



ELSEVIER

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

Discrete Mathematics 269 (2003) 93–112

**DISCRETE
MATHEMATICS**

www.elsevier.com/locate/disc

Finite BL-algebras

Antonio Di Nola^a, Ada Lettieri^{b,*}^a*Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università di Salerno, Via S. Allende,
Baronissi, Salerno, Italy*^b*Dipartimento di Costruzioni e Metodi Matematici in Architettura, Università di Napoli "Federico II",
Via Monteoliveto 3, 80134 Napoli, Italy*

Received 24 June 2002; accepted 22 July 2002

Abstract

BL-algebras were introduced by Hájek as algebraic structures of Basic Logic. The aim of this paper is to analyze the structure of finite BL-algebras. Extending the notion of ordinal sum, we characterize a class of finite BL-algebras, actually BL-comets. Then, just using BL-comets, we can represent any finite BL-algebra as a direct product of BL-comets. Furthermore we define a class of labelled trees, which can be one-to-one mapped onto finite BL-algebras.

© 2002 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: BL-algebra; BL-comet; Labelled tree

1. Introduction

BL-algebras were introduced by Hájek [4] as algebraic structures of Basic Logic. A BL-algebra is an algebra $A = (A, \wedge, \vee, \odot, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$ such that:

1. $(A, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ is a lattice with 0 as least element and 1 as greatest element,
2. $(A, \odot, 1)$ is a commutative monoid,
3. the following statements hold for every $x, y, z \in A$:

- (a) $z \leq x \rightarrow y$ iff $x \odot z \leq y$,
- (b) $x \wedge y = x \odot (x \rightarrow y)$,
- (c) $(x \rightarrow y) \vee (y \rightarrow x) = 1$.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: dinola@unisa.it (A. Di Nola), letteri@unina.it (A. Lettieri).

By former operations a negation operation $*$ is defined in the following way: $x^* = x \rightarrow 0$, for every $x \in A$. We will write x^p instead of $\underbrace{x \odot \cdots \odot x}_p$.

The set of all BL-algebras is a variety, whose subvariety defined by the further axiom $(x^*)^* = x$, for every $x \in A$, coincides with the variety of MV-algebras. Let A be a BL-algebra and $MV(A) = \{x \in A \mid x^{**} = x\}$. $MV(A)$ is a subalgebra of A . It is the greatest subalgebra of A that is an MV-algebra [4].

We say that the BL-algebra A is totally ordered or that the BL-algebra A is a chain (shortly BL-chain) if the lattice $(A, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ is totally ordered. Every BL-algebra is a subdirect product of BL-chains [4].

We say that the BL-algebra A is finite if the cardinal of the set A is finite.

The aim of this paper is to analyze the structure of finite BL-algebras. In the case of MV-algebras their structure is already well known. Every finite BL-chain is a finite ordinal sum whose components are finite MV-chains (see [1, Theorem 3.6]). Extending the notion of ordinal sum of BL-algebras (see Preliminaries), we characterize a class of finite BL-algebras, actually BL-comets (see Section 4) which can be seen as a generalization of finite BL-chains. Then, just using BL-comets, we can represent any finite BL-algebra A as a direct product of BL-comets. This result can be understood as a generalization of the representation of finite MV-algebras as a direct product of MV-chains (see [3]). Furthermore, in Section 5 we define a class of labelled trees, which can be one-to-one mapped onto finite BL-algebras. The class of all finite BL-algebras will be denoted by **FBL**. For any unexplained notion on MV-algebras see [3], on BL-algebras see [4].

2. Preliminaries

Let A be a finite BL-algebra, subdirect product of the BL-chains C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n . We say that the chain C_i , $i \in I_n = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, is *essential* in the representation of A iff A is not a subdirect product of $C'_1, \dots, C'_{i-1}, C'_{i+1}, \dots, C'_n$, with $C'_t \cong C_t$ for every $t \in \{1, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, n\}$. Let us assume that every chain C_i is essential in the representation of A .

Definition 1 (Agliano and Montagna [1]). Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (A_i, \wedge_i, \vee_i, \odot_i, \rightarrow_i, 0_i, 1)$ be BL-chains for $i \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$ and a BL-algebra for $i = r$. Assume:

1. $A_i \cap A_j = \{1\}$, for $i \neq j$.

Then the ordinal sum $\biguplus_{i=1}^r A_i = (\bigcup_{i=1}^r A_i, \wedge, \vee, \odot, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$ is a new BL-algebra whose operations \wedge, \vee, \odot coincide with those of A_i , when applied on pairs of elements of A_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, and on the rest of pairs are defined as follows, for $x \in A_i \setminus \{1\}$, $y \in A_j$ and $i < j$:

1. $x \wedge y = y \wedge x = x$,
2. $x \vee y = y \vee x = y$,
3. $x \odot y = y \odot x = x$.

Finally, the operation \rightarrow is defined by

$$x \rightarrow y = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \leq y, \\ x \rightarrow_i y & \text{if } x, y \in A_i, \\ y & \text{if } x \in A_i, y \in A_j \text{ and } i > j. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ denote by $0_i = \alpha_{i,0} < \alpha_{i,1} < \dots < \alpha_{i,n_i} < \alpha_{i,n_i+1} = 1_i$ the chain of the idempotent elements of C_i , shortly $\mathbb{I}(C_i, n_i + 1)$. By [1] Theorem 3.6, C_i is an ordinal sum of finite MV-chains, i.e. finite BL-chains that are MV-algebras, in symbols $C_i = \bigoplus_{h=1}^{n_i+1} M(\alpha, i, h)$, where $M(\alpha, i, h) = [\alpha_{i,h-1}, \alpha_{i,h}[\cup\{1_i\}$. Then for every $i \in I_n$ and $h \in \{1, \dots, n_i + 1\}$ the restrictions of the operations defined on C_i to the subset $M(\alpha, i, h)$ make it into a finite MV-chain, hence it is isomorphic to the MV-algebra $S_p = \{0, 1/p, \dots, (p-1)/p, 1\}$, for some $p \geq 1$. From now on, every time we will deal with a finite BL-algebra A , we will use the above notations to give a subdirect representation of A by finite BL-chains and the decomposition of such chains as ordinal sum. Furthermore, in the sequel, every finite MV-chain will be identified with the subalgebra of $[0, 1]$, which it is isomorphic to. For every $f \in A$, denote by f_i the i th component of f . Moreover, for every $x \in C_i$, set $\alpha(x) = \max\{y \in \mathbb{I}(C_i, n_i + 1) \mid y \leq x\}$ and for every $f \in A$, set $\alpha(f) = (\alpha(f_1), \dots, \alpha(f_n))$. If $f \in A$, then $\alpha(f) \in A$. Indeed, let $f_i \in M(\alpha, i, h_i) \cong S_{p_i}$ and $\mu = \max\{p_i, i \in I_n\}$; then $f^\mu = \alpha(f)$. In the sequel we will mean $\alpha_{i,h} = \alpha_{j,k}$ if $h = k, h, k < \min\{n_i + 1, n_j + 1\}$. Moreover, we will denote by α_h the n -tuple $(\alpha_{1,h}, \dots, \alpha_{n,h})$, for every $h \leq \min\{n_i + 1, i \in I_n\}$, by $\mathbf{1}$ the n -tuple, having its i th component equal to 1_i and by $\mathbf{0}$ the n -tuple, having its i th component equal to 0_i , for every $i \in I_n$.

With the above notations we get.

Proposition 2. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$ and $f, g \in A$ such that for some $(i, j) \in I_n^2$:

1. $f_i = \alpha_{i,h}$ and $g_i = \alpha_{i,k}$, $h = 0, 1, \dots, n_i + 1$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i + 1$, $h \neq k$,
2. $f_j = g_j = \alpha_{j,m}$, $m = 0, 1, \dots, n_j + 1$.

Then, for every $(x, y) \geq (\alpha_{i,t}, \alpha_{j,m})$, $t = \min\{h, k\}$, there is an element $l \in A$ such that $(l_i, l_j) = (x, y)$.

Proof. Assume $h < k$ and $(x, y) \geq (\alpha_{i,h}, \alpha_{j,m})$. Let u be an element of A , having its i th component equal to x and v be an element of A , having its j th component equal to y . Then $l = ((g \rightarrow f) \vee u) \wedge (((g \rightarrow f) \rightarrow f) \vee v)$ verifies the claim. \square

Proposition 3. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$ and $f \in A$ such that for some $(i, j) \in I_n^2$:

$$(f_i, f_j) = (\alpha_{i,h}, \alpha_{j,k}), \quad h = 0, 1, \dots, n_i + 1, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n_j + 1, \quad h \neq k.$$

Then there is $g \in A$ such that $(g_i, g_j) = (\alpha_{i,t}, \alpha_{j,t})$, $t = \min\{h, k\}$.

