

# Difference posets and orthoalgebras <sup>1</sup>

Mirko NAVARA and Pavel PTÁK

*Center for Machine Perception, Faculty of Electrical Engineering,  
Czech Technical University, Karlovo nám. 13, 121 35 Praha, Czech Republic  
navara@cmp.felk.cvut.cz*

*Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Electrical Engineering,  
Czech Technical University, Technická 2, 166 27 Praha, Czech Republic  
ptak@math.feld.cvut.cz*

## Abstract

We show that (and how) difference posets are isomorphic to orthoalgebras. As a corollary, we find a characterization of orthomodular lattices and Boolean algebras in terms of a difference operation. The results are relevant to the logico-algebraic foundation of quantum mechanics. (It should be noted that the manuscript form of this paper has circulated among interested readers for a longer time. As a result, the contents of this paper has been referred to in numerous papers, notably in the papers [7, 4, 11].)

## 1 Introduction

When we deal with a complemented poset we usually derive the difference operation (of comparable pairs) as a secondary notion. Taking the difference operation as primitive and imposing certain natural conditions on it, we obtain a *difference poset*. As it turns out, difference posets enjoy conceptual merits which might be utilized in quantum axiomatics and in the study of observables — see [11], see also [9], [12]). In this note we point out an explicit relationship of difference posets with structures already established in the foundation of quantum mechanics — with the *orthoalgebras* (see [6], [8], [10], [13], etc.). As a main result (Th. 2.11), we find a description of an orthoalgebra in terms of a difference operation on a poset. Using this description, we further obtain a characterization of orthomodular posets, orthomodular lattices and Boolean algebras in a difference poset setup.

## 2 Notions and results

Let us start with a basic notion of this paper (see also [11]).

**Definition 2.1 :** *Let  $(S, \leq)$  be a partially ordered set and let  $S$  possess a least and a greatest element,  $0, 1$ . Let  $\ominus$  be a partial binary operation on  $S$  such that*

---

<sup>1</sup>Research supported by the project No. VS96049 of the Czech Ministry of Education.

$b \ominus a$  is defined if and only if  $a \leq b$ . Then  $(S, 0, 1, \leq, \ominus)$  is called a difference poset (a DP) if the following conditions are satisfied:

(dp1) For any  $a \in S$ ,  $a \ominus 0 = a$ .

(dp2) If  $a \leq b \leq c$ , then  $c \ominus b \leq c \ominus a$  and  $(c \ominus a) \ominus (c \ominus b) = b \ominus a$ .

In what follows, we shall often use  $S$  instead of  $(S, 0, 1, \leq, \ominus)$  if there is no danger of misunderstanding. Typical examples of DPs are as follows.

**Example 2.2 :** Let  $V$  be an ordered linear space and let  $f$  be a positive element of  $V$ . Put  $V_f = \{g \in V \mid 0 \leq g \leq f\}$ . Then  $V_f$  becomes a DP. In particular, the interval  $[0, 1]$  of real numbers is a DP.

**Example 2.3 :** Let  $X$  be a set and let  $\exp X$  denote the set of all subsets of  $X$ . Let  $\Delta$  be a subset of  $\exp X$  that contains  $X$  and that is closed under the formation of the set-theoretic difference of the sets which are in the inclusion relation. Then  $\Delta$  with  $\leq$  being the inclusion relation and  $\ominus$  being the set-theoretic difference forms a DP.

**Example 2.4 :** Suppose that  $(S, 0, 1, \leq, ')$  is an orthomodular poset (see e.g. [12]). If we put, for  $a, b \in S$  such that  $a \leq b$ ,  $b \ominus a = b \wedge a'$ , then  $S$  becomes a DP.

**Example 2.5 :** Let  $F$  be a collection of functions  $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  which fulfils the following properties:

1. the constant unit function  $\mathbf{1}$  belongs to  $F$ ,
2. if  $f, g, \in F$ ,  $f \leq g$ , then  $g - f \in F$ .

