

# Foulis m-semilattices and their modules

Michal Botur

Department of Algebra and Geometry  
Faculty of Science, Palacký University Olomouc  
Olomouc, Czech Republic  
michal.botur@upol.cz

Jan Paseka, Milan Lekár

Department of Mathematics and Statistics  
Faculty of Science, Masaryk University  
Brno, Czech Republic  
paseka@math.muni.cz

**Abstract**—Building upon the results of Jacobs, we show that the category  $\mathbf{OMLatLin}$  of orthomodular lattices and linear maps forms a dagger category. For each orthomodular lattice  $X$ , we construct a Foulis m-semilattice  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$  composed of endomorphisms of  $X$ . This m-semilattice acts as a quantale, enabling us to regard  $X$  as a left  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$ -module. Our novel approach introduces a fuzzy-theoretic dimension to the theory of orthomodular lattices.

**Index Terms**—quantale, quantale module, orthomodular lattice, linear map, Sasaki projection, Foulis m-semilattice, m-semilattice module

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantale modules offer a robust algebraic framework for studying fuzzy set theory and its generalizations. Originating from Mulvey’s pioneering work [9], quantales emerged as non-commutative generalizations of locales, providing a rich mathematical structure that naturally accommodates various forms of fuzzy logic and reasoning.

Höhle [4] first systematically explored the connection between quantale modules and fuzzy sets [14], demonstrating that categories of fuzzy sets can be viewed as categories of modules over specific quantales. By representing fuzzy sets as elements of a quantale module, we can leverage the algebraic structure to define and analyze fuzzy operations rigorously. This perspective has proven instrumental in developing the theoretical foundations of many-valued and fuzzy logics.

Unital quantales, in particular, play a dual role as both truth-value sets for fuzzy logics and coefficient structures for their corresponding categories of modules [7]. This duality enables an elegant treatment of both the logical and set-theoretic aspects of fuzzy mathematics within a unified framework [2].

The module-theoretic approach offers several advantages: it naturally accommodates various t-norms and their associated logics, provides clear conceptual tools for handling grades of membership, and offers powerful categorical methods for studying fuzzy algebraic structures [13]. Moreover, quantale modules have extended classical results from fuzzy set theory to more general settings.

Key applications include:

- **Fuzzy Logic:** Modeling fuzzy logical connectives and inference rules.
- **Fuzzy Set Operations:** Defining and analyzing operations like union, intersection, and complement.
- **Fuzzy Topology:** Constructing fuzzy topological spaces.

- **Image Processing:** Applying fuzzy logic techniques for image processing tasks.

In this research, motivated by the aforementioned considerations, we investigate Foulis m-semilattices, which will serve as quantale-like structures for orthomodular lattices. By doing so, we introduce a natural fuzzy-theoretic aspect to the theory of orthomodular lattices.

The paper is structured as follows. After this introduction, Section II provides some basic notions, notations, and results that will be used in the article. In particular, we introduce here a category  $\mathbf{OMLatLin}$  of orthomodular lattices and linear maps and study its properties. In Section III, we introduce the notion of a Foulis m-semilattice and show that the m-semilattice  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$  of endomorphisms of an orthomodular lattice  $X$  is a Foulis m-semilattice. Conversely, every Foulis m-semilattice  $S$  yields an orthomodular lattice  $[S]$  of projections of  $S$ .

Moreover, in Section IV on m-semilattice modules we show first that, for an orthomodular lattice  $X$ ,  $X$  is a left  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$ -module. Second, the orthomodular lattice  $[S]$  of projections of a Foulis m-semilattice  $S$  is a left  $S$ -module.

Our conclusions follow in Section V.

In what follows, we assume familiarity with the fundamental concepts and results of lattice and poset theory. For further details on these topics, readers are referred to the monographs [3] by G. Birkhoff and [6] by G. Kalmbach. For concepts and results on quantales and quantale modules, we direct the reader to [7], [10], and [12]. The necessary categorical background can be found in [1]; we recommend [5] for dagger categories.

## II. BASIC CONCEPTS

**Definition 1.** A meet semi-lattice  $(X, \wedge, 1)$  is called an *ortholattice* if it comes equipped with a function  $(-)^{\perp}: X \rightarrow X$  satisfying:

- $x^{\perp\perp} = x$ ;
- $x \leq y$  implies  $y^{\perp} \leq x^{\perp}$ ;
- $x \wedge x^{\perp} = 1^{\perp}$ .

