

ON COMMUTATIVE T-CLOSURE OPERATORS*

By Sitiro HANAI

1. Let S be a complete lattice and \mathfrak{E} be the set of all T-closure operators \mathfrak{g} defined on S , that is, each element a of S is mapped by \mathfrak{g} on an element $a^{\mathfrak{g}}$ of S such that $a < a^{\mathfrak{g}}$, $(a \cup b)^{\mathfrak{g}} = a^{\mathfrak{g}} \cup b^{\mathfrak{g}}$, $(a^{\mathfrak{g}})^{\mathfrak{g}} = a^{\mathfrak{g}}$, $o^{\mathfrak{g}} = o$, where o is the zero element of S . Let \mathfrak{f} , \mathfrak{h} be two elements of \mathfrak{E} . When $a^{\mathfrak{f}} < a^{\mathfrak{h}}$ for any element a of S , we define $\mathfrak{f} < \mathfrak{h}$. Then it is known that \mathfrak{E} is a complete lattice by this partial order $<$ ¹⁾. When $(a^{\mathfrak{f}})^{\mathfrak{h}} = (a^{\mathfrak{h}})^{\mathfrak{f}}$ for any element a of S , we say that \mathfrak{f} and \mathfrak{h} are commutative. Denoting $(a^{\mathfrak{f}})^{\mathfrak{h}}$ by $a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}}$, we say $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}$ the product of \mathfrak{f} and \mathfrak{h} .

In this note, we will obtain the condition that \mathfrak{f} and \mathfrak{h} should be commutative, and as an application, we will next investigate what properties a maximal subset Ψ of \mathfrak{E} has, of which any two elements are commutative.

2. In the first place, we will consider the condition for commutability, by the partial order of \mathfrak{E} .

Theorem 1. If $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}$, then $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{f} \cap \mathfrak{h}$.

Proof. If $a^{\mathfrak{f}} = a$, a is said to be \mathfrak{f} -closed. Let $C_{\mathfrak{f}}$, $C_{\mathfrak{h}}$ be the set of all \mathfrak{f} -closed elements and \mathfrak{h} -closed elements respectively. Then $C_{\mathfrak{f}}$ and $C_{\mathfrak{h}}$ are both complete sublattices over S with respect to meet²⁾ and $\mathfrak{f} \cap \mathfrak{h}$ is a T-closure operator determined by $C_{\mathfrak{f}} \cap C_{\mathfrak{h}}$ ³⁾.

Let a be any element of S , then

$$a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}} = \bigcap_x (x \in C_{\mathfrak{h}}; x > a^{\mathfrak{f}}) = \bigcap_x (x \in C_{\mathfrak{h}}; x > a^{\mathfrak{f}} \cup a^{\mathfrak{h}}).$$

Similarly

$$a^{\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}} = \bigcap_x (x \in C_{\mathfrak{f}}; x > a^{\mathfrak{h}} \cup a^{\mathfrak{f}}).$$

Since, by hypothesis $a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}} = a^{\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}}$ and $C_{\mathfrak{f}}$, $C_{\mathfrak{h}}$ are both complete sublattices over S with respect to meet,

$$a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}} = a^{\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}} = \bigcap_x (x \in C_{\mathfrak{f}} \cap C_{\mathfrak{h}}; x > a^{\mathfrak{f}} \cup a^{\mathfrak{h}}).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} a^{\mathfrak{f} \cap \mathfrak{h}} &= \bigcap_x (x \in C_{\mathfrak{f}} \cap C_{\mathfrak{h}}; x > a) \\ &= \bigcap_x (x \in C_{\mathfrak{f}} \cap C_{\mathfrak{h}}; x > a^{\mathfrak{f}} \cup a^{\mathfrak{h}}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}$. Q.E.D.

Remark. It is easy to see by giving an example that the converse of this theorem does not always hold. But the following corollary is easily verified.

Corollary. When $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h} < \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}$, then $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}$ if and only if $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{f} \cap \mathfrak{h}$. In the next place, we will consider the condition for commutability, by the product of elements of \mathfrak{E} .

Theorem 2. $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}$ if and only if $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}$.

Proof. As the necessity is obvious, we will prove the sufficiency. Since $a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}} = a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}}$ for any element a of S , $a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}} \in C_{\mathfrak{f}}$.

On the other hand, $a^{\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}} = \bigcap_x (x \in C_{\mathfrak{f}}; x > a^{\mathfrak{h}})$, hence $a^{\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}} \in C_{\mathfrak{f}}$.

Similarly, from $a^{\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}} = a^{\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}}$ we get $a^{\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}} \in C_{\mathfrak{h}}$. Q.E.D.

Corollary. $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}$ if and only if $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}$ are both T-closure operators.

Proof. As the necessity follows from Theorem 1, we will prove the sufficiency. By the assumption that $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}$ is a T-closure operator, we have

$$(a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}})^{\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}} = \bigcap_x (x \in C_{\mathfrak{h}}; x > a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}}) = a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}}.$$

Then $a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}} > a^{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}}$.

On the other hand, $a^{\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}} \in C_{\mathfrak{f}}$ hence $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}$.

