

FOULIS-HOLLAND THEOREM FOR IMPLICATIVE-ORTHOMODULAR LATTICES

LAVINIA CORINA CIUNGU

Department of Mathematics

St Francis College

179 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, NY 11201, USA

lciungu@sfc.edu

ABSTRACT. We introduce the notion of distributivity for implicative-orthomodular lattices, proving an analogue result of the Foulis-Holland theorem. Based on this result, we characterize the distributive implicative-orthomodular lattices. Moreover, we define the center of an implicative-orthomodular lattice as the set of all elements that commute with all other elements, and we prove that the center is an implicative-Boolean algebra. Additionally, we give new characterizations of implicative-orthomodular lattices.

Keywords: implicative BE algebra, implicative-orthomodular lattice, distributivity, Foulis-Holland theorem, implicative-Boolean center, commutator

AMS classification (2020): 06C15, 03G25, 06A06, 81P10

1. INTRODUCTION

Orthomodular lattices were first introduced by G. Birkhoff and J. von Neumann, by studying the structure of the lattice of projection operators on a Hilbert space. They introduced the orthomodular lattices as the event structure describing quantum mechanical experiments [3]. Later, orthomodular lattices and orthomodular posets were considered as the standard quantum logic [16] (see also [2, 7, 8]). Complete studies on orthomodular lattices are presented in the monographs [4] and [2], while details on distributive lattices can be found in [1]. Based on the commutativity relation, D.J. Foulis ([9]) and, independently, S.S. Holland ([10]) proved that, given a triple of elements in an orthomodular lattice, if at least one of them commutes with other two, then the triple is distributive. We also mention that certain results of continuous geometry were presented in [11] for the case of complete orthomodular lattices. An orthomodular lattice (OML for short) is an ortholattice $(X, \wedge, \vee, ', 0, 1)$ verifying

(OM) $(x \wedge y) \vee ((x \wedge y)' \wedge x) = x$, for all $x, y \in X$, or, equivalently

(OM') $x \vee (x' \wedge y) = y$, whenever $x \leq y$ (where $x \leq y$ iff $x = x \wedge y$) ([15]).

The orthomodular lattices were redefined and studied by A. Iorgulescu ([12]) based on involutive m-BE algebras, and two generalizations of orthomodular lattices were given: orthomodular softlattices and orthomodular widelattices. Based on implicative involutive BE algebras, we redefined in [6] the orthomodular lattices, by introducing and studying the implicative-orthomodular lattices (IOML for short), giving certain characterizations of these structures. In this paper, we define the notion of distributivity for implicative-orthomodular lattices and

we investigate for these structures certain results presented in [10] in the case of orthomodular lattices. We prove the Foulis-Holland theorem for implicative-orthomodular lattices, and, based on this result, we characterize the distributive implicative-orthomodular lattices. We also show that an implicative involutive BE algebra is an implicative-orthomodular lattice if and only if the commutativity relation is symmetric. We introduce the notion of the center $\mathcal{C}(X)$ of an implicative-orthomodular lattice X as the set of all elements of X that commute with all other elements of X , and we prove that $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is an implicative-Boolean subalgebra of X . We characterize $\mathcal{C}(X)$ with respect to the set $\mathcal{K}(x)$ of all complements of the elements $x \in X$. We also define the commutor of an implicative-orthomodular lattice X as the generalization of the concept of the center of X , and we prove that the commutor is a sublattice of X containing $\mathcal{C}(X)$. Finally, we apply the Foulis-Holland theorem to prove new properties and characterizations of implicative-orthomodular lattices.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We recall some basic notions and results regarding BE algebras that will be used in the paper.

BE algebras were introduced in [14] as algebras $(X, \rightarrow, 1)$ of type $(2, 0)$ satisfying the following conditions, for all $x, y, z \in X$: (BE_1) $x \rightarrow x = 1$; (BE_2) $x \rightarrow 1 = 1$; (BE_3) $1 \rightarrow x = x$; (BE_4) $x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z) = y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z)$. A relation \leq is defined on X by $x \leq y$ iff $x \rightarrow y = 1$. A BE algebra X is *bounded* if there exists $0 \in X$ such that $0 \leq x$, for all $x \in X$. In a bounded BE algebra $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$ we define $x^* = x \rightarrow 0$, for all $x \in X$. A bounded BE algebra X is called *involutive* if $x^{**} = x$, for any $x \in X$.

Lemma 2.1. ([6]) *Let $(X, \rightarrow, 1)$ be a BE algebra. The following hold for all $x, y, z \in X$:*

(1) $x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x) = 1$; (2) $x \leq (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y$.

If X is bounded, then:

(3) $x \rightarrow y^* = y \rightarrow x^*$; (4) $x \leq x^{**}$.

If X is involutive, then:

(5) $x^* \rightarrow y = y^* \rightarrow x$; (6) $x^* \rightarrow y^* = y \rightarrow x$; (7) $(x \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow z = x \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow z)$;

(8) $x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z) = (x \rightarrow y^*)^* \rightarrow z$; (9) $(x^* \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y) = (x^* \rightarrow x)^* \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow y)$.

In a BE algebra X , we define the additional operation:

$$x \uplus y = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y.$$

If X is involutive, we define the operation:

$$x \upmho y = ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^*,$$

and the relations \leq_Q and \leq_L by:

$$x \leq_Q y \text{ iff } x = x \upmho y \text{ and } x \leq_L y \text{ iff } x = (x \rightarrow y^*)^*.$$

We can see that $x \leq_L y$ iff $x^* = y \rightarrow x^*$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $(X, \rightarrow, 1)$ be an involutive BE algebra. The following holds*

$$(x_1 \rightarrow y_1^*)^* \rightarrow (x_2 \rightarrow y_2^*) = (x_1 \rightarrow x_2^*)^* \rightarrow (y_1 \rightarrow y_2^*),$$

for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in X$.

Proof. Using twice Lemma 2.1(7), we get:

$$(x_1 \rightarrow y_1^*)^* \rightarrow (x_2 \rightarrow y_2^*) = x_1 \rightarrow (y_1 \rightarrow (x_2 \rightarrow y_2^*))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= x_1 \rightarrow (x_2 \rightarrow (y_1 \rightarrow y_2^*)) \\
&= (x_1 \rightarrow x_2^*)^* \rightarrow (y_1 \rightarrow y_2^*). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.3. ([6]) *Let X be an involutive BE algebra. Then the following hold for all $x, y, z \in X$:*

- (1) $x \leq_Q y$ implies $x = y \cap x$ and $y = x \cup y$;
- (2) \leq_Q is reflexive and antisymmetric;
- (3) $x \cap y = (x^* \cup y^*)^*$ and $x \cup y = (x^* \cap y^*)^*$;
- (4) $x \leq_Q y$ implies $x \leq y$;
- (5) $x, y \leq_Q z$ and $z \rightarrow x = z \rightarrow y$ imply $x = y$ (cancellation law);
- (6) $x \rightarrow ((y \rightarrow x^*)^* \cup z) = y \cup (x \rightarrow z)$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let X be an involutive BE algebra. Then:*

- (1) \leq is not an order relation;
- (2) \leq_L implies \leq ;
- (3) \leq_L is an order relation on X ;
- (4) $z \leq_L x$ and $z \leq_L y$ imply $z \leq_L (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$.