One can then define a bottom element as  $0 = 1 \wedge 1^{\perp} = 1^{\perp}$  and join by  $x \vee y = (x^{\perp} \wedge y^{\perp})^{\perp}$ , satisfying  $x \vee x^{\perp} = 1$ .

We write  $x \perp y$  if and only if  $x \leq y^{\perp}$ .

Such an ortholattice is called *orthomodular* if it satisfies (one of) the three equivalent conditions:

- $x \leq y$  implies  $y = x \vee (x^{\perp} \wedge y)$ ;

- $x \leq y$  implies  $x = y \wedge (y^\perp \vee x)$ ;
- $x \leq y$  and  $x^\perp \wedge y = 0$  implies  $x = y$ .

**Definition 2.** A *dagger* on a category  $\mathcal{C}$  is a functor  $*$ :  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  that is involutive and the identity on objects. A category equipped with a dagger is called a *dagger category*.

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a dagger category. A morphism  $f: A \rightarrow B$  is called a *dagger monomorphism* if  $f^* \circ f = \text{id}_A$ , and  $f$  is called a *dagger isomorphism* if  $f^* \circ f = \text{id}_A$  and  $f \circ f^* = \text{id}_B$ .

We now introduce a new way of organising orthomodular lattices into a dagger category.

**Definition 3.** The category **OMLatLin** has orthomodular lattices as objects. A morphism  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  in **OMLatLin** is a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  between the underlying sets such that there is a function  $h: Y \rightarrow X$  and, for any  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ ,

$$f(x) \perp y \text{ if and only if } x \perp h(y).$$

We say that  $h$  is an *adjoint* of a *linear map*  $f$ . It is clear that adjointness is a symmetric property: if a map  $f$  possesses an adjoint  $h$ , then  $f$  is also an adjoint of  $h$ . We denote  $\mathbf{Lin}(X, Y)$  the set of all linear maps from  $X$  to  $Y$ . If  $X = Y$  we put  $\mathbf{Lin}(X) = \mathbf{Lin}(X, X)$ .

Moreover, a map  $f: X \rightarrow X$  is called *self-adjoint* if  $f$  is an adjoint of itself.

The identity morphism on  $X$  is the self-adjoint identity map  $\text{id}: X \rightarrow X$ . Composition of  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$  is given by usual composition of maps.

We immediately see that **OMLatLin** is really a category. Namely, if  $h$  is an adjoint of  $f$  and  $k$  is an adjoint of  $g$  we have, for any  $x \in X$  and  $z \in Z$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} g(f(x)) \perp z &\text{ if and only if } f(x) \perp k(z) \\ &\text{ if and only if } x \perp h(k(z)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $h \circ k$  is an adjoint of  $g \circ f$ . Moreover, for any  $x, y \in X$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{id}(x) \perp y &\text{ if and only if } x \perp y \\ &\text{ if and only if } x \perp \text{id}(y) \end{aligned}$$

and  $\text{id}: X \rightarrow X$  is self-adjoint.

Our guiding example is the following.

**Example 4.** Let  $H$  be a Hilbert space. We denote the closed subspace spanned by a subset  $S \subseteq H$  by  $[S]$ . Let  $C(H) = \{[S]: S \subseteq H\}$ . Then  $C(H)$  is an orthomodular lattice such that  $\wedge = \cap$  and  $P^\perp$  is the orthogonal complement of a closed subspace  $P$  of  $H$ .

Let  $f: H_1 \rightarrow H_2$  be a bounded linear map between Hilbert spaces and let  $f^*$  be the usual adjoint of  $f$ . Then the induced map  $C(H_1) \rightarrow C(H_2)$ ,  $[S] \mapsto [f(S)]$  has the adjoint  $C(H_2) \rightarrow C(H_1)$ ,  $[T] \mapsto [f^*(T)]$ .

**Lemma 5.** Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a linear map between orthomodular lattices. Then  $f$  is order-preserving.

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in X$ . It follows that  $f(x)$  and  $f(x)^\perp$  are orthogonal. This orthogonality implies that  $x$  is orthogonal

to  $f^*(f(x)^\perp)$ , meaning that  $f^*(f(x)^\perp) \leq x^\perp$ . Consequently,  $x \leq (f^*(f(x)^\perp))^\perp$ .