Then  $F$  with  $\ominus$  defined as the pointwise difference of functions is a DP. The latter DP plays an essential role in the quantum axiomatics based on fuzziness (see e.g. [2], [3], [5], etc.).

**Definition 2.6 :** Let  $S, T$  be two DPs. A DP morphism is a mapping  $\alpha : S \rightarrow T$  such that (i)  $\alpha(1) = 1$ , (ii) if  $a, b \in S$  with  $a \leq b$ , then  $\alpha(a) \leq \alpha(b)$  and  $\alpha(b \ominus a) = \alpha(b) \ominus \alpha(a)$ .

As one can check easily, the class of DPs with the DP morphisms forms a category (see e.g. [1] for the category theory terminology). We shall denote the latter category by  $\mathcal{DP}$ .

Our intention in this note is to find a link of DPs with orthoalgebras. Let us first recall the definition of an orthoalgebra (see e.g. [8]).

**Definition 2.7 :** Let  $K$  be a set containing two distinguished elements  $0, 1$  and let  $K$  be endowed with a partially defined binary operation  $\oplus$  which satisfies the following four conditions ( $a, b, c \in K$ ):

- (oa1) If  $a \oplus b$  is defined, then  $b \oplus a$  is defined and  $a \oplus b = b \oplus a$ .
- (oa2) If  $b \oplus c$  is defined and  $a \oplus (b \oplus c)$  is defined, then  $a \oplus b$  is defined,  $(a \oplus b) \oplus c$  is defined and  $a \oplus (b \oplus c) = (a \oplus b) \oplus c$ .
- (oa3) For every  $a \in K$  there exists a unique  $b \in K$  such that  $a \oplus b$  is defined and  $a \oplus b = 1$ .
- (oa4) If  $a \oplus a$  is defined, then  $a = 0$ .

Then  $(K, 0, 1, \oplus)$  is called an orthoalgebra (an OA).

In what follows, we shall often use  $K$  instead of  $(K, 0, 1, \oplus)$  if there is no danger of misunderstanding. It should be noted that orthoalgebras have been found a useful tool in the pursuit of quantum mechanical constructs (see e.g. [6], [13], etc.).

**Definition 2.8 :** Let  $K, L$  be two orthoalgebras. Then a mapping  $\beta : K \rightarrow L$  is called an OA morphism if (i)  $\beta(1) = 1$ , (ii) if  $a, b \in K$  and  $a \oplus b$  exists, then  $\beta(a) \oplus \beta(b)$  exists in  $L$  and  $\beta(a \oplus b) = \beta(a) \oplus \beta(b)$ .

It can be shown easily that OAs with OA morphisms form a category. Let us denote this category by  $\mathcal{OA}$ .

In what follows, we shall be interested in the connection of DPs and OAs. The point of departure is the following observation.

**Proposition 2.9 :** Let  $(K, 0, 1, \oplus)$  be an orthoalgebra. Let us define a relation,  $\leq$ , and a partial binary operation,  $\ominus$ , in  $K$  as follows: For  $a, b \in K$ , we set  $a \leq b$  if and only if there is a  $c \in K$  such that  $b = a \oplus c$ , and in the latter case we put  $b \ominus a = c$ . Then  $(K, 0, 1, \leq, \ominus)$  is a difference poset.

*Proof.* One first has to check that the above defined relation  $\leq$  is indeed a partial ordering making  $0$  and  $1$  a least and a greatest element. This has been done in [8]. (In fact, only the antisymmetry of  $\leq$  needs to be verified, the other properties are obvious. Suppose that  $a \leq b$  and  $b \leq a$ . Then there are elements  $c, d$  such that  $b = a \oplus c$ ,  $a = b \oplus d$ . We have  $a = (a \oplus c) \oplus d = a \oplus (c \oplus d) = a \oplus (c \oplus d) \oplus (c \oplus d)$ . By (oa4),  $c \oplus d = 0$ . Thus,  $c = d = 0$  and therefore  $a = b$ .)

