Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic Volume XIII, Number 1, January 1972 NDJFAM

## AN ABBREVIATION OF CROISOT'S AXIOM-SYSTEM FOR DISTRIBUTIVE LATTICES WITH *I*

## BOLESŁAW SOBOCIŃSKI

In [2] there have been established the axiom-systems which satisfy certain formal requirements defined in that paper for distributive lattices with the constant elements. Unfortunately, only when [2] was already composed and in the final proofs, and, therefore, could not be changed, I unexpectedly obtained a rather interesting result which makes the deductions presented in [2] obsolete, although they are entirely correct. Namely, I have proved that in the sets of postulates given in the assumptions of Theorem 2, cf. [2], section 3, axiom A 17 is redundant.

1 It is obvious, that if an algebraic system

$$\mathbf{G} = \langle A, \cap, \cup, I \rangle$$

with two binary operations  $\cap$  and  $\cup$ , and with a constant element  $I \epsilon A$ , is a distributive lattice with I, then the following formulas

S1 $[a]: a \in A . \supset . I = a \cup I$ [i.e. AI in [2], section 2]S2 $[a]: a \in A . \supset . a = a \cap I$ [i.e. A2 in [2], section 2]S3 $[abc]: a, b, c \in A . \supset . a \cap ((b \cap b) \cup c) = (c \cap a) \cup (b \cap a)$ [i.e. A4 in [2], section 2]

are provable in the field of  $\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{S}}$ . I shall prove here the converse of this statement. Namely:

If the system  $\mathfrak{S}$  satisfies the formulas S1, S2 and S3, then it is a distributive lattice with I.

*Proof*: Let us assume S1, S2 and S3. Then:

Received September 20, 1971