
ON IDEALS IN QUANTALES, I

by

Amartya Goswami

Abstract. — Taking a ring-theoretic perspective as our motivation, the main aim of this series is to establish a comprehensive theory of ideals in commutative quantales with an identity element. This particular article focuses on an examination of several key properties related to ideals in quantale, including prime, semiprime, radical, primary, irreducible, and strongly irreducible ideals. Furthermore, we investigate the primary decomposition problem for quantale ideals. In conclusion, we present a set of future directions for further exploration, serving as a natural continuation of this article.

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Ideals.....	2
2.1. Operations on ideals.....	2
2.2. Prime and semiprime ideals.....	9
2.3. Primary ideals and primary decompositions.....	15
2.4. Irreducible and strongly irreducible ideals.....	19
References.....	22

1. Introduction

As pointed out in [36], a quantale can be regarded as a special case within various algebraic and categorical perspectives. Here are a few examples:

- complete multiplicative lattices,
- complete residuated lattices,
- semirings with infinitary sums,
- thin closed monoidal categories,
- monoids in complete semilattices.

For the purpose of developing an ideal theory of quantales, we will adopt the first approach mentioned above. Ideal theory in an algebraic structure provides a powerful framework for understanding the structural properties and behaviour of ideals within the algebraic system. It focuses on the investigation of properties and characteristics of ideals in algebraic structures, such as their generation, factorization, and intersection. It explores the interplay between ideals and other fundamental algebraic concepts, such as modules, prime ideals, and quotient structures. One of the primary goals of ideal theory is to establish connections between ideals and the overall structure of the algebraic system in which they reside.

Although abstract ideal theory has been extensively studied (see, e.g., [1, 3, 4, 11, 12, 44, 45]) for various classes of lattices by introducing different types of elements (replacing various types of ideals), there is a notable absence of detailed study on semiprime, primary, strongly irreducible, *etc.*, types

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. — 06F07; 13A15; 06B23.

Key words and phrases. — Quantale; Multiplicative lattice; Semiprime ideal; Primary decomposition; Strongly irreducible ideal.

of elements in the context of multiplicative lattices⁽¹⁾. It is worth noting that in a lattice without a multiplication operation, the notions of prime and strongly irreducible elements coincide. However, in the context of rings, these two types of ideals are distinct from each other.

Surprisingly, despite the wealth of research on ideal theory, we have not come across a well-defined notion of an ideal in the context of quantales. Motivated by this observation, the primary objective of this series of papers is to explore the extent to which the ideal theory of rings can be extended to quantales. In many instances, the reader find that the proofs of various properties for different classes of ideals in rings can be adapted almost identically for ideals in quantales. However, we shall present complete proofs for all results unless they are trivial. This approach serves two main purposes:

Firstly, providing comprehensive proofs contribute to the understanding and advancement of this field of study. By presenting detailed arguments, we aim to enhance the readers' comprehension and facilitate further developments in this area.

Secondly, we intend to showcase the reliance on multiplicative ideal theory principles by explicitly demonstrating the application of these principles in quantale analysis. Through the presentation of proofs, we aim to emphasize the significance of ideal-theoretic aspects in the study of quantales.

Here is an explanation of the terminology and notation used in this paper. The symbol \mathbb{N} represents the set of natural numbers, *i.e.*, $1, 2, 3, \dots$. When we have a set X and S is a subset of X , we denote the complement of S with respect to X as $X \setminus S = \{x \in X \mid x \notin S\}$. The empty set is denoted by \emptyset , while the top and bottom elements of a lattice $(\mathcal{L}, \preceq, \vee, \wedge)$ are represented as \top and \perp , respectively. For any element $x \in \mathcal{L}$ with $x \neq \perp$, the notation nx signifies the repeated join (supremum) of x with itself n times, *i.e.*, $x \vee \dots \vee x$. Throughout the paper, the default ordering relation for the poset of subsets of a set be the set inclusion relation, denoted by \preceq .

The paper is organized as follows. In §2.1, we provide an introduction to the concept of ideals in quantales and explore the construction of new ideals using operations between them. We examine the general properties of ideals and investigate their behavior under quantale homomorphisms. Additionally, we briefly discuss some key results pertaining to maximal ideals in quantales.

