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[abstract] As a kind of generalization of dynamical system theory, we recently proposed measurement theory, which has two formulations, i.e., $C^*$-algebraic formulation and $W^*$-algebraic formulation. However, we now think that this assertion should be reconsidered, that is, the two formulations should be combined. Here we propose the new compromise formulation, which has both merits of $C^*$-algebraic formulation and $W^*$-algebraic formulation.
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1. Introduction

In [2,3,4], as a kind of generalization of dynamical system theory, we proposed measurement theory, which is formulated in a certain operator algebra (i.e., $C^*$-algebra and $W^*$-algebra, cf.[7]) as follows.

"(pure) measurement theory" = [measurement] + [the relation among systems]. (Axiom 1)

"quantum mechanics" = [quantum measurement] + [unitary time evolution] (BORN’S measurement) (Heisenberg kinetic equation)

such as it includes dynamical system theory (=DST) in engineering:

"DST" = \[
\begin{cases}
    y(t) = g(x(t), u_1(t), t) & \cdots \text{(measurement equation)} \\
    \frac{dx(t)}{dt} = f(x(t), u_2(t), t), \ x(0) = x_0 & \cdots \text{(state equation)}
\end{cases}
\]

where $u_1$ and $u_2$ are external forces (or noises).
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Therefore, we can say $(2)+(3) \subset (1)$. And thus, measurement theory (1) may be also called “generalized quantum theory” or “generalized dynamical system theory (=GDSST)”.

Although it is certain that DST(3) is a good mathematical theory to analyze usual phenomena in our usual life (or, economics, psychology, engineering and so on), it should be noted that it is difficult to say that DST(3) is axiomatic. Further, we have the following classification:

“(pure) measurement theory (1)” = \[
\begin{cases} 
\text{quantum measurement theory} & (4) \\
\text{classical measurement theory} & (5)
\end{cases}
\]

where the algebra is either non-commutative or commutative. Thus we consider that $(2)=(4)$, and the $(5)$ is the axiomatic form of DST(3). Therefore, we believe that the $(5)$ is the fundamental theory to describe usual phenomena in our usual life, that is, it is the axiomatic theory of the epistemology called “the mechanical world view”.

For completeness, again note that measurement theory is quite fundamental and wide, as symbolized in the following picture:

The “MT (measurement theory) tree” (extracted from [ref.4: page 323])

As seen in [4] (or, our papers in the references of the book [4]), the above measurement theory (1) has two formulations, i.e., $C^*$-algebraic formulation and $W^*$-algebraic formulation. However, we now think that this assertion should be reconsidered, that is, the two formulations should be combined. The purpose of this paper is to propose the new compromise formulation, which has both merits of $C^*$-algebraic formulation
and $W^*$-algebraic formulation.

2. Measurement theory (mathematical preparations)

Let $V$ be a complex Hilbert space with the norm $|| \cdot ||_V$. Put

$$B(V) \equiv \{ T \mid T \text{ is a bounded linear operator from a Hilbert space } V \text{ into itself } \}.$$  

Define $\|T\|_{B(V)} = \sup \{\|Tv\|_V : \|v\|_V = 1\}$, and $(T_1T_2)(v) = T_1(T_2v) \ (\forall v \in V)$. And $T^*$ is defined by the adjoint operator of $T$. Note that it holds that $\|T^*T\|_{B(V)} = \|T\|_{B(V)}^2 \ (\forall T \in B(V))$. And thus, $B(V)$ is a $C^*$-algebra (cf. [7]).

An element $F$ in $B(V)$ is called self-adjoint if it holds that $F = F^*$. A self-adjoint element $F$ in $B(V)$ is called positive (and denoted by $F \geq 0$) if there exists an element $F_0$ in $B(V)$ such that $F = F_0^*F_0$. Also, a positive element $F$ is called a projection if $F = F^2$ holds.

