127 (2002) MATHEMATICA BOHEMICA No. 4, 525–529

# REMARKS ON COMMUTATIVE HILBERT ALGEBRAS

Radomír Halaš, Olomouc

(Received December 7, 2000)

*Abstract.* The paper shows that commutative Hilbert algebras introduced by Y. B. Jun are just J. C. Abbot's implication algebras.

*Keywords*: Hilbert algebra, implication algebra, Boolean algebra

*MSC 2000*: 03B60

## 1. Introduction

Hilbert algebras are important tools for certain investigations in algebraic logic since they can be considered as fragments of any propositional logic containing a logical connective implication and the constant 1 which is considered as the logical value "true". As usual, the operation is denoted by "$\cdot$" instead of "$\Rightarrow$" although it has the same meaning.

The concept of Hilbert algebra was introduced in the 50-ties by L. Henkin and T. Skolem for investigations in intuitionistic and other non-classical logics. A. Diego [5] proved that Hilbert algebras form a variety which is locally finite.

They were studied from various points of view. Concerning congruence properties it is shown in [2] that Hilbert algebras form a congruence distributive variety the congruences in which are in a 1-1 correspondence with ideals [4]. Pseudocomplements as well as relative pseudocomplements of elements in lattices of ideals of Hilbert algebras were then described and studied in [3].

In [6] the notion of a commutative Hilbert algebra was introduced and studied. The aim of this short note is to show that this paper contains non-valid theorems as well as that commutative Hilbert algebras are exactly implication algebras treated by J. C. Abbott [1].

## 2. Preliminaries

**Definition 1.** A *Hilbert algebra* is a triplet $\mathcal{H} = (H; \cdot, 1)$, where $H$ is a non-empty set, $\cdot$ is a binary operation on $H$ and 1 is a fixed element of $H$ (i.e. a nullary operation) such that the following axioms hold in $\mathcal{H}$:

(HA1) $x \cdot (y \cdot x) = 1$,
(HA2) $(x \cdot (y \cdot z)) \cdot ((x \cdot y) \cdot (x \cdot z)) = 1$,
(HA3) $x \cdot y = 1$ and $y \cdot x = 1$ imply $x = y$.

For the proof of the following result, see e.g. [5].

**Proposition 1.** *Every Hilbert algebra satisfies the following properties:*
(1) $x \cdot x = 1$,
(2) $1 \cdot x = x$,
(3) $x \cdot 1 = 1$,
(4) $x \cdot (y \cdot z) = (x \cdot y) \cdot (x \cdot z)$,
(5) $x \cdot (y \cdot z) = y \cdot (x \cdot z)$,
(6) $x \leqslant y \Rightarrow y \cdot z \leqslant x \cdot z$,
(7) $x \leqslant y \Rightarrow z \cdot x \leqslant z \cdot y$.

It can be easily verified that the relation $\leqslant$ defined in a Hilbert algebra $\mathcal{H} = (H; \cdot, 1)$ by

$$x \leqslant y \text{ if and only if } x \cdot y = 1$$

is a partial order relation on $H$ with 1 as the greatest element. This order relation is called the *natural ordering* on $H$.

Example 1. It is of great importance that every partially ordered set $(P, \leqslant, 1)$ with the greatest element 1 can be regarded as a Hilbert algebra, namely, if we define for $x, y \in P$

$$x \cdot y = 1 \text{ whenever } x \leqslant y, \text{ and } x \cdot y = y \text{ otherwise,}$$

then $(P, \cdot, 1)$ is a Hilbert algebra the natural ordering on which coincides with the relation $\leqslant$.

Hilbert algebras generalize properties of implicative reducts of Boolean algebras (i.e. algebras corresponding to a classical logic), the so called implication algebras, treated by J. C. Abbott in [1]:

**Definition 2.** An *implication algebra* (IA) is an algebra $(A, \cdot, 1)$ of type (2,0) satisfying the following conditions:

(I1) $x \cdot x = 1$,
(I2) $(x \cdot y) \cdot x = x$,
(I3) $x \cdot (y \cdot z) = y \cdot (x \cdot z)$,
(I4) $(x \cdot y) \cdot y = (y \cdot x) \cdot x$.

Of course, since implication algebras are a special case of Hilbert algebras, one can define a natural ordering $\leqslant$ on $A$ in the same way as for Hilbert algebras.