Let us now verify the axioms of a DP for  $(K, 0, 1, \leq, \ominus)$ . Suppose that  $a \leq b$ . Thus,  $b = a \oplus c$  and therefore  $b \ominus a$  is defined and  $b \ominus a = c$ . Let  $a \in K$ . We have to prove that  $a \ominus 0 = a$ . This is equivalent to proving that  $a = a \oplus 0$ . To this end, observe first that  $1 = 1 \oplus 0$ . (Indeed, according to (oa3), there is a  $b \in K$  such

that  $1 = 1 \oplus b = (1 \oplus b) \oplus b = 1 \oplus (b \oplus b)$ . By (oa2),  $b \oplus b$  is defined and, by (oa4),  $b = 0$ .) Let  $c \in K$  satisfy  $c \oplus a = 1$ . Then  $c \oplus (a \oplus 0) = (c \oplus a) \oplus 0 = 1 \oplus 0 = 1$  and, by (oa3),  $a \oplus 0 = a$ . Further, let us suppose that  $a \leq b \leq c$ . Thus,  $b = a \oplus d$  and  $c = b \oplus e$ . This means that  $c = a \oplus d \oplus e$ . It follows that  $(c \oplus a) \ominus (c \oplus b) = (d \oplus e) \ominus e = d = b \ominus a$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.10 :** *The category  $\mathcal{OA}$  is a full subcategory of  $\mathcal{DP}$ .*

*Proof.* By Prop. 2.9, every OA can be naturally viewed as a DP. Suppose that  $K, L$  are OAs and suppose further that  $\beta : K \rightarrow L$  is an OA morphism. Then, obviously,  $\beta(1) = 1$ . If  $a \leq b$ , we have  $a \oplus c = b$  for some  $c \in K$ . Thus,  $\beta(a) \oplus \beta(c) = \beta(b)$  and therefore  $\beta(a) \leq \beta(b)$ . Moreover, the equality  $\beta(a) \oplus \beta(c) = \beta(b)$  reads  $\beta(c) = \beta(b \ominus a) = \beta(b) \ominus \beta(a)$ . Thus,  $\beta$  is a DP morphism for  $K, L$  if  $K, L$  are understood as DPs. On the other hand, suppose that  $K, L$  are understood as DPs and  $\alpha : K \rightarrow L$  be a DP morphism. Obviously,  $\alpha(1) = 1$ . If  $a \oplus b = c$ , then  $a = c \ominus b$ . It follows that  $\alpha(a) = \alpha(c) \ominus \alpha(b)$  and therefore  $\alpha(c) = \alpha(a) \oplus \alpha(b)$ . Thus,  $\alpha$  is an OA morphism and this completes the proof.  $\square$

A natural question now arises of which DPs can be given an orthoalgebra structure. Let  $K$  be a DP. Let us say that  $K$  is *regular* if it satisfies the following condition: If  $a \in K$  and  $a \leq 1 \ominus a$ , then  $a = 0$ . Let us denote by  $\mathcal{DP}_{reg}$  the category of regular DPs. (Prior to the next result, let us observe that a DP does not have to be regular. In fact, none of the examples  $V_f$  (Ex. 2.2) is a regular DP.)

**Theorem 2.11 :** *Let  $(K, 0, 1, \leq, \ominus)$  be a regular DP. For any  $a, b \in K$  with  $b \leq 1 \ominus a$ , put  $a \oplus b = 1 \ominus [(1 \ominus a) \ominus b]$ . Then  $(K, 0, 1, \oplus)$  becomes an OA. A corollary: The categories  $\mathcal{OA}$  and  $\mathcal{DP}_{reg}$  are isomorphic.*

*Proof.* Prior to verifying the axioms for an orthoalgebra observe that  $b \ominus (b \ominus a) = a$  for any  $a, b \in K$  with  $a \leq b$ . Indeed,  $b \ominus a \leq b$  (from the definition of  $\ominus$ ) and, by (dp2),  $b \ominus (b \ominus a) = (b \ominus 0) \ominus (b \ominus a) = a \ominus 0 = a$ .