Proof. Assume $h < k$. If $h = 0$, then it is trivial. For otherwise let w be an element of A , having its j th component equal to $\alpha_{j,h}$. Set $\alpha(w_i) = \alpha_{i,h_1}$ for a suitable h_1 .

If $h_1 \geq h$, then $g = w \wedge f \in A$ verifies the claim.

If $h_1 < h$, we choose an element $w^1 \in A$, having its j th component equal to α_{j,h_1} . Set $\alpha(w_i^1) = \alpha_{i,h_2}$. If $h_2 \geq h_1$, then $w^1 \wedge \alpha(w) \in A$, moreover $w_i^1 \wedge \alpha(w_i) = \alpha_{i,h_1}$ and $w_j^1 \wedge \alpha(w_j) = \alpha_{j,h_1}$. Hence, the conclusion follows from Proposition 2. If $h_2 < h_1$, proceeding as above, the thesis shall be attained as soon as we find an element w^r such that $\alpha(w_j^r) = \alpha_{j,h_r}$, $\alpha(w_i^r) = \alpha_{i,h_{r+1}}$ and $h_{r+1} \geq h_r$. If the last condition is never verified, then we get a strictly decreasing sequence $k > h > h_1 > h_2 > \dots > h_r > \dots$ of natural numbers; consequently there must ultimately be an s , such that $h_s = 0$. Hence we will find an element w^{s-1} such that $(\alpha(w_i^{s-1}), \alpha(w_j^{s-1})) = (0_i, \alpha_{j,h_{s-1}})$, where $\alpha_{j,h_{s-1}} \neq 0_j$. Also in this case the claim follows by Proposition 2. \square

Corollary 4. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$ and $f \in A$ such that for some $(i, j) \in I_n^2$:

$$(f_i, f_j) = (\alpha_{i,h}, \alpha_{j,k}), \quad h \text{ and } k \text{ run from } 0, 1, \dots, \text{ like in Proposition 3.}$$

Then for every $(x, y) \geq (\alpha_{i,t}, \alpha_{j,t})$, with $t = \min\{h, k\}$, there is an element $l \in A$, such that $(l_i, l_j) = (x, y)$.

Proof. It follows by Propositions 2 and 3. \square

Corollary 5. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$. Then, for every $h \leq \min\{n_i + 1, i \in I_n\}$, $\alpha_h = (\alpha_{1,h}, \dots, \alpha_{n,h}) \in A$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on n . Let $n = 2$, $h \leq \min\{n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1\}$, and $x, y \in A$ such that $x_1 = \alpha_{1,h}$ and $y_2 = \alpha_{2,h}$. If x and y are incomparable, then either $x \vee y = \alpha_h$ or $x \wedge y = \alpha_h$. Otherwise, consider $\alpha(x_2) = \alpha_{2,t}$ and $\alpha(y_1) = \alpha_{1,l}$. If $t = h$ or $l = h$, then either $\alpha(x) = \alpha_h$ or $\alpha(y) = \alpha_h$. Assume either $l > h$ or $t > h$; in both cases the conclusion follows from Proposition 3.

Suppose now the corollary true for $n - 1$. Set $I_n^i = I_n \setminus \{i\}$ and let $A_{\uparrow\{I_n^i\}}$ be the set of the restrictions of all the elements of A to I_n^i ; $A_{\uparrow\{I_n^i\}}$ is a finite BL-algebra and it is, up to isomorphism, a subdirect product of $\{C_i, i \in I_n^i\}$. Fix $h \leq \min\{n_i + 1, i \in I_n\}$. By induction, for every $i \in I_n$, there is an element $x^i \in A$ such that $(x^i)_j = \alpha_{j,h}$ for $j \neq i$. If two of the elements x^1, x^2 and x^3 are incomparable, say x^1 and x^2 , then either $x^1 \vee x^2$ or $x^1 \wedge x^2$ satisfies the claim. Otherwise x^1, x^2 and x^3 are comparable. We safely can set $x^1 \leq x^2 \leq x^3$. Then we have $\alpha_{2,h} \leq x_2^2 \leq \alpha_{2,h}$, that is $x_2^2 = \alpha_{2,h}$. From that we get $x^2 = \alpha_h \in A$. \square

Lemma 6. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$, $i, j \in I_n$, $h = 1, \dots, n_i + 1$, $k = 1, \dots, n_j + 1$ and $h \neq k$. Then the following are equivalent:

1. there exists $f \in A$ such that $(f_i, f_j) \in M(\alpha, i, h) \times M(\alpha, j, k) \setminus \{(1_i, 1_j)\}$,
2. for every $(x, y) \geq (\alpha_{i,h-1}, \alpha_{j,k-1})$ there is an element $g \in A$ such that $(g_i, g_j) = (x, y)$.

Proof. Let $f \in A$ such that $(f_i, f_j) \in M(\alpha, i, h) \times M(\alpha, j, k) \setminus \{(1_i, 1_j)\}$. Then

$$(\alpha(f_i), \alpha(f_j)) = \begin{cases} (\alpha_{i,h-1}, \alpha_{j,k-1}) & \text{if } \alpha(f_i) \neq 1_i \text{ and } \alpha(f_j) \neq 1_j, \\ (\alpha_{i,h-1}, 1_j) & \text{if } \alpha(f_j) = 1_j, \\ (1_i, \alpha_{j,k-1}) & \text{if } \alpha(f_i) = 1_i. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Thus, the conclusion follows by Corollary 4. Vice versa is obvious. \square

Lemma 7. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$, $h \leq \min\{n_i + 1, n_j + 1 : i, j \in I_n\}$, $M(\alpha, i, h) \cong S_p$, $M(\alpha, j, h) \cong S_q$ and $p \neq q$.

Then for every $(x, y) \geq (\alpha_{i, h-1}, \alpha_{j, h-1})$, there is an element $g \in A$ such that $(g_i, g_j) = (x, y)$.

Proof. Let $p < q$ and $f \in A$ such that $f_j = (q - 1)/q \in M(\alpha, j, h)$.

If $f_i < \alpha_{i, h-1}$, we get $(\alpha(f_i), \alpha(f_j)) = (\alpha_{i, k}, \alpha_{j, h-1})$, $k < h - 1$.

If $\alpha_{i, h-1} \leq f_i < \alpha_{i, h}$, then $(f^p \rightarrow \alpha_{h-1})^q$ is an element of A , having its i th component equal to 1_i and its j th component equal to $\alpha_{j, h-1}$.

Finally, if $f_i \geq \alpha_{i, h}$, we get $(\alpha(f_i), \alpha(f_j)) = (\alpha_{i, l}, \alpha_{j, h-1})$, $l > h - 1$.

In any case the claim follows by Corollary 4. \square

Lemma 8. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$, $h \leq \min\{n_i + 1, n_j + 1 : i, j \in I_n\}$.

If there is an element $f \in A$ such that:

1. $(f_i, f_j) \in M(\alpha, i, h) \times M(\alpha, j, h)$,
2. $f_i \neq f_j$,

then for every $(x, y) \geq (\alpha_{i, h-1}, \alpha_{j, h-1})$, there is an element $g \in A$ such that $(g_i, g_j) = (x, y)$.

Proof. If $M(\alpha, i, h) \cong S_p$, $M(\alpha, j, h) \cong S_q$ and $p \neq q$, it follows from Lemma 7. Therefore, it shall be understood $M(\alpha, i, h) \cong M(\alpha, j, h) \cong S_p$.

By Corollary 4, we get the claim in the following cases:

1. $f_i = 1_i$ or $f_j = 1_j$,
2. $f_i = \alpha_{i, h-1}$, hence the element $l = (f \rightarrow \alpha_{h-1})^p$ has its i th component equal to 1_i and its j th component equal to $\alpha_{j, h-1}$,
3. $f_j = \alpha_{j, h-1}$, hence the element $m = (f \rightarrow \alpha_{h-1})^p$ has its j th component equal to 1_j and its i th component equal to $\alpha_{i, h-1}$.

Assume now $f_i = r/p \in M(\alpha, i, h)$, $f_j = s/p \in M(\alpha, j, h)$ and $0 < r < s < p$. Then we get
 Case 1: $s = p - 1$. Then the element $f^{p-1} \in A$ has its i th component equal to $\alpha_{i, h-1}$ and its j th component equal to $1/p \in M(\alpha, i, h)$. Then we proceed as in 2.

Case 2: $s < p - 1$.

Let $g \in A$ such that $g_j = (p - 1)/p \in M(\alpha, j, h)$.

- (a) If $g_i \leq f_i$, then the element $h = ((f \vee g) \rightarrow f)^p$, has its i th component equal to 1_i and its j th component equal to $\alpha_{j, h-1}$.
- (b) If $g_i \geq \alpha_{i, h}$, then the element $k = ((f \rightarrow f \odot g)^p$, has its i th component equal to 1_i and its j th component equal to $\alpha_{j, h-1}$.
- (c) Finally, if $f_i < g_i < \alpha_{i, h}$ then the element $d = (g^r \odot f) \rightarrow \alpha_h$ has its i th component equal to 1_i and its j th component equal to $\alpha_{j, h-1}$.

