There Is No Collapse: Measurement as Spectral Projection

Not waves. Not probabilities. Mode amplitudes that get evaluated.

Tam\{}\{}'as Nagy, Ph.D.

tnagyphd@gmail.com

Draft

Abstract

We reformulate quantum measurement using the language of spectral pattern theory. The pre-measurement state is not a "wave" (misleading: it does not propagate in 3D space) and not a "probability distribution" (incomplete: it has phase). It is a **spectral state** $\{c_k\}$ — a list of complex mode amplitudes in the eigenbasis of the system's generator. Measurement is not "collapse" (mystical). It is **projection**: the mode amplitudes are evaluated at the measurement point, $c_k \to c_k \cdot \psi_k(x_0)$. The Born rule $P = |c_k|^2$ follows from the orthogonality of modes. The measurement "problem" dissolves: there is nothing to explain beyond projection in a Hilbert space. We formalize this using the spectral generator framework: evolution is $c_k(t) = c_k(0) \cdot e^{\lambda_k t}$ (mode-independent), measurement is $c_k \to c_k \cdot \psi_k(x_0)$ (evaluation), and the cycle EVOLVE → PROJECT → EVOLVE is identical to Bayesian updating, Kalman filtering, and conditioning in probability theory. The "wave function" is demystified: it is a list of numbers. "Collapse" is evaluation of that list at a point. The mystery was never physical — it was linguistic.

---

1. The Linguistic Problem

1.1 Three Wrong Words

The quantum measurement debate has persisted for 100 years partly because the standard vocabulary is misleading:

"Wave function" — implies a wave propagating in 3D space, like water or sound. In reality, ψ for N particles lives in $3N$-dimensional configuration space. A 2-particle ψ is 6-dimensional. You cannot draw it. It is not a wave.

"Probability distribution" — $|\psi|^2$ is a probability density, but ψ itself is COMPLEX-VALUED. It has phase: $c_k = |c_k|e^{i\phi_k}$. The phase is physically essential (it produces interference) but has no probabilistic interpretation. ψ contains MORE than a probability distribution.

"Collapse" — implies a physical process: something that was extended suddenly becomes localized. No mechanism is given. No time scale is specified. The word invites mystery where none is needed.

1.2 The Right Word: Spectral State

Definition (Spectral State). *The state of a system is the list of complex mode amplitudes:*

$$\{c_k\}_{k=0}^{N-1}, \qquad c_k \in \mathbb{C} \tag{1}$$

in the eigenbasis $\{\psi_k\}$ of the system's generator (Hamiltonian, Fokker–Planck, Lindblad, or Koopman operator).

This is a list of numbers. Not a wave. Not a probability. Not a field. **Numbers.**

---

2. The Three Operations

Everything that happens to a quantum system (or any spectral system) is one of three operations on $\{c_k\}$:

2.1 Evolution: Multiply Each Mode by $e^{\lambda_k t}$

$$c_k(t) = c_k(0) \cdot e^{\lambda_k t} \tag{2}$$

Each mode evolves INDEPENDENTLY. No mode knows about any other. The evolution is determined by the generator eigenvalue λ_k: - Quantum: $\lambda_k = -iE_k/\hbar \to$ oscillation (no decay, unitary) - Stochastic: $\lambda_k < 0 \to$ exponential decay (dissipative) - Open quantum: λ_k complex $\to$ oscillation + decay (Lindblad)

2.2 Measurement: Evaluate Each Mode at x_0

$$c_k \;\longrightarrow\; c_k' = c_k \cdot \psi_k(x_0) \tag{3}$$

Each mode amplitude is MULTIPLIED by the eigenfunction value at the measurement point. This is EVALUATION, not collapse. The list $\{c_k\}$ is updated by elementwise multiplication with $\{\psi_k(x_0)\}$.

After measurement, renormalize: $c_k' \to c_k'/\sqrt{\sum_j |c_j'|^2}$.

2.3 Preparation: Set the List

$$c_k = \langle \psi_k, \phi_{\text{initial}} \rangle \tag{4}$$

Project the initial condition onto the eigenbasis. This converts a "physical" description (particle at position x_0, temperature T, etc.) into the spectral state.

2.4 That's All

Every quantum experiment is a sequence of PREPARE → EVOLVE → MEASURE → EVOLVE → MEASURE → ...

In spectral language: 1. Set $\{c_k\}$ (preparation) 2. Multiply by $e^{\lambda_k t}$ (evolution) 3. Multiply by $\psi_k(x_0)$ and renormalize (measurement) 4. Repeat

There is no "collapse." There is no "wave." There are mode amplitudes that get multiplied by two different things: $e^{\lambda_k t}$ (time) and $\psi_k(x_0)$ (observation).

---

3. Why This Dissolves the Measurement Problem

3.1 The Problem as Usually Stated

"The Schrödinger equation is deterministic and linear. How does a definite measurement outcome arise from a superposition?"

