

# The Physics of Negative Absolute Temperatures

Eitan Abraham\*

*Institute of Biological Chemistry, Biophysics, and Bioengineering,  
School of Engineering and Physical Sciences, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh EH14 4AS, UK*

Oliver Penrose†

*Department of Mathematics and the Maxwell Institute for Mathematical Sciences,  
Colin Maclaurin Building, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh EH14 4AS, UK*

(Dated: November 24, 2016)

Negative absolute temperatures were introduced into experimental physics by Purcell and Pound, who successfully applied this concept to nuclear spins; nevertheless the concept has proved controversial: a recent article aroused considerable interest by its claim, based on a classical entropy formula (the ‘volume entropy’) due to Gibbs, that negative temperatures violated basic principles of statistical thermodynamics. Here we give a thermodynamic analysis which confirms the negative-temperature interpretation of the Purcell-Pound experiments. We also examine the principal arguments that have been advanced against the negative temperature concept; we find that these arguments are not logically compelling and moreover that the underlying ‘volume’ entropy formula leads to predictions inconsistent with existing experimental results on nuclear spins. We conclude that, despite the counter-arguments, negative absolute temperatures make good theoretical sense and did occur in the experiments designed to produce them.

PACS numbers: 05.70.-a, 05.30.d

Keywords: Negative absolute temperatures, nuclear spin systems, entropy definitions

## I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of negative absolute temperature, first mooted by Onsager[1, 2] in the context of two-dimensional turbulence, fits consistently into the description of various experimental findings. In 1951 Purcell and Pound[3], by rapidly reversing the applied magnetic field applied to the nuclear spins in LiF crystals, produced a state displaying negative magnetic susceptibility which lasted for several minutes. In 1957, Abragam and Proctor[4, 5] did experiments, also on LiF, which they described as ‘calorimetry . . . at negative temperature’. In 1997 a group from Helsinki[6, 7], by a similar procedure, brought the nuclear spins in silver to temperatures measured to be around  $-2$  nanoKelvin, and in 2013 Braun et al[8] brought a system of interacting bosons in an optical lattice to a state exhibiting Bose-Einstein condensation into the single-particle state of highest, rather than lowest, energy. Nevertheless, the negative absolute temperature concept has proved controversial: Berdichevsky *et al.*[9] argued that Onsager’s use of it was flawed, and a recent article[10] argued that the negative-temperature concept was inconsistent with basic thermodynamic principles. Subsequently a number of articles have appeared on both sides of the argument [11–22].

In this paper we give, in sections II and III, an argument based on the second law of thermodynamics which confirms the negative-temperature interpretation of the nuclear-spin experiments mentioned above. We also ex-

amine, in section IV, the statistical mechanics argument which has been held to rule out negative temperatures; we find that this argument is not logically compelling and moreover (subsection IV D) that it leads to predictions inconsistent with known experimental results.

## II. MACROSCOPIC BEHAVIOUR AND TIME SCALES

The Purcell-Pound experiment uses a system of nuclear spins located on a crystal lattice in a uniform magnetic field  $\mathbf{h}$ . The energy of this system can be written

$$E = -\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{M} + W_{ss} + W_{sl} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{M}$  is the magnetic moment vector,  $W_{ss}$  is the spin-spin interaction and  $W_{sl}$  is the spin-lattice interaction.

At sufficiently low temperatures the spin-lattice interaction acts very slowly; the relevant relaxation time  $\tau_{sl}$  can be of the order of minutes[23] or even hours[6]. On shorter time scales, we can, following Abragam (chapter 5 of ref.[24]), neglect  $W_{sl}$  and treat the spin system as isolated apart from the effect of changes in  $\mathbf{h}$ . If we perturb the spin system by changing  $\mathbf{h}$ , and then leave it alone for a time short compared to  $\tau_{sl}$  it may come to a (transient) internal equilibrium under the action of the spin-spin interaction, at a ‘spin temperature’[4, 5, 24] which can differ from that of the lattice. The lifetime of this transient equilibrium state, being of order  $\tau_{sl}$ , is much greater than the relaxation time  $\tau_{ss}$  for approaching it, which can[23] be less than 0.1 sec. In such a state the magnetic moment  $\mathbf{M}$  must (assuming  $\mathbf{h} \neq 0$ ) be parallel or antiparallel to the applied field  $\mathbf{h}$ , for otherwise the

---

\* E.Abraham@hw.ac.uk

† O.Penrose@hw.ac.uk

Larmor precession would cause the vector  $\mathbf{M}$  to rotate about  $\mathbf{h}$ .

The energy of any such transient equilibrium state can be found from (1) which, provided that  $\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{M}$  is large enough to justify neglecting<sup>1</sup>  $W_{ss}$ , simplifies to

$$E \approx -\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{M} \quad (2)$$

where the sign  $\approx$  means that the difference between the quantities it separates is negligible when  $|W_{ss}| \ll E$ . The transient equilibrium states can conveniently be labelled by their values of the energy  $E$  and magnetic field  $\mathbf{h}$ . Their magnetic moments are determined by these two parameters, since  $\mathbf{M}(E, \mathbf{h})$  has to be parallel or antiparallel to  $\mathbf{h}$ , and therefore equals the only scalar multiple of  $\mathbf{h}$  satisfying (2), namely

$$\mathbf{M}(E, \mathbf{h}) \approx -\mathbf{h}E/|\mathbf{h}|^2 \quad (3)$$

### III. USING THE ENTROPY INCREASE PRINCIPLE

The procedure used by Purcell and Pound in their quest for negative temperatures was to bring the system to equilibrium at a very low (positive) temperature in a strong magnetic field and then reverse the field rapidly, in a time much less than the period  $\tau_L$  of the Larmor precession, so that the magnetic moment has no time to change. Assuming that  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{h}$  were parallel in the old state, the new magnetic field is in the opposite direction to the magnetic moment, so that there is no Larmor precession in the new state. The new state is therefore also a transient equilibrium state. By eqn (2) the energy of the new state is the negative of the old. If the energy of the old state was negative, that of the new one is positive.

