Mathematical Institute
Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava

Preprint 11/2000

Ján Jakubík

Higher degrees of distributivity in MV-algebras

July 9, 2000

PREPRINT SERIES

HIGHER DEGREES OF DISTRIBUTIVITY IN MV-ALGEBRAS

JÁN JAKUBÍK, KOŠICE

ABSTRACT. In this paper we deal with the (α, β)-distributivity of an MV-algebra $\mathcal{A}$, where α and β are nonzero cardinals. It is proved that if $\mathcal{A}$ is singular and $(\alpha, 2)$-distributive, then it is (α, α)-distributive. We show that if $\mathcal{A}$ is complete then it can be represented as a direct product of MV-algebras which are homogeneous with respect to higher degrees of distributivity.

INTRODUCTION

For MV-algebras, several equivalent systems of axioms have been applied in the literature. We use the axioms as in the forthcomming monograph [2]. The definition is recalled in Section 1 below.

If A is an MV-algebra, then by means of the basic operations defined in A we can introduce a partial order $\leqq$ on A; it turns out that $(A, \leqq)$ is a bounded distributive lattice. We denote it by $\ell(A)$.

Let α and β be nonzero cardinals. In the present paper we deal with the condition of (α, β)-distributivity in the lattice $\ell(A)$. (We often speak about (α, β)-distributive of A meaning the corresponding condition for the lattice $\ell(A)$.)

The condition of (α, β)-distributivity has been studied in several papers in Boolean algebras (for references, cf. [14]) and in lattice ordered groups (cf. [1], [3], [6], [7], [12], [16], [17]).

Each MV-algebra A can be constructed by means of an appropriate abelian lattice ordered group G with a strong unit u; we put $A = \Gamma(G, u)$ (cf. [2]); in [8], [9], [10] the notation $A_0(G, u)$ was used instead of $\Gamma(G, u)$).

We prove that if $A = \Gamma(G, u)$, then the lattice $\ell(A)$ is (α, β)-distributive if and only if the lattice ordered group G is (α, β)-distributive.

Assume that A is an archimedean MV-algebra. If A is (α, β)-distributive and each nontrivial interval of $\ell(A)$ has a nontrivial subinterval whose cardinality is less or equal to β, then the Dedekind completion of A is (α, β)-distributive. This yields, in particular, that A is completely distributive if and only if the Dedekind completion of A is completely distributive.

An MV-algebra A is called singular if for each $0 < a \in A$ there exists $0 < a_1 \leqq a$ such that the interval $[0, a_1]$ of $\ell(A)$ is complemented. If A is singular and $(\alpha, 2)$-distributive, then it is (α, α)-distributive.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 06D35, 06F20, 06D10.

Key words and phrases. MV-algebra, archimedean MV-algebra, completeness, singular MV-algebra, higher degrees of distributivity.

Supported by Grant VEGA 2/6087/99

Let A be an MV-algebra and $a \in A$. There exists a convex sublattice $L(a, \alpha, \beta)$ of $\ell(A)$ such that $a \in L(a, \alpha, \beta)$ and $L(a, \alpha, \beta)$ is maximal with respect to the property of being (α, β)-distributive. If A is a complete MV-algebra, then we can introduce in a natural way the MV-structure on the lattice $L(0, \alpha, \beta)$; we prove that the corresponding MV-algebra is a direct factor of the MV-algebra A.

We show that each complete MV-algebra can be represented as a direct product of MV-algebras which are homogeneous with respect to the higher degrees of distributivity.

1. Preliminaries

We recall that a lattice L is called infinitely distributive if it satisfies the following condition (a_1) and the condition (a_2) which is dual to (a_1).

(a_1) Whenever $(x_i)_{i\in I}$ is an indexed system of elements of L such that $\bigvee_{i\in I} x_i$ exists in L and $y \in L$, then $\bigvee_{i\in I}(y \wedge x_i)$ exists in L and

$$y \wedge (\bigvee_{i\in I} x_i) = \bigvee_{i\in I}(y \wedge x_i).$$

Let α and β be nonzero cardinals. Consider the following condition for the lattice L:

(b_1) Whenever T, S are nonempty sets of indices with $\operatorname{card} T \leqq \alpha$, $\operatorname{card} S \leqq \beta$ and $(x_{t,s})_{t\in T, s\in S}$ is an indexed system of elements of L such that

$$\bigwedge_{t\in T}\bigvee_{s\in S} x_{t,s} \quad \text{and} \quad \bigvee_{\varphi\in S^T}\bigwedge_{t\in T} x_{t,\varphi(t)}$$

exist in L, then

$$\bigwedge_{t\in T}\bigvee_{s\in S} x_{t,s} = \bigvee_{\varphi\in S^T}\bigwedge_{t\in T} x_{t,\varphi(t)}.$$

We denote by (b_2) the condition which is dual to (b_1).

