

This is a pre-print version of a paper published in:

Speculations in Science and Technology **21**, 329-44 (1999)

**Planck's constant and
necessarily time-extended phenomena**

Ingvar Johansson

Department of Philosophy and Philosophy of Science, Umeå University,

S-901 87 Umeå, Sweden

This paper is an attempt to make a wholly new interpretation of the uncertainty principle in quantum mechanics. It is conjectured that where there is supposed to be uncertainty of energy, there is instead a specific form of energy - non-classical energy - which is necessarily extended in time. The conjecture gives rise to a realist interpretation of quantum mechanics which does not rest on any really new mathematical theorem. Instead, the reinterpretation is based on an insight belonging to the philosophy of science. It says that dimensional identities may hide spatiotemporal differences. Non-classical energy has exactly the same physical dimension as action and Planck's constant, but it does nonetheless not correspond to action.

0. Introduction

This paper is an attempt to do to some concepts of quantum mechanics what Ernst Mach once tried to do with the newtonian concept of mass, supply a new ontological interpretation. In several respects, however, my reinterpretation moves in a direction opposite to that of Mach's proposals. He tried to turn a *property* into a *relation*, whereas I am trying to turn a curious kind of property or relation, that of uncertainty, into another kind of property. According to Mach, the inertial mass of a particle x is not an intrinsic *property* of x , but a *relation* between x and all other particles in the universe with which x interacts. I will argue that there are no uncertainties of energy and temporal position, no uncertainties of momentum and spatial position, and consequently no physically meaningful product in either case. However, there are instead necessarily time-extended energy, *non-classical energy*, and necessarily space-extended momentum, *non-classical momentum*. My discussion is primarily centred around the concept of energy, but the concept of momentum cannot be dispensed with in the discussion.

Mach did not want to reject the functional relationships of newtonian mechanics. He wanted to free the theory from a realist interpretation of forces and to get rid of absolute space. And in order to achieve this aim, he argued that mass is not a measure of the quantity of matter *in* a particle, but a measure of a coupling *between* the particle and all other particles. (For a brief exposition of Mach's fundamental idea see Sachs (1988) pp. 13-18; a more detailed account can be found in Jammer (1961) pp. 91-102; for Mach's own words see Mach (1960) chapter II.)

Similarly, I will not propose any new functional relationships. No attempt will be made to deduce any new but hitherto undiscovered mathematical theorem. But in

contradistinction to Mach, I have no positivist aims. On the contrary. My conjecture of non-classical energy amounts to a new kind of realist interpretation of quantum mechanics. (Mach's principle can, by the way, be used within a realist frame too; see Sachs (1972).)

The proposed non-classical energy is *necessarily* extended in time. Therefore, the time dependence of such energy has to be represented by functions of the form $f(\Delta t)$. Non-classical energy can be measured by a magnitude called its *temporal bulk*. The physical dimension of this magnitude is the same as the dimension of Planck's constant and of action (i.e. energy multiplied by time, or joules times seconds). However, non-classical energy bulks correspond to *differences* of action (ΔA), not to actions (A) in the classical sense. Dimensional identities can hide ontological differences (see section 3). This is one of the crucial insights behind my conjecture of non-classical energy.

Phenomena which have to be represented by functions of the form $f(\Delta x)$ can nonetheless have the same physical dimension as phenomena which can be represented by $f(x)$.

Before I can put forward my idea of non-classical energy, I have to make the reader familiar both with the concept of temporal bulk in itself and with the difference between the concept as a mere mathematical construct and as a magnitude with real physical significance. This is done by means of a short trip through parts of the history of physics. I start in newtonian mechanics (sections 1-3). Then I move via Hamilton's concept of action (section 4) and Einstein's analysis of the photoelectric effect (section 5) to quantum mechanics. Here, there is first a discussion of the uncertainty principle in general (section 6), and after that a discussion of the uncertainties within which virtual particles are assumed to exist (section 7). Some concluding remarks (section 8) end the paper.

1. Physics and Extension in Time

Pre-newtonian physics worked only with properties extended in time. Both property states and property changes were taken to be extended for at least a very short period of time. Before the invention of the infinitesimal calculus one simply could not make real sense of what is temporally punctual. In newtonian and post-newtonian physics it is the other way round. All magnitudes which are regarded as fundamental represent properties which in principle can exist at a momentary point of time, i.e. they can be described by a function $f(t)$ where t represents continuous time. Mass, force, velocity, field strength and many other magnitudes are defined in such a way that their numerical values primarily relate to points in time. Of course, if the magnitude does not change, the corresponding value represents a property state which, *as a matter of fact*, is extended in time in the sense that all time *points* in an interval has the same non-zero value. I shall call such magnitudes *momentary magnitudes*. The kind of phenomena they represent I will call *possibly momentary phenomena*.