A triplet $[A, \mathcal{N}(\equiv A^w), B(V)]$ is called an operator algebraic structure, if $A(\subseteq B(V))$ is the norm closed sub-$^*$-algebra of $B(V)$, and if $\mathcal{N}(\equiv A^w(\subseteq B(V)))$ is the weak$^*$-closure of $A$ in $B(V)$. Thus note that $A$ and $A^w$ are $C^*$-algebras. Let $A^*$ be the dual Banach space of $A$. That is, $A^* \equiv \{ \rho \mid \rho : A \to \mathbb{C} \text{ is a complex-valued continuous linear function } \}$, and the norm $\|\rho\|_{A^*}$ is defined by $\sup\{|\rho(F)| \mid \|F\|_A \leq 1\}$. Define the mixed state space $\mathcal{S}^m(A^*)$ such that:

$$\mathcal{S}^m(A^*) \equiv \{ \rho \in A^* \mid \|\rho\|_{A^*} = 1 \text{ and } \rho(F) \geq 0 \text{ for all } F \geq 0 \}.$$  

A mixed state $\rho \ (\in \mathcal{S}^m(A^*))$ is called a pure state if it satisfies that “$\rho = \theta \rho_1 + (1 - \theta) \rho_2$ for some $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{S}^m(A^*) \text{ and } 0 < \theta < 1$” implies “$\rho = \rho_1 = \rho_2$”. Define

$$\mathcal{S}^p(A^*) \equiv \{ \rho^p \in \mathcal{S}^m(A^*) \mid \rho^p \text{ is a pure state} \},$$

which is called a state space (or pure state space, phase space). Note that $\mathcal{S}^p(A^*)$ is locally compact in the sense of the weak$^*$ topology $\sigma(A^*; A)$.

It is well known that $\mathcal{N}(\equiv A^w)$ is not only a $C^*$-algebra but also a $W^*$-algebra, that is, it is a $C^*$-algebra with the unique pre-dual Banach space $N_\ast$ (i.e., $\mathcal{N} = (N_\ast)^*$). Also, note that the identity $I$ belongs to $\mathcal{N} (\subseteq B(V))$. Now we can define the normal state-class $\mathcal{S}^n(N_\ast)$ such as

$$\mathcal{S}^n(N_\ast) \equiv \{ \rho^n \in N_\ast \mid \|\rho^n\|_{N_\ast} = 1 \text{ and } \rho^n \geq 0 \text{ (i.e., } \rho^n(T^*T) \geq 0 \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{N}) \}.$$
The element $\rho^n (\in \mathcal{S}^n(N_\pi))$ is called a normal state (or, density state). Although we are not concerned with the normal state in this paper, it plays an important role in statistical measurement theory (9), cf. [4].

Example 1 (i). Let $\Omega$ be a locally compact topological space, and let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega, \mu)$ be a measure space such that $0 < \mu(U) \leq \infty$ for any open set $U \subseteq \Omega$, and $0 \leq \mu(\{\omega\}) < \infty$ $(\forall \omega \in \Omega)$. Define the Banach space $L^r(\Omega, \mu)$, $(r = 1, 2, \infty)$, by the set of all complex valued measurable functions on $\Omega$ such that the norm $\|f\|_{L^r(\Omega, \mu)}$ is finite, where $\|f\|_{L^r(\Omega, \mu)} = \left[ \int_{\Omega} |f(\omega)|^r \mu(d\omega) \right]^{1/r}$ (if $r = 1, 2$), $= \text{ess.sup}_{\omega \in \Omega}|f(\omega)|$ (if $r = \infty$). The operator algebraic structure $[C_0(\Omega), L^\infty(\Omega, \mu), B(L^2(\Omega, \mu))]$ is essential to the classical measurement theory (5). Here, note that

$$\overline{C_0(\Omega)^{w^*}} = L^\infty(\Omega, \mu) \subseteq B(L^2(\Omega, \mu))$$

where $C_0(\Omega)$ is the algebra composed of all continuous complex-valued functions vanishing at infinity on $\Omega$, and the norm $\|f\|_{C_0(\Omega)}$ is defined by $\|f\|_{C_0(\Omega)} = \max\{|f(\omega)| \mid \omega \in \Omega\} (\forall f \in C_0(\Omega))$. Also, it is well known that

$$\mathcal{G}^p(C_0(\Omega)^*) = \{\delta_\omega \mid \omega \in \Omega\} = \Omega,$$

$$\mathcal{G}^n(L^\infty(\Omega, \mu)) = L^1_{+1}(\Omega, \mu) \equiv \{f \mid f \in L^1(\Omega, \mu), 0 \leq f, \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega, \mu)} = 1\}$$

where $\delta_\omega(\in C_0(\Omega)^*)$ is the point measure at $\omega(\in \Omega)$.