The lattice L is called (α, β)-distributive if it satisfies both the conditions (b_1) and (b_2).

L is said to be α-distributive if it is (α, α)-distributive. L is called completely distributive if it is α-distributive for each nonzero cardinal α.

It is obvious that each interval of an (α, β)-distributive lattice is (α, β)-distributiveas well.

An interval of L is called nontrivial if it has more than one element.

For lattice ordered groups we apply the notation as in [4]. In particular, the group operation in a lattice ordered group G is denoted by $+$. The underlying lattice of G is denoted by $\ell(G)$, but often we say lattice G rather than lattice $\ell(G)$.

It is well-known that the lattice $\ell(G)$ is infinitely distributive. Further, the mapping $\varphi(x) = -x$ is a dual automorphism of $\ell(G)$; hence $\ell(G)$ is (α, β)-distributive if and only if it satisfies the condition (b_1).

1.1. Lemma. *Let G be a lattice ordered group, $0 < u \in G$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *The interval $[0, u]$ is (α, β)-distributive.*
(ii) *The interval $[0, u]$ satisfies the condition (b_1).*

Proof. Clearly (i)⇒(ii). Assume that (ii) is valid. For $x \in [0, u]$ put $\varphi(x) = -x$. Then φ is a dual isomorphism of $[0, u]$ onto the interval $[-u, 0]$. Hence $[-u, 0]$ satisfies the condition (b_2).

Further, for each $y \in [-u, 0]$ we set $\psi(y) = y + u$. Then ψ is an isomorphism of $[-u, 0]$ onto $[0, u]$. Thus the condition (b_2) is satisfied in $[0, u]$. □

An MV-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is defined to be an algebraic structure $(A; \oplus, \neg, 0)$, where A is a nonempty set, $\oplus$ is a binary operation, $\neg$ a unary operation and 0 a constant in A such that the following identities are satisfied:

MV 1) $x \oplus (y \oplus z) = (x \oplus y) \oplus z$;
MV 2) $x \oplus y = y \oplus x$;
MV 3) $x \oplus 0 = x$;
MV 4) $\neg\neg x = x$;
MV 5) $x \oplus \neg 0 = \neg 0$;
MV 6) $\neg(\neg x \oplus y) = \neg(\neg y \oplus x) \oplus x$.

(Cf. [2].)

We often apply the symbol A in the sense of $\mathcal{A}$.

Let A be an MV-algebra. For any $x, y \in A$ we write $x \leqq y$ if $\neg x \oplus y = \neg 0$. Then $(A; \leqq)$ is a distributive lattice with the least element 0 and the greatest element $\neg 0$. (Cf. [2], Chapter 1.) Hence without loss of generality we can consider also the lattice operations $\wedge$ and $\vee$ as belonging to the basic operations on A.

Let G be an abelian lattice ordered group and $0 < u \in G$. For each $x, y \in [0, u]$ we put

$$x \oplus y = u \wedge (x + y)\ , \quad \neg x = u - x\ .$$

The structure $([0, u]; \oplus, \neg, 0)$ will be denoted by $\Gamma(G, u)$. Then (cf. [2], 2.1.2), $\Gamma(G, u)$ is an MV-algebra with $u = \neg 0$. Conversely, for each MV-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ there exists an abelian lattice ordered group G with a strong unit u such that $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(G, u)$ (cf. [2], Section 7.1).

From these results and from 1.1 we conclude:

1.2. Lemma. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an MV-algebra. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *The lattice $\ell(\mathcal{A})$ is (α, β)-distributive.*
(ii) *The lattice $\ell(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies the condition (b_1).*

Hence by considering the condition of (α, β)-distributivity in lattice ordered groups or in MV-algebras it suffices to take the condition (b_1) into account.

2. Infinite distributivity and (α, β)-distributivity

2.1. Lemma. (Cf. [6], 1.3.) *Let L be a lattice. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *L does not satisfy (b_1).*

(ii) *There exist nonempty sets T, S with* $\operatorname{card} T \leqq \alpha$, $\operatorname{card} S \leqq \beta$, *elements $u, v \in L$ and an indexed system $(x_{t,s})_{t\in T, s\in S}$ of elements of L such that the relations*

$$v = \bigwedge_{t\in T} \bigvee_{s\in S} x_{t,s}, \quad u = \bigvee_{\varphi\in S^T} \bigwedge_{t\in T} x_{t,\varphi(t)}, \quad u < v$$

are valid.