However, there are also in classical physics magnitudes which cannot, not even in principle, be regarded as representing something temporally punctual. This is true of continuous changes in general. Let me take continuous change of place as an example. Such a change can be described by the integral $\int v(t) \cdot dt$ between t_1 and t_2 . Here $v(t)$ is the function which tells how the velocity varies with time, t_1 is the time the movement begins and t_2 the time it ends. These three magnitudes represent momentary phenomena. But a continuous *change* of place cannot possibly be momentary. If the integral which measures the distance of the change of place shall yield non-zero results, t_2 must differ from t_1 . There *has to be* a time interval in order for a continuous change of place to exist. A continuous change is necessarily extended in time. All phenomena which are similar to continuous changes in this respect, I will call *necessarily time-extended*

phenomena. When the corresponding magnitudes are described by functions of time, the functions must have the form $f(\Delta t)$. States, in contradistinction to continuous changes, can be momentary as well as temporally extended.

In order to discuss, from a realist point of view, the distinction between momentary and necessarily time-extended magnitudes, we have to remember that magnitudes can be mathematically definable but lack direct physical significance, and also that only some of the magnitudes which are physically significant need to be regarded as fundamental.

In classical physics, there are physically significant magnitudes which represent possibly momentary phenomena as well as physically significant magnitudes which represent necessarily time-extended phenomena; the magnitudes are physically significant in the sense that they are taken to represent something real in nature. But there has among physicists been a strong tendency to *regard only momentary magnitudes as fundamental*. And for good reasons. Magnitudes which are derivatives with regard to time must, if they are representing something real at all, represent possibly momentary phenomena, and most fundamental laws of physics contain such magnitudes.

2. The Concept of Temporal Bulk

Consider a *change* of place, e.g. the movement of a classical particle. It is usually characterised by three magnitudes: the distance of the movement Δx , the time of the movement Δt , and the mean velocity of the movement, $v = \Delta x / \Delta t$. There is, though, a fourth mathematically possible magnitude. We can also *multiply* the distance of the change of place by the time of the movement. This magnitude I shall call the temporal *bulk* of the particle movement, and symbolise it by #M:

$$(1) \#M = \Delta x \cdot \Delta t$$

The physical dimension of this magnitude is distance times time interval, and if it represents something real at all, it represents something which is necessarily extended in time. But it is hard to give the magnitude a real physical significance, much less regard it as fundamental. It looks like a mere mathematical possibility and playing.

The definition of the temporal bulk of a change of place (1) fits the following general definition: *A temporal bulk is a magnitude which has been obtained by multiplying a magnitude representing something extended in time by the numerical value of the corresponding temporal extension.*

In what follows I shall use this concept of temporal bulk in order to discuss the general idea of necessarily time-extended phenomena. However, as will be clear later on, many such temporally extended phenomena are connected with phenomena which are necessarily extended in space. Therefore, I will make use of a concept of *spatial* bulk too. Its definition is obtained by merely substituting 'spatial' for 'temporal' (and 'space' for 'time') in the definition above.

Particle movement is merely one example of something which is necessarily extended in both time and space. Ordinary wave movement is another. A wave at sea may be looked upon as a change of place of a spatially extended wave shape. The temporal movement bulk of a wave pulse (which equals the corresponding spatial bulk) may be defined as:

$$(2) \#M_w = \lambda \cdot T$$

It is equally easy to define a temporal bulk for velocity changes, $\#\Delta v$. Velocity changes are, like all changes, necessarily extended in time:

$$(3) \#\Delta v = \Delta v \cdot \Delta t = (v_2 - v_1) \cdot \Delta t$$

A movement may undergo a change of velocity, but it may also be in a certain state of velocity during a time interval. Even in this case, i.e. when a state *as a matter of fact* is temporally extended, a temporal bulk can be defined. We get the temporal bulk for velocity *states*, #v:

$$(4) \#v = v \cdot \Delta t$$

The velocity *state* temporal bulk represents something real. It equals the distance of the movement. The velocity *change* temporal bulk, however, seems to be a mere mathematical construct.

3. Work as an Aspect of a Temporal Energy Transfer Bulk

Let us now look at the kinetic energy of a classical particle in an inertial system. Since both mass and velocity may be ascribed a momentary existence, i.e. there are functions $m(t)$ and $v(t)$, the same goes for kinetic energy. But as remarked in section 1, continuous changes (here, changes of energy) do not have a momentary existence. Assume that work is either being done on the particle by something or by the particle on something else. In both cases there is a *transfer* of kinetic energy. Where there is work, there is energy transfer; where there is energy transfer, there are energy changes in at least two entities.

It should be noted that energy states, work, and energy changes have the same physical dimension, joule. This is due to the fact that we represent an energy state by naming its place on a scale. A certain energy state is represented by a point on the scale, whereas an energy change is represented by a distance between two points on the scale. Nonetheless the state and the change have the same dimension because the points on the scale are *named* by their *distance from* other points on the same scale. In particular, of course, from the zero point. Trivially, an energy state of 5 joules is 3 units away from an

energy state of 2 joules, and 5 joules away from the zero point. The energy amount of this *state* equals a *change* of 5 joules.