Suppose now that  $x \leq y$ . Then  $x \leq y \leq (f^*(f(y)^\perp))^\perp$ , which implies that  $x \perp f^*(f(y)^\perp)$ . This orthogonality translates to  $f(x) \perp f(y)^\perp$ . As a result,  $f(x) \leq f(y)^\perp{}^\perp = f(y)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  and  $h: Y \rightarrow X$  be maps between orthomodular lattices. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- $f$  possesses a right order-adjoint  $\hat{h}: Y \rightarrow X$  such that  $\hat{h} = \perp \circ h \circ \perp$ .
- $f$  possesses the adjoint  $h: Y \rightarrow X$ .

*Proof.* Ad (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): We have, for any  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) \perp y &\text{ if and only if } f(x) \leq y^\perp \text{ if and only if } x \leq \hat{h}(y^\perp) \\ &\text{ if and only if } x \leq h(y)^\perp \text{ if and only if } x \perp h(y). \end{aligned}$$

Ad (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): We have, for any  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) \leq y &\text{ if and only if } f(x) \perp y^\perp \text{ if and only if } x \perp h(y^\perp) \\ &\text{ if and only if } x \leq h(y^\perp)^\perp \text{ if and only if } x \leq \hat{h}(y). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

If  $f$  does have an adjoint, it has exactly one adjoint and we shall denote it by  $f^*$ .

Moreover, we define the *kernel* and the *range* of  $f$ , respectively, by

$$\begin{aligned} \ker f &= \{x \in X: f(x) = 0\}, \\ \text{im } f &= \{f(x): x \in X\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Corollary 7.** Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a map between orthomodular lattices and assume that  $f$  possesses the adjoint  $h: Y \rightarrow X$ . Then  $f$  preserves arbitrary existing joins in  $X$ . In particular,  $f$  preserves finite joins and  $f(0) = 0$ .

**Theorem 8.** **OMLatLin** is a dagger category.

*Proof.* Since every morphism in **OMLatLin** has a unique adjoint we obtain that  $*$ : **OMLatLin**<sup>op</sup>  $\rightarrow$  **OMLatLin** is involutive and the identity on objects.  $\square$

Let us recall the following elementary results and definition.

**Lemma 9.** [5, Lemma 3.4] Let  $X$  be an orthomodular lattice, with element  $a \in X$ . The (principal) downset  $\downarrow a = \{u \in X \mid u \leq a\}$  is again an orthomodular lattice, with order, meets and joins as in  $X$ , but with its own orthocomplement  $\perp_a$  given by  $u^\perp_a = a \wedge u^\perp$ , where  $\perp$  is the orthocomplement from  $X$ .

**Definition 10.** Let  $X$  be an orthomodular lattice. Then the map  $\pi_a: X \rightarrow X$ ,  $y \mapsto a \wedge (a^\perp \vee y)$  is called the *Sasaki projection* to  $a \in X$ .

We need the following facts about Sasaki projections (see [8]):

**Lemma 11.** Let  $X$  be an orthomodular lattice, and let  $a \in X$ . Then for each  $y, z \in L$  we have

- (a)  $y \leq a$  if and only if  $\pi_a(y) = y$ ;
- (b)  $\pi_a(\pi_a(y^\perp)^\perp) \leq y$ ;
- (c)  $\pi_a(y) = 0$  if and only if  $y \leq a^\perp$ ;
- (d)  $\pi_a(y) \perp z$  if and only if  $y \perp \pi_a(z)$ .

**Corollary 12.** *Let  $X$  be an orthomodular lattice, and let  $a \in X$ . Then  $\pi_a$  is self-adjoint and idempotent.*

Similarly as in [5, Lemma 3.4] we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $X$  be an orthomodular lattice, with element  $a \in X$ . There is a dagger monomorphism  $\downarrow a \rightarrow X$  in **OMLatLin**, for which we also write  $a$ , with*

$$a(u) = u \quad \text{and} \quad a^*(x) = \pi_a(x).$$

*Proof.* Let  $x \in X$  and  $u \in \downarrow a$ .

We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} a(u) \perp x &\text{ if and only if } \pi_a(u) = u \perp x \\ &\text{ if and only if } u \perp \pi_a(x) \\ &\text{ if and only if } u \leq \pi_a(x)^\perp \\ &\text{ if and only if } u \leq \pi_a(x)^\perp \wedge a = \pi_a(x)^\perp a. \end{aligned}$$

The first equivalence follows from Lemma 11(a), the second one from Lemma 11(d). The remaining equivalences are evident.

