

# Operator structure of a non quantum and a non classical system\*

Diederik Aerts and Bart D'Hooghe

Department of Theoretical Physics, Brussels Free University,  
Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussels, Belgium.  
e-mail: diraerts@vub.ac.be,  
bdhooghe@easynet.be

## Abstract

There exists a connection between the vectors of the Poincaré-sphere and the elements of the complex Hilbert Space  $C^2$ . This latter space is used to describe spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  measurements. We will now use this connection to study the intermediate cases of a more general spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  measurement model which has no representation in a Hilbert Space. We will construct the set of operators of this general model, and investigate under which circumstances it is possible to define linear operators. Because no Hilbert Space structure is possible for these intermediate cases, it can be expected that no linear operators are possible and it is shown that under very plausible assumptions this is indeed the case.

## 1 Introduction

In previous papers (Aerts, 1983, 1986, 1987) one of the authors proposed an explanation for the probabilities of quantum mechanics. It is based on the assumption that quantum structures arise as a consequence of the presence of fluctuations on the interaction between the measurement apparatus and the entity under study. It is shown in this approach, that has been called meanwhile the 'hidden measurement' approach, that quantum probabilities can be reproduced by considering an experiment as a class of sub-experiments (the hidden measurements), indistinguishable to the macroscopic observer and which can be parameterized by a real parameter. The resulting probabilities through the averaging process over the whole class of hidden measurements coincided with the quantum probabilities. A model for the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  experiments was introduced, and later on generalized to include cases of arbitrary fluctuations, going from maximal fluctuations which coincide with quantum mechanics, till cases of zero fluctuations which showed to be classical experiments. The amount of fluctuations can be parametrized by a real parameter  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ , such that the name  $\epsilon$ -model was given to the model (Aerts, Durt and Van Bogaert, 1993 a, b). To make this article self-contained we will briefly represent this  $\epsilon$ -model in section 2. By now considering  $\epsilon \neq 1, 0$  intermediate cases can be found, which are neither quantum ( $\epsilon = 1$ ) nor classical ( $\epsilon = 0$ ). So it was necessary to present a theory (Aerts 1994, Aerts and Durt 1994 a, b) which is much more general than quantum mechanics, and where these intermediate cases can be examined.

Already in several different mathematical categories the intermediate cases have been investigated now. The structure of the Piron-lattice of properties (Piron, 1976) of the entity was investigated and was found to be Boolean for the classical case with zero fluctuations, and pure quantum for the case of maximal fluctuations. For the intermediate cases the lattice was neither Boolean nor quantum (Aerts and Durt 1994 a, b). In the category of the closures it was shown (Aerts and Durt 1994 a, b) how the superposition principle disappears during the transition from quantum to classical, and that for the intermediate cases the Piron-axioms to find a representation of the entity in a general Hilbert Space are violated. In another category, that of the probability structures, a transition from Kolmogorovian to non-Kolmogorovian was discovered such that again the intermediate cases are neither Kolmogorovian nor quantumlike (Aerts D. 1995, Aerts S. 1996).

---

\*Published as: Aerts, D. and D'Hooghe, B., 1996, "Operator structure of a non-quantum and a non-classical system", *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, **35**, 2285-2298

In this paper we will investigate the  $\epsilon$ -model in yet another category, that one of the observables. More precisely, we will look at the properties of the  $*$ -algebra of linear operators which are used in quantum mechanics to describe the observables, as we go from quantum to classical by varying the parameter  $\epsilon$ . In analogy with the disappearing of the superposition principle we expect to find a loss of the linearity of the operators as we pass from quantum to classical, and rigorous proofs of this presumption will be sought.

## 2 The $\epsilon$ -model

The physical entity  $S$  that we consider is a point particle  $P$  that can move on the surface of a sphere, denoted by  $surf$ , with center  $O$  and radius 1. The unit-vector  $v$  where the particle is located on  $surf$  represents the state  $p_v$  of the particle. Hence the set of states that we consider is given by  $\Sigma = \{p_v \mid v \in surf\}$ . To introduce the experiments, we consider two diametrically opposite points  $u$  and  $-u$  on the surface of the sphere, and denoted by  $[-1, +1]_u$  the interval of real numbers  $[-1, +1]$  coordinating the points of the line between  $u$  and  $-u$ , in such a way that  $-1$  coordinates  $-u$  and  $+1$  coordinates  $u$ . We introduce a real parameter  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ , and consider the subinterval  $[-\epsilon, +\epsilon]_u \subset [-1, +1]_u$ . The experiment  $e_u^\epsilon$  consists of the particle  $P$  falling from its original place  $v$  orthogonally onto the line between  $u$  and  $-u$ , and arriving in a point, coordinated in the interval  $[-1, +1]_u$  by the real number  $v \cdot u$ . In the interval  $[-\epsilon, +\epsilon]_u$  we consider a uniformly distributed random variable  $\kappa$ , and the experiment proceeds as follows. If  $\kappa \in [-\epsilon, v \cdot u[$ , the particle  $P$  moves to the point  $u$ , and the experiment  $e_u^\epsilon$  gives outcome  $x_u^1$ . If  $\kappa \in ]v \cdot u, +\epsilon]$ , it moves to the point  $-u$  and the experiment  $e_u^\epsilon$  gives outcome  $x_u^2$ . If  $\kappa = v \cdot u$ , it moves with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  to the point  $u$ , and the experiment  $e_u^\epsilon$  gives outcome  $x_u^1$ , and it moves with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  to the point  $-u$ , and the experiment  $e_u^\epsilon$  gives outcome  $x_u^2$ . This completes the description of the experiment  $e_u^\epsilon$ . We shall denote the set of possible outcomes  $\{x_u^1, x_u^2\}$  of the experiment  $e_u^\epsilon$  by  $O_{e_u^\epsilon}$ , and the probability to obtain an outcome  $x_u^1$  by performing an experiment  $e_u^\epsilon$  (respectively an outcome  $x_u^2$ ) if the entity is in a state  $p_v$  by  $P(e_u^\epsilon = x_u^1 \mid p_v)$  (respectively  $P(e_u^\epsilon = x_u^2 \mid p_v)$ ).

