The prime and maximal spectra and the reticulation of BL-algebras

Laurenţiu Leuştean

National Institute for Research and Development in Informatics,
8-10 Averescu Avenue, 71316, Bucharest, 1, Romania,
E-mail: leo@u3.ici.ro

November 29, 2004

Abstract

In this paper we study the prime and maximal spectra of a BL-algebra, proving that the prime spectrum is a compact T_0 topological space and that the maximal spectrum is a compact Hausdorff topological space. We also define and study the reticulation of a BL-algebra.

2000 MSC : 08A72, 03G25, 06F99, 06D05.
Keywords : BL-algebras, prime spectrum, maximal spectrum, reticulation, bounded distributive lattices.

Introduction

BL-algebras are the algebraic structures for Hájek's Basic Logic [10], arising from the continuous triangular norms (t-norms), familiar in the frameworks of fuzzy set theory. The main example of a BL-algebra is the interval [0,1] endowed with the structure induced by a continuous t-norm.

The paper is divided in three sections. In the first section we recall some facts concerning BL-algebras.

In the second section we study the prime spectrum $Spec(A)$ and the maximal spectrum $Max(A)$ of a BL-algebra, following a standard method [1]. It turns out that $Spec(A)$ is a compact T_0 topological space and $Max(A)$ is a compact Hausdorff topological space.

The *reticulation* of a ring was defined by Simmons [14] for commutative rings and it was extended by Belluce to non-commutative rings [3]. The reticulation of a ring R is a bounded distributive lattice $L(R)$ such that the prime spectrum of R, endowed with the Zariski topology, is homeomorphic to the prime spectrum of $L(R)$, endowed with the Stone topology. By this connection, many properties can be transfered from R to $L(R)$ and vice versa. A similar construction was done by Belluce for MV-algebras [2]. Hence, a natural problem is to define a reticulation for some classes of universal algebras. This was done by Georgescu [8] for quantales [13], which constitute a good abstraction of the lattice of congruence for many types of algebraic structures.

In Section 3 we define the reticulation $\beta(A)$ of a BL-algebra A. We get that $\beta(A)$ is a normal and completely normal lattice such that the lattices of filters of A and $\beta(A)$ are isomorphic and that the prime (maximal) spectra of A and $\beta(A)$ are homeomorphic topological spaces.

1 Definitions and first properties

A *BL-algebra* [10] is an algebra $(A, \wedge, \vee, \odot, \to, 0, 1)$ with four binary operations $\wedge, \vee, \odot, \to$ and two constants $0, 1$ such that $(A, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ is a bounded lattice, $(A, \odot, 1)$ is a commutative monoid, and for all $a, b, c \in A$,

$$c \leq a \to b \quad \text{iff} \quad a \odot c \leq b \tag{1.1}$$

$$a \wedge b = a \odot (a \to b) \tag{1.2}$$

$$(a \to b) \vee (b \to a) = 1. \tag{1.3}$$

Example 1.1. A *continuous t-norm* is a continuous map

$$\star : [0,1] \times [0,1] \to [0,1]$$

such that $([0,1], \star)$ is a commutative partially ordered monoid. There are three fundamental t-norms:

Łukasiewicz t-norm:	$x \star_L y = max(x + y - 1, 0)$,
Gödel t-norm:	$x \star_G y = min\{x, y\}$,
Product t-norm:	$x \star_P y = xy$.

Since the natural ordering on $[0,1]$ is a complete lattice ordering, each continuous t-norm induces naturally a *residuum*, or an implication in more logical terms, by

$$x \to y = max\{z \mid z \star x \leq y\}.$$

The implications associated to the three fundamental norms are:

$$x \to_L y = min(y - x + 1, 1),$$

$$x \to_G y = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \leq y, \\ y & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$x \to_P y = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \leq y, \\ y/x & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $\star$ is a continuous t-norm and $\to$ is its residuum, then

$$([0,1], min, max, \star, \to, 0, 1)$$

is a BL-algebra. Taking the three fundamental norms and their residua, we get three particular BL-algebras:

Łukasiewicz structure:	$([0,1], min, max, \star_L, \to_L, 0, 1)$,
Gödel structure:	$([0,1], min, max, \star_G, \to_G, 0, 1)$,
Product structure:	$([0,1], min, max, \star_P, \to_P, 0, 1)$.

A BL-algebra A is nontrivial iff $0 \neq 1$. For any BL-algebra A, the reduct $L(A) = (A, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ is a bounded distributive lattice. For any $a \in A$, we define $a^- = a \to 0$. We shall denote $(a^-)^-$ by a^{--}.

The following properties hold in any BL-algebra A and will be used in the sequel:

$$a \odot b \leq a \wedge b \leq a, b \tag{1.4}$$

$$a \odot a^- = 0 \tag{1.5}$$

$$a \wedge (b \vee c) = (a \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge c). \tag{1.6}$$

Let A be a BL-algebra. A *filter* of A is a nonempty set $F \subseteq A$ such that for all $a, b \in A$,
(i) $a, b \in F$ implies $a \odot b \in F$;
(ii) $a \in F$ and $a \leq b$ imply $b \in F$.

Trivial examples of filters are $\{1\}$ and A. By (1.4) it is obvious that any filter of A is also a filter of the lattice $L(A)$.

A *deductive system* [15] of A is a set $D \subseteq A$ such that
(i) $1 \in D$
(ii) for all $a, b \in A$,
$a, a \to b \in D$ imply $b \in D$.

Proposition 1.2. [16, Proposition 2]
Let $F \subseteq A$. The following are equivalent:
(i) F is a filter of A;
(ii) F is a deductive system of A.

The following remark is obvious and it will be very used in the sequel.