Proof. (1) \leq is not transitive.

(2) If $x \leq_L y$, then $x = (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$, so that

$$x \rightarrow y = (x \rightarrow y^*)^* \rightarrow y = y^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*) = x \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow y^*) = 1,$$

hence $x \leq y$.

(3) If $x \leq_L y$ and $y \leq_L x$, then $x^* = x \rightarrow y^* = y^*$, hence $x = y$. From $x \leq_L y$ and $y \leq_L z$, we get:

$$x^* = x \rightarrow y^* = x \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*) = z \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*) = z \rightarrow x^*,$$

hence $x \leq_L z$. Since, obviously, \leq_L is reflexive and antisymmetric, it follows that it is an order relation.

(4) From $z \leq_L x$ and $z \leq_L y$ we have $z^* = x \rightarrow z^*$ and $z^* = y \rightarrow z^*$. It follows that $z^* = x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)$, and by Lemma 2.1(7), we get $z^* = (x \rightarrow y^*)^* \rightarrow z^*$, that is $z \leq_L (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$. \square

A *quantum-Wajsberg algebra* (*QW algebra, for short*) ([6]) $(X, \rightarrow, *, 1)$ is an involutive BE algebra $(X, \rightarrow, *, 1)$ satisfying the following condition: for all $x, y, z \in X$,

$$(QW) \quad x \rightarrow ((x \cap y) \cap (z \cap x)) = (x \rightarrow y) \cap (x \rightarrow z).$$

It was proved in [6] that condition (QW) is equivalent to the following conditions:

$$(QW_1) \quad x \rightarrow (x \cap y) = x \rightarrow y;$$

$$(QW_2) \quad x \rightarrow (y \cap (z \cap x)) = (x \rightarrow y) \cap (x \rightarrow z).$$

An involutive-BE algebra satisfying condition (QW_2) is called an *implicative-orthomodular algebra*.

3. ON IMPLICATIVE-ORTHOMODULAR LATTICES

In this section, we recall certain notions and results regarding the implicative-orthomodular lattices ([6]), and we prove new properties and characterizations of these structures.

Definition 3.1. A BE algebra is called *implicative* if it satisfies the following condition: for all $x, y \in X$,

$$(Impl) \quad (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x = x.$$

Lemma 3.2. ([6]) *Let $(X, \rightarrow, *, 1)$ be an implicative involutive BE algebra. Then X verifies the following axioms: for all $x, y \in X$,*

- (iG) $x^* \rightarrow x = x$, or equivalently, $x \rightarrow x^* = x^*$;
- (Iabs-i) $(x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)) \rightarrow x = x$;
- (Pimpl) $x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y) = x \rightarrow y$.

Lemma 3.3. ([6]) *Let $(X, \rightarrow, *, 1)$ be an involutive BE algebra. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) X is implicative;
- (b) X verifies axioms (iG) and (Iabs-i);
- (c) X verifies axioms (Pimpl) and (Iabs-i).

Lemma 3.4. *Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra. The following hold, for all $x, y \in X$:*

- (1) $x \leq_L y$ iff $y^* \leq_L x^*$;
- (2) \leq_Q implies \leq_L .

Proof. (1) If $x \leq_L y$, then $x^* = x \rightarrow y^* = y \rightarrow x^*$, and we get $y^* \rightarrow (x^*)^* = y^* \rightarrow x = x^* \rightarrow y = (y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow y = y$ (by (Impl)), hence $y^* = (y^* \rightarrow (x^*)^*)^*$, so that $y^* \leq_L x^*$. Conversely, if $y^* \leq_L x^*$, then $y = x^* \rightarrow y$ and we get $x \rightarrow y^* = y \rightarrow x^* = (x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x^* = x^*$ (by (Impl)), so that $x \leq_L y$.

(2) Assume that $x \leq_Q y$, that is $x \pitchfork y = x$. Since by Lemma 3.2, (Impl) implies (iG), we have $y \rightarrow y^* = y^*$. It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} x \rightarrow y^* &= y \rightarrow x^* = y \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^* = y \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*) \\ &= (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow y^*) = (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^* = (x \pitchfork y)^* = x^*. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $x = (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$, hence $x \leq_L y$. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let X be an involutive BE algebra. The following are equivalent for all $x, y \in X$:*

- (IOM) $x \pitchfork (y \rightarrow x) = x$;
- (IOM')
- (IOM'')

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

Definition 3.6. An *implicative-orthomodular lattice* (IOML for short) is an implicative involutive BE algebra satisfying any one (and hence all) of the equivalent conditions of Lemma 3.5

The orthomodular lattices $(X, \wedge, \vee, ', 0, 1)$ are definitionally equivalent to implicative-orthomodular lattices $(X, \rightarrow, *, 1)$, by the mutually inverse transformations

$$\varphi : x \rightarrow y := (x \wedge y')' \quad \text{and} \quad \psi : x \wedge y := (x \rightarrow y^*)^*,$$

and the relation $x \vee y := (x' \wedge y')' = x^* \rightarrow y$.

Proposition 3.7. ([6]) *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice. Then the following hold for all $x, y, z \in X$:*

- (1) $x \pitchfork (y \cup x) = x$ and $x \cup (y \pitchfork x) = x$.
- If $x \leq_Q y$, then:
 - (2) $y \cup x = y$ and $y^* \leq_Q x^*$;
 - (3) $y \rightarrow z \leq_Q x \rightarrow z$ and $z \rightarrow x \leq_Q z \rightarrow y$;
 - (4) $x \pitchfork z \leq_Q y \pitchfork z$ and $x \cup z \leq_Q y \cup z$.

Proposition 3.8. ([6]) *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice. Then the following hold for all $x, y, z \in X$:*

- (1) $x \rightarrow (y \frown x) = x \rightarrow y$;
- (2) $(x \cup y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = y^*$;
- (3) $x \frown ((y \rightarrow x) \frown (z \rightarrow x)) = x$;
- (4) $(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \frown x) = x$;
- (5) \leq_Q is an order relation on X ;
- (6) $x \leq_Q y$ and $x \leq y$ imply $x = y$;
- (7) $x \frown y \leq_Q y \leq_Q x \cup y$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice. Then the following hold for all $x, y, z, x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in X$:*

- (1) $x \leq_Q y$ implies $(x \rightarrow z^*)^* \leq_Q (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$;
- (2) $y \leq_Q x$ and $z \leq_Q x$ imply $y^* \rightarrow z \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow z \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow x = x$;
- (3) $x_1 \leq_Q y_1, x_2 \leq_Q y_2$ imply $x_1^* \rightarrow x_2 \leq_Q y_1^* \rightarrow y_2$;
- (4) $(x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* \leq_Q x$;
- (5) $(z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \leq_Q z^* \rightarrow x$.

Proof. (1) $x \leq_Q y$ implies $y \rightarrow z^* \leq_Q x \rightarrow z^*$, hence $(x \rightarrow z^*)^* \leq_Q (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$.

(2) By hypothesis and (iG), we get: $y^* \geq_Q x^*$, so that $y^* \rightarrow z \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow z \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow x = x$.

(3) By hypothesis, we have: $x_1^* \geq_Q y_1^*$, hence $x_1^* \rightarrow x_2 \leq_Q y_1^* \rightarrow x_2 \leq_Q y_1^* \rightarrow y_2$.