In §2.2, we study prime and semiprime ideals in quantales. We examine the notion of radicals of ideals and establish an equivalence between semiprime ideals and radical ideals in a quantale. Throughout this analysis, the significance of multiplicatively closed subsets becomes apparent as they play a crucial role in the development of the theory.

Moving forward, §2.3 focuses on primary ideals in quantales and primary decompositions. We explore the properties of primary ideals and investigate their decompositions. This section sheds light on the fundamental aspects of primary ideals within the context of quantales.

Lastly, in §2.4, we delve into the discussion of irreducible and strongly irreducible ideals in quantales. We present a representation theorem, stating that any ideal in a Noetherian quantale can be expressed as an intersection of a finite number of irreducible ideals. Furthermore, we partially characterize arithmetic quantales by examining their strongly irreducible ideals.

2. Ideals

2.1. Operations on ideals. — Quantales can be seen as a generalization of rings, where the underlying additive abelian groups are replaced by sup-lattices and multiplication part as a semigroup. Since in our

1. however, definitions of semiprime and primary ideals have been mentioned in [46, Definition 2.6] (see also [37, Definition 2.2]) in order to introduce rough semiprime and rough primary ideals in a quantale. Also, a definition of prime ideal and completely prime ideal has been introduced in [10, Definition 3 and Definition 4] to show when they coincide.

investigation, we aim to extend the ideal theory associated with commutative rings with identity, our focus shall be on a specific type of quantales that align with this goal. For a more comprehensive exploration of the algebraic aspects of quantales in general, we recommend [41].

DEFINITION 2.1.1. — An *unital commutative quantale* is a complete lattice $(\mathcal{Q}, \preceq, \perp, \top)$ endowed with an operation $\&$, satisfying the following axioms:

- (1) $x\&(y\&z) = (x\&y)\&z$,
- (2) $x\&y = y\&x$,
- (3) $x\&(\bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} y_\lambda) = \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (x\&y_\lambda)$,
- (4) $x\&\top = x$,

for all $x, y, y_\lambda, z \in \mathcal{Q}$, and for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, where Λ is an index set.

Throughout this paper, unless otherwise stated, by a “quantale,” we shall always refer to a commutative quantale with the top element \top as the identity with respect to $\&$. We shall also use the notation x^n to denote $x\&\cdots\&x$ (repeated n times).

REMARK 2.1.1. — The aforementioned Definition 2.1.1 was first introduced in [45] (also see [11]), where the authors referred to it as a *multiplicative lattice*.

Unital commutative quantales offer numerous examples that illustrate their versatility and applicability. Below, we provide a few of them.

- (1) The quantale of non-negative real numbers with the operation of maximum (supremum) and the identity element 0. This quantale is generally denoted as $([0, \infty], \max, 0)$.
- (2) The quantale $(\mathcal{P}(X), \cup, X)$ of non-empty subsets of a set X , ordered by inclusion and equipped with the operation of set union as the multiplication and the full set X as the identity element.
- (3) The quantale $(\mathcal{C}(X), \vee, 0)$ of continuous real-valued functions on a topological space X , ordered pointwise and equipped with the operation of pointwise maximum (supremum) as the multiplication and the constant function 0 as the identity element.
- (4) The quantale $(\mathcal{I}(R), \cap, 0)$ of ideals in a commutative unital ring R , ordered by inclusion and equipped with the operation of ideal intersection as the multiplication and the zero ideal 0 as the identity element.

In the following lemma, we compile a number of elementary results on quantales that be utilized in sequel.

LEMMA 2.1.2. — Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale. Then the following hold.

- (1) $x\&y \preceq x \wedge y$, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (2) If $x \preceq y$, then $x\&z \preceq y\&z$, for all $z \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (3) If $x \preceq y$ and $u \preceq v$, then $x\&u \preceq y\&v$, for all $x, y, u, v \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (4) If $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and if $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$, then

$$(2.1) \quad (x \vee y)^n = \bigvee_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} \& b^k, \quad \text{where, } \binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}.$$

Proof. — (1) Notice that $x = x \& \top = x \& (y \vee \top) = (x \& y) \vee x$, and this implies $x \& y \preceq x$. Similarly, we have $x \& y \preceq y$, and hence $x \& y \preceq x \wedge y$.

