

7. An Algebra Related with a Propositional Calculus

By Kiyoshi ISÉKI

(Comm. by Kinjirô KUNUGI, M.J.A., Jan. 12, 1966)

In this note, we shall consider a new algebra induced by the *BCI*-system of propositional calculus by C. A. Meredith quoted into A. N. Prior, *Formal Logic* ([4], p. 316).¹⁾

Unfortunately, we can not find the details on the *BCI* and *BCK*-systems in literatures. For the completeness, giving its detail, we shall develop our consideration.

If we take the *BCI*-system or the weak positive implicational calculus by A. Church, these systems are given by the following axioms.

BCI-system: $CCpqCCqrCpr$, $CpCCpqq$, and Cpp ,

WPI-system: $CCpCpqCpq$, $CCqrCCpqCpr$, $CCpCqrCqCpr$, and Cpp .

In these systems, we can not deduce an important thesis: $CpCqp$. From an attempt of algebraic formulations, we have a quite different situation from our former discussions (see [1], [2]).

Let $M = \langle X, 0, * \rangle$ be an abstract algebra consisting of a set X with an element 0 and a binary operation $*$. If M satisfies the following conditions *BCI* 1~5, it is called a *BCI-algebra*.

BCI 1 $(x * y) * (x * z) \leq z * y$,

BCI 2 $x * (x * y) \leq y$,

BCI 3 $x \leq x$,

BCI 4 $x \leq y, y \leq x$ imply $x = y$,

BCI 5 $x \leq 0$ implies $x = 0$,

where $x \leq y$ means $x * y = 0$.

Here we do not assume $0 * x = 0$, i.e. $0 \leq x$. This is an essential part and differs from axiom systems formulated in our previous notes [1], [2]. *BCI* 5 shows that $x * 0 = 0$ implies $x = 0$. And we have $0 * x = 0 * 0 = 0$. Hence if $x * 0 = 0 * x = 0$, then $x = 0$.

From the first axiom, we have the following important results:

(1) $x \leq y$ implies $z * y \leq z * x$. $x \leq y, y \leq z$ imply $x \leq z$.

By (1), if $x = y, y = z$, then $x = z$.

Theorem 1. *The second axiom in BCI-algebra is replaced by*

(2) $(x * y) * z \leq (x * z) * y$.

1) In my seminar on mathematical logic, Mr. Shôtarô Tanaka announced forming rules to produce a single axiom from several axioms of *CN*-types in propositional calculi. His results are based on so called *BCI*, *BCK*-systems introduced by C. A. Meredith (see A. N. Prior [4], p. 316).

Proof. Assume axioms 1, 3 and the condition (2), then

$$(x * (x * y)) * y \leq (x * y) * (x * y) = 0.$$

By *BCI* 5, we have $(x * (x * y)) * y = 0$, i.e. $x * (x * y) \leq y$.

Conversely, we shall show that axioms of *BCI*-algebra imply (2).

By (1), we have

$$(3) \quad u * (z * y) \leq u * ((x * y) * (x * z)).$$

We substitute $x * u$ for x , $x * z$ for z , $((x * u) * y) * (z * u)$ for u in (3), and use (3), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & ((x * u) * y) * (z * u) * ((x * z) * y) \\ & \leq (((x * u) * y) * (z * u)) * (((x * u) * y) * ((x * u) * (x * z))) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$(4) \quad ((x * u) * y) * (y * u) \leq (x * z) * y,$$

which is a thesis in J. Lukasiewicz [2]. In this formula, let $u = z$, $z = x * y$, then we have the following formula

$$((x * z) * y) * ((x * y) * z) \leq (x * (x * y)) * y.$$

The right side is equal to 0 by *BCI* 2. Therefore we have $(x * z) * y \leq (x * y) * z$, which means the formula (2). We complete the proof of Theorem 1.

Remark 1. Under the formula (2), $(x * y) * (x * z) \leq z * y$ and $(x * y) * (z * y) \leq x * z$ are equivalent.

Remark 2. Let $(x * y) * z = 0$, i.e. $x * y \leq z$, then by (1), we have $x * z \leq x * (x * y) \leq y$. Hence if $x * y \leq z$, then $x * z \leq y$.

Remark 3. Formula (2) is written in form of

$$(x * y) * z = (x * z) * y$$

by *BCI* 4.

Theorem 2. In a *BCI*-algebra, we have the following formulas:

$$(5) \quad ((x * y) * z) * (u * z) \leq (x * u) * y,$$

$$(6) \quad ((x * y) * z) * ((x * u) * y) \leq u * z,$$

$$(7) \quad (x * y) * (z * u) \leq x * (z * (u * y)),$$

$$(8) \quad (x * y) * (x * (z * (u * y))) \leq z * u.$$

Proof. By the formula

$$(9) \quad (x * y) * (z * y) \leq x * z$$

and (2), we have

$$((x * y) * z) * (u * z) \leq (x * y) * u \leq (x * u) * y,$$

which shows formula (5). Formula (6) is obtained by (2) and (5). By Remark 3, we have $(x * y) * (z * u) = (x * (z * u)) * y$ and by using *BCI* 1 and 2,

$$(x * (z * u)) * (x * (z * (u * y))) \leq (z * (u * y)) * (z * u) \leq u * (u * y) \leq y.$$

Therefore

$$(x * (z * u)) * y \leq x * (z * (u * y)),$$

and we have

$$(x * y) * (z * u) \leq x * (z * (u * y)),$$

which is formula (7). Further, by (2) and (7), we have formula (8). Therefore the proof is complete.

