Pacific Journal of Mathematics

A NOTE ON PROPOSITION OBSERVABLES

STANLEY P. GUDDER

Vol. 28, No. 1

March 1969

A NOTE ON PROPOSITION OBSERVABLES

STANLEY P. GUDDER

We consider some questions which were brought up in a previous paper: (1) If the product of two proposition observables is a proposition observable, do the corresponding propositions split? (2) What is the relationship, if any, between the concepts of compatibility and simultaneity of proposition observables? It is shown that the answer to (1) is yes and as a corollary we find the partial answer to (2) that compatibility implies simultaneity. It is also proved that the sum of two proposition observables is a proposition observable if and only if the corresponding propositions are orthogonal and also that $(x_a \circ x_b)^n$ converges weakly to $x_{a \wedge b}$ as $n \to \infty$.

We assume that all observables are defined on a quite full logic satisfying conditions U and E. (See [1] for definitions and notation.) Recall that an observable x is a proposition observable if $\sigma(x) \subset \{0, 1\}$. (These observables are also called questions, cf. [3].) If $x(\{1\}) = a$ we denote x by x_a . It is clear that proposition observables behave, in some respects, like orthogonal (self-adjoint) projections on a Hilbert space and for this reason it is natural to consider certain properties of projections and ask whether these properties are retained by proposition observables. For example, it is easy to show that if A and B are orthogonal projections then A + B is an orthogonal projection if and only if AB = BA = 0 and AB is an orthogonal projection if and only if AB = BA ([4], Th. 13.4). Also if C is the orthogonal projection on the range of A intersected with the range of B then Cis the strong operator limit of the sequence A, BA, ABA, BABA, ... ([4] Th. 13.7). We show that these results generalize to proposition observables. Recall that the product $x \circ y$ of two bounded observables x, y is $x \circ y = \frac{1}{2}[(x + y)^2 - x^2 - y^2]$ and that x and y are compatible if $x \circ (z \circ y) = (x \circ z) \circ y = (x \circ y) \circ z$ for all bounded observables z.

2. The theorems.

LEMMA 1. The following statements are equivalent. (i) $a \leftrightarrow b$. (ii) m(a) = 1, $m(a \wedge b) = 0$ implies m(b) = 0 for any state m. (iii) $\sigma(x_a + x_b) \subset \{0, 1, 2\}$.

Proof. Since $a = (a - a \land b) + (a \land b)$ and $b = (b - a \land b) + (a \land b)$, $a \leftrightarrow b$ if and only if $(a - a \land b) \perp (b - a \land b)$. But the latter holds if and only if $m(a - a \land b) = 1$ implies $m(b - a \land b) = 0$. This last condition is equivalent to (ii) and hence (i) and (ii) are equivalent.

Since $\sigma(x_a + x_b) \subset [0, 2]$ applying Lemma 6.2 [1] we have

$$\begin{split} m(a) + m(b) &= m(x_a + x_b) = \int_{[0,2]} \lambda m[(x_a + x_b)(d\lambda)] \\ &= m[x_a + x_b)(\{1\})] + m(a \wedge b) + m[(x_a + x_b)(\{0, 1, 2\}')] \,. \end{split}$$

If $\sigma(x_a + x_b) \subset \{0, 1, 2\}$ and m(a) = 1, $m(a \land b) = 0$ then

 $m(b) = m[(x_a + x_b)(\{1\})] - 1 = 0$,

and hence $a \leftrightarrow b$. Conversely if $a \leftrightarrow b$ it easily follows that

 $m[(x_a + x_b)(\{1\})] = m(a \wedge b') + m(b \wedge a')$

for every state. It then follows that $(x_a + x_b)(\{0, 1, 2\}') = 0$ and hence $\sigma(x_a + x_b) \subset \{0, 1, 2\}$.

THEOREM 2. The following statements are equivalent. (i) $x_a \circ x_b$ is a proposition observable. (ii) $x_a \circ x_b = x_{a \wedge b}$. (iii) $a \leftrightarrow b$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 6.6 [1] that $(iii) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (i)$. To show $(i) \Rightarrow (iii)$ suppose $x_a \circ x_b$ is a proposition observable. Define the continuous function $f(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda^2 - \lambda)$. Since a proposition observable is its own square we have

$$\{0, 1\} \supset \sigma(x_a \circ x_b) = \sigma[\frac{1}{2}((x_a + x_b)^2 - (x_a + x_b))] = \sigma[f(x_a + x_b)].$$

Applying the spectral mapping theorem (Theorem 4.2 [2]) we have $f(\sigma(x_a + x_b)) \subset \{0, 1\}$. We then conclude that $\sigma(x_a + x_b) \subset \{0, 1, 2\}$ and using Lemma 1 we have that $a \leftrightarrow b$.

COROLLARY 3. If x_a and x_b are compatible, then $x_a \leftrightarrow x_b$.

Proof. If x_a and x_b are compatible, then

$$(x_a \circ x_b)^2 = (x_a \circ x_b) \circ (x_a \circ x_b) = ((x_a \circ x_b) \circ x_a) \circ x_b = (x_a \circ x_b) \circ x_b = x_a \circ x_b$$

and hence $x_a \circ x_b$ is a proposition observable. Applying Theorem 2, $a \leftrightarrow b$ and hence $x_a \leftrightarrow x_b$.

COROLLARY 4. The following statements are equivalent. (i) $x_a + x_b$ is a proposition observable. (ii) $a \perp b$. (iii) $\sigma(x_a + x_b) \subset [0, 1]$. (iv) $x_a \circ x_b = 0$.

