Zeitschrift: Helvetica Physica Acta
Band: 44 (1971)
Heft: 2

Artikel: Is a quantum logic a logic?
Autor: Greechie, R.J. / Gudder, S.P.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-114279

Nutzungsbedingungen
Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation
L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use
The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 30.11.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

Is a Quantum Logic a Logic?

by **R. J. Greechie**[1]) and **S. P. Gudder**

Kansas State University, Dept. of Mathematics, Manhattan, Kansas, USA
and University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, USA

(1. V. 70)

In a recent study Jauch and Piron [2] have considered the possibility that a quantum proposition system is an infinite valued logic. They argue that if this is the case then for any two propositions p and q there must exist a conditional proposition $p \to q$. Following Lukasiewicz [3] the truth value $[p \to q]$ of the conditional $p \to q$ is defined as follows: $[p \to q] = \min\{1, 1 - [p] + [q]\}$ where $[p]$ and $[q]$ are the truth values of $[p]$ and $[q]$ respectively. Here $[p] = 1$ is interpreted as 'p is true'. Note that $[p] = 1$ and $[p \to q] = 1$ implies $[q] = 1$ so we have a law of deduction, which is a property that any reasonable logic should possess. Notice further that if $[p \to q] = 1$ and $[q \to r] = 1$ then $[p \to r] = 1$ so that implication is transitive as it should be.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be an orthomodular poset (representing some quantum proposition system) and let $\mathcal{S}$ be an order determining (full in [1]) set of states on $\mathcal{L}$. We further assume that if $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{S}$, then $1/2\, m_1 + 1/2\, m_2 \in \mathcal{S}$, that is, $\mathcal{S}$ is closed under the formation of mid-points. We say that $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$ are *conditional* is there exists $c \in \mathcal{L}$ such that for all $m \in \mathcal{S}$ $m(c) = \min\{1, m(a') + m(b)\}$. If c exists it is unique. We call c the *conditional* of a and b and write $c = a \to b$. We say that $\mathcal{L}$ (or, more correctly, the pair $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{S})$) is *conditional* if every pair $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$ are conditional. Now if $\mathcal{L}$ is to be a logic with a law of deduction then $\mathcal{L}$ must be conditional. Jauch and Piron [2] have shown that standard proposition systems (that is, ones that are isomorphic to the lattice of all closed subspaces of a Hilbert space) are not conditional and thus cannot be logics in the usual sense. We generalize their results to the orthomodular posets $\mathcal{L}$ considered above. In fact we obtain the strong result that $\mathcal{L}$ is conditional if and only if $\mathcal{L} = \{0, 1\}$. We then characterize the pairs $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$ which are conditional.

Undefined terms appear in [1]. If $a \leqslant b'$ we write $a + b$ for $a \vee b$. If $a \leqslant b$ we write $b - a$ for $b \wedge a'$. We first state a useful lemma whose simple proof is left to the reader.

Lemma 1. (i) $m(a \to b) = 1$ if and only if $m(a) \leqslant m(b)$; $m(a \to b) = m(a') + m(b)$ if and only if $m(b) \leqslant m(a) = 1$.

(ii) $m\ (a \to b) = m(b)$ if and only if $m(b) = 1$ or $m(a) = 1$.

This lemma will be frequently used without further comment.

Theorem 2. $\mathcal{L}$ is conditional if and only if $\mathcal{L} = \{0, 1\}$.

---

[1]) Research supported in part by the National Science Foundation Grant Number GP-11241 and in part by the Fonds National Suisse.

Proof: Clearly $\{0, 1\}$ is conditional; in fact $1 = 0 \to 1$ and $0 = 1 \to 0$. Now let $\mathcal{L}$ be conditional and suppose there exists $a \in \mathcal{L} - \{0, 1\}$. Then $c = a \to a'$ exists and $m(c) = \min\{1, 2\, m(a')\}$. Since $\mathcal{S}$ is order determining $a' \leqslant c$. Hence there exists $b \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $a' + b = c$. Now $m(b) = m(c) - m(a') = \min\{m(a), m(a')\}$. Thus $m(b) \leqslant 1/2$ for all $m \in \mathcal{S}$. It follows that $b \leqslant b'$ since $\mathcal{S}$ is order determining. Hence $b = 0$ and $c = a'$. Thus $m(c) = \min\{1, 2\, m(c)\}$ and hence $m(c) = 0$ or 1 for all $m \in \mathcal{S}$. Moreover since $0 < c < 1$ there exist $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ with $m_1(c) = 0$ and $m_2(c) = 1$. Letting $m = 1/2\, m_1 + 1/2\, m_2$ we have $m(c) = 1/2$, a contradiction. Hence $\mathcal{L} = \{0, 1\}$.

We have seen that, for non-trivial posets $\mathcal{L}$, not every pair of elements is conditional. We now study the properties of pairs of elements that are conditional.

Lemma 3. If $a \to b$ and $a' \vee b$ exist and are equal then $a\, C\, b$.

