

Joseph Neggers; Young Bae Jun; Hee Sik Kim
On d -ideals in d -algebras

Mathematica Slovaca, Vol. 49 (1999), No. 3, 243--251

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/129056>

Terms of use:

© Mathematical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1999

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

ON d -IDEALS IN d -ALGEBRAS

J. NEGGERS* — YOUNG BAE JUN** — HEE SIK KIM***

(Communicated by Anatolij Dvurečenskij)

ABSTRACT. We introduce the notions of d -subalgebra, d -ideal, $d^\#$ -ideal and d^* -ideal in d -algebras, and investigate relations among them. Furthermore, we are able to define the idea of a quotient d -algebra and to prove a fundamental theorem of d -morphisms for d -algebras as a consequence.

1. Introduction

Y. Imai and K. Iséki [II] and K. Iséki [Is1] introduced two classes of abstract algebras: namely, BCK-algebras and BCI-algebras. It is known that the class of BCK-algebras is a proper subclass of the class of BCI-algebras. In [HL1], [HL2] Q. P. Hu and X. Li introduced a wide class of abstract algebras: BCH-algebras. They have shown that the class of BCI-algebras is a proper subclass of the class of BCH-algebras. J. Neggers and H. S. Kim [NK] introduced the notion of d -algebras which is another generalization of BCK-algebras, and investigated relations between d -algebras and BCK-algebras. In this paper we discuss the ideal theory in d -algebras. We introduce the notions of d -subalgebra, d -ideal, $d^\#$ -ideal and d^* -ideal, and investigate relations among them. Furthermore, we are able to define the idea of a quotient d -algebra and to prove a fundamental theorem of d -morphisms for d -algebras as a consequence.

AMS Subject Classification (1991): Primary 06F35, 06A06.

Key words: BCK-algebra, d -(d^* -)algebra, d -subalgebra, d -($d^\#$ -, d^* -)ideal.

** *** Supported by the Basic Science Research Institute program, 1997, project No. BSRI-97-1406.

2. Preliminaries

A *d*-algebra is a non-empty set X with a constant 0 and a binary operation “ $*$ ” satisfying the following axioms:

- (I) $x * x = 0$,
- (II) $0 * x = 0$,
- (III) $x * y = 0$ and $y * x = 0$ imply $x = y$

for all x, y in X .

A *BCK*-algebra is a *d*-algebra $(X, *, 0)$ satisfying the following additional axioms:

- (IV) $((x * y) * (x * z)) * (z * y) = 0$,
- (V) $(x * (x * y)) * y = 0$

for all x, y, z in X .

In a *BCK*-algebra $(X, *, 0)$ the following hold:

- (1) $(x * y) * x = 0$,
- (2) $((x * z) * (y * z)) * (x * y) = 0$

for arbitrary $x, y, z \in X$.

A non-empty subset I of a *BCK*-algebra X is called a *BCK*-ideal of X if

- (i) $0 \in I$,
- (ii) $x \in I$ and $y * x \in I$ imply $y \in I$,

for all $x, y \in X$.

PROPOSITION 2.1. *Let X be a *d*-algebra. If $x \neq y$ and $x * y = 0$, then $y * x \neq 0$.*

Proof. By (III), it is straightforward. □

3. *d*-ideals

DEFINITION 3.1. Let $(X, *, 0)$ be a *d*-algebra and $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq X$. I is called a *d*-subalgebra of X if $x * y \in I$ whenever $x \in I$ and $y \in I$. I is called a *BCK*-ideal of X if it satisfies:

- (D_0) $0 \in I$,
- (D_1) $x * y \in I$ and $y \in I$ imply $x \in I$.

I is called a *d*-ideal of X if it satisfies (D_1) and

- (D_2) $x \in I$ and $y \in X$ imply $x * y \in I$, i.e., $I * X \subseteq I$.