2.2. Lemma. *Let L be an infinitely distributive lattice. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *L does not satisfy the condition (b_1).*
(ii) *There exists a nontrivial interval in L which does not satisfy the condition (b_1).*

Proof. The implication (ii)⇒(i) is obviously valid. Suppose that (i) holds. Then there exists an indexed system $(x_{t,s})_{t\in T, s\in S}$ with the properties as in the condition (ii) of 2.1. Denote

$$x'_{t,s} = (x_{t,s} \wedge v) \vee u \quad \text{for each} \quad t \in T, s \in S\ .$$

Then we have

$$v = \bigwedge_{t\in T} \bigvee_{s\in S} x'_{t,s} \quad u = \bigvee_{\varphi\in S^T} \bigwedge_{t\in T} x'_{t,\varphi(t)}, \quad u < v \tag{1}$$

and $x'_{t,s} \in [u, v]$ for each $t \in T$ and each $s \in S$. Hence in view of 2.1, $[u, v]$ does not satisfy (b_1). □

2.3. Lemma. *Let L be an infinitely distributive lattice. Suppose that the condition* (ii) *of* 2.1 *is valid. Let (under the notation as in* 2.1*) $u_1, v_1 \in L$, $u \leqq u_1 < v_1 \leqq v$. Then the interval $[u_1, v_1]$ of L does not satisfy (b_1).*

Proof. For each $t \in T$ and $s \in S$ we put

$$x''_{t,s} = (x_{t,s} \wedge v_1) \vee u_1\ .$$

Then, by using infinite distributivity, we obtain

$$v_1 = \bigwedge_{t\in T} \bigvee_{s\in S} x''_{t,s}, \quad u_1 = \bigvee_{\varphi\in S^T} \bigwedge_{t\in T} x''_{t,\varphi(t)}.$$

Since $x''_{t,s} \in [u_1, v_1]$ for each $t \in T$ and each $s \in S$, the interval $[u_1, v_1]$ does not satisfy (b_1). □

2.4. Lemma. *Let G be a lattice ordered group with the strong unit u_0. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *G is (α, β)-distributive.*
(ii) *The interval $[0, u_0]$ of G is (α, β)-distributive.*

P r o o f . The implication (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii) obviously holds. Assume that (ii) is valid. By way of contradiction, suppose that G is not (α,β)-distributive. Then the condition (ii) from 2.1 is valid. Thus according to 2.3, each subinterval of $[u,v]$ having more than one element fails to be (α,β)-distributive. Denote $b_1 = v - u$. The interval $[u,v]$ and $[0,b_1]$ are isomorphic, hence for each $b_2 \in G$ with $0 < b_2 \leqq b_1$, the interval $[0,b_2]$ is not (α,β)-distributive. Consider the interval $b_2 = b_1 \wedge u_0$. We have $b_1 > 0$, hence $0 < b_2 \leqq u_0$. According to (ii), the interval $[0,b_2]$ must be (α,β)-distributive. We arrived at a contradiction. □

Now let $\mathcal{A}$ be an MV-algebra. In view of Section 1 there exists an abelian lattice ordered group G with a strong unit u such that $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(G,u)$.

From 2.4 and from the relation between $\mathcal{A}$ and G we immediately obtain

2.5. Proposition. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an MV-algebra, $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(G,u)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *G is (α,β)-distributive.*
(ii) *$\ell(\mathcal{A})$ is (α,β)-distributive.*

2.6. Lemma. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an MV-algebra, $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(G,u)$. Let β be a cardinal. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *Each nontrivial interval in G has a nontrivial subinterval whose cardinality is less or equal to β.*
(ii) *The same condition as in* (i) *with G replaced by $\ell(\mathcal{A})$.*

P r o o f . The relation (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii) is obvious. The converse implication is a consequence of the fact that u is a strong unit in G. □

The Dedekind completion of an archimedean lattice ordered group G will be denoted by $D(G)$; cf., e.g., Fuchs [5]. The definition of $D(G)$ yields:

2.7. Lemma. *Let $0 < x \in D(G)$. Then there exists a subset X of G^+ such that*

(i) *X is upper bounded in G;*
(ii) *the relation $\sup X = x$ is valid in $D(G)$.*

Moreover, G is a regular ℓ-subgroup of $D(G)$ (in the sense that if $x_1 \in G$ is a supremum in G of a subset X_1 of G, then this remains to be valid in $D(G)$, and dually).

2.8. Proposition. (Cf. [7].) *Let G be an archimedean (α,β)-distributive lattice ordered group, $\beta \geqq \aleph_0$. Assume that for each $0 < a$ there is $b \in G$ such that $0 < b \leqq a$ and $\operatorname{card}[0,b] \leqq \beta$. Then the lattice ordered group $D(G)$ is (α,β)-distributive.*

For the notion of archimedean MV-algebra cf., e.g., [10] (in [2], the term 'semisimple' has been applied).

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an archimedean MV-algebra. Assume that $\mathcal{B}$ is a complete MV-algebra such that

(i) $\mathcal{A}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}$,
(ii) the lattice $\ell(\mathcal{B})$ is the Dedekind completion of the lattice $\mathcal{A}$.