From Lemma 11(a) we also obtain that the map  $a: \downarrow a \rightarrow X$  is a dagger monomorphism since:

$$a^*(a_*(u)) = \pi_a(u) = u.$$

□

**Lemma 14.** *Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a morphism of orthomodular lattices. Then  $\ker f = \downarrow f^*(1)^\perp$  is an orthomodular lattice.*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in X$ . We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} x \in \ker f &\text{ if and only if } f(x) = 0 \text{ if and only if } f(x) \perp 1 \\ &\text{ if and only if } x \perp f^*(1) \text{ if and only if } x \leq f^*(1)^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary 15.** *Let  $X$  be an orthomodular lattice, and let  $f: X \rightarrow X$  be a self-adjoint morphism of orthomodular lattices. Then  $\ker f = \downarrow f(1)^\perp$  and  $f(f(y^\perp)^\perp) \leq y$  for all  $y \in X$ .*

*Proof.* It is enough to check that  $f(f(y^\perp)^\perp) \leq y$ . We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} f(f(y^\perp)^\perp) \leq y &\text{ if and only if } f(f(y^\perp)^\perp) \perp y^\perp \\ &\text{ if and only if } f(y^\perp)^\perp \perp f(y^\perp). \end{aligned}$$

□

We show that **OMLatLin** has a *zero object*  $\underline{0}$ ; this means that there is, for any orthomodular lattice  $X$ , a unique morphism  $\underline{0} \rightarrow X$  and hence also a unique morphism  $X \rightarrow \underline{0}$ . The zero object  $\underline{0}$  will be one-element orthomodular lattice  $\{0\}$ .

Let us show that  $\underline{0}$  is indeed an initial object in **OMLatLin**. Let  $X$  be an arbitrary orthomodular lattice. The only function  $f: \underline{0} \rightarrow X$  is  $f(0) = 0$ . Since we may identify  $\underline{0}$  with  $\downarrow 0$  we have that  $f$  is a dagger monomorphism and it has an adjoint  $f^*: X \rightarrow \underline{0}$  defined by  $f^*(x) = \pi_0(x) = 0$ .

### III. FOULIS M-SEMILATTICES

An *m-semilattice* is a join-semilattice  $(S, \sqcup, 0)$  with an associative binary multiplication satisfying

$$x \cdot \bigvee_{i \in I} x_i = \bigwedge_{i \in I} x \cdot x_i \quad \text{and} \quad \left( \bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i \right) \cdot x = \bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i \cdot x$$

for all  $x, x_i \in S, i \in I$  ( $I$  is a finite set). We denote the respective order on  $S$  by  $\sqsubseteq$ .

An m-semilattice  $S$  is called *unital* if there is an element  $e \in S$  such that

$$e \cdot a = a = a \cdot e$$

for all  $a \in S$ .

By an *involution m-semilattice* will be meant an m-semilattice  $S$  together with a semigroup involution  $*$  satisfying

$$\left( \bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i \right)^* = \bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i^*$$

for all  $x_i \in S, i \in I$  ( $I$  is a finite set). In the event that  $S$  is also unital, then necessarily  $e$  is selfadjoint i.e.

$$e = e^*.$$

We also define  $s \leq t$  if and only if  $s = t \cdot s$ , and  $s \perp t$  if and only if  $0 = s^* \cdot t$  for all  $s, t \in S$ .

**Proposition 16.** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be orthomodular lattices. Then*

- (i)  $\mathbf{Lin}(X, Y)$  is a join-semilattice,
- (ii)  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$  is an involutive unital m-semilattice.

*Proof.* Ad (i): Clearly, the zero map  $0_{X,Y}$  has as adjoint the zero map  $0_{Y,X}$ . Hence  $\mathbf{Lin}(X, Y)$  has a smallest element. Now, let  $f, g \in \mathbf{Lin}(X, Y) \subseteq Y^X$ . Assume that  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (f \vee g)(x) \perp y &\text{ if and only if } f(x) \leq y^\perp \text{ and } g(x) \leq y^\perp \\ &\text{ if and only if } f^*(y) \leq x^\perp \text{ and } g^*(y) \leq x^\perp \\ &\text{ if and only if } (f^* \vee g^*)(y) \leq x^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $f \vee g \in \mathbf{Lin}(X, Y)$  and  $(f \vee g)^* = f^* \vee g^*$ .