EXAMPLE 3.2. Let $X := \{0, a, b, c, d\}$ be a d -algebra which is not a BCK-algebra with the Cayley table as follows:

$*$	0	a	b	c	d
0	0	0	0	0	0
a	a	0	a	0	a
b	b	b	0	c	0
c	c	c	b	0	c
d	c	c	a	a	0

Then $I := \{0, a\}$ is a d -ideal of X .

EXAMPLE 3.3. Let $X := \{0, a, b, c\}$ be a d -algebra which is not a BCK-algebra with the Cayley table as follows:

$*$	0	a	b	c
0	0	0	0	0
a	a	0	0	a
b	b	b	0	0
c	c	c	a	0

Then $J := \{0, a, c\}$ satisfies (D_2) , but not (D_1) since $b * c = 0 \in J$ and $c \in J$, but $b \notin J$, i.e., J is a d -subalgebra, but not a BCK-ideal of X .

In a d -algebra, a BCK-ideal need not be a d -subalgebra, and also a d -subalgebra need not be a BCK-ideal as shown in the following example.

EXAMPLE 3.4. Let $X := \{0, a, b, c\}$ be a d -algebra which is not a BCK-algebra with the following Cayley table:

$*$	0	a	b	c
0	0	0	0	0
a	a	0	0	b
b	b	c	0	0
c	c	c	c	0

Then $I := \{0, a, b\}$ is a BCK-ideal which is not a d -subalgebra of X , while $J := \{0, c\}$ is a d -subalgebra which is not a BCK-ideal of X .

Clearly, $\{0\}$ is a d -subalgebra of every d -algebra X and every d -ideal of X is a d -subalgebra, but the converse need not be true.

EXAMPLE 3.5. Let $X := \{0, a, b, c\}$ be a d -algebra which is not a BCK-algebra with the following Cayley table:

$*$	0	a	b	c
0	0	0	0	0
a	a	0	0	b
b	b	b	0	0
c	c	c	c	0

Then $I := \{0, a\}$ is a d -subalgebra of X , but not a d -ideal of X , since $a * c = b \notin I$.

LEMMA 3.6. *If I is a d -ideal of a d -algebra X , then $0 \in I$.*

Proof. Since $I \neq \emptyset$, there exists x in I and hence $0 = x * x \in I$ by (D_2) . □

Note that every d -ideal of a d -algebra is a BCK-ideal, but the converse need not be true. In Example 3.5, $I := \{0, a\}$ is a BCK-ideal of X , but not a d -ideal of X .

PROPOSITION 3.7. *Let I be a d -ideal of a d -algebra X . If $x \in I$ and $y * x = 0$, then $y \in I$.*

Proof. Assume that $x \in I$ and $y * x = 0$. By Lemma 3.6 and (D_1) , we have $y \in I$. This completes the proof. □

DEFINITION 3.8. Let X be a d -algebra. A d -ideal I of X is called a d^{\sharp} -ideal of X if, for arbitrary $x, y, z \in X$,

$$(D_3) \quad x * z \in I \text{ whenever } x * y \in I \text{ and } y * z \in I.$$

EXAMPLE 3.9. Let X be a d -algebra as in Example 3.5. Then $K := \{0, a, b\}$ is a d^{\sharp} -ideal of X .

Obviously, every d^{\sharp} -ideal is a d -ideal, but the converse need not be true.

EXAMPLE 3.10. Let X be a d -algebra as in Example 3.2. Then $L := \{0, a\}$ is a d -ideal which is not a d^\sharp -ideal of X , since $b * d = 0 \in L$, $d * c = a \in L$, but $b * c = c \notin L$.

Note that we can see that d^\sharp -ideal $\subsetneq d$ -ideal $\subsetneq d$ -subalgebra and d^\sharp -ideal $\subsetneq d$ -ideal \subsetneq BCK-ideal in d -algebras.

In a d -algebra X , the identity $(x * y) * x = 0$ does not hold in general. For instance, in Example 3.5, we know that $(a * c) * a = b * a = b \neq 0$.

DEFINITION 3.11. A d -algebra X is called a d^* -algebra if it satisfies the identity $(x * y) * x = 0$ for all $x, y \in X$.