Ad (oa1): Suppose that  $a \oplus b$  is defined. This occurs exactly when  $b \leq 1 \ominus a$ . Then  $1 \ominus b \geq 1 \ominus (1 \ominus a) = a$ . Observe now that  $(1 \ominus a) \ominus b = (1 \ominus b) \ominus a$ . Indeed, making use of the axioms of a DP we obtain  $(1 \ominus a) \ominus b = (1 \ominus a) \ominus [1 \ominus (1 \ominus b)] = (1 \ominus b) \ominus a$ . Applying the latter equality, we infer that  $a \oplus b = 1 \ominus [(1 \ominus a) \ominus b] = 1 \ominus [(1 \ominus b) \ominus a] = b \oplus a$ .

Ad (oa2): Suppose that  $a \oplus (b \oplus c)$  is defined. Using (oa1), we obtain

$$a \oplus (b \oplus c) = (b \oplus c) \oplus a = 1 \ominus [(1 \ominus (b \oplus c)) \ominus a] =$$

$$1 \ominus \{[1 \ominus [1 \ominus ((1 \ominus b) \ominus c)]] \ominus a\} = 1 \ominus [((1 \ominus b) \ominus c) \ominus a] =$$

$$1 \ominus [((1 \ominus b) \ominus a) \ominus c] = (b \oplus a) \oplus c = (a \oplus b) \oplus c.$$

Ad (oa3): Suppose that  $a \in K$ . If we put  $b = 1 \ominus a$ , we obtain  $a \oplus b = 1 \ominus [(1 \ominus a) \ominus b] = 1 \ominus (b \ominus b) = 1 \ominus 0 = 1$ . We see that for  $b = 1 \ominus a$  we have  $a \oplus b = 1$ . Suppose on the contrary that  $a \oplus b = 1$  for an element  $b \in K$ . This means that  $1 \ominus [(1 \ominus a) \ominus b] = 1$ . It follows that  $1 \ominus [1 \ominus ((1 \ominus a) \ominus b)] = 1 \ominus 1 = (1 \ominus 0) \ominus (1 \ominus 0) = 0 \ominus 0 = 0$ . We infer that  $(1 \ominus a) \ominus b = 0$  and therefore  $1 \ominus a = (1 \ominus a) \ominus 0 = (1 \ominus a) \ominus ((1 \ominus a) \ominus b) = b$ .

Ad (oa4): Suppose that  $a \oplus a$  is defined. It follows that  $a \leq 1 \ominus a$ . Since  $K$  is supposed regular, we infer that  $a = 0$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

If  $K$  is DP, we can also view it as a poset with a complementation if we endow it with a unary operation  $'$  defined by putting  $a' = 1 \ominus a$  ( $a \in K$ ). Then Th. 2.11 above implies:  $(K, 0, 1, \oplus)$  is an orthoalgebra (with  $a \oplus b = 1 \ominus [(1 \ominus a) \ominus b]$ ) if and only if  $(K, 0, 1, \leq, ')$  is an orthoposet. (Recall that a bounded poset  $(K, 0, 1, \leq, ')$  is called an orthoposet if  $'$  is an involutive antiisomorphism such that  $a \vee a' = 1$  for all  $a \in K$ .)

In our next result we find conditions for a DP to become an orthomodular poset, an orthomodular lattice, or a Boolean algebra. This result may be useful in the logico-algebraic foundation of quantum theories, or elsewhere. (The proofs are easily available from Th. 2.11 above, Th. 2.11 of [8] and the rudiments on orthomodular posets (see e.g. [12])).