Again the conclusion follows from Corollary 4. \square

Proposition 9. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$ and $J = \{i_1, \dots, i_r\} \subseteq I_n$.

If, for every $i_p, i_q \in J$ and for every pair $(x_{i_p}, x_{i_q}) \geq (\alpha_{i_p, h_p}, \alpha_{i_q, h_q})$, there is an element $g^{p,q} \in A$ such that $(g_{i_p}^{p,q}, g_{i_q}^{p,q}) = (x_{i_p}, x_{i_q})$, then for every r -tuple $(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_r}) \geq (\alpha_{i_1, h_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_r, h_r})$, there is an element $g \in A$ such that $(g_{i_1}, \dots, g_{i_r}) = (x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_r})$.

Proof. The proposition is true for $r=2$. Let $r \geq 3$ and let us proceed by induction on the cardinality of J . Assume the proposition is true for $r-1$. Let $x = (x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_r}) \geq (\alpha_{i_1, h_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_r, h_r})$.

For every $i_u \in J$, denote by x^u the $(r-1)$ -tuple obtained from $(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_r})$, by deleting the i_u th component of x . By induction, there is an element $g^u \in A$ such that $g_{i_m}^u = x_{i_m}$, for every $m \in \{1, \dots, u-1, u+1, \dots, r\}$. If the restrictions to J of two among these elements, say g^{u_1} and g^{u_2} , are not comparable, then we have: either

$$1. (g^{u_1})_{u_1} \leq (g^{u_2})_{u_1} = x_{u_1} \text{ and } x_{u_2} = (g^{u_1})_{u_2} \geq (g^{u_2})_{u_2}$$

or

$$2. (g^{u_1})_{u_1} \geq (g^{u_2})_{u_1} = x_{u_1} \text{ and } x_{u_2} = (g^{u_1})_{u_2} \leq (g^{u_2})_{u_2}.$$

In the former case $(g^{u_1} \vee g^{u_2})_{i_m} = x_{i_m}$, for every $m \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. In the latter case x is given by the restriction to J of $g^{u_1} \wedge g^{u_2}$.

Assume that the restrictions to J of all the elements g^u are each other comparable, then we safely can write $g^1 \leq g^2 \leq g^3$. From that $x_{i_2} = (g^1)_{i_2} \leq (g^2)_{i_2} \leq (g^3)_{i_2} = x_{i_2}$. Then it is $(g^2)_{i_m} = x_{i_m}$ for every $m \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. \square

Corollary 10. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$, $M(\alpha, i, 1) \cong S_{p_i}$ and $S_{p_i} \neq S_{p_j}$ for every $(i, j) \in I_n^2$. Then $A = C_1 \times \dots \times C_n$.

Proof. This follows by Lemma 7 and Proposition 9. \square

Corollary 11. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$. Then the following implication holds:

(for every $i \in I_n$ there is an element $f^i \in A$ such that $\alpha(f^i) \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\alpha(f_i^i) = 0_i \Rightarrow (A = C_1 \times \dots \times C_n)$).

Proof. This follows by Propositions 2 and 9. \square

3. Direct decomposition

Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$. It is known that $MV(A) = A \cap \prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, 1)$ [1]. Define on I_n the following equivalence relation:

$$i \equiv j \text{ iff for every } f \in MV(A), f_i = f_j.$$

Let $\pi = \{J_1, \dots, J_r\}$ be the partition of I_n yielded by this relation.

Remark 12. The above definition is equivalent to the following: $i \equiv' j$ iff $f_i = f_j$ for every $f \in A$ such that $(f_i, f_j) \in M(\alpha, i, 1) \times M(\alpha, j, 1)$.

Indeed, let $i \equiv j$, $f \in A$, and $(f_i, f_j) \in M(\alpha, i, 1) \times M(\alpha, j, 1)$. Since $f^{**} \in MV(A)$, we get $f_i = f_i^{**} = f_j^{**} = f_j$, hence $i \equiv' j$.

For a positive integer k denote by A_{J_k} the set of the restrictions to J_k of all the elements of A ; A_{J_k} is a BL-algebra and it is, up to isomorphism, subdirect product of $\{C_i, i \in J_k\}$. In the sequel the restriction of $f \in A$ to J_k will be denoted by f_{J_k} .

The following result is crucial:

Theorem 13. *Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$. Then A is isomorphic to the direct product $A_{J_1} \times \cdots \times A_{J_r}$.*

Proof. The map $\phi : f \in A \rightarrow (f_{J_1}, \dots, f_{J_r}) \in A_{J_1} \times \cdots \times A_{J_r}$ is a homomorphism. Now we shall prove that ϕ is bijective.

Claim 1. *ϕ is injective.*

Indeed, if $f \neq g$, then $f_i \neq g_i$ for some i . Let $i \in J_k$, then $f_{J_k} \neq g_{J_k}$ hence $\phi(f) \neq \phi(g)$.

Claim 2. *ϕ is surjective.*

We will prove the surjectivity of ϕ by induction on the cardinal of the set π . It is trivial if $|\pi| = 1$. Assume that it is true for $|\pi| = r - 1$ and set:

$\phi' : f \in A_{J_1 \cup \dots \cup J_{r-1}} \rightarrow (f_{J_1}, \dots, f_{J_{r-1}}) \in A_{J_1} \times \cdots \times A_{J_{r-1}}$. By induction, ϕ' is surjective.

Let $(f_{J_1}^1, \dots, f_{J_r}^r) \in (A_{J_1} \times \cdots \times A_{J_{r-1}}) \times A_{J_r}$ and $f \in A$ such that $\phi'(f_{J_1 \cup \dots \cup J_{r-1}}) = (f_{J_1}^1, \dots, f_{J_{r-1}}^{r-1})$; moreover let $g \in A$ such that $g_{J_r} = f_{J_r}^r$.

Fix a subset J of I_n containing exactly a single representative element from each class of π , that is $J = \{i_1, \dots, i_r\}$ and $i_m \in J_m$, $m \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. By Lemmas 7 and 8 and Proposition 9, for every r -tuple $(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_r}) \in M(\alpha, i_1, 1) \times \cdots \times M(\alpha, i_r, 1)$, there is an element $g' \in A \cap \prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, 1)$, such that $(g'_{i_1}, \dots, g'_{i_r}) = (x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_r})$.

Therefore, let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ such that:

1. $(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_r}), (b_{i_1}, \dots, b_{i_r}) \in M(\alpha, i_1, 1) \times \cdots \times M(\alpha, i_r, 1)$,
2. $a_{i_h} < b_{i_h}$ for $h = 1, \dots, r - 1$,
3. $a_{i_r} > b_{i_r}$.

Then we have

$$(a \rightarrow b)_i = \begin{cases} 1_i & \text{if } i \in J_1 \cup \cdots \cup J_{r-1}, \\ a_{i_r}^* \oplus b_{i_r} \in M(\alpha, i, 1) & \text{if } i \in J_r. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Set $c = \alpha(a \rightarrow b)$. Then $c_i = 1_i$ for $i \in J_1 \cup \cdots \cup J_{r-1}$ and $c_i = 0_i$ for $i \in J_r$. On other side,

$$(b \rightarrow a)_i = \begin{cases} b_i^* \oplus a_i \in M(\alpha, i, 1) \setminus \{1_i\} & \text{if } i \in J_1 \cup \cdots \cup J_{r-1}, \\ 1_i & \text{if } i \in J_r. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Let $w = \alpha(b \rightarrow a)$. Then $w_i = 1_i$ for $i \in J_r$ and $w_i = 0_i$ for $i \in J_1 \cup \cdots \cup J_{r-1}$. Thus $(c \odot f) \vee (w \odot g) \in A$ and $\phi((c \odot f) \vee (w \odot g)) = (f_{J_1}, \dots, f_{J_r})$. \square

Corollary 14. *Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *for every (i, j) and $i \neq j$ there is an element $f \in \mathbf{MV}(A)$ such that $f_i \neq f_j$,*
2. $A = \prod_{i=1}^n C_i$.