Remark 1.3. *Let F be a filter of A and $a, b \in A$. Then*

$$a \odot b \in F \text{ iff } a \wedge b \in F \text{ iff } a \in F, b \in F.$$

A filter F of A is *proper* iff $F \neq A$. It is easy to see that a filter F is proper iff $0 \notin F$. A proper filter P of A is called *prime* provided that it is prime as a filter of $L(A)$, that is

$$a \vee b \in P \quad \text{implies} \quad a \in P \text{ or } \ b \in P.$$

A proper filter M of A is called *maximal* (or *ultrafilter*) if it is not contained in any other proper filter.

We shall denote the set of prime filters of A by $Spec(A)$ and the set of maximal filters of A by $Max(A)$.

We remind some properties of filters that will be used in the sequel.

Proposition 1.4. [5, Corollary 4.26]
If P is a prime filter of A and F is a proper filter of A such that $P \subseteq F$, then F is also prime.

Proposition 1.5. Prime filter theorem[6, Theorem 4.28]
Let F be a filter of the BL-algebra A and let $S \neq \emptyset$ be a $\vee$-closed subset of A (that is, $a, b \in S$ implies $a \vee b \in S$) such that $F \cap S = \emptyset$. Then there exists a prime filter P of A such that $F \subseteq P$ and $P \cap S = \emptyset$.

Proposition 1.6. [10, Lemma 2.3.15]
Let $a \in A$, $a \neq 1$. Then there is a prime filter P of A such that $a \notin P$.

Proposition 1.7. [15, Theorem 3]
If A is a nontrivial BL-algebra, then any proper filter of A can be extended to a prime, maximal filter.

Proposition 1.8. [16, Proposition 7]
Any maximal filter of A is a prime filter of A.

Proposition 1.9. [7, Proposition 1.4]
If A is a nontrivial BL-algebra, then any proper filter F of A is the intersection of all prime filters containing F.

Proposition 1.10. [7, Proposition 1.6]
If A is a nontrivial BL-algebra, then any prime filter of A is contained in a unique maximal filter.

Let $X \subseteq A$. The filter of A generated by X will be denoted by $< X >$. We have that $< \emptyset >= \{1\}$ and, if $X \neq \emptyset$,

$$\begin{aligned} < X > \quad &= \quad \{y \in A \mid x_1 \odot \ldots \odot x_n \leq y \\ & \qquad \text{for some } n \in \omega - \{0\} \text{ and some } x_1, \ldots, x_n \in X\}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $a \in A$, $< a >$ denotes the principal filter of A generated by $\{a\}$. Then,

$$< a >= \{b \in A \mid a^n \leq b \text{ for some } n \in \omega - \{0\}\}.$$

It follows immediately that $< 1 >= \{1\}$ and $< 0 >= A$.

Lemma 1.11. *Let $a \in A$. Then*
$< a >= \{1\}$ *iff* $a = 1$.

We shall denote by $\mathcal{F}(A)$ the set of filters of the BL-algebra A.

Proposition 1.12. *$(\mathcal{F}(A), \subseteq)$ is a complete lattice. For every family $\{F_i\}_{i\in I}$ of filters of A, we have that*

$$\bigwedge_{i\in I} F_i = \bigcap_{i\in I} F_i,$$
$$\bigvee_{i\in I} F_i = <\bigcup_{i\in I} F_i> .$$

Let A, B be two BL-algebras. A *BL-morphism* is a function $h : A \to B$ such that $h(a \wedge b) = h(a) \wedge h(b)$, $h(a \vee b) = h(a) \vee h(b)$, $h(a \odot b) = h(a) \odot h(b)$, $h(a \to b) = h(a) \to h(b)$, and $h(0) = 0$, $h(1) = 1$. A *BL-isomorphism* is a bijective BL-morphism.

Proposition 1.13. [7, Lemma 1.7]
Let $h : A \to B$ be a BL-morphism.
(i) if G is a (proper) filter of B, then $h^{-1}(G)$ is a (proper) filter of A;
(ii) if Q is a prime filter of B, then $h^{-1}(Q)$ is a prime filter of A.

2 The prime and maximal spectra

Let A be a nontrivial BL-algebra. For each subset X of A, we define

$$V(X) = \{P \in Spec(A) \mid X \subseteq P\}.$$

Proposition 2.1. *Let A be a nontrivial BL-algebra. Then*
(i) $X \subseteq Y \subseteq A$ implies $V(Y) \subseteq V(X) \subseteq Spec(A)$;
(ii) $V(\{0\}) = \emptyset$ and $V(\emptyset) = V(\{1\}) = Spec(A)$;
(iii) $V(X) = \emptyset$ iff $< X >= A$;
(iv) $V(X) = Spec(A)$ iff $X = \emptyset$ or $X = \{1\}$;
(v) if $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ is any family of subsets of A, then $V(\bigcup_{i\in I} X_i) = \bigcap_{i\in I} V(X_i)$;
(vi) $V(X) = V(< X >)$;
(vii) $V(X) \cup V(Y) = V(< X > \cap < Y >)$;
(viii) if X, $Y \subseteq A$, then $< X >=< Y >$ iff $V(X) = V(Y)$;
(ix) if F, G are filters of A, then $F = G$ iff $V(F) = V(G)$.