We shall now consider different situations labeled by the parameter  $\epsilon$ . The entity  $S(\epsilon)$  is described by a set of states  $\Sigma = \{p_v \mid v \in surf\}$ , a set of experiments  $E(\epsilon) = \{e_u^\epsilon \mid u \in surf, \epsilon \in [0, 1]\}$ , and a set of probabilities

$\{P(e_u^\epsilon = x_u^i \mid p_v) \mid e_u^\epsilon \in E(\epsilon), x_u^i \in O_{e_u^\epsilon}, p_v \in \Sigma\}$ . To lighten the notation we denote the probability  $P(e_u^\epsilon = x_u^1 \mid p_v)$  by  $P^\epsilon(p_u \mid p_v)$ , and the probability  $P(e_u^\epsilon = x_u^2 \mid p_v)$  by  $P^\epsilon(p_{-u} \mid p_v)$ . We have the following cases :

1.  $\epsilon \leq v \cdot u$ .

Then  $P^\epsilon(p_u \mid p_v) = 1$  and  $P^\epsilon(p_{-u} \mid p_v) = 0$ .

2.  $-\epsilon \leq v \cdot u \leq +\epsilon$

$$P^\epsilon(p_u \mid p_v) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon}(v \cdot u + \epsilon)$$

$$P^\epsilon(p_{-u} \mid p_v) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon}(-v \cdot u + \epsilon)$$

3.  $v \cdot u \leq -\epsilon$

Then  $P^\epsilon(p_u \mid p_v) = 0$  and  $P^\epsilon(p_{-u} \mid p_v) = 1$

In the case  $\epsilon = 1$ , we see that the probabilities coincide with the probability of a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  entity in quantum mechanics, and that the entity  $S$  can be described in a Hilbert Space and the experiments  $e_u^\epsilon$  by the linear self-adjunct operators of that Hilbert Space.

When we vary  $\epsilon$  over  $[0, 1]$ , we get intermediate cases going from quantum ( $\epsilon = 1$ ) to classical ( $\epsilon = 0$ ). It is possible to study whether the axioms to derive a Hilbert Space structure from the lattice of properties are satisfied for the intermediate cases. It was proven that this is only the case for  $\epsilon = 1$ . We will now study the  $\epsilon$ -model in the category of the operators, more precisely in the  $*$ -algebra used to describe the operators of Hilbert Space quantum mechanics. Because there is no Hilbert Space structure available for the intermediate cases, we need another guideline. The most natural guidelines we can think of are based on physical observables and mathematical simplicity.

### 3 The map from Poincaré-sphere to a set of eigenvectors

We can establish a correspondence between the points of the unit-sphere in  $\mathfrak{R}^3$  which we will call from hereon the Poincaré-sphere and the eigenvectors of the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  operators in the complex space  $\mathbb{C}^2$  the following way. The mapping

$$S : \mathfrak{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2 : u = ( \sin \theta \cos \varphi, \sin \theta \sin \varphi, \cos \theta ) \rightarrow S_u = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta e^{-i\varphi} \\ \sin \theta e^{i\varphi} & -\cos \theta \end{pmatrix}$$

maps a unit vector  $u$  on the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  operator  $S_u$  which has two eigenvectors, namely

$$s_{u+} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} e^{-i\frac{\varphi}{2}} \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{i\frac{\varphi}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } s_{u-} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{-i\frac{\varphi}{2}} \\ \cos \frac{\theta}{2} e^{i\frac{\varphi}{2}} \end{pmatrix}$$

with eigenvalue  $+1$  and  $-1$  respectively. The set of these two orthogonal eigenvectors is a basis for the complex space  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . We can attribute the following meaning to these eigenvectors: if the entity is in a state  $s_{u+}$  we will find the value  $+1$  with certainty. The interpretation is then that on the Poincaré-sphere the entity is in the state  $p_u$  given by the point  $u$ . In short we make correspond a unit-vector  $u$  in  $\mathfrak{R}^3$  with an eigenvector  $s_{u+}$  in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . This correspondence can be made one-to-one, as we shall show now.

