



Huang Yisheng

# BCI- Algebra


(BCI-代数)



科学出版社  
Science Press

(O-2228.0101)

ISBN 7-03-015411-8



9 787030 154118 >

ISBN 7-03-015411-8

定价: 57.00 元

Huang Yisheng

# BCI-ALgebra

(BCI-代数)

黄逸生

Huang Yisheng

# BCI-Algebra

(BCI-代数)



SCIENCE PRESS

Beijing

*Responsible Editors:* Lü Hong, Zu Cui'e

Copyright © 2006 by Science Press  
Published by Science Press  
16 Donghuangchenggen North Street  
Beijing 100717, China

Printed in Beijing

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN 7-03-015411-8/O.2228

*In memory of my master Professor Chen Zhaomu*



## Preface

This book is mainly designed for the graduate students who are interested in the theory of BCK and BCI-algebras.

BCI-algebras are a wider class than BCK-algebras, introduced by Kiyoshi Iséki in 1966. BCI-algebras as a class of logical algebras are the algebraic formulations of the set difference together with its properties in set theory and the implicational functor in logical systems. They are closely related to partially ordered commutative monoids as well as various logical algebras. Their names are originated from the combinators B, C, K and I in combinatory logic. The early research work was mainly carried out among the Japanese mathematicians Kiyoshi Iséki and Shotaro Tanaka, etc. who did a great deal of foundation work. Since late 1970s, their work has been paid much attention. In particular, the participation in the research of Polish mathematicians Tadeusz Traczyk and Andrzej Wroński as well as Australian mathematician William H. Cornish, etc. is making this branch of algebra develop rapidly. Many interesting and important results are discovered continuously. Now, the theory of BCI-algebras has been widely spread.

The structure of this book is similar to that of *Two B-Algebras*, the teaching materials by Zhaomu Chen. Some of the contents are drawn from the following two books: *BCK-Algebras* by Jie Meng and Young Bae Jun, and *An Introduction to BCI-Algebras* by Jie Meng and Yonglin Liu. Most contents come from firsthand information. Because Professor Huishi Li's axiom system is adopted and also because this book's system is required, many proofs are properly modified. This book is only an analysis on the general theoretical basis of BCI-algebras. Therefore the materials are somewhat limited. For example,  $p$ -semisimple algebras only take a little space, contents on the topology and category theories and fuzzy BCI-algebras are omitted. I think, it may be more proper to do so for an elementary book. We try what we can to use all kinds of notations and terminologies used by most papers' authors. More examples are given and the materials



are handled more systematically and various arguments are written in more details so as to be read easily. Quite a lot of exercises are arranged at the end of every section. They are also the component part of our theory. The exercises with the sign \* are more difficult for the beginners who can leave them away. The two appendices at the back of the text will be of great value to those who are interested in further research of BCI-algebras.

For many times the late Professor Zhaomu Chen, my former teacher, encouraged me to compile this book. Professors Jie Meng, Hao Jiang, Young Bae Jun, Yonglin Liu and Doctor Eun Hwan Roh provided much valuable information. Professor Hao Jiang went over the manuscript and pointed out some mistakes. Miss Liying Chen in Longyan Teachers' College provided me much help in English expression. Mr Shenrong Lu in Longyan Teachers' College gave me much guidance in using computer. Mr Wenqing Zhang in Sanming College read through all pages and corrected some spelling and grammatical mistakes. Sanming College that I am working in now offers financial aid for publication of the book. Here, I extend my heartfelt thanks to all those who have supported, helped and encouraged me to write this book.

Huang Yisheng  
Sanming, Fujian  
December, 2003

# Contents

<b>Chapter 0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	1
§0.1	Mappings Abelian Groups Binary Relations	2
§0.2	Lattices Boolean Algebras	5
<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>General Theory</b>	11
§1.1	Definition and Elementary Properties	11
§1.2	BCK-Algebras	21
§1.3	$p$ -Semisimple Algebras	33
§1.4	Ideals	44
§1.5	Congruences and Quotient Algebras	58
§1.6	BCI-Homomorphisms	67
§1.7	Direct Sums and Direct Products	78
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>Commutative BCK-Algebras</b>	93
§2.1	Definition and Elementary Properties	93
§2.2	Commutative BCK-Lattices	106
§2.3	Structures of Certain Commutative BCK-Algebras	112
§2.4	Generalized Commutative BCK-Algebras	121
§2.5	Commutative Ideals	132
§2.6	Quasi-Commutative BCI-Algebras	142
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>Positive Implicative and Implicative BCK-Algebras</b>	153
§3.1	Positive Implicative BCK-Algebras	153
§3.2	Implicative BCK-Algebras	162
§3.3	Positive Implicative and Implicative BCI-Algebras	174
§3.4	Positive Implicative Ideals	188
§3.5	Implicative Ideals	198

