International Review of Fuzzy Mathematics Vol. 3 No. 1 (June, 2018)

Received: 03rd March 2017 Revised: 14th April 2017 Accepted: 10th September 2017

# Young Bae Jun & Seok Zun Song

# FUZZY IDEALS WITH OPERATORS IN BCC-ALGEBRAS

ABSTRACT: The notions of BCC-algebras with operators (brie,  $\Omega$ -BCC algebras) and  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideals of  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebras are given. Some properties of  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideals of  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebras are investigated.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 06F35, 03B52.

Key words and phrases:  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra,  $\Omega$ -BCC-ideal,  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCK-ideal,  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideal.

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

In 1966, Y. Imai and K. Iséki [8] defined a class of algebras of type (2,0) called *BCK-algebras* which generalizes on one hand the notion of algebra of sets with the set subtraction as the only fundamental non-nullary operation, on the other hand the notion of implication algebra. The class of all BCK-algebras is a quasivariety. K. Iséki posed an interesting problem (solved by A. Wroński [11]) whether the class of BCK-algebras is a variety. In connection with this problem, Y. Komori [9] introduced a notion of *BCC*-algebras, and W. A. Dudek [1, 2] redefined the notion of *BCC*-algebras by using a dual form of the ordinary definition in the sense of Y. Komori. In [6], W. A. Dudek and X. H. Zhang introduced a notion of *BCC*-ideals in *BCC*-algebras (see [3, 4, 5]). In this paper, we introduce the notions of *BCC*-algebras with operators (briefly,  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-algebras) and  $\Omega$ -fuzzy *BCC*-ideals of  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-algebras.

## 2. BASIC CONCEPTS AND RESULTS

We record here some basic concepts and clarify notions which are used in the sequel. For more details, we refer to the textbook BCK-Algebras (Meng and Jun [10]) and references which are given in this article.

Recall that a *BCC-algebra* is an algebra (X,\*, 0) of type (2,0) satisfying the following axioms:

for every  $x, y, z \in X$ . For any *BCC*-algebra *X*, the relation  $\leq$  defined by  $x \leq y$  if and only if x \* y = 0 is a partial order on *X*. In a *BCC*-algebra *X*, the following holds (see [7]).

• 
$$x * x = 0$$
,

- $x * y \leq x$ ,
- $x \le y$  implies  $x * z \le y * z$  and  $z * y \le z * x$

for all  $x, y \in X$ . A nonempty subset *S* of a *BCC*-algebra *X* is said to be a *subalgebra* of *X* if  $x * y \in S$  whenever  $x, y \in S$ . A nonempty subset *A* of a *BCC*-algebra *X* is called a *BCK-ideal* of *X* if it satisfies

• 
$$0 \in A$$

•  $(\forall x \in X) (\forall y \in A) (x * y \in A \Longrightarrow x \in A).$ 

A nonempty subset A of a BCC-algebra X is called a BCC-ideal of X if it satisfies

- $0 \in A$ ,
- $(\forall x, z \in X) (\forall y \in A) ((x * y) * z \in A \Rightarrow x * z \in A).$

Note that every *BCC*-ideal of a *BCC*-algebra *X* is a subalgebra of *X*. For a fuzzy set  $\mu$  in *X* and  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the set  $\mu_t := \{x \in X \mid \mu(x) \ge t\}$  is called a *level set* of  $\mu$ . A fuzzy set  $\mu$  in a *BCC*-algebra *X* is called a *fuzzy subalgebra* of *X* if  $\mu(x * y) \ge \min \{\mu(x), \mu(y)\}$  for all  $x, y \in X$ . A fuzzy set  $\mu$  in a *BCC*-algebra *X* is called a *fuzzy BCK*-*ideal* of *X* it it satisfies

• 
$$(\forall x \in X) \ (\mu(0) \ge \mu(x)).$$

•  $(\forall x, y \in X) \ (\mu(x) \ge \min \{\mu(x * y), \mu(y)\}).$ 

A fuzzy set  $\mu$  in a *BCC*-algebra X is called a *fuzzy BCC-ideal* of X if it satisfies

- $(\forall x \in X) \ (\mu(0) \ge \mu(x)).$
- $(\forall x, y, z \in X) \ (\mu(x * z) \ge \min \{\mu((x * y) * z), \mu(y)\}).$

#### 3. FUZZY BCC-IDEALS WITH OPERATORS

We begin with the definition of a *BCC*-algebra with operators.