Independently of whether a scale has an absolute zero or not, it is true of the corresponding quantified magnitude that there is no dimensional difference between *having* a certain value of the magnitude on the one hand and *undergoing a change* of the magnitude on the other. Both are represented by a distance on the scale. The ontological difference between energy *states* and energy *changes* cannot possibly be found by pure dimensional analysis since the corresponding magnitudes have the same dimension.

In the former section I introduced the concept of temporal bulk and defined some bulk magnitudes. I shall now define yet another temporal bulk, the *kinetic energy transfer bulk*, $\#\Delta E_k$. This time we multiply the work ΔE_k by the time interval Δt during which the work is done. We get :

$$(5) \quad \#\Delta E_k = \Delta E_k \cdot \Delta t$$

Since ΔE_k represents a transfer of kinetic energy to or from a particle, ΔE_k is identical with $(F \cdot \Delta x)$, where F is a constant newtonian force which does the work, and Δx is the distance needed for the work to be done. (If F varies, ΔE_k is identical with $\int F(x) \cdot dx$.) Therefore, formula (5) is equivalent to the following formula:

$$(6) \quad \#\Delta E_k = (F \cdot \Delta x) \cdot \Delta t = (F \cdot \Delta t) \cdot \Delta x$$

The expression $(F \cdot \Delta t)$ represents of course the impulse of the particle, i.e. the particle's *change* of momentum during Δt . Momentum and impulse have the same physical dimension but different relations to time; momentum, like kinetic energy, may be punctual in time and be represented by functions $f(t)$, whereas continuous impulse (change of momentum), like change and transfer of kinetic energy, is necessarily extended in time and must be represented by functions $f(\Delta t)$.

According to my definitions, the whole expression $((F \cdot \Delta t) \cdot \Delta x)$ represents the *spatial impulse bulk*. Formula (6) can be read as saying that the *temporal* bulk of the kinetic energy transfer equals the corresponding *spatial* bulk of the impulse. It is another way of saying that the work done multiplied by the time for the work equals the impulse multiplied by the distance needed for the work to be done.

The remarks made in relation to formula (6) imply a very simple geometrical representation of the connection between change of momentum (impulse) and change of kinetic energy (work) of a classical particle. We can construct a three-dimensional space where the x-axis represents distance along the line the particle is moving, the y-axis represents time, and the z-axis the force acting along the x-axis. When the force is constant the *temporal energy transfer bulk*, $\# \Delta E_k$, is represented by a parallelepiped where one of the side surfaces represents the work, ΔE_k , and where one of the other sides represents the impulse, Δp , and where the bottom surface represents the temporal bulk of the movement, $\#M$; see figure 1.

Figure 1.

The mathematical relationships are easily read off, but I have nevertheless written some of them down.

$$(7) \quad \# \Delta E_k / \Delta t = \Delta E_k \quad \text{or} \quad \# \Delta E_k = \Delta E_k \cdot \Delta t$$

$$(8) \quad \# \Delta E_k / \Delta x = \Delta p \quad \text{or} \quad \# \Delta E_k = \Delta p \cdot \Delta x$$

$$(9) \quad \# \Delta E_k = F \cdot \#M$$

According to formulas (7) and (8) and figure 1, we can at least from a mathematical point of view look upon work (energy change) and impulse (momentum change) as two aspects (surfaces) of a transfer bulk (the volume) which is necessarily both spatially and temporally extended. Force may also be seen as a property (the height) of the

parallelepiped. This way of speaking turns the original newtonian mechanics upside down. In newton's own presentation, force is logically prior to energy and momentum. newton's laws of motion speak about forces, but not of energies and momenta. In each momentary instant there is a force which in a time interval and over a distance produces impulse and work. Having recourse to the concept of temporal bulk, one can try to imagine the temporal energy transfer bulk as being logically prior to work, impulse, and force; the bulk should then be regarded as the fundamental thing without which the properties of work, impulse, and force would have no existence at all.

All the remarks now made in relation to classical particles, their possibly momentary energy, and their necessarily time-extended energy transfers, can with only minor modifications be made also in relation to classical fields. The particle whose movement is represented in figure 1 can be regarded as moving in some kind of constant force field. However, the same quantitative changes of energy and momentum can occur if it is the field instead of the particle that is moving. The field can be ascribed a state of possibly momentary energy which it during Δt transfers to the particle. (This momentary field energy, however, cannot, like that of a particle, be localised in one point; it is stretched out along the x-axis.) Such a field, of course, need not be constant. It can vary in all sorts of ways, both wave-like and others. The formulas (7) to (9) can easily be transformed in order to take care of varying forces, momenta, and energies. If F is not constant, but varies according to some continuous function of x and t , then the formula (9) has to be substituted by formula (9')

$$(9') \quad \Delta E_k = \iint F(x,t) \cdot \delta x \delta t$$

F takes instantaneous forces as values, i.e. F represents a momentary magnitude. Work (energy transfer) and impulse (momentum change) are, in classical physics, generally regarded as effects of forces. The energy transfer temporal bulk is such an

effect, and it appears to be a mere mathematical construct like the temporal movement bulk and the temporal velocity change bulk.

