

Quantum mechanics and the limits of classical description

Juan Segurola

Core question

How did quantum mechanics replace classical trajectories with a mathematical framework for amplitudes, operators and probabilities, and what did this reveal about the limits of classical description?

Historical and evolutionary context

By the early twentieth century black-body radiation, atomic spectra, the photoelectric effect and atomic stability resisted classical explanation. Planck's 1900 quantisation of energy exchange and Einstein's 1905 light-quantum proposal were early ruptures, but a coherent mechanics arrived only in the mid-1920s. Heisenberg's 1925 matrix mechanics, Born and Jordan's formalisation, Schrödinger's 1926 wave mechanics and Born's probabilistic interpretation created mathematically different but ultimately equivalent routes to quantum theory. Heisenberg's 1927 uncertainty relation made explicit that classical simultaneous specification of conjugate variables could not simply be retained.

What could communities know before this transition?

Classical mechanics and electromagnetism could predict planetary motion, machines and fields with enormous success. Atomic spectroscopy supplied precise regularities, and PIO-075 had made atoms experimentally penetrable. The limitation was that classical particles and fields could not consistently account for quantised spectra, stable atoms and microscopic radiation-matter interactions.

What changed?

Observable relations replaced imagined classical orbits

Heisenberg's 1925 programme deliberately reformulated mechanics around quantities connected to observable spectral transitions. Matrix multiplication introduced noncommuting quantities, breaking the classical assumption that physical variables could always be combined in arbitrary order without consequence.

Wave mechanics supplied a different representation

Schrödinger's 1926 equation treated quantum states through wavefunctions and differential equations. He soon demonstrated the relation between his formulation and matrix mechanics. The existence of equivalent representations was itself epistemically important: the theory was not tied to one intuitive picture.

Probability became fundamental to prediction

Born interpreted the wavefunction probabilistically in scattering. Quantum theory therefore did not merely add measurement noise to classical certainty; it changed the form of prediction. Heisenberg's 1927 uncertainty relation further showed that certain pairs of quantities cannot be assigned arbitrarily precise simultaneous values within the theory.

Why could this capability emerge?

Quantum mechanics depended on precision spectroscopy, atomic and radiation experiments, mathematical matrices and differential equations, the old quantum theory of Planck, Einstein and Bohr, and a dense European network of seminars and correspondence. The crisis was productive because experimental regularities were precise enough to reject inadequate classical models.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Quantum mechanics enabled atomic, molecular and solid-state physics, semiconductor theory, lasers, nuclear physics, quantum chemistry and much of modern materials science. It also provided the language for later quantum field theories and information technologies.

New limits and risks

Quantum mechanics predicts experimental distributions with extraordinary precision but leaves interpretive disputes about measurement, ontology and classical emergence. Mathematical formalism can be mistaken for direct description of unobserved reality, while popular accounts can exaggerate uncertainty into a claim that anything is possible. Technological applications also connect quantum knowledge to dual-use systems.

What changed in the architecture of knowledge?

Physics moved from a primarily **trajectory-based description to an operator-and-state architecture of probabilistic prediction**. The relation between theory and observation became more explicit, and classical concepts became limiting approximations rather than universal primitives.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

Textbook narratives often compress the transition into a few famous men while underplaying experimentalists, spectroscopists, mathematicians and contributors such as Born, Jordan, Pauli and Dirac. “Copenhagen interpretation” is also historically heterogeneous. PIO therefore distinguishes the formal achievements of 1925–1927 from later philosophical codifications.

Dependency map

- INDIRECT ← PIO-075 X-rays, radioactivity and the measurable atom
- INDIRECT ← PIO-079 Noether, symmetry and conservation
- DIRECT → PIO-083 Nuclear physics, nuclear energy and dual-use knowledge
- INDIRECT → PIO-087 DNA and molecular heredity

References

1. Heisenberg, W. “Über quantentheoretische Umdeutung kinematischer und mechanischer Beziehungen.” *Zeitschrift für Physik* 33, 879–893 (1925). DOI: 10.1007/BF01328377.
2. Schrödinger, E. “Über das Verhältnis der Heisenberg-Born-Jordanschen Quantenmechanik zu der meinen.” *Annalen der Physik* 384(8), 734–756 (1926). DOI: 10.1002/andp.19263840804.
3. Heisenberg, W. “Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik.” *Zeitschrift für Physik* 43, 172–198 (1927). DOI: 10.1007/BF01397280.
4. Camilleri, K. “How quantum mechanics emerged in a few revolutionary months 100 years ago.” *Nature* 637, 269–271 (2025). DOI: 10.1038/d41586-024-04217-0.