Because we are switching from the space of reals  $\mathfrak{R}^3$  to the complex space  $\mathbb{C}^2$  we will not use the word “dimensions” but the expression “degrees of freedom”. On the Poincaré-sphere we have two degrees of freedom:  $\theta$  and  $\varphi$ . In the complex space  $\mathbb{C}^2$  there are four : each complex number can be written as the sum of its real part and its imaginary part ; but by demanding that the norm of the eigenvector is 1, and because an eigenvector is defined upon an arbitrary constant (following the first requirement of modulus 1) we have a one-to-one correspondence between the vector of unit length  $u$  and the set of eigenvectors of  $S_u$  with eigenvalue 1 and norm 1. It is obvious that there exists a map between the Poincaré-sphere and the set of eigenvectors of  $S_u$  with eigenvalue 1 and norm 1 by the foregoing remarks. The inverse map does exist also. Indeed : if we take an arbitrary element of  $\mathbb{C}^2$  with norm 1 we can always construct one and only one unit-vector corresponding with this element, invariant under multiplication of this element by an arbitrary complex number of modulus 1. Let's take  $s = \begin{pmatrix} r_1 e^{i\theta_1} \\ r_2 e^{i\theta_2} \end{pmatrix}$  with  $r_1^2 + r_2^2 = 1$ , then we can

let this coincide with a  $s_{u+} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} e^{-i\frac{\varphi}{2}} \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{i\frac{\varphi}{2}} \end{pmatrix}$  by

$$\begin{cases} e^{i\theta_1} = e^{-i\frac{\varphi}{2}} \\ e^{i\theta_2} = e^{i\frac{\varphi}{2}} \end{cases} \Rightarrow \theta_2 - \theta_1 = \varphi + k \cdot 2\pi \quad ; \quad k \in Z$$

and  $\begin{cases} r_1 = \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \\ r_2 = \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \end{cases} \Rightarrow \tan \frac{\theta}{2} = \frac{r_2}{r_1}$

We see that multiplication of  $s$  with an arbitrary constant of modulus 1 changes  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  with the same constant so that in the remainder to obtain  $\varphi$  this constant disappears. Or in other words : the vector  $u$  is uniquely defined; and the map is now indeed one-to-one.

## 4 The action of the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ operators on the Poincaré-sphere

### 4.1 Physical assumptions

We have now made clear the connection between an element of the complex space  $\mathbb{C}^2$  and an element of the space of reals  $\mathfrak{R}^3$ . There also exists a connection between the operators in the complex space  $\mathbb{C}^2$  and the operators on the Poincaré-sphere. Our guideline is that the averages of a physical observable are independent of our description (thus independent of the fact that we are describing it in the complex space  $\mathbb{C}^2$  or on the Poincaré-sphere) and the connection that exists between the in-product in  $\mathbb{C}^2$  and the scalar product of vectors on the Poincaré-sphere. More precisely, the average  $\overline{S_1(\psi_w)}$  of an observable  $S_1$  when the entity is in a state  $\psi_w$  is given by :

$$\overline{S_1(\psi_w)} = \langle S_1(\psi_w) | \psi_w \rangle$$

and if we denote the action of the spin operator on the Poincaré-sphere by  $T_1$  (thus with  $S_1(\psi_w)$  is associated the vector  $T_1(w)$  on the Poincaré-sphere) we can write the connection of the inner product which is of interest to us :

$$|\langle S_1(\psi_w) | \psi_w \rangle|^2 = \frac{1 + T_1(w) \cdot w}{2}$$

These two formulas will be sufficient to define and study the action on a state  $w$  by a general spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  measurement  $e_u^\epsilon$  on the Poincaré-sphere. By the word “action” we mean that the square of the average  $\overline{T_\epsilon(w)}$  of the operator  $T_\epsilon$  (corresponding with the general spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  measurement  $e_u^\epsilon$ ) on the Poincaré-sphere when the entity is in a state  $p_w$  is given per definition and in analogy with the quantum case by :

$$\overline{T_\epsilon(w)}^2 = \frac{1 + T_\epsilon(w) \cdot w}{2}$$

The operator  $T_1$  corresponds to a rotation over  $\pi$ . This is so because the formula shows us that the angle between  $T_\epsilon(w)$  and  $w$  is twice the angle  $\theta$  between  $w$  and  $u$  :