In relativistic dynamics the definitions of energy and momentum of electromagnetic field waves easily lend themselves to a definition of temporal energy transfer bulk similar to the one just put forward in relation to classical particles. The energy of a wave equals the kinetic energy which one completed oscillation can maximally transfer to a particle, and the momentum of a wave equals the linear momentum which one completed oscillation can maximally transfer to a particle. This means that neither the energy nor the momentum of a wave can inhere in something which is point-like in space and time; a wave is necessarily extended in both space and time. Electromagnetic *wave energy* and *wave momentum* are in that sense special. In formula (2) the temporal movement bulk of a wave was defined. Since, in relativistic dynamics $p = E / c$, $\Delta p = \Delta E / c$ and $c = \lambda / T$, we can define the temporal energy transfer bulk of an electromagnetic wave pulse as in formula (10).

$$(10) \quad \# \Delta E_w = \Delta E \cdot T = \Delta p \cdot \lambda$$

In passing, we can note that it is here possible to define a mean force F_w of a wave pulse as the quotient between two bulks:

$$(11) \quad F_w = \# \Delta E_w / \# M_w \quad (\text{where } \# M_w = T \cdot \lambda; \text{ compare formulas (1), (2) and (9)})$$

I have introduced the concept of temporal bulk in order to get a wholly new general concept. The magnitude $\# \Delta E$ has, as far as I know, not been used anywhere in physics. It is, however, very closely related to the concept of action put forward by William Hamilton in the nineteenth century. Some words are needed about this connection.

4. Action as Temporal Energy State Bulk

When there is a transfer of kinetic energy, we can define its temporal bulk as the whole energy change multiplied by the time it takes for the transfer to take place. Assume now a classical particle moving with constant velocity in the time interval Δt , i.e. there is no change in kinetic energy during Δt ; the particle is in a certain energy *state*. Even in such a case, however, we can construct a mathematical magnitude connected with extension in time. We can multiply the constant kinetic energy E_k by Δt and get the temporal energy state bulk. For reasons that will soon emerge, I will call this magnitude A . We get formula (12):

$$(12) \quad A = E_k \cdot \Delta t \quad (\text{cf. formula 7: } \# \Delta E_k = \Delta E_k \cdot \Delta t)$$

The Hamiltonian action of a particle moving a certain distance is the integral over time for this movement of the infinitesimals $(E_k - E_p) \cdot dt$, where E_k is the particle's kinetic energy and E_p its potential energy. We can write:

$$(13) \quad A_H = \int (E_k - E_p) \cdot dt$$

When the kinetic energy and the potential energy are constant, then the Hamiltonian action of the particle follows from formula (13')

$$(13') \quad A_H = (E_k - E_p) \cdot \Delta t$$

When the potential energy is zero (or is disregarded), then formula (13') becomes equivalent to formula (12). The Hamiltonian action A_H reduces to $A = E_k \cdot \Delta t$, i.e. this Hamiltonian action is identical with an energy state temporal bulk.

In order clearly to see the difference between the Hamiltonian action and the concept of temporal energy transfer bulk introduced in this paper, one should note that a temporal energy transfer bulk does not correspond to an action but to a *difference of action*.

$$(14) \quad \# \Delta E = \Delta E \cdot \Delta t = (E_2 - E_1) \cdot \Delta t = E_2 \cdot \Delta t - E_1 \cdot \Delta t = A_2 - A_1 = \Delta A$$

The magnitude ΔA cannot possibly be called a *change* of action since A_1 and A_2 refer to exactly the same time interval. It has to be called a *difference*.

The relationship between action difference and action is analogous to the relationship earlier pointed out both between energy change and energy state and between impulse (= momentum change) and momentum (= momentum state). Action difference relates to *changes* of energy ($\Delta A = \Delta E \cdot \Delta t$) whereas action relates to time-extended *states* of energy ($A = E \cdot \Delta t$). And just like energy changes and energy states have the same physical dimension (joule), action differences and actions have the same dimension (joules times seconds). Difference of action corresponds to temporal energy *change* (transfer) bulk and action corresponds to temporal energy *state* bulk.

In today's quantum mechanics there is hardly any talk at all about the magnitude of action. But both Planck and Bohr talked a lot about it. Quantum theory, it should be remembered, was born with Planck's hypothesis that *action* is atomic instead of continuous. And Bohr's original hypothesis was that the electron orbits of the hydrogen atom had *actions* which were integer multiples of Planck's constant.

5. Action versus Difference of Action - the Photoelectric Effect

From the dimensional identity of action and difference of action, it follows that it is mathematically possible to reinterpret Planck's constant as representing temporal energy transfer bulks (or action differences) instead of actions. Let us look at this possibility in relation to Einstein's analysis of the photoelectric effect.

According to Einstein, electromagnetic radiation consists of energy quanta, photons, which in the photoelectric effect are transferred to electrons. The quantized energy can be calculated by means of the formula $E = h \cdot f$, where f is the frequency of the radiation. Both the energy *transport* by photons and the energy *transfer* from photons to electrons

are in the ordinary interpretation quantized. However, these two kinds of energy phenomena are not necessarily similar. By energy transport I mean a change of place of energy where the energy, during the movement, inheres in one and the same entity. An energy transfer, on the other hand, consists necessarily in at least two simultaneous energy changes. Energy is lost in one entity and gained in another. The discussion below is only about the energy transfers in the photoelectric effect.