(4) By (IOM'), $(x \rightarrow y^*)^* \leq_Q x$ and $(x \rightarrow y)^* \leq_Q x$, and applying (2), it follows that $(x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* \leq_Q x$.

(5) We have $x^* \frown z \leq_Q z \leq_Q z^* \rightarrow x$. Since $x^* \frown z = (x \cup z^*)^* = ((x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*)^* = (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^*$, we get $(z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \leq_Q z \leq_Q z^* \rightarrow x$. \square

Theorem 3.10. *An implicative involutive BE algebra X . The following are equivalent:*

- (a) X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice;
- (b) X satisfies condition (QW₁);
- (c) X satisfies condition (QW₂);
- (d) X satisfies condition (QW).

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (c) Assume that X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice. By Proposition 3.8(3), we have $x^* \cup ((y \rightarrow x)^* \cup (z \rightarrow x)^*) = x^*$. Replacing x, y, z with x^*, y^*, z^* , respectively, we get $x \cup ((y^* \rightarrow x^*)^* \cup (z^* \rightarrow x^*)^*) = x$. It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
x \rightarrow (y \frown (z \frown x)) &= x \rightarrow (y \frown (z^* \cup x^*)^*) \\
&= x \rightarrow (y^* \cup (z^* \cup x^*)^*) \\
&= x \rightarrow (y^* \cup ((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^*) \\
&= x \rightarrow (y^* \cup (x \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x^*)^*))^* \\
&= x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow ((y^* \rightarrow x^*)^* \cup (z^* \rightarrow x^*)^*))^* \text{ (Prop. 2.3(6))} \\
&= (x \cup ((y^* \rightarrow x^*)^* \cup (z^* \rightarrow x^*)^*)) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow ((y^* \rightarrow x^*)^* \cup (z^* \rightarrow x^*)^*))^* \\
&= ((y^* \rightarrow x^*)^* \cup (z^* \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \text{ (Prop. 3.8(2))} \\
&= (y^* \rightarrow x^*) \frown (z^* \rightarrow x^*) = (x \rightarrow y) \frown (x \rightarrow z).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence axiom (QW₂) is satisfied.

(c) \Rightarrow (a) Replacing $y := 0$ in (QW₂), we have $x^* = x^* \frown (x \rightarrow z)$, and replacing x with x^* and z with y , we get $x = x \frown (x^* \rightarrow y)$. It follows that X satisfies condition (IOM'), hence it is an implicative-orthomodular lattice.

(c) \Rightarrow (b) and (c) \Rightarrow (d) According to [6], if X is an implicative involutive BE algebra, then axioms (QW_1) , (QW_2) , (QW) are equivalent. \square

Corollary 3.11. *Any implicative-orthomodular lattice is a quantum-Wajsberg algebra.*

Proposition 3.12. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice. The following hold for all $x, y \in X$:*

- (1) $(x \frown y) \rightarrow (y \frown x) = 1$;
- (2) $(x \cup y) \rightarrow (y \cup x) = 1$.

Proof. According to Theorem 3.10, X satisfies condition (QW_1) , and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (x \frown y) \rightarrow (y \frown x) &= (y \frown x)^* \rightarrow (x \frown y)^* = (y \frown x)^* \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*) \\ &= (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow ((y \frown x)^* \rightarrow y^*) = (y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow (y \frown x)) \\ &= (y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

(2) Using (1), we get:

$$(x \cup y) \rightarrow (y \cup x) = (x^* \frown y^*)^* \rightarrow (y^* \frown x^*)^* = (y^* \frown x^*) \rightarrow (x^* \frown y^*) = 1. \quad \square$$

Theorem 3.13. *Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice;
- (b) \leq_L implies \leq_Q ;
- (c) for $x, y \in X$, $x \leq_L y$ implies $y = y \cup x$.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b) Let $x, y \in X$ such that $x \leq_L y$, that is $y \rightarrow x^* = x^*$. Then we get:

$$\begin{aligned} x \frown y &= ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* = (((y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* \\ &= (((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* = ((x \cup y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* \\ &= (y \rightarrow (x \cup y^*))^* = (y \rightarrow (x^* \frown y))^* = (y \rightarrow x^*)^* \text{ (Prop. 3.8(1))} \\ &= (x \rightarrow y^*)^* = x. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $x = x \frown y$, that is $x \leq_Q y$.

(b) \Rightarrow (a) Let $x, y \in X$ such that $x \leq_L y$ implies $x \leq_Q y$.

Since by $(Impl)$, $(x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x^*))^* = ((y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow x^*)^* = ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* = (x^*)^* = x$, it follows that $x \leq_L y \rightarrow x$. Hence $x \leq_Q y \rightarrow x$, that is $x \frown (y \rightarrow x) = x$, so that X verifies condition (IOM) . Thus X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice.

(b) \Rightarrow (c) Let $x, y \in X$ such that $x \leq_L y$. It follows that $y^* \leq_L x^*$, and by (b), $y^* \leq_Q x^*$, so that $y^* = y^* \frown x^*$, that is $y = y \cup x$.

(c) \Rightarrow (b) If $x \leq_L y$, then $y^* \leq_L x^*$, so that, by (c), $x^* = x^* \cup y^*$. Hence $x = x \frown y$, that is $x \leq_Q y$. \square

Corollary 3.14. *If X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice, then $\leq_Q = \leq_L$.*

Proof. It follows by Theorem 3.13 and Lemma 3.4. \square

4. FOULIS-HOLLAND THEOREM FOR IMPLICATIVE-ORTHOMODULAR LATTICES

In this section, we define and study the notion of distributivity for implicative-orthomodular lattices. Similarly as in the case of orthomodular lattices ([10]), we prove the Foulis-Holland theorem for implicative-orthomodular lattices. We show that an implicative-orthomodular lattice is distributive if and only if it satisfies the divisibility condition. Moreover, we prove

that an implicative involutive BE algebra is an implicative-orthomodular lattice if and only if the commutativity relation is symmetric.

Definition 4.1. Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra. We say that X satisfies the *divisibility condition* if, for all $x, y \in X$:

$$(Idiv) \quad x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = x \rightarrow y^*.$$

If $x, y \in X$ such that $x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = x \rightarrow y^*$, we write $(x, y)Idiv$. Obviously, if $(x, y)Idiv$ for all $x, y \in X$, then X verifies condition $(Idiv)$.

Lemma 4.2. Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra and let $x, y \in X$. If $(x, y)Idiv$, then $x \leq y$ implies $x \leq_L y$.

Proof. Let $x, y \in X$ such that $x \leq y$, that is $x \rightarrow y = 1$. Since $(x, y)Idiv$, we get: $(x \rightarrow y^*)^* = (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* = (x \rightarrow 1^*)^* = x$, hence $x \leq_L y$. \square

Definition 4.3. Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra and let $x, y \in X$. We say that x *commutes* with y , denoted by $x\mathcal{C}y$, if $x = (x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*$.

Lemma 4.4. Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra and let $x \in X$. Then:

- (1) $x\mathcal{C}x, x\mathcal{C}0, 0\mathcal{C}x, x\mathcal{C}1, 1\mathcal{C}x, x\mathcal{C}x^*, x^*\mathcal{C}x$;
- (2) $x \leq_L y$ or $x \leq_L y^*$ implies $x\mathcal{C}y$;
- (3) $x \leq_Q y$ or $x \leq_Q y^*$ implies $x\mathcal{C}y$;
- (4) $x\mathcal{C}(y \rightarrow x)$.