Proof: There exists $d \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $b + d = a' \vee b$. We show $d \leqslant a'$. Otherwise there exists $m \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $m(d) > m(a')$. Then $m(a' \vee b) = m(b) + m(d) > 1 - m(a) + m(b)$ so $m(a) > m(b)$. Hence $m(a' \vee b) = m(a \to b) = 1 - m(a) + m(b)$, a contradiction. Now there exists $e \in \mathcal{L}$ with $d + e = a'$. We show $e \leqslant b$. Otherwise there exists $m \in \mathcal{S}$ with $m(e) > m(b)$. Then $m(a') = m(d) + m(e) > m(d) + m(b) = m(a' \vee b) \geqslant m(a')$, a contradiction. Hence there exists $f \in \mathcal{L}$ with $b = f + e$, $a' = d + e$ and $f \leqslant b \leqslant d'$ so that $a'\, C\, b$. Thus $a\, C\, b$.

Lemma 4. If $c = a \to b$ exists then $a' \leqslant c$ and $b \leqslant c$.

Proof: If $a' \leqslant c$ then there exists $m \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $m(c) < m(a')$. Hence $m(c) < 1$ and $1 - m(a) + m(b) = m(c) < 1 - m(a)$. Thus $m(b) < 0$, a contradiction. That $b \leqslant c$ is immediate.

We say that $\mathcal{S}$ is *sufficient* if $0 \neq a \in \mathcal{L}$ implies there exists $m \in \mathcal{S}$ with $m(a) = 1$.

Theorem 5. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be sufficient and assume that $a' \vee b$ exists. Then $a \to b$ exists if and only if $a \leqslant b$ or $b \leqslant a$.

Proof: Clearly, if $a \leqslant b$ then $a \to b = 1$ and if $b \leqslant a$, then $a \to b = a' + b$. Conversely, assume $c = a \to b$ exists. By Lemma 4 $c \geqslant a' \vee b$. Hence there exists $d \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $(a' \vee b) + d = c$. Suppose $d \neq 0$. Then there exists $m \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $m(d) = 1$. Hence $m(a') = m(b) = 0$ and $m(c) = 1 - m(a) + m(b) = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore $d = 0$ and $c = a' \vee b$. It now follows from Lemma 3 that $a\, C\, b$. Suppose a and b are not comparable. Then $a \wedge b < a$ and $a \wedge b < b$. Hence there exists $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $m_1\,(a - (a \wedge b)) = 1$ and $m_2\,(b - (a \wedge b)) = 1$. It follows that $m_1(a) = m_2(b) = 1$ and $m_1(b) = m_1\,(a \wedge b) = m_2(a) = m_2\,(a \wedge b) = 0$. Let $m = 1/2\,(1/2\, m_1 + 1/2\, m_2) + 1/2\, m_1 = 3/4\, m_1 + 1/4\, m_2$. Then $m\,(a \wedge b) = 0$ and $m(b) = 1/4 < 3/4 = m(a)$. Hence $m(a') + m(b) = m(c) = m\,(a' \vee b) = m\,(a' + (a \wedge b)) = m(a') + m\,(a \wedge b)$. Thus $m(b) = m\,(a \wedge b)$, a contradiction.

Corollary 6. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be sufficient and $a' \vee b$ exist. If $a \to b$ exists, then $a \to b = a' \vee b$, $b \to a$ exists, $b' \vee a$ exists, and $b \to a = b' \vee a$.

The proofs of the previous theorems depend heavily on the fact that $\mathcal{S}$ is order determining, sufficient or both. If we strengthen $\mathcal{S}$ still further we obtain a stronger result. We say that $\mathcal{S}$ is *strongly order determining* if $\{m \in \mathcal{S} : m(a) = 1\} \subseteq \{m \in \mathcal{S} : m(b) = 1\}$

implies that $a \leqslant b$. It can be shown that strongly order determining implies both order determining and sufficiency. (The converse fails; see [1].) Notice that the set of states on the lattice of all closed subspaces of a Hilbert space is strongly order determining.

Theorem 7. If $\mathcal{S}$ is strongly order determining, then $a \to b$ exists if and only if $a \leqslant b$ or $b \leqslant a$.

Proof: As in Theorem 5, if a and b are comparable, then $a \to b$ exists. Now assume $c = a \to b$ exists. Suppose $a \nleqslant b$ and $b \nleqslant a$. Then there exists $m_0, m_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $m_0(a) = 1$, $m_0(b) < 1$, $m_1(a) < 1$ and $m_1(b) = 1$. Note that $m_0(c) = m_0(b)$ and $m_1(c) = 1$. Let $m = 1/2\, m_0 + 1/2\, m_1$. Then $m(a) = 1/2 + 1/2\, m_1(a) < 1$, $m(b) = 1/2\, m_0(b) + 1/2 < 1$ and $m(c) = m(b)$. This last sentence contradicts Lemma 1 (ii). Hence a and b are comparable.

REFERENCES

[1] R. J. Greechie, *An Orthomodular Poset with a Full Set of States not Embeddable in Hilbert Space*, Carib. J. Sci. Math. *1*, 15 (1969).

[2] J. M. Jauch and C. Piron, *What is 'Quantum-Logic'? quanta*, edited by P. G. O. Freund, C. J. Goebel and Y. Nambu (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London 1970), p. 166–181.

[3] J. Lukasiewicz and A. Tarski, *Investigations into the Sentential Calculus, Logic, Semantics and Metamathematics* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1956).