Every energy transfer which is not momentary can be associated with a temporal energy transfer bulk, $\# \Delta E$. If, in the usual formulas describing the photoelectric effect, we substitute energy transfer (ΔE) for energy (E) and substitute $1/T$ for f , where f is the frequency and T the time for one corresponding oscillation, then instead of the usual formula (15) we can deduce (17) below.

$$(15) \quad E = h \cdot f \quad (\text{substitution gives } 16)$$

$$(16) \quad \Delta E = h \cdot 1/T \quad (\text{which is mathematically equivalent to } 17)$$

$$(17) \quad h = \Delta E \cdot T$$

The variable T represents a time interval, and that interval may here very well be interpreted as the time it takes to transfer ΔE from a photon to an electron, i.e. T corresponds to Δt in formula (5). This, in turn, means that h should be interpreted as a *temporal energy transfer bulk*, $\# \Delta E$. As remarked earlier, h and $\# \Delta E$ have the same dimension (joules times seconds). Formula (17) then implies that in the photoelectric effect all energy transfers must have a temporal bulk which is an integer multiple of Planck's constant:

$$(18) \quad \# \Delta E = n \cdot h$$

In formula (18), Planck's constant represents temporal energy transfer bulks (or *differences of action*), not actions. Einstein's analysis of the photoelectric effect can be

reinterpreted as saying that there is a least atomic temporal energy transfer *bulk* between photons and electrons. If, now, we regard the parallelepiped of figure 1 as measuring the temporal bulk of energy transfers in the photoelectric effect, then that volume has to be an integer multiple of h .

Since, in the reinterpretation above, T can represent both the frequency of the impinging radiation and the time needed for a least atomic energy transfer, each frequency has its own specific least time which it needs in order to transfer energy to a particle. But if h is a temporal energy transfer *bulk* in the sense defined, then, beside the energy transfer, there should also be a corresponding change of momentum or *momentum transfer*, Δp , which satisfies formula (19):

$$(19) \quad \# \Delta E = h = \Delta p \cdot \Delta x = \Delta E \cdot \Delta t \quad (\text{cf. formulas 7 and 8})$$

Formula (19) can be read as saying that a *spatial* impulse bulk ($\Delta p \cdot \Delta x$) equals the *temporal* energy transfer bulk ($\Delta E \cdot \Delta t$). This kind of impulse transfer can be found in the Compton effect if that effect is reinterpreted along the lines of my reinterpretation of the photoelectric effect. The usual conclusion of the Compton scatter is that photons have a momentum, p , which corresponds to its wavelength, λ , according to formula (20):

$$(20) \quad p = h / \lambda$$

I would like to reinterpret (20) by using the concept of temporal wave energy transfer bulk which was introduced in formula (10), i.e. $\# \Delta E_w = \Delta E \cdot T = \Delta p \cdot \lambda$. In formula (20) we should substitute Δp for p . This means that, in photon electron interactions, there are not only quanta of energy transfer (work), but quanta of momentum transfer (impulse) as well. The capability of the photon to produce these two kinds of transfers is captured

in formula (21). Here we find a *temporal energy transfer bulk* and a *spatial momentum transfer bulk* which are determined by Planck's constant:

$$(21) \quad \# \Delta E = h = \Delta p \cdot \lambda = \Delta E \cdot T$$

Such an interpretation may turn temporal bulk from a mere mathematical construct into something with physical significance. We can regard this temporal bulk magnitude as representing a really existing necessarily time-extended and mind-independent capability in nature. This interpretation also means that *temporal energy transfer bulk is here a fundamental magnitude*; we cannot derive its amount (h) from any natural laws which are more fundamental .

Now, since the old quantum theory is gone, we shall at last turn to the quantum mechanics of Schrödinger and Heisenberg. The problem is to find out whether the ideas of bulks and necessarily time-extended phenomena can be fitted into these theories and be given physical significance there, too.

6. Planck's Constant and the Uncertainty Principle

Let us look at the uncertainty principle, or, rather, principles. One of them (22) says that the product of the uncertainties of energy and time equals or exceeds h divided by 2π , and the other one (23) says that the product of the uncertainties of momentum and position is subject to the same relation.

$$(22) \quad \Delta E \cdot \Delta t \geq h/2\pi$$

$$(23) \quad \Delta p \cdot \Delta x \geq h/2\pi$$

The similarities between the equalities of formula (19) and the inequalities of formulas (22) and (23) are obvious. We have to ask whether in these formulas, too, it is possible to reinterpret h as representing a temporal energy *transfer bulk* and a spatial momentum *transfer bulk*, respectively. First of all we should note that h cannot represent a temporal energy *state bulk* or a Hamiltonian action, since in that case formula (22) should have contained the symbol E instead of ΔE . The concept of action ($= E \cdot \Delta t$), dear to Planck and Bohr, cannot be used here. Quite consistently, the concept

of action has got no significant place in modern quantum mechanics. But this does not imply that the concept of *difference* of action ($=\Delta E \cdot \Delta t$) cannot have such a place.