(2) Since $x \preceq y$, we have $y \& z = (x \vee y) \& z = (x \& z) \vee (y \& z)$, which implies that $x \& z \preceq y \& z$.

(3) Since $x \preceq y$ and $u \preceq v$, by (2), we have $x \& u \preceq y \& u$ and $y \& u \preceq y \& v$. From these, we obtain the claim.

(4) For $n = 1$, the formula (2.1) is trivially true. Suppose the formula is true for $n = k$. Using the conditions of Definition 2.1.1, it is a routine exercise to check that the formula is also true for $n = k + 1$. Hence by induction we have the desired claim. \square

We shall now present the definition of the central concept in this paper, which pertains to the notion of ideals in a quantale.

DEFINITION 2.1.2. — A nonempty subset I in \mathcal{Q} is called an *ideal*, if for all $x, y, l \in \mathcal{Q}$,

- (1) $x, y \in I$ implies that $x \vee y \in I$, and
- (2) $x \in I$ and $l \preceq x$ implies that $l \in I$.

We shall denote the set of all ideals in \mathcal{Q} by $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, and by 0 , the zero ideal in \mathcal{Q} .

REMARK 2.1.3. — One may immediately notice that this definition does not involve any axiom related to the operation \oplus . If $l \preceq x$, where $l \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $x \in I$, then according to Lemma 2.1.2(1), we can deduce that $l \& x \in I$. This implies that in the context of rings, the property of an ideal mentioned above is automatically satisfied in a quantale, whereas it needs to be explicitly defined as an axiom. In simpler terms, the definitions of an ideal in a complete lattice and in a quantale are identical.

Note that a definition of an ideal in a (commutative) quantale without identity requires the following additional axiom:

$$(2.2) \quad \text{If } l \preceq x, \text{ where } l \in \mathcal{Q} \text{ and } x \in I, \text{ and } l \& x \in I,$$

(see [46, Definition 2.2] and [10, Definition 2(2)]). This is because we have obtained (2.2) using the fact that $x \& y \preceq x \wedge y$ holds for all $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$, which we proved assuming the existence of an identity element in \mathcal{Q} (see Lemma 2.1.2(1)).

Based on Definition 2.1.2, we shall now introduce a set of operations on ideals in a quantale. These operations play a fundamental role in the development of our theory.

DEFINITION 2.1.3. — Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale.

- (1) The *meet* $\bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} I_{\lambda}$ of ideals $\{I_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ in \mathcal{Q} is given by their intersection.
- (2) The *join* of ideals $\{I_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of \mathcal{Q} is defined by

$$\bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} I_{\lambda} = \left\{ l \in \mathcal{Q} \mid l \preceq \bigvee_{\text{finite}} x_{\lambda} \text{ for } x_{\lambda} \in I_{\lambda} \right\}.$$

- (3) The *product* of two ideals I and J in \mathcal{Q} is defined as

$$I \& J = \left\{ l \in \mathcal{Q} \mid l \preceq \bigvee_{\text{finite}} \{x \& y \mid x \in I, y \in J\} \right\}.$$

- (4) The *residual* of an ideal I by an ideal J is defined by

$$(I : J) = \{x \in \mathcal{Q} \mid x \& J \preceq I\} = \{x \in \mathcal{Q} \mid x \& j \in I, \text{ for all } j \in J\}.$$

Through the operations defined above, we can establish that the resulting entities are indeed ideals. This be demonstrated in the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.1.4. — *Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale. If I and J are ideals in \mathcal{Q} , then so are (a) $I \wedge J$, (b) $I \vee J$, (c) $I \& J$, and (d) $(I : J)$.*

Proof. — (a) Since I and J are ideals in \mathcal{Q} , if $x, y \in I \wedge J$, then $x \vee y \in I \wedge J$. Moreover, if $z \in I \wedge J$ then for any $x \leq z$, $x \in I \wedge J$. Thus $I \wedge J$ is an ideal.