Proof. (i) Obviously.
(ii) For any $P \in Spec(A)$, P is a proper filter of A, so $0 \notin P$, that is $P \notin V(\{0\})$. Hence, $V(\{0\}) = \emptyset$. It is obvious that $V(\emptyset) = Spec(A)$. Since 1 is an element of any filter of A, it follows that 1 is an element of any prime filter of A, that is, $V(\{1\}) = Spec(A)$.
(iii)”$\Rightarrow$” Suppose that $< X >\neq A$, that is $< X >$ is a proper filter of A. Applying Proposition 1.7, there is a prime filter P of A that includes the proper filter $< X >$. Since $X \subseteq< X >$, it follows that $X \subseteq P$, so $P \in V(X)$. Thus, $V(X) \neq \emptyset$.
”$\Leftarrow$” If $V(X) \neq \emptyset$, then there is $P \in V(X)$. Since P is a filter including X and $< X >$ is the least filter of A with this property, it follows that $A =< X >\subseteq P$, i.e. $P = A$. We have got that P is not a proper filter. This is a contradiction, since P is prime.
(iv) ”$\Leftarrow$” By (ii).
”$\Rightarrow$” Suppose that $X \neq \emptyset$ and $X \neq \{1\}$. Then, there is $a \in X$, $a \neq 1$. Applying Proposition 1.6, there is a prime filter P of A such that $a \notin P$. Thus, $X \not\subseteq P$, so $P \notin V(X)$. That is, $V(X) \neq Spec(A)$.
(v) ”$\subseteq$” We have that $X_i \subseteq \bigcup_{i\in I} X_i$ for all $i \in I$. Applying (i), it follows that $V(\bigcup_{i\in I} X_i) \subseteq V(X_i)$ for all $i \in I$, hence $V(\bigcup_{i\in I} X_i) \subseteq \bigcap_{i\in I} V(X_i)$.
”$\supseteq$” If $P \in \bigcap_{i\in I} V(X_i)$, then $X_i \subseteq P$ for all $i \in I$. We get that $\bigcup_{i\in I} X_i \subseteq P$, that is $P \in V(\bigcup_{i\in I} X_i)$.
(vi) ”$\supseteq$” Since $X \subseteq< X >$, from (i) we get that $V(< X >) \subseteq V(X)$.
”$\subseteq$” Let $P \in V(X)$, so $X \subseteq P$. It follows that $< X >\subseteq P$, i.e. $P \in V(< X >)$.
(vii) ”$\subseteq$” Apply (i).
”$\supseteq$” Let $P \in V(< X > \cap < Y >)$ and suppose that $P \notin V(X) \cup V(Y)$. Hence, $P \notin V(X) =$

$V(< X >)$ and $P \notin V(Y) = V(< Y >)$, i.e. $< X > \not\subseteq P$ and $< Y > \not\subseteq P$. Thus, there are $x \in < X >$, $y \in < Y >$ such that $x, y \notin P$. Since $x, y \leq x \vee y$ and $< X >, < Y >$ are filters of A, we get that $x \vee y \in < X > \cap < Y > \subseteq P$. Hence, we have obtained $x, y \in A$ such that $x \vee y \in P$ and $x, y \notin P$. This contradicts the fact that P is prime.
(viii) "$\Rightarrow$" Applying (vi), we get that $V(X) = V(< X >) = V(< Y >) = V(Y)$.
"$\Leftarrow$" If $< X >= A$, then $V(X) = \emptyset$, by (iii). Thus, $V(Y) = \emptyset$, so, applying again (iii), we get that $< Y >= A$. Hence, $< X >=< Y >= A$. Suppose now that $< X >, < Y >$ are proper filters of A. Applying twice Proposition 1.9 and (vi), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} < X > &= \bigcap\{P \in Spec(A) \mid P \in V(< X >)\} \\ &= \bigcap\{P \in Spec(A) \mid P \in V(X)\} \\ &= \bigcap\{P \in Spec(A) \mid P \in V(Y)\} \\ &= \bigcap\{P \in Spec(A) \mid P \in V(< Y >)\} \\ &= < Y > . \end{aligned}$$

(ix) Apply (viii) and the fact that, since F, G are filters of A, we have $< F >= F$ and $< G >= G$. □

By Proposition 2.1(ii), (v) and (vii), it follows that the family $\{V(X)\}_{X \subseteq A}$ of subsets of $Spec(A)$ satisfies the axioms for closed sets in a topological space. The resulting topology is called the Zariski topology and the topological space $Spec(A)$ is called the prime spectrum of A.

For any $X \subseteq A$, let us denote the complement of $V(X)$ by $D(X)$. Hence,

$$D(X) = \{P \in Spec(A) \mid X \not\subseteq P\}.$$

It follows that the family $\{D(X)\}_{X \subseteq A}$ is the family of open sets of the Zariski topology. By duality, from Proposition 2.1 we get the following.

Proposition 2.2. *Let A be a nontrivial BL-algebra. Then*
(i) $X \subseteq Y \subseteq A$ implies $D(X) \subseteq D(Y) \subseteq Spec(A)$;
(ii) $D(\{0\}) = Spec(A)$ and $D(\emptyset) = D(\{1\}) = \emptyset$;
(iii) $D(X) = Spec(A)$ iff $< X >= A$;
(iv) $D(X) = \emptyset$ iff $X = \emptyset$ or $X = \{1\}$;
(v) if $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ is any family of subsets of A, then $D(\bigcup_{i \in I} X_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} D(X_i)$;
(vi) $D(X) = D(< X >)$;
(vii) $D(X) \cup D(Y) = D(< X > \cup < Y >)$;
(viii) if X, $Y \subseteq A$, then $< X >=< Y >$ iff $D(X) = D(Y)$;
(ix) if F, G are filters of A, then $F = G$ iff $D(F) = D(G)$.

For any $a \in A$, let us denote $V(\{a\})$ by $V(a)$ and $D(\{a\})$ by $D(a)$. Then,

$$V(a) = \{P \in Spec(A) \mid a \in P\} \text{ and } D(a) = \{P \in Spec(A) \mid a \notin P\}.$$

Proposition 2.3. *Let a, $b \in A$. Then*
(i) $D(a) = Spec(A)$ iff $< a >= A$;
(ii) $D(a) = \emptyset$ iff $a = 1$;
(iii) $D(a) = D(b)$ iff $< a >=< b >$;
(iv) $V(a) \subseteq D(a^-)$;
(v) if $a \leq b$, then $D(b) \subseteq D(a)$;
(vi) $D(a) \cap D(b) = D(a \vee b)$;
(vii) $D(a) \cup D(b) = D(a \wedge b) = D(a \odot b)$.