Abbott has shown that implication algebras are a natural generalization of Boolean algebras in the following sense:

**Proposition 2.** (i) *Let $(A, \cdot, 1)$ be an implication algebra. Then each interval $[p, 1]$ in $A$ is a Boolean algebra w.r.t. operations defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} x \vee y &= (x \cdot y) \cdot y, \\ x \wedge y &= ((x \cdot p) \vee (y \cdot p)) \cdot p, \\ x' &= x \cdot p. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *Conversely, if $(A, \vee)$ is a $\vee$-semilattice each interval in which is a Boolean algebra w.r.t. the induced order, then $A$ with the operation $\cdot$ defined by*

$$x \cdot y = (x \vee y)^y,$$

*where $(x \vee y)^y$ is the relative pseudocomplement of $x \vee y$ in the Boolean algebra $[y, 1]$, is an implication algebra.*

Proposition 2 says that there is a 1-1 correspondence between implication algebras and join semilattices having Boolean algebras for intervals.

By [6], a Hilbert algebra $\mathcal{H}$ is said to be *commutative* if it satisfies the axiom (I4). Hence $\mathcal{H}$ is then an implication algebra if and only if also (I3) is satisfied in $\mathcal{H}$.

Theorem 3.3. in [6] claims that commutative Hilbert algebras are just those which are join semilattices w.r.t. the natural ordering. $A$ simple inspection shows that this does not hold:

Example 2. Let us consider a 4-element Boolean algebra $A = \{0, 1, a, a'\}$ with the corresponding order relation $\leqslant$. By Example 1, the operation $\cdot$ defined on $A$ by

$$x \cdot y = 1 \text{ if and only if } x \leqslant y, \ \ x \cdot y = y \text{ otherwise},$$

defines on $A$ a Hilbert algebra which is surely a join semilattice. On the other hand, it is not commutative, since e.g. $1 = (a \cdot 0) \cdot 0 \neq (0 \cdot a) \cdot a = a$.

In the next section we will show by using Proposition 2 that commutative Hilbert algebras are just the implication ones.

## 3. Commutative Hilbert algebras

First we show that commutative Hilbert algebras form a join semillatice w.r.t. the natural ordering:

**Lemma 1.** *If $\mathcal{H} = (H, \cdot, 1)$ is a commutative Hilbert algebra then the natural ordering $\leqslant$ on $H$ is a semilattice and $x \vee y = (x \cdot y) \cdot y$.*

Proof. According to (HA1) and commutativity it is clear that the element $(x \cdot y) \cdot y = (y \cdot x) \cdot x$ is an upper bound of $x$ and $y$. Suppose that $x \leqslant q$, $y \leqslant q$ for some $q \in H$. Then Proposition 1(6) yields $q \cdot y \leqslant x \cdot y$ and $(x \cdot y) \cdot y \leqslant (q \cdot y) \cdot y = (y \cdot q) \cdot q = 1 \cdot q = q$, proving that $(x \cdot y) \cdot y$ is the least upper bound of $x$ and $y$. □

**Lemma 2.** *Let $\mathcal{H} = (H, \cdot, 1)$ be a commutative Hilbert algebra and let $a, b, p \in H$. Then*

*(1) $p \leqslant a$ yields $(a \cdot p) \cdot a = a$;*

*(2) $p \leqslant b$ yields $a \cdot b = (a \cdot p) \vee b$.*

Proof. (1) Suppose $p \leqslant a$. Then $p \cdot a = 1$ and

$$(p \cdot a) \cdot a = 1 \cdot a = a = a \vee p = (a \cdot p) \cdot p.$$

Hence

$$(a \cdot p) \cdot a = (a \cdot p) \cdot [(a \cdot p) \cdot p] = [(a \cdot p) \cdot (a \cdot p)] \cdot [(a \cdot p) \cdot p] = 1 \cdot [(a \cdot p) \cdot p] = a.$$

(2) We compute

$$(a \cdot p) \vee b = [b \cdot (a \cdot p)] \cdot (a \cdot p) = [a \cdot (b \cdot p)] \cdot (a \cdot p) = a \cdot [(b \cdot p) \cdot p] = a \cdot (b \vee p) = a \cdot b.$$

□

The foregoing theorem describes intervals in commutative Hilbert algebras:

**Theorem.** *Let $\mathcal{H} = (H, \cdot, 1)$ be a commutative Hilbert algebra. For every $p \in H$ the interval $[p, 1]$ is a Boolean algebra where for $a, b \in [p, 1]$ we have $a \vee b = (a \cdot b) \cdot b$, $a \wedge b = [a \cdot (b \cdot p)] \cdot p$, and the complement of $a$ is $a^p = a \cdot p$.*

Proof. The first assertion follows from Lemma 1. Let us prove that $a \wedge b = [a \cdot (b \cdot p)] \cdot p$. Evidently, $[a \cdot (b \cdot p)] \cdot p \in [p, 1]$. By Lemma 2(2) we have $a \cdot (b \cdot p) = (a \cdot p) \vee (b \cdot p)$. Since $a \cdot p \leqslant (a \cdot p) \vee (b \cdot p)$, by using Proposition 1(7) we get

$$[a \cdot (b \cdot p)] \cdot p = [(a \cdot p) \vee (b \cdot p)] \cdot p \leqslant (a \cdot p) \cdot p = a \vee p = a,$$

thus $(a\cdot(b\cdot p))\cdot p \leqslant a$. Analogously we can show $(a\cdot(b\cdot p))\cdot p \leqslant b$ and hence $(a\cdot(b\cdot p))\cdot p$ is a lower bound of both $a$ and $b$. Suppose $q \in [p,1]$, $q \leqslant a$, $q \leqslant b$. Then applying Proposition 1(6) again we have $a \cdot p \leqslant q \cdot p$, $b \cdot p \leqslant q \cdot p$, hence $(a \cdot p) \vee (b \cdot p) \leqslant q \cdot p$. Further, this gives

$$q \leqslant q \vee p = (q \cdot p) \cdot p \leqslant [(a \cdot p) \vee (b \cdot p)] \cdot p = [a \cdot (b \cdot p)] \cdot p,$$

thus $[a \cdot (b \cdot p)] \cdot p$ is the least upper bound of $a$ and $b$ in $[p,1]$. Let us prove that $a^p = a \cdot p$ is a complement of $a \in [p,1]$ in this interval. By Lemma 2(1) we have also

$$a \vee (a \cdot p) = [(a \cdot p) \cdot a] \cdot a = a \cdot a = 1.$$

Since $p \leqslant a \cdot p$, we have

$$a \wedge (a \cdot p) = [a \cdot ((a \cdot p) \cdot p)] \cdot p = (a \cdot a) \cdot p = 1 \cdot p = p.$$

Moreover,

$$a^{pp} = (a \cdot p) \cdot p = a \vee p = a.$$

If we prove that $a^p$ is simultaneously a pseudocomplement of $a$ in $[p,1]$, then by the previous property every element of this interval is Boolean and so $[p,1]$ is a Boolean algebra. Suppose that $b \in [p,1]$ is such that $a \wedge b = p$, hence $[a \cdot (b \cdot p)] \cdot p = p$. Then

$$a^p = a \cdot p = a \cdot [(a \cdot (b \cdot p)) \cdot p] = [a \cdot (b \cdot p)] \cdot (a \cdot p) = a \cdot [(b \cdot p) \cdot p] = a \cdot (b \vee p) = a \cdot b,$$

henceforth $b \cdot a^p = b \cdot (a \cdot b) = 1$, or $b \leqslant a^p$. □

Comparing this Theorem with Proposition 2 we immediately get

**Corollary.** *Every commutative Hilbert algebra is an implication algebra.*

*References*


[1] *Abott J. C.*: Semi-Boolean algebras. Matem. Vestnik *4* (1967), 177–198.
[2] *Chajda I.*: The lattice of deductive systems on Hilbert algebras. Southeast Asian Bull. Math. To appear.
[3] *Chajda I., Halaš R.*: Annihilators in Hilbert algebras. Mult.-Valued Log. To appear.
[4] *Chajda I., Halaš R.*: Congruences and ideals in Hilbert algebras. Kyungpook Mathem. J. *39* (1999), 429–432.
[5] *Diego A.*: Sur algébres de Hilbert. Collect. Logique Math. Ser. A *21* (1967), 177–198.
[6] *Jun Y. B.*: Commutative Hilbert algebras. Soochow J. Math. *22* (1996), 477–484.



*Author's address*: *Radomír Halaš*, Department of Algebra and Geometry, Palacký University Olomouc, Tomkova 40, 779 00 Olomouc, Czech Republic, e-mail: halas@risc.upol.cz.