Then $\mathcal{B}$ is called the Dedekind completion of $\mathcal{A}$.

Let $\mathcal{A}_1$ be any archimedean MV-algebra. There exists an abelian lattice ordered group G_1 with a strong unit u_1 such that $\mathcal{A}_1 = \Gamma(G_1,u_1)$. Then G_1 is archimedean (see [1]). In [9] it was proved that $\mathcal{A}_1$ is complete if and only if G_1 is a complete lattice ordered group.

From this we immediately conclude that if $\mathcal{A}$ is as above and $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(G, u)$, then the MV-algebra $\mathcal{B} = \Gamma(D(G), u)$ is the Dedekind completion of $\mathcal{A}$.

It is well-known that there exists a canonied embedding of the lattice $L = \ell(\mathcal{A})$ into its Dedekind completion $D(L)$ and that $D(L)$ is defined uniquely up to isomorphism leaving all elements of L fixed. By applying 2.7 we can verify that the same is valid for $D(\mathcal{A})$.

(We remark that in [11] the notion of the maximal completion $M(\mathcal{A})$ of an MV-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ was investigated without assuming the archimedean property; if $\mathcal{A}$ is archimedean, then $M(\mathcal{A}) = D(\mathcal{A})$.)

Thus from 2.5 and 2.8 we obtain

2.9. Proposition. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an archimedean (α, β)-distributive MV-algebra, $\beta \geqq \aleph_0$. Assume that for each $0 < a \in A$ there is $b \in A$ with $0 < b \leqq a$ such that $\operatorname{card}[0, b] \leqq \beta$. Then the MV-algebra $D(\mathcal{A})$ is (α, β)-distributive.*

Now let G be an archimedean lattice ordered group. Put $D(G) = H$. If $\{h_i\}_{i\in I}$ is an upper-bounded subset of H, then there exists $\sup\{h_i\}_{i\in I}$ in H; we denote this element by $\vee^H_{i\in I} h_i$. For a lower-bounded subset $\{h'_j\}_{j\in J}$, the meaning of $\wedge^H_{j\in J} h'_j$ is analogous.

2.10. Proposition. *Let G be an archimedean lattice ordered group, $H = D(G)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *G is (α, β)-distributive.*

(ii) *Whenever T, S are nonempty sets of incices with $\operatorname{card} T \leqq \alpha$. $\operatorname{card} S \leqq \beta$ and $\{x_{t,s}\}_{t\in T, s\in S}$ is an indexed system of elements of G which is bounded in G then*

$$\bigwedge_{t\in T}^{H} \bigvee_{s\in S}^{H} x_{t,s} = \bigvee_{\varphi\in S^T}^{H} \bigwedge_{t\in T}^{H} x_{t,\varphi(t)}.$$

P r o o f . Assume that (i) fails to hold. Then in view of 1.1 and 2.1 the condition (ii) from 2.1 is satisfied. Since G is a regular ℓ-subgroup of H we obtain

$$v = \bigwedge_{t\in T}^{H} \bigvee_{s\in S}^{H} x_{t,s} > u = \bigvee_{\varphi\in S^T}^{H} \bigwedge_{t\in T}^{H} x_{t,\varphi(t)}, \tag{1}$$

whence (ii) is not valid.

Further suppose that (i) holds. By way of contradiction, assume that (ii) is not satisfied. Hence there are $u, v \in H$, $\{x_{t,s}\}_{t\in T, s\in S} \subseteq G$, $\operatorname{card} T \leqq \alpha$, $\operatorname{card} S \leqq \beta$ such that (1) is valid in H.

Each element of H^+ is a join (in H) of some elements of G^+. Since $u < v$, there is $a \in G$ such that $a \leqq v$, $0 < a \nleqq u$. For each $t \in T$ and $s \in S$ we put

$$x'_{t,s} = x_{t,s} \wedge a.$$

In view of the infinite distributivity of H we obtain

$$a = v \wedge a = \bigwedge_{t\in T}^{H} \bigvee_{s\in S}^{H} x'_{t,s} \tag{2}$$

$$u \wedge a = \bigvee_{\varphi \in S^T}^{H} \bigwedge_{t \in T}^{H} x'_{t,\varphi(t)} \tag{3}$$

and $u \wedge a < a$. Since $x'_{t,s}$, a and $u \wedge a$ are elements of G, from (2), (3) we infer

$$a = \bigwedge_{t \in T} \bigvee_{s \in S} x'_{t,s},$$

$$u \wedge a = \bigvee_{\varphi \in S^T} \bigwedge_{t \in T} x'_{t,\varphi(t)}.$$

Thus G is not (α, β)-distributive, which is a contradiction. □

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an archimedean MV-algebra and let G be an abelian lattice ordered group with a strong unit u such that $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(G, u)$.