3.2 The Problem Restated Spectrally

"The list $\{c_k\}$ evolves by multiplying each element by $e^{\lambda_k t}$. How does a single outcome x_0 arise?"

3.3 The Answer

It arises the same way a die roll arises from a probability distribution: **by sampling.** The list $\{c_k\}$ defines a probability distribution $P(x) = |\sum_k c_k \psi_k(x)|^2$. Measurement samples from this distribution. The outcome x_0 is one sample.

The "mystery" was: how does a smooth, extended object (ψ) become a point (x_0)?

The spectral answer: ψ **was never a smooth object. It was a list of numbers $\{c_k\}$. The numbers define a distribution. The distribution is sampled. There is no extended object that needs to "collapse."**

The list $\{c_k\}$ lives in MODE SPACE (abstract, N-dimensional). It does not live in PHYSICAL SPACE (3D). Nothing "extends" in 3D. Nothing "collapses" in 3D. The 3D picture (a wave spreading and collapsing) was always an artifact of plotting $|\psi(x)|^2$ — which is a DERIVED quantity, not the fundamental one.

3.4 What About Entanglement?

For two particles with spectral states $\{c_k^{(1)}\}$ and $\{c_l^{(2)}\}$, the joint state is:

$$\{c_{kl}\}_{k,l} = \text{NOT necessarily } c_k^{(1)} \cdot c_l^{(2)}$$

When $c_{kl} \neq c_k^{(1)} c_l^{(2)}$, the particles are ENTANGLED: their mode amplitudes are correlated. Measuring particle 1 (evaluating at $x_0^{(1)}$) updates the JOINT list: $c_{kl} \to c_{kl} \cdot \psi_k(x_0^{(1)})$. This changes the marginal $\{c_l^{(2)}\}$ — instantaneously, nonlocally.

This is "spooky action at a distance" — but spectrally, it's just: **updating a correlated list.** If I know the correlation between elements 5 and 12, and I observe element 5, my estimate of element 12 changes. No information is transmitted. No signal is sent. A correlated list is updated.

---

4. The Kernel Is the Observer

4.1 The Measurement Basis = The Kernel

When you "measure position," you project onto the position eigenbasis $\{\delta(x - x_0)\}$. When you "measure momentum," you project onto $\{e^{ipx/\hbar}\}$. The CHOICE of what to measure = the choice of eigenbasis = the choice of KERNEL.

$$\text{Measurement apparatus} = \text{Kernel } \mathcal{K} = \text{Which eigenbasis to project onto}$$

Different kernels → different projections → different outcomes. The "reality" you observe depends on the kernel. Not because reality is subjective — but because **projection is basis-dependent.**

4.2 The Pattern Is Relative to the Kernel

The spectral state $\{c_k\}$ is defined relative to a basis $\{\psi_k\}$, which comes from a kernel $\mathcal{K}$. Change the kernel → change the basis → change the c_k values → **see different patterns.**

But: the EIGENVALUES σ_k (pattern strength) and ρ (decay rate) are RELATIVELY stable across reasonable kernels. The EXISTENCE of pattern ($\rho > 1.1$) is nearly kernel-independent. The DETAILS (which ψ_k) are kernel-dependent.

4.3 Science = Finding Better Kernels

The history of physics is a sequence of better kernels:

Era	Kernel	What became visible (ρ increased)
Aristotle	Qualitative (earth, water, fire, air)	Categories ($\rho \sim 1.5$)
Newton	$F = ma$, Euclidean space	Orbits, mechanics ($\rho > 10$)
Maxwell	Vector fields on $\mathbb{R}^3$	Electromagnetic waves ($\rho > 100$)
Schrödinger	$L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$, Hilbert space	Atomic spectra ($\rho > 1000$)
Feynman	Path integral: $\int e^{iS/\hbar}\mathcal{D}[\text{path}]$	QFT, particles ($\rho \to \infty$)

Each new kernel made MORE structure visible (higher ρ). The Standard Model is the current best kernel: 17 particles, 4 forces, all eigenvalues of one Lagrangian.

Scientific progress = ρ-maximization over the space of kernels.

---

5. The Spectral Measurement Cycle

5.1 The Universal Cycle

$$\boxed{\text{PREPARE } (\{c_k\}) \longrightarrow \text{EVOLVE } (c_k \cdot e^{\lambda_k t}) \longrightarrow \text{PROJECT } (c_k \cdot \psi_k(x_0)) \longrightarrow \text{REPEAT}}$$

This cycle is IDENTICAL in every framework:

Framework	PREPARE	EVOLVE	PROJECT
Quantum mechanics	$c_k = \langle \psi_k \mid \phi_0 \rangle$	$c_k \cdot e^{-iE_k t/\hbar}$	$c_k \cdot \psi_k(x_0)$ (Born rule)
Bayesian statistics	Prior $\pi(c_k)$	Propagate forward	$c_k \cdot L(x_0 \mid c_k)$ (Bayes' rule)
Kalman filtering	$\hat{x}_0$	$\hat{x}_{t+1} = A\hat{x}_t$	$\hat{x} + K(y - H\hat{x})$ (update)
Our spectral framework	$A(0)$	$e^{Mt}A(0)$	$A_k \cdot \varphi_k(x_0)$

Quantum measurement, Bayesian updating, and Kalman filtering are the SAME operation (spectral projection) applied to the SAME object (mode amplitudes) with the SAME rule (multiply by basis function at the observed point).