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle S_\epsilon(\psi_w) | \psi_w \rangle|^2 &= \frac{1 + T_\epsilon(w) \cdot w}{2} \\ &= \cos^2 \theta \\ &= \frac{1 + \cos 2\theta}{2} \end{aligned}$$

because  $\langle S_\epsilon(\psi_w) | \psi_w \rangle$  is the average and this is  $\cos \theta$  in the quantum case. Moreover also the angle between  $T_\epsilon(w)$  and  $u$  is  $\theta$  :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S_1(\psi_w) | \psi_u \rangle &= \langle \psi_w | S_1^\top(\psi_u) \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi_w | S_1(\psi_u) \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi_w | \psi_u \rangle \end{aligned}$$

because  $S_1$  is self-adjunct and  $\psi_u$  is an eigenvector of  $S_1$  with eigenvalue  $+1$ . Using elementary triangle inequalities

on the sphere, we see thus that  $S_1$  is a rotation over 180 degrees. An elementary calculation reveals for an arbitrary  $u = (\sin \theta_1 \cos \varphi_1, \sin \theta_1 \sin \varphi_1, \cos \theta_1)$  the following form of the rotation:

$$S_{e_{u(\theta_1, \varphi_1)}} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 + 2 \cos^2 \varphi_1 \sin^2 \theta_1 & 2 \sin^2 \theta_1 \cos \varphi_1 \sin \varphi_1 & 2 \cos \varphi_1 \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_1 \\ 2 \sin^2 \theta_1 \cos \varphi_1 \sin \varphi_1 & -1 + 2 \sin^2 \varphi_1 \sin^2 \theta_1 & 2 \sin \varphi_1 \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_1 \\ 2 \cos \varphi_1 \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_1 & 2 \sin \varphi_1 \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_1 & \cos 2\theta_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

## 4.2 Mathematical assumptions

The physical assumptions only make it possible to define the angle  $\gamma_w$  between a vector  $w$  and its image  $T_\epsilon(w)$ , which will become clearer in a following section. In general this means that we only can say that  $T_\epsilon(w)$  lies on a small circle on the Poincaré-sphere, centered around the axis  $[-w, w]$  and making an angle  $\gamma_w$  with it. Here we can make different choices to define our  $T_\epsilon(w)$  unambiguously. We can make the assumption that  $T_\epsilon(w)$  makes the same angle  $\theta$  with  $u$  as  $u$  with  $w$ . This is a completely arbitrary demand. It is inspired by the fact that in the quantum case we have that  $(T_1)^2 = id_{C^2}$ . There is always the possibility to “get back where you started from”. If we need the possibility to get back from  $T_\epsilon(w)$  to  $w$ , we have to be aware of the fact that the action of  $T_\epsilon$  on  $T_\epsilon(w)$  depends on the angle  $\theta_{T_\epsilon(w)}$  between  $T_\epsilon(w)$  and  $u$ , and it is necessary that this angle is equal to the angle  $\theta_w$  between  $u$  and  $w$ , if we want that a same but opposite action is made. If we look at the quantum case more closely, we see that it is in fact the inverse of  $S_1$  which is involved :  $S^2 = S \cdot S^{-1} = S^{-1} \cdot S = id_{C^2}$ , because in the quantum case we have that  $S^{-1} = S$ . Of course in the intermediate cases this property of the spin operator is lost. More precisely, we can say that the operator  $T_\epsilon$  is split for  $\epsilon \neq 1$  into two operators : a “left handed”  $T_l$  (the set  $\{T_l(w), w, u\}$  is “left handed”) and a “right handed”  $T_r$ . Then we can restate the formula  $(T_1)^2 = id_{surf}$  by  $T_r \cdot T_l = T_l \cdot T_r = id_{surf}$ . It simply means that for the non quantum case symmetry is lost.

### 4.3 Study of the algebra of spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ measurement operators $T_1$ in the quantum case.

With the general matrix-representation  $S_{e_{u(\theta_1, \varphi_1)}}^1$ , we can imitate consecutive measurements around different arbitrary axes by multiplying their matrix-representations, and study the consequences. In particular we are interested whether we have commutativity. We therefore take two arbitrary unit vectors  $u$  and  $w$  :

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \begin{pmatrix} \sin \theta_1 \cos \varphi_1, & \sin \theta_1 \sin \varphi_1, & \cos \theta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\ w &= \begin{pmatrix} \sin \theta_2 \cos \varphi_2, & \sin \theta_2 \sin \varphi_2, & \cos \theta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and their corresponding matrices  $S_{e_{u(\theta_1, \varphi_1)}}^1$  and  $S_{e_{w(\theta_2, \varphi_2)}}^1$  :