Proof. (i), (ii), (iii) Apply Proposition 2.2(iii), (iv) and (viii).
(iv) Let $P \in V(a)$, hence $a \in P$. If $a^- \in P$, then $0 = a \odot a^- \in P$, so P is not proper. Thus, we must have $a^- \notin P$, that is $P \in D(a^-)$.
(v) Let $P \in D(b)$, so $b \notin P$. If $P \notin D(a)$, then $a \in P$ and from $a \leq b$ we get that $b \in P$, that

is, a contradiction.
(vi) For any prime filter P of A, we have that $a \vee b \notin P$ iff $a \notin P$ and $b \notin P$. Hence, $P \in D(a \vee b)$ iff $a \vee b \notin P$ iff $a \notin P$ and $b \notin P$ iff $P \in D(a)$ and $P \in D(b)$ iff $P \in D(a) \cap D(b)$.
(vii) Applying Remark 1.3, we get that for any filter F of A, ($a \notin F$ or $b \notin F$) iff $a \odot b \notin F$ iff $a \wedge b \notin F$. It follows that for any prime filter P of A, $P \in D(a) \cup D(b)$ iff $P \in D(a \odot b)$ iff $P \in D(a \wedge b)$. □

Proposition 2.4. *Let A be a nontrivial BL-algebra. The family $\{D(a)\}_{a \in A}$ is a basis for the topology of Spec(A).*

Proof. Let $X \subseteq A$ and $D(X)$ an open subset of *Spec*(A). Then $D(X) = D(\bigcup_{a \in X}\{a\}) = \bigcup_{a \in X} D(a)$, by Proposition 2.2(v). Hence, any open subset of *Spec*(A) is the union of subsets from the family $\{D(a)\}_{a \in A}$. □

The sets $D(a)$ will be called *basic open sets* of *Spec*(A).

Proposition 2.5. *For any $a \in A$, $D(a)$ is compact in Spec(A).*

Proof. It is enough to prove that any cover of $D(a)$ with basic open sets contains a finite cover of $D(a)$. Let $D(a) = \bigcup_{i \in I} D(a_i) = D(\bigcup_{i \in I} a_i)$. By Proposition 2.2(viii), we get that $< a > = < \bigcup_{i \in I} a_i >$, so $a \in < \bigcup_{i \in I} a_i >$. Hence, there are $n \geq 1$ and $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in I$ such that $a_{i_1} \odot \cdots \odot a_{i_n} \leq a$. We shall prove that $D(a) = D(a_{i_1}) \cup \cdots \cup D(a_{i_n})$. Applying Proposition 2.3(v) and (vi), we obtain that $D(a) \subseteq D(a_{i_1} \odot \cdots \odot a_{i_n}) = D(a_{i_1}) \cup \cdots \cup D(a_{i_n})$. The other inclusion is obvious, since $D(a_{i_1}) \cup \cdots \cup D(a_{i_n}) \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} D(a_i) = D(a)$. □

Proposition 2.6. *The compact open subsets of Spec(A) are exactly the finite unions of basic open sets.*

Proof. Since any basic open set is compact open, then a finite union of basic open sets is also compact open. Let now $D(X)$, with $X \subseteq A$, be a compact open subset of *Spec*(A). Since $D(X)$ is open, we get that $D(X)$ is a union of basic open sets. Since $D(X)$ is compact, it follows that $D(X)$ is a finite union of basic open sets. □

Theorem 2.7. *Spec(A) is a compact T_0 topological space.*

Proof. Applying Proposition 2.2(ii), we have that *Spec*$(A) = D(0)$. Apply now Proposition 2.5 to get that *Spec*(A) is compact. It remains to prove that *Spec*(A) is a T_0 space, which means that for any two distinct prime filters $P \neq Q \in$ *Spec*(A) there is an open set U of *Spec*(A) such that $P \in U, Q \notin U$ or $Q \in U, P \notin U$. Since $P \neq Q$, we have that $P \not\subseteq Q$ or $Q \not\subseteq P$. Assume that $P \not\subseteq Q$, so there is $a \in P$ such that $a \notin Q$. Take $U = D(a)$. Then $Q \in U$ and $P \notin U$. Similarly if $Q \not\subseteq P$. □

In the sequel, let $Max(A)$ be the set of maximal filters of A. Since, by Proposition 1.8, $Max(A) \subseteq$ *Spec*(A), we consider on $Max(A)$ the topology induced by the Zariski topology. Thus, we obtain a topological space called the *maximal spectrum* of A.

For any $X \subseteq A$ and $a \in A$ let us define

$$\begin{aligned} V_{Max}(X) &= V(X) \cap Max(A) &= \{M \in Max(A) \mid X \subseteq M\} \\ D_{Max}(X) &= D(X) \cap Max(A) &= \{M \in Max(A) \mid X \not\subseteq M\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V_{Max}(a) &= V(a) \cap Max(A) &= \{M \in Max(A) \mid a \in M\}, \\ D_{Max}(a) &= D(a) \cap Max(A) &= \{M \in Max(A) \mid a \notin M\}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the family $\{V_{Max}(X)\}_{X \subseteq A}$ is the family of closed sets of the maximal spectrum, the family $\{D_{Max}(X)\}_{X \subseteq A}$ is the family of open sets of the maximal spectrum and the family $\{D_{Max}(a)\}_{a \in A}$ is a basis for the topology of $Max(A)$.

