On B-algebras and quasigroups

Jung R. Cho and Hee Sik Kim

Abstract

In this paper we discuss further relations between B-algebras and quasigroups.

1. Introduction

Y. Imai and K. Iséki introduced two classes of abstract algebras: BCKalgebras and BCI-algebras ([2, 3]). It is known that the class of BCKalgebras is a proper subclass of the class of BCI-algebras. In [4, 5] Q. P. Hu and X. Li introduced a wide class of abstract algebras: BCH-algebras. They have shown that the class of BCI-algebras is a proper subclass of the class of *BCH*-algebras. J. Neggers and H. S. Kim introduced in [8] the notion of d-algebras, i.e. algebras satisfying (1) xx = 0, (5) 0x = 0, (6) xy = 0 and yx = 0 imply x = y, which is another useful generalization of BCK-algebras, and then they investigated several relations between d-algebras and BCK-algebras as well as some other interesting relations between *d*-algebras and oriented digraphs. Recently, Y. B. Jun, E. H. Roh and H. S. Kim introduced in [6] a new notion, called an BHalgebra, determined by (1), (2) x0 = x and (6), which is a generalization of BCH/BCI/BCK-algebras. They also defined the notions of ideals and boundedness in BH-algebras, and showed that there is a maximal ideal in bounded BH-algebras. J. Neggers and H. S. Kim introduced in [9] and investigated a class of algebras which is related to several classes of algebras of interest such as BCH/BCI/BCK-algebras and which seems to have rather nice properties without being excessively complicated otherwise. In this paper we discuss further relations between B-algebras and other topics, especially quasigroups. This is a continuation of [9].

²⁰⁰⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification: 06F35, 20N05 Keywords: *B*-algebra, quasigroup, cancellation

2. Preliminaries

A *B*-algebra is a non-empty set X with a constant 0 and a binary operation " \cdot " (denoted by juxtaposition) satisfying the following axioms:

- (1) xx = 0,
- $(2) \quad x0 = x,$
- $(3) \quad (xy)z = x(z(0y))$

for all $x, y, z \in X$.

Example 2.1. It is easy to see that $X = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ with the multiplication:

·	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	0	2	1	3	4	5
1	1	0	2	4	5	3
2	2	1	0	5	3	4
3	3	4	5	0	2	1
4	4	5	3	1	0	2
5	5	3	4	2	1	0

is a *B*-algebra.

The following result is proved in [9].

Proposition 2.2. If $(X; \cdot, 0)$ is a *B*-algebra, then

- $(i) \quad x(yz) = (x(0z))y,$
- $(ii) \quad (xy)(0y) = x,$
- (*iii*) xz = yz implies x = y

for all $x, y, z \in X$.

A B-algebra $(X; \cdot, 0)$ is said to be 0-commutative if x(0y) = y(0x) for any $x, y \in X$.

The *B*-algebra from the above example is not 0-commutative, since we have $3 \cdot (0 \cdot 4) = 2 \neq 1 = 4 \cdot (0 \cdot 3)$. A simple example of a 0-commutative *B*-algebra is a Boolean group. It is not difficult to see that a *B*-algebra is a Boolean group iff it satisfies one from the following identities: 0x = x, xy = yx, (xy)z = x(yz).

3. B-algebras and quasigroups

Lemma 3.1. Let $(X; \cdot, 0)$ be a *B*-algebra. Then for all $x, y \in X$

- (i) xy = 0 implies x = y,
- (*ii*) 0x = 0y *implies* x = y,
- $(iii) \quad 0(0x) = x.$

Proof. (i) Trivially follows from Proposition 2.2 (iii) and the fact that 0 = yy.

(ii) If 0x = 0y, then

$$0 = xx = (xx)0 = x(0(0x)) = x(0(0y)) = (xy)0 = xy,$$

and hence x = y by (i).

(iii) For any $x \in X$, since 0x = (0x)0 = 0(0(0x)) by (ii), we have x = 0(0x).

Theorem 3.2. In any *B*-algebra the left cancellation law holds.

Proof. Assume that xy = xz. Then 0(xy) = 0(xz). By Proposition 2.2 (i), we obtain that (0(0y))x = (0(0z))x. By Lemma 3.1 (iii) we have yx = zx. Hence y = z by Proposition 2.2 (iii).

Let L_a and R_a be the *left* and *right* translation of X (respectively), i.e. let $L_a(x) = ax$ and $R_a(x) = xa$ for all $x \in X$.