To obtain thermodynamic information about these transient equilibrium states, we shall use the second law of thermodynamics. An integral part of this law is<sup>2</sup> the Principle of Increase of Entropy (or, more precisely, non-decrease of entropy), which asserts[26, p. 77] that *the entropy of the final state of any adiabatic transition is never less than that of its initial state*<sup>3</sup>. Here ‘adiabatic transition’ means a process during which no heat enters or leaves the system — that is, one during which any change in the energy of the system is equal to the work done on it by external mechanisms. To avoid misunderstandings,

we emphasize (i) that the word ‘adiabatic’ is *not* being used here to mean ‘infinitely slow’ (i.e. quasi-static), as in the adiabatic theorem of mechanics discussed in section IV C below, nor (as in ref.[16, p. 12]) ) as a synonym for ‘isentropic’ (ii) that (as noted explicitly in ref.[26]) there is no requirement for the system to be isolated (iii) that although the initial and final states are equilibrium states (otherwise their entropies would not be defined) there is no need for the states passed through during the process to be equilibrium states, not even approximately.

So long as  $\mathbf{M}$  remains constant, the field-reversal process considered here satisfies the definition of ‘adiabatic transition’; for it follows from (2) that

$$dE = -\mathbf{M} \cdot d\mathbf{h} - \mathbf{h} \cdot d\mathbf{M} \quad (4)$$

so that, with  $\mathbf{M}$  constant (i.e.  $d\mathbf{M} = 0$ ), the change in  $E$  is  $-\mathbf{M} \cdot d\mathbf{h}$  which, as shown for example in Reif’s textbook[28, pp 440-444]<sup>4</sup>, is equal to the work done by external mechanisms in changing  $\mathbf{h}$  so that the process is indeed an ‘adiabatic transition’ as defined above. It follows, by the entropy increase principle, that neither of the two states with opposite  $\mathbf{h}$  but the same  $\mathbf{M}$ , can have greater entropy than the other, *i.e.* their entropies are equal. But by (2) these two states have equal and opposite energies, and so if the entropy is written as a function of  $E$  and  $\mathbf{h}$ , the function  $S(E, \mathbf{h})$  has the property

$$S(E, \mathbf{h}) = S(-E, -\mathbf{h}) \quad (5)$$

We define the reciprocal temperature  $\theta$  (usually denoted  $1/T$ , or else  $k\beta$ ) by

$$\theta := \frac{\partial S(E, \mathbf{h})}{\partial E} \quad (6)$$

The physical significance of this definition is that if a small amount of energy is transferred from a body with a lower  $\theta$  to one with a higher  $\theta$ , then the total entropy will increase. Moreover, if the two bodies are in thermal contact (i.e. if energy can pass by heat conduction from one to the other) then at equilibrium their  $\theta$  values must be equal. In everyday language, the body with lower  $\theta$  is[23] ‘hotter’ than the other. In particular, a body with negative temperature (negative  $\theta$ ) is ‘hotter’ than any body whatever with positive temperature. An example of this is the experiment of Abragam and Proctor discussed in more detail below (section IV D), where a spin system with positive energy (corresponding to a negative temperature, i.e.  $\theta < 0$ ) gave up energy to another spin system with zero energy (corresponding to an infinite temperature, i.e.  $\theta = 0$ ).

<sup>1</sup> Although we neglect the contribution of  $W_{ss}$  to the energy, we do not neglect its dynamical effect, which is what brings the spin system to internal equilibrium. There is an analogy with the kinetic theory of gases, where the effect of the molecular interactions on the energy may be neglected even though their effect on the time evolution is crucial

<sup>2</sup> This is what Campisi[25] calls ‘part B’ of the second law.

<sup>3</sup> An alternative to the formulation in ref.[26] is the Entropy Principle used by Lieb and Yngvason[27] in their axiomatic formulation of thermodynamics.

<sup>4</sup> An alternative to Reif’s argument is to imagine the magnetic field acting on the system to be produced by movable permanent magnets so that the work done on the system in changing  $\mathbf{h}$  equals the mechanical work done in moving these magnets

Defining the temperature  $T := 1/\theta$ , it follows from (5) and (6) that

$$T(E, \mathbf{h}) = -T(-E, -\mathbf{h}) \quad (7)$$

Thus, when the magnetic field is reversed, the temperature  $T$  changes sign along with  $E$ , in agreement with the interpretation given by Purcell and Pound[3], by Abragam and Proctor[4, 5] and by the Helsinki group[6, 7] that the states they obtained by magnetic field reversal had negative thermodynamic temperatures.

The negative-temperature interpretation has, however, been challenged[10], using a statistical mechanics argument. This argument is considered in the next section.