Proposition 2.8. *Let A be a nontrivial BL-algebra, $X, Y \subseteq A$, $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ a family of subsets of A, and $a, b \in A$. Then*
(i) $X \subseteq Y \subseteq A$ implies $D_{Max}(X) \subseteq D_{Max}(Y) \subseteq Max(A)$;
(ii) $D_{Max}(0) = Max(A)$ and $D_{Max}(\emptyset) = D_{Max}(1) = \emptyset$;
(iii) $D_{Max}(X) = Max(A)$ iff $< X >= A$;
(iv) $D_{Max}(\bigcup_{i\in I} X_i) = \bigcup_{i\in I} D_{Max}(X_i)$;
(v) $D_{Max}(X) = D_{Max}(< X >)$;
(vi) $D_{Max}(X) \cap D_{Max}(Y) = D_{Max}(< X > \cap < Y >)$;
(vii) $D_{Max}(a) = Max(A)$ iff $< a >= A$;
(viii) if $a \leq b$, then $D_{Max}(b) \subseteq D_{Max}(a)$;
(ix) $V_{Max}(a) \subseteq D_{Max}(a^-)$;
(x) $D_{Max}(a) \cap D_{Max}(b) = D_{Max}(a \vee b)$;
(xi) $D_{Max}(a) \cup D_{Max}(b) = D_{Max}(a \wedge b) = D_{Max}(a \odot b)$.

Proof. We have only to prove (iii), the other ones being immediate consequences of the corresponding properties for $Spec(A)$.
(iii) "$\Rightarrow$" If $< X >\neq A$, then $< X >$ is a proper filter of A, hence, applying Proposition 1.7, there is a maximal filter M of A such that $< X >\subseteq M$. It follows that $X \subseteq M$, that is, $M \notin D_{Max}(X)$. This contradicts the fact that $D_{Max}(X) = Max(A)$.
"$\Leftarrow$" If $< X >= A$, then $D(X) = Spec(A)$, by Proposition 2.2(iii), so $D_{Max}(X) = Max(A)$. □

Theorem 2.9. *$Max(A)$ is a compact Hausdorff topological space.*

Proof. Let us prove first that $Max(A)$ is compact. Let $Max(A) = \bigcup_{i\in I} D_{Max}(a_i) = D_{Max}(\bigcup_{i\in I} a_i)$, by Proposition 2.8(iv). Applying now Proposition 2.8(iii), we get that $A =< \bigcup_{i\in I} a_i >$, hence $0 \in< \bigcup_{i\in I} a_i >$. It follows that there are $n \geq 1$ and $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in I$ such that $a_{i_1} \odot \ldots \odot a_{i_n} = 0$. By Proposition 2.8(ii) and (ix), we get that $Max(A) = D_{Max}(0) = D_{Max}(a_{i_1} \odot \ldots \odot a_{i_n}) = D_{Max}(a_{i_1}) \cup \ldots \cup D_{Max}(a_{i_n})$. Hence, $Max(A)$ is compact.

Let M and N be two distinct maximal filters of A. Since $M \neq N$, there are $x \in M \setminus N$ and $y \in N \setminus M$. Let $a = x \to y$ and $b = y \to x$. Then, using Proposition 1.2(ii), we infer immediately that $a \notin M$ and $b \notin N$. Hence, $M \in D_{Max}(a)$ and $N \in D_{Max}(b)$. Moreover, by Proposition 2.8(x), (ii), and (1.3), $D_{Max}(a) \cap D_{Max}(b) = D_{Max}(a \vee b) = D_{Max}(1) = \emptyset$. Hence, $Max(A)$ is Hausdorff. □

3 The reticulation of a BL-algebra

In this section we shall use lattice-theoretical concepts without defining them. For a detailed analysis of these notions see, for example, [9].

Let A be a nontrivial BL-algebra. For any $a, b \in A$ define

$$a \equiv b \text{ iff } D(a) = D(b).$$

Hence, $a \equiv b$ iff for any $P \in Spec(A)$, ($a \notin P$ iff $b \notin P$) iff for any $P \in Spec(A)$, ($a \in P$ iff $b \in P$).

Proposition 3.1. *The relation $\equiv$ is a congruence relation on A with respect to $\odot, \wedge$, and $\vee$.*

Proof. It is obvious that $\equiv$ is an equivalence relation on A. Let $a, b, c, d \in A$ such that $a \equiv b$ and $c \equiv d$. We shall prove that $a \odot c \equiv b \odot d$, $a \wedge c \equiv b \wedge d$ and $a \vee c \equiv b \vee d$. Let $P \in Spec(A)$. Then $a \odot c \in P$ iff $a \in P$ and $c \in P$ iff $b \in P$ and $d \in P$ iff $b \odot d \in P$. That is, $a \odot c \equiv b \odot d$. We obtain similarly that $a \wedge c \equiv b \wedge d$. Since P is a prime filter, we get that $a \vee c \in P$ iff $a \in P$ or $c \in P$ iff $b \in P$ or $d \in P$ iff $b \vee d \in P$. Hence, $a \vee c \equiv b \vee d$. □

Let us denote by $[a]$ the equivalence class of $a \in A$ and let $A/_\equiv$ be the quotient set. We also denote by $\beta : A \to A/_\equiv$ the canonical surjection defined by $\beta(a) = [a]$.

Proposition 3.2. *The algebra* $(A/_{\equiv}, \wedge, \vee, [0], [1])$ *is a bounded distributive lattice, where*

$$\begin{aligned}[a] \vee [b] &= [a \vee b],\\ [a] \wedge [b] &= [a \wedge b].\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, the operations $\vee$, $\wedge$ on $A/_{\equiv}$ are well-defined. The rest of the proof is routine. We shall prove, for example, that $A/_{\equiv}$ is distributive. If a, b, $c \in A$, then

$$[a] \wedge ([b] \vee [c]) = [a \wedge (b \vee c)] = [(a \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge c)] = [a \wedge b] \vee [a \wedge c] = ([a] \wedge [b]) \vee ([a] \wedge [c]).$$

□

Proposition 3.3. *Let* $a, b \in A$.
(i) $[a] \leq [b]$ *iff* $D(b) \subseteq D(a)$
(ii) if $a \leq b$, *then* $[a] \leq [b]$;
(iii) $[a] = [b]$ *iff* $< a >=< b >$;
(iv) $[a] = [1]$ *iff* $a = 1$;
(v) $[a] = [0]$ *iff* $a^n = 0$ *for some* $n \in \omega - \{0\}$;
(vi) $[a^n] = [a]$ *for any* $n \in \omega - \{0\}$;
(vii) $[a \wedge b] = [a \odot b]$;
(viii) if $e \in B(A)$, *then* $[e] \leq [a]$ *iff* $e \leq a$.

