

ON PARA-ASSOCIATIVE BCC-ALGEBRAS

Izabela M. Dudek

*Institute of Mathematics, Pedagogical
University, Al. Zawadzkiego 13/15
42-200 Częstochowa, Poland*

ABSTRACT

An algebra $(G, \cdot, 0)$ of type $(2,0)$ is called a weak BCC-algebra iff $xy = yx = 0$ implies $x = y$ and if the conditions $(yz)((xy)(xz)) = 0$, $xx = 0$, $0x = x$ hold for all $x, y, z \in G$. In the paper it is proved that a weak BCC-algebra is a BCI-algebra, i.e. satisfies $((xy)xz)(zy) = 0$ and $x0 = x$ iff it is a Boolean group. It is proved also that every left (right) alternative weak BCC-algebra is a Boolean group. In the end the so-called para-associative weak BCC-algebras are considered, i.e. weak BCC-algebras with the condition: $(x_1 x_2) x_3 = x_i (x_j x_k)$, where (i, j, k) is a fixed permutation of the set $\{1, 2, 3\}$. It is proved that these weak BCC-algebras are Boolean groups.

BCK-algebras were introduced as an algebraic formulation of C.A. Meredith's BCK-implicational calculus by K. Iséki in [5]. BCK-algebras form a quasivariety of algebras amongst whose subclasses can be found the earlier implicational models of Henkin [3], algebras of sets closed under set-subtraction, and dual relatively pseudocomplemented upper semilattices.

AMS Mathematics Subject Classification (1980): Primary 03G25, Secondary 08B99

Key words and phrases: BCC-algebra, weak BCC-algebra, BCI-algebra, para-associativity.

K. Iséki posed an interesting problem (solved by A. Wroński in [8]) whether the class of BCK-algebras is a variety. In connection with this problem Y. Komori introduced in [6] the notion of BCC-algebras and proved (using some Gentzen-type system LC) that the class of all BCC-algebras is not a variety, but the variety generated by BCC-algebras, that is, the smallest variety containing the class of all BCC-algebras, is finitely based [7].

In this note we shall consider so-called weak BCC-algebras which are a generalization of BCC-algebras and give some necessary and sufficient conditions for a weak BCC-algebra to be a Boolean group.

1.

First we shall give some basic definitions and results.

By a *BCC-algebra* we mean a non-empty set G together with a binary multiplication denoted by juxtaposition and a distinguished element 0 such that the following axioms are satisfied for all $x, y, z \in G$:

- (1) $(yz)((xy)(xz)) = 0,$
- (2) $xx = 0,$
- (3) $x0 = x,$
- (4) $0x = x,$
- (5) $xy = yx = 0$ implies $x = y.$

By a *BCI-algebra* we mean an algebra $(G, \cdot, 0)$ of type $(2, 0)$ in which conditions (2), (5) and

- (6) $((xy)(xz))(zy) = 0,$
- (7) $(x(xy))y = 0,$
- (8) $x0 = x$

are satisfied.

If a BCI-algebra $(G, \cdot, 0)$ satisfies also $0x = 0$, then it is called a BCK-algebra.

The above axiom systems are not independent. One can prove (cf. [1]) that the class of all BCI-algebras is uniquely determined by (5), (6) and (8). BCK-algebras are determined by (5), (6), (8) and $0x = 0$. Also axioms of (weak) BCC-algebras are dependent. Indeed, putting $x = y = 0$ in (1) and using (4), we obtain (2).

Y. Komori noticed in [6] that if we exchange (1) for

$$(9) \quad (xy)((yz)(xz)) = 0,$$

then we obtain the axiom system of BCK-algebras (but dual form).

Similarly, if we consider a general algebra $(G, \cdot, 0)$ of type (2,0) which satisfies (1), (2), (4), (5) and if we exchange (1) for (9), then we obtain the dual form of the axioms system of BCI-algebras which are a generalization of BCK-algebras. Hence, a general algebra $(G, \cdot, 0)$ of type (2) with conditions (1), (2), (4) and (5) is called a weak BCC-algebra.

A simple example of a weak BCC-algebra is a Boolean group or an algebra $(G, *, 0)$ with $x * y = y - x$, where $(G, +, 0)$ is an Abelian group. These algebras are not BCC-algebras.