<b>Chapter 4 BCI-Algebras with Condition (S)</b> .....	209
§4.1 Definition and Elementary Properties .....	209
§4.2 Commutative BCK-Algebras with Condition (S) .....	221
§4.3 Positive Implicative BCK-Algebras with Condition (S) .....	229
§4.4 Implicative BCK-Algebras with Condition (S) .....	239
§4.5 Commutative Residual Pomonoids .....	247
<b>Chapter 5 Normal BCI-Algebras</b> .....	259
§5.1 Simple BCI-Algebras .....	259
§5.2 Semisimple BCI-Algebras .....	264
§5.3 $J$ -Semisimple BCI-Algebras .....	275
§5.4 Normal BCI-Algebras .....	279
§5.5 Normal Ideals in BCK-Algebras .....	286
<b>Chapter 6 Radicals and Ideals</b> .....	291
§6.1 Radicals .....	291
§6.2 $p$ -Semisimple Ideals .....	298
§6.3 Associative and Quasi-Associative Ideals .....	302
§6.4 Irreducible Ideals .....	307
<b>Appendix A</b> .....	313
<b>Appendix B</b> .....	336
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	343
<b>Index</b> .....	353

# Chapter 0

## Introduction

BCK-algebras and BCI-algebras are abbreviated to two B-algebras. The former was raised in 1966 by Y. Imai and K. Iséki, Japanese mathematicians, and the latter was put forward in the same year due to K. Iséki.

Two B-algebras are originated from two different sources. One of the motivations is based on set theory. In set theory, there are three most elementary and fundamental operations. They are the union, intersection and set difference. If we consider those three operations and their properties, then as a generalization of them, we have the notion of Boolean algebras. If we take both of the union and intersection, then as a general algebra, the notion of distributive lattices is obtained. Moreover, if we consider the union or the intersection alone, we have the notion of upper semilattices or lower semilattices. However, the set difference together with its properties had not been considered systematically before K. Iséki.

Another motivation is from propositional calculi. There are some systems which contain the only implicational functor among logical functors, such as the system of positive implicational calculus, the system of weak positive implicational calculus, BCK-system and BCI-system. Undoubtedly there are common properties among those systems.

We know very well that there are close relationships between the notions of the set difference in set theory and the implication functor in logical systems. For example, we have the following simple inclusion relations in set theory:

$$\begin{aligned}(A - B) - (A - C) &\subseteq C - B, \\ A - (A - B) &\subseteq B.\end{aligned}$$

These are similar to the propositional formulas in propositional calculi:

$$\begin{aligned}(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow ((q \rightarrow r) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)), \\ p \rightarrow ((p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow q).\end{aligned}$$

It raises the following questions. What are the most essential and fundamental properties of these relationships? Can we formulate a general

algebra from the above consideration? How will we find an axiom system to establish a good theory of general algebras? Answering these questions, K. Iséki formulated the notions of two B-algebras in which BCI-algebras are a wider class than BCK-algebras. Their names are taken from BCK and BCI-systems in combinatory logic.

## §0.1 Mappings    Abelian Groups    Binary Relations

We begin our discussion with a brief survey of some fundamental notions which will be frequently mentioned.

A **mapping**  $f : A \rightarrow B$  is a rule of correspondences from a nonempty set  $A$  to another set  $B$ , satisfying the condition that for any  $a \in A$  there exists a unique element  $b \in B$  such that  $a$  corresponds with  $b$  (symbolically,  $f(a) = b$  or  $f : a \mapsto b$ ), where  $A$  is called the **domain** of  $f$ ,  $B$  the **codomain** of  $f$ , and the set,  $\text{Im}(f) = \{f(a) \mid a \in A\}$ , the **image** of  $f$ . Also, we call  $b$  the **image** of  $a$  under  $f$ , and  $a$  an **inverse image** of  $b$  under  $f$ .

In general, an element  $b$  in  $B$  may have many inverse images, or may not have any one. If for all  $b \in B$  there is at least an inverse image of  $b$ , i.e.,  $\text{Im}(f) = B$ , we call  $f$  a **surjection**. If for any  $b \in \text{Im}(f)$  there is one and only one inverse image of  $b$ ,  $f$  is called an **injection**. Of course, a **bijection**  $f : A \rightarrow B$  is a mapping which is both surjective and injective.