$$\begin{aligned} S_{e_{u(\theta_1, \varphi_1)}}^1 &= \begin{pmatrix} -1 + 2 \cos^2 \varphi_1 \sin^2 \theta_1 & 2 \sin^2 \theta_1 \cos \varphi_1 \sin \varphi_1 & 2 \cos \varphi_1 \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_1 \\ 2 \sin^2 \theta_1 \cos \varphi_1 \sin \varphi_1 & -1 + 2 \sin^2 \varphi_1 \sin^2 \theta_1 & 2 \sin \varphi_1 \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_1 \\ 2 \cos \varphi_1 \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_1 & 2 \sin \varphi_1 \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_1 & \cos 2\theta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\ S_{e_{w(\theta_2, \varphi_2)}}^1 &= \begin{pmatrix} -1 + 2 \cos^2 \varphi_2 \sin^2 \theta_2 & 2 \sin^2 \theta_2 \cos \varphi_2 \sin \varphi_2 & 2 \cos \varphi_2 \cos \theta_2 \sin \theta_2 \\ 2 \sin^2 \theta_2 \cos \varphi_2 \sin \varphi_2 & -1 + 2 \sin^2 \varphi_2 \sin^2 \theta_2 & 2 \sin \varphi_2 \cos \theta_2 \sin \theta_2 \\ 2 \cos \varphi_2 \cos \theta_2 \sin \theta_2 & 2 \sin \varphi_2 \cos \theta_2 \sin \theta_2 & \cos 2\theta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and study the cases where these two matrices commute. It is easy to see that there only will be problems on the non-diagonal elements of the matrix product. Moreover we only need to calculate 3 of these non-diagonal elements, because the other three elements will contribute no more conditions on  $u$  and  $w$ . This is so because:

$$\begin{aligned} \left( S_{e_{u(\theta_1, \varphi_1)}}^1 \cdot S_{e_{w(\theta_2, \varphi_2)}}^1 \right)^t &= S_{e_{w(\theta_2, \varphi_2)}}^1 \cdot S_{e_{u(\theta_1, \varphi_1)}}^1 \\ &= S_{e_{w(\theta_2, \varphi_2)}}^1 \cdot S_{e_{u(\theta_1, \varphi_1)}}^1 \end{aligned}$$

so that commutativity is obtained if and only if the matrix  $S_{e_{u(\theta_1, \varphi_1)}}^1 \cdot S_{e_{w(\theta_2, \varphi_2)}}^1$  is equal to its transponant. After again some elementary calculations this leads to the following set of conditions on  $u$  and  $w$ :

$$\begin{cases} (u \cdot w) \sin(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) \sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 = 0 \\ (u \cdot w)(\cos \varphi_1 \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 - \cos \varphi_2 \sin \theta_2 \cos \theta_1) = 0 \\ (u \cdot w)(\sin \varphi_1 \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 - \sin \varphi_2 \sin \theta_2 \cos \theta_1) = 0 \end{cases}$$

So that we see that a sufficient condition for commutativity is that  $u$  and  $w$  are orthogonal. If they are not, we can divide by their scalar product which is now non-zero and we obtain the following relations:

$$\begin{cases} \sin(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) \sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 = 0 \\ \cos \varphi_1 \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 - \cos \varphi_2 \sin \theta_2 \cos \theta_1 = 0 \\ \sin \varphi_1 \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 - \sin \varphi_2 \sin \theta_2 \cos \theta_1 = 0 \end{cases}$$

from which we can deduce that either  $u = w$  or else that  $u = -w$ , thanks to the need for  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  to have a value between 0 and  $\pi$ . Only then we see that the product-matrix  $S_{e_{u(\theta_1, \varphi_1)}}^1 \cdot S_{e_{w(\theta_2, \varphi_2)}}^1$  becomes diagonal, in perfect correspondence with the description in Hilbert Space of course.

## 5 The generalized spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ measurement of the $\epsilon$ - model

### 5.1 Satisfying the physical assumptions

We will study the spin operator for the various values of  $\epsilon$ . For  $\epsilon = 1$  we have found that the action of the spin operator was that of a rotation over  $\pi$ . Because the state space is in general not a Hilbert Space we use the following correspondence:

$$\frac{1 + T_\epsilon(w) \cdot w}{2} = \overline{T_\epsilon(w)}^2$$

and give to the outcome  $x_u^1$  the numerical value of +1 and to the outcome  $x_u^2$  the numerical value of -1. Doing this, the average  $\overline{T_\epsilon(w)}$  can be calculated by means of the given probabilities:

$$\overline{T_\epsilon(w)} = (+1) P^\epsilon(p_u | p_w) + (-1) P^\epsilon(p_{-u} | p_w)$$

and can be found to depend upon the angle  $\theta$  between  $w$  and the spin direction  $u$  in the following way:

1. If  $\cos \theta \geq \epsilon$ , then  $\overline{T_\epsilon(w)} = 1$ .
2. If  $\epsilon \geq \cos \theta \geq -\epsilon$ , then  $\overline{T_\epsilon(w)} = \frac{\cos \theta}{\epsilon}$ .
3. If  $\cos \theta \leq -\epsilon$ , then  $\overline{T_\epsilon(w)} = -1$ .