Proof. Assume that for every (i, j) and $i \neq j$ there is an element $f \in \mathbf{MV}(A)$ such that $f_i \neq f_j$. Then $\pi = I$. Let $A_{\uparrow\{i\}}$ be the BL-algebra of the restrictions to $\{i\}$ of all the elements in A . The $A_{\uparrow\{i\}} \cong C_i$, for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Hence the conclusion follows by Theorem 13. Vice versa is obvious. \square

4. BL-comet

In this section we will introduce the concept of BL-comet and we will prove the main result according to any finite BL-algebra is a direct product of BL-comets (Corollary 28). To this aim we hold to describe the structure of the algebra A_{J_h} , that is the structure of a finite BL-algebra $A = (A, \wedge, \vee, \odot, \rightarrow, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$, having the further following property:

$$\text{every } f \in A \cap \prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, 1) = \mathbf{MV}(A) \text{ is constant on } I_n. \quad (5)$$

Such an algebra will be denoted by A_c and the class of all the algebras A_c will be denoted by \mathbf{A}_c .

Lemma 15. *Let $A_c \in \mathbf{A}_c$. Then, for every $(i, j) \in I_n^2$, $M(\alpha, i, 1) \cong M(\alpha, j, 1)$.*

Proof. Suppose there is $(i, j) \in I_n^2$ such that $M(\alpha, i, 1) \not\cong M(\alpha, j, 1)$. We can safely assume $|M(\alpha, i, 1)| < |M(\alpha, j, 1)|$. By Lemma 7, we find an element $g \in A_c$ such that $g_i = 0_i$ and $g_j \in M(\alpha, j, 1) \setminus \{0_j\}$. Hence $g^* \in \mathbf{MV}(A)$ and it is not constant on I_n , absurd. \square

Set $M(\alpha, i, h_1^m) = \biguplus_{h=1}^m M(\alpha, i, h)$ and, for every A_c , define:
 $\delta_{A_c} = \max\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{for every } f \in A_c \cap \prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, h_1^m), f \text{ is constant on } I_n\}$. We get $1 \leq \delta_{A_c} \leq \min\{n_i + 1 \mid i \in I_n\}$.

With the above notations we have:

Lemma 16. *Let $A_c \in \mathbf{A}_c$. Then, for every $(i, j) \in I_n^2$ and for every $1 \leq m \leq \delta_{A_c}$, $M(\alpha, i, h_1^m) \cong M(\alpha, j, h_1^m)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 15 it is true for $m = 1$, then we proceed by induction. Assume $M(\alpha, i, h_1^{m-1}) \cong M(\alpha, j, h_1^{m-1})$, for every $(i, j) \in I_n^2$. Suppose there is (i, j) such that $M(\alpha, i, m) \not\cong M(\alpha, j, m)$. Arguing as in Lemma 15, we find an element $g \in A_c$ such that $g_i = \alpha_{i, m-1}$ and $g_j \in M(\alpha, j, m) \setminus \{\alpha_{j, m-1}\}$. Hence $(g \rightarrow \alpha_{m-1}) \in \prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, h_1^{\delta_{A_c}})$ and it is not constant on I_n , absurd. Since $M(\alpha, i, h_1^m) \cong M(\alpha, i, h_1^{m-1}) \uplus M(\alpha, i, m)$, for every $i \in I_n$, the desired conclusion immediately follows. \square

In the sequel, when there is no misunderstanding, we will denote δ_{A_c} simply by δ .

Lemma 17. *Let $A_c \in \mathbf{A}_c$. Then $A_c \setminus (\prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, h_1^\delta) \setminus \{1_i\}) = \{x \in A_c \mid x \geq \alpha_\delta\}$.*

Proof. The inclusion $\{x \in A_c \mid x \geq \alpha_\delta\} \subseteq A_c \setminus (\prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, h_1^\delta) \setminus \{1_i\})$ is immediate.

Assume now $x \in A_c \setminus (\prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, h_1^\delta) \setminus \{1_i\})$ and $x \not\geq \alpha_\delta$.

Then the subsets:

$$I_1 = \{i \in I_n \mid x_i \geq \alpha_{i,\delta}\},$$

$$I_2 = \{i \in I_n \mid x_i < \alpha_{i,\delta}\}$$

are not empty and

$$(\alpha_\delta \rightarrow x)_i = \begin{cases} 1_i & \text{if } i \in I_1, \\ x_i & \text{if } i \in I_2. \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Consequently $\alpha_\delta \rightarrow x \in \prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, h_1^\delta)$, but $\alpha_\delta \rightarrow x$ is not a constant function on I_n , absurd. \square

Corollary 18. *Let $A_c \in \mathbf{A}_c$. Then $A_c \cap \prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, h_1^\delta)$ is a totally ordered subalgebra of A_c and it is isomorphic to $M(\alpha, i, h_1^\delta)$ for every $i \in I_n$.*

Proof. By subdirect product properties and by Lemma 17 it follows that, for every $i \in I_n$, $p_i: f \in A_c \cap \prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, h_1^\delta) \rightarrow f_i$ is a bijective map from $A_c \cap \prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, h_1^\delta)$ on $M(\alpha, i, h_1^\delta)$. Indeed p_i is the claimed isomorphism. \square

Remark 19. As a consequence of Lemma 17 and Corollary 18 $\delta_{A_c} < v = \min\{n_i + 1 \mid i \in I_n\}$. Indeed set $I_v = \{i \in I_n \mid n_i + 1 = v\}$. If $\delta_{A_c} = v$, then, for every $x \in A_c \setminus (\prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, h_1^\delta) \setminus \{1_i\})$, $x_i = 1_i$, for each $i \in I_v$. Whence the function p_v mapping any element f to its restriction to $I_n \setminus I_v$, $f_{I_n \setminus I_v}$ is an isomorphism between A_c and $(A_c)_{I_n \setminus I_v}$. Whereas, under our assumptions, any chain $C_i, i \in I_n$, has to be essential in the representation of A_c .

Proposition 20. *Let $A_c \in \mathbf{A}_c$. Set*

1. $B = A_c \setminus (\prod_{i=1}^n M(\alpha, i, h_1^\delta) \setminus \{1_i\})$,
2. $0_B = \alpha_\delta$,
3. $1_B = \mathbf{1}$,
4. \odot_B be the restriction of the product of A_c to B ,
5. \rightarrow_B be the restriction of the operation \rightarrow of A_c to B .

Then $B = (B, \wedge, \vee, \odot_B, \rightarrow_B, 0_B, 1_B)$ is a BL-algebra.

Proof. By Lemma 17, $B = (B, \wedge, \vee, 0_B, 1_B)$ is a lattice with 0_B as least element and 1_B as greatest element. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{if } x \geq \alpha_\delta \text{ and } y \geq \alpha_\delta \text{ then } x \odot y \geq \alpha_\delta, \\ &\text{if } f \geq \alpha_\delta \text{ and } g \geq \alpha_\delta \text{ then } f \rightarrow g \geq \alpha_\delta. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Let A be a BL-algebra. By $\mathbb{I}(A)$ we denote the set of all idempotent elements of A . We remark that $\mathbb{I}(A_c) \neq \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$ for every finite BL-algebra A that is not a MV-chain. For otherwise A is locally finite, hence it is an MV-chain [5].

The above remark suggests the following considerations:

Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$, for $x \in \mathbb{I}(A)$, denote by $\mathbb{C}(x)$ the subset of $\mathbb{I}(A)$ whose elements are comparable with x . Define $K(A) \subseteq \mathbb{I}(A)$ as follows:

$x \in K(A)$ iff the following conditions are satisfied:

1. $\mathbb{C}(x) = \mathbb{I}(A)$;
2. $\{y \in \mathbb{I}(A) \mid y \leq x\}$ is a chain.

We stress that $K(A)$ is not empty: indeed $\mathbf{0} \in K(A)$.

The above notations and remarks allow us to introduce the main following definitions:

Definition 21. Let A be a nontrivial element of \mathbf{FBL} . Then A is called *BL-comet* if $\max K(A) \neq \mathbf{0}$.

Definition 22. Let A be is a BL-comet, then $\max K(A)$ is called *pivot* of A and it will be denoted by $\text{pivot}(A)$.

Set $\rho = \max\{n_i + 1, i \in I_n\}$. For every $h \leq \rho$ we will denote by $\alpha_{(h)}$ the n -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ where

$$\alpha_i = \begin{cases} 1_i & \text{if } h \geq n_i + 1, \\ \alpha_{i,h} & \text{if } h < n_i + 1. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

With above notations we introduce the following:

Definition 23. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{I}(A)$. β is called *pseudoconstant* on I_n if there is $h \leq \rho$ such that $\beta = \alpha_{(h)}$.

By (7) every idempotent $\alpha_h \in A$, constant on I_n , is pseudoconstant on I_n ; moreover $\alpha_{(h)} = \mathbf{1}$ iff $h = \rho$.

Lemma 24. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$. Then, for every $h \leq \rho$, $\alpha_{(h)} \in A$.