(b) To show $I \vee J$ is an ideal, let $l, l' \in I \vee J$. This implies that $l \preceq x \vee y$ and $l' \preceq x' \vee y'$ for some $x, x' \in I$ and $y, y' \in J$. Therefore,

$$l \vee l' \preceq (x \vee y) \vee (x' \vee y') = (x \vee x') \vee (y \vee y') \in I \vee J.$$

Also, if $l \in I \vee J$ and $l' \preceq l$, then $l' \preceq l \preceq x \vee y$ for some $x \in I$ and $y \in J$. This implies that $l' \in I \vee J$.

(c) The proof of $I \& J$ is an ideal is similar to (b).

(d) Finally, to show $(I : J)$ is an ideal, let $l, l' \in (I : J)$. Then $l \& J \preceq I$ and $l' \& J \preceq I$. This by Definition 2.1.1(3) implies that

$$(l \vee l') \& J = (l \& J) \vee (l' \& J) \preceq I.$$

Suppose $l \in (I : J)$ and $l' \preceq l$. Then by Lemma 2.1.2(2), we have $l' \& j \preceq l \& j$ for all $j \in J$. Hence $l' \& J \preceq l \& J \preceq I$. In other words, $l' \in (I : J)$ as required. \square

DEFINITION 2.1.4. — If S is a nonempty subset in a \mathcal{Q} , then the *ideal generated by S* is defined by

$$\langle S \rangle = \left\{ x \in \mathcal{Q} \mid x \preceq \bigvee_{i=1}^n a_i, \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } a_i \in \mathcal{Q} \& S \right\}.$$

In particular, if $S = \{s\}$, then the ideal $\langle \{s\} \rangle$ is called *principal*. We shall write $\langle s \rangle$ for $\langle \{s\} \rangle$. The following lemma is going to be useful in the sequel.

LEMMA 2.1.5. — *Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale. If S and T are nonempty subsets of a quantale \mathcal{Q} , then $\langle S \wedge T \rangle = \langle S \rangle \wedge \langle T \rangle$.*

Proof. — Since $S \wedge T \preceq S$ and $S \wedge T \preceq T$, we immediately have $\langle S \wedge T \rangle \preceq \langle S \rangle \wedge \langle T \rangle$. For the converse, let $x \in \langle S \rangle \wedge \langle T \rangle$. Then $x \preceq \bigvee_{i=1}^n a_i$ and $x \preceq \bigvee_{j=1}^m b_j$, for some $a_i \in \mathcal{Q} \& S$ and $b_j \in \mathcal{Q} \& T$, where $1 \leq i \leq n$ and

$1 \leq j \leq m$. This implies that $x \preceq \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n a_i \right) \wedge \left(\bigvee_{j=1}^m b_j \right)$, i.e., $x \in \langle S \wedge T \rangle$. \square

The algebraic manipulation of ideals in a quantale closely resembles that of a commutative ring. We can draw analogies between the following ideal-theoretic relations and their counterparts in the elementwise setting in a multiplicative lattice (see [45, 11]).

PROPOSITION 2.1.6. — *Let $I, \{I_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}, J, \{J_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, and K be ideals in a quantale \mathcal{Q} . Then the following hold.*

- (1) $I \& (J \& K) = (I \& J) \& K$.
- (2) $I \& J = J \& I$.
- (3) $\mathcal{Q} \& I = I$.
- (4) $0 \& I = 0$.

- (5) $I \& \left(\bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J_\lambda \right) = \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (I \& J_\lambda)$.
- (6) $I \& J \preceq I \wedge J$.
- (7) $I \& (J \wedge K) \preceq (I \& J) \wedge (I \& K)$.
- (8) $(I \vee J) \& (J \vee K) \preceq (I \& J) \vee K$.
- (9) If $I \vee K = J \vee K = \mathcal{Q}$, then $((I \& J) \vee K) = \mathcal{Q}$.
- (10) If $I \vee K = \mathcal{Q}$, then $(I \wedge J) \vee K = J \vee K$.
- (11) $(I : J) \& J \preceq I$.
- (12) $I \preceq (I : J)$.
- (13) $J \preceq I$ if and only if $(I : J) = \mathcal{Q}$.
- (14) $(I : \mathcal{Q}) = I$.
- (15) $I \preceq ((I \& J) : J)$.
- (16) $\left(\bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} I_\lambda : J \right) = \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (I_\lambda : J)$.
- (17) $\bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (I : J_\lambda) \leq \left(I : \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J_\lambda \right)$.
- (18) $((I : J) : K) = (I : (J \& K))$.
- (19) $(I : J) = (I : (I \vee J))$.
- (20) $(I : J) = ((I \wedge J) : J)$.