Similarly $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h}$. Therefore, by Theorem 2, $\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{f}$. Q.E.D.

In the above reasonings, we considered from the point of view of the partial order and the product of elements of \mathfrak{E} . We will next consider according to the relation be-

tween C_φ and C_ψ . Let $C_\varphi^\downarrow, C_\psi^\downarrow$ be the sets of elements of C_φ, C_ψ which do not belong to $C_\varphi \cap C_\psi$ respectively, then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3. $\varphi\psi = \psi\varphi$ if and only if any element a of C_φ^\downarrow and any element b of C_ψ^\downarrow are not comparable, except the case when there exists at least one element of $C_\varphi \cap C_\psi$ between a and b *).

Proof. Necessity. Suppose, if possible, that there exist $a \in C_\varphi^\downarrow, b \in C_\psi^\downarrow$ such that $a < b$ and no element of $C_\varphi \cap C_\psi$ is between a and b . Then

$$(a^\varphi)^\psi = a^\psi = \bigcap \{x \in C_\psi; x > a\} < b.$$

Denoting $(a^\varphi)^\psi$ by c , then $c \neq a$.

On the other hand, since $b > c$, then $c \notin C_\varphi \cap C_\psi$. Hence $(a^\psi)^\varphi = c^\varphi > c$ and $c^\varphi \neq c$. Therefore $a^\psi \varphi > a^\varphi \psi$ and $a^\psi \varphi \neq a^\varphi \psi$.

Sufficiency. Let A be the set of all elements of $C_\varphi \cap C_\psi$ which contains all elements of C_φ^\downarrow and C_ψ^\downarrow . Then $A \neq \emptyset$ follows from $A \ni I$, where I is the unit element of S . Let B denote the set of all elements of $C_\varphi \cap C_\psi$ which are contained in all elements of C_φ^\downarrow and C_ψ^\downarrow . Then $B \neq \emptyset$ follows from the fact that $B \ni 0$. And let C be the set of all elements of $C_\varphi \cap C_\psi$ which do not belong to A and B .

Let a_0 be any element of S . When we denote by $+$ or $-$ the cases according to whether a_0 is contained in some element of B (or $C, C_\varphi^\downarrow, C_\psi^\downarrow$) or not, it is obvious that there arise the following seven cases to be considered. In the following, we will prove $a_0^\psi \varphi = a_0^\varphi \psi$. In the cases (i), (iii), (iv), (vii), we can easily see that $a_0^\psi \varphi = a_0^\varphi \psi$, so we will prove the other cases.

	B	C	C_φ^\downarrow	C_ψ^\downarrow
(i)	-	-	-	-
(ii)	-	-	+	-
(iii)	-	-	+	+
(iv)	-	+	-	-
(v)	-	+	+	-
(vi)	-	+	+	+
(vii)	+	+	+	+

Case (ii). As we can consider the latter case similarly, we will prove only the above case. Let $a_x \in C_\varphi^\downarrow$ such that $a_x > a_0$,

then $\bigcap a_x \in C_\varphi^\downarrow$. Hence $a_0^\varphi = \bigcap a_x \in C_\varphi^\downarrow$. Therefore $a_0^\psi \varphi = \bigcap \{x \in A; x > \bigcap a_x\}$. On the other hand, $a_0^\psi = \bigcap \{x \in A; x > a_0\}$. Since any element of A contains any element of C_φ^\downarrow and $C_\psi^\downarrow, a_0^\psi > \bigcap a_x$. Hence $a_0^\psi \varphi > a_0^\varphi \psi$. Therefore $a_0^\psi \varphi = a_0^\varphi \psi$. From $a_0^\psi \in A$, it follows that $a_0^\psi \varphi = a_0^\psi$. Therefore $a_0^\psi \varphi = a_0^\psi \varphi$.

Case (v). We will only consider the above case. Let $a_x \in C_\varphi^\downarrow$ such that $a_x > a_0$, then $\bigcap a_x \in C_\varphi^\downarrow$. Then there arise the following two cases: (1) $\bigcap a_x \in C$, (2) $\bigcap a_x \in C_\varphi^\downarrow$.

Case (1). Let $c_y \in C$ such that $c_y > a_0$, then $\bigcap c_y \in C$. Hence $a_0^\psi = (\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y) \in C$. Therefore $a_0^\psi \varphi = a_0^\psi$. On the other hand, since $a_0^\psi = (\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y), a_0^\psi \varphi = (\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y)$. Thus $a_0^\psi \varphi = a_0^\psi \varphi$.

Case (2). Since $a_0^\psi = (\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y), a_0^\psi \varphi = \bigcap \{x \in C_\psi; x > a_0^\psi\} = \bigcap \{x \in C_\psi; x > (\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y)\}$. Then, in any case between $(\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y) \in C_\varphi \cap C_\psi$ and $(\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y) \in C_\varphi \cap C_\psi, \bigcap c_y$ is the least element of C_ψ containing $(\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y)$. Hence $a_0^\psi \varphi = \bigcap c_y$. On the other hand, $a_0^\psi \varphi = \bigcap c_y$ follows from $a_0^\psi = \bigcap c_y$.