**Definition 3.1.** A *BCC-algebra with operators* is an algebraic system consisting of a *BCC*-algebra *X*, a nonempty set  $\Omega$  and a function defined on the product set  $\Omega \times X$  and having values in *X* such that, if *ax* denotes the element in *X* determined by the element *x* of *X* and the element  $\alpha$  of  $\Omega$ , then  $\alpha(x * y) = \alpha x * \alpha y$  holds for any *x*,  $y \in X$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega$ . We shall usually use the phrase "*X* is an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-algebra" to a *BCC*-algebra with operators. A subalgebra *S* of an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-algebra *X* is said to be an  $\Omega$ -*subalgebra* of *X* if  $\alpha x \in S$  for every  $\alpha \in \Omega$  and  $x \in S$ . A *BCC*-ideal *A* of an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-algebra *X* is said to be an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-ideal of *X* if  $\alpha x \in A$  for every  $\alpha \in \Omega$  and  $x \in A$ .

**Example 3.2.** Let *X* be a *BCC*-algebra and let  $\Omega$  be a nonempty set. If we define  $\alpha x = 0$  (or,  $\alpha x = x$ ) for all  $x \in X$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega$ , then *X* is an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-algebra.

**Proposition 3.3.** Let X be an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra. For each  $\alpha \in \Omega$ , the set

$$X_{\alpha} := \{ x \in X \mid \alpha x = x \}$$

is a subalgebra of X. Moreover, if X satisfies the right cancellation law, then  $X_{\alpha}$  is a BCK-ideal of X.

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in X_{\alpha}$  for each  $\alpha \in \Omega$ . Then  $\alpha x = x$  and  $\alpha y = y$ , which imply that  $\alpha(x * y) = \alpha x * \alpha y = x * y$ , i.e.,  $x * y \in X_{\alpha}$ . Hence  $X_{\alpha}$  is a subalgebra of X. Assume that X satisfies the right cancellation law and let  $x, y \in X$  be such that  $x * y \in X_{\alpha}$  and  $y \in X_{\alpha}$ . Then  $\alpha x * y = \alpha x * \alpha y = \alpha(x * y) = x * y$ , and hence  $\alpha x = x$  by the right cancellation law. Thus  $x \in X_{\alpha}$ , and  $X_{\alpha}$  is a *BCK*-ideal of X.

**Proposition 3.4.** In an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra X, the following hold:

- (i)  $(\forall \alpha \in \Omega) (\alpha 0 = 0)$ .
- (ii)  $(\forall x, y \in X) (\forall \alpha \in \Omega) (x \le y \Longrightarrow \alpha x \le \alpha y).$

*Proof.* (i) For any  $x \in X$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega$  we have  $\alpha 0 = \alpha(x * x) = \alpha x * \alpha x = 0$ .

(ii) Let  $x, y \in X$  be such that  $x \le y$  and let  $\alpha \in \Omega$ . Then  $\alpha x * \alpha y = \alpha(x * y) = \alpha 0 = 0$ , and so  $\alpha x \le \alpha y$ .

**Proposition 3.5.** Let X be an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra. For each  $\alpha \in \Omega$ , the set

$$X(\alpha, 0) := \{x \in X \mid \alpha x = 0\}$$

is a BCC-ideal of X.

*Proof.* Proposition 3.4 (i) implies  $0 \in X(\alpha, 0)$ . Let  $x, y, z \in X$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega$  be such that  $(x * y) * z \in X(\alpha, 0)$  and  $y \in X(\alpha, 0)$ . Then

$$\alpha(x * z) = \alpha x * \alpha z = (\alpha x * 0) * \alpha z = (\alpha x * \alpha y) * \alpha z$$
  
=  $\alpha(x * y) * \alpha z = \alpha((x * y) * z) = 0,$ 

and so  $x * z \in X(\alpha, 0)$ . Thus  $X(\alpha, 0)$  is a *BCC*-ideal of *X*.