So that we find that

1. If  $\cos \theta \geq \epsilon$ , then  $\frac{1+T_\epsilon(w) \cdot w}{2} = 1$
2. If  $\epsilon \geq \cos \theta \geq -\epsilon$ , then  $\frac{1+T_\epsilon(w) \cdot w}{2} = \frac{\cos^2 \theta}{\epsilon^2}$
3. If  $\cos \theta \leq -\epsilon$ , then  $\frac{1+T_\epsilon(w) \cdot w}{2} = 1$

If we now make the assumption that  $T_\epsilon(w)$  is of unit length, we can calculate the angle  $\gamma_w$  between  $T_\epsilon(w)$  and  $w$ :

1. If  $\cos \theta \geq \epsilon$  or  $\cos \theta \leq -\epsilon$ , then  $\cos \gamma_w = 1$ .
2. If  $\epsilon \geq \cos \theta \geq -\epsilon$ , then  $\cos \gamma_w = \frac{2 \cos^2 \theta - \epsilon^2}{\epsilon^2}$

It is obvious that this indeed reduces to a rotation over 180 degrees if  $\epsilon = 1$ . This is so because the formula shows us that the angle between  $T_1(w)$  and  $w$  is twice the angle  $\theta$  between  $w$  and  $u$ . Moreover also the angle between  $T_1(w)$  and  $u$  is  $\theta$  like we have proven earlier already for the quantum case and demanded for the intermediate cases.

For  $\epsilon = 1$  we see that the operator  $T_\epsilon$  is linear:  $T_1(\frac{w+v}{\sqrt{2}}) = \frac{T_1(w)+T_1(v)}{\sqrt{2}}$ . This is trivial if we write the action of  $T_1$  down in some more geometrical way, making clear its linearity:  $T_1(w) = -w + 2(u \cdot w)u$ . This result makes it a natural question to ask under which circumstances the operator  $T_\epsilon$  is linear.

## 5.2 The intermediate cases ( $0 \neq \epsilon \neq 1$ )

Under which circumstances is this  $T_\epsilon$  a linear operator on the Poincaré-sphere? We will show that there is no such operator.

**Theorem 1**  $T_\epsilon$  is a linear operator if and only if  $\epsilon = 1$ .

PROOF: We have to show that  $T_\epsilon(w+v) = T_\epsilon(w) + T_\epsilon(v)$  for every  $v, w$  on the sphere. Because we supposed that  $T_\epsilon$  is a linear operator on the Poincaré-sphere, we will check that  $\frac{T_\epsilon(w)+T_\epsilon(v)}{\sqrt{2}} = T_\epsilon(\frac{w+v}{\sqrt{2}})$  and this is sufficient if  $T_\epsilon$  is linear.

Let's take  $w = u$  and  $v = u_\perp$ , an arbitrary vector orthogonal to  $u$ . It is obvious that  $\cos \gamma_w = 1$  because  $\theta_{uw}$  (the angle between  $u$  and  $w$ ) = 0 and  $\cos \gamma_v = -1$  because  $\theta_{uv} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ . In other words a vector  $v$  on the equator of  $u$  will always be mapped on its antipode  $-v$ , and  $u$  will always be mapped by  $T_\epsilon$  onto itself. More precisely, if we define the eigensets  $\text{eig}_u^\epsilon(1)$  and  $\text{eig}_u^\epsilon(2)$  as the sets  $\text{eig}_u^\epsilon(1) = \{p_v | \epsilon \leq v \cdot u\}$  and  $\text{eig}_u^\epsilon(2) = \{p_v | v \cdot u \leq -\epsilon\}$ , then every vector of an eigenset will be unchanged by the operator. Anyhow, we find that

$$\frac{T_\epsilon(w) + T_\epsilon(v)}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{w - u_\perp}{\sqrt{2}}$$

We have now two possibilities for  $\frac{w+v}{\sqrt{2}}$ :

1. If  $\frac{w+v}{\sqrt{2}}$  is in an eigenset, it will be mapped onto itself, and  $T_\epsilon$  is clearly not linear.
2.  $\frac{w+v}{\sqrt{2}}$  is not in an eigenset, and the action of  $T_\epsilon$  will transform it into  $T_\epsilon(\frac{w+v}{\sqrt{2}})$ . The angle  $\theta$  between  $\frac{w+v}{\sqrt{2}}$  and  $u$  is  $\frac{\pi}{4}$ . So we find for  $\cos \gamma_{\frac{w+v}{\sqrt{2}}} = \frac{2 \cos^2 \theta - \epsilon^2}{\epsilon^2} = \frac{1 - \epsilon^2}{\epsilon^2}$ . On the other hand we see that the angle between  $\frac{w - u_\perp}{\sqrt{2}}$  and  $\frac{w+v}{\sqrt{2}}$  is  $\frac{\pi}{2}$  (they're orthogonal) such that we also have that  $\cos \gamma_{\frac{w+v}{\sqrt{2}}} = 0$ . This can only be the case if and only if  $\epsilon = 1$ . Thus only in the quantum case we find that  $T_\epsilon$  is linear.