Proof. If $h \leq v$ (see Remark 19), the claim is already proved (see Corollary 5). Then we can safely assume $v < h < \rho$. Suppose $n = 2$ and $n_1 + 1 < h < n_2 + 1$. Let $x \in A$ such that $x_2 = \alpha_{2,h}$. Set $\alpha(x_1) = \alpha_{1,k}$, for some $k \leq n_1 + 1$. Then, by applying Corollary 5, $(\alpha(x) \rightarrow \alpha_k) \vee x = \alpha_{(h)} \in A$. Proceeding by induction, let the lemma be true for $n - 1$. Analogously to Corollary 5, for every $i \in I_n$, we find an element $x^i \in A$ such that for $j \neq i$

$$(x^i)_j = \begin{cases} 1_j & \text{if } h \geq n_j + 1, \\ \alpha_{j,h} & \text{if } h < n_j + 1. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

If two of the elements x^1, x^2 and x^3 are incomparable, say x^1 and x^2 , then either $x^1 \vee x^2$ or $x^1 \wedge x^2$ satisfies the claim. For otherwise x^1, x^2 and x^3 are comparable. We safely

can set $x^1 \leq x^2 \leq x^3$. Then by (8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{if } h \geq n_2 + 1, \text{ then } 1_2 = (x^1)_2 \leq (x^2)_2, \text{ hence } (x^2)_2 = 1_2; \\ &\text{if } h < n_2 + 1, \text{ then } (x^1)_2 = \alpha_{2,h} \leq x^2_2 \leq (x^3)_2 = \alpha_{2,h}, \text{ hence } x^2_2 = \alpha_{2,h}. \end{aligned}$$

In both cases $x^2 = \alpha_{(h)} \in A$. \square

Lemma 25. *Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$ and $\mathbb{L}(A)$ be a chain. Then for every $x \in A$ there exists $h \leq \rho$ such that:*

$$x_i = \begin{cases} 1_i & \text{if } h \geq n_i + 1, \\ \in M(\alpha, i, h + 1) \setminus \{1_i\} & \text{if } h < n_i + 1. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Consequently $\mathbb{L}(A)$ is the set of all the pseudoconstant elements of A .

Proof. Let $x \in A \setminus \{1\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \{i \in I_n \mid x_i = 1_i\}, \\ I_2 &= \{i \in I_n \mid x_i < 1_i\}. \end{aligned}$$

If for some $(i, j) \in I_2^2$, $x_i \in M(\alpha, i, h + 1) \setminus \{1_i\}$, $x_j \in M(\alpha, j, k + 1) \setminus \{1_j\}$ and $h < k$, then, by applying Corollary 4 for $f = \alpha(x)$, we find $a, b \in A$ such that $(a_i, a_j) = (1_i, \alpha_{j,h})$ and $(b_i, b_j) = (\alpha_{i,h}, 1_j)$. So $\alpha(a)$ and $\alpha(b)$ have to be two incomparable elements of $\mathbb{L}(A)$, absurd. Consequently, there is an $h < \rho$ such that $x_i \in M(\alpha, i, h + 1) \setminus \{1_i\}$, for every $i \in I_2$. Let now $I_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $h < n_i + 1$ for some $i \in I_1$. By Lemma 24, $\alpha(x) \rightarrow \alpha_{(h)} \in \mathbb{L}(A)$, but it is not comparable with $\alpha(x)$. This contradiction shows that x verifies (9). \square

Proposition 26. *Let A be a nontrivial element of \mathbf{FBL} . Then the following are equivalent:*

1. A is a BL-chain,
2. A is a BL-comet and $\text{pivot}(A) = 1$.

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$ is trivial. In order to show $2 \Rightarrow 1$ set, for every $x \in A$, $I_x = \{i \in I_n \mid x_i = 1_i\}$.

Claim 1. *The family $(I_x)_{x \in A}$ is totally ordered by inclusion.*

Actually let $x, y \in A$, $x \neq y$, $i \in I_x \setminus I_y$ and $j \in I_y \setminus I_x$. Then $(\alpha(x_i), \alpha(x_j)) = (1_i, \alpha_{j,h}) < (1_i, 1_j)$ and $(\alpha(y_i), \alpha(y_j)) = (\alpha_{i,k}, 1_j) < (1_i, 1_j)$, for suitable h and k . Consequently $\alpha(x)$ and $\alpha(y)$ are two incomparable elements of $\mathbb{L}(A)$, which contradicts the hypothesis $\text{pivot}(A) = 1$.

Claim 2. $I_x \subsetneq I_y \Rightarrow x < y$.

We can safely assume $y < 1$. Then by Lemma 25 there are suitable $h, k < \rho$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{for every } i \in I_n \setminus I_x, \ x_i \in M(\alpha, i, h + 1) \setminus \{1_i\} \\ &\text{and} \\ &\text{for every } i \in I_n \setminus I_y, \ y_i \in M(\alpha, i, k + 1) \setminus \{1_i\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let now $j \in I_y \setminus I_x$; by (9) $h < n_j + 1 \leq k$, whence $x < y$.

Claim 3. $I_x = I_y \Rightarrow x$ and y comparable.

If $x = \mathbf{1}$ or $y = \mathbf{1}$, the claim is trivial. Then assume $x < \mathbf{1}$ and $y < \mathbf{1}$. Let h and k be as in the previous claim.

If $h < k$, then $x < y$,

If $k < h$, then $y < x$.

Assume now $h = k$. Since $\mathbb{L}(A)$ is a chain, as a consequence of Lemma 8 the restrictions of x and y to $I_n \setminus I_y$ are constant, which implies x and y comparable.

The conclusion now follows from Claims 1–3. \square

Theorem 27. Let A be a nontrivial element of **FBL**. Then the following are equivalent:

1. A is a BL-comet,
2. $A \in \mathbf{A}_c$.

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$: If $\text{pivot}(A) = \mathbf{1}$, then the implication follows by Proposition 26. Then assume $\beta = \text{pivot}(A) < \mathbf{1}$. Rejecting the thesis, by Lemma 8 there is $f \in A$ such that $(f_i, f_j) = (0_i, \mathbf{1}_j)$, for some $(i, j) \in I_n^2$. We can safely assume $f \in \text{MV}(A)$. Since $\alpha(f)$ and $\alpha(f^*)$ are two incomparable elements of $\mathbb{L}(A)$, necessarily we get $\alpha(f), \alpha(f^*) \geq \beta$. From that $\mathbf{0} = \alpha(f) \wedge \alpha(f^*) \geq \beta$, a contradiction.

$2 \Rightarrow 1$: By Lemma 17 and Corollary 18 it follows $\alpha_\delta \in K(A)$, whence $\alpha_\delta \leq \max K(A) = \text{pivot}(A)$. By definition $\alpha_\delta > \mathbf{0}$, so $\max K(A) \neq \mathbf{0}$. \square

Corollary 28. Let A be a nontrivial element of **FBL**. Then A is isomorphic to a direct product of BL-comets.

Proof. It follows by Theorems 13 and 27. \square

Proposition 29. Let $A_c \in \mathbf{A}_c$. Then $\text{pivot}(A_c) = \alpha_\delta$.

Proof. If $\text{pivot}(A_c) = \mathbf{1}$, it follows by Proposition 26. Assume $\text{pivot}(A_c) < \mathbf{1}$. In the proof of Theorem 27 ($2 \Rightarrow 1$) it is proved that $\alpha_\delta \leq \text{pivot}(A_c)$. On other hand by definition of δ and by Lemma 8 we can find $f \in A_c$ such that for some $(i, j) \in I_n^2$, $(f_i, f_j) = (\alpha_{i,\delta}, \mathbf{1}_j)$. Since $\alpha(f)$ and $\alpha(f) \rightarrow \alpha_\delta$ are two incomparable elements of $\mathbb{L}(A)$, it follows $\alpha(f), \alpha(f) \rightarrow \alpha_\delta \geq \text{pivot}(A_c)$. Hence $\text{pivot}(A_c) \leq \alpha(f) \wedge (\alpha(f) \rightarrow \alpha_\delta) = \alpha_\delta$. \square

Corollary 30. Let $A_c \in \mathbf{A}_c$ and $\text{pivot}(A_c) < \mathbf{1}$. Then A_c is the ordinal sum of a finite BL-chain and a finite BL-algebra that is not a BL-comet.

Proof. It follows by Corollary 18, and Propositions 20 and 29. \square

5. Labelled trees

Now we recall some definitions about partially ordered sets.

Definition 31. A partial ordered set (T, \leq) is called *tree* if T has a minimum element T_0 and, for every $x \in T$, the set $T_x = \{y \in T: y \leq x\}$ is totally ordered. The elements of a tree are called *nodes*.

Definition 32. Let (T, \leq) be a finite tree, $x \in T$ and $x \neq T_0$. The greatest element of $T_x \setminus \{x\}$ is called the *previous element of x* and it shall be denoted by $pr(x)$.

Definition 33. Let (T, \leq) be a finite tree, the elements $x, y \in T$. We say that y *covers* x if $pr(y) = x$. In this case we write $x \prec y$.