Clearly, a BCK-algebra is a d^* -algebra, but the converse need not be true.

EXAMPLE 3.12. Let $X := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ and let the binary operation $*$ be defined as follows:

$$x * y := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq y, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $(X, *, 0)$ is a d -algebra which is not a BCK-algebra (see [NK; Example 2.8]). We can easily see that $(X, *, 0)$ is a d^* -algebra.

THEOREM 3.13. In a d^* -algebra, every BCK-ideal is a d -ideal.

Proof. Let I be a BCK-ideal of a d^* -algebra X and let $x \in I, y \in X$. Since $(x * y) * x = 0$ for all $x, y \in X$, it follows from Proposition 3.7 that $x * y \in I$. Hence I is a d -ideal of X . □

The following corollary is obvious.

COROLLARY 3.14. In a d^* -algebra, every BCK-ideal is a d -subalgebra.

DEFINITION 3.15. If a d^\sharp -ideal I of a d -algebra X satisfies

(D_4) $x * y \in I$ and $y * x \in I$ imply $(x * z) * (y * z) \in I$ and $(z * x) * (z * y) \in I$ for all $x, y, z \in X$, then we say that I is a d^* -ideal of X .

In Example 3.3, the set $I := \{0, a\}$ is a d^* -ideal of X . Obviously, every d^* -ideal in a d -algebra is a d^\sharp -ideal, but the converse does not hold in general.

EXAMPLE 3.16. Let $X := \{0, a, b, c\}$ be a set with the following Cayley table:

$*$	0	a	b	c
0	0	0	0	0
a	a	0	0	a
b	c	b	0	c
c	c	b	b	0

Then $(X, *, 0)$ is a d -algebra, but not a BCK-algebra. We can see that $I := \{0, a\}$ is a d^\sharp -ideal, but not d^* -ideal, since $0 * a = 0 \in I$ and $a * 0 = a \in I$, but $(c * 0) * (c * a) = c * b = b \notin I$.

LEMMA 3.17. (Iséki et al. [IT1]) *Let I be a BCK-ideal of a BCK-algebra X . If $x \in I$ and $y * x = 0$ then $y \in I$.*

THEOREM 3.18. *If $(X, *, 0)$ is a BCK-algebra, then every BCK-ideal of X is a d^* -ideal of X .*

Proof. Let I be a BCK-ideal of X and let $x \in I$ and $y \in X$. Since $(x * y) * x = 0$ by (1), it follows from Lemma 3.17 that $x * y \in I$, proving (D_2) .

Assume that $x * y \in I$ and $y * z \in I$ for all $x, y, z \in I$. Then $((x * z) * (y * z)) * (x * y) = 0$ by (2), and hence $(x * z) * (y * z) \in I$. Since $y * z \in I$ and since I is a BCK-ideal of X , it follows that $x * z \in I$. This proves (D_3) .

Let $x * y, y * x \in I$ for all $x, y \in X$. Then, by (IV) and (2), we have

$$((z * x) * (z * y)) * (y * x) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad ((x * z) * (y * z)) * (x * y) = 0,$$

respectively. It follows from Lemma 3.17 that $(z * x) * (z * y) \in I$ and $(x * z) * (y * z) \in I$, proving (D_4) . This completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.19.

- (i) In a d^* -algebra, the concept of d -ideal, d -subalgebra and BCK-ideal coincide.
- (ii) In a BCK-algebra, the concept of d -ideal, d^\sharp -ideal, d^* -ideal and BCK-ideal coincide.

4. Quotient d -algebras

Let $(X; *, 0_X)$ and $(Y; *, 0_Y)$ be d -algebras. A mapping $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is called a d -morphism ([NK]) if $f(x * y) = f(x) * f(y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. Note that $f(0_X) = 0_Y$. A d -algebra $(X; *, 0_X)$ is said to be d -transitive ([NK]) if $x * z = 0$ and $z * y = 0$ imply $x * y = 0$. Every BCK-algebra is a d -transitive d -algebra, but the converse does not hold in general. See Example 3.2.