To repeat, the deltas of formulas (22) and (23) indicate that ΔE cannot represent an energy eigenstate and that Δp cannot represent a momentary momentum. An energy state, E , is localised in a point on the energy scale, but ΔE takes up a distance on the same scale. According to the ordinary interpretation of the uncertainty principle, ΔE represents an energy interval and Δt a time interval; similarly, Δp represents a momentum interval and Δx a distance. An entity is said to be in a certain state of energy and momentum with a certain uncertainty. In this interpretation, ΔE is not the magnitude of an energy change, it represents an interval on the constructed energy scale; and Δt does not represent something which is extended *in* time but an interval of time itself. Therefore, the product $\Delta E \cdot \Delta t$ does not represent a temporal *state* bulk or action.

If we try to regard h in the uncertainty principle as representing a temporal energy *transfer* bulk (instead of a temporal energy *state* bulk), we stumble on another difficulty. Since ΔE is often associated with stable non-changing particles in well defined energy *states*, h cannot be taken as representing a temporal energy *transfer* (or *change*) bulk either. My attempt at a reinterpretation seems to have reached an impasse. Are there other interpretations of ΔE ? Yes, there is still another interpretative possibility; although a curious one. ΔE may be interpreted as representing a (non-classical) form of energy which *in itself is necessarily stretched out in time*. Such an energy would be to classical energy states what a cylinder is to a circle. A cylinder is stretched out in one spatio-temporal dimension more than the circle is.

If, in the uncertainty principle, ΔE really represents a form of energy which is necessarily time-extended, then Planck's constant would represent the *temporal bulk* of this energy. In what follows I will call such a form of energy *non-classical energy*, and I will symbolize it by E_N instead of ΔE . The inequality (22) is then no longer about *uncertainty* of classical energy *states*. Instead it says that there is a *temporal bulk of non-classical energy*, $\#E_N$, which is larger than $h/2\pi$. Of course a temporal bulk of non-

classical energy ($\#E_N$), just like an energy transfer temporal bulk ($\#\Delta E$), corresponds to an action difference (ΔA).

The fact that there can exist very essential differences between properties which relate to different numbers of spatio-temporal dimensions, is most easily seen in the case of two-dimensional shapes. If we go down from two to one dimension, all shapes are projected on a line and turned into distances. Shapes are necessarily extended in at least two dimensions.

My ontological hypothesis is that energy can exist in a form which is necessarily extended in time. The physical dimension of this energy is of course joule, but it is not joule in a (time) point. It is joule along a (temporal) line.

If this conjecture is true, then there are two different basic forms of energy, *classical (possibly momentary) energy* and *non-classical (necessarily time-extended) energy*. On the one hand there are all the classical kinds of energy which can be defined for *momentary* time points and be represented by functions of the form $f(t)$. On the other hand there are *non-classical energies* which, just like energy transfers, have to be represented by functions of the form $f(\Delta t)$. Classical states of energy have their physical dimension of energy (joule) defined for momentary time points (t), but non-classical energy has this dimension (joule) defined only for time intervals (Δt).

Where there is extension along a mathematical line, there are of course mathematical points contained in the line. Where there is non-classical energy, there must be some magnitude which is defined for the contained momentary time points, too. This latter magnitude has the dimension $E_N / \Delta t$, joules per second. Obviously, this magnitude does not represent classical momentary energy, it represents the *temporal intensity* of the conjectured non-classical energy.

The temporal bulk of kinetic energy change of a *classical* particle measures a process which is extended not only in time but also in space. When a change of kinetic energy takes place, the particle also necessarily changes its momentum. The *temporal* energy change bulk ($\Delta E \cdot \Delta t$) of the particle equals its *spatial* momentum change bulk ($\Delta p \cdot \Delta x$); see section 3, formulas (7) and (8). A corresponding connection between temporal

energy change bulk and spatial momentum change bulk is to be found in the photoelectric effect; see section 5, formula (19). And such a connection remains in quantum mechanics, and even in my reinterpretation of ΔE . If ΔE in formula (22) is reinterpreted as representing non-classical (necessarily time-extended) energy, E_N , then Δp in formula (23) should be reinterpreted too. I will symbolize the new interpretation of Δp by p_N and say that p_N represents *non-classical momentum*. Classical momentum can be a property of a point particle in a spatial point, but non-classical momentum is *necessarily* space-extended. Instead of formulas (22) and (23) we then get:

$$(24) \quad E_N \cdot \Delta t \geq h/2\pi$$

$$(25) \quad p_N \cdot \Delta x \geq h/2\pi$$

If we assume:

$$(26) \quad p_N \cdot \Delta x = E_N \cdot \Delta t$$

we get:

$$(27) \quad \#_T E_N = \#_S p_N \geq h/2\pi$$

(Note the subscripts of the bulk symbols; all the earlier uses of # means $\#_T$, i.e. temporal bulk in contradistinction to spatial bulk.)