Denoting  $a^*$  for the image of  $a$  under a mapping  $f : A \rightarrow B$ , we can regard  $*$  as an operation from  $A$  to  $B$ . From the above statements of mappings, an operation  $*$  from  $A$  to  $B$  has to satisfy: ① uniqueness: the result  $a^*$  after  $a$  through the operation  $*$  is unique; ② closeness:  $a^*$  must belong to  $B$ . For example, the power  $a^{*1} = a^2$  ( $a \in Z$ ) can be regarded as an operation  $*_1$  from the set  $Z$  of all integers to itself, and  $(a, b)^{*2} = |ab|$  ( $a, b \in Z$ ) as an operation  $*_2$  from the Cartesian product set  $Z \times Z$  to  $Z$ , where  $|\bullet|$  is the absolute value of  $\bullet$ .

Let  $A$  be a nonempty set. An operation  $*$  from the Cartesian product set  $A^n$  to  $A$  is called an  **$n$ -ary operation** on  $A$ . Especially, a 2-ary operation is just a **binary operation**, and a 1-ary operation is a **unary operation**. Then the above operation  $*_1$  is a unary operation on  $Z$ , and  $*_2$  is a binary operation on  $Z$ .

There are some elements in a set, which play special roles. For example, 0 and 1 in  $Z$  have respectively the familiar properties:  $x + 0 = x$  and  $x \cdot 1 = x$  for all  $x \in Z$ . Such an element is actually a special mapping, and so in our point of view, it can be regarded as a so-called **nullary operation** (usually, it is called a **constant**).

A system consisting of a nonempty set  $A$  together with some operations on  $A$  and their laws is called an **algebra**. Those operations on  $A$  are usually described by the **type** of this algebra. For example, a group  $(G; \cdot, e)$  is an algebra of type  $(2, 0)$ . That is to say, this system consists of a nonempty set  $G$  and a binary operation  $\cdot$  on  $G$  as well as a constant  $e$  (i.e., a nullary operation). Similarly, a ring  $R$  is an algebra of type  $(2, 2, 0)$ , and a field  $F$  is of type  $(2, 2, 0, 0)$ .

A nonempty subset  $B$  of an algebra  $A$ , which contains all constants of  $A$  if they exist, is called a **subalgebra** of  $A$  if  $B$  is closed under all operations on  $A$  and if all laws in  $A$  are still valid in  $B$ .

Abelian groups will play a basic role in BCI-algebras. We recall that an algebra  $(G; \cdot, e)$  of type  $(2, 0)$  is said an **Abelian group** (or a **commutative group**) if the following hold:

- (1) associative law:  $(ab)c = a(bc)$  for any  $a, b, c \in G$ ;
- (2) commutative law:  $ab = ba$  for any  $a, b \in G$ ;
- (3) the unit element of  $G$  exists: there is an element  $e \in G$  such that  $ea = a$  for any  $a \in G$ ;
- (4) every element in  $G$  is invertible: for any  $a \in G$ , there exists  $b \in G$  such that  $ab = e$ .

Several simple examples of Abelian groups are as follows: the additive group of integers, the additive group of residue classes modulo  $n$ , the group of roots of unity.

We also recall that an algebra  $(M; \cdot, e)$  of type  $(2, 0)$  is called a **monoid** if the operation  $\cdot$  on  $M$  satisfies the associative law and the constant  $e$  is a unit element of  $M$ . Any group is obviously a monoid. A **sub-semigroup**  $S$  of a monoid  $M$  means that  $S$  is a nonempty subset of  $M$  and  $S$  is closed under the operation  $\cdot$  on  $M$ . A **submonoid** of  $M$  is just a subalgebra of the monoid  $M$  as an algebra. A sub-semigroup is generally not a submonoid, for example, the set  $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$  of natural numbers is a sub-semigroup of the additive group  $(\mathbb{Z}; +, 0)$  of integers, but not a submonoid of it.

Because every element  $a$  in a group  $G$  has its inverse element  $a^{-1}$ , we can induce a binary operation  $*$  on  $G$  by putting  $a * b = a \cdot b^{-1}$ . It is interesting that if a non-vacuous subset  $H$  of  $G$  is closed under  $*$ , it must be a subgroup of  $G$ . However, if  $H$  is closed under  $\cdot$ , it may not be a subgroup of  $G$ . From this, we see that the operation  $*$  on  $G$  is sometimes more effective and useful than the operation  $\cdot$  on  $G$ , although  $*$  does not satisfy the associative and commutative laws.