**Definition 3.6.** Let X be an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra. A fuzzy set  $\mu$  in X is called an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy subalgebra (resp.  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCK-ideal,  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideal) of X if it is a fuzzy subalgebra (resp. fuzzy BCK-ideal, fuzzy BCC-ideal) of X such that the following inequality:

$$(\forall x \in X) \ (\forall \alpha \in \Omega) \ (\mu(\alpha x) \ge \mu(x)).$$

**Example 3.7.** Let  $\mu$  be a fuzzy set in an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-algebra *X* defined by

$$\mu(x) := \begin{cases} 0.7 & if \ \alpha x = 0 \ for \ each \ \alpha \in \Omega, \\ 0.4 & otherwise. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that  $\mu$  is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy *BCC*-ideal of *X*.

**Proposition 3.8.** If  $\mu$  is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy subalgebra of an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra X, then

(i)  $(\forall x, y \in X) (\forall \alpha \in \Omega) (\mu(\alpha(x * y)) \ge \min \{\mu(\alpha x), \mu(\alpha y)\}).$ 

(i)  $(\forall x \in X) (\forall \alpha \in \Omega) (\mu(\alpha 0) (= \mu(0)) \ge \mu(\alpha x)).$ 

Proof. Straightforward.

Given  $\Omega$ -fuzzy *BCC*-ideal, we make a fuzzy *BCC*-ideal.

**Theorem 3.9.** Let  $\mu$  be an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideal of an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra X. For any  $\alpha \in \Omega$ , let  $\nu$  be a fuzzy set in X given by  $\nu(x) = \mu(\alpha x)$  for all  $x \in X$ . Then  $\nu$  is a fuzzy BCC-ideal of X.

*Proof.* Using Proposition 3.4(i), we have

$$v(0) = \mu(\alpha 0) = \mu(0) \ge \mu(\alpha x) = v(x)$$

for all  $x \in X$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega$ . For any  $x, y, z \in X$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega$ , we get

$$v(x * z) = \mu(\alpha(x * z)) = \mu(\alpha x * \alpha z) \ge \min \{\mu((\alpha x * \alpha y) * \alpha z), \mu(\alpha y)\}$$

 $= \min \{\mu(\alpha((x * y) * z), \mu(\alpha y))\} = \min \{\nu((x * y) * z), \nu(y)\}.$ 

Therefore v is a fuzzy *BCC*-ideal of X.

**Theorem 3.10.** Let X be an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra. If  $\mu$  is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideal of X, then for each  $\alpha \in \Omega$  the set

$$G_{\alpha} := \{x \in X \mid \mu(\alpha x) = \mu(0)\}$$

is an  $\Omega$ -BCC-ideal of X.

*Proof.* Clearly  $0 \in G_{\alpha}$ . Let  $x, y, z \in X$  be such that  $(x * y) * z \in G_{\alpha}$  and  $y \in G_{\alpha}$ . Then

$$\mu(\alpha(x * z)) = \mu(\alpha x * \alpha z) \ge \min \{\mu((\alpha x * \alpha y) * \alpha z), \mu(\alpha y)\}$$
$$= \min \{\mu(\alpha((x * y) * z), \mu(\alpha y)\} = \mu(0),$$

and so  $x * z \in G_{\alpha}$ . This completes the proof.

If  $\mu$  is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy *BCC*-ideal of an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-algebra *X*, then  $\mu_t$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , is either empty or a *BCC*-ideal of *X* (see [3, Theorem 4.9]). Let  $x \in \mu_t$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega$ . Then  $\mu(\alpha x) \ge \mu(x) \ge t$ , and so  $\alpha x \in \mu_t$ . Thus  $\mu_t$  is an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-ideal of *X*. Now let  $\mu$  be a fuzzy set in an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-algebra *X* for which every nonempty level set is an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-ideal of *X*. Then  $\mu$  is a fuzzy *BCC*-ideal of *X* (see [3, Theorem 4.9]). Assume that there exists

 $x \in X$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega$  such that  $\mu(\alpha x) < \mu(x)$ . Taking  $t = \frac{1}{2} (\mu(\alpha x) + \mu(x))$  implies that  $\mu(\alpha x) < t < \mu(x)$ , and so  $\alpha x \notin \mu_t$  and  $x \in \mu_t$ . This contradicts to the fact that every nonempty level set is an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-ideal of *X*. This shows that  $\mu$  is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy *BCC*-ideal of *X*: Hence we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.11.** A fuzzy set  $\mu$  in an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra X is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideal of X if and only if for every  $t \in [0, 1]$  the level set  $\mu_t$  is either empty or an  $\Omega$ -BCC-ideal of X.