In this way the uncertainty principle can be reinterpreted as a *principle of least temporal bulk of non-classical energy* and as a *principle of least spatial bulk of non-classical momentum*.

My ontological hypothesis is, to put it simply, that what has appeared as two connected uncertainties, the uncertainty of energy and the uncertainty of momentum, may in fact be two properties of an entity which is extended in both time and space. One of these properties, non-classical energy (E_N), exists *along* this entity's temporal extension. However, since changes of spatial extension do not affect the value of E_N , it should be assumed to exist *in* every point of the entity's spatial extension. The other property, non-classical momentum (p_N), exists *along* the entity's spatial extension but *in* every point of the temporal extension. E_N should be represented by functions of the form $f(x, \Delta t)$ and p_N by functions of the form $f(\Delta x, t)$. This conjecture affords us a non-classical momentum-energy unit in about the sense in which a rectangular surface is a

length-breadth unit. The length of a rectangle exists *along* one side but *in* every point of the other side.

It is important to note that the question whether a specific quanta of non-classical energy is at rest or is in motion is *a meaningless question*. Non-classical energy can neither exist at rest in a momentary point of time, nor can it exist as a movement. It simply but necessarily is extended along time's arrow.

Formula (27) says that the *temporal bulk* of non-classical energy (and the *spatial bulk* of non-classical momentum) can never be smaller than Planck's (original) constant (divided by 2π). If, now, we regard the parallelepiped of figure 1 as representing, not a temporal energy transfer bulk, but a temporal bulk of non-classical energy which equals $h/2\pi$, then the volume of this parallelepiped is the smallest one possible. This means that if we make Δt smaller E_N must be made larger, and vice versa. Similarly, if we make Δx smaller, then p_N must be made larger, and vice versa. Formula (27) says nothing about the shape or internal structure of the volume. It puts constraints only on the size. These constraints, however, are sufficient to turn Δt and E_N on the one hand, and Δx and p_N on the other hand, into *complementary variables*. E_N behaves in relation to time (and p_N in relation to space) as the pressure of a gas behaves in relation to its volume when the temperature is constant.

7. Virtual Particles and Non-Classical Energy

I have so far tried to apply some different concepts of energy bulks to classical physics, to early quantum theory, and to the uncertainty principle of quantum mechanics. A last attempt of application will be made in relation to relativistic quantum field theory. My conjecture here is that virtual particles can be reinterpreted as being entities with *non-classical energies whose quanta of temporal bulk equals Planck's constant*; and with *non-classical momenta whose quanta of spatial bulk equals Planck's constant*, too.

Instead of saying that a photon carries with it a cloud of virtual particles, and that a free electron carries with it a cloud of virtual photons, we should say that all real entities are connected with non-classical energy and non-classical momentum.

Virtual particles are particles which evade or violate the conservation laws of energy and momentum. In relation to both these laws, the "law-breaking" is regarded as restricted by the uncertainty principle. Let us look at an ordinary space-time diagram (figure 2) of an interaction between an electron and a proton which takes place by means of a virtual photon. Both the electron and the proton are at rest when the interaction starts.

Figure 2.

The traditional description looks as follows. At time t_1 the electron emits a virtual photon which, with the speed of light, travels towards the proton. Then, at t_2 , the proton absorbs the virtual photon. During $\Delta t = t_2 - t_1$, and in the distance $\Delta x = x_2 - x_1$, the virtual photon has energy and momentum which, together with the energies and momenta of the electron and the proton, break the conservation laws. The energy and momentum of the virtual photon, however, can only exist in a time interval and a space interval which are so small that they are confined within the limits given by the uncertainty principle applied to the energy and the momentum of the electron. The virtual photon "borrows" its energy and momentum from the uncertainty of the electron. In this story the uncertainty principle is used in a new way. The products of energy and time (and of momentum and distance), shall now be *smaller than* or equal to $h/2\pi$, not larger than or equal to $h/2\pi$.

$$(28) \quad \Delta E \cdot \Delta t = \Delta p \cdot \Delta x \leq h/2\pi$$

Let us now assume that, in fact, we here have non-classical energy and momentum instead of uncertainties, and that in these interactions the temporal bulk of this form of energy is always equal to Planck's constant. These assumptions transform (28) into the following formula:

$$(29) \quad \#E_N = E_N \cdot \Delta t = p_N \cdot \Delta x = h/2\pi$$

Formula (29) corresponds to formula (19) which was discussed in section 5. That equality was in the pre-Heisenberg/Schrödinger period to be found in the analyses of the photoelectric effect and the Compton effect. With respect to the space-time diagram now at hand (figure 2), my proposal is that there is in the represented interaction no

moving virtual photon. There is instead a spatiotemporally extended momentum-energy unit which has the property of non-classical energy (E_N) along its temporal extension and the property of non-classical momentum (p_N) along its spatial extension. The *temporal* bulk of its non-classical energy (as well as the *spatial* bulk of its non-classical momentum) is given by formula (29) and it equals Planck's constant. Such quanta of non-classical energy cannot move, since like movements they are extended in time; nor can they be at rest in the ordinary sense of rest. If the amounts of E_N and p_N are given, both the temporal extension (Δt) and the spatial extension (Δx) of their common property bearer can be calculated; and vice versa. If the existence of non-classical energy and momentum is assumed, the space-time diagram of the interaction ought to look like figure 3.