**Theorem 2.12 :** *Let  $K$  be a regular DP and let  $'$  denote a unary operation on  $K$  such that, for any  $a \in K$ ,  $a' = 1 \ominus a$ .*

1.  *$K$  is an orthomodular poset if and only if the following condition (OP) is fulfilled: If  $b \leq 1 \ominus a$ , then the supremum  $a \vee b$  exists in  $K$  and equals  $1 \ominus [(1 \ominus a) \ominus b]$ . A corollary: The full subcategory of  $\mathcal{DP}_{reg}$  consisting of exactly those objects that fulfil the condition (OP) is isomorphic to the category of orthomodular posets.*
2.  *$K$  is an orthomodular lattice if and only if it is a lattice. A corollary: The full subcategory of  $\mathcal{DP}_{reg}$  consisting of exactly those objects that are lattices is isomorphic to the category of orthomodular lattices with the OA morphisms.*
3.  *$K$  is a Boolean algebra if and only if the following condition (B) is fulfilled: For any pair  $a, b \in K$  there is a triple  $e, f, g \in K$  such that  $e \leq 1 \ominus f$ ,  $f \leq 1 \ominus g$ ,  $g \leq 1 \ominus e$  and  $f = a \ominus e$ ,  $g = b \ominus e$ . A corollary: The full subcategory of  $\mathcal{DP}_{reg}$  whose objects fulfil (B) is isomorphic to the category of Boolean algebras.*

Let us note in conclusion of this note that the isomorphism of regular DPs and OAs allows us to unify the investigation of states and observables in OAs. Indeed, if  $K$  is an OA and if  $K$  is viewed as a DP, then a state on  $K$  may be

identified with a DP morphism of  $K$  into  $V_f$  (see Ex. 2.2) and an observable on  $K$  may be identified with a DP morphism from  $\mathcal{B}(R)$  into  $K$ , where  $\mathcal{B}(R)$  is the Boolean algebra of Borel subsets of  $R$  (see [11]). Thus, both a state and an observable can be associated with the same mathematical entity. This might help in their description and investigation.

## References

- [1] Adámek, J.: *Theory of Mathematical Structures*. D. Reidel, Dordrecht/Boston/Lancaster, 1983.
- [2] Cattaneo, G., Nisticò, G.: *Brouwer-Zadeh posets and three-valued Lukasiewicz posets*. Fuzzy Sets Syst. **33** (1989), 165–190.
- [3] Dalla Chiara, M.L.: *Quantum logic*. In *Handbook of Philosophical Logic III*, D. Gabbay and F. Guentner (eds.), D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1986.
- [4] Dvurečenskij, A.: *Tensor product of difference posets*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **347** (1995), 1043–1057.
- [5] Dvurečenskij, A., Riečan, B.: *On joint distribution of observables for  $F$ -quantum spaces*. Fuzzy Sets Syst. **39** (1991), 65–73.
- [6] Foulis, D.: *Coupled physical systems*. Found. Physics **7** (1989), 905–922.
- [7] Foulis, D., Bennett, M.K.: *Effect algebras and unsharp quantum logics*. Found. Physics **24** (1994), 1331–1352.
- [8] Foulis, D., Greechie, R., Rüttimann, G.: *Filters and supports in orthoalgebras*. Int. J. Theor. Phys. **31** (1992), 787–807.
- [9] Gudder, S.P.: *Stochastic Methods in Quantum Mechanics*. North Holland, New York, 1979.
- [10] Hamhalter, J., Navara, M., Pták, P.: *States on orthoalgebras*. Int. J. Theor. Physics **34** (1995), No. 8, 1439–1465.
- [11] Kôpka, F., Chovanec, F.:  *$D$ -posets*. Math. Slovaca **44** (1994), 21–34.
- [12] Pták, P., Pulmannová, S.: *Orthomodular Structures as Quantum Logics*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht/Boston/London, 1991.
- [13] Randall, C., Foulis, D.: *What are quantum logics and what ought they to be?* In *Current Issues in Quantum Logic*, E. Beltrametti and B. van Fraassen (eds.), Ettore Majorana International Science Series **8**, Plenum, New York, 1981, 35–52.