Proof. (1) It is straightforward.

(2) Since $x \leq_L y$, by $(Impl)$, $(x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = x^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x = x$, hence $x\mathcal{C}y$. Similarly, $x \leq_L y^*$ implies $x^* = x \rightarrow y$. Then, by $(Impl)$, we get $(x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = (x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow x = x$, that is $x\mathcal{C}y$.

(3) It follows by (2), since by Lemma 3.4, $x \leq_Q y$ implies $x \leq_L y$.

(4) It follows by (2), since $x \leq_L y \rightarrow x$. \square

Proposition 4.5. Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra, and let $x, y \in X$. If $x\mathcal{C}y$, then $x \mathfrak{m} y = (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$.

Proof. Suppose $x\mathcal{C}y$, that is $(x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = x$. It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} (x \mathfrak{m} y)^* &= (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^* = (y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow y^* \\ &= (y \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)) \rightarrow y^* \\ &= ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)) \rightarrow y^* \\ &= ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y^*)) \rightarrow y^* \\ &= ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow y^*)) \rightarrow y^* \\ &= ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^* \text{ (by } (Impl)) \\ &= (x \mathfrak{U} y^*) \rightarrow y^* = y \rightarrow (x^* \mathfrak{m} y) = y \rightarrow x^* \text{ (by Prop. 3.8(1))} \\ &= x \rightarrow y^*. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $x \mathfrak{m} y = (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$. \square

Corollary 4.6. Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra. If $x\mathcal{C}y$ for all $x, y \in X$, then X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice.

Proof. If $x\mathcal{C}y$, then by Proposition 4.5, $x \mathfrak{m} y = (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$, so that $x \leq_L y$ if and only if $x \leq_Q y$, for all $x, y \in X$. According to Theorem 3.13, X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice. \square

Theorem 4.7. *Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice;
- (b) whenever $x\mathcal{C}y$, then $y\mathcal{C}x$.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b) Suppose X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice, and let $x, y \in X$ such that $x\mathcal{C}y$, that is $x = (x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x)^* &= (y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*))^* \\
&= (y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*))^* \\
&= (y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y^*))^* \\
&= (y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow y^*))^* \\
&= (y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* \text{ (by (Impl))} \\
&= (y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x \uplus y^*)^* \\
&= (y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x^* \mathbin{\frown} y) \\
&= y \text{ (by Prop. 3.8(4)).}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $y\mathcal{C}x$.

(b) \Rightarrow (a) Let $x \leq_L y$, so that $y^* \leq_L x^*$. By Lemma 4.4, we have $y^*\mathcal{C}x^*$, and by (b) we get $x^*\mathcal{C}y^*$, hence $x^* = (x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^*$. Since $y^* \leq_L x^*$ implies $x^* \rightarrow y = y$, we get: $x^* = y \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^* = (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^* = (x^* \uplus y^*)$. Hence $x = x \mathbin{\frown} y$, that is $x \leq_Q y$. Thus \leq_L implies \leq_Q , so that, by Theorem 3.13, X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice. \square

Lemma 4.8. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice and let $x, y \in X$. Then $x\mathcal{C}y$ implies $x\mathcal{C}y^*$, $x^*\mathcal{C}y$ and $x^*\mathcal{C}y^*$.*

Proof. Since $x\mathcal{C}y$, we have: $(x \rightarrow (y^*)^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^* = (x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = x$, thus $x\mathcal{C}y^*$. Using Theorem 4.7, it follows that $y^*\mathcal{C}x$, so that $y^*\mathcal{C}x^*$. Applying again Theorem 4.7, we get $x^*\mathcal{C}y^*$. \square

Proposition 4.9. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice, and let $x, y \in X$. Then $x\mathcal{C}y$ if and only if $(x, y)Idiv$.*

Proof. Assume that $x\mathcal{C}y$. By Proposition 3.7(2), $x \leq_Q y$ implies $y = y \uplus x = x^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x)^*$. Since $y \leq_Q x \rightarrow y$, we get $(x \rightarrow y)^* \leq_Q y^*$, so that $x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* \leq_Q x \rightarrow y^*$. Then, by above remark, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
x \rightarrow y^* &= (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*))^* \\
&= (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*))^* \\
&= (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow x)^* \text{ (since } x\mathcal{C}y, (x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = x) \\
&= (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* \rightarrow 0 = x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $(x, y)Idiv$. Conversely, suppose $(x, y)Idiv$, that is $x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = x \rightarrow y^*$. Since by (IOM'') , $x \uplus (x \rightarrow y)^* = x$, we get:

$$x = (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = (x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*,$$

that is $x\mathcal{C}y$. \square

Proposition 4.10. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice, and let $x, y \in X$. Then $x\mathcal{C}y$ if and only if $y \mathbin{\frown} x = (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$.*

Proof. If $x\mathcal{C}y$, by Proposition 4.9, $(x, y)Idiv$, and we have:

$$(x \rightarrow y^*)^* = (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* = ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x^*)^* = ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* = y \mathbin{\frown} x.$$

Conversely, assume that $y \mathbin{\frown} x = (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$. Applying Proposition 3.8(4), it follows that:

$(x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = (y \text{ \(\(\wedge\) \(x\) \)}^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \text{ \(\(\wedge\) \(x\) \)} = x$,

that is $x\mathcal{C}y$. □

Corollary 4.11. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice, and let $x, y \in X$. Then $x\mathcal{C}y$ if and only if $x \text{ \(\(\wedge\) \(y\) \)} = y \text{ \(\(\wedge\) \(x\) \)}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.10, $x\mathcal{C}y$ if and only if $y \text{ \(\(\wedge\) \(x\) \)} = (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$. Using Theorem 4.7, $x\mathcal{C}y$ if and only if $y\mathcal{C}x$ if and only if $x \text{ \(\(\wedge\) \(y\) \)} = y \text{ \(\(\wedge\) \(x\) \)} = (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$. □

Remark 4.12. Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice.

- (1) Corollary 4.11 explains why relation \mathcal{C} is called the *commutativity relation* on X .
- (2) If $x\mathcal{C}y$ for all $x, y \in X$, then X is commutative, so that it is a Wajsberg lattice. We will see in the next section that X is an implicative-Boolean algebra.

Definition 4.13. An implicative-orthomodular lattice X is *distributive* if it satisfies the following conditions, for all $x, y, z \in X$:

$$(Idis_1) ((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* = (x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*,$$

$$(Idis_2) ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow z)^* = ((z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow y))^*.$$

Remark 4.14. Using the mutually inverse transformations

$$\varphi : x \rightarrow y := (x \wedge y')' \quad \text{and} \quad \psi : x \wedge y := (x \rightarrow y^*)^*,$$

we can easily see that $(Idis_1)$ and $(Idis_2)$ are equivalent to conditions:

$$(D_1) (x \vee y) \wedge z = (x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(D_2) (x \wedge y) \vee z = (x \vee z) \wedge (y \vee z),$$

from the definition of distributive lattices.