**Theorem 3.12.** Let A be a nonempty subset of an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra X and let v be a fuzzy set in X defined by

$$v(x) := \begin{cases} s & if \ x \in A, \\ t & otherwise, \end{cases}$$

for all  $x \in X$  and s > t in [0, 1]. Then v is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideal of X if and only if A is an  $\Omega$ -BCC-ideal of X.

Proof. Note that

$$v_r := \begin{cases} X & \text{if } 0 \le r \le t, \\ A & \text{if } t < r \le s, \\ \phi & \text{if } s < r \le 1. \end{cases}$$

Hence the proof follows from Theorem 3.11.

**Proposition 3.13.** Every  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCK-ideal  $\mu$  of an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra X satisfies the following inequality:

$$(\forall x, y \in X) (\forall \alpha \in \Omega) (\mu(\alpha(x * y)) \ge \min \{\mu(\alpha x), \mu(\alpha y)\})$$

*Proof.* Since  $x * y \le x$  for all  $x, y \in X$ ,  $\alpha(x * y) \le \alpha x$  by Proposition 3.4 (ii). Since  $\mu$  is order reversing, it follows that

$$\mu(\alpha(x * y)) \ge \mu(\alpha x) \ge \min \{\mu(\alpha x * \alpha y), \mu(\alpha y)\}$$
  
= min { $\mu(\alpha(x * y)), \mu(\alpha y)$ } \ge min { $\mu(\alpha x), \mu(\alpha y)$ },

which completes the proof.

Let  $\{A_t \mid t \in T\}$ , where  $\phi \neq T \subseteq [0, 1]$ , be a collection of  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-ideals of an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-algebra *X* such that

$$(\forall s, t \in T) (s > t \Leftrightarrow A_s \subset A_t).$$

Then  $\bigcup_{t \le s} A_s$  and  $\bigcap_{s < t} A_s$  are  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-ideals of *X*. Combining Theorem 3.11 and [5, Proposition 3.8] induce the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.14.** Let  $\{A_t | t \in T\}$ , where  $\phi \neq T \subseteq [0, 1]$ , be a collection of  $\Omega$ -BCC ideals of an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra X such that

(i) 
$$X = \bigcup_{t \in T} A_t$$

(ii)  $(\forall s, t \in T) (s > t \Leftrightarrow A_s \subset A_t)$ .

Then a fuzzy set  $\mu$  on X defined by  $\mu(x) = \sup \{t \in T \mid x \in A_t\}$  for all  $x \in X$  is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideal of X.

**Theorem 3.15.** Let  $\mu$  be a fuzzy set in an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra X and let Im( $\mu$ ) = { $t_0$ ,  $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ }, where  $t_0 > t_1 > \ldots > t_n$ . If  $A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \ldots \subset A_n = X$  are  $\Omega$ -BCC-ideals of X such that  $\mu(A_k \setminus A_{k-1}) = t_k$  for  $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ , where  $A_{-1} = \phi$  then  $\mu$  is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideal of X.

*Proof.* Using [5, Proposition 3.11] we know that  $\mu$  is a fuzzy *BCC*-ideal of *X*. Let  $x \in X$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega$ . Then  $x \in A_k \setminus A_{k-1}$  for some  $k \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ . Since  $A_k$  is an  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-ideal of *X*,  $\alpha x \in A_k$ . Hence  $\mu(\alpha x) \ge t_k = \mu(x)$ . This shows that  $\mu$  is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy *BCC*-ideal of *X*.

**Theorem 3.16.** If every  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideal  $\mu$  in an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra X has the finite image, then every descending chain of  $\Omega$ -BCC-ideals of X terminates at finite step.