Proof. (i) Applying Proposition 2.3(vii), $[a] \leq [b]$ iff $[a] = [a] \wedge [b]$ iff $[a] = [a \wedge b]$ iff $D(a) = D(a \wedge b) = D(a) \cup D(b)$ iff $D(b) \subseteq D(a)$.
(ii) By Proposition 2.3(v), $a \leq b$ implies $D(b) \subseteq D(a)$. Apply now (i).
(iii) We have that $[a] = [b]$ iff $D(a) = D(b)$ iff $< a >=< b >$, by Proposition 2.3(iii).
(iv) By (ii) and Lemma 1.11, we get that $[a] = [1]$ iff $< a >=< 1 >$ iff $< a >= \{1\}$ iff $a = 1$.
(v), Again, by (ii). we get that $[a] = [0]$ iff $< a >=< 0 >= A$ iff $0 \in< a >$ iff $a^n = 0$ for some $n \in \omega - \{0\}$.
(vi), (vii) Apply Proposition 2.3(vii).
(viii) "$\Leftarrow$" By (ii).
"$\Rightarrow$" From $[e] \leq [a]$, we get that $[e \wedge a] = [e]$, so $< e \wedge a >=< e >$, by (iii). Hence, $e \wedge a \geq e$. Since, obviously, $e \wedge a \leq e$, we get that $e \wedge a = e$, that is, $e \leq a$. □

The lattice $\beta(A) = A/_{\equiv}$ will be called the *reticulation* of A.

Lemma 3.4. *Let* $h : A \to B$ *be a BL-morphism. For any* $a, b \in A$,

$$D(a) = D(b) \textit{ implies } D(h(a)) = D(h(b)).$$

Proof. Let $Q \in Spec(B)$. Applying Proposition 1.13(ii), we have that $h^{-1}(Q) \in Spec(A)$. It follows that $Q \in D(h(a))$ iff $h(a) \notin Q$ iff $a \notin h^{-1}(Q)$ iff $h^{-1}(Q) \in D(a)$ iff $h^{-1}(Q) \in D(b)$ iff $b \notin h^{-1}(Q)$ iff $h(b) \notin Q$ iff $Q \in D(h(b))$. Hence, $D(h(a)) = D(h(b))$. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let* A *be a BL-algebra,* F *a filter of* A *and* $a, b \in A$ *such that* $[a] = [b]$. *Then*

$$a \in F \textit{ iff } b \in F.$$

Proof. If $F = A$, it is obvious. Let us assume that F is a proper filter of A. Suppose that $a \in F$ and $b \notin F$. Applying Prime Filter Theorem with F and $S = \{b\}$, we get a prime filter P such that $F \subseteq P$ and $b \notin P$. Hence, $P \in D(b)$, but $P \notin D(a)$, since $a \in F \subseteq P$. We have got that $D(a) \neq D(b)$, i.e. $[a] \neq [b]$. This is a contradiction with the hypothesis. □

Let $h : A \to B$ be a BL-morphism. of BL-algebras and let us define

$$\beta(h) : \beta(A) \to \beta(B) \text{ by } \beta(h)[a] = [h(a)]$$

Proposition 3.6. $\beta(h)$ *is a bounded lattice morphism.*

Proof. If a, $b \in A$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(h)([a] \wedge [b]) &= \beta(h)([a \wedge b]) = [h(a \wedge b)] = [h(a) \wedge h(b)] \\ &= [h(a)] \wedge [h(b)] = \beta(h)([a]) \wedge \beta(h)([b]).\end{aligned}$$

We get similarly that $\beta(h)([a] \vee [b]) = \beta(h)([a]) \vee \beta(h)([b])$. Finally, $\beta(h)([0]) = [h(0)] = [0]$ and $\beta(h)([1]) = [h(1)] = [1]$. □

Hence, we have defined a functor

$$\beta : \mathcal{BL} \to \mathcal{LD}01,$$

called the *reticulation functor*.

For any $F \in \mathcal{F}(A)$, let

$$\beta(F) = \{[a] \mid a \in F\}.$$

For any $H \in \mathcal{F}(\beta(A))$, let

$$H_* = \beta^{-1}(H).$$

Lemma 3.7. *Let A be a nontrivial BL-algebra. Then*
(i) if $F \in \mathcal{F}(A)$, then for any $a \in A$,
$[a] \in \beta(F)$ iff $a \in F$;
(ii) If $F \in \mathcal{F}(A)$, then $\beta(F) \in \mathcal{F}(\beta(A))$;
(iii) If $H \in \mathcal{F}(\beta(A))$, then $H_* \in \mathcal{F}(A)$;
(iv) If $F \in \mathcal{F}(A)$, then $(\beta(F))_* = F$;
(v) If $H \in \mathcal{F}(\beta(A))$, then $\beta(H_*) = H$.
(vi) If $F, G \in \mathcal{F}(A)$, then
$F \subseteq G$ iff $\beta(F) \subseteq \beta(G)$.