Similarly to notations from [10, Def. 3], we write $(x, y, z)Idis_1$ and $(x, y, z)Idis_2$ if the triple (x, y, z) verifies conditions $(Idis_1)$ and $(Idis_2)$, respectively. If $(x, y, z)Idis_1$ and $(x, y, z)Idis_2$, we write $(x, y, z)Idis$. Obviously, $(x, y, z)Idis_1$ if and only if $(x^*, y^*, z^*)Idis_2$. We say that (x, y, z) is a distributive triple if $(x, y, z)Idis$, for all permutations of $\{x, y, z\}$.

Definition 4.15. Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra. We say that X is *distributive* or X satisfies condition $(Idis)$ if all triples (x, y, z) are distributive.

Now we can prove the Foulis-Holland theorem for implicative-orthomodular lattices.

Theorem 4.16. (Foulis-Holland theorem) *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice and let $x, y, z \in X$, such that one of these elements commutes with the other two. Then (x, y, z) is a distributive triple.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, suppose that $z\mathcal{C}x$ and $z\mathcal{C}y$. We need to verify six different relations: three for $Idis_1$ and three for $Idis_2$. From $z\mathcal{C}x$ and $z\mathcal{C}y$ we also have $z^*\mathcal{C}x^*$ and $z^*\mathcal{C}y^*$, so that $(x, y, z)Idis_1$ implies $(x^*, y^*, z^*)Idis_2$. Similarly $(y, z, x)Idis_1$ implies $(y^*, z^*, x^*)Idis_2$ and $(z, x, y)Idis_1$ implies $(z^*, x^*, y^*)Idis_2$. Moreover $(y, z, x)Idis_1$ follows similarly as $(z, x, y)Idis_1$, so that we need to prove only $(x, y, z)Idis_1$ and $(z, x, y)Idis_1$. Let us prove $(x, y, z)Idis_1$. Since by (IOM') and (IOM) , $x \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$ and $y \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$, we get $(x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^* \leq_Q x \rightarrow z^*$, $(x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^* \leq_Q y \rightarrow z^*$, so that $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \geq_Q (x \rightarrow z^*)^*$, $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \geq_Q (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$. Applying Lemma 3.9(2) for $X := ((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^*$, $Y := (x \rightarrow z^*)^*$, $Z := (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$, we get $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \geq_Q (x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$.

By Proposition 3.7(2), $u \leq_Q v$ implies $v = v \cup u = u^* \rightarrow (v \rightarrow u)^*$. Denoting $u = (x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow$

$(y \rightarrow z^*)^*$, $v = ((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^*$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
v \rightarrow u &= ((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*) \\
&= (x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*)) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= (x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z^*)^*)^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= (x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*) \\
&= (x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow x)^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*) \text{ (by Prop. 4.9, } z\mathcal{C}x^* \text{ implies} \\
&\hspace{15em} z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^* = z \rightarrow x) \\
&= (x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow z^*)^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*) \\
&= (x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow (z \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*)) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= (x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^*)) \\
&= (x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y)) \text{ (by Prop. 4.9, } z\mathcal{C}y^* \text{ implies} \\
&\hspace{15em} z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^* = z \rightarrow y) \\
&= (x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y)) \\
&= z \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y)) = z \rightarrow 1 = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* &= v = u^* \rightarrow (v \rightarrow u)^* = ((x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*)^* \rightarrow 0 \\
&= (x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $(x, y, z)Idis_1$. We prove now $(z, x, y)Idis_1$.

From $z \leq_Q z^* \rightarrow x$, $x \leq_Q z^* \rightarrow x$, we get $((z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow y^*)^* \geq_Q (z \rightarrow y^*)^*$ and $((z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow y^*)^* \geq_Q (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$, respectively. By Lemma 3.9(2), we have $((z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow y^*)^* \geq_Q (z \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$. By Proposition 3.7(2), $u \leq_Q v$ implies $v = v \uplus u = u^* \rightarrow (v \rightarrow u)^*$. Denoting $u = (z \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$, $v = ((z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow y^*)^*$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
v \rightarrow u &= ((z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow y^*)^* \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \\
&= (z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*)) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= (z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow ((y \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^*)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= (z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow ((y \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \\
&= (z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow ((y \rightarrow z)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \text{ (by Prop. 4.9, } y\mathcal{C}z^* \text{ implies} \\
&\hspace{15em} y \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^* = y \rightarrow z) \\
&= (z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow ((z^* \rightarrow y^*)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \\
&= (z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*)) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= ((z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow z)^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= (z^* \rightarrow x^*)^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \text{ (by Prop. 4.9, since } z^*\mathcal{C}x, \\
&\hspace{15em} (z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow z = z^* \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x)^* = z^* \rightarrow x^*) \\
&= z^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*)) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= z^* \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y^*)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= z^* \rightarrow 1 = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
((z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow y^*)^* &= v = u^* \rightarrow (v \rightarrow u)^* = ((z \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*)^* \rightarrow 0 \\
&= (z \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $(z, x, y)Idis_1$. We conclude that (x, y, z) is a distributive triple. \square

Corollary 4.17. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice and let $x_1, x_2, y \in X$, such that, for each $i = 1, 2$, $x_i \leq_Q y$ or $x_i \geq_Q y$. Then the triple (x_1, x_2, y) is distributive.*

Proof. If $x_i \leq_Q y$ or $x_i \geq_Q y$, then $x_i\mathcal{C}y$, $i = 1, 2$, and we apply Theorem 4.16. \square

The next result allows us to characterize the distributivity of an implicative-orthomodular lattice by divisibility property.

Proposition 4.18. *Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra, and let $x, y, z \in X$. If $(z, x)Idiv$ and $(z, y)Idiv$, then $(x, y, z)Idis_1$.*

Proof. Assume that $(z, x)Idiv$ and $(z, y)Idiv$. Since $x \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$ and $y \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$, we have $(x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^* \leq_Q x \rightarrow z^*$, $(x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^* \leq_Q y \rightarrow z^*$, so that $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \geq_Q (x \rightarrow z^*)^*$, $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \geq_Q (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$. Applying Lemma 3.9(2) for $X := ((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^*$, $Y := (x \rightarrow z^*)^*$, $Z := (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$, we get $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \geq_Q (x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$.

Now we prove that $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \leq (x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$. Indeed, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
x^* \rightarrow y &\leq_Q z \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y) \\
&= (z \rightarrow z^*)^* \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y) \text{ (by (iG))} \\
&= z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y)) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= z \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y)) \\
&= (z \rightarrow x)^* \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \rightarrow (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^*) \text{ (since (z, x)Idiv, (z, y)Idiv)} \\
&= z \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^*)) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^*)) \\
&= (z \rightarrow z^*)^* \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^*) \text{ (by Lemma 2.1(7))} \\
&= z \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^*) \text{ (by (iG))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $x^* \rightarrow y \leq_Q z \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^*)$, so that, by Proposition 2.3(4), $(x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^*)) = 1$. Applying Lemma 2.1(7), it follows that $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^*) = 1$, that is $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \leq ((z \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y^*)^*)$. Taking into consideration that $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \geq_Q (x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$, by Proposition 3.8(6), we get $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* = (x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$, that is $(x, y, z)Idis_1$. \square

Theorem 4.19. *An implicative-orthomodular lattice X is distributive if and only if it satisfies condition $(Idiv)$.*

Proof. Assume that X satisfies condition $(Idiv)$. Since $(x, y)Idiv$, for each $x, y \in X$, then by Proposition 4.9, xCy , for each $x, y \in X$. Applying Proposition 4.18 and Lemma 4.8, it follows that $(x, y, z)Idis_1$ and $(x^*, y^*, z^*)Idis_1$, for each $x, y, z \in X$. Since $(x^*, y^*, z^*)Idis_1$ is equivalent to $(x, y, z)Idis_2$, it follows that $(x, y, z)Idis$, for each $x, y, z \in X$, hence X is distributive.