Lemma 3.3. If $(X; \cdot, 0)$ is a *B*-algebra, then

- (i) L_0 is a bijection,
- (*ii*) $R_0 = R_0^{-1} = id_X$,
- (iii) L_a and R_a are injective for all $a \in X$,
- (iv) $L_0^{-1}(0 \cdot x) = L_0^{-1}(L_0(x)) = x$ and $0 \cdot (L_0^{-1}(x)) = L_0(L_0^{-1}(x)) = x$ for $x \in X$.

Proof. (i) Since 0(0x) = x, $L_0^2 = id_X$ and so L_0 is a bijection. (ii) is a consequence of (2).

(iii) follows from Proposition 2.2 (iii) and Theorem 3.2. \Box

Lemma 3.4. L_a and R_a are surjective for all $a \in X$.

Proof. Let $c \in X$. Putting $b = (L_0^{-1}(c)) \cdot (0 \cdot a)$, we obtain

$$L_a(b) = L_a(L_0^{-1}(c) \cdot (0 \cdot a)) = a \cdot (L_0^{-1}(c) \cdot (0 \cdot a))$$

= $(a \cdot a) \cdot (L_0^{-1}(c)) = 0 \cdot (L_0^{-1}(c)) = c.$

Thus L_a is surjective.

Similarly, for $b = c \cdot (L_0^{-1}(a))$ we have

$$R_a(b) = R_a((c \cdot (L_0^{-1}(a))) = (c \cdot (L_0^{-1}(a))) \cdot a$$

= $(c \cdot (L_0^{-1}(a))) \cdot (0 \cdot (L_0^{-1}(a))) = c.$

by Proposition 2.2 (ii). Hence R_a is surjective.

Theorem 3.5. Every *B*-algebra is a quasigroup.

Proof. By Lemma 3.3 (iii) and Lemma 3.4.

Proposition 3.6. A *B*-algebra $(X; \cdot, 0)$ satisfies the identity (yx)x = y if and only if it is a loop and 0 is its neutral element.

Proof. If a *B*-algebra $(X; \cdot, 0)$ satisfies the identity (yx)x = y, then putting y = 0 in this identity we have (0x)x = 0, which by Lemma 3.1 (i) gives 0x = x. Hence 0 is the neutral element of $(X; \cdot, 0)$. By Theorem 3.5 $(X; \cdot, 0)$ is a loop.

Conversely, if 0 is the neutral element of a *B*-algebra $(X; \cdot, 0)$, then

$$(yx)x = y(x(0x)) = y(xx) = y0 = y$$

for all $x, y \in X$. This proves the proposition.

Theorem 3.7. A B-algebra satisfies the identity x(xy) = y if and only if it is 0-commutative.

Proof. If a *B*-algebra $(X; \cdot, 0)$ satisfies the identity x(xy) = y, then

$$\begin{aligned} (x(0y))y &= x(y(0(0y))) = x(yy) = x0 = x = y(yx) \\ &= y(y(0(0x))) = (y(0x))y \,. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have (x(0y))y = (y(0x))y. Then, by the right cancellation law, we obtain x(0y) = y(0x).

The converse statement is proved in [9].

Remark. A *B*-algebra satisfying the identity x(xy) = y is not, in general, a loop. Indeed, if (G, +, 0) is an abelian group, then *G* with the operation $x \cdot y = x - y$ is an example of a 0-commutative *B*-algebra, which satisfies this identity but it is not a loop.

References

- R. H. Bruck: A survey of binary systems, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971.
- [2] Q. P. Hu and X. Li On BCH-algebras, Math. Seminar Notes 11 (1983), 313 – 320.
- [3] Q. P. Hu and X. Li: On proper BCH-algebras, Math. Japon. 30 (1985), 659 - 661.
- [4] K. Iséki and S. Tanaka: An introduction to theory of BCK-algebras, Math. Japon. 23 (1978), 1 – 26.
- [5] **K. Iséki**: On BCI-algebras, Math. Seminar Notes 8 (1980), 125–130.
- [6] Y. B. Jun, E. H. Roh and H. S. Kim: On BH-algebras, Sci. Mathematicae 1 (1998), 347 – 354.
- [7] J. Meng and Y. B. Jun: BCK-algebras, Kyung Moon Sa Co., Seoul 1994.
- [8] J. Neggers and H. S. Kim: On d-algebras, Math. Slovaca 49 (1999), 19-26.
- [9] J. Neggers and H. S. Kim, On B-algebras, (submitted)
- [10] J. Neggers and H. S. Kim, A fundamental theorem of B-homomorphism for B-algebras, Inter. Math. J. 2 (2002), (to appear)

Jung R. Cho Department of Mathematics Pusan National University Pusan 609-735, Korea jungcho@hyowon.pusan.ac.kr Received March 21, 2001

Hee Sik Kim Department of Mathematics Hanyang University Seoul 133-791, Korea heekim@hanyang.ac.kr