Definition 34. Let (T, \leq) be a finite tree and $x \in T$. We say that x is a *simple node* if there is exactly one element covering x . If x is not simple or if $x = T_0$, x will be called a *multiple node*.

Definition 35. Let (T, \leq) be a finite tree. We call *height* of an element $x \in T$, in symbols $l(x)$, the cardinal of the set of all multiple nodes of the chain $]T_0, x]$.

Definition 36. Let (T, \leq) be a finite tree. We call *height of T* , in symbols $l(T)$, the non negative integer equal to $\max\{l(x): x \in T\}$.

Definition 37. Let (T, \leq) be a finite tree, $x \in T$ and $x \neq T_0$. The greatest multiple node of $T_x \setminus \{x\}$ is called *multiple node previous of x* , and it shall be denoted by $prm(x)$.

Let N be the set of all the positive integers; then we set:

$$\mathbf{N} = \{0\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{r \in N} N^r \right)$$

and, for every integer positive number p , $\mathbf{N}_p = (\{0\} \cup (\bigcup_{r \in N} N^r))^p$

Definition 38. A *labelled tree* is a triple (T, \leq, h) , verifying the following:

- (T, \leq) is a finite tree,
- h is a map from T to $\bigcup_{p \in N} \mathbf{N}_p$,
- $h(x) = 0$ iff $x = T_0$.

If $h(T) \subseteq \{0\} \cup N$, then (T, \leq, h) is called a *simply labelled tree*.

By definition, a *simply labelled tree* is a tree, having every node marked by an integer number m . Such a number m represents the MV-chain with $m + 1$ elements.

Our aim now is to map finite *simply labelled trees* on finite BL-algebras.

Let (T, \leq, h) be a *simply labelled tree* and (T_f, \leq) the subtree of (T, \leq) of all *multiple nodes*. Define the map $h_f: T_f \rightarrow \mathbf{N}_1 = \{0\} \cup (\bigcup_{r \in N} N^r)$ as follows:

$$h_f(x) = \begin{cases} (h(x_1), \dots, h(x_r), h(x)) & \text{if } x \text{ is a multiple node different from } T_0 \text{ and} \\ & (x_1, \dots, x_r, x) =]prm(x), x], \subseteq T, \\ 0 & \text{if } x = T_0. \end{cases}$$

Then the triple (T_f, \leq, h_f) is a labelled finite tree. Each (multiple) *node* is marked by h_f with a finite sequence of positive integers n_1, \dots, n_t . Such a sequence represents the BL-chain which is a finite ordinal sum whose components are the finite MV-chains with $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_t + 1$ elements, respectively: $h_f(x) = S_{n_1} \uplus \dots \uplus S_{n_t}$.

Now denote by

$\mathbf{T}_{s,1}$ the set of all finite simply labelled trees,
and

$\mathbf{T}_{m,1}$ the set of all finite labelled trees (T, \leq, h) such that:
every $x \in T$ is multiple,
 $h(T) \subseteq \mathbf{N}_1$.

With the above notations and arguments we can claim the following theorem:

Theorem 39. *The map f , defined by $f(T, \leq, h) = (T_f, \leq, h_f)$, is a bijective map between $\mathbf{T}_{s,1}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{m,1}$.*

Proof. It is obvious. \square

In the sequel, when there is no misunderstanding, we will denote $f(T, \leq, h)$ by $f(T)$ or T_f .

Next we will define a function σ , mapping every element of $\mathbf{T}_{m,1}$ on a finite BL-algebra.

First let $(T, \leq, h) \in \mathbf{T}_{m,1}$, $l(T) = 1$ and $T_1 = T \setminus \{T_0\}$. Then we define:

$$\sigma(T) = \begin{cases} h(T_1) & \text{if } |T_1| = 1, \\ \prod_{x \in T_1} h(x) & \text{if } |T_1| > 1. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Assume now $l(T) = n > 1$ and set:

$$T_i = \{x \in T : l(x) = i\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

$$T^r = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-r} T_i, \quad r = 1, \dots, n - 1,$$

and

M equal to the set of all maximal elements of T .

Define a mapping $h^1 : T^1 = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} T_i \rightarrow \bigcup_{p \in N} \mathbf{N}_p$, by

$$h^1(x) = \begin{cases} (h(x), (h(y), x \prec y)) & \text{if } l(x) = n - 1 \text{ and } x \notin M, \\ h(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

In the labelled tree (T^1, \leq, h^1) , every (multiple) *node*, such that $l(x) = n - 1$ and $x \notin M$, is marked by h^1 with a pair: $(h(x), (h(y), x \prec y))$. $h(x)$ is a sequence of positive integers, representing the BL-algebra $h(x) = S_{n_1} \uplus \dots \uplus S_{n_t}$. The second component is a finite family of sequence of positive integers $(h(y), x \prec y)$, representing the BL-algebra $(h(y), x \prec y) = \prod_{x \prec y} h(y)$. The pair $h^1(x)$ shall represent the finite BL-algebra which is an ordinal sum of BL-algebras: $h^1(x) = h(x) \uplus (h(y), x \prec y) = (S_{n_1} \uplus \dots \uplus S_{n_t}) \uplus \prod_{x \prec y} h(y)$.

Define now an application $h^2 : T^2 = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-2} T_i \rightarrow \bigcup_{p \in N} \mathbf{N}_p$, as follows:

$$h^2(x) = \begin{cases} (h^1(x), (h^1(y), x \prec y)) & \text{if } l(x) = n - 2 \text{ and } x \notin M, \\ h^1(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

In the tree (T^2, \leq, h^2) , every (multiple) node x , such that $l(x) = n - 2$ and $x \notin M$, is marked by h^2 with a pair: $(h^1(x), (h^1(y), x \prec y))$. The pair $h^2(x)$ shall represent the finite BL-algebra that is an ordinal sum of BL-algebras: $h^2(x) = h^1(x) \uplus \prod_{x \prec y} h^1(y)$.

Proceeding as above, at step $(n - 1)$ th, we get a map $h^{n-1} : T^{n-1} = T_1 \cup \{T_0\} \rightarrow \bigcup_{p \in N} \mathbf{N}_p$, by

$$h^{n-1}(x) = \begin{cases} (h^{n-2}(x), (h^{n-2}(y), x \prec y)) & \text{if } x \notin M, \\ h^{n-2}(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Finally we define

1. $\sigma(T) = h^{n-1}(T_1)$ if $|T_1| = 1$,
2. $\sigma(T) = \prod_{x \in T_1} h^{n-1}(x)$, otherwise.

Theorem 40. *There is a map Γ from $\mathbf{T}_{s,1}$ to \mathbf{FBL} .*

Proof. It is sufficient to set $\Gamma = \sigma \circ f$. Then Γ furnishes the claimed map. \square

6. Idempotent irreducible elements

Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$. In the lattice $(A, \wedge, \vee, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$ an element x is called *irreducible* if $x = u \vee v$ implies $x = u$ or $x = v$. Denote by $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A))$ the ordered set of all idempotent irreducible elements of A .

Proposition 41. *Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$ and $x \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A))$. Then the set $A_x = \{y \in A : y \leq x\}$ is a chain of irreducible elements.*

Proof. Let $x \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A))$ and $h, k \in A$ such that $h < x$ and $k < x$. Then we have $x = x \wedge \mathbf{1} = x \wedge ((h \rightarrow k) \vee (k \rightarrow h)) = (x \wedge (h \rightarrow k)) \vee (x \wedge (k \rightarrow h))$. By hypothesis we get either $x = (x \wedge (h \rightarrow k))$ or $x = (x \wedge (k \rightarrow h))$. Assume $x = (x \wedge (h \rightarrow k))$, then $x \leq h \rightarrow k$ and $h = h \odot x \leq h \odot (h \rightarrow k) \leq k$. So h and k are comparable. Analogously if $x = x \wedge (k \rightarrow h)$. \square

From the above proposition we immediately obtain:

Corollary 42. *Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$. The ordered set $(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A)), \leq)$ is a finite tree, having $\mathbf{0}$ as least element.*

Proposition 43. *Let A be a BL-comet. Then $\text{pivot}(A)$ is a multiple node of $(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A)), \leq)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 27, Proposition 29 and Corollary 18 $\alpha_\delta = \text{pivot}(A) \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A))$. To show that α_δ is a *multiple node*, we observe that, by definition of δ and by Lemma 8, we can find $f \in A$ such that for some $(i, j) \in I_n^2$, $(f_i, f_j) = (\alpha_{i, \delta}, 1_j)$. Then $\alpha(f) \rightarrow \alpha_\delta$ and $(\alpha(f) \rightarrow \alpha_\delta) \rightarrow \alpha_\delta$ are incomparable and both greater than α_δ . Moreover $(\alpha(f) \rightarrow \alpha_\delta) \wedge [(\alpha(f) \rightarrow \alpha_\delta) \rightarrow \alpha_\delta] = \alpha_\delta$. Whence α_δ is a multiple node. \square

Proposition 44. Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$, $\alpha \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A)) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Set

1. $C = [\text{pr}(\alpha), \alpha]$,
2. $0_C = \text{pr}(\alpha)$,
3. $1_C = \alpha$,
4. \odot_C be the restriction to C of the product defined on A ,
5. $x^{*c} = \alpha \odot (x \rightarrow \text{pr}(\alpha))$, for every $x \in C$.

