallace: Everettian Rationality: defending Deutsch's approach to probability in the Everett interpretation. *Stud. Hist. Philos. Mod. Phys.* **34** (2003), 415–438.
27. W.H. Zurek: Probabilities from entanglement, Born's rule $p_k = |\Psi_k|^2$ from envariance, *Phys. Rev.* **A71**, 052105 (2005).