

ON THE LATTICE OF IDEALS OF AN MV -ALGEBRA

DUMITRU BUȘNEAG AND DANA PICIU

Received January 24, 2002

ABSTRACT. For an MV-algebra $(A, +, *, 0)$ we denote by $I(A)$ the set of all ideals of A . For $I_1, I_2 \in I(A)$ we define $I_1 \wedge I_2 = I_1 \cap I_2$, $I_1 \vee I_2 =$ the ideal generated by $I_1 \cup I_2$, and for $I \in I(A)$, $I^* = \{a \in A : a \wedge x = 0 \text{ for every } x \in I\}$.

The aim of this paper is to prove that $(I(A), \vee, \wedge, *, \{0\}, A)$ is a Boolean lattice iff A is a finite Boolean lattice relative to the natural order on A (Theorem 2.8.)

1 Definitions and preliminaries

Definition 1.1 [2,3]. An MV-algebra is an algebra $(A, +, *, 0)$ of type $(2, 1, 0)$ satisfying the following equations:

$$MV_1) \quad x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z$$

$$MV_2) \quad x + y = y + x$$

$$MV_3) \quad x + 0 = x$$

$$MV_4) \quad x^{**} = x$$

$$MV_5) \quad x + 0^* = 0^*$$

$$MV_6) \quad (x^* + y)^* + y = (y^* + x)^* + x.$$

MV-algebras were originally introduced by Chang in [2] in order to give an algebraic counterpart of the Lukasiewicz many valued logic (MV=many valued). Note that axioms MV_1)- MV_3) state that $(A, +, 0)$ is an abelian monoid; following tradition, we denote an MV-algebra $(A, +, *, 0)$ by its universe A .

Remark 1 If in MV_6) we put $y = 0$ we obtain $x^{**} = 0^{**} + x$, so, if $0^{**} = 0$ then $x^{**} = x$ for every $x \in A$. Hence, the axiom MV_4) is equivalent with $MV_4')$ $0^{**} = 0$.

Examples:

E_1) A singleton $\{0\}$ is a trivial example of an MV-algebra; an MV-algebra is said *nontrivial* provided its universe has more than one element.

E_2) Let $(G, \oplus, -, 0, \leq)$ an l-group. For each $u \in G$, $u > 0$, let

$$[0, u] = \{x \in G : 0 \leq x \leq u\}$$

and for each $x, y \in [0, u]$, let $x + y = u \wedge (x \oplus y)$ and $x^* = u - x$. Then $([0, u], +, *, 0)$ is an MV-algebra. In particular, if consider the real unit interval $[0, 1]$ and for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$ we define $x \oplus y = \min\{1, x + y\}$ and $x^* = 1 - x$, then $([0, 1], \oplus, *, 0)$ is an MV-algebra.

E_3) If $(A, \vee, \wedge, *, 0, 1)$ is a Boolean lattice, then $(A, \vee, *, 0)$ is an MV-algebra.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 06D35, 03G25.

Key words and phrases. MV-algebra, Boolean lattice, ideal.

E_4) The rational numbers in $[0, 1]$, and, for each integer $n \geq 2$, the n -element set $L_n = \left\{0, \frac{1}{(n-1)}, \dots, \frac{(n-2)}{(n-1)}, 1\right\}$ yield examples of subalgebras of $[0, 1]$.

E_5) Given an MV -algebra A and a set X , the set A^X of all functions $f : X \rightarrow A$ becomes an MV -algebra if the operations $+$, and $*$ and the element 0 are defined pointwise. The continuous functions from $[0, 1]$ into $[0, 1]$ form a subalgebra of the MV -algebra $[0, 1]^{[0, 1]}$.

In the rest of this paper, by A we denote an MV -algebra.

On A we define the constant 1 and the operations $+, \cdot$ and $-$ as follows: $1 = 0^*$, $x \cdot y = (x^* + y^*)^*$ and $x - y = x \cdot y^* = (x^* + y)^*$ (we consider the $*$ operation more binding than any other operation, and the $+, \cdot$ more binding than $+$ and $-$).