Case (vi). In this case, it is sufficient to consider the following two cases: (α) There exists $c_y \in C$ such that $\bigcap a_x > c_y > a_0$, (β) There exists no element of C between $\bigcap a_x$ and a_0 and between $\bigcap c_y$ and a_0 , where $c_y \in C_\psi$ and $c_y > a_0$.

Case (α). In this case, $a_0^\psi = \bigcap c_y, a_0^\psi \varphi = (\bigcap c_y) \cap (\bigcap c_y)$, hence $a_0^\psi \varphi = \bigcap c_y$. In this case, $a_0^\psi \varphi = \bigcap c_y, a_0^\psi \varphi = \bigcap \{x \in C_\psi; x > (\bigcap c_y) \cap (\bigcap c_y)\}$. Suppose that $a_0^\psi \varphi < \bigcap c_y$ and $a_0^\psi \varphi \neq \bigcap c_y$, then $a_0^\psi \varphi < \bigcap c_y, a_0^\psi \varphi \neq \bigcap c_y$. This contradicts $a_0^\psi = \bigcap c_y$. Hence $a_0^\psi \varphi = \bigcap c_y$.

Case (β). Since $a_0^\psi = (\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y), a_0^\psi \varphi = \bigcap \{x \in C_\psi; x > (\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y)\}$, where $c_y > a_0, \bigcap a_x \in C_\varphi, c_y \in C$. Then $(\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y) \in C_\varphi$ by the hypothesis. On the other hand, since any element of C_ψ is not comparable with any element of C_φ^\downarrow , no element of C_ψ is between $\bigcap c_y$ and $(\bigcap a_x) \cap (\bigcap c_y)$. Hence $a_0^\psi \varphi = \bigcap c_y$. Similarly $a_0^\psi \varphi = \bigcap c_y$. Q.E.D.

As an application of Theorem 3, we will prove the following theorem concerning the set Ψ .

Theorem 4. Ψ is a complete sublattice over \mathbb{Z} with respect to meet.

Proof. -As Ψ^* contains the unit element 1 and the zero element 0 of Φ , it is sufficient to prove that if χ is any subset of Ψ , $\bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} \varphi \in \Psi^*$. Let γ be any element of Ψ such that $\gamma \in \chi$. Let $K_{\gamma\varphi} = C_{\gamma} \cap C_{\varphi}$, then it is easy to see that $(\bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} C_{\varphi}) \cap C_{\gamma} = \bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} K_{\gamma\varphi}$. Let L be the set $\bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} C_{\varphi} - \bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} K_{\gamma\varphi}$, that is, the set of all elements which belong to $\bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} C_{\varphi}$ but not to $\bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} K_{\gamma\varphi}$, then $L = \bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} C_{\varphi} - K_{\gamma\varphi}$, where $C_{\gamma\varphi}$ denotes the set $C_{\gamma} - K_{\gamma\varphi}$.

On the other hand, since γ is commutative with any $\varphi \in \chi$, by Theorem 3 any element of $C_{\gamma\varphi}$ is not comparable with any element of C_{γ} , with the same exception as Theorem 3, where $C_{\gamma\varphi}$ denotes the set $C_{\gamma} - K_{\gamma\varphi}$. Then any element of L is not comparable with any element of the set $C_{\gamma} - \bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} K_{\gamma\varphi}$, with the same exception as Theorem 3. As $\bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} \varphi$ is determined by $\bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} C_{\varphi}$, by Theorem 3, $\bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} \varphi$ is a T-closure operator and is commutative with γ .

When $\gamma \in \chi$, then $\gamma > \bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} \varphi$. It is easy to verify that γ and $\bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} \varphi$ are commutative, so we omit the proof of this case.

On the other hand, since Ψ is a maximal subset of Φ , therefore $\bigcap_{\varphi \in \chi} \varphi \in \Psi$.

Q.E.D.

*) This note owes to the problem suggested by Prof. K. Morita of Tokyo Bunrika Daigaku.

- 1) G. Birkhoff; On the combination of topologies, Fund. Math. 26 (1936), pp.156-165.
- 2) O. Ore; Galois connexions, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 55 (1944), pp.493-512. According to O. Ore, a subset T of a complete lattice S is called "a complete sublattice over S with respect to meet" when T is a complete lattice such that when $a > b$ for two elements of T, then $a > b$ in S and T contains the unit element and the zero element of S, and moreover the meet operation in T coincides with the meet operation in S both for finite or infinite sets.
- 3) M. Nakamura; Closure in general lattices, Proc. Imp. Acad. Tokyo, 17 (1941), pp.5-6.
- 4) If C_{γ} (or C_{ψ}) is void, then $C_{\varphi} \subset C_{\psi}$ (or $C_{\psi} \subset C_{\varphi}$). In this case it is easy to see that $\varphi\psi = \psi\varphi$.
- 5) G. Birkhoff; Lattice Theory (1940), p.17, Theorem 2. 2.

Shizuoka University.

(*) Received Nov. 1, 1952.