(ii). Also, the operator algebraic structure $[\mathcal{C}(V), B(V), B(V)]$ is essential to the quantum measurement theory (4). Here, note that

$$\overline{\mathcal{C}(V)^{w^*}} = B(V)$$

where $\mathcal{C}(V) \equiv \{T \in B(V) \mid T \text{ is a compact operator }\}$. Also, note that

$$\mathcal{G}^p(\mathcal{C}(V)^*) = \{|u\rangle\langle u| \mid u \in V\}, \quad (\text{where } |u\rangle\langle u| \text{ is the Dirac notation})$$

$$\mathcal{G}^n(B(V)^*) = Tr_{+1}(V) \equiv \{T \in Tr(V) \mid T \text{ is a positive such that } ||T||_{Tr(V)} = 1\}$$

where $Tr(V)$ is the trace class (with the trace norm $|| \cdot ||_{Tr(V)}$) in $B(V)$.

Definition 2 [Observable]. Let $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{N}(\equiv \mathcal{A}^{w^*}), B(V)]$ be an operator algebraic structure. An observable $O \equiv (X, \mathcal{F}_X, F)$ in $\mathcal{N}$ is defined such that it satisfies that
(i) [ σ-field ]. \((X, \mathcal{F}_X)\) is a measurable space, that is, \(\mathcal{F}_X (\subseteq 2^X)\) is a σ-field on \(X\), i.e., it satisfies that

\[
\emptyset \in \mathcal{F}_X, \quad \Xi_k \in \mathcal{F}_X (k = 1, 2, \ldots) \implies \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Xi_k \in \mathcal{F}_X, \quad \Xi \in \mathcal{F}_X \implies \Xi^c \in \mathcal{F}_X,
\]

(ii) for every \(\Xi \in \mathcal{F}_X\), \(F(\Xi)\) is a positive element in \(\mathcal{N}\) (i.e., \(0 \leq F(\Xi) \in \mathcal{N}\)) such that \(F(\emptyset) = 0\) and \(F(X) = 1\).

(iii) [ countably additivity ]. For any countable decomposition \(\{\Xi_1, \Xi_2, \ldots, \Xi_j, \ldots\}\) of \(\Xi\), \(\left(\text{i.e., } \Xi, \Xi_j \in \mathcal{F}_X, \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \Xi_j = \Xi, \Xi_j \cap \Xi_i = \emptyset \text{ (if } j \neq i\right)\), it holds that

\[
F(\Xi) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} F(\Xi_j)
\]

where the series is convergent in the sense of the weak*-topology \(\sigma(\mathcal{N}; N_n)\) in \(\mathcal{N}\).

For each \(k = 1, 2, \ldots, n\), consider an observable \(O_k \equiv (X_k, \mathcal{F}_{X_k}, F_k)\) in a \(W^*\)-algebra \(\mathcal{N}(\equiv \mathcal{A}^{w^*})\). Define the product σ-field \(\mathcal{F}^{P}_{\times_{k=1}^{n}X_k} (\subseteq 2^{\times_{k=1}^{n}X_k})\) such as the smallest σ-field on \(\times_{k=1}^{n}X_k\) that contains \(\times_{k=1}^{n}\Xi_k, \Xi_k \in \mathcal{F}_{X_k}\). An observable \(\widehat{O} \equiv (\times_{k=1}^{n}X_k, \mathcal{F}^{P}_{\times_{k=1}^{n}X_k}, F)\) in \(\mathcal{N}(\equiv \mathcal{A}^{w^*})\) is called the quasi-product observable of \(\{O_k : k = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}\) if it holds that

\[
F(X_1 \times \cdots \times X_{k-1} \times \Xi_k \times X_{k+1} \times \cdots \times X_n) = F_k(\Xi_k) \quad (\forall \Xi_k \in \mathcal{F}_{X_k}, \forall k = 1, \ldots, n).
\]

Here, the \(\widehat{O}\) is denoted by \(\biguplus_{k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}} O_k\).