Lemma 1.2 [3,4] For $x, y \in A$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $x^* + y = 1$
- (ii) $x \cdot y^* = 0$
- (iii) $y = x + (y - x)$
- (iv) There is an element $z \in A$ such that $x + z = y$.

For any two elements $x, y \in A$ let us agree to write $x \leq y$ iff x and y satisfy the equivalent conditions (i)-(iv) in the above lemma. So, \leq is a partial order relation on A (which is called the *natural order* on A).

Theorem 1.3 [3,4] If $x, y, z \in A$ then the following hold:

- c_1) $1^* = 0$
- c_2) $x + y = (x^* \cdot y^*)^*$
- c_3) $x + 1 = 1$
- c_4) $(x - y) + y = (y - x) + x$
- c_5) $x + x^* = 1$
- c_6) $x - 0 = x, 0 - x = 0, x - x = 0, 1 - x = x^*, x - 1 = 0$
- c_7) $x + x = x$ iff $x \cdot x = x$
- c_8) $x \leq y$ iff $y^* \leq x^*$
- c_9) If $x \leq y$, then $x + z \leq y + z$ and $x \cdot z \leq y \cdot z$
- c_{10}) If $x \leq y$, then $x - z \leq y - z$ and $z - y \leq z - x$
- c_{11}) $x - y \leq x, x - y \leq y^*$
- c_{12}) $(x + y) - x \leq y$
- c_{13}) $x \cdot z \leq y$ iff $z \leq x^* + y$
- c_{14}) $x + y + x \cdot y = x + y$

Remark 2 [3,4] *On A , the natural order determines a bounded distributive lattice structure. Specifically, the join $x \vee y$ and the meet $x \wedge y$ of the elements x and y are given by:*

$$x \vee y = (x - y) + y = (y - x) + x$$

$$x \wedge y = (x^* \vee y^*)^*$$

Clearly, $x \cdot y \leq x \wedge y \leq x \leq x \vee y \leq x + y$.

For each $x \in A$, we let $0 \cdot x = 0$, and for each integer $n \geq 0$, $(n + 1)x = nx + x$.

Theorem 1.4 [3,4] *If $x, y, z, (x_i)_{i \in I}$ are elements of A , then the following hold:*

$$\mathbf{c}_{15}) \quad x + y = (x \vee y) + (x \wedge y)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_{16}) \quad x \cdot y = (x \vee y) \cdot (x \wedge y)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_{17}) \quad x + \left(\bigvee_{i \in I} x_i \right) = \bigvee_{i \in I} (x + x_i)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_{18}) \quad x + \left(\bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i \right) = \bigwedge_{i \in I} (x + x_i)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_{19}) \quad x \cdot \left(\bigvee_{i \in I} x_i \right) = \bigvee_{i \in I} (x \cdot x_i)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_{20}) \quad x \cdot \left(\bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i \right) = \bigwedge_{i \in I} (x \cdot x_i)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_{21}) \quad x \wedge \left(\bigvee_{i \in I} x_i \right) = \bigvee_{i \in I} (x \wedge x_i)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_{22}) \quad x \vee \left(\bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i \right) = \bigwedge_{i \in I} (x \vee x_i) \text{ (if all the suprema and infima exist).}$$

Lemma 1.5 *For every $x, y, z \in A$ we have*

$$\mathbf{c}_{23}) \quad (x + y) - z \leq (x - z) + (y - z).$$

Proof. We have $((x + y) - z)^* + (x - z) + (y - z) = (x + y)^* + z + (x - z) + (y - z) = (x + y)^* + (z + (x - z)) + (y - z) = (x + y)^* + (x \vee z) + (y - z) = (x + y)^* + ((x \vee z) + (y - z)) \stackrel{\text{by } \mathbf{c}_{17}}{=} (x + y)^* + ((x + (y - z)) \vee (z + (y - z))) \stackrel{\text{by } \mathbf{c}_{17}}{=} (x + y)^* + ((x + (y - z)) \vee y \vee z) = (x + y)^* + (((x + (y - z)) \vee y) \vee z) \stackrel{\text{by } \mathbf{c}_{17}}{=} (x + y)^* + (((x \vee y) + ((y - z) \vee y)) \vee z) = (x + y)^* + (((x \vee y) + y) \vee z).$