#### IV. STATISTICAL MECHANICS AND NEGATIVE TEMPERATURES

##### A. The ‘Boltzmann’ entropy

When we come to apply statistical mechanics to negative absolute temperatures the first question to consider is what ensemble to use. The canonical ensemble, based on the Gibbs canonical distribution  $\exp(-\beta\mathcal{H})$  where  $\mathcal{H}$  is the Hamiltonian and  $\beta$  is a parameter specifying the reciprocal temperature, seems natural; but it has the disadvantage that this distribution describes a system in thermal contact with a heat bath whose temperature is treated as something already given, rather than being expressed in terms of more ‘fundamental’ concepts whose meaning is unequivocal.

For this reason our discussion here will be based on the microcanonical rather than the canonical ensemble. The main conceptual problem is how best to extend the notion of entropy, originally a thermodynamic concept, into the realm of mechanics. There is no unique solution to this problem; the choice of entropy definition is partly a matter of taste, so long as the chosen definition agrees with the thermodynamic entropy when applied to macroscopic systems.

Traditionally, the microcanonical definition of entropy has been based on Boltzmann’s principle<sup>5</sup>

$$S = k \log W \quad (8)$$

where  $W$  is the number of quantum states constituting the microcanonical ensemble. For our spin system, the energy levels are highly degenerate and a microcanonical ensemble can be set up for each energy level, comprising all the states with that energy. In that case eqn (8) gives, for all  $E$  in the energy spectrum for the given value of  $\mathbf{h}$ ,

$$S = S_B(E, \mathbf{h}) := k \log \omega(E, \mathbf{h}) \quad (9)$$

where  $k$  is Boltzmann’s constant, and  $\omega(E)$  is the multiplicity of the energy level  $E$ . If  $E$  is not in the energy spectrum, Boltzmann’s principle gives no clear guidance; the usual procedure is to use a convenient interpolation formula. For more general systems, where the energy levels may not be degenerate at all, the ensemble can be defined[30] to comprise all the states whose energies lie in a specified interval, say  $(E - \epsilon, E]$ , where  $\epsilon$  is a parameter large in comparison with the energy level spacing but small in comparison with  $E$  itself; the corresponding entropy formula would be

$$S_{B\epsilon} = k \log(\Omega(E, \mathbf{h}) - \Omega(E - \epsilon, \mathbf{h})) \quad (10)$$

where  $\Omega(E, \mathbf{h})$  denotes the number of energy levels with energies not exceeding  $E$ . In refs.[10, 16, 19] the formula (10) is approximated as

$$S_B = k \log(\epsilon \varpi(E)) \quad (11)$$

in which  $\varpi(E)$ , the ‘density of states’, is the derivative of a differentiable approximation to  $\Omega(E)$ .

For a system of  $N$  spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  particles in a magnetic field  $\mathbf{h}$ , the energy levels are given by the formula

$$E = (2n - N)\mu|\mathbf{h}| \quad (12)$$

where  $n$  is the number of spins pointing along the negative  $\mathbf{h}$  direction and  $\mu$  denotes the magnetic moment of one spin. Each energy level has a definite magnetic moment along or against the direction of  $\mathbf{h}$ , whose component in the direction of  $\mathbf{h}$  is

$$M = (N - 2n)\mu \quad (13)$$

$$= -E/|\mathbf{h}| \quad (14)$$

The vector  $\mathbf{M}$  is given in terms of  $E$  and  $\mathbf{h}$  in eqn (3).

A standard combinatorial formula gives, using (13),

$$\omega(E, \mathbf{h}) = \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} = \frac{N!}{\left(\frac{N}{2} - \frac{M}{2\mu}\right)! \left(\frac{N}{2} + \frac{M}{2\mu}\right)!} \quad (15)$$

From (14) and (15) it follows that  $\omega(E, \mathbf{h})$  is an even function of  $E$  at constant  $|\mathbf{h}|$ , so that the ‘Boltzmann’ entropy defined by (9) has the symmetry property (5). The temperature  $T_B$  associated (via eqn (6)) with this entropy definition therefore has the antisymmetry property (7) and is negative for the states reached by magnetic field reversal. Thus the consequences of the ‘Boltzmann’ entropy formula in this case are consistent with the thermodynamic argument leading to (7) and with the negative-temperature interpretation of the magnetic field reversal experiments.

##### B. The thermostistical consistency condition

Some authors[10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19] have challenged the negative-temperature interpretation of the experiments

<sup>5</sup> See, for example p.170 of ref.[29]

described above. In their argument, originally due to Berdichevsky *et al.*[9], the microcanonical entropy is defined not by (9) but by

$$S = S_G := k \log \Omega(E) \quad (16)$$

where  $\Omega(E)$  (more precisely,  $\Omega(E, \mathbf{h})$ ) is the number of energy levels with energies not exceeding  $E$ . The classical analogue of (16) was used by Gibbs[31, p. 170] and so  $S_G$  is often called the ‘Gibbs’ entropy. Since the function  $\Omega(E)$  is manifestly non-decreasing, the ‘Gibbs temperature’, defined in analogy with (6) as  $T_G := (\partial S_G / \partial E)^{-1}$ , cannot be negative; thus the definition (16) implies that negative absolute temperatures are impossible.