*Proof.* Let  $\mu$  be a fuzzy set in X defined by

$$\mu(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{n}{n+1} & \text{if } x \in A_n \setminus A_{n+1}, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in \bigcap A_n, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \end{cases}$$

where  $X = A_0 \supset A_1 \supset A_2 \supset ...$  is a strictly descending chain of  $\Omega$ -BCC-ideals of X which does not terminate at finite step. Then  $\mu$  is a fuzzy BCC-ideal of X (see [5,

Proposition 3.16]). If 
$$x \in A_n \setminus A_{n+1}$$
 and  $\alpha \in \Omega$ , then  $\alpha x \in A_n$ . Hence  $\mu(\alpha x) \ge \frac{n}{n+1} =$ 

 $\mu(x)$ . Now if  $x \in A_n$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega$ , then  $\alpha x \in \bigcap A_n$ . Thus  $\mu(\alpha x) = 1 = \mu(x)$ . Therefore  $\mu$  is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy *BCC*-ideal of *X* which has an infinite number of different values. This is impossible, and the result is valid.

**Theorem 3.17.** Let  $\mu$  be an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy BCC-ideal of an  $\Omega$ -BCC-algebra X. If Im( $\mu$ ) is a well-ordered subset of [0, 1], then every ascending chain of  $\Omega$ -BCC-ideals of X terminates at finite step.

*Proof.* Let  $\mu$  be a fuzzy set in X defined by

$$\mu(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & if \ x \notin \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n, \\ \frac{1}{k} & where \ k = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid x \in A_n\} \end{cases}$$

where  $A_1 \subset A_2 \subset A_3 \subset ...$  is a strictly ascending chain of  $\Omega$ -*BCC*-ideals of *X* which does not terminate at finite step. Then  $\mu$  is a fuzzy *BCC*- ideal of *X* (see [5, Proposition 3.17]). Now if  $x \notin \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$ , then obviously  $\mu(\alpha x) \ge 0 = \mu(x)$  for all  $\alpha \in \Omega$ . Assume

that  $x \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega$ . Then  $x \in A_n \setminus A_{n-1}$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus  $\alpha x \in A_n$ , and

hence  $\mu(\alpha x) \ge \frac{1}{n} = \mu(x)$ . Therefore  $\mu$  is an  $\Omega$ -fuzzy *BCC*-ideal of *X* which has an

infinite number of different values. This is impossible, and the result is valid.

### REFERENCES

- [1] W. A. Dudek, *The number of subalgebras of finite BCC-algebras*, Bull. Inst. Math. Academia Sinica **20** (1992), 129-136.
- W. A. Dudek, On proper BCC-algebras, Bull. Inst. Math. Academia Sinica 20 (1992), 137-150.
- W. A. Dudek and Y. B. Jun, *Fuzzy BCC-ideals in BCC-algebras*, Math. Montisnigri 10 (1999), 21-30.
- [4] W. A. Dudek and Y. B. Jun, *Fuzzifications of ideals in BCC-algebras*, Glasnik Math. 36(56) (2001), 127-138.
- [5] W. A. Dudek, Y. B. Jun and Z. Stojaković, *On fuzzy ideals in BCC-algebras*, Fuzzy Sets and Systems **123** (2001), 251-258.
- [6] W. A. Dudek and X. H. Zhang, *On ideals and congruences in BCC-algebras*, Czech. Math. J. 48(123) (1998), 21-29.
- [7] J. Hao, *Ideal theory of BCC-algebras*, Scientiae Mathematicae 1(3) (1998), 373-381.

- [8] Y. Imai and K. Iséki, *On axiom system of propositional calculi XIV*, Proc. Japan Academy **42** (1966), 19-22.
- Y. Komori, *The class of BCC-algebras is not a variety*, Math. Japon. 29 (1984), 391-394.
- [10] J. Meng and Y. B. Jun, *BCK-algebras*, Kyungmoonsa, Korea, 1994.
- [11] A. Wroński, BCK-algebras do not form a variety, Math. Japon. 28 (1983), 211-213.

## Y.B. Jun

Department of Mathematics Education Gyeongsang National, University Chinju 660-701, Korea E-mail address: ybjun@gnu.ac.kr

#### S. Z. Song

Department of Mathematics Cheju National University Cheju, 690-756, Korea *E-mail address*: szsong@cheju.ac.kr