

Ewa Czekwianianc

Joint distributions and compatibility of observables in quantum logics

Mathematica Slovaca, Vol. 38 (1988), No. 4, 361--366

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/129938>

Terms of use:

© Mathematical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1988

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

JOINT DISTRIBUTIONS AND COMPATIBILITY OF OBSERVABLES IN QUANTUM LOGICS

EWA CZKWIANIANC

In the paper presented the joint probability distribution in the Urbanik sense on a logic will be studied. A relation between the existence of the joint probability distribution and the existence of compatible observables will be shown.

Let L be a poset with the first and the last element 0 and 1 , respectively, with the orthocomplementation $\perp: L \rightarrow L$, for which we have (i) $(a^\perp)^\perp = a$ for all $a \in L$, (ii) if $a < b$, then $b^\perp < a^\perp$ (iii) $a \vee a^\perp = 1$ for all $a \in L$. If $a < b^\perp$, then a, b are said to be orthogonal and we write $a \perp b$. Further we assume that if $a_i \perp a_j$, $i \neq j$, then $\bigvee_i a_i$ exists in L ; and if $a < b$, then there is $c \perp a$ such that $b = a \vee c$.

A poset L satisfying the above axioms is called a logic.

We say that $a, b \in L$ are compatible written $(a \leftrightarrow b)$ if there exist mutually orthogonal elements $a_1, b_1, c \in L$, such that $a = a_1 \vee c$, $b = b_1 \vee c$.

An observable is a map $x: B(R^1) \rightarrow L$ such that (i) $x(R^1) = L$, (ii) if $E \cap F = \emptyset$ then $x(E) \perp x(F)$, (iii) $x\left(\bigcup_i E_i\right) = \bigvee_i x(E_i)$ if $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$, $i \neq j$. If f is a Borel function and x is an observable, then $f \circ x: E \rightarrow x(f^{-1}(E))$, $E \in B(R^1)$ is an observable. Two observables x, y are compatible (written $x \leftrightarrow y$) if $x(E) \leftrightarrow y(F)$ for $E, F \in B(R^1)$. The spectrum $\sigma(x)$ of an observable x is the smallest closed subset A of R^1 such that $x(A) = 1$. An observable x is bounded if $\sigma(x)$ is a bounded set.

A state is a map $m: L \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that (i) $m(1) = 1$, (ii) $m\left(\bigvee_i a_i\right) = \sum_i m(a_i)$ if $a_i \perp a_j$, $i \neq j$. A system M of states of L is called (i) quite full if the statement $m(b) = 1$, whenever $m(a) = 1$, $m \in M$ implies $a < b$, (ii) full if $a < b$ iff $m(a) \leq m(b)$ for all $m \in M$. Gudder [2] showed that if M is quite full, then M is full. We call the probability measure $m^x(\cdot) = m(x(\cdot))$ on $B(R^1)$ the distribution of x in the state m . The mean of x in the state m if it exists is

$$E_x^m = \int_{R^1} \lambda m^x(d\lambda).$$

The sum of bounded observables has been studied by Gudder [2, 3, 4]. In [2, 3] there is given the definition of the sum of unbounded observables.

Dvurečenskij and Pulmannová [1] showed that this definition does not include the important case of a logic $L(H)$, (H Hilbert space, $3 \leq \dim H \leq \aleph_0$). In the following we shall suppose that a couple (L, M) is a sum quantum logic in the sense of Dvurečenskij—Pulmannová [1].

Definition 1. We shall say that on a sum logic (L, M) the observables x_1, \dots, x_k are regular if

$$M_{x_1, \dots, x_k} = \{m \in M : E_{x_i}^m < \infty, i = 1, \dots, k\} \text{ is a full system.}$$

The set of all regular systems $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ of observables will be denoted by O_k . All systems of bounded observables are regular [1]. Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ be a system of observables on a sum logic (L, M) and let $x \in O_k$. Then the observable

$\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i x_i$ exists for all $a \in R^k$, $a = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$. We shall use the following notation.