Put $\mathcal{B} = D(\mathcal{A})$. The lattice operations in $\mathcal{B}$ will be denoted by $\wedge^{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\vee^{\mathcal{B}}$.

From 2.10 and from the relation between $D(G)$ and $D(\mathcal{A})$ we conclude

2.11. Proposition. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an archimedean MV-algebra, $\mathcal{B} = D(\mathcal{A})$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *$\mathcal{A}$ is (α, β)-distributive.*

(ii) *Whenever T, S are nonempty sets of indices with card $T \leqq \alpha$, $\operatorname{card} S \leqq \beta$ and $\{x_{t,s}\}$ is an indexed system of elements of A, then*

$$\bigwedge_{t \in T}^{\mathcal{B}} \bigvee_{s \in S}^{\mathcal{B}} x_{t,s} = \bigvee_{\varphi \in S^T}^{\mathcal{B}} \bigwedge_{t \in T}^{\mathcal{B}} x_{t,\varphi(t)}.$$

Since each Boolean algebra B can be viewed as an archimedean MV-algebra (i.e., there exists an archimedean MV-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\ell(\mathcal{A}) = B$), we obtain as a corollary that 2.11 holds for the case when $\mathcal{A}$ is a Boolean algebra (cf. also [14], 35.4).

3. Singular MV-algebras

The notion of singular MV-algebra was defined in Introduction above. By the same condition we define also the notion of a singular lattice ordered group (cf. [4]). Let $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(G, u)$; it is obvious that $\mathcal{A}$ is singular if and only if G is singular.

3.1. Lemma. *Let G be a singular lattice ordered group. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *G is (α, β)-distributive.*

(ii) *If $0 < a \in G$ and if the interval $[0, a]$ of G is complemented, then it is (α, β)-distributive.*

Proof. The implication (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii) is obvious. Assume that (ii) is valid. By way of contradiction, suppose that (i) does not hold. Hence the condition (ii) from 2.1 is satisfied. Put $b = v - u$. The intervals $[u, v]$ and $[0, b]$ are isomorphic; thus in view of 2.3, no nontrivial interval of $[0, b]$ is (α, β)-distributive. Since G is singular, we arrived at a contradiction. □

3.2. Proposition. *Let G be a singular lattice ordered group. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *G is α-distributive.*
(ii) *G is $(\alpha, 2)$-distributive.*

Proof. It is obvious that (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii). Suppose that (ii) is satisfied. Let $0 < a \in G$ such that the interval $[0, a]$ is complemented. Then $[0, a]$ is a Boolean algebra. Thus in view of [13] (cf. also [14], 19.1), the interval $[0, a]$ is α-distributive. Now 3.1 yields that G is α-distributive. □

From 2.5 and 3.2 we conclude

3.3. Proposition. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a singular MV-algebra. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is α-distributive if and only if it is $(\alpha, 2)$-distributive.*

Another result of this type is

3.4. Proposition. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a complete MV-algebra. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *$\mathcal{A}$ is α-distributive.*
(ii) *$\mathcal{A}$ is $(\alpha, 2)$-distributive.*

Proof. Clearly (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii). Let (ii) be valid. As usual, let $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(G, u)$. According to 2.5, G is $(\alpha, 2)$-distributive. In view of [9], G is complete. Thus [7], Theorem 3.9 yields that G is α-distributive. By applying 2.5 again we conclude that $\mathcal{A}$ is α-distributive. □

4. The sublattices $L^{\mathcal{A}}(a, \alpha, \beta)$

Let α and β be as above.

First suppose that G is a lattice ordered group and $a \in G$. We denote by $\mathcal{L}^G(a, \alpha, \beta)$ the system of all convex sublattices X of $\ell(G)$ such that the element a belongs to X and X is (α, β)-distributive. Let the system $\mathcal{L}^G(a, \alpha, \beta)$ be partially ordered by the set-theoretical inclusion.

The assertions of the following propostion have been proved in [6].

4.1. Proposition. *Let G be a lattice ordered group and $a \in G$.*

(i) *The system $\mathcal{L}^G(a, \alpha, \beta)$ has a greatest element which will be denoted by $L^G(a, \alpha, \beta)$.*
(ii) *$L^G(a, \alpha, \beta)$ is a closed sublattice of $\ell(G)$.*
(iii) *If $b \in H$, then either $L^G(a, \alpha, \beta) = L^G(b, \alpha, \beta)$ or $L^G(a, \alpha, \beta) \cap L^G(b, \alpha, \beta) = \emptyset$.*
(iv) *$L^G(0, \alpha, \beta)$ is an ℓ-ideal of G and*

$$L^G(a, \alpha, \beta) = L^G(0, \alpha, \beta) + a.$$

Now let $\mathcal{A}$ be an MV-algebra. Suppose that G is an abelian lattice ordered group with a strong unit u such that $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(G, u)$.