Let \([A, \mathcal{N}(\equiv \mathcal{A}^{w^*}), B(V)]\) be an operator algebraic structure. Let \(W\) be any element in \(\mathcal{A}^{w^*}\) such that \(0 \leq W \leq I\). Define the function \(f^{(l)}_W : \mathcal{G}^{p}(A^*) \to [0, 1]\) [resp. \(f^{(u)}_W : \mathcal{G}^{p}(A^*) \to [0, 1]\) ] such that, for any \(\rho^p \in \mathcal{G}^{p}(A^*)\),

\[
f^{(l)}_W(\rho^p) = \sup \{\rho^p(U) \mid U \in A, 0 \leq U \leq W\}
\]

[resp. \(f^{(u)}_W(\rho^p) = \inf \{1 - \rho^p(U) \mid U \in A, 0 \leq U \leq I - W\}\)].

Note that \(\rho^p(W) = f^{(l)}_W(\rho^p) = f^{(u)}_W(\rho^p) \quad (\forall \rho^p \in \mathcal{G}^{p}(A^*)\) if \(W \in A\). Also, if it holds that \(f^{(l)}_W(\rho^p_0) = f^{(u)}_W(\rho^p_0)\) for some \(\rho^p_0 \in \mathcal{G}^{p}(A^*)\), then we say that \(W\) is essentially continuous at \(\rho^p_0\), and define that \(\rho^p_0(W) := f^{(l)}_W(\rho^p_0) \quad (= f^{(u)}_W(\rho^p_0))\).
3. Measurement (Axiom 1)

Under the mathematical preparations in the previous sections, now we can propose a new formulation of measurement theory.

With any system $S$, an operator algebraic structure $[A, N(\equiv \mathcal{A}_w^w), B(V)]$ can be associated in which measurement theory of that system can be formulated. A state of the system $S$ is represented by a pure state $\rho_0^p (\in S_p(\mathcal{A}_w^w))$. Also, an observable is represented by an observable $O \equiv (X, F_X, F)$ in the $W^*$-algebra $N$. The measurement of an observable $O$ for the system $S$ with (or, in) the state $\rho_0^p$ is represented by $M_A(O, S[\rho_0^p])$. Also, we can take only one measurement $M_A(O, S[\rho_0^p])$, and obtain a measured value $x (\in X)$.

The axiom presented below is analogous to (or, a kind of generalizations of) Born’s probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics [1,6,8]. We of course assert that the axiom is a principle for all measurements, i.e., classical and quantum measurements.

**AXIOM 1** [New measurement axiom]. Consider a measurement $M_A(O \equiv (X, F_X, F), S[\rho_0^p])$ formulated in an operator algebraic structure $[A, N(\equiv \mathcal{A}_w^w), B(V)]$. Assume that the measured value $x (\in X)$ is obtained by the measurement $M_A(O, S[\rho_0^p])$. Then, the probability that the $x (\in X)$ belongs to a set $\Xi (\in F_X)$ is given by $\rho_0^p(F(\Xi))$ if $F(\Xi)$ is essentially continuous at $\rho_0^p$.

4. The relation among systems (Axiom 2)

Let $[A_1, N_1(\equiv \mathcal{A}_1^w), B(V_1)]$ and $[A_2, N_2(\equiv \mathcal{A}_2^w), B(V_2)]$ be operator algebraic structures. Assume that $N_1$ and $N_2$ have weak$^*$-topologies $\sigma(N_1, (N_1)_*)$ and $\sigma(N_2, (N_2)_*)$ respectively. A continuous linear operator $\Psi_{1,2} : N_2 \rightarrow N_1$ is called a Markov operator, if it satisfies that

(i) $\Psi_{1,2}(F_2) \geq 0$ for any positive element $F_2$ in $N_2$,

(ii) $\Psi_{1,2}(I_2) = I_1$, where $I_k$ is the identity in $N_k (k = 1, 2)$.