Proof. — (1) Follows from Definition 2.1.1(1).

(2) Follows from Definition 2.1.1(2).

(3) From Remark 2.1.3, it follows that $\mathcal{Q} \& I \preceq I$. Indeed, $x \in \mathcal{Q}, i \in I$ implies $x \& i \preceq x \wedge i \preceq i \in I$. By Definition 2.1.1(4), $i = \top \& i \in \mathcal{Q} \& I$ for all $i \in I$, proving that $I \preceq \mathcal{Q} \& I$.

(4) Let $i \in I$. Then $\perp \& i \preceq \perp \wedge i = \perp \preceq i$ implies that $\perp \& i \in I$, and hence, $0 \& I \preceq I$. Since $\perp \preceq x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{Q}$, in particular, $\perp \preceq \perp \& i$ for all $i \in I$, showing that $0 \preceq 0 \& I$.

(5) Follows from Definition 2.1.1(3).

(6) Follows from Remark 2.1.3.

(7) Since $J \wedge K \preceq J$ and $J \wedge K \preceq K$, by Lemma 2.1.2(2), we obtain $I \& (J \wedge K) \preceq (I \& J) \wedge (I \& K)$.

(8) For all $i \in I, j \in J$, and $k \in K$, applying Definition 2.1.1(3), we have

$$(i \vee k) \& (j \vee k) = (i \& j) \vee (i \vee j \vee k) \& k \in (I \& J) \vee K.$$

(9) From (8), it follows that $\mathcal{Q} \preceq ((I \& J) \vee K)$, whereas the other inclusion is trivial.

(10) Since $I \wedge J \preceq J$, we have $(I \wedge J) \vee K \preceq J \vee K$. For the other half of the inclusion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J \vee K &= (I \vee K) \& (J \vee K) \\ &= I \& (J \vee K) \vee K \& (J \vee K) \\ &\preceq I \& (J \vee K) \vee K \\ &= (I \& J) \vee ((I \& K) \vee K) \\ &= (I \& J) \vee K \\ &\preceq (I \wedge J) \vee K. \end{aligned}$$

(11) If $x \in (I : J) \& J$, then for some finite set $\{1, \dots, n\}$, we have $x \preceq \bigvee_{i=1}^n l_i \& j_i \in J$, where $l_i \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $j_i \in J$.

(12) If $i \in I$, then by Lemma 2.1.2(2), $i \& J \preceq I \& J$, and since I is an ideal, by Remark 2.1.3, $i \& J \preceq I$.

(13) If $J \preceq I$ then by applying (3), we have $\mathcal{Q} \& J = J \preceq I$. Hence $(I : J) = \mathcal{Q}$. Conversely, if $(I : J) = \mathcal{Q}$, then by Definition 2.1.1(4), $\top \& j = j \in I$ for all $j \in J$.

(14) Follows from (3).

(15) Follows by Lemma 2.1.2(2).

(16) The desired identity follows from the following chain of equivalent statements:

$$l \in \left(\bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} I_\lambda : J \right) \Leftrightarrow l \& J \preceq \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} I_\lambda \Leftrightarrow l \& J \preceq I_\lambda, \forall \lambda \in \Lambda \Leftrightarrow l \in \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (I_\lambda : J).$$

(17) Note that

$$l \in \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (I : J_\lambda) \Rightarrow l \& J_\lambda \subseteq I, \forall \lambda \in \Lambda \Rightarrow \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} l \& J_\lambda \subseteq I \Rightarrow l \& \left(\bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J_\lambda \right) \subseteq I \Rightarrow l \in (I : \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J_\lambda).$$

(18) Observe that $l \in ((I : J) : K) \Leftrightarrow l \& K \preceq (I : J) \Leftrightarrow (l \& K) \& J \preceq I \Leftrightarrow l \& ((J \& K)) \subseteq I \Leftrightarrow l \in (I : J \& K)$.