Ad (ii): Evidently,  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$  has arbitrary finite joins and is a monoid with respect to composition of linear maps. Moreover,  $*$  is a semigroup involution on  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$ . Now, let  $f, g_i \in \mathbf{Lin}(X), i \in I$  ( $I$  is a finite set). Assume that  $x \in X$ . We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} (f \circ \bigvee_{i \in I} g_i)(x) &= f\left(\bigvee_{i \in I} g_i(x)\right) = \bigvee_{i \in I} f(g_i(x)) \\ &= \left(\bigvee_{i \in I} f \circ g_i\right)(x) \end{aligned}$$

The remaining distributive law follows by the same arguments as before. □

**Definition 17.** A Foulis semigroup consists of a monoid  $(S, \cdot, 1)$  together with two endomaps  $(-)^*: S \rightarrow S$  and  $[-]: S \rightarrow S$  satisfying:

- (1)  $1^* = 1$  and  $(s \cdot t) = t^* \cdot s^*$  and  $s^{**} = s$ , making  $S$  an involutive monoid;
- (2)  $[s]$  is a self-adjoint idempotent, i.e.,  $[s] \cdot [s] = [s] = [s]^*$ ;
- (3)  $0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [1]$  is a zero element:  $0 \cdot s = 0 = s \cdot 0$ ;
- (4)  $s \cdot x = 0$  iff  $\exists y. x = [s] \cdot y$ .

For an arbitrary  $t \in S$  put  $t^\perp \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [t^*] \in [S]$ . Hence from (2) we get equations  $t^\perp \cdot t^\perp = t^\perp = (t^\perp)^*$ .

**Definition 18.** By a *Foulis m-semilattice* will be meant a m-semilattice  $S$  together with a semigroup involution  $*$  that is a Foulis semigroup. We will call elements of  $[S]$  *projections*.

**Remark 19.** We immediately see that an m-semilattice  $S$  is a Foulis m-semilattice if and only if it is a unital involutive m-semilattice  $S$  together with an endomap  ${}^\perp: Q \rightarrow Q$  satisfying:

- (1)  $s^\perp$  is a self-adjoint idempotent, i.e., satisfies  $s^\perp \cdot s^\perp = s^\perp = (s^\perp)^*$ ;
- (2)  $0 = e^\perp$ ;
- (3)  $s \perp x = 0$  iff  $\exists y. x = s^\perp \cdot y$ .

Since  $s^\perp \cdot s^\perp = s^\perp$  we conclude that  $s \perp s^\perp$ , i.e.,  $s^* \cdot s^\perp = 0$  and  $s^\perp \cdot s = 0$ .

**Theorem 20** ([6, Chapter 5, §§18]). *Let  $X$  be an orthomodular lattice and let us define the endomap  $[-]: \mathbf{Lin}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{Lin}(X)$  by  $[s] = \pi_{s^*(1)^\perp}$  for all  $s \in \mathbf{Lin}(X)$ . Then  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$  is a Foulis semigroup.*

**Corollary 21.** *Let  $X$  be an orthomodular lattice. Then  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$  is a Foulis m-semilattice.*

**Theorem 22.** *Let  $S$  be a Foulis m-semilattice. Then, for all  $t, r \in S$  and  $k \in [S]$ ,*

$$r^* \cdot t = 0 \iff t = [r^*] \cdot t, \quad (*)$$

$$t \leq r \implies r^\perp \leq t^\perp \quad \text{and} \quad k^{\perp\perp} = k, \quad (**)$$

$$t \leq r^\perp \iff r \leq t^\perp. \quad (***)$$

and the subset

$$[S] = \{[t] \mid t \in S\} \subseteq S,$$

is an orthomodular lattice with the following structure.

|                    |                  |                   |  |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|--|
| Order              | $k_1 \leq k_2$   | $\Leftrightarrow$ | $k_1 = k_2 \cdot k_1$                        |
| Top                | $1$              | $=$               | $[0]$  |
| Orthocomplement    | $k^\perp$        | $=$               | $[k]$  |
| Finite binary meet | $k_1 \wedge k_2$ | $=$               | $(k_1 \cdot [[k_2] \cdot k_1])^{\perp\perp}$ |
| Finite join        | $\bigvee X$      | $=$               | $[[\bigwedge X]]$ .                          |

*Proof.* The majority of this content is widely recognized in [5, Lemma 4.6.] and its proof for a Foulis semigroups. It remains only to show that  $[[\bigwedge X]]$  is the join of the finite subset  $X \subseteq [S]$ . We put  $t = \bigwedge X$ . Clearly,  $t$  is self-adjoint.