Proof. (i) Suppose that $[a] \in \beta(F)$. Then, there is $b \in F$ such that $[a] = [b]$. Applying now Lemma 3.5, it follows that $a \in F$, too.
(ii) We have that $1 \in F$, so $[1] \in \beta(F)$, hence, $\beta(F)$ is nonempty. Let $a, b \in A$ such that $[a], [b] \in \beta(F)$. Then, by (i), $a, b \in F$, so $a \wedge b \in F$, since F is a filter of A. It follows that $[a] \wedge [b] = [a \wedge b] \in \beta(F)$. Let $a, b \in A$ such that $[a] \leq [b]$ and $[a] \in \beta(F)$. It follows that $[a \vee b] = [a] \vee [b] = [b]$ and $a \vee b \in F$, since $a \leq a \vee b$ and $a \in F$. We have got that $[b] \in \beta(F)$. Hence, $\beta(F)$ is a filter of the lattice $\beta(A)$.
(iii) Since $[1] \in H$, it follows that $1 \in H_*$. Let $a, b \in H_*$, so $[a], [b] \in H$. By Proposition 3.3 (vii), we get $[a \odot b] = [a \wedge b] = [a] \wedge [b] \in H$, that is $a \odot b \in H_*$. Let $a \in H_*$ and $b \in A$ such that $a \leq b$. Applying Proposition 3.3 (ii), it follows that $[a] \leq [b]$ and, since $[a] \in H$, we get that $[b] \in H$, that is $b \in H_*$.
(iv) Let $a \in A$. By (i), we get that $a \in (\beta(F))_*$ iff $[a] \in \beta(F)$ iff $a \in F$. Hence, $(\beta(F))_* = F$.
(v) Let $a \in A$. By (i), it follows that $[a] \in \beta(H_*)$ iff $a \in H_*$ iff $[a] \in H$.
(vi) Applying (i), we get $F \subseteq G$ iff for any $a \in A$, $a \in F$ implies $a \in G$ iff for any $a \in A$, $[a] \in \beta(F)$ implies $[a] \in \beta(G)$ iff $\beta(F) \subseteq \beta(G)$. □

Proposition 3.8. *The mapping $F \mapsto \beta(F)$ is an isomorphism between the lattices $\mathcal{F}(A)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\beta(A))$.*

Proof. Let us define

$$u : \mathcal{F}(A) \to \mathcal{F}(\beta(A)), \quad u(F) = \beta(F)$$

for any filter F of A and

$$v : \mathcal{F}(\beta(A)) \to \mathcal{F}(A), \quad v(H) = H_*$$

for every filter H of $\beta(A)$. By Lemma 3.7 (ii) and (iii), it follows that u and v are well-defined. Applying Lemma 3.7 (iv) and (v), we get that u is a bijection and its inverse is v. Finally, from Lemma 3.7 (vi) we obtain that u is a lattice homomorphism. Hence, u is a bijective homomorphism of lattices, that is an isomorphism of lattices. □

Thus, the BL-algebra A and its associated lattice $\beta(A)$ have the same filter structure. This is not the case with the lattice $L(A) = (A, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$, whose filter structure is in general quite diferent from that of A. For example if A is the Łukasiewicz structure, then A has only two filters as a BL-algebra: $\{1\}$, and $[0, 1]$, while every interval $[x, 1]$, with $x \in [0, 1]$ is a filter of the lattice $L(A)$. Hence, the lattices $\beta(A)$ and $L(A)$ are in general different lattices.

Lemma 3.9. *Let A be a BL-algebra and $F \in \mathcal{F}(A)$. Then*
(i) F is a proper filter of A iff $\beta(F)$ is a proper filter of $\beta(A)$;
(ii) $F \in Spec(A)$ iff $\beta(P) \in Spec(\beta(A))$;
(ii) $F \in Max(A)$ iff $\beta(F) \in Max(\beta(A))$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.8, it follows that $F \in \mathcal{F}(A)$ iff $\beta(F) \in \mathcal{F}(\beta(A))$. In the proof, we shall apply more times Lemma 3.7 (i).
(i) F is a proper filter of A iff $0 \notin F$ iff $[0] \notin \beta(F)$ iff $\beta(F)$ is a proper filter of $\beta(A)$.
(ii) $F \in Spec(A)$ iff F is proper and for any $a, b \in A$, $a \vee b \in F$ implies $a \in F$ or $b \in F$ iff $\beta(F)$ is proper and for any $a, b \in A$, $[a \vee b] \in \beta(F)$ implies $[a] \in \beta(F)$ or $[b] \in \beta(F)$ iff $\beta(F)$ is proper and for any $a, b \in A$, $[a] \vee [b] \in \beta(F)$ implies $[a] \in \beta(F)$ or $[b] \in \beta(F)$ iff $\beta(F) \in Spec(\beta(A))$.
(iii) Applying (i) and Proposition 3.8, we get that $F \in Max(A)$ iff F is proper and for any proper filter G of A, $F \subseteq G$ implies $F = G$ iff $\beta(F)$ is proper and for any proper filter $\beta(G)$ of $\beta(A)$, $\beta(F) \subseteq \beta(G)$ implies $\beta(F) = \beta(G)$. Using now that any proper filter H of $\beta(A)$ is $\beta(G)$ for some proper filter G of A, we get that $F \in Max(A)$ iff $\beta(F)$ is proper and for any proper filter H of $\beta(A)$, $\beta(F) \subseteq H$ implies $\beta(F) = H$ iff $\beta(F) \in Max(\beta(A))$. □

Proposition 3.10. *The mapping $P \mapsto \beta(P)$ is a homeomorphism between the topological spaces $Spec(A)$ and $Spec(\beta(A))$.*