The principal argument given in refs [9, 10] and elsewhere in support of the ‘Gibbs’ entropy definition (16) makes use of a ‘thermostatistical consistency’ condition[10] which for spin systems using the microcanonical ensemble reads

$$T dS(E, \mathbf{h}) = dE + \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_{E, \mathbf{h}} \cdot d\mathbf{h} \quad (17)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M} := -\partial \mathcal{H} / \partial \mathbf{h} \quad (18)$$

is the magnetic moment operator, defined in terms of the Hamiltonian operator  $\mathcal{H}$  in which  $\mathbf{h}$  is a parameter, and  $\langle \dots \rangle_{E, \mathbf{h}}$  denotes a microcanonical average at energy  $E$  and magnetic field  $\mathbf{h}$ . Eqn (17) ensures that the statistical mechanics formula  $\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_{E, \mathbf{h}}$  for the magnetic moment coincides with the thermodynamic formula for the same quantity, which can be written  $\partial E(S, \mathbf{h}) / \partial \mathbf{h}$ . As shown in the Supplementary Materials of ref.[10]), the ‘Gibbs’ entropy (16) exactly satisfies (17) whereas the ‘Boltzmann’ entropy as defined in (10) does not. The conclusion drawn in ref.[10] is that the ‘Boltzmann’ entropy is inherently unsatisfactory and should never be used.

What this argument ignores, however, is that for spin systems there is an alternative, simpler, definition of ‘Boltzmann’ entropy, namely (9), and that this simpler definition does exactly satisfy thermodynamic consistency. To see this we use the fact, evident from (15), that  $\omega(E, \mathbf{h})$  can be written as a function of the single variable  $M$ . It follows that differentiation holding  $S_B$  fixed is equivalent to differentiation holding  $M$  fixed, so that<sup>6</sup>

$$\left( \frac{\partial E}{\partial \mathbf{h}} \right)_{S_B} = \left( \frac{\partial E}{\partial \mathbf{h}} \right)_M \quad (19)$$

$$= -\mathbf{M} \text{ by (4)} \quad (20)$$

By a standard calculus formula, it follows that

$$\frac{\partial S_B(E, \mathbf{h}) / \partial \mathbf{h}}{\partial S_B(E, \mathbf{h}) / \partial E} = \mathbf{M} \quad (21)$$

and hence that

$$\begin{aligned} T_B dS_B &= T_B \left( \frac{\partial S_B}{\partial E} dE + \frac{\partial S_B}{\partial \mathbf{h}} \cdot d\mathbf{h} \right) \\ &= dE + \mathbf{M} \cdot d\mathbf{h} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where  $T_B$  is the ‘Boltzmann’ temperature, defined in analogy with (6) by

$$T_B = \left( \frac{\partial S_B(E, \mathbf{h})}{\partial E} \right)^{-1} \quad (23)$$

But by its definition (see (13))  $\mathbf{M}$  is the microcanonical expectation of the magnetic moment, and so our result (22) confirms that the Boltzmann entropy, as defined in (9), satisfies the thermostatistical consistency condition (17) — not only in the thermodynamic limit, as shown for example in ref.[21], but for finite systems as well.

Thus for the nuclear spin system the thermostatistical consistency criterion is neutral between the ‘Gibbs’ and ‘Boltzmann’ entropies, giving no reason to disbelieve our result obtained earlier that the magnetic field reversal experiments produced negative absolute temperatures, even though such temperatures are incompatible with the ‘Gibbs’ formula (16).

### C. ‘Gibbs’ entropy and the adiabatic theorem of mechanics

An important strand in the rationale behind the ‘Gibbs’ entropy formula (16) is[10, 32] the adiabatic theorem of classical mechanics[33]. This theorem tells us how energy varies with time for any system whose Hamiltonian contains a parameter such as  $\mathbf{h}$ , when that parameter is varied extremely slowly (the type of process known in thermodynamics as quasi-static). The theorem states that, provided certain further conditions are satisfied, the energy  $E$  will vary with time in such a way that  $\Omega(E, \mathbf{h})$  is invariant. The most important of these conditions is that, as  $\mathbf{h}$  changes, the phase-space region inside a given closed energy surface must always be transformed into the region inside, rather than outside, the new energy surface. Since the thermodynamic entropy is also invariant in any quasi-static process, this theorem supports the claim that  $k \log \Omega(E, \mathbf{h})$  equals the thermodynamic entropy — *provided* that the energy surfaces satisfy the condition just mentioned.

For quantum systems the corresponding necessary condition is that the energy levels should not cross during the process. For the Hamiltonian of the spin system,

$$\mathcal{H} := -\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathcal{M}, \quad (24)$$

this condition is satisfied if and only  $\mathbf{h}$  does not pass through the value zero during the process. Thus, for all the equilibrium states that can be reached quasi-statically with  $\mathbf{h} \neq 0$  throughout, the entropy formula (16) is a good one. The catch is that  $\mathbf{h}$  does pass through

<sup>6</sup> The notation  $\partial / \partial \mathbf{h}$  denotes a gradient in  $\mathbf{h}$  space

zero in the field reversal process used to reach positive values of  $E$ ; thus the necessary condition is not satisfied and the theorem does not require  $\Omega(E, \mathbf{h})$  to be invariant during this process. Our contention that  $k \log \Omega(E, \mathbf{h})$  is not the thermodynamic entropy for the (transient) equilibrium states reached by field reversal is therefore compatible with the theorem.