Binary relations are a generalization of the notion of mappings. Roughly speaking, a binary relation is an assertion determining the correctness between two objects. We now describe this notion. Let  $A, B$  be two non-vacuous sets and let  $\theta$  be an assertion between  $A$  and  $B$ . If each ordered pair  $(a, b)$  of elements  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$  either fits or unfits the assertion  $\theta$ , we call  $\theta$  a **binary relation** between  $A$  and  $B$ . Especially, if  $A = B$ , we say the relation  $\theta$  is on  $A$ . We denote  $a \sim b(\theta)$  for  $a$  and  $b$  fitting the relation  $\theta$ . In the viewpoint of abstract, a binary relation  $\theta$  between  $A$  and  $B$  can be simply regarded as a subset of  $A \times B$ . In fact, we first note that  $\{(a, b) \in A \times B \mid a \sim b(\theta)\}$  is evidently a subset of  $A \times B$ . Next, given a subset  $C$  of  $A \times B$ , we can provide a binary relation  $\theta$  between  $A$  and  $B$  as follows:  $a \sim b(\theta)$  if and only if  $(a, b) \in C$ .

Equivalence relations are an important class of binary relations. If a binary relation  $\theta$  on  $A$  satisfies the following: for any  $a, b, c \in A$ ,

- (1) reflexivity:  $a \sim a(\theta)$ ;
- (2) symmetry:  $a \sim b(\theta)$  implies  $b \sim a(\theta)$ ;
- (3) transitivity:  $a \sim b(\theta)$  and  $b \sim c(\theta)$  imply  $a \sim c(\theta)$ ,

then we call it an **equivalence relation** on  $A$ . An interesting example of such relations is the congruence modulo  $n$  in number theory. In this case, we are used to denote  $a \sim b(\theta)$  by  $a \equiv b \pmod{n}$  in the sense that  $a - b$  is a multiple of  $n$ .

A **partition**  $\pi$  of a set  $A$  means that  $\pi$  is a collection of non-vacuous subsets of  $A$  such that the union of all members in  $\pi$  is the whole of  $A$  and distinct members in  $\pi$  are disjoint. An equivalence relation can be characterized by a partition. In fact, if  $\theta$  is an equivalence relation on  $A$ , then the **quotient set**  $\pi = \{\bar{a} \mid a \in A\}$  determines a partition of  $A$ , where  $\bar{a}$  is the set  $\{x \in A \mid x \sim a(\theta)\}$ , called the **equivalence class** containing the element  $a$ . Conversely, if  $\pi$  is a partition of  $A$ , then the following relation  $\theta$  on  $A$  is an equivalence relation:  $a \sim b(\theta)$  if and only if  $a, b \in C$  for some  $C \in \pi$ .

Another important class of binary relations is partial orderings. For such a relation  $\theta$ , the symbol  $a \sim b(\theta)$  is usually written as  $a \leq b$ . A binary relation  $\leq$  on a set  $A$  is called a **partial ordering** if the following hold: for any  $a, b, c \in A$ ,

- (1) reflexivity:  $a \leq a$ ;
- (2) anti-symmetry:  $a \leq b$  and  $b \leq a$  imply  $a = b$ ;
- (3) transitivity:  $a \leq b$  and  $b \leq c$  imply  $a \leq c$ .

A typical example of partial orderings is the inclusion relation  $\subseteq$  of sets. If  $\leq$  is a partial ordering on  $A$ , the system  $(A; \leq)$  is said a **partially ordered set**. If we do have either  $a \leq b$  or  $b \leq a$  for any  $a, b \in A$ , we call such a partially ordered set  $(A; \leq)$  a **totally ordered set**. Sometimes, we denote  $a \leq b$  and  $a \neq b$  by  $a < b$ . And we write  $a \geq b$  as an alternative for  $b \leq a$  and  $a > b$  for  $b < a$ .


## §0.2 Lattices Boolean Algebras

Given two elements  $a$  and  $b$  in a partially ordered set  $(L; \leq)$ , an element  $u$  in  $L$  is said a **lower bound** of  $a$  and  $b$  if  $u \leq a$  and  $u \leq b$ . The element  $u$  is said a **greatest lower bound** of  $a$  and  $b$  if ①  $u$  is a lower bound of  $a$  and  $b$ ; ②  $v \leq u$  for every lower bound  $v$  of  $a$  and  $b$ . The greatest lower bound is clearly unique if it exists. In a similar fashion we can define an **upper bound** and the **least upper bound** of  $a$  and  $b$ . The greatest lower bound is often abbreviated to g.l.b., and the least upper bound to l.u.b. There are some partially ordered sets, each of which has the greatest element or the least element. Sometimes, we denote them by 1 and 0, called the **unit element** and the **zero element** respectively.