So, to prove \mathbf{c}_{23} it suffices to prove $x + y \leq ((x \vee y) + y) \vee z$ which result from \mathbf{c}_9 (since $x \leq x \vee y$, hence $x + y \leq (x \vee y) + y \leq ((x - y) + y) \vee z$). ■

2 The lattice of ideals of an MV-algebra

Definition 2.1 *A ideal of an MV-algebra A is a non-void subset I of A satisfying the following conditions:*

I₁) *If $x \in I$, $y \in A$ and $y \leq x$, then $y \in I$*

I₂) *If $x, y \in I$ then $x + y \in I$.*

We denote by $I(A)$ the set of all ideals of A . For $M \subseteq A$ we denote by $(M]$ the ideal of A generated by M (that is $(M] = \bigcap \{I \in I(A) \mid M \subseteq I\}$). If $M = \{a\}$ with $a \in A$, we denote by $(a]$ the ideal generated by $\{a\}$ ($(a]$ is called *principal*)

Proposition 2.2 [3,4]

(i) If $M \subseteq A$, then $(M] = \{x \in A : x \leq x_1 + \dots + x_n \text{ for some } x_1, \dots, x_n \in M\}$.

In particular, for $a \in A$, $(a] = \{x \in A : x \leq na \text{ for some integer } n \geq 0\}$.

(ii) If $I_1, I_2 \in I(A)$, then

$I_1 \vee I_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (I_1 \cup I_2] = \{a \in A : a \leq x_1 + x_2 \text{ for some } x_1 \in I_1 \text{ and } x_2 \in I_2\}$

(iii) If $x, y \in A$, then $(x] \cap (y] = (x \wedge y]$ (see [4, p.112]).

For $I \in I(A)$ and $a \in A \setminus I$ we denote by $I(a) = (a] \vee I = (I \cup \{a\}]$.

Remark 3 [3,4] For $I(a)$ we have the next characterization:

$I(a) = \{x \in A : x \leq y + (na) \text{ for some } y \in I \text{ and integer } n \geq 0\}$.

Proposition 2.3 For $a \in A \setminus I$, $I(a) = \{x \in A : x - a \in I\}$

Proof. Let $I_a = \{x \in A : x - a \in I\}$. Since $a - a = 0 \in I$ we deduce that $a \in I_a$. Since for $x \in I$, $x - a \leq x$ (by c₁₁) we deduce that $x - a \in I$, hence $I \subseteq I_a$. To prove $I_a \in I(A)$ we observe that $0 - a = 0 \in I$, hence $0 \in I_a$. If $x \leq y$ and $y \in I_a$, then from $x - a \leq y - a$ (c₁₀) and $y - a \in I$ we deduce $x - a \in I$, hence $x \in I_a$. Let $x, y \in I_a$, that is $x - a, y - a \in I$. From Lemma 1.5. we have $(x + y) - a \leq (x - a) + (y - a)$, hence $(x + y) - a \in I$ that is $x + y \in I_a$. From $a \in I_a$, $I \subseteq I_a$ and $I_a \in I(A)$ we deduce $I(a) \subseteq I_a$. Let now $J \in I(A)$ such that $a \in J$ and $I \subseteq J$. If $x \in I_a$, then $x - a \in I \subseteq J$, hence $x \vee a = (x - a) + a \in J$. Since $x \leq x \vee a$ we deduce $x \in J$ that is $I_a \subseteq J$, hence $I_a \subseteq \bigcap J = I(a)$. From $I(a) \subseteq I_a$ and $I_a \subseteq I(a)$ we deduce $I_a = I(a)$. ■

Corollary 2.4 If $x, y \in A$ then $(x] \vee (y] = (x + y]$.

Proof 1: By Proposition 2.3. we have

$$(x] \vee (y] = (y](x) = \{a \in A : a - x \in (y]\}.$$

Since by c₁₂ $(x + y) - x \leq y$, we deduce $x + y \in (x] \vee (y]$, hence $(x + y] \subseteq (x] \vee (y]$. Since the inclusion $(x] \vee (y] \subseteq (x + y]$ is obviously, we obtain the equality $(x] \vee (y] = (x + y]$.