Some other arguments that have been put forward in favour of using  $S_G$  rather than  $S_B$  are considered in the appendix, section C

#### D. An experimental test of the entropy formulas

Consider an experiment in which two spin systems, each comprising  $N$  nuclei with magnetic moment  $\mu$ , are brought into thermal contact. Such an experiment was carried out by Abragam and Proctor[4, 5], the two spin systems being the Li nuclei in an LiF crystal and the F nuclei in the same crystal. Initially both systems are in thermal equilibrium, one having energy 0 and the other having the maximum positive energy,  $E_{max} := N\mu|\mathbf{h}|$ . How will this energy be apportioned between the two systems when the new equilibrium is reached? For the spin system a standard calculation based on applying Stirling's approximation to eqn (15) gives, using (9),

$$S_B(E) \cong -Nk(x \log x + (1-x) \log(1-x)) \quad (25)$$

where  $x := n/N = (E + E_{max})/2E_{max}$  with  $E_{max} := N\mu|\mathbf{h}|$ , and the symbol  $\cong$  signifies that the difference between the expressions it separates is thermodynamically negligible, or more precisely that  $1/N$  times this difference tends to 0 in the *thermodynamic limit* where  $N, E \rightarrow \infty$  at constant  $E/N$  and constant  $\mathbf{h}$

From (25) we have, for a spin system,

$$\begin{aligned} S_B(0) &\cong Nk \log 2 = 0.69 \dots Nk \\ S_B(\frac{1}{2}E_{max}) &\cong Nk(2 \log 2 - (3/4) \log 3) = 0.56 \dots Nk, \\ S_B(E_{max}) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

If  $N$  spins with energy 0 and  $N$  spins with total energy  $E_{max}$  are brought into thermal contact their initial Boltzmann entropy of  $(0 + 0.69)k$  per spin can increase to  $(0.56 + 0.56)k = 1.12k$  per spin if they share their energy equally. Thus the Boltzmann entropy formula (9) predicts that in the new equilibrium state the energy will be shared between the two groups of spins<sup>7</sup>. And that is just what happened in the experiments of Abragam and Proctor[4, 5, 35].

<sup>7</sup> This may be thought of as an application of Callen's 'entropy maximum postulate'[34], which asserts that at equilibrium the available energy will be distributed between the subsystems in the way that maximizes the total entropy. The entropy-maximizing energy apportionment is the one that equalizes the reciprocal temperatures of the two groups of spins and hence also, by (6), their energies.

Now consider the predictions of the 'Gibbs' entropy formula (16). Since  $\Omega(E)$  increases monotonically with  $E$ , the entropy increase achieved by giving energy  $E_1$  to one subsystem and  $E_2$  to the other, where  $E_1 + E_2 = E_{max}$ , has the following upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} &(S_G(E_1) + S_G(E_2)) - (S_G(0) + S_G(E_{max})) \\ &\leq S_G(E_{max}) - S_G(0) \\ &= k \log \left( \frac{\Omega(E_{max})}{\Omega(0)} \right) \\ &= k \log \left( \frac{\Omega(E_{max})}{\frac{1}{2}(\Omega(E_{max}) + \omega(0))} \right) \\ &< k \log 2 \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where we have used first the monotonicity of  $S_G(E)$ , which implies that  $S_G(E_1) + S_G(E_2) \leq 2S_G(E_{max})$ , and afterwards the symmetry of the energy spectrum about  $E = 0$ , which implies that the number of energy levels with negative energy, namely  $\Omega(0) - \omega(0)$ , is equal to the number with positive energy, namely  $\Omega(E_{max}) - \Omega(0)$ , so that  $\Omega(E_{max}) + \omega(0) = 2\Omega(0)$ . The inequality (26) shows that the composite system cannot significantly increase its 'Gibbs' entropy by transferring energy from one subsystem to another; consequently if the Gibbs entropy is the same as the thermodynamic entropy one might expect the energy of each subsystem to perform some kind of random walk after the two subsystems are brought into thermal contact, but never to settle down at any definite 'equilibrium' value<sup>8</sup>. But this prediction is inconsistent with the experimental results of Abragam and Proctor[4, 5], who found that the energy apportionment went to a definite value, not far from that which maximizes the 'Boltzmann' entropy of the composite system. One is led to the conclusion that the 'Gibbs' entropy formula (16), whatever its other virtues, is not a secure foundation for the discussion of systems capable of negative absolute temperatures.

## V. DISCUSSION

### A. Negative temperatures in a system of particles

The discussion given so far shows that negative absolute temperatures make thermodynamic sense and are necessary for a coherent description of nuclear spin experiments; but negative absolute temperatures can also arise in other types of experiment. One such experiment, described by Braun et al.[8], involves <sup>39</sup>K atoms in an optical lattice. The system was first brought to equilibrium at a positive temperature and then manipulated by changing the experimental parameters in a way which, in

<sup>8</sup> This is an illustration of the unphysically large fluctuations predicted, according to ref.[22], by the 'Gibbs' entropy formula.

essence, reversed the sign of the Hamiltonian. Like the magnetic field reversal for nuclear spin systems, this manipulation can bring the atomic system to a state where the negative temperature concept is appropriate. A more detailed analysis is given in the Appendix.

### B. Negative temperatures in other systems.

It is sometimes stated, e.g. in refs[13, 23, 35] that negative absolute temperatures can arise in any system whatever whose energy spectrum is bounded above. Even without any specific mechanism such as magnetic field reversal for bringing the system on its own to a negative temperature, such a claim still makes sense because the system can, in principle, be placed in a negative-temperature heat bath consisting of nuclear spins. By a standard result of statistical mechanics (see, for example, chapter 11 of ref.[35]) the system's probability distribution at equilibrium would then be canonical at the temperature of the heat bath. If the energy spectrum of the original system is bounded above, its partition function is a convergent sum when the temperature is negative, and so this system can come to equilibrium with a negative-temperature heat bath. In that situation it would be reasonable to describe the system itself as being at a negative absolute temperature.