Let I be a d^* -ideal of a d -algebra $(X; *, 0_X)$. For any x, y in X , we define $x \sim y$ if and only if $x * y \in I$ and $y * x \in I$. We claim that \sim is an equivalence relation on X . Since $0 \in I$, we have $x * x = 0 \in I$, i.e., $x \sim x$, for any $x \in X$. If $x \sim y$ and $y \sim z$, then $x * y, y * x \in I$ and $y * z, z * y \in I$. By (D_3) $x * z, z * x \in I$ and hence $x \sim z$. This proves that \sim is transitive. The symmetry of \sim is trivial. By (D_4) we can easily see that \sim is a congruence relation on X . Using the notion of d -transitivity we obtain:

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a d -morphism from a d -algebra X into a d -transitive d -algebra Y . Then $\text{Ker } f$ is a d^* -ideal of X .*

Proof. The properties (D_1) and (D_2) are simple. If $x*y, y*z \in \text{Ker } f$, then $f(x)*f(y) = 0_Y = f(y)*f(z)$. Since Y is d -transitive, we obtain $f(x)*f(z) = 0$ and hence $x*z \in \text{Ker } f$, which proves (D_3) . Let $x*y, y*x \in \text{Ker } f$. Then $f(x)*f(y) = 0_Y = f(y)*f(x)$. By (III) we obtain $f(x) = f(y)$. It follows that $f((x*z)*(y*z)) = f(x*z)*f(y*z) = (f(x)*f(z))*(f(y)*f(z)) = 0_Y$ and hence $(x*z)*(y*z) \in \text{Ker } f$. Similarly, $(z*x)*(z*y) \in \text{Ker } f$, which proves (D_4) . \square

EXAMPLE 4.2. Let X be a d -algebra as in Example 3.3, and let Y be a d -transitive d -algebra as in Example 3.2. Define a map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ by $f(0) = f(a) = 0, f(b) = f(c) = a$. Then f is a d -morphism. Obviously, $\text{Ker } f = \{0, a\}$ is a d^* -ideal of X .

We denote the congruence class containing x by $[x]_I$, i.e., $[x]_I = \{y \in X \mid x \sim y\}$. We see that $x \sim y$ if and only if $[x]_I = [y]_I$. Denote the set of all equivalence classes of X by X/I , i.e., $X/I = \{[x]_I \mid x \in X\}$.

LEMMA 4.3. *Let I be a d^* -ideal of a d -algebra $(X; *, 0)$. Then $I = [0]_I$.*

Proof. If $x \in I$, then $x*0 \in I*X \subseteq I$ and hence $x \in [0]_I$, i.e., $I \subseteq [0]_I$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} [0]_I &= \{x \in X \mid x \sim 0\} \\ &= \{x \in X \mid x*0, 0*x \in I\} \\ &= \{x \in X \mid x*0 \in I\} && (0 \in I) \\ &\subseteq I, && (D1) \end{aligned}$$

it follows that $I = [0]_I$. \square

THEOREM 4.4. *Let $(X; *, 0)$ be a d -algebra and I be a d^* -ideal of X . If we define $[x]_I * [y]_I := [x*y]_I$ ($x, y \in X$), then $(X/I; *, 0)$ is a d -algebra, called the quotient d -algebra.*

Proof. Since \sim is a congruence relation on X , $x*y \sim x'*y'$ for any $x \sim x', y \sim y'$. This means that $[x]_I * [y]_I = [x*y]_I$ is well-defined. Let $[x]_I, [y]_I \in X/I$ with $[x]_I * [y]_I = [0]_I = [y]_I * [y]_I$. Then $[x*y]_I = [0]_I = [y*x]_I$ and $x*y, y*x \in I$. Thus $x \sim y$ and $[x]_I = [y]_I$. The rest is trivial, and so we omit the proof. \square