(19) Note that

$$x \in (I : J) \Rightarrow x \& J \preceq I \Rightarrow x \& I \vee x \& J \preceq x \& I \vee I \Rightarrow x \& (I \vee J) \preceq I \Rightarrow x \in (I : (I \vee J)),$$

and for the other half of the inclusion,

$$x \in (I : (I \vee J)) \Rightarrow x \& (I \vee J) \preceq I \Rightarrow x \& I \vee x \& J \preceq I \Rightarrow x \& J \preceq I.$$

(20) Finally, we have $x \in (I : J) \Leftrightarrow x \& J \preceq I \Leftrightarrow x \& J \preceq I \wedge J \Leftrightarrow x \in ((I \wedge J) : J)$. \square

The well-known fact is that the set of ideals in a commutative ring with identity forms a quantale, following the definition provided in Definition 2.1.1. Now, we shall proceed to demonstrate in the following theorem that the set of ideals in a quantale possesses an analogous structure.

THEOREM 2.1.7. — *If \mathcal{Q} is a quantale, then $(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \preceq, \vee, \wedge, \perp, \top, \&)$ is a quantale.*

Proof. — By (1) and (2) of Definition 2.1.3, it follows that arbitrary joins and arbitrary meets exist in the poset $(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \preceq)$, where \preceq is the usual subset inclusion relation. It is easy to see that the bottom element \perp and the top element \top of the poset $(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \preceq)$ are respectively 0 (the zero ideal) and \mathcal{Q} . Hence $(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \preceq)$ is a complete lattice. Taking the multiplication operation between ideals in \mathcal{Q} as in Definition 2.1.3(3), it follows respectively from (1), (2), (5), and (3) of Proposition 2.1.6 that the operation $\&$ satisfies Axioms (1), (2), (3), and (4) of Definition 2.1.1. \square

Similar to rings, the concept of an annihilator of a subset in a quantale is also established as a special case of the residual operation.

DEFINITION 2.1.5. — If S is a nonempty subset in a quantale \mathcal{Q} , then the *annihilator* of S is defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S) = \{x \in \mathcal{Q} \mid x \& s = \perp, \text{ for all } s \in S\}.$$

In the following lemma, we discuss a few elementary properties of annihilators.

LEMMA 2.1.8. — *Let S and T be subsets in a quantale \mathcal{Q} . Then the following hold.*

(1) $S \preceq T$ implies that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(T) \preceq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$.

- (2) $S \preceq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S))$.
- (3) $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S) = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S)))$.

Proof. — (1) If $x \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(T)$, then $x \& t = \perp$ for all $t \in T$. Since $S \preceq T$, this implies that $x \& s = \perp$ for all $s \in S$. Hence $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(T) \preceq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$.

(2) If $s \in S$, then $x \& s = s \& x = \perp$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$, and hence $s \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S))$.

(3) Since by (2), $S \preceq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S))$, by (1), it follows that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S))) \preceq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$. By (2), it follows that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S) \preceq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}(S)))$. \square

DEFINITION 2.1.6. — Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale.

- (1) An ideal I of \mathcal{Q} is called *proper* if $I \neq \mathcal{Q}$, and we shall denote the set of all proper ideals in \mathcal{Q} by $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}^+$.
- (2) A proper ideal M of \mathcal{Q} is called *maximal* if there is no other proper ideal I of \mathcal{Q} properly containing M . A quantale \mathcal{Q} with exactly one maximal ideal is called *local*.
- (3) An ideal I of \mathcal{Q} is called *minimal* if $I \neq 0$ and I properly contains no other nonzero ideals in \mathcal{Q} .

The subsequent result ensures that the set of maximal ideals in a quantale is not empty.

THEOREM 2.1.9. — *Every quantale \mathcal{Q} with $0 \neq 1$ has a maximal ideal.*

Proof. — Since $0 \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}^+$, $\text{Prp}(\mathcal{Q}) \neq \emptyset$. Consider a chain $\{I_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of ideals in $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}^+$. By Definition 2.1.3(1), it follows that $\bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} I_{\lambda} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}^+$ and $I_{\lambda} \preceq \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} I_{\lambda}$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Hence, by Zorn's lemma, $\text{Prp}(\mathcal{Q})$ has a maximal element, which is our desired maximal ideal in \mathcal{Q} . \square

COROLLARY 2.1.10. — *Every proper ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} is contained in a maximal ideal in \mathcal{Q} .*

The following proposition presents a condition that is sufficient for a quantale to be local.