For $a, b \in R^k$, (a, b) will denote the inner product in R^k and $a \in R^k$ and $x \in O_k$,

$$(a, x) = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i x_i \text{ if } a = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k).$$

Definition 2. We say that $x \in O_k$ has joint distribution of type 2 if there is a measure μ_m^λ on $B(R^k)$ such that

$$\mu_m^\lambda(\omega : (a, \omega) \in E) = m^{(a, x)}(E)$$

for all $a \in R^k$ and $E \in B(R^1)$.

By the Cramer-Wold theorem, if the joint distribution exists, it is unique. Joint distributions of this type were introduced by Urbanik [5] and they were studied by Urbanik [5, 6], Gudder [2, 3] and Varadarajan [7].

By $\hat{\mu}_m^x$ we will denote the characteristic function of μ_m^λ and by $\hat{m}^{(a, x)}$ we will denote the characteristic function of the measure $m^{(a, x)}(\cdot)$. By Definition 2 we have

$$(1) \quad \hat{\mu}_m^x(t) = \hat{m}^{(t, x)}(1),$$

where $t \in R^k$. Given $x \in O_k$, we shall denote by $M(x)$ the set of all states m for which μ_m^x exists. Let y be a system of compatible observables. The observables y_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$ are compatible if and only if there is an observable x and Borel functions f_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$, such that $y_i = f_i \circ x$ [4].

If $y \in O_k$, then $y_1 + \dots + y_k = (f_1 + \dots + f_k) \circ x$, [1]. $M(x) = M$ if and only if x consists of compatible observables [2, 3, 7].

Definition 3. Let $x \in O_k$. We say that x fulfils the probabilistic commutation condition if there exists a system $y \in O_k$ consisting of compatible observables such that

$$\mu_m^y = \mu_m^x \text{ for all } m \in M(x).$$

Let $a = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$, $\alpha_i \in R^1$, $\alpha_i \neq 0$, $b = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$, $\beta_i \in R^1$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$, $x \in O_k$. We shall use the notation

$$ax + b = (\alpha_1 x_1 + \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_k x_k + \beta_k),$$

where $\alpha_i x_i + \beta_i$ will denote the observables $y_i = f_i \circ x_i$ and $f_i(u) = \alpha_i u + \beta_i$, $u \in R^1$.

Since $E_m^{f_j \circ x} = \int_{R^1} f_j(u) m^x(du)$ [4] we have: if $x \in O_k$, then $ax + b \in O_k$. Let $t = (t_1, \dots, t_k)$, $t_i \in R^1$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, $at = (\alpha_1 t_1, \dots, \alpha_k t_k)$, $(t, ax + b) = (at, x) + (t, b)$. It is evident that $\hat{m}(\tau)^{(t, ax + b)} = e^{i\tau(t, b)} \hat{m}(\tau)^{(at, x)}$ for $m \in M$. For every $m \in M(x)$ we have (1), consequently $\hat{\mu}_m^{ax + b}(t) = e^{i\tau(t, b)} \hat{\mu}_m^x(at)$. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *If $a = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in R^k$, $\alpha_j \neq 0$, $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $b \in R^k$, then $x \in O_k$ if and only if $ax + b \in O_k$ and $M(x) = M(ax + b)$.*

Lemma 2. *If $a = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in R^k$, $\alpha_j \neq 0$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, $b \in R^k$ and $x \in O_k$, then x and $ax + b$ fulfil or do not fulfil the probabilistic commutation condition simultaneously.*

The proof is obvious.

Theorem 1 is the generalization of the (L, M) Urbanik—Theorem [6, Theorem 1]. K. Urbanik considers a situation in a Hilbert space H . In the proof of Theorem [6] the spectral theorem is used. In this paper instead of the spectral theorem we introduce a system consisting of compatible observables directly.

Theorem 1. *Let $x \in O_k$ and x consists of one side bounded observables with a purely point spectrum. Then x fulfils the probabilistic commutation condition.*

Proof. If $M(x)$ is empty, then our assertion is obvious. We assume that $M(x)$ is non-empty. Let E_j be the spectrum of x_j , $j = 1, \dots, k$. By Lemma 2 we may assume that E_j contains positive numbers only. The probability measure $m^y(\cdot)$ is concentrated on the set E_j for every $m \in M$. Let $E = E_1 \times E_2 \times \dots \times E_k$. Gudder [2] showed that if M is quite full, then if $l \in L$, $l \neq 0$, there exists $m \in M$ such that $m(l) = 1$. Consequently, for any $a \in R^k$ the probability measure $m^{(a, x)}(\cdot)$ is concentrated on the set $(a, E) = \{(a, e) : e \in E\}$ $m \in M$ [3].