Here note that, for any observable $(X, F_X, F_2)$ in $N_2$, the $(X, F_X, \Psi_{1,2}F_2)$ is an observable in $N_1$, which is denoted by $\Psi_{1,2}O_2$.

Let $(T, \leq)$ be a tree-like partial ordered set, i.e., a partial ordered set such that “$t_1 \leq t_3$ and $t_2 \leq t_3$” implies “$t_1 \leq t_2$ or $t_2 \leq t_1$”. Put $T^+_\leq = \{(t_1, t_2) \in T^2 | t_1 \leq t_2\}$. 
An element \( t_0 \in T \) is called a root if \( t_0 \leq t \) (\( \forall t \in T \)) holds. Note that the sub-tree \( T_{t_0} = \{ t \in T \mid t \geq t_0 \} \) has the root \( t_0 \). Thus we always assume that the tree-like ordered set \( (T, \leq) \) has the root.

**Definition 3** [Sequential observable]. The family \( \{ \Phi_{t_1, t_2} : \mathcal{N}_{t_2} \to \mathcal{N}_{t_1} \}_{(t_1, t_2) \in T_2^\leq} \) is called a Markov relation among systems if it satisfies the following conditions (i) and (ii).

(i) With each \( t(\in T) \), an operator algebraic structure \( [\mathcal{A}_t, \mathcal{N}_t(= \overline{\mathcal{A}_t})^\pi, B(\mathcal{V}_t)] \) is associated.

(ii) For every \( (t_1, t_2) \in T_2^\leq \), Markov operator \( \Phi_{t_1, t_2} : \mathcal{N}_{t_2} \to \mathcal{N}_{t_1} \) is defined such that
\[
\Phi_{t_1, t_2} \Phi_{t_2, t_3} = \Phi_{t_1, t_3} \text{ holds for all } (t_1, t_2), (t_2, t_3) \in T_2^\leq.
\]

Let an observable \( \mathbf{O}_t \equiv (X_t, \mathcal{F}_X, F_t) \) in a \( W^\ast \)-algebra \( \mathcal{N}_t \) be given for each \( t \in T \). Then, the pair \( [(\{ \mathbf{O}_t \}_{t \in T}, \{ \Phi_{t_1, t_2} : \mathcal{N}_{t_2} \to \mathcal{N}_{t_1} \}_{(t_1, t_2) \in T_2^\leq}) \) is called a sequential observable which is denoted by \( [\mathbf{O}_T] \), i.e.,
\[
[\mathbf{O}_T] \equiv [(\{ \mathbf{O}_t \}_{t \in T}, \{ \Phi_{t_1, t_2} : \mathcal{N}_{t_2} \to \mathcal{N}_{t_1} \}_{(t_1, t_2) \in T_2^\leq})].
\]

Before we explain Axiom 2, we prepare some notations. For simplicity, assume that \( T \) is finite. Let \( T_0 = \{ 0, 1, \ldots, N \} \) be a tree with the root 0. Define the parent map \( \pi : T \setminus \{ 0 \} \to T \) such that \( \pi(t) = \max\{ s \in T \mid s < t \} \). It is clear that the tree \( (T = \{ 0, 1, \ldots, N \}, \leq) \) can be identified with the pair \( (T_0 = \{ 0, 1, \ldots, N \}, \pi : T \setminus \{ 0 \} \to T) \).