A groupoid (G, \cdot) is called a *para-associative groupoid of type (i,j,k)* (cf. [2]) or an *(i,j,k)-associative groupoid*, if

$$(x_1 \cdot x_2) \cdot x_3 = x_1 \cdot (x_j \cdot x_k)$$

for all $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in G$, where (i,j,k) is a fixed permutation of 1, 2 and 3. It is clear that a *para-associative groupoid of type (1,2,3)* is a semigroup. Every (1,3,2)-associative groupoid is left alternative, every (2,1,3)-associative - right alternative. The class of all flexible groupoids is contained in the class of all (2,3,1)-associative groupoids.

2.

First we shall prove a simple but useful lemma.

Lemma. A weak BCC-algebra is a BCI-algebra iff it is Abelian.

Proof. An Abelian weak BCC-algebra is obviously a BCI-algebra. On the other hand, if a weak BCC-algebra $(G, \cdot, 0)$ is a BCI-algebra, then $x = 0x = x0$ for all $x \in G$. Hence by the Lemma from [1] we obtain $xy = yx$, which finishes our proof.

As it is well-known (see [4]) a BCI-algebra is a Boolean group iff it is associative or iff it satisfies the identity $x = 0x$. Hence as a simple consequence of the above lemma we obtain

Corollary 1. A weak BCC-algebra is a BCI-algebra iff it is a Boolean group.

Remark 1. From (3) it follows that a Boolean group is not a BCC-algebra. Moreover, from (3) and (4) follows that a BCC-algebra is a BCK-algebra iff it is trivial, i.e. iff it has only one element.

Proposition 1. Every left (right) alternative weak BCC-algebra is a Boolean group.

Proof. If a weak BCC-algebra $(G, \cdot, 0)$ is left alternative, then $(yx)x = y(xx)$ for all $x, y \in G$. Hence $x = (x0)0 = x(00) = x0$. Thus putting $z = x$ in (1), we obtain $0 = (yx)((xy)(xx)) = (yx)(xy)$, which proves that $(G, \cdot, 0)$ is Abelian.

Similarly, if $(G, \cdot, 0)$ is right alternative, i.e. if $(xx)y = x(xy)$, then $y = x(xy)$ and $x0 = x$. Since (1) for $z = 0$

implies $y((xy)x) = 0$, then, putting in this equation $y = xz$, we get $0 = (xz((x(xz))x) = (xz)(zx)$, which proves that also in this case $(G, \cdot, 0)$ is Abelian. But by the Lemma an Abelian weak BCC-algebra is a BCI-algebra, i.e. $(G, \cdot, 0)$ is a Boolean group (Corollary 1).

Proposition 2. *A weak BCC-algebra with the identity $(xy)x = y$ is a Boolean group.*

Proof. If a weak BCC-algebra $(G, \cdot, 0)$ satisfies $(xy)x = y$, then $y = y0$ and for every $a, b \in G$ the equation $bx = a$ is uniquely solvable. Indeed, an element $x = ab$ satisfies the equation $xa = b$ and $bx = a$, since $(ab)a \in b$ and $a = (xa)x = bx$. Moreover $bx = bz$ gives $x = z$, since $x = (bx)b = (bz)b = z$. Thus for every $a, b \in G$ the solution $x \in G$ of the equation $bx = a$ exists and is uniquely determined. Hence from (1) we have $(xy)(xz) = yz$ and $x(xy) = (x0)(xy) = 0y = (xx)y$, which shows that this weak BCC-algebra is right alternative. By Proposition 1 it is a Boolean group.

Corollary 2. *If a weak BCC-algebra $(G, \cdot, 0)$ is a quasigroup, then it is a (Boolean) group iff $x0 = x$ for all $x \in G$, i.e. iff it has a neutral element.*

Proof. If a weak BCC-algebra $(G, \cdot, 0)$ is a quasigroup and 0 is its neutral element, then from (1) we get $yz = (xy)(xz)$ and $y = y0 = (xy)(x0) = (xy)x$, which finishes the first part of the proof.

The second part is obvious.