For an element a of A we define $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}}(a, \alpha, \beta)$ analogously as we defined $\mathcal{L}^G(a, \alpha, \beta)$ in the case when a was an element of G.

4.2. Proposition. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an MV-algebra and $a \in A$.*

(i) *The system $L^{\mathcal{A}}(a, \alpha, \beta)$ has a greatest element which will be denoted by $L^{\mathcal{A}}(a, \alpha, \beta)$.*
(ii) *$L^{\mathcal{A}}(a, \alpha, \beta)$ is a closed sublattice of $\ell(\mathcal{A})$.*
(iii) *If $b \in A$, then either $L^{\mathcal{A}}(a, \alpha, \beta) = L^{\mathcal{A}}(b, \alpha, \beta)$ or*

$$L^{\mathcal{A}}(a, \alpha, \beta) \cap L^{\mathcal{A}}(b, \alpha, \beta) = \emptyset.$$

(iv) *$L^{\mathcal{A}}(0, \alpha, \beta)$ is closed with respect to the operation $\oplus$.*

Proof. The assertions (i), (ii) and (iii) were proven (for any infinitely distributive lattice) in [6], Section 2.

From the relations between $\mathcal{A}$ and G we conclude that

$$L^{\mathcal{A}}(a, \alpha, \beta) = L^{G}(a, \alpha, \beta) \cap A$$

is valid for each $a \in A$.

Since $x \oplus y = (x + y) \wedge a$ holds for each $x, y \in A$, from 4.1 (iv) we obtain that $L^{\mathcal{A}}(0, \alpha, \beta)$ is closed with respect to the operation $\oplus$. □

Suppose that the MV-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is complete (i.e., $\ell(\mathcal{A})$ is a complete lattice). Then in view of 4.2 (ii), $L^{\mathcal{A}}(0, \alpha, \beta)$ has a greatest element; let us denote it by u_1. Hence $L^{\mathcal{A}}(0, \alpha, \beta)$ is the interval $[0, u_1]$ of the lattice $\ell(\mathcal{A})$. We also have

$$[0, u_1] = L^{G}(0, \alpha, \beta) \cap A. \tag{1}$$

Further, in view of [9], G is a complete lattice ordered group. Thus [6], Theorem 7.7 yields that $L^{G}(0, \alpha, \beta)$ is a direct factor of the lattice ordered group G.

We denote by G_1 the convex ℓ-subgroup of G generated by the element u_1. Then u_1 is a strong unit in G_1. Put $\mathcal{A}_1 = \Gamma(G_1, u_1)$. Then $L^{\mathcal{A}}(0, \alpha, \beta)$ is the underlying lattice of $\mathcal{A}_1$.

From the fact that $L^{G}(0, \alpha, \beta)$ is a direct factor of G, from (1) and from [8], Lemma 3.2 we conclude

4.3. Proposition. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a complete MV-algebra and let $\mathcal{A}_1$ be as above. Then $\mathcal{A}_1$ is a direct factor of the MV-algebra $\mathcal{A}$.*

5. d-HOMOGENEOUS MV-ALGEBRAS

Let L be a distributive lattice having more than one element. If L is completely distributive, then we put $d(L) = \alpha^*$.

Suppose that L fails to be compoletely distributive. Then there exsists an infinite cardinal α such that

(i) L is not α-distributive;
(ii) if β is a nonzero cardinal with $\beta < \alpha$, then L is β-distributive.

We put $d(L) = \alpha$.

A lattice L will be called homogeneous with respect to the higher degrees of distributivity if either $\operatorname{card} L = 1$, or $\operatorname{card} L > 1$ and for each nontrivial interval $[a, b]$ in L the relation

$$d([a, b]) = d(L)$$

is valid.

We denote by C the class of all infinite cardinals; put $C_1 = C \cup \{\alpha^*\}$. Let G be a lattice ordered group. For $i \in C_1$ let $H_i(0)$ be the set of all elements $x \in G$ such that either $x = 0$, or $x \neq 0$ and

$$d([x \wedge 0, x \vee 0]) = i.$$

Then (cf. [6], 7.2) $H_i(0)$ is a convex ℓ-subgroup of G. The results of [6], Sections 3 and 4 yield if $H_i(0) \neq \{0\}$, then $d(H_i(0)) = i$ and that $H_i(0)$ is d-homogeneous.

The notion of completely subdirect decomposition of a lattice ordered group has been introduced in [15]; cf. also [6].