### 5.3 The classical case

The classical case needs a special study, because now  $\epsilon = 0$ , making it impossible to follow the guideline of the previous sections. Let us remind that if  $\kappa = v \cdot u$ , the experiment  $e_u^\epsilon$  gives outcome  $x_u^1$  with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  and outcome  $x_u^2$  with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Thus the average  $\overline{T_0(w)}$  for an arbitrary  $w$  on the equator ( $w \cdot u = 0$ ) :

$$\overline{T_0(w)} = (+1) P^0(p_u | p_w) + (-1) P^0(p_{-u} | p_w) = (+1) \frac{1}{2} + (-1) \frac{1}{2} = 0.$$

Hence  $\frac{1+T_0(w) \cdot w}{2} = 0$ , and the angle  $\gamma_w$  between  $w$  and  $T_0(w)$  is  $\pi$ .

We have two possibilities :

1. We neglect the foregoing remark and define  $T_0$  as the identity for  $\epsilon = 0$ , making an extrapolation of the eigensets. Indeed : the upper open half sphere is an eigenset and the lower open half sphere is an eigenset of  $T_0$ . Making the eigensets closed by defining the action of  $T_0$  on the equator as the identity, we recover a linear operator. Unfortunately, doing this we not only abandon our guidelines we set out in the beginning, but we also lose symmetry and the eigensets get mixed up, which is an untenable situation.
2. That  $T_0$  is the identity on the whole sphere, except on the equator, where it maps the points on their antipodes. And we see that we have no linearity in the classical case too. It seems the most natural thing to do, maintaining our guidelines and respecting symmetry.

## 6 The asymmetric and general asymmetric case

The reasoning above can be repeated for an even more general model : the asymmetric  $\epsilon$ -model in which an extra parameter  $d$  is introduced :  $d \in [-1 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon]$ , describing this asymmetry. If  $d$  equals zero, we find back the previous case. For  $d \neq 0$ , no linearity will be found, as we shall prove below. We will use the notation  $T_\epsilon^d$  to denote the corresponding operator.

### 6.1 The $\epsilon, d$ -model

The probability  $P_d^\epsilon(p_u | p_w)$  to obtain an outcome  $x_u^1 = +1$  is given by :

1. If  $u \cdot w \geq d + \epsilon$ ,  $P_d^\epsilon(p_u | p_w) = 1$
2. If  $d + \epsilon \geq u \cdot w \geq d - \epsilon$ ,  $P_d^\epsilon(p_u | p_w) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon} (w \cdot u - d + \epsilon)$
3. If  $d - \epsilon \geq u \cdot w$ ,  $P_d^\epsilon(p_u | p_w) = 0$

and the probability  $P_d^\epsilon(p_{-u} | p_w)$  to obtain an outcome  $x_u^2 = -1$  is given by:

1. If  $u \cdot w \geq d + \epsilon$ ,  $P_d^\epsilon(p_{-u} | p_w) = 0$
2. If  $d + \epsilon \geq u \cdot w \geq d - \epsilon$ ,  $P_d^\epsilon(p_{-u} | p_w) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon} (d + \epsilon - w \cdot u)$
3. If  $d - \epsilon \geq u \cdot w$ ,  $P_d^\epsilon(p_{-u} | p_w) = 1$

so that we have after a completely analogous calculation to the previous sections that the angle  $\gamma_w$  between  $T_\epsilon^d(w)$  and  $w$  is given by:

1. If  $u \cdot w \geq d + \epsilon$ ,  $\cos \gamma_w = 1$
2. If  $d + \epsilon \geq u \cdot w \geq d - \epsilon$ ,  $\cos \gamma_w = \frac{2(u \cdot w - d)^2 - \epsilon^2}{\epsilon^2}$
3. If  $d - \epsilon \geq u \cdot w$ ,  $\cos \gamma_w = 1$ .

## 6.2 Satisfaction of the mathematical assumption

Can now the left spin operator  $T_\epsilon^d$  which we denote by  $T_{\epsilon,l}^d(w)$  be chosen in a way such that  $T_{\epsilon,l}^d(T_{\epsilon,r}^d(w))$  is back again  $w$ ? This is not always the case. For an arbitrary  $w$  the calculations show that  $T_{\epsilon,l}^d(w)$  lies on a circle which makes an angle  $\gamma$  with  $w$ , which depends on the angle  $\theta_w$  between  $w$  and  $u$ . So to go back to  $w$  we need that  $T_{\epsilon,r}^d(w)$  makes the same angle  $\theta_w$  with  $u$ . But for  $w$  with  $u \cdot w = d$ , we see that  $\cos \gamma = -1$ , so that  $T_{\epsilon,r}^d(w) = -w$  and  $\theta_{T_{\epsilon,r}^d(w)} = \pi - \theta_w$ , such that  $T_{\epsilon,l}^d(T_{\epsilon,r}^d(w)) \neq w$ , hence  $T_{\epsilon,l}^d \cdot T_{\epsilon,r}^d \neq id_{surf}$ . A simple calculation shows that for  $d = 0$ , it is always possible to chose  $T_{\epsilon,l}^d(w)$  such that  $T_{\epsilon,l}^d(T_{\epsilon,r}^d(w)) = w$ . One can see this easily by considering the fact that the “trouble some” case  $w$  with  $u \cdot w = d = 0$ , gives no more problems because now  $T_{\epsilon,r}^d(w) = -w$  lies also on the equator and no more under it. So even in that extreme case no more problems arise. The reasoning for  $T_{\epsilon,r}^d \cdot T_{\epsilon,l}^d \neq id_{surf}$  is completely analogous.