Let \( [\mathbf{O}_T] \equiv [(\{ \mathbf{O}_t \}_{t \in T}, \{ \Phi_{t_1, t_2} : \mathcal{N}_{t_2} \to \mathcal{N}_{t_1} \}_{(t_1, t_2) \in T_2^\leq}) \) be a sequential observable. For each \( s \in T \), define iteratively the observable \( \tilde{\mathbf{O}}_s = (\times_{t \in T_s} X_t, \mathcal{F}^P_{\times_{t \in T_s} X_t}, \tilde{F}_s) \) in \( \mathcal{N}_s \) (where \( T_s = \{ t \in T \mid s \leq t \} \)) such that:
\[
\tilde{\mathbf{O}}_s = \begin{cases} 
\mathbf{O}_s & (\text{if } s \in T \setminus \pi(T)) \\
\mathbf{O}_s \times^{\pi} (\times_{t \in \pi^{-1}({t_s})} \Phi_{\pi(t), t} \mathbf{O}_t) & (\text{if } s \in \pi(T)).
\end{cases}
\]

Thus, if the procedure (6) is possible, we can get the observable \( \tilde{\mathbf{O}}_0 \equiv (\times_{t \in T} X_t, \mathcal{F}^P_{\times_{t \in T} X_t}, \tilde{F}_0) \) in \( \mathcal{N}_0 \). The \( \tilde{\mathbf{O}}_0 \) is called the Heisenberg picture representation of the sequential observable \( [\mathbf{O}_T] \).

Summing up the essential part of the above argument, we can propose the following axiom, which corresponds to “the rule of the relation among systems”. Also, it should be noted that it is essentially the same as Proclaim\(^W\). 2 in [4].

\[\text{7}\]
AXIOM 2 (= Proclaim W2 in [4]) [The relation among systems]. For each \( t(\in T) \), consider an operator algebraic structure \([A_t, N_t(\equiv \mathcal{A}_t^w), B(V_t)]\). Then the relation among systems is represented by a Markov relation among systems \( \{\Phi_{t_1,t_2} : N_{t_2} \rightarrow N_{t_1}\}_{(t_1,t_2)\in T^2_\leq} \). Let \([O_T] = \{\{O_t(\equiv (X_t, \mathcal{F}_X(t), F))\}_{t\in T}, \{\Phi_{t_1,t_2} : N_{t_2} \rightarrow N_{t_1}\}_{(t_1,t_2)\in T^2_\geq} \] be a sequential observable. If the procedure (6) is possible, the sequential observable \([O_T]\) can be realized as the observable \(O_0 \equiv (\times_{t\in T} X_t, \mathcal{F}_X^{P_{X_t}}, \tilde{F}_0)\) in \(N_0\).

Thus, we can conclude that:

- Let \([O_T] = \{\{O_t(\equiv (X_t, \mathcal{F}_X(t), F))\}_{t\in T}, \{\Phi_{t_1,t_2} : N_{t_2} \rightarrow N_{t_1}\}_{(t_1,t_2)\in T^2_\geq} \] be a sequential observable, which is assumed to be realized by \(O_0 \equiv (\times_{t\in T} X_t, \mathcal{F}_X^{P_{X_t}}, \tilde{F}_0)\) (due to Axiom 2). Let \(\rho_0^P(, \in \mathcal{S}^{P_{A_0^w}})\) be a pure state. Then, we have the measurement \(M_{A_0}(O_0, S_{[\rho_0^P]}))\). And thus, Axiom 1 is applicable.

We know many fundamental theories that start from axioms (or, laws, principles), e.g., Newtonian mechanics, electromagnetic theory, the theory of relativity, quantum mechanics, and so on. However, we have no axiomatic theory to describe usual phenomena in our usual life. This seems strange. However, we now have classical measurement theory (5), i.e., the axiomatic theory of “the mechanical world view”.

The following remark will promote the better understanding of the difference between physics and measurement theory.

Remark 4. (a). Although both measurement theory and physical theory (e.g., the theory of relativity, etc.) start from principles (i.e., axioms), measurement theory is not physics but a kind of philosophy, i.e., the axiomatic theory of “the mechanical world view”. In physics, theory must be always tested by experiments. On the other hand, experiments are not necessarily essential for measurement theory, and thus it is somewhat subjective. Thus, there is a reason to consider that we have two mathematical scientific theories (i.e., (i) theoretical physics, (ii) measurement theory) as indicated in the following table (extracted from [ref.4: page 5]):
Here we have no answer to the question: “What is the third mathematical scientific theory (iii) in the above table?” We believe that it is one of the most important problems in mathematical science. For the further arguments, see Chap. 1 in [4].