Let F be the subset of R^k consisting of all elements $a = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ with linearly independent coordinates $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ over the denumerable field generated by the set $\bigcup_{j=1}^k E_j$. It is clear that F is dense in R^k . Moreover, for $a \in F$ the mapping $e \rightarrow (a, e)$ from E onto (a, E) is one-to-one. Let $(a, e) \in (a, E)$. By Definition 2 we have

$$\mu_m^x(\omega : (a, \omega) = (a, e)) = m^{(a, x)}(\{(a, e)\}).$$

However, for every $m \in M(x)$ the joint probability distribution μ_m^x is concentrated on the set E [2] and for every $a \in F$ the mapping $e \rightarrow (a, e)$ is one-to-one, and we have the formula

$$(2) \quad \mu_m^x(\{e\}) = m^{(a,x)}(\{(a,e)\}) (m \in M(x), e \in E, a \in F).$$

Since F is dense in R^k we can find an element $b \in F$ with positive coordinates. Let $y = (b, x)$, y is the observable with a purely point, positive spectrum. We shall define z_j which is concentrated on the set E_j : let $e \in E$, $e = \{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k\}$,

$$z_j(\{\varepsilon_j\}) = \bigvee_{\substack{e \in E \\ e = \{\dots, \varepsilon_j, \dots\}}} y(\{(b, e)\}), \quad \varepsilon_j \in E_j.$$

This z_j is an observable. Indeed if $\varepsilon_j \neq \varepsilon'_j$, then $y(\{(b, e)\}) \perp y(\{(b, e')\})$ and $e = \{\dots, \varepsilon_j, \dots\}$ $e' = \{\dots, \varepsilon'_j, \dots\}$

$$\bigvee_{\substack{e \in E \\ e = \{\dots, \varepsilon_j, \dots\}}} y(\{(b, e)\}) \perp \bigvee_{\substack{e' \in E \\ e' = \{\dots, \varepsilon'_j, \dots\}}} y(\{(b, e')\}), \quad z_j\left(\bigcup_k B_k\right) = \bigvee_k z_j(B_k)$$

where $B_l \cap B_m = \emptyset$, $l \neq m$, $B_k \in B(R^1)$, $k = 1, \dots$, $z_j(R^1) = 1$.

We will show that $z_i \leftrightarrow z_j$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \dots, k$. Let $i < j$, $\varepsilon_i \in E_i$, $\varepsilon_j \in E_j$.

$$z_i(\{\varepsilon_i\}) = \bigvee_{\substack{e \in E \\ e = \{\dots, \varepsilon_i, \dots, \varepsilon_j, \dots\}}} y(\{(b, e)\}) \vee \bigvee_{\substack{e \in E \\ e = \{\dots, \varepsilon_i, \dots, \varepsilon_j^{(n_i)} \neq \varepsilon_j, \dots\}}} y(\{(b, e)\})$$

$$z_j(\{\varepsilon_j\}) = \bigvee_{\substack{e \in E \\ e = \{\dots, \varepsilon_i, \dots, \varepsilon_j, \dots\}}} y(\{(b, e)\}) \vee \bigvee_{\substack{e \in E \\ e = \{\dots, \varepsilon_i^{(n_j)} \neq \varepsilon_i, \dots, \varepsilon_j, \dots\}}} y(\{(b, e)\})$$

where $\varepsilon_j^{(n_i)} \in E_j$ and $\varepsilon_j^{(n_j)} \neq \varepsilon_j$, $j = 1, \dots, k$. Since $z_i \leftrightarrow z_j$ then $\alpha_i z_i \leftrightarrow \alpha_j z_j$, $i, j = 1, \dots, k$ [4].