In the same manner as Proposition 2, we can prove

Proposition 3. *A weak BCC-algebra with the identity $x(yx) = y$ is a Boolean group.*

We are now in a position to state the full characterization of para-associative weak BCC-algebras.

Proposition 4. *Every para-associative weak BCC-algebra is a Boolean group.*

Proof. We shall consider six cases of the para-associativity.

i) The case of (1,2,3)-associativity.

Since the multiplication in this case is associative, then from (1) we get

$$0 = (yz)((xy)(xz)) = ((yz)x)(y(xz))$$

and

$$0 = (yx)((zy)(zx)) = (y(xz))((yz)x),$$

which gives (by (5)) $(yz)x = y(xz)$. Hence a (1,2,3)-associative weak BCC-algebra is also (1,3,2)-associative.

ii) The case of (1,3,2)-associativity immediately follows from Proposition 1, since every (1,3,2)-associative weak BCC-algebra is left alternative.

iii) The case of (2,1,3)-associativity also follows from Proposition 1 since in this case a weak BCC-algebra is right alternative.

iv) In the case of (2,3,1)-associativity, we have $(xy)z = y(zx)$ for all $x, y \in G$. Hence $x = (00)x = 0(x0) = x0$ and $(xy)x = y(xx) = y0 = y$ which proves (by Proposition 2) that this weak BCC-algebra is a Boolean group.

v) The case of (3,1,2)-associativity.

Putting $x = 0$ in $(xy)z = z(xy)$, we obtain $yz = zy$, which implies (by the Lemma) that this weak BCC-algebra is Abelian. It is obviously a Boolean group (Corollary 1).

vi) The case of (3,2,1)-associativity.

As in the previous case putting $x = 0$ in $(xy)z = z(yx)$, we get $yz = zy$, since

$$z = 0z = (xx)z = z(xx) = z0$$

and

$$yz = (0y)z = z(y0) = zy.$$

Remark 2. It is obvious that every Boolean group satisfies all the conditions given in the above propositions. Therefore, these conditions are necessary and sufficient for a weak BCC-algebra to be a Boolean group.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dudek W.A., *On the axioms system for BCI-algebras (to appear)*.
- [2] Глейхрехвигт Б., *Параассоциативные кольца и алгебры*, Acta Univ. Wratislaviensis 58 (1967), 21 - 35.
- [3] Henkin L., *An algebraic characterization of quantifiers*, Fund. Math., 37 (1950), 63 - 74.
- [4] Hu Q.P., Iséki K., *On BCI-algebras satisfying $(x*y)*z = x*(y*z)$* , Math. Sem., Notes Kobe Univ., 8 (1980), 123 - 130.
- [5] Iséki K., *An algebra related with a propositional calculus*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci., 42 (1966), 26 - 29.
- [6] Komori Y., *The class of BCC-algebras is not a variety*, Math. Japon., 29 (1984), 391 - 394.
- [7] Komori Y., *The variety generated by BCC-algebras is finitely based*, Reports Fac. Sci. Shizuoka Univ., 17 (1983), 13 - 16.
- [8] Wroński A., *BCC-algebras do not form a variety*, Math. Japon., 28 (1983), 211 - 213.

REZIME

O PARA-ASOCIJATIVNIM BCC-ALGEBRAMA

Algebra $(G, \cdot, 0)$ tipa $(2,0)$ se naziva slaba BCC-algebra ako i samo ako $xy = yx = 0$ implicira $x = y$ i ako uslovi $(yz)((xy)(xz)) = 0$ $xx = 0$, $0x = x$ važe sa sve $x, y, z \in G$. U ovom radu je dokazano da je

jedna slaba BCC-algebra i BCI-algebra odnosno važi $((xy)xz)(zy) = 0$ i $x0 = x$ ako i samo ako je ona jedna Bulova grupa. Dokazano je takodje da je svaka levo (desno) alternativna slaba BCC-algebra i jedna Bulova grupa. Posmatrane su takozvane para-asocijativne slabe BCC-algebre odnosno slabe BCC-algebre sa uslovom: $(x_1x_2)x_3 = x_i(x_jx_k)$, gde je (i,j,k) fiksirana permutacija skupa $\{1,2,3\}$. Dokazano je da su ove BCC-algebre Bulove grupe.

Received by the editors March 16, 1987.