- (i) Let  $r \in X$ . Since  $r \cdot [\bigwedge X] \subseteq \bigwedge X \cdot [\bigwedge X] = 0$  we have that  $r \cdot [\bigwedge X] = 0$ . Since both  $r$  and  $t$  are self-adjoint we conclude that also  $[\bigwedge X] \cdot r = 0$ . Using (\*) we obtain that  $[[\bigwedge X]] \cdot r = r$ , i.e.,  $r \leq [[\bigwedge X]]$ . Hence  $[[\bigwedge X]]$  is an upper bound of  $X$ .
- (ii) Let  $u$  be an upper bound of  $X$  in  $[S]$ , i.e.,  $s = u \cdot s$  for all  $s \in X$ . We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} u \cdot t &= u \cdot \bigwedge X = \bigwedge \{u \cdot s \mid s \in X\} = \bigwedge \{s \mid s \in X\} \\ &= t. \end{aligned}$$

From the conclusion that  $t \leq u$ , we derive from (\*\*\*) that  $[[\bigwedge X]] = t^{\perp\perp} \leq u^{\perp\perp} = u$ . Hence  $[[\bigwedge X]]$  is the smallest upper bound of  $S$ . □

#### IV. M-SEMILATTICE MODULES

**Definition 23.** Given a unital m-semilattice  $S$ , a *left  $S$ -module* is a join-semilattice  $A$  and a map  $\bullet: S \times A \rightarrow A$  satisfying:

- (A1)  $s \bullet (\bigvee B) = \bigvee_{x \in B} (s \bullet x)$  for every finite  $B \subseteq A$  and  $s \in S$ .
- (A2)  $(\bigwedge T) \bullet a = \bigvee_{t \in T} (t \bullet a)$  for every finite  $T \subseteq S$  and  $a \in A$ .
- (A3)  $u \bullet (v \bullet a) = (u \cdot v) \bullet a$  for every  $u, v \in S$  and every  $a \in A$ .
- (A4)  $e \bullet a = a$  for all  $a \in A$  (unitality).

Right  $S$ -modules are defined similarly. Evidently, every join-semilattice  $A$  is a right  $\mathbf{2}$ -module. Here,  $\mathbf{2}$  is a 2-element chain, its multiplication is a meet and involution is the identity map on it.

**Proposition 24.** *Let  $X$  be an orthomodular lattice. Then  $X$  is a left  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$ -module and also a right  $\mathbf{2}$ -module.*

*Proof.* We define the action  $\bullet: \mathbf{Lin}(X) \times X \rightarrow X$  by  $f \bullet x = f(x)$  for all  $f \in \mathbf{Lin}(X)$  and all  $x \in X$ . The verification of conditions (A1)-(A4) is transparent. □

**Theorem 25.** *Let  $S$  be a Foulis m-semilattice. Then  $[S]$  is a left  $S$ -module with action  $\bullet$  defined as  $u \bullet k = (u \cdot k)^{\perp\perp}$  for all  $u \in S$  and  $k \in [S]$  and also a right  $\mathbf{2}$ -module.*

*Proof.* **Claim 1.**  $e \bullet k = k$  for all  $k \in [S]$ .

*Proof of Claim 1.* We compute:

$$e \bullet k = (e \cdot k)^{\perp\perp} = k^{\perp\perp} = k. \quad \blacksquare$$

**Claim 2.** For all  $r, s, t \in S$ ,

$$s \leq t \implies r \cdot s \leq (r \cdot s)^{\perp\perp} \leq (r \cdot t)^{\perp\perp}. \quad (\text{M1})$$

*Proof of Claim 2.* From Remark 19 we obtain  $(r \cdot t)^\perp \cdot (r \cdot t) = 0$ . Hence also  $(r \cdot t)^\perp \cdot (r \cdot t \cdot s) = 0$ . Since  $t \cdot s = s$  we conclude that  $(r \cdot t)^\perp \cdot (r \cdot s) = 0$ . From (\*) we conclude that  $r \cdot s = (r \cdot t)^{\perp\perp} \cdot (r \cdot s)$ , i.e.,  $r \cdot s \leq (r \cdot t)^{\perp\perp}$ . Using (\*\*) we have that  $r \cdot s \leq (r \cdot s)^{\perp\perp} \leq (r \cdot t)^{\perp\perp}$ . ■