Then $C = (C, \odot_C, *_C, 0_C, 1_C)$ is an MV-chain.

Proof. Indeed,

if $\text{pr}(\alpha) \leq x \leq \alpha$ and $\text{pr}(\alpha) \leq y \leq \alpha$, then $\text{pr}(\alpha) \leq x \odot y \leq \alpha$,
 $0_C^{*c} = \alpha \odot (\text{pr}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{pr}(\alpha)) = \alpha = 1_C$,
 and $1_C^{*c} = \alpha \odot (\alpha \rightarrow \text{pr}(\alpha)) = \alpha \wedge \text{pr}(\alpha) = \text{pr}(\alpha) = 0_C$.

Since for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ either $(\text{pr}(\alpha))_i = \text{pr}(\alpha_i)$ or $(\text{pr}(\alpha))_i = \alpha_i$, it follows that $\text{pr}(\alpha) \leq x \leq \alpha$ implies $\text{pr}(\alpha) \leq x^{*c} \leq \alpha$ and $(x^{*c})^{*c} = x$. \square

Remark 45. By the above proposition, we get $[\text{pr}(\alpha), \alpha] \cong S_m$, for some $m \in N$.

Let $i: \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A)) \rightarrow N$ be the map defined by: $i(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ and $i(x) = m$, if $x \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $[\text{pr}(x), x] \cong S_m$. Then $(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A)), \leq, i)$ is a simply labelled tree.

With above notations we have:

Theorem 46. There is a map Λ from \mathbf{FBL} to $\mathbf{T}_{s,1}$.

Proof. Let A be a finite BL-algebra, set $\Lambda(A) = (\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A)), \leq, i)$. Then Λ maps every finite BL-algebra into a simply labelled tree. \square

Proposition 47. Let $A_i \in \mathbf{FBL}$, $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \prod_{i=1}^r A_i$. Then the following are equivalent:

1. $x \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(\prod_{i=1}^r A_i))$,
2. there is $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $x_i \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_i))$ and $x_j = 0_j$ for every $j \neq i$.

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$: Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(\prod_{i=1}^r A_i))$. Assume $x_{i_1} \neq 0_{i_1}$ and $x_{i_2} \neq 0_{i_2}$ for $i_1 \neq i_2$. Then choose two elements:

$y = (y_1, \dots, y_r)$, setting $y_{i_1} = 0_{i_1}$ and $y_i = x_i$, for $i \neq i_1$,

and $z = (z_1, \dots, z_r)$, setting $z_{i_2} = 0_{i_2}$ and $z_i = x_i$, for $i \neq i_2$.

Then we get $x \neq y$, $x \neq z$ and $x = y \vee z$, absurd. If x_i is the only non-zero component of x , it is obvious that $x_i \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_i))$.

$2 \Rightarrow 1$: Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \prod_{i=1}^r A_i$. Assume there is $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $x_i \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_i))$ and $x_j = 0_j$ for every $j \neq i$. Thus from $x = y \vee z$ it follows $x_i = y_i \vee z_i$ and $x_j = y_j = z_j = 0_j$ for every $j \neq i$. By hypothesis $x_i = y_i$ or $x_i = z_i$, whence $x = y$ or $x = z$, that is $x \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(\prod_{i=1}^r A_i))$. \square

Theorem 48. *Let A be a non-trivial element of **FBL**. If $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A))$ is a chain, then A is a BL-chain.*

Proof. First we prove that A is a BL-comet.

By Corollary 28 $A = A_1 \times \dots \times A_r$ and, $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}, A_i \neq \{0_i\}$ is a BL-comet. Let $r > 1$ and $a = (a_1, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $b = (0, b_2, 0, \dots, 0)$ be two elements of $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A))$. Then either $a_1 = 0_1$ or $b_2 = 0_2$. That is either $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_1)) = \{0_1\}$ or $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_2)) = \{0_2\}$, absurd. Thus $r = 1$ and A is a BL-comet.

Assume $\text{pivot}(A) < 1$.

Then, by Corollary 30, $A = C \uplus B$, with C a BL-chain and B a finite BL-algebra that is not a BL-comet; hence $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(B)) \subseteq \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A))$. Consequently $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(B))$ has to be a chain and, by previous claim, B is a BL-comet, absurd. From that $\text{pivot}(A) = 1$, therefore, by Proposition 26, A is a BL-chain. \square

7. Dualizing BL-algebras and labelled trees

Following [2], we recall that, if (C, \leq) is a finite chain and (T, \leq') is a finite tree, C and T disjoint sets, then the ordinal sum of C and T , in symbols $C \dot{+} T$, is the finite tree, (T'', \leq'') , where $T'' = C \cup T \setminus T_0$ and \leq'' is defined by $x \leq'' y$ for every $x \in C$ and for every $y \in T$, while the order of the elements in C and the order of the elements in T are unchanged.

Proposition 49. *Let A be a finite BL-chain and $B \in \mathbf{FBL}$. Then $(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A \uplus B)), \leq) \cong (\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A)), \le) \dot{+} (\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(B)), \le)$.*

Proof. It follows by definitions. \square

Let (S, \leq) and (T, \leq') be two trees. The direct product of S and T [2], in symbols $C \otimes T$, need not be a tree. Then we introduce the following definition:

Definition 50. We call *0-product of the two trees* (S, \leq) and (T, \leq') , in symbols $C \odot T$, the ordered subset of $C \otimes T$, whose elements are the pairs (x, y) such that $x = S_0$ or $y = T_0$.

The above definition can be extended to a finite number of trees as follows:

Definition 51. We call *0-product of the trees* $(S^i, \leq^i), i = 1, \dots, r$, in symbols $\odot_{i=1}^r (S^i, \leq^i)$, the ordered subset of $\otimes_{i=1}^r S^i$, whose elements are the r -tuples (x_1, \dots, x_r) such that there is $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $x_i = S_0^i$ for every $i \neq i_0$.

Remark 52. There are natural embeddings $g_i : S^i \rightarrow S = \odot_{i=1}^r S^i$. Identifying S^i and $g_i(S^i)$, we get $S^i \cap S^j = \{S_0\}$, for $i \neq j$ and $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^r S^i$.

Proposition 53. The 0-product of a finite number of trees is a tree.

Proof. It is a trivial. \square

Proposition 54. Let $A_i \in \mathbf{FBL}, i = 1, \dots, r$. Then $(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(\prod_{i=1}^r A_i)), \leq) \cong (\odot_{i=1}^r \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_i)), \leq)$.

Proof. Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(\prod_{i=1}^r A_i))$. By Proposition 47, there is $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $x_i \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_i))$ and $x_j = 0_j$ for every $j \neq i$. Thus, the map $f : \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(\prod_{i=1}^r A_i)) \rightarrow \odot_{i=1}^r \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_i))$, defined by $f((0_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, 0_r)) = (\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_1))_0, \dots, x_i, \dots, \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_r))_0)$, is the claimed order isomorphism. \square

Definition 55. Let (S, \leq, h) be a labelled chain and (T, \leq', k) be a labelled tree. The ordinal sum of (S, \leq, h) and (T, \leq', k) is the labelled tree (R, \leq'', d) such that (R, \leq'') is the ordinal sum of (S, \leq) and (T, \leq') and d is defined by

$$d(x) = \begin{cases} h(x) & \text{if } x \in S, \\ k(x) & \text{if } x \in T. \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

Definition 56. Let (S, \leq, h) and (T, \leq', k) be two labelled trees. The labelled 0-product of (S, \leq, h) and (T, \leq', k) is the labelled tree (R, \leq'', d) such that (R, \leq'') is the 0-product of (S, \leq) and (T, \leq') and d is defined by

$$d(x, y) = \begin{cases} h(x) & \text{if } (x, y) = (x, T_0), \\ k(y) & \text{if } (x, y) = (S_0, y). \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

The above definition of a labelled 0-product can be extended to a finite number of trees in the obvious way. In the sequel we shall denote the ordinal sum and the 0-product of two labelled trees, S and T , by $S \dot{+} T$ or $S \odot T$, respectively.

Let f be defined as in Theorem 39. Then we get:

Proposition 57. Let (T, \leq, h) be a simply labelled chain and, for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, let $(T^i, \leq^i, h^i) \in \mathbf{T}_{s,1}$. Then

1. $f(T \dot{+} T^i) = f(T) \dot{+} f(T^i), i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$,
2. $f(\odot_{i=1}^r T^i) = \odot_{i=1}^r f(T^i)$.