(b). In measurement theory, space (i.e., state space $\Omega$) and time (e.g., $T$ in Axiom 2) are not objective. For example, in measurement theory we consider that time is a mathematical handy tool when we want to understand some occurrences in “causal relationship”. In other words, time and space are regarded as merely kinds of parameters. Thus, it should be noted that the measurement theoretical “time and space” is different from that of physics.

(c). We can also see such a subjectivity mentioned in the above (a) and (b) in Kant’s philosophy [5]. Compared with physics (i.e., Newtonian mechanics), he himself called this kind of property of his philosophy “Copernican revolution” or “transcendental idealism.” The non-measurability of “thing-in-itself (= ding an sich)” in his philosophy may corresponds to the spirit (mentioned in the above (a)) of measurement theory such that experiments are not necessarily the highest priority in measurement theory. We can assure that it is interesting to reconsider epistemologies (in the following table).
in light of measurement theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>measurement theory ⇒</th>
<th>observable</th>
<th>state space</th>
<th>Markov relation</th>
<th>(T) Which is essential?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zeno (BC490-BC430)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Achilles and tortoise</td>
<td>(T,E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokrates (BC469-BC399)</td>
<td>What is &quot;brave&quot;?</td>
<td></td>
<td>What is &quot;beauty&quot;?</td>
<td>(T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato (BC427-BC347)</td>
<td>idea theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle (BC384-BC322)</td>
<td>form syllogism</td>
<td>material</td>
<td>the efficient cause</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine (354-430)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274)</td>
<td>problem of universals</td>
<td>realism</td>
<td></td>
<td>(T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ockham (1285-1349)</td>
<td>problem of universals</td>
<td>nominalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>(T) Ockham’s razor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocke (1632-1704)</td>
<td>primary quality</td>
<td>secondary quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>(T,E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton (1643-1727)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kinetic equation</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley (1685-1753)</td>
<td>To be is to be perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(T) solipsism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kant (1724-1804)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>subjective time-space</td>
<td>(T) thing in itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huserl (1859-1938)</td>
<td>intuition of essences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(T) Reduction,epoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einstein (1880-1950)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>physical time-space</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schrödinger (1887-1961)</td>
<td>kinetic equation</td>
<td>(of state)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(T,E) Schrödinger’s cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heisenberg (1901-1976)</td>
<td>uncertainty relation</td>
<td>kinetic equation</td>
<td>(of observable)</td>
<td>(T,E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born (1882-1970)</td>
<td>quantum measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(T,E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher (1890-1962)</td>
<td>maximum likelihood method</td>
<td></td>
<td>regression analysis design of experiments</td>
<td>(T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittgenstein (1889-1951)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The world is everything that is the case</td>
<td>(T) solipsism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusions

As shown in [4], we have the following classification:

\[
\text{“measurement theory”} = \begin{cases} 
\text{(pure) measurement theory} \\
\text{statistical measurement theory.}
\end{cases}
\] (7)
In this paper we devoted ourselves to (pure) measurement theory, and proposed

\[
\text{“(pure) measurement theory”} = \text{[measurement]} + \text{[the relation among systems]},
\]

(Axiom 1)

\[(\text{Axiom } 2 (= \text{Proclaim } W^* \text{ in [4]}))\] (8)

which has both merits of \(C^*-\text{algebraic formulation}\) and \(W^*-\text{algebraic formulation}\). Also, note that statistical measurement theory proposed in [4] need not be changed. That is, we have

\[
\text{“statistical measurement theory”} = \text{[statistical measurement]} + \text{[the relation among systems]}
\]

(Proclaim \(W^*\) 1 in [4]) (Axiom 2 (= Proclaim \(W^*\) 2 in [4])) (9)

Therefore we consider that the measurement theory (7) should be based on (8) and (9). And we believe that the measurement theory (7) is the most useful in all epistemologies (i.e., philosophies).

We hope that our proposal will be examined from various view-points.
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