**Claim 3.** For all  $s, t \in S$ ,

$$(s \cdot t)^{\perp\perp} = (s \cdot t^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} \quad (\text{M2})$$

Proof of Claim 3. From Remark 19 we have  $(s \cdot t) \perp (s \cdot t)^{\perp}$ . We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} (s \cdot t)^* \cdot (s \cdot t)^{\perp} = 0 &\iff t^* \cdot s^* \cdot (s \cdot t)^{\perp} = 0 \\ &\stackrel{\text{Remark 19}}{\iff} t^{\perp\perp} \cdot s^* \cdot (s \cdot t)^{\perp} = 0 \\ &\iff (s \cdot t)^{\perp} \cdot s \cdot t^{\perp\perp} = 0 \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\iff} (s \cdot t)^{\perp\perp} \cdot s \cdot t^{\perp\perp} = s \cdot t^{\perp\perp} \\ &\iff s \cdot t^{\perp\perp} \leq (s \cdot t)^{\perp\perp} \\ &\iff (s \cdot t^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} \leq (s \cdot t)^{\perp\perp}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $t \leq t^{\perp\perp}$  we have from ((M1)) that  $(s \cdot t)^{\perp\perp} \leq (s \cdot t^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp}$ , i.e., ((M2)) holds. ■

**Claim 4.** For all  $s, t \in S$  and  $k \in [S]$ ,

$$s \bullet (t \bullet k) = (s \cdot t) \bullet k.$$

Proof of Claim 4. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} s \bullet (t \bullet k) &= (s \cdot (t \bullet k))^{\perp\perp} = (s \cdot (t \cdot k)^{\perp\perp})^{\perp\perp} \\ &= (s \cdot (t \cdot k))^{\perp\perp} = ((s \cdot t) \cdot k)^{\perp\perp} = (s \cdot t) \bullet k. \end{aligned}$$

**Claim 5.** For all  $T \subseteq S$ ,  $T$  finite

$$\left(\bigsqcup T\right)^{\perp} = \bigwedge_{s \in T} s^{\perp} \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\bigsqcup T\right)^{\perp\perp} = \bigvee_{s \in T} s^{\perp\perp}. \quad (\text{M3})$$

Proof of Claim 5. Let  $u \in [S]$ . Then by (\*\*\*)  $u \leq (\bigsqcup T)^{\perp}$  if and only if  $\bigsqcup_{s \in T} s \leq u^{\perp}$  if and only if  $\bigsqcup_{s \in T} s = u^{\perp}$ .  $\bigsqcup_{s \in T} s = \bigsqcup_{s \in T} (u^{\perp} \cdot s)$ .

Remark 19 implies that  $\bigsqcup_{s \in T} u^* \cdot s = \bigsqcup_{s \in T} (u^* \cdot u^{\perp} \cdot s) = 0$ . Hence we conclude that  $u^* \cdot s = 0$ , i.e.,  $u \leq s^{\perp}$  for all  $s \in T$ .

Conversely, let  $u \leq s^{\perp}$  for all  $s \in T$ . Then  $u^* \cdot \bigsqcup_{s \in T} s = \bigsqcup_{s \in T} (u^* \cdot s) = 0$ . We obtain that  $u \perp \bigsqcup T$ , i.e.,  $u \leq (\bigsqcup T)^{\perp}$ .

Alltogether,  $u \leq (\bigsqcup T)^{\perp}$  if and only if  $u \leq \bigwedge_{s \in T} s^{\perp}$ .

The second equation follows immediately from the first one and the fact that  $[S]$  is an orthomodular lattice. ■

**Claim 6.** For all  $s \in S$  and  $T \subseteq [S]$ ,  $T$  finite

$$s \bullet \left(\bigvee T\right) = \bigvee_{t \in T} (s \bullet t).$$

Proof of Claim 6. By utilizing ((M2)) and ((M3)), we are able to perform the calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} s \bullet \left(\bigvee T\right) &= (s \cdot \left(\bigsqcup T\right))^{\perp\perp} = \left(\bigsqcup_{t \in T} (s \cdot t)\right)^{\perp\perp} \\ &= \left(\bigsqcup_{t \in T} (s \cdot t)^{\perp\perp}\right)^{\perp\perp} = \left(\bigsqcup_{t \in T} (s \bullet t)\right)^{\perp\perp} = \bigvee_{t \in T} (s \bullet t). \end{aligned}$$