Proof. It follows by the definitions. \square

With arguments and notations of Section 5, we get:

Proposition 58. For $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, let $(T^i, \leq^i, h^i) \in \mathbf{T}_{m,1}$. Then $\sigma(\odot_{i=1}^r T^i) = \prod_{i=1}^r \sigma(T^i)$.

Proof. Set $\bigodot_{i=1}^r T^i = (S, \leq, d)$, $l(S) = n$ and $l(T^i) = n_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, r$. If $x \in T^i$ and $x \neq S_0$, then $\{y \in S \mid x < y\} \subseteq T^i$. Hence $(h^i)^{n_i-1}(x) = d^{n_i-1}(x)$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $x \in T^i$. Therefore, $\sigma(S) = \prod_{x \in S_1} d^{n-1}(x) = \prod_{x \in (T^1)_1} (h^1)^{n-1}(x) \times \prod_{x \in (T^2)_1} (h^2)^{n-1}(x) \times \dots \times \prod_{x \in (T^r)_1} (h^r)^{n-1}(x) = \sigma(T^1) \times \sigma(T^2) \times \dots \times \sigma(T^r) = \prod_{i=1}^r \sigma(T^i)$. \square

In the next theorems Γ and A are defined as in Theorems 40 and 46, respectively.

Theorem 59. *Let $(T, \leq, h) \in \mathbf{T}_{s,1}$. Then $A(\Gamma(T))$ is isomorphic to (T, \leq, h) .*

Proof. We will prove the theorem for induction on $l(T)$. Suppose $l(T) = 1$ and consider the set $T_1 = \{x \in T : l(x) = 1\}$.

Case 1: $|T_1| = 1$. Let $]T_0, T_1] = \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}, x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_r$. By definition of σ , $\Gamma(T) = S_{n_1} \uplus \dots \uplus S_{n_r}$, where $n_i = h(x_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. Then $A(\Gamma(T)) = \text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(S_{n_1} \uplus \dots \uplus S_{n_r})) \cong T$.

Case 2: $|T_1| = p > 1$. Set $T_1 = \{t_1, \dots, t_p\}$ and $]T_0, t_i] = \{x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,q_i}\}, x_{i,1} < x_{i,2} < \dots < x_{i,q_i}$, for every $i = 1, \dots, p$. Then $T \cong \bigodot_{i=1}^p (]T_0, t_i] \leq^i h^i)$, with $t_i \in T_1$ and \leq^i, h^i restrictions of \leq and h to $]T_0, t_i]$ respectively. By Propositions 57 and 58, $\Gamma(T) = \sigma(\bigodot_{i=1}^p f(]T_0, t_i]) = \prod_{i=1}^p h_f(t_i) = \prod_{i=1}^p (S_{n_{i,1}} \uplus \dots \uplus S_{n_{i,q_i}})$, where $n_{i,s} = h(x_{i,s}), x_{i,s} \in]T_0, t_i]$, for $i = 1, \dots, p$ and $s = 1, \dots, q_i$. From that and Proposition 54, $A(\Gamma(T)) = \text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(\prod_{i=1}^p (S_{n_{i,1}} \uplus \dots \uplus S_{n_{i,q_i}}))) = \bigodot_{i=1}^p \text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(S_{n_{i,1}} \uplus \dots \uplus S_{n_{i,q_i}}))$.

Using the arguments and the conclusion of the previous case, we get:

$$\text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(S_{n_{i,1}})) \uplus \dots \uplus S_{n_{i,q_i}} = A(\Gamma(]T_0, t_i]) \cong]T_0, t_i], \text{ hence } A(\Gamma(T)) \cong \bigodot_{i=1}^p]T_0, t_i] \cong T.$$

Suppose now $l(T) = n > 1$.

If $|T_1| = 1$, then $T \setminus]T_0, T_1[$ is a tree and $T =]T_0, T_1] \dot{+} T \setminus]T_0, T_1[$. Since $l(T \setminus]T_0, T_1[) = n - 1$, by induction hypothesis and the above results we get: $A(\Gamma(T \setminus]T_0, T_1[)) \cong T \setminus]T_0, T_1[$ and $A(\Gamma(]T_0, T_1]) \cong]T_0, T_1]$. By Proposition 57, $\Gamma(T) = \Gamma(]T_0, T_1]) \uplus \Gamma(T \setminus]T_0, T_1[)$. Therefore, by Proposition 49, $A(\Gamma(T)) = A(\Gamma(]T_0, T_1]) \dot{+} A(\Gamma(T \setminus]T_0, T_1[)) \cong]T_0, T_1] \dot{+} T \setminus]T_0, T_1[\cong T$.

Let now $|T_1| = p > 1$ and $T_1 = \{t_1, \dots, t_p\}$. Set $R^i = \{x \in T : x \geq t_i\}$ and $S^i =]T_0, t_i] \dot{+} R^i$. Then we get $T \cong \bigodot_{i=1}^p S^i$. Thus, by Propositions 57, 58 and 47, it follows $A(\Gamma(T)) \cong \bigodot_{i=1}^p A(\Gamma(S^i))$. Since $|\{x \in S^i : l(x) = 1\}| = 1$, $A(\Gamma(T)) \cong \bigodot_{i=1}^p S^i \cong T$. \square

Theorem 60. *Let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$. Then $\Gamma(A(A)) \cong A$.*

Proof. We will prove the theorem by induction on $n = l(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A)))$. Assume $l(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A))) = 1$ and set $I_1 = \{\alpha \in \text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A)) : l(\alpha) = 1\}$.

Let us consider two cases:

Case 1: Let $|I_1| = 1$. Then $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A))$ is a chain, and, by Theorem 48, A is a BL-chain. Hence A is an ordinal sum of MV-chains. From that $\Gamma(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A))) = \Gamma(A(A)) \cong A$.

Case 2: Let $|I_1| = p > 1$. Applying Corollary 28 and Propositions 54, $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A)) \cong \text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A_1)) \odot \dots \odot \text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A_r))$, where for each $i = 1, \dots, r, A_i$ is a BL-comet. By assumption $l(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A))) = 1$ and by Proposition 43, it follows $l(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A_i))) = 1$. Thus A_i is a BL-chain, for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Then (see Case 1) $\Gamma(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A_i))) = \Gamma(A(A_i)) \cong A_i$. Using Proposition 49, 57 and 58, we have: $\Gamma(A(A)) = \Gamma(A(A_1 \times \dots \times A_r)) = \Gamma(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A_1)) \odot \dots \odot \text{Irr}(\mathbb{I}(A_r))) = \Gamma(A(A_1)) \times \dots \times \Gamma(A(A_r)) \cong A_1 \times \dots \times A_r = A$.

Assume now $l(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A))) = n > 1$.

Suppose first that A is a BL-comet. Let $\text{pivot}(A) < 1$. By Corollary 30 and Proposition 49, $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A)) \cong \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_1)) \uplus \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_2))$. Thus by Proposition 57, $\Gamma(\mathbb{L}(A)) \cong \Gamma(\mathbb{L}(A_1)) \uplus \Gamma(\mathbb{L}(A_2))$. We recall that A_1 is a BL-chain and that, by Proposition 43, $l(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_2))) = n - 1$. Thus by induction hypothesis $\Gamma(\mathbb{L}(A)) \cong A_1 \uplus A_2 \cong A$.

Finally let $A \in \mathbf{FBL}$. By Corollary 28, $A = A_1 \times \cdots \times A_r$, with A_1, \dots, A_r BL-comets. By Proposition 54, $\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A)) \cong \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_1)) \odot \cdots \odot \text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_r))$. Therefore, by Propositions 57 and 58, $\Gamma(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A))) \cong \Gamma(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_1))) \odot \cdots \odot \Gamma(\text{Irr}(\mathbb{L}(A_r)))$, that is $\Gamma(\mathbb{L}(A)) \cong \Gamma(\mathbb{L}(A_1)) \times \cdots \times \Gamma(\mathbb{L}(A_r)) \cong A_1 \times \cdots \times A_r = A$. \square

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank the reviewer for his helpful suggestions.

References

- [1] P. Agliano, F. Montagna, Varieties of BL algebras I: general properties, Technical Report, University of Siena.
- [2] G. Birkhoff, Lattice Theory, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1984.
- [3] R.L.O. Cignoli, I.M.L. D’ottaviano, D. Mundici, Algebraic Foundations of Many-valued Reasoning (Trends in Logic, Studia Logica Library), Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2000.
- [4] P. Hájek, Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic (Trends in Logic, Studia Logica Library), Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1998.
- [5] E. Turunen, BL-algebras of Basic Fuzzy logic, Mathware Soft Comput. 6 (1999) 49–61.