### C. Gibbs versus Boltzmann

The debate about negative absolute temperatures tends to take the form of a contest between the 'Gibbs' and 'Boltzmann' formulas for the microcanonical entropy; for example it is argued in refs[10, 16, 18] that the 'Boltzmann' formula is flawed and that the 'Gibbs' formula should always be used, whereas refs[11, 13, 17, 21, 22] take the opposite view. Our work suggests, however, that there is no definitive way to decide in advance which entropy formula should be used — the choice between them can depend on what system is being considered, and even on what state that system is in. For spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  systems at positive energies ( $T_B < 0$ ) the 'Gibbs' entropy definition is unsatisfactory (see section IV above), but at negative energies ( $T_B > 0$ ) there is little to choose between the two definitions. And for classical systems of particles the 'Gibbs' definition has some advantages[10, 31] which include the fact that no arbitrary parameter  $\epsilon$  appears in it.

Incidentally, this parameter  $\epsilon$  is not quite as innocent as it may look. Although its contribution  $k \log \epsilon$  to the entropy is macroscopically negligible, the way it is chosen can make the difference between thermostistical consistency and inconsistency. In ref.[18] the choice  $\epsilon = \text{const.}$  in (11) leads to a formula for the magnetization which is thermodynamically inconsistent (it disagrees with (2)); but by choosing  $\epsilon \propto \mu |\mathbf{h}|$  instead, the inconsistency can be removed (see the calculation in section IV B). The

reader may like to investigate whether or not an equally effective choice of  $\epsilon$  is always possible.

### D. Super-efficient Carnot engines?

It is sometimes asserted[8, 23] that negative temperatures make Carnot engines of efficiency greater than 1 possible. This paradoxical assertion seems to stem from an uncritical application of the standard formula  $1 - T_2/T_1$  for the efficiency of a reversible Carnot engine operating between positive temperatures  $T_1, T_2$  with  $T_1 > T_2$ . A more careful treatment[11, 36] shows, however, that the standard formula does not apply if one of the temperatures is negative. Denoting the increases in entropy of the working substance at the temperatures  $T_1, T_2$  by  $\delta S_1, \delta S_2$  per cycle, the amounts of heat taken in at the two temperatures are  $T_1 \delta S_1$  and  $T_2 \delta S_2$ . If  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  have opposite signs then, since  $\delta S_1 + \delta S_2 = 0$  in a reversible cycle, the amounts of heat taken in at the two temperatures have the same sign; therefore the work done by the engine per cycle is equal to the total heat taken in : no heat is wasted and the efficiency is 1. An efficiency of 1 is remarkable enough, but there is no mysterious creation of mechanical energy from nowhere.

Such a Carnot-type engine might be useful working in reverse, as a heat pump[36] which would take in mechanical energy and pump out some of it as heat into a negative-temperature system, thereby helping to maintain that system at a desired negative temperature against the inevitable loss of heat to its 'cooler' positive-temperature surroundings. A possible cycle for such a device is described in the Appendix.

## VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this paper is to clarify the current controversy where it has been claimed, on one hand, that certain experimental procedures produce negative absolute temperatures and, on the other, that negative temperatures are incompatible with basic thermodynamic principles.

These experimental procedures involve reversing the magnetic field acting on a system of nuclear spins in a crystal whose initial temperature is so low that the interaction of the spin system with crystal lattice vibrations can be neglected. Using the thermodynamic Principle of Entropy Increase, we show that the magnetic field reversal does not change the entropy and hence, since the energy of the spin system is reversed, that the temperature  $(\partial S/\partial E)^{-1}$ , initially positive, is negative after field reversal.

The challenge to the negative  $T$  concept has been mainly based on the claim that it is incompatible with the 'thermostistical consistency condition' (17), since the most obvious entropy definition satisfying that condition, the 'Gibbs' formula (16), implies  $T \geq 0$ . Here we

show that there is in fact no incompatibility, since (for spin systems) the ‘Boltzmann’ entropy, as defined in (9) also satisfies thermostatical consistency and yet does permit negative temperatures. To confirm that the Gibbs formula is not the right entropy definition for nuclear spin systems we also show that it is incompatible with the experimental results of Abragam and Proctor[4, 5] on the way that energy is shared between spin systems in thermal contact.

In conclusion, we have shown that negative absolute temperatures arise naturally in the analysis of these experiments on spin systems and that for those systems the Gibbs entropy definition gives misleading results, whereas the Boltzmann definition does not.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to André Martin for drawing our attention to the work of Abragam and Proctor, and to a referee for constructive criticisms.

### Appendix A: Negative temperatures in a system of particles

The experiment described by Braun et al.[8] involves a system of  $^{39}\text{K}$  atoms in an optical lattice. They modelled this system using a Hamiltonian of ‘Bose-Hubbard’ type which can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_1 := & c_1 \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} (a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - a_{\mathbf{l}}^\dagger)(a_{\mathbf{k}} - a_{\mathbf{l}}) + c_2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}} + \\ & + c_3 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} r_{\mathbf{k}}^2 a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where  $c_1, c_2, c_3$  are positive constants, the indices  $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}$  label the lattice sites, the double sum goes over all nearest-neighbour pairs of sites,  $a_{\mathbf{k}}$  is the operator annihilating a particle at lattice site  $\mathbf{k}$ , the dagger indicates a Hermitian conjugate, and  $r_{\mathbf{k}}$  is the distance from the lattice site  $\mathbf{k}$  to a fixed origin. In the experiment, the system was started in equilibrium at a positive temperature  $T$ , with Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , and then manipulated by changing the parameters  $c_1, c_2, c_3$  until the Hamiltonian became (essentially)  $-\mathcal{H}_1$ . To study what happens to the thermodynamic entropy during such a process, consider the family of Hamiltonians