Proof. From Theorem 2 and Theorem 6.7 [1] we deduce that $(iv) \Leftrightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (i)$ and it is trivial that $(i) \Rightarrow (iii)$. Now (iii) is equivalent to $0 \leq m(a) + m(b) \leq 1$ or $m(a) \leq 1 - m(b)$ for every state m. But

this last statement is equivalent to (ii) and thus (iii) and (ii) are equivalent.

COROLLARY 5. The following statements are equivalent. (i) $x_b - x_a$ is a proposition observable. (ii) $a \leq b$. (iii) $\sigma(x_b - x_a) \subset [0, 1]$. (iv) $x_a \circ x_b = x_a$.

Proof. Replace b by b' in Corollary 4.

We say that a sequence of observables x_n converges weakly to an observable x if $\lim_{n\to\infty} m(x_n) = m(x)$ for every state m.

THEOREM 6. The sequence of observables $(x_a \circ x_b)^n$ converges weakly to the proposition observable $x_{a \wedge b}$.

Proof. Let $z = x_a \circ x_b$ and again let $f(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda^2 - \lambda)$. Then using the spectral mapping theorem and the fact that $\sigma(x_a + x_b) \subset [0, 2]$ we have

$$\sigma(z) = \sigma(f(x_a + x_b)) = f(\sigma(x_a + x_b)) \subset f([0, 2]) \subset [-1/8, 1].$$

Since

$$m(z^{n}) = \int_{[-1/8,1)} \lambda^{n} m[z(d\lambda)] + m[z(\{1\})]$$

we have

$$|m(z^n) - m[z(\{1\})]| \leq \int_{[-1/8,1)} |\lambda|^n m[z(d\lambda)]$$

Applying the dominated convergence theorem, the integral approaches zero as $n \to \infty$ and hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} m(z^n) = m[z(\{1\})]$. Applying Lemma 6.2 [1] we have

$$z(\{1\}) = f(x_a + x_b)(\{1\}) = (x_a + x_b)[f^{-1}(\{1\})]$$

= $(x_a + x_b)(\{-1, 2\}) = (x_a + x_b)(\{2\}) = a \wedge b$

and since $m(x_{a \wedge b}) = m(a \wedge b)$, the proof is complete.

COROLLARY 7. The sequence of observables $I - [I - x_a) \circ (I - x_b)]^n$ converges weakly to the proposition observable $x_{a \lor b}$.

REMARKS. Strictly speaking Theorem 6 is not exactly a generalization of Von Neumann's Theorem 13.7 [4], however it is probably the most natural form that a corresponding result would take under these more general circumstances. Notice that our definition of compatibility is stronger than that given in [1].

STANLEY P. GUDDER

References

1. S. P. Gudder, Uniqueness and existence properties of bounded observables, Pacific J. Math. **19** (1966), 81-93.

2. _____, Spectral methods for a generalized probability theory, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **119** (1965), 428-442.

3. G. W. Mackey, The mathematical foundations of Quantum mechanics, W.A. Benjamin Inc., New York, 1963.

4. J. von Neumann, Functional operators, Vol. II, Princeton University Press, 1950.

Received August 9, 1967. While conducting research for this paper the author was supported by NSF contract GP-6764.

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

H. ROYDEN Stanford University Stanford, California

R. R PHELPS University of Washington Seattle, Washington 98105 J. DUGUNDJI Department of Mathematics University of Southern California Los Angeles, California 90007

RICHARD ARENS University of California Los Angeles, California 90024

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Е.	F.	Beckenbach	в.	H. NEUM	ANN	F.	Wolf	к.	Yosida
						-			

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF OREGON OSAKA UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF UTAH WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY CHEVRON RESEARCH CORPORATION TRW SYSTEMS NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER

Printed in Japan by International Academic Printing Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan

Pacific Journal of Mathematics Vol. 28, No. 1 March, 1969

Patrick Robert Ahern, On the geometry of the unit ball in the space of real annihilating measures	1
Kirby Alan Baker, Equational classes of modular lattices	9
E. F. Beckenbach and Gerald Andrew Hutchison, <i>Meromorphic minimal</i> surfaces	17
Tae Ho Choe, Intrinsic topologies in a topological lattice	49
John Bligh Conway, A theorem on sequential convergence of measures and some applications	53
Roger Cuppens, On the decomposition of infinitely divisible probability laws without normal factor	61
Lynn Harry Erbe, Nonoscillatory solutions of second order nonlinear	
differential equations	77
Burton I. Fein, The Schur index for projective representations of finite groups	87
Stanley P. Gudder. A note on proposition observables	101
Kenneth Kapp. On Croisot's theory of decompositions	105
Robert P. Kaufman, <i>Gap series and an example to Malliavin's theorem</i>	117
E. J. McShane, Robert Breckenridge Warfield, Jr. and V. M. Warfield,	
Invariant extensions of linear functionals, with applications to measures and stochastic processes	121
Marvin Victor Mielke Rearrangement of spherical modifications	1/13
Akio Osada On unicity of canacity functions	151
Donald Steven Passman. Some 5/2 transitive permutation groups	157
Harold L. Peterson, Ir., Regular and irregular measures on groups and	157
dyadic spaces	173
Habib Salehi, On interpolation of q-variate stationary stochastic	
processes	183
Michael Samuel Skaff, Vector valued Orlicz spaces generalized	
N-functions. I	193
A. J. Ward, On H-equivalence of uniformities. II	207
Thomas Paul Whaley, Algebras satisfying the descending chain condition	
for subalgebras	217
G. K. White, On subgroups of fixed index	225
Martin Michael Zuckerman, A unifying condition for implications among	
the axioms of choice for finite sets	233