Proof 2: It suffices to show the inclusion $(x + y] \subseteq (x] \vee (y]$. If $z \in (x + y]$ then $z \leq n(x + y)$ for some integer $n \geq 0$. But $n(x + y) = (nx) + (ny)$ and so $z \leq (nx) + (ny)$. Since $nx \in (x]$ and $ny \in (y]$ we deduce that $z \in (x] \vee (y]$, that is $(x + y] \subseteq (x] \vee (y]$. ■

For $I_1, I_2 \in I(A)$, we put $I_1 \wedge I_2 = I_1 \cap I_2$, $I_1 \vee I_2 = (I_1 \cup I_2]$, $I_1 \longrightarrow I_2 = \{a \in A : (a] \cap I_1 \subseteq I_2\}$.

Then $(I(A), \vee, \wedge, \{0\}, A)$ is a complete Brouwerian lattice ([4, p.114]); we recall that a complete lattice is Brouwerian if it satisfies the identity $a \wedge \left(\bigvee_{i \in I} b_i \right) = \bigvee_{i \in I} (a \wedge b_i)$.

Lemma 2.5 If $I_1, I_2 \in I(A)$, then

(i) $I_1 \longrightarrow I_2 \in I(A)$

(ii) If $I \in I(A)$, then $I_1 \cap I \subseteq I_2$ iff $I \subseteq I_1 \longrightarrow I_2$ (that is, $I_1 \longrightarrow I_2 = \sup\{I \in I(A) : I_1 \cap I \subseteq I_2\}$).

Proof (i) Since $(0] \cap I_1 \subseteq I_2$ we deduce that $0 \in I_1 \longrightarrow I_2$. If $x, y \in A$, $x \leq y$ and $y \in I_1 \longrightarrow I_2$, then $(y] \cap I_1 \subseteq I_2$. Since $(x] \subseteq (y]$ we deduce that $(x] \cap I_1 \subseteq (y] \cap I_1 \subseteq I_2$, hence $x \in I_1 \longrightarrow I_2$. Let now $x, y \in I_1 \longrightarrow I_2$; then $(x] \cap I_1 \subseteq I_2$ and $(y] \cap I_1 \subseteq I_2$. We deduce $((x] \cap I_1) \vee ((y] \cap I_1) \subseteq I_2$ hence $((x] \vee (y]) \cap I_1 \subseteq I_2$, so $(x+y] \cap I_1 \subseteq I_2$ (by Corollary 2.4.), that is $x+y \in I_1 \longrightarrow I_2$.

(ii) (\implies) Let $I \in I(A)$; then $I_1 \cap I \subseteq I_2$. If $x \in I$ then $(x] \cap I_1 \subseteq I \cap I_1 \subseteq I_2$ hence $x \in I_1 \longrightarrow I_2$, that is $I \subseteq I_1 \longrightarrow I_2$.

(\impliedby) We suppose $I \subseteq I_1 \longrightarrow I_2$ and let $x \in I_1 \cap I$; then $x \in I$, hence $x \in I_1 \longrightarrow I_2$, that is $(x] \cap I_1 \subseteq I_2$. Since $x \in (x] \cap I_1$, then $x \in I_2$, that is $I_1 \cap I \subseteq I_2$. ■

Remark 4 *From Lemma 2.5. we deduce that $(I(A), \vee, \wedge, \longrightarrow, \{0\}, A)$ is a Heyting algebra; for $I \in I(A)$, $I^* = I \longrightarrow \{0\} = \{x \in A : (x] \cap I = \{0\}\}$.*

Corollary 2.6 (i) *For every $I \in I(A)$, $I^* = \{x \in A : x \wedge y = 0 \text{ for every } y \in I\}$ (see[4, p.114])*

(ii) *For any $x \in A$, $(x]^* = \{y \in A : (y] \cap (x] = \{0\} = \{y \in A : x \wedge y = 0\}$ (by Proposition 2.2., (iii)).*

We recall that for a bounded distributive lattice L , following tradition, by $B(L)$ we denoted the *Boolean lattice* of complemented elements in L .