Proof. Let us consider the restriction of u to $Spec(A)$, denoted also by u. By Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 3.9(ii), we get that $u : Spec(A) \to Spec(\beta(A))$ is bijective. In order to obtain that u is a homeomorphism, we shall prove that u is continuous and open. Let $a \in A$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} u^{-1}(D([a])) &= \{P \in Spec(A) \mid u(P) \in D([a])\} \\ &= \{P \in Spec(A) \mid \beta(P) \in D([a])\} \\ &= \{P \in Spec(A) \mid [a] \notin \beta(P)\} \\ &= \{P \in Spec(A) \mid a \notin P\} \\ &= D(a). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, u is continuous.

$$\begin{aligned} u(D(a)) &= \{\beta(P) \mid P \in Spec(A),\ P \in D(a)\} \\ &= \{\beta(P) \mid P \in Spec(A),\ a \notin P\} \\ &= \{\beta(P) \mid P \in Spec(A),\ [a] \notin \beta(P)\} \\ &= \{T \in Spec(\beta(A)) \mid [a] \notin T\} \\ &= D([a]). \end{aligned}$$

We have got also that u is open. □

Proposition 3.11. *The mapping $M \mapsto \beta(M)$ is a homeomorphism between the topological spaces $Max(A)$ and $Max(\beta(A))$.*

Proof. We consider now the restriction of u to $Max(A)$, denoted also by u. By Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 3.9(iii), we get that $u : Max(A) \to Max(\beta(A))$ is bijective. By the proof of the above proposition, it follows that for any $a \in A$, $u^{-1}(D_{Max}([a])) = u^{-1}(D([a]) \cap Max(\beta(A))) = u^{-1}(D([a])) \cap Max(A) = D_{Max}(A)$, and $u(D_{Max}(a)) = u(D(a) \cap Max(A)) = u(D(A)) \cap Max(\beta(A)) = D([a]) \cap Max(\beta(A)) = D_{Max}([a])$. Hence, u is continuous and open. □

Let us remind that a bounded distributive lattice $(L, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ is called *normal* [17, 4] if for all $a, b \in L$, $a \wedge b = 0$ implies there exist $u, v \in L$ such that $u \vee v = 1$ and $a \wedge u = b \wedge v = 0$. Normal lattices were introduced by Wallman[17] as an abstraction of the lattice of closed sets of a normal topological space.

The following proposition gives an equivalent characterization of normal lattices.

Proposition 3.12. [4]
Let L be a bounded distributive lattice. The following are equivalent:
(i) L is normal;
(ii) any prime filter of L is contained in a unique maximal filter of L.

Completely normal lattices were introduced as an abstraction of the lattice of closed sets of a completely normal topological space. Thus, a bounded distributive lattice L is called *completely normal* (or *relatively normal* in [4]) if each interval $[x, y]$ with $x < y$ is a normal lattice.

Proposition 3.13. [4, 11, 12]
Let L be a bounded distributive lattice.The following are equivalent:
(i) L is completely normal;
(ii) each proper filter of L which contains a prime filter is prime;
(iii) the set of filters of L including a given prime filter is linearly ordered by set-theoretical inclusion;
(iv) the set of prime filters of L including a given prime filter is linearly ordered by set-theoretical inclusion.

Proposition 3.14. $\beta(A)$ *is a normal and completely normal lattice.*

Proof. By Propositions 1.10, 3.8, and 3.12(ii), we get that $\beta(A)$ is a normal lattice. The fact that $\beta(A)$ is completely normal follows applying Propositions 3.8, 1.4, and 3.13(ii). □

Acknowledgments

This paper was presented in the Autumn of 2001 in the seminar "Fuzzy Logic: Theory and Applications", at National Institute for Research and Development in Informatics from Bucharest. The author wishes to express his gratitude to the members of the seminar for their valuable comments.

References

[1] M. F. Atiyah, I. G. Macdonald, Introduction to Commutative Algebra, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company (1969).

[2] L. P. Belluce, Semisimple algebras of infinite valued logic and bold fuzzy set theory, Can. J. Math. **38**, No. 6 (1986), 1356-1379.

[3] L. P. Belluce, Spectral spaces and non-commutative rings, Comm. Algebra **19** (1991), 1855-1865.

[4] W. Cornish, Normal lattices, J. Austral. Math. Soc. **14** (1972), 200-215.

[5] A. Di Nola, G. Georgescu, A. Iorgulescu, Pseudo-BL algebras: Part I, Mult.-Valued Log. **8**, No. 5-6 (2002), 673-714.

[6] A. Di Nola, G. Georgescu, A. Iorgulescu, Pseudo-BL algebras: Part II, Mult.-Valued Log. **8**, No. 5-6 (2002), 717-750.

[7] A. Di Nola, G. Georgescu, L. Leuştean, Boolean products of BL-algebras, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **251**, No.1(2000), 106-131.

[8] G. Georgescu, The reticulation of a quantale, Rev. Roum. Math. Pures Appl. **40**, No. 7-8 (1995), 619-631.

[9] G. Grätzer, Lattice Theory. First Concepts and Distributive Lattices, San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company (1972).

[10] P. Hájek, Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic, Trends in Logic–Studia Logica Library 4, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers (1998).

[11] M. Mandelker, Relative annihilators in lattices, Duke Math. J. **37** (1970), 377-386.

[12] A. Monteiro, L'arithmétique des filtres et les espaces topologiques. I-II, Notas de Lógica Mathématica No. 29-30, Instituto de Mathématica, Univ. Nac. del Sur. Bahia Blanca, Argentina (1974).

[13] K. I. Rosenthal, Quantales and their applications, Longman Scientific and Technical (1989).

[14] H. Simmons, Reticulated rings, J. Algebra **66** (1980), 169-192.

[15] E. Turunen, Mathematics behind fuzzy logic, Advances in Soft Computing, Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag (1999).

[16] E. Turunen, BL-algebras of basic fuzzy logic, Mathware Soft Comput. **6**, No. 1 (1999), 49-61.

[17] H. Wallman, Lattices and topological spaces, Ann. Math. (2) **39** (1938), 112-126.