Formulas (5), (6), (7), and (8) are found in [4].

If *BCI* 5 is replaced by $0 * x = 0$, i.e.

BCI 6. $0 \leq x$ for every $x \in X$,

then, by (2) and *BCI* 6, we have

$$(x * y) * x \leq (x * x) * y = 0$$

for every $y \in X$. Hence we have $x * y \leq x$. Conversely, if $x * y \leq x$ and (2) hold, then $0 = x * x \leq y$ for every $y \in X$.

An algebra M satisfying *BCI* 1~4 and *BCI* 6 corresponds to the *BCK* system on propositional calculus introduced by C. A. Meredith. If the axiom *Cpp* in the *BCI* system of propositional calculus is replaced by *CpCqp*, then we obtain the *BCK* system of propositional calculus (see A. N. Prior [4]). Therefore M is called *BCK-algebra*.

Next we shall consider formulas to characterize two algebras mentioned above.

Consider an algebra satisfying *BCI* 3~5 and (5), then it is a *BCI*-algebra.

To prove it, we first show (5) implies (6) under the condition *BCI* 3~5. Assume that formula (5), if $x * u \leq y$, then $(x * y) * z \leq u * z$. Put $u = z$, then we have $x * y \leq z$, if $x * z \leq y$. Hence *BCI* 3~5 and (5) imply that if $x * y \leq z$, then $x * z \leq y$. Hence *BCI* 3~5 and (5) imply (6). In formula (6), let $u = z$, then $(x * y) * z \leq (x * z) * y$. Hence by *BCI* 4, we have

$$(10) \quad (x * y) * z = (x * z) * y.$$

In formula (5), let $y = x * u$, then

$$(x * (x * u)) * z \leq u * z.$$

Applying (10), then we have

$$(x * y) * (x * z) \leq z * y,$$

which is *BCI* 1. Further, in (5), put $y = x * x$, $u = z = y$, then

$$((x * (x * y) * y) * (y * y)) \leq (x * y) * (x * y) = 0.$$

Since $y * y = 0$, we have $x * (x * y) * y = 0$, which is *BCI* 2.

Next, assume (6) and *BCI* 3~5. As shown above, (6) implies (10). Hence under these conditions, we have (5). Therefore we have the following

Theorem 3. *A BCI-algebra is characterized by BCI 3~5 and (5) (or (6)),*

and

Theorem 4. *A BCK-algebra is characterized by BCI 3, 4, 6, and (5) (or (6)).*

Next consider *BCI* 3~5, and (7). In formula (7), put $x = (x * y) * (z * u)$, $y = u * y$, $z = x$, and $u = z$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(((x * y) * (z * u)) * (u * y)) * (x * z) \\ &\leq((x * y) * (z * u)) * (x * (z * (u * y))) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by (7). Hence $((x * y) * (z * u)) * (u * y) \leq x * z$. Further in this formula, let $x * z = 0$, $u = y$, then we have $((x * y) * (z * u)) * 0 = 0$, and we have $x * y \leq z * y$. Hence if $x \leq z$, then $x * y \leq z * y$. Therefore $x \leq y$, $y \leq z$ imply $x \leq z$. To deduce *BCI* 1, we again use formula (7). We substitute x for z , z for u in (7), then

$$(x * y) * (x * z) \leq x * (x * (z * y)).$$

On the other hand, in (7), put $x = z * (u * y)$, then

$$(((z * (u * y)) * y) * (z * u)) \leq (z * (u * y)) * (z * (u * y)) = 0,$$

and we have $(z * (u * y)) * y \leq z * u$. Let $u = z$ in this formula, then we have $x * (x * y) \leq y$, which is *BCI* 2. This implies $x * (x * (z * y)) \leq z * y$. Therefore we have the following formula

$$(x * y) * (x * z) \leq x * (x * (z * y)) \leq z * y,$$

which is *BCI* 1. Hence we have the following

Theorem 5. *A BCI-algebra is characterized by BCI 3~5 and (7). A BCK-algebra is characterized by BCI 3, 4, 6, and (7).*

Remark 4. S. Tanaka has shown (in an oral communication) that the *BCI*, *BCK* algebras are characterized by using formula (8). The detail will be published.

Remark 5. Roughly speaking, 0 is the least element in the *BCI*-algebra, and a minimal element in the *BCK*-algebra. An algebra having 0 as the least element is *Sobociński algebra* formulated by three value calculus (see [5]).

References

- [1] K. Iséki: Algebraic formulations of propositional calculi. Proc. Japan Acad., **41**, 803-807 (1965).
- [2] Y. Imai and K. Iséki: On axiom systems of propositional calculi. XIV. Proc. Japan Acad., **42**, 19-22 (1966).
- [3] J. Lukasiewicz: Elements of Mathematical Logic. Oxford (1963).
- [4] A. N. Prior: Formal Logic. Oxford (1963).
- [5] B. Sobociński: Axiomatization of a partial system of three value calculus of propositions. Jour. of Computing Systems., **1**, 23-55 (1952).