Conversely, assume that $(x, y, z)Idis_1$ holds, thus $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* = (x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*$, for all $x, y, z \in X$. Replacing y by z^* in $(x, y, z)Idis_1$ we get $z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x)^* = z \rightarrow x^*$, so that $(z, x)Idiv$, for all $z, x \in X$, hence X satisfies condition $(Idiv)$. \square

5. IMPLICATIVE-BOOLEAN CENTER OF IMPLICATIVE-ORTHOMODULAR LATTICES

In this section, we prove in the case of implicative-orthomodular lattices other notions and results studied in [10] for orthomodular lattices. We define the center $\mathcal{C}(X)$ of an implicative-orthomodular lattice X as the set of all elements of X that commute with all other elements of X , and we prove that $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is an implicative-Boolean subalgebra of X . We give a characterization of $\mathcal{C}(X)$ with respect to the set $\mathcal{K}(x)$ of all complements of an element $x \in X$. As a

generalization of the concept of the center of an implicative-orthomodular lattice X , we define the commutor Y^c of a subset Y of X proving that Y^c is a sublattice of X containing $\mathcal{C}(X)$.

Proposition 5.1. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice and let $x, y, z \in X$. If $x\mathcal{C}z$ and $y\mathcal{C}z$, then $(x \rightarrow y)\mathcal{C}z$.*

Proof. By (IOM') and (IOM) , we have $x^* \leq_Q x \rightarrow y$ and $y \leq_Q x \rightarrow y$, respectively. Applying Lemma 3.9(1), we get:

$$(x^* \rightarrow z^*)^* \leq_Q ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^* \text{ and } (y \rightarrow z^*)^* \leq_Q ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^*.$$

Using Lemma 3.9(2), it follows that:

$$(x^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^* \leq_Q ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*)^*.$$

Similarly we have:

$$(x^* \rightarrow z) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z)^* \leq_Q ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z)^*.$$

By Lemma 3.9(3), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} ((x^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z^*)^*)^* \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow z) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z)^*) &\leq_Q \\ ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z)^* & \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 2.2, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} ((x^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow z^*)^*)^* \rightarrow ((y \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z)^*) &\leq_Q \\ ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z)^* & \end{aligned}$$

Since $x^*\mathcal{C}z$ and $y\mathcal{C}z$, we get:

$$x \rightarrow y \leq_Q ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z)^*.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.9(4),

$$((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z)^* \leq_Q x \rightarrow y.$$

Since \leq_Q is antisymmetric, it follows that

$$((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow z)^* = x \rightarrow y,$$

hence $(x \rightarrow y)\mathcal{C}z$. \square

Definition 5.2. The *center* of X is the set $\mathcal{C}(X) = \{x \in X \mid x\mathcal{C}y, \text{ for all } y \in X\}$.

Remark 5.3. Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice and let $x_1, x_2, y \in X$, such that $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ or $y \in \mathcal{C}(X)$. Then the triple (x_1, x_2, y) is distributive.

Proof. If $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ or $y \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, then $x_1\mathcal{C}y$ and $x_2\mathcal{C}y$, and we apply Theorem 4.16. \square

The notion of *implicative-Boolean algebras* was introduced by A. Iorgulescu in 2009 as implicative involutive BE algebras $(X, \rightarrow, *, 1)$ satisfying condition $(Idiv)$ (see [13, Def. 3.4.12]).

Theorem 5.4. *The center $\mathcal{C}(X)$ of an implicative-orthomodular lattice X is an implicative-Boolean subalgebra of X .*

Proof. According to Lemma 4.4, $0, 1 \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, and, by Proposition 5.1, $x \rightarrow y \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, whenever $x, y \in \mathcal{C}(X)$. Hence $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is a subalgebra of X . By Foulis-Holland theorem, $\mathcal{C}(X)$ satisfies condition $(Idis)$, and according to Theorem 4.19, it also satisfies condition $(Idiv)$. It follows that $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is an implicative-Boolean algebra. \square

Corollary 5.5. *If X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice such that $x\mathcal{C}y$ for all $x, y \in X$, then X is an implicative-Boolean algebra.*

For $x \in X$, denote $\mathcal{K}(x) = \{z \in X \mid x \rightarrow z^* = x^* \rightarrow z = 1\}$, that is the set of all complements of x . Obviously $x^* \in \mathcal{K}(x)$.

Theorem 5.6. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice, let $x \in X$ and denote $x_z = (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*) \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x)^*$, with $z \in X$. The following hold:*

- (1) $x_z \in \mathcal{K}(x)$;
- (2) for any $y \in \mathcal{K}(x)$, there exists $z \in X$ such that $y = x_z$;
- (3) $x_z = x^*$ if and only if $x\mathcal{C}z$.

Proof. (1) We have:

$$\begin{aligned} x^* \rightarrow x_z &= x^* \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*) \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x)^*) \\ &= (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x)^*) \\ &= ((x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow ((z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow x) \\ &= (x \cup z^*) \rightarrow (z^* \cup x) \\ &= 1 \text{ (by Prop. 3.12)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.9(5), we have $(z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \leq_Q z^* \rightarrow x$, so that $(z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^*\mathcal{C}(z^* \rightarrow x)$, hence $(z^* \rightarrow x)^*\mathcal{C}(z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^*$. Moreover, since $x \leq_Q z^* \rightarrow x$, we get $x\mathcal{C}(z^* \rightarrow x)$, hence $(z^* \rightarrow x)^*\mathcal{C}x$. By Foulis-Holland theorem, it follows that $((z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^*, (z^* \rightarrow x)^*, x)Idis_1$. Denoting $X := (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^*$, $Y := (z^* \rightarrow x)^*$, $Z := x$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (X^* \rightarrow Y) \rightarrow Z^* &= ((z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*) \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x)^*) \rightarrow x^* \\ &= x \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*) \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x)^*)^* = x \rightarrow x_z^*, \text{ and} \\ (X \rightarrow Z^*) \rightarrow (Y \rightarrow Z^*)^* &= (Z \rightarrow X^*) \rightarrow (Z \rightarrow Y^*)^* \\ &= (x \rightarrow (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x)^*)^* \\ &= (x \rightarrow (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*) \rightarrow 1^*) \\ &= (x \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow z^*))^* \\ &= ((x \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z^*))^* = 1^* = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $((X^* \rightarrow Y) \rightarrow Z^*)^* = (X \rightarrow Z^*) \rightarrow (Y \rightarrow Z^*)^*$, it follows that $(x \rightarrow x_z^*)^* = 0$, that is $x \rightarrow x_z^* = 1$. Hence $x_z \in \mathcal{K}(x)$.