$$\mathcal{H}_\lambda := \lambda \mathcal{H}_1 \quad (-1 \leq \lambda \leq 1) \quad (\text{A2})$$

and consider a thought experiment in which the (time-dependent) Hamiltonian is  $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$  with  $\lambda$  being controlled so that its value starts at 1 and ends at  $-1$ . The system starts in equilibrium, modelled by a microcanonical ensemble at energy  $E = E_1$ . Since the operator  $\mathcal{H}_1$  commutes with the time-varying Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$ , its expectation  $\langle \mathcal{H}_1 \rangle$  is an invariant and therefore preserves its initial value,  $E_1$ ; thus, the energy, i.e. the expectation

of  $\mathcal{H}_\lambda = \lambda \mathcal{H}_1$ , is equal to  $\lambda E_1$  throughout and finally reaches the value  $-E_1$ . The final ensemble is again microcanonical and therefore describes a new equilibrium state, this time with energy  $-E_1$ . Moreover, the process can be reversed, bringing us back to the original equilibrium state with  $\lambda = 1$  and energy  $E_1$ . Hence, by an argument similar to the one used in deriving (5), the entropy as a function of energy and  $\lambda$  must satisfy<sup>9</sup>

$$S(-E, -\lambda) = S(E, \lambda) \quad (\text{A3})$$

and it follows, as in the discussion of (5), that

$$T(-E, -\lambda) = -T(E, \lambda) \quad (\text{A4})$$

confirming the interpretation made in ref.[8] that the equilibrium state reached by reversing the signs of  $c_1, c_2, c_3$  does have a negative absolute temperature.

The Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}_1$  is not bounded above; therefore the reversed Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}_{-1} := -\mathcal{H}_1$ , used here to model the ‘inverted’ state produced in the experiment, is not bounded below. This fact has the consequence that  $\Omega(E)$  is not defined for the reversed Hamiltonian, so that it does not have a ‘Gibbs’ entropy, nor a ‘Gibbs’ temperature. One could instead work with the ‘complementary Gibbs entropy’ defined[13, 16] in terms of the number of energy levels above, rather than below, the actual energy of the system. The ramifications of this possibility will not be explored further here.

### Appendix B: A possible negative-temperature maintenance cycle

The engine might operate as follows (see diagram<sup>10</sup>)

- (i) as in section III: working substance starts in equilibrium at temperature  $T_1 > 0$  with magnetic field  $h_1$  and magnetic moment  $M_1$  both in the positive  $z$  direction, so that (by (1)) the energy is  $E = -h_1 M_1 < 0$  initially. Magnetic field is then quickly reversed (to  $-h_1$ ); energy increases from  $-h_1 M_1$  to  $+h_1 M_1$ , temperature changes to  $-T_1$  but entropy and magnetic moment stay constant
- (ii) Working substance is placed in contact with the (relatively large) object which is to be maintained at temperature  $-T_1$  in the face of energy losses to its environment. Heat is taken from working substance isothermally so that  $|h|$  and  $M$  both decrease but the reciprocal temperature, which for the spin systems considered earlier can be shown<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> It does not matter that the density matrix when  $\lambda = 0$  is not microcanonical and therefore does not describe an equilibrium state — as noted in section III, the entropy increase principle does not require the intermediate states to be equilibrium states.

<sup>10</sup> A very similar diagram, with more isotherms, is given in ref.[11].  
<sup>11</sup> See, for example, eqn (6.3.3) on page 207 of ref.[28], or eqn (15) of ref.[11].

to be equal to  $(k/\mu h)\text{arctanh}(M/N\mu)$ , remains constant; magnetic field decreases from  $-h_1$  to  $-h_2$  and energy decreases from  $h_1M_1$  to  $h_2M_2$ , with  $h_2 < h_1, M_2 < M_1$ ; entropy of working substance increases by  $\Delta E/T = (h_2M_2 - h_1M_1)/(-T_1) > 0$  (i.e. it takes entropy out of the object)

- (iii) magnetic field is again quickly reversed (from  $-h_2$  to  $+h_2$ ); magnetic moment stays at  $M_2$  but temperature goes back to  $T_1$ ; energy decreases from  $h_2M_2$  to  $-h_2M_2$ .
- (iv) working substance is placed in contact with a heat sink at temperature  $T_1$  and gives out heat isothermally. Magnetic field returns to  $h_1$  and magnetic moment returns to  $M_1$ ; energy of working substance decreases (see (1) from  $-h_2M_2$  to  $-h_1M_1$ , entropy of working substance increases by  $\Delta E/T = (-h_1M_1 + h_2M_2)/T_1 < 0$  (i.e. it gives up entropy to the heat sink.)

An important difference from positive-temperature Carnot cycles is that steps (i) and (iii) are not quasi-static, so that the system need not pass through equilibrium states and does not have a well-defined temperature throughout. In particular, when the magnetic field passes through the value zero the system is not in equilibrium and so there is no violation of the third law of thermodynamics, even though the representative point in the  $(M, h)$  plane crosses isotherms belonging to arbitrarily small temperatures.