**Claim 7.** For all  $s \in [S]$  and  $T \subseteq S$ ,  $T$  finite

$$\left(\bigsqcup T\right) \bullet s = \bigvee_{t \in T} (t \bullet s).$$

Proof of Claim 7. Through the application of ((M2)) and ((M3)), we can carry out the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\bigsqcup T\right) \bullet s &= \left(\left(\bigsqcup T\right) \cdot s\right)^{\perp\perp} = \left(\bigsqcup_{t \in T} (t \cdot s)\right)^{\perp\perp} \\ &= \left(\bigsqcup_{t \in T} (t \cdot s)^{\perp\perp}\right)^{\perp\perp} = \left(\bigsqcup_{t \in T} (t \bullet s)\right)^{\perp\perp} = \bigvee_{t \in T} (t \bullet s). \end{aligned}$$

From Claims 1, 4, 6 and 7 we can conclude that  $[S]$  is a left  $S$ -module. ■

## V. CONCLUSIONS

Our research demonstrates that, analogous to the findings in [5], **OMLatLin** is a dagger category. We associate with every orthomodular lattice  $X$  a Foulis  $m$ -semilattice  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$  of endomorphisms of  $X$ , which serves as a quantale.  $X$  then becomes a left  $\mathbf{Lin}(X)$ -module. Consequently, we introduce a natural fuzzy-theoretic aspect to the theory of orthomodular lattices.

For future research, we intend to explore several problems, including:

- 1) Following [5], we plan to show that
  - a) the category **OMLatLin** is a dagger kernel category, and
  - b) for a dagger kernel category  $\mathbf{D}$ , the kernel subobject functor  $\mathbf{KSub}(-)$  is a functor  $\mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{OMLatLin}$ .
- 2) Our analysis revealed that **OMLatLin** behaves as a quantaloid as introduced in [11]. We aim to show that **OMLatLin** is an involutive semi-quantaloid.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The first author acknowledges the support of project 23-09731L by the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR), entitled ‘‘Representations of algebraic semantics for substructural logics’’. The support of the second author’s research by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), project I 4579-N, and the Czech Science Foundation, project 20-09869L, entitled ‘‘The many facets of orthomodularity’’ are gratefully acknowledged. The third author was supported by the project MUNI/A/1457/2023 by Masaryk University.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Adámek, H. Herrlich, G.E. Strecker, Abstract and Concrete Categories: The Joy of Cats. John Wiley and Sons, New York (1990).
- [2] R. Bělohávek, Fuzzy Relational Systems: Foundations and Principles. Springer (2002)
- [3] G. Birkhoff, Lattice Theory. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I., 1979.
- [4] U. Höhle, Commutative, residuated  $\ell$ -monoids. In: U. Höhle, E.P. Klement, (eds), Non-classical Logics and their Applications to Fuzzy Subsets, Theory and Decision Library, vol 32, Springer, Dordrecht, (1995) 53–106.
- [5] B. Jacobs, Orthomodular lattices, Foulis Semigroups and Dagger Kernel Categories. Logical Methods in Computer Science **6** (2:1), 1–26 (2010).

- [6] G. Kalmbach, *Orthomodular Lattices*. Academic Press, London 1983.
- [7] D. Krüml, J. Paseka, *Algebraic and categorical aspects of quantales*. *Handbook of algebra* (M. Hazewinkel, ed.), vol. 5, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2008, pp. 323–362.
- [8] B. Lindenhovius, T. Vetterlein, A characterisation of orthomodular spaces by Sasaki maps. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, **62**, Article number: 59 (2023).
- [9] C.J. Mulvey, &. *Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo, Series 2, Supplemento* **12**, 99–104 (1986)
- [10] K.J. Rosenthal, *Quantales and Their Applications*. Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series 234, Longman Scientific & Technical, 1990.
- [11] K.J. Rosenthal, *The Theory of Quantaloids*. Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series 348, Longman Scientific & Technical, 1996.
- [12] C. Russo, *Quantale Modules: with Applications to Logic and Image Processing*, Lambert Academic Publishing, 2009.
- [13] S. Solovjovs, On ordered categories as a framework for fuzzification of algebraic and topological structures. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* **160** (20), 2910–2925 (2009).
- [14] Zadeh, L.A.: Fuzzy sets. *Information and Control* **8** (3), 338–353 (1965).