Assume that G is a complete lattice ordered group, $G \neq \{0\}$. Put

$$C_1^0 = \{i \in C_1 : H_i(0) \neq \{0\}.$$

5.1. Proposition. *Each complete MV-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ with $A \neq \{0\}$ can be represented as a direct product of d-homogeneous MV-algebras.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a complete MV-algebra, $A \neq \{0\}$, $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(G, u)$. Then G is a complete lattice ordered group and $G \neq \{0\}$. Thus from [6], Theorem 7.9 we infer that G can be represented as a completely subdirect product of its ℓ-subgroups $H_i(0)(i \in C_1^0)$. All these $H_i(0)$ are d-homogeneous.

For each $i \in C_1^0$ let u_i be the component of the element u in $H_i(0)$. Put $\mathcal{A}_i = \Gamma(G, u_i)$. Clearly $\mathcal{A}_i = \Gamma(H_i(0), u_i)$. Then the lattice $\ell(\mathcal{A}_i)$ has more than one element and is d-homogeneous.

According to Theorem 4.2 in [8], the MV-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is a direct product of the MV-algebras $\mathcal{A}_i$ $(i \in C_1^0)$. □

Let α be an infinite cardinal. For the notion of weak α-distributivity in a Boolean algebra and also for the detailed references of authors and papers dealing with this notion cf [14], §30 (sample names: Banach, Kuratowski, Horn, Tarski, Sikorski).

The mentioned definition given in [14] can be applied also for complete MV-algebras. Similarly as in the case of homogenity with respect to higher degrees of distributivity we can introduce the notion of homogenity with respect to higher degrees of weak distributivity.

By the same reasoning as above we can prove the result analogous to Proposition 5.1 where distributivity is replaced by weak distributivity.

References

[1] D. Byrd, J. T. Lloyd, *Closed subgroups and complete distributivity in lattice-ordered groups*, Math. Zeitschrift **101** (1967), 123–130.

[2] R. Cignoli, I. M. L. D'Ottaviano, D. Mundici, *Algebraic Foundations of many-valued Reasoning*, Forthcomming.

[3] P. Conrad, *The relationship between the radical of a lattice ordered group and complete distributivity*, Pacific J. Math **14** (1964), 494–499.

[4] P. Conrad, *Lattice Ordered Groups*, Tulane University, 1970.

[5] L. Fuchs, *Partially Ordered Algebraic Systems*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1963.

[6] J. Jakubík, *Higher degrees of distributivity in lattices and lattice ordered groups*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **18** (1968), 356–376.

[7] J. Jakubík, *Distributivity in lattice ordered groups*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **22** (1972), 108–125.

[8] J. Jakubík, *Direct product decompositions of MV-algebras*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **44** (1994), 725–739.
[9] J. Jakubík, *On complete MV-algebras*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **45** (1995), 473–480.
[10] J. Jakubík, *On archimedean MV-algebras*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **48** (1998), 575–582.
[11] J. Jakubík, *Complete generators and maximal completions of MV-algebras*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **48** (1998), 597–608.
[12] J. T. Lloyd, *Complete distributivity in certain infinite permutation groups*, Michigan Math. J. **14** (1967), 393–400.
[13] R. S. Pierce, *Distributivity in Boolean algebras*, Pacific J. Math. **7** (1957), 983–992.
[14] R. Sikorski, *Boolean Algebras, Second Edition*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1964.
[15] F. Šik, *Über subdirekte Summen geordneter Gruppen*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **10** (1960), 400–424.
[16] E. C. Weinberg, *Higher degrees of distributivity in lattices of continuous functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **104** (1962), 334–346.
[17] E. C. Weinberg, *Completely distributive lattice ordered groups*, Pacific J. Math. **12** (1962), 1131–1148.

Matematický ústav SAV, Grešákova 6, 040 01 Košice, Slovakia

This preprint series was founded in 1996. Its purpose is to present manuscripts of submitted or unpublished papers and reports of fellows of the Mathematical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava and its Košice branch. The authors are fully responsible for the content of the preprints. Postal addresses:

Mathematical Institute
Slovak Academy of Sciences
Štefánikova 49
SK–814 73 Bratislava
SLOVAKIA

Tel./Fax (+421 7) 5249 7316

Mathematical Institute
Slovak Academy of Sciences
Grešákova 6
SK–040 01 Košice
SLOVAKIA

Tel./Fax (+421 95) 6228291

PostScript files of preprints are available at WWW address:
`http://www.mat.savba.sk/preprints`

Latest preprints of the series:

11/2000 *Ján Jakubík*: Higher degrees of distributivity in MV-algebras

10/2000 *Beloslav Riečan*: On the probability on BL algebras

9/2000 *Beloslav Riečan*: On the Yager type entropy of dynamical systems

8/2000 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij*: States on pseudo MV-algebras

7/2000 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij, Thomas Vetterlein*: Pseudo-effect algebras. II. group representations

6/2000 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij, Thomas Vetterlein*: Pseudo-effect algebras. I. basic properties