(2) Let $y \in \mathcal{K}(x)$, that is $x^* \rightarrow y = x \rightarrow y^* = 1$. Taking $z := y$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} x_z &= x_y = (y \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x^*)^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow x)^* \\ &= (y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y)^* \\ &= (y \rightarrow 1^*) \rightarrow 1^* = y^{**} = y. \end{aligned}$$

(3) If $z\mathcal{C}x$, then $z\mathcal{C}x^*$ and $x^*\mathcal{C}z$. According to Proposition 4.9, $z\mathcal{C}x^*$ implies $(z, x^*)Idiv$, and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} x_z &= (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*) \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x)^* \\ &= ((z \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x)^* \text{ (since } (x^*, z)Idiv)) \\ &= (x^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow z)^* \\ &= x^* \text{ (since } x^*\mathcal{C}z). \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, suppose $x_z = x^*$, and we have successively:

$$\begin{aligned} (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*) \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x)^* &= x^*, \\ (z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* &= x^*, \\ (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \leq_Q (z^* \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* &= x^*, \\ (z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \leq_Q x^*. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $z^* \leq_Q z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*$, so that $(z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \leq_Q z$. Applying Lemma 2.4, we get $(z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \leq_Q (x^* \rightarrow z^*)^* = (z \rightarrow x)^*$. It follows that $z \rightarrow x \leq_Q z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^*$. Since $x^* \leq_Q z \rightarrow x^*$ implies $(z \rightarrow x^*)^* \leq_Q x$, we have $z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^* \leq_Q z \rightarrow x$, hence $z \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x^*)^* = z \rightarrow x$. It follows that $(z, x^*)Idiv$, and applying Proposition 4.9, we get $z\mathcal{C}x^*$, and finally, $x\mathcal{C}z$. \square

Corollary 5.7. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice and let $x \in X$. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) $x \in \mathcal{C}(X)$;
- (b) $\mathcal{K}(x) = \{x^*\}$.

Proof. By Theorem 5.6(1),(2), it follows that $\mathcal{K}(x) = \{x_z \mid z \in X\}$. Since by Theorem 5.6(3), $x_z = x^*$ if and only if $x\mathcal{C}z$, we have $\mathcal{K}(x) = \{x^*\}$ if and only if $x\mathcal{C}z$, for all $z \in X$. Hence $\mathcal{K}(x) = \{x^*\}$ if and only if $x \in \mathcal{C}(X)$. \square

The notion of a commutor generalizes the concept of the center of an implicative-orthomodular lattice.

Definition 5.8. Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice, and let $Y \subseteq X$ be a nonempty subset of X . The *commutor* of Y is the set $Y^c = \{x \in X \mid x\mathcal{C}y, \text{ for all } y \in Y\}$.

Proposition 5.9. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice, and let $Y \subseteq X$ be a nonempty subset of X . The following hold:*

- (1) Y^c is a sublattice of X ;
- (2) $\mathcal{C}(X) \subseteq Y^c$;
- (3) $X^c = X$.

Proof. (1) By Lemma 4.4, $0, 1 \in Y^c$. Let $x, y \in Y^c$, that is $x\mathcal{C}z$ and $y\mathcal{C}z$ for all $z \in Y$. By Proposition 5.1, $(x \rightarrow y)\mathcal{C}z$, hence $x \rightarrow y \in Y^c$. Hence Y^c is a sublattice of X .

(2) and (3) are obvious. \square

6. APPLICATIONS OF FOULIS-HOLLAND THEOREM

Foulis-Holland theorem provides a method to prove new properties of implicative-orthomodular lattices. We prove for the case of implicative-orthomodular lattices a characterization of orthomodular lattices given in [5] by S. Bonzio and I. Chajda. We also prove new properties, and we give new proofs of certain known properties of implicative-orthomodular lattices.

Theorem 6.1. *Let X be an implicative involutive BE algebra. Then following are equivalent:*

- (a) X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice;
- (b) for all $x, y \in X$,

$$((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y)^*)^* = x^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y^*).$$

Proof. Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice, and let $x, y \in X$. By (IOM) , $(IOM)'$, we have $x \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$ and $y \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$. Using Lemma 4.4, we get $x\mathcal{C}(x^* \rightarrow y)$, $y\mathcal{C}(x^* \rightarrow y)$, so that, by Theorem 4.7 and Lemma 4.8, it follows that $(x^* \rightarrow y)\mathcal{C}x$ and $(x^* \rightarrow y)\mathcal{C}y^*$. Hence, by Foulis-Holland theorem, the triple $(x, y^*, x^* \rightarrow y)$ is distributive, that is it satisfies condition $(Idis_1)$. It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y)^*)^* &= (x \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y)^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y)^*)^* \\ &= ((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y)^* \\ &= x^* \rightarrow (x^* \sqcup y)^* \text{ (by (Impl))} \\ &= x^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y^*). \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, assume that X satisfies the above identity, and let $x, y \in X$ such that $x \leq_L y$. Then also $y^* \leq_L x^*$, so that $y = x^* \rightarrow y$, and we have: $((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y)^*)^* = ((x^* \rightarrow$

$y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* = x \pitchfork y$. Moreover, since $y^* \leq_L x^*$ implies $y = x^* \rightarrow y$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} x^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y^*) &= x^* \rightarrow (x^* \sqcup y)^* = (x^* \sqcup y) \rightarrow x \\ &= ((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x = (y \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x = x. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $x = x \pitchfork y$, so that $x \leq_Q y$. Hence $x \leq_L y$ implies $x \leq_Q y$, and according to Theorem 3.13, X is an implicative-orthomodular lattice. \square

Remark 6.2. Using the mutually inverse transformations

$$\varphi : x \rightarrow y := (x \wedge y')' \quad \text{and} \quad \psi : x \wedge y := (x \rightarrow y^*)^*,$$

and the relation $x \vee y := (x' \wedge y')' = x^* \rightarrow y$, we can easily check that the identity from Theorem 6.1 is equivalent to the identity

$$x \vee (y' \wedge (x \vee y)) = (x \vee y') \wedge (x \vee y),$$

used in [5, Th. 2] in the case of an ortholattice $(L, \vee, \wedge, ', 0, 1)$.

The next result gives a necessary condition for an implicative involutive BE algebra to be an implicative-orthomodular lattice.

Proposition 6.3. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice. Then the following holds, for all $x, y \in X$:*


$$x^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y^*) = x^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y).$$

Proof. Let $x, y \in X$. Similarly as in Theorem 6.1, we get that the triple $(x, y, x^* \rightarrow y^*)$ is distributive, so that it satisfies condition $(Idis_1)$. Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} ((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^*)^* &= (x \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^*)^* \\ &= ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* \\ &= x^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y) \quad (\text{by } (Impl)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $((x^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^*)^* = ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y)^*)^*$, so that, by Theorem 6.1, we get $x^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y^*) = x^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)$. \square

Example 6.4. *Consider the algebra $\mathbf{O}_6 = (O_6, \rightarrow, *, 1)$, with $O_6 = \{0, x, y, x^*, y^*, 1\}$ and \rightarrow defined below.*



We can easily check that \mathbf{O}_6 is an implicative involutive BE algebra, but it is not an implicative-orthomodular lattice. Indeed, we have $(x \rightarrow y^*)^* = x$ and $x \pitchfork y = y$, so that $x \leq_L y$, but $x \not\leq_Q y$, hence, by Theorem 3.13, \mathbf{O}_6 is not an implicative-orthomodular lattice.