We will prove that $z = (z_1, \dots, z_k) \in O_k$.

$$E_{y^2}^m = \sum_{e \in E} (b, e)^2 m^y(\{(b, e)\}).$$

Since $x \in O_k$ then $bx = (b_1 x_1, \dots, b_k x_k) \in O_k$ [1]. By Definition 1 we have $E_{y^2}^m < \infty$ for any $m \in M_y \supset M_{bx} = M_x$. We can find $b = b^* \in F$, such that $\varepsilon_j^2 \leq (b^*, e)^2$, $j = 1, \dots, k$.

$$E_{z_j}^m = \sum_{e \in E} \varepsilon_j^2 m^y(\{(b, e)\}) \quad \text{if} \quad E_{z_j}^m < \infty$$

If $b = b^*$ and $m \in M_x$, then $E_{z_j}^m \leq E_{y^2}^m < \infty$, $j = 1, \dots, k$. Since M_x is full then $z \in O_k$. We have

$$\sum_{j=1}^k E_{z_j}^m = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\varepsilon_j \in E_j} \alpha_j \varepsilon_j m \left(\bigvee_{\substack{e \in E \\ e = \{\dots, \varepsilon_j, \dots\}}} y(\{(b, e)\}) \right) =$$

$$= \sum_{e \in E} (a, e) m^y(\{(b, e)\})$$

for every $m \in M_x$, $b = b^*$ and $a \in R^k$.

The spectrum of (a, z) , $\sigma(a, z) = \{(a, e) : e \in E\}$ and

$$(a, z)(\{(a, e)\}) = \bigvee_{\substack{e \in E \\ (a, e) = (a, e')}} y(\{(b, e)\})$$

for every $a \in R^k$.

Consequently, by (2) $\hat{m}^{(a, z)}(\tau) = \sum_{e \in E} e^{i\tau(a, e)} \mu_m^x(\{e\})$ for every $m \in M(x)$, $a \in R^k$. It is easy to see that $\hat{\mu}_m^x(\tau a) = \hat{m}^{(a, x)}(\tau)$ for every $m \in M(x)$, $\tau \in R^1$, $a \in R^k$ and by the formula $\hat{\mu}_m^x(\tau a) = \sum e^{i\tau(a, e)} \mu_m^x(\{e\})$ we have $\hat{m}^{(a, z)}(\tau) = \hat{m}^{(a, x)}(\tau)$ for every $m \in M(x)$ and $a \in R^k$. This yields the equation $\mu_m^z = \mu_m^x$ for all $m \in M(x)$, which completes the proof.

Q.E.D.

Remark. Theorem 1 may be proved for the definition of a sum of observables in the sense of Gudder [2, 3, 4].

REFERENCES

- [1] DVUREČENSKIJ, A.—PULMANNOVÁ, S.: On the sum of observables in a logic. *Math. Slovaca.*, 30, 4, 1980, 393—399.
- [2] GUDDER, S. P.: Uniqueness and existence properties of bounded observables. *Pac. J. Math.*, 19, 1966, 1, 81—83.
- [3] GUDDER, S. P.: Joint distributions of observables. *J. Math. Mech.*, 18, 4, 1968, 326—335.
- [4] GUDDER, S. P.: *Stochastic Methods in Quantum Mechanics*. North Holland, 1979.
- [5] URBANIK, K.: Joint probability distributions of observables in quantum mechanics. *Studia Math.*, 21, 1961, 118—133.
- [6] URBANIK, K.: Joint distributions and commutability of observables. *Demonstratio Math.*, 1, 1985, 31—41.
- [7] VARADARAJAN, V. S.: *Geometry of Quantum Theory*. Van Nostrand, New York 1968.

Received October 29, 1986

*Institute of Mathematics
Lodz University
ul. Stefana Banacha 22
90-238 Lodz
Poland*

СОВМЕСТНОЕ РАСПРЕДЕЛЕНИЕ И СОГЛАСЕ НАВЛЮДАЕМЫХ НА ЛОГИКЕ

Ewa Czkwianianc

Резюме

К. Урбаник в [6] доказал теорему о существовании для некоторой системы наблюдаемых в пространстве Гильберта, которая имеет одно и тоже совместное распределение. В данной работе этот результат обобщается на логику.