## 6.3 Linearity for the asymmetric situation

It can be shown that an asymmetric situation can never give rise to a linear spin operator. If  $T_\epsilon^d$  is a linear function which maps the Poincaré-sphere onto itself,  $d$  must equal zero.

**Theorem 2**  $T_\epsilon^d$  is a linear function which maps the Poincaré-sphere onto itself  $\Rightarrow d = 0$ .

PROOF: If  $T_\epsilon^d$  is linear, we must have  $\forall v, w : T_\epsilon^d(v) + T_\epsilon^d(w) = T_\epsilon^d(v + w)$

and  $T_\epsilon^d(\alpha \cdot v) = \alpha \cdot T_\epsilon^d(v)$ ,  $\forall \alpha \in \mathfrak{R}$ . In particular, for  $v = u$ , and  $w$  such that  $\cos \theta_w = d$ , we have that  $T_\epsilon^d(v) = u$ , and  $T_\epsilon^d(w) = -w$ . The norm of  $v + w = \sqrt{2(1 + \cos \theta_w)} = \sqrt{2(1 + d)}$ . So  $\frac{v+w}{\sqrt{2(1+d)}}$  has norm 1 and lies on the sphere. Its image lies also on the sphere by assumption and has thus norm one.

But  $T_\epsilon^d\left(\frac{v+w}{\sqrt{2(1+d)}}\right) = \frac{T_\epsilon^d(v) + T_\epsilon^d(w)}{\sqrt{2(1+d)}} = \frac{v-w}{\sqrt{2(1+d)}}$  which has norm  $\frac{\sqrt{2(1-d)}}{\sqrt{2(1+d)}}$ . This can only be 1 for  $d = 0$ .

## 7 Conclusion

We have constructed a set of operators of the generalized  $\epsilon, d$ - model, and investigated under which circumstances these operators become linear. It was shown that only for the symmetric case with maximal fluctuations of the interaction between entity and measurement apparatus the operators become linear on the Poincaré-sphere. This case coincides with ordinary quantum mechanics, where the set is the generating set of a  $*$ -algebra. In a later article we will investigate further the structure of the set of general operators of the  $\epsilon, d$ -model.

## 8 Acknowledgments

TENA is supported by Federale Diensten voor Wetenschappelijke, Technische en Culturele Aangelegenheden; IUAP-III n°9. Dirk Aerts is Senior Research Associate of the Belgian National Fund for Scientific Research and Bart D’Hooghe is Research Assistant of the National Fund for Scientific Research.

## 9 References

- Aerts, D. (1983). *A possible explanation for the probabilities of quantum mechanics and a macroscopic situation that violates Bell inequalities*, in *Recent Developments in Quantum Logic*, eds. P. Mittelstaedt et al., in *Grundlagen der Exakten Naturwissenschaften*, vol.6, Wissenschaftsverlag, Bibliographisches Institut, Mannheim, 235.
- Aerts, D. (1986). *A possible explanation for the probabilities of quantum mechanics*, *J. Math. Phys.*, **27**, 202.
- Aerts, D. (1987). *The origin of the non-classical character of the quantum probability model*, in *Information, Complexity, and Control in Quantum Physics*, A. Blanquiere, et al., eds., Springer-Verlag.
- Aerts, D. (1994). *Quantum structures, separated physical entities and probability*, *Found. Phys.* **24**, 1227.
- Aerts, D. (1995). *Quantum structures: an attempt to explain the origin of their appearance in nature*, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **34**, 1165 - 1187. Physics.

- Aerts, D., Durt, T. and Van Bogaert, B. (1993a). *A physical example of quantum fuzzy sets, and the classical limit*, in the proceedings of the *International Conference on Fuzzy Sets*, Liptovsky, Tatra mountains, 5 - 15.
- Aerts, D., Durt, T. and Van Bogaert, B. (1993b). *Quantum Probability, the Classical Limit and Non-Locality*, in the proceedings of the *International Symposium on the Foundations of Modern Physics 1992*, Helsinki, Finland, ed. T. Hyvonen, World Scientific, Singapore, 35 - 56.
- Aerts, D. and Durt, T. (1994a). *Quantum, Classical and Intermediate, an illustrative example*, *Found. Phys.* **24**, (1994), 1353 - 1368 .
- Aerts, D. and Durt, T. (1994b). *Quantum, Classical and Intermediate: A Measurement Model*, in the proceedings of the *International Symposium on the Foundations of Modern Physics 1994*, Helsinki, Finland, eds.C. Montonen et al., Editions Frontieres, Givès Sur Yvettes, France.
- Piron C., (1976). *Foundations of Quantum Physics*, Benjamin.
- Aerts, S. (1996) *Conditional Probabilities with a Quantal and a Kolmogorovian Limit, this issue.*