Remark 6.5. An implicative-orthomodular lattice X does not contain a subalgebra isomorphic to \mathbf{O}_6 . Indeed, in such a case, $x = x^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y^*) = x^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y) = y$, a contradiction, so that the identity from Proposition 6.3 is not satisfied.

Proposition 6.6. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice, and let $x, y \in X$. Then $x \rightarrow (x^* \pitchfork y^*) = x^*$ iff $y \rightarrow (y^* \pitchfork x^*) = y^*$.*

Proof. Since $x^* \leq_Q x \rightarrow y$ and $y \leq_Q x \rightarrow y$, we get $x^*\mathcal{C}(x \rightarrow y)$ and $y\mathcal{C}(x \rightarrow y)$, so that $(x \rightarrow y)\mathcal{C}x^*$ and $(x \rightarrow y)\mathcal{C}y^*$. By Foulis-Holland theorem, the triple $(x^*, y^*, x \rightarrow y)$ is distributive, and applying $(Idis_1)$ for $X := x^*$, $Y := y^*$ and $Z := x \rightarrow y$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* &= (x^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* \\ &= ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y)^* \\ &= x \rightarrow (x \uplus y)^* \text{ (by } (Impl)) \\ &= x \rightarrow (x^* \mathbin{\&}\! \mathbin{\&}\! y^*). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the triple $(y^*, x^*, y \rightarrow x)$ is distributive, and we get: $((y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x)^*)^* = y \rightarrow (y^* \mathbin{\&}\! \mathbin{\&}\! x^*)$. If $x \rightarrow (x^* \mathbin{\&}\! \mathbin{\&}\! y^*) = x^*$, it follows that $((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* = x^*$, hence $(x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = x$, that is $x\mathcal{C}y$. By Theorem 4.7, we have $y\mathcal{C}x$, so that $(y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x)^* = y$, hence $y \rightarrow (y^* \mathbin{\&}\! \mathbin{\&}\! x^*) = ((y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x)^*)^* = y^*$. The converse follows similarly. \square

Using the Foulis-Holland theorem, we can give new proofs of certain known properties of implicative-orthomodular lattices.

Proposition 6.7. *Let X be an implicative-orthomodular lattice. The following hold for all $x, y \in X$:*

- (1) $x \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\&}\! \mathbin{\&}\! x) = x \rightarrow y$;
- (2) $(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\&}\! \mathbin{\&}\! x) = x$;
- (3) $(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x) = y \rightarrow x$;
- (4) $(x \uplus y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = y^*$.

Proof. (1) Since $x\mathcal{C}x^*$, and $x^*\mathcal{C}(y^* \rightarrow x^*)$ implies $x\mathcal{C}(y^* \rightarrow x^*)^*$, by Foulis-Holland theorem the triple $((y^* \rightarrow x^*)^*, x^*, x)$ is distributive. Applying $(Idis_1)$ for $X := (y^* \rightarrow x^*)^*$, $Y := x^*$, $Z := x$, we get successively:

$$\begin{aligned} (((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* &= ((y^* \rightarrow x^*)^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow x^*)^*, \\ ((y^* \uplus x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* &= (x \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow x^*)) \rightarrow 1^*, \\ (x \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\&}\! \mathbin{\&}\! x))^* &= (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y))^*, \\ x \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\&}\! \mathbin{\&}\! x) &= x \rightarrow y \text{ (by } (Pimpl)). \end{aligned}$$

(2) Obviously, $(x \rightarrow y)\mathcal{C}(x \rightarrow y)^*$ implies $(x \rightarrow y)\mathcal{C}(y^* \rightarrow x^*)^*$, and $x^*\mathcal{C}(x \rightarrow y)$ implies $(x \rightarrow y)\mathcal{C}x^*$. Hence the triple $((y^* \rightarrow x^*)^*, x^*, x \rightarrow y)$ is distributive. By $(Idis_1)$ for $X := (y^* \rightarrow x^*)^*$, $Y := x^*$, $Z := x \rightarrow y$, we have successively:

$$\begin{aligned} (((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* &= ((y^* \rightarrow x^*)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^*, \\ ((y^* \uplus x^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* &= ((x \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x)^*, \\ ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\&}\! \mathbin{\&}\! x))^* &= 1 \rightarrow x^* \text{ (by } (Impl)), \\ (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\&}\! \mathbin{\&}\! x) &= x. \end{aligned}$$

(3) We have $((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x))^* = ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*))^*$, and using $(Idis_1)$ for the distributive triple $(x^*, y, (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^*)$, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*))^* &= (x^* \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*)) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*))^* \\ &= (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow y^*))^* \text{ (by } (Pimpl)) \\ &= (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^* \text{ (by } (iG)) \\ &= (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^* \text{ (by } (iG)) \\ &= (y \rightarrow x)^*. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x) = y \rightarrow x$.

(4) The triple $((x \rightarrow y)^*, y, (x \rightarrow y))$ is distributive, hence, by $(Idis_1)$ for $X := (x \rightarrow y)^*$, $Y := y$, $Z := x \rightarrow y$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
((x \cup y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* &= (((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* \\
&= (((x \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*))^* \\
&= 1 \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y^*)^* \\
&= ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* \\
&= (y^*)^* = y \text{ (by (Impl))}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $(x \cup y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = y^*$. □

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Balbes, P. Dwinger, *Distributive lattices*, Univ. Missouri Press, 1974.
- [2] L. Beran, *Orthomodular Lattices: Algebraic Approach. Mathematics and its Applications*, Springer, Netherland, 1985.
- [3] G. Birkhoff, J. von Neumann, *The logic of quantum mechanics*, Ann. Math. **37**(1936), 823–834.
- [4] G. Birkhoff, *Lattice theory*, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloq. Publ., Amer. Math. Soc., 1961.
- [5] S. Bonzio, I. Chajda, *A note on orthomodular lattices*, Internat. J. Theoret. Phys. **56**(2017), 3740–3743.
- [6] L.C. Ciungu, *Implicative-orthomodular lattices*, arxiv.org:2401.12845.
- [7] A. Dvurečenskij, S. Pulmannová, *New trends in Quantum Structures*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Ister Science, Bratislava, 2000.
- [8] A. Dvurečenskij, M. Kúková, *Observables on quantum structures*, Inf. sci. **262**(2014), 215–222.
- [9] D.J. Foulis, *A note on orthomodular lattices*, Portugal. Math. **21**(1962), 65–72.
- [10] S.S. Holland, *A Radon-Nikodim theorem in dimension lattices*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **108**(1963), 66–87.
- [11] S.S. Holland, *Distributivity and perspectivity in orthomodular lattices*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **112**(1964), 330–343.
- [12] A. Iorgulescu, *On quantum-MV algebras - Part II: Orthomodular lattices, softlattices and widelattices*, Trans. Fuzzy Sets Syst. **1**(2022), 1–41.
- [13] A. Iorgulescu, *BCK algebras versus m-BCK algebras*. Foundations, Studies in Logic, Vol. 96, 2022.
- [14] H.S. Kim, Y.H. Kim, *On BE-algebras*, Sci. Math. Jpn. **66**(2007), 113–116.
- [15] R. Padmanabhan, S. Rudeanu, *Axioms for lattices and Boolean algebras*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2008.
- [16] V.S. Varadarajan, *Geometry of Quantum Theory*, Vol. 1, D. Van Nostrand, Princeton, New Jersey, 1968.