### Appendix C: Replies to some other arguments for using $S_G$

An argument sometimes given for preferring the ‘Gibbs’ to the ‘Boltzmann’ entropy definition is[16, 19] that ‘only  $S_G$  obeys the second law’ in the sense that  $S_G$  always increases when two systems, both previously in equilibrium but separated, are brought together, whereas  $S_{B\epsilon}$  (defined in (10)) may decrease slightly (depending on the value of  $\epsilon$ ). The Boltzmann entropy  $S_B$  as defined

here (see (9)) does, however, obey the second law in this sense.

An ingenious argument due to Campisi[18, 37] depends on the fact that all exact solutions of (17) have the form  $S(E) = g(\Omega(E))$ ; it is argued that, if the function  $g$  is known for one system (such as the classical ideal gas, for which  $g(x) = k \log x$ ) then ‘it has to be one and the same for all systems...because by adjusting the external parameters...one can transform any Hamiltonian into any other.’ However it is not self-evident that the change from one system to another can always be accomplished by a mere adjustment of external parameters. The change from classical to quantum mechanics is the most obvious example, and the change from a system with unbounded energy spectrum to one with bounded spectrum, or even the magnetic field reversal considered




FIG. 1. ‘Carnot’ cycle for a heat pump using negative temperatures. The area enclosed by the loop equals the total energy transferred per cycle. For the nuclear spin system the equation of the temperature- $T$  isotherm is  $h = (kT/\mu)\text{arctanh}(M/N\mu)$ . The vertical line at  $M = N\mu$  is an asymptote of all the isotherms, both for positive and negative temperatures.

in section III, also involve discontinuous changes in the properties of the system which may require a corresponding discontinuous change in the function  $g(\cdot)$ .

- 
- [1] L. Onsager, Nuovo Cimento, Suppl. **6**, 1 (1949).
  - [2] G. Eyink and K. R. Sreenivasan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 87 (2006).
  - [3] E. Purcell and R. Pound, Phys. Rev. **81**, 279 (1951).
  - [4] A. Abragam and W. Proctor, Phys. Rev. **106**, 160 (1957).
  - [5] A. Abragam and W. Proctor, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1441 (1958).
  - [6] P. Hakonen, K. Nummila, R. Vuorinen, and O. Lounasmaa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 365 (1992).
  - [7] A. Oja and O. Lounasmaa, Rev. Mod. Phys. **69**, 1 (1997).
  - [8] S. Braun, J. Ronzheimer, M. Schreiber, S. Hodgman, T. Rom, and U. Bloch, I. and Schneider, Science **339**, 52 (2013).
  - [9] V. Berdichevsky, I. Kunitz, and F. Hussain, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 2050 (1991).
  - [10] J. Dunkel and S. Hilbert, Nature Physics **10**, 67 (2014).
  - [11] D. Frenkel and P. Warren, Am. J. Phys. **83**, 163 (2015).
  - [12] J. Dunkel and S. Hilbert, ArXiv:1403.6058v1 (2014).
  - [13] U. Schneider, S. Mandt, A. Rapp, S. Braun, H. Weimer, I. Bloch, and A. Rosch, arXiv 1407.4127 [cond-mat.quant-gas] (2014).
  - [14] J. Dunkel and S. Hilbert, arXiv 1408.5392 (2014).
  - [15] J. Vilar and J. Rubi, J. Chem. Phys. **140**, 201101 (2014).
  - [16] S. Hilbert, P. Hänggi, and J. Dunkel, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 062116 (2014).
  - [17] R. Swendsen and J.-S. Wang, Phys.Rev. E **92**, 020103



- (2015).
- [18] M. Campisi, Phys Rev.E **91**, 052147 (2015).
- [19] P. Hänggi, S. Hilbert, and J. Dunkel, Phil Trans Roy Soc A **374**, 20150039 (2016).
- [20] R. Swendsen and J.-S. Wang, Physica A **453**, 24 (2016).
- [21] J. Poulter, Phys. Rev. E **93**, 032149 (2016).
- [22] D.-V. Anghel, EPJ Web of Conferences **1008**, 02007 (2016).
- [23] N. F. Ramsey, Phys. Rev. **103**, 20 (1956).
- [24] A. Abragam, *The principles of nuclear magnetism* (Oxford, 1961).
- [25] M. Campisi, Stud. Hist. Philos. Mod. Phys. **36**, 275 (2005).
- [26] H. Buchdahl, *The concepts of classical thermodynamics* (Cambridge, 1966).
- [27] E. Lieb and J. Yngvason, Physics Reports **310**, 1 (1999).
- [28] F. Reif, *Fundamentals of statistical and thermal physics* (Cambridge, 1966).
- [29] O. Penrose, *Foundations of statistical mechanics* (Dover, New York, 2005).
- [30] R. B. Griffiths, J. Math. Phys. **6**, 1447 (1965).
- [31] J. W. Gibbs, *Elementary principles in statistical mechanics* (reprinted by OxBow Press, ( Woodbridge, Conn., USA), 1981).
- [32] P. Hertz, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **33**, 225 (1910).
- [33] T. Kasuga, Proc. Japan Acad. **37**, 366 (1961).
- [34] H. Callen, *Thermodynamics* (Wiley, New York, 1960).
- [35] C. Kittel, *Elementary Statistical Physics* (Wiley, 1961).
- [36] P. T. Landsberg, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **10**, 1773 (1977).
- [37] M. Campisi, Phys Rev.E **93**, 039901(E) (2016).