5/2000 *Ján Jakubík*: On free MV-algebras

4/2000 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij*: Pseudo MV-algebras are intervals in l-groups

3/2000 *Anna Jenčová*: Geometry of quantum states: dual connections and divergence functions

2/2000 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij*: MV-observables and MV-algebras

1/2000 *Michal Fečkan*: Transversal bounded solutions for difference equations

21/1999 *Roman Frič*: Lukasiewicz tribes are absolutely sequentially closed bold algebras

20/1999 *Miroslav Repický*: Spaces not distinguishing convergences

19/1999 *Beloslav Riečan*: On the probability theory on MV algebras

18/1999 *Beloslav Riečan, Jozefína Petrovičová*: Kolmogorov-Sinai theorem for fuzzy T-dynamical systems

17/1999 *Beloslav Riečan*: On a Banach space valued observables

16/1999 *Michal Fečkan*: Criteria on the nonexistence of invariant submanifolds for dynamical systems

15/1999 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij*: On Loomis-Sikorski's theorem for MV-algebras and BCK-algebras

14/1999 *Otakar Grošek, Ladislav Satko, Karol Nemoga*: ZKDWCNDPDC...

13/1999 *Otakar Grošek, Karol Nemoga, Ladislav Satko*: A remark to Luby-Rackoff and Ueli M. Maurer pseudorandom generators

12/1999 *Beloslav Riečan*: On the sum of observables in product MV algebras

11/1999 *Peter Eliaš*: A hierarchy of thin sets related to the boundedness of trigonometric series

10/1999 *Miloslav Duchoň, Peter Maličký*: On Herglotz theorem in partially ordered vector spaces

(continued on inside back cover)

9/1999 *Ján Jakubík*: Torsion classes of specker lattice ordered groups

8/1999 *Ján Jakubík*: Graph automorphisms and cells of lattices

7/1999 *Miloslav Duchoň, Peter Maličký*: Positive linear maps on trigonometric polynomials

6/1999 *Miloslav Duchoň, Anna Kolesárová*: Fourier transforms of vector-valued measures on a certain compact semigroup

5/1999 *Miroslav Ploščica*: Separation properties in congruence lattices of lattices

4/1999 *Georges Chevalier, Anatolij Dvurečenskij, Karl Svozil*: Piron's and Bell's geometric lemmas and Gleason's theorem

3/1999 *Jarmila Hedlíková*: Relatively orthomodular lattices

2/1999 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij, Pekka Lahti, Kari Ylinen*: Some remarks on the moment problem

1/1999 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij*: Loomis-Sikorski theorem for σ-complete MV-algebras and ℓ-groups

27/1998 *Martin Kochol*: Cubic graphs without a Petersen minor have nowhere-zero 5-flows

26/1998 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij, Ferdinand Chovanec, Eva Rybáriková*: D-homomorphisms and atomic σ-complete Boolean D-posets

25/1998 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij*: Commutative BCK-algebras with product

24/1998 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij, Antonio Di Nola*: Product MV-algebras

23/1998 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij, Maria Gabriella Graziano*: Dedekind complete commutative BCK-algebras

22/1998 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij*: Ideals of commutative BCK-algebras

21/1998 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij, Beloslav Riečan*: Weakly divisible MV-algebras and product

20/1998 *Ivan Korec*: Definability of addition and multiplication from Pascal's triangle modulo n and number-theoretical functions

19/1998 *Roberto Giuntini, Sylvia Pulmannová*: Ideals and congruences in effect algebras and QMV algebras

18/1998 *Ivan Korec*: Definability of exact arithmetical operations from approximate ones

17/1998 *Georges Chevalier, Sylvia Pulmannová*: Some ideal lattices in partial abelian monoids

16/1998 *Anatolij Dvurečenskij*: On categorical equivalences of commutative BCK-algebras

15/1998 *Ivan Korec*: Definability of addition and multiplication from some quadratic forms $ax^2 + cy^2$

14/1998 *Beloslav Riečan*: On the L^p space of observables on product MV algebras

13/1998 *Beloslav Riečan*: On the strong law of large numbers on some ordered structures

12/1998 *Ladislav Mišík, jr., Tibor Žáčik*: A simplified formula for calculation of metric dimension of converging sequences

11/1998 *Beloslav Riečan*: On the joint distribution of observables

10/1998 *Beloslav Riečan*: On the product MV algebras

9/1998 *Roman Frič*: A Stone-type duality and its applications to probability

8/1998 *Roman Frič*: Ring of maps: sequential convergence and completion

7/1998 *Roman Frič, Ján Jakubík*: Sequential convergences on Boolean algebras defined by systems of maximal filters

6/1998 *Roman Frič*: Categorical reflections on fields of events and probability

5/1998 *Beloslav Riečan*: On the probability theory and fuzzy sets