For an MV-algebra $(A, +, *, 0, 1)$ we shall denote by $B(A)$ the Boolean lattice associated with the bounded distributive lattice $(A, \vee, \wedge, 0, 1)$.

Proposition 2.7 [4, p. 127] *For every $x \in A$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $x \in B(A)$
- (ii) $x + x = x$
- (iii) $x \cdot x = x$
- (iv) $x \wedge x^* = 0$
- (v) $x \vee x^* = 1$.

Theorem 2.8 *If A is an MV-algebra, then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $(I(A), \vee, \wedge, *, \{0\}, A)$ is a Boolean lattice
- (ii) $(A, \vee, \wedge, *, 0, 1)$ is a finite Boolean lattice.

Proof (i) \implies (ii). Let $x \in A$; since $I(A)$ is a Boolean lattice then $(x] \vee (x]^* = A$. By Proposition 2.3. and Corollary 2.6. (ii), we have $(x] \vee (x]^* = (x]^*(x) = \{y \in A : y-x \in (x]^*\} = \{y \in A : (y-x) \wedge x = 0\}$. Since $(x] \vee (x]^* = A$, then $1 \in (x] \vee (x]^*$, hence $(1-x) \wedge x = 0$. We obtain that $x^* \wedge x = 0$, hence $x \in B(A)$ (by Proposition 2.7.(iii)), that is $(A, \vee, \wedge, *, 0, 1)$ is a Boolean lattice. To show that A is finite it suffices to prove that every ideal of A is principal ([5, p.77]). If $I \in I(A)$, because $I(A)$ is supposed Boolean lattice then $I \vee I^* = A$, hence $1 \in I \vee I^*$. By Proposition 2.2. (ii), $1 = a + b$ with $a \in I$ and $b \in I^*$. By Corollary 2.6.(i), $x \wedge b = 0$ for every $x \in I$. So $(x^* \vee b^*)^* = 0 \iff x^* \vee b^* = 1 \iff (x + b^*)^* + b^* = 1 \iff x + b^* \leq b^* \iff x + b^* = b^*$ for every $x \in I$. Since $a + b = 1$ we obtain $b^* \leq a$ hence $x + b^* = b^* \leq a$ for every $x \in I$. Finally, we obtain $x \leq x + b^* \leq a$, hence $x \leq a$ for every $x \in I$, that is $I = (a]$.

(ii) \implies (i). Suppose $(A, \vee, \wedge, *, 0, 1)$ is a finite Boolean lattice. By Remark 4, $I(A)$ is a Heyting algebra. To prove $I(A)$ is a Boolean lattice we must show $I^* = \{0\}$ only for $I = A$ ([1, p.175]). Since in finite Boolean lattice every ideal is principal, then $I = (a]$ for some $a \in A$. By Corollary 2.6. (ii), $I^* = (a]^* = \{x \in A : x \wedge a = 0\}$. Since $I^* = \{0\}$ and $a^* \wedge a = 0$, then $a^* = 0$, hence $a = 1$ so $I = (1] = A$. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Balbes, Ph. Dwinger: *Distributive lattices*, University of Missouri Press, 1974
- [2] C. C. Chang: *Algebraic analysis of many valued logics*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 88(1958) pp 467-490
- [3] R. Cignoli, I.M.L. D'Ottaviano, D. Mundici: *Algebraic foundation of many -valued Reasoning*, Kluwer Academic Publ., Dordrecht, 2000
- [4] G.Georgescu, A. Iorgulescu: *Pseudo- MV algebras*, Multi. Val. Logic, 2001, vol 6, pp.95-135
- [5] G. Grätzer: *Lattice theory*, W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1979

Department of Mathematics, University of Craiova,
A. I. Cuza Street, 13, 1100-Craiova, Romania
Phone: 40 51 412673, Fax: 40 51 412673
E-mail: busneag@central.ucv.ro, danap@central.ucv.ro