Figure 3.

The non-classical energy which effects the interaction between the electron and the proton does not move at all. It just comes into being, with its temporal extension, and then passes out of being again.

Instead of assuming *virtual momentary* particles which move and which "borrow" energy and momentum from real momentary particles with uncertainties of energy and momentum, we may assume the existence of real but non-moving spatiotemporally extended entities with the properties of non-classical energy and of non-classical momentum. Such entities come into being and pass out of being at the same time as they transfer energy changes, momentum changes and charges among real momentary particles. During the time $0 - t_1$, and the time after t_2 , there is in each instant one electron with its energy state and momentum and one proton with its energy state and momentum. In the time interval $t_1 - t_2$ there is similarly in each *momentary instant* the electron, the proton and their energy *states*, but there is also in each instant the *temporal intensity* of the non-classical energy. It has the dimension $E_N / \Delta t$, joules per seconds. The momentary energy states of the electron and the proton have of course the dimension joule.

Most conservation laws rely on some principle of addition. If we *add* the relevant magnitudes, then the sum for the system shall be conserved. Now, a necessary requirement for a physically significant addition is that all the added magnitudes have the same physical dimension. In the law of the conservation of energy, all the different kinds of energies that are meant to be added have to have the dimension joule. Some other requirements, however, relate to time.

When different energy *states* are added, for instance potential and kinetic energy in newtonian mechanics, these states must belong to *one* and the same time point. When an energy *change* (ΔE) is added to a certain energy *state* (E), *two* time points have to be reckoned with. First the instant when the change starts and then the instant when it ends. Since a change is necessarily extended in time, when an energy change is added one must take two time points into account. An energy change cannot possibly be added to an energy state *in one temporal point*. This, of course, means that non-classical energies cannot possibly be added to a classical energy state *in* a time point. Non-classical energies are, just like energy changes, necessarily extended in time.

Classical energy states can have the physical dimension joule *in a momentary point of time*, but non-classical energies can only have this dimension *in a temporal interval*. Therefore, non-classical energy cannot possibly be included in the classical law of the conservation of energy *states*. However, non-classical energy can be added and subtracted to energy *processes*. Analogous remarks, but in relation to space instead of time, can be worked out for non-classical momentum in relation to the classical law of the conservation of momentum.

8. Concluding Remarks

I have argued (section 6) that the uncertainty principle of energy may be reinterpreted as representing an hitherto unnoticed form of energy which is necessarily temporally extended. I named it non-classical energy. This reinterpretation affects the so-called uncertainty principle, and makes its name a misnomer. I have tried to reinterpret the principle as saying that, independently of measurements, there is a least temporal bulk

of non-classical energy in the world. Instead of disclosing the curious property of uncertainty, quantum mechanics has uncovered non-classical energy (and non-classical momentum).

I have also argued (section 7) that the so-called virtual particles can be regarded as real but necessarily time-extended entities which have non-classical energy as a fundamental property. Their temporal bulk of non-classical energy equals Planck's constant. Such a reinterpretation makes it possible to retain the conservation laws of classical energy (and momentum) without any talk of systems which "borrow" classical energy.

I am fully aware that the idea of necessarily time-extended phenomena which I have put forward, leads to conceptual and metaphysical difficulties of its own which I have not dealt with. In particular, there is the problem of how to interpret the concept of the present ('now') in physics if temporally extended magnitudes, which are both physically significant and fundamental, are allowed. Should each 'now' embrace the whole temporal extension of a quantum of non-classical energy, or can a quantum of non-classical energy be extended both into the past and into the future? However, in view of all the philosophical riddles and fanciful interpretations connected with quantum mechanics today, I think the notions of *necessarily time-extended phenomena*, *temporal bulks*, *difference of action*, and *non-classical energy*, are as worthy of consideration as any other ideas which are used in attempts to transcend the Copenhagen interpretation. Perhaps these notions can shed some new light on the measurement problem and the collapse of the wave function, too.

In science, mostly, conceptual construction precedes measurement. For instance, before the theories of electricity were developed no measurement of any electrical magnitude was possible. If we assume that nature contains non-classical energy, then (a) some old theorems of quantum mechanics may take on a new significance, and (b) measurements may be possible to discuss in ways which are closed if the idea of necessarily time-extended energy is not taken into account.

References

- 1 Jammer, M. 1961. *Concepts of Mass*, Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- 2 Mach, E. 1960. *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, La Salle, Illinois.
- 3 Sachs, M. 1972. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, **23**, 117.
- 4 Sachs, M. 1988. *Einstein versus Bohr*, Open Court, La Salle, Illinois.

(For helpful comments I want to thank Mendel Sachs, Buffalo - USA, Lars-Göran Johansson, Linköping - Sweden, and Kaj Børge Hansen, Uppsala - Sweden.)