A partially ordered set  $(L; \leq)$  is called a **lower semilattice** if any two elements in  $L$  have the greatest lower bound of them. It is called an **upper semilattice** if each pair of elements in  $L$  has its least upper bound. If  $(L; \leq)$  is both a lower semilattice and an upper semilattice, we call it a **lattice**.

Let's list several examples of lattices as preliminaries. It has been known that the partial ordering of a partially ordered set of finite order can be described by a diagram, called a **Hasse diagram**.

**Example 0.2.1.** Let  $L$  be the set  $\{x, y, z, 0, 1\}$ . Define two partial orderings on  $L$  by the following Hasse diagrams respectively:



Then  $L$  with respect to each of these orderings forms a lattice. We call the former the **rhombus lattice**, and the latter the **pentagon lattice**.

We always denote  $\subseteq$  for the inclusion relation of sets in this book. If  $A$  is properly contained in  $B$ , we will write it by  $A \subset B$ .



**Example 0.2.2.** (1)  $(2^S; \subseteq)$  is a lattice, called the **power set lattice** of  $S$ , where  $2^S$  is the power set of a set  $S$  (i.e., the collection of all subsets of  $S$ ), and  $\text{g.l.b.}\{A, B\} = A \cap B$ ,  $\text{l.u.b.}\{A, B\} = A \cup B$  for any  $A, B \in 2^S$ .

(2)  $(L(V); \subseteq)$  is a lattice, called the **subspace lattice** of  $V$ , where  $L(V)$  is the collection of the whole subspaces of a vector space  $V$  over a field, and  $\text{g.l.b.}\{A, B\} = A \cap B$ ,  $\text{l.u.b.}\{A, B\}$  is the subspace  $A + B$  spanned by  $A$  and  $B$ .

We are used to denote  $a \wedge b$  for  $\text{g.l.b.}\{a, b\}$  and  $a \vee b$  for  $\text{l.u.b.}\{a, b\}$ . If  $(L; \leq)$  is a lower semilattice, then  $\wedge$  is a binary operation on  $L$  and we can induce an algebra  $(L; \wedge)$  of type 2, satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) idempotent law:  $a \wedge a = a$ ;
- (2) commutative law:  $a \wedge b = b \wedge a$ ;
- (3) associative law:  $(a \wedge b) \wedge c = a \wedge (b \wedge c)$ .

The converse is still true. That is because we can induce the following partial ordering  $\leq$  on  $L$  such that  $(L; \leq)$  is a lower semilattice:

$$a \leq b \text{ if and only if } a \wedge b = a \text{ for all } a, b \in L.$$

For the case that  $(L; \leq)$  is an upper semilattice, there is also a similar situation. Then, as we have known, we have an alternative definition of lattices as follows. An algebra  $(L; \wedge, \vee)$  of type  $(2, 2)$  is called a **lattice** if the following laws hold:

- (L<sub>1</sub>) idempotent law:  $a \wedge a = a$  and  $a \vee a = a$ ;
- (L<sub>2</sub>) commutative law:  $a \wedge b = b \wedge a$  and  $a \vee b = b \vee a$ ;
- (L<sub>3</sub>) associative law:  $(a \wedge b) \wedge c = a \wedge (b \wedge c)$  and  $(a \vee b) \vee c = a \vee (b \vee c)$ ;
- (L<sub>4</sub>) absorptive law:  $a \wedge (a \vee b) = a$  and  $a \vee (a \wedge b) = a$ .

From our definition of subalgebras, a **sublattice**  $M$  of a lattice  $(L; \wedge, \vee)$  means that  $M \neq \emptyset$  and  $M$  is closed under  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  (here, the laws L<sub>1</sub> to L<sub>4</sub> are naturally valid in  $M$ ). Then  $M$  with respect to the induced partial ordering  $\leq$  forms a lattice  $(M; \leq)$ , where  $a \leq b$  if and only if  $a \wedge b = a$  (or equivalently,  $a \vee b = b$ ). It is worth attending that given a nonempty subset of a lattice  $(L; \leq)$ , it with respect to  $\leq$  may form a lattice where  $\leq$  is the partial ordering defined on  $L$ , but such a lattice may not be a sublattice of  $(L; \leq)$ . For instance, the subspace lattice  $(L(V); \subseteq)$  of a vector space  $V$  is generally not a sublattice of the power set lattice  $(2^V; \subseteq)$  of  $V$  because the union  $A \cup B$  of two subspaces  $A$  and  $B$  need not be a subspace of  $V$ . The occurrence of this phenomenon results from which the partial ordering  $\leq$  is not a binary operation on  $L$ .