The "measurement problem" of QM is the "conditioning problem" of probability theory. Nobody considers Bayesian updating "mysterious." It shouldn't be mysterious in QM either.

5.2 Where the Born Rule Comes From

The Born rule says: $P(k) = |c_k|^2$. In the spectral framework:

The modes ψ_k are ORTHOGONAL: $\langle \psi_j, \psi_k \rangle = \delta_{jk}$. When you project onto x_0, the probability of finding mode k is proportional to $|c_k \psi_k(x_0)|^2$. Summing over all x_0: $\int |c_k \psi_k(x)|^2 dx = |c_k|^2$ (by normalization of ψ_k).

The Born rule is a CONSEQUENCE of orthogonality + normalization. It is not an independent postulate. (This is essentially Gleason's theorem (1957) in spectral language.)

---

6. What Exists Before Measurement?

6.1 The Three Levels of Description

Level	What it is	Measurable?	Contains phase?
Spectral state $\{c_k\}$	Complex mode amplitudes	NOT directly	YES
Probability density $p(x) = \lvert\Sigma c_k \psi_k(x)\rvert^2$	Real function	YES (from many measurements)	NO (phase lost in $\lvert\cdot\rvert^2$)
Measurement outcome x_0	Single real number	YES (one measurement)	NO

Before measurement: the spectral state $\{c_k\}$ exists. It is not a wave (it lives in mode space, not 3D). It is not a probability (it has phase). It is a LIST OF COMPLEX NUMBERS.

After one measurement: a single outcome x_0. The spectral state updates via projection.

After many measurements: the probability density $p(x)$ is reconstructed from the histogram of outcomes. The phase information is LOST (only $|c_k|^2$ survives, not c_k itself).

6.2 Is the Spectral State "Real"?

The spectral state $\{c_k\}$ is: - **Complete**: all predictions about the system follow from it - **Not directly observable**: you can only observe projections (measurement outcomes) - **Basis-dependent**: the values c_k depend on the kernel (choice of eigenbasis) - **Phase-containing**: the phases ϕ_k are physically real (they cause interference) but not individually measurable

Whether this is "real" depends on your definition of "real." In the spectral framework: $\{c_k\}$ **is as real as the system gets.** There is no deeper level. There is no "hidden variable" beneath it (Bell, 1964). There is no "wave" beneath it. It is the bottom.

---

7. The Dissolution

The measurement "problem" assumes that measurement is a DIFFERENT KIND of process than evolution. In the spectral framework, both are the SAME kind of operation on the SAME object:

	Evolution	Measurement
Operation on c_k	Multiply by $e^{\lambda_k t}$	Multiply by $\psi_k(x_0)$
What changes	Amplitudes rotate/decay	Amplitudes weighted by basis
Deterministic?	Yes	No (the x_0 is sampled)
Reversible?	Yes (for unitary systems)	No (phase information lost in $\|c_k\|^2$)

The ONLY difference: evolution multiplies by $e^{\lambda_k t}$ (known, deterministic), measurement multiplies by $\psi_k(x_0)$ (where x_0 is random, sampled from $P(x) = |\sum c_k \psi_k(x)|^2$).

There is no "collapse." There is multiplication by two different things. One is deterministic ($e^{\lambda_k t}$). The other involves sampling ($\psi_k(x_0)$ where x_0 is drawn from P). The sampling is the only non-deterministic step. And sampling from a distribution is not "mysterious" — it is what dice do.

$$\boxed{\text{There is no collapse. There is a list of numbers that gets multiplied.}}$$

During the preparation of this work the author used large language models in order to assist with manuscript drafting, literature search, and coding assistance. After using these tools, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the published article.

References

- Bell, J. S (1964). On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox. *Physics*, 1(3).
- Bohr, N (1928). The Quantum Postulate and the Recent Development of Atomic Theory. *Nature*.
- Gleason, A. M (1957). Measures on the closed subspaces of a Hilbert space. *J. Math. Mech.*.
- Koopman, B. O (1931). Hamiltonian systems and transformations in Hilbert space. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 17(5).
- Nagy, T. (2026). Lean 4 Formal Verification of the Spectral Fenton Distribution and Related Financial Mathematics. *Working paper*.
- Nagy, T. (2026). The Quantum Spectral Representation Theorem: What Can and Cannot Be Compressed. *Working paper*.
- Nagy, T. (2026). What Is a Pattern? A Spectral Answer. *Working paper*.
- Rovelli, C (1996). Relational quantum mechanics. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, 35(8).
- Zurek, W. H (2003). Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. *Reviews of Modern Physics*. DOI: 10.1103/revmodphys.75.715