PROPOSITION 4.5. *Let I be a d^* -ideal of the d -algebra X . Then the mapping $\pi: X \rightarrow X/I$ defined by $\pi(x) = [x]_I$ is a d -morphism of X onto the quotient d -algebra X/I and the kernel of π is precisely the set I .*

Proof. Since $[x * y]_I = [x]_I * [y]_I$, π is a d -morphism. By Lemma 4.3 we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ker } \pi &= \{x \in X \mid \pi(x) = [0]_I\} \\ &= \{x \in X \mid [x]_I = [0]_I\} \\ &= \{x \in X \mid x \sim 0\} \\ &= [0]_I \\ &= I. \end{aligned}$$

□

THEOREM 4.6. *If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a d -morphism from a d -algebra X onto a d -transitive d -algebra Y , then $X/\text{Ker } f \cong Y$.*

Proof. Assume $\mu: X/\text{Ker } f \rightarrow Y$ such that $\mu([x]_{\text{Ker } f}) = f(x)$. If $[x]_{\text{Ker } f} = [y]_{\text{Ker } f}$ then $x * y, y * x \in \text{Ker } f$, and so $f(x) * f(y) = 0 = f(y) * f(x)$. By (III) we have $f(x) = f(y)$, i.e., $\mu([x]_{\text{Ker } f}) = \mu([y]_{\text{Ker } f})$. This means that μ is well-defined. For any $y \in Y$, there is an $x \in X$ such that $y = f(x)$ since f is onto. Hence $\mu([x]_{\text{Ker } f}) = f(x) = y$, which means that μ is onto. If $\mu([x]_{\text{Ker } f}) \neq \mu([y]_{\text{Ker } f})$ then either $x * y \notin \text{Ker } f$ or $y * x \notin \text{Ker } f$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $x * y \notin \text{Ker } f$. It follows that $f(x) * f(y) = f(x * y) \neq 0$ and hence $f(x) \neq f(y)$. This means that μ is one-one. Since $\mu([x]_{\text{Ker } f} * [y]_{\text{Ker } f}) = \mu([x * y]_{\text{Ker } f}) = f(x * y) = f(x) * f(y) = \mu([x]_{\text{Ker } f}) * \mu([y]_{\text{Ker } f})$, μ is a d -morphism. Thus we have $X/\text{Ker } f \cong Y$, completing the proof. □

Acknowledgement

The authors are deeply grateful to the referee for some valuable suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [HL1] HU, Q. P.—LI, X.: *On BCH-algebras*, Math. Sem. Notes, Kobe Univ. **11** (1983), 313–320.
- [HL2] HU, Q. P.—LI, X.: *On proper BCH-algebras*, Math. Japon. **30** (1985), 659–661.
- [II] IMAI, Y.—ISÉKI, K.: *On axiom systems of propositional calculi XIV*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **42** (1966), 19–22.
- [Is1] ISÉKI, K.: *An algebra related with a propositional calculus*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **42** (1966), 26–29.
- [Is2] ISÉKI, K.: *On BCI-algebras*, Math. Sem. Notes, Kobe Univ. **8** (1980), 125–130.
- [IT1] ISÉKI, K.—TANAKA, S.: *Ideal theory of BCK-algebras*, Math. Japon. **21** (1976), 351–366.
- [IT2] ISÉKI, K.—TANAKA, S.: *An introduction to the theory of BCK-algebras*, Math. Japon. **23** (1978), 1–26.

ON d -IDEALS IN d -ALGEBRAS

[NK] NEGGERS, J.—KIM, H. S. : *On d -algebras*, Math. Slovaca **49** (1999), 19–26.

Received November 10, 1997

Revised March 20, 1998

* *Department of Mathematics*

University of Alabama

Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0350

U. S. A.

E-mail: jneggers@gp.as.ua.edu

** *Department of Mathematics Education*

Gyeongsang National University

Chinju 660-701

KOREA

E-mail: ybjun@nongae.gsnu.ac.kr

*** *Department of Mathematics*

Hanyang University

Seoul 133-791

KOREA

E-mail: heekim@email.hanyang.ac.kr