PROPOSITION 2.1.11. — *Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale and $M \neq \mathcal{Q}$ an ideal in \mathcal{Q} such that every $x \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus M$ is a unit in \mathcal{Q} . Then \mathcal{Q} is local and M is its maximal ideal.*

Proof. — Let I be an ideal in \mathcal{Q} such that $M \subsetneq I \preceq \mathcal{Q}$. By hypothesis, every element $x \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus M$ is a unit and since $M \neq \mathcal{Q}$, we must have $\top = x \& y \in I$ for some $y \in \mathcal{Q}$. Hence $I = \mathcal{Q}$, showing that M is maximal. Since every element of $\mathcal{Q} \setminus M$ is a unit, if M' be another maximal ideal in \mathcal{Q} , then we must have

$$(\mathcal{Q} \setminus M) \wedge M' = \emptyset,$$

which implies that $M' \preceq M$. But M' is a maximal ideal. Therefore, $M' = M$. \square

Our next objective is to examine the properties of ideals and their products, meet, and residual operations under quantale homomorphisms. These properties serve as the lattice-theoretic counterparts to their respective ring-theoretic versions (see [6, Proposition 1.17 and Exercise 1.18]). To this end, recall that a map $\phi: \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}'$ from \mathcal{Q} to \mathcal{Q}' is called a *quantale homomorphism* if

- (1) $x \preceq x'$ implies that $\phi(x) \preceq \phi(x')$;
- (2) $\phi(x \vee x') = \phi(x) \vee \phi(x')$;
- (3) $\phi(x \wedge x') = \phi(x) \wedge \phi(x')$;
- (4) $\phi(x \& x') = \phi(x) \& \phi(x')$,

for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{Q}$. Suppose that $\phi: \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}'$ is a quantale homomorphism. If J is an ideal in \mathcal{Q}' , then the *contraction* of J , denoted by J^c , is defined by $\phi^{-1}(J)$. If I is an ideal in \mathcal{Q} , then the *extension* of I , denoted by I^e , is defined by $\langle \phi(I) \rangle$.

THEOREM 2.1.12. — *Let $\phi: \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}'$ be a quantale homomorphism. For $I, I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, and $J, J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Q}')$, the following hold.*

- (1) J^c is an ideal in \mathcal{Q} .
- (2) I^e is an ideal in \mathcal{Q}' .
- (3) (a) $I \preceq I^{ec}$. (b) $J^{ce} \preceq J$. (c) $J^c = J^{cec}$. (d) $I^e = I^{ece}$.
- (4) There is a bijection between the sets $\{I \mid I^{ec} = I\}$ and $\{J \mid J^{ce} = J\}$.
- (5) (a) $(I_1 \wedge I_2)^e \preceq I_1^e \wedge I_2^e$. (b) $(I_1 \& I_2)^e = I_1^e \& I_2^e$. (c) $(I_1 : I_2)^e \preceq (I_1^e : I_2^e)$.
- (6) (a) $(J_1 \wedge J_2)^c = J_1^c \wedge J_2^c$. (b) $J_1^c \& J_2^c \preceq (J_1 \& J_2)^c$. (c) $(J_1 : J_2)^c \preceq (J_1^c : J_2^c)$.

Proof. — (1) Let $x, x' \in J^c$. Then $\phi(x), \phi(x') \in J$. Since J is an ideal, we have $\phi(x \vee x') = \phi(x) \vee \phi(x') \in J$, implying that $x \vee x' \in J^c$. If $x' \preceq x$ and $x \in J^c$, then $\phi(x') \preceq \phi(x) \in J$, proving that $x' \in J^c$, as required.

(2) Follows from Definition 2.1.4.

(3)–(4) Follows by usual set-theoretic arguments.

5(a) Observe that

$$(I_1 \wedge I_2)^e = \langle \phi(I_1 \wedge I_2) \rangle \preceq \langle \phi(I_1) \wedge \phi(I_2) \rangle = \langle \phi(I_1) \rangle \wedge \langle \phi(I_2) \rangle = I_1^e \wedge I_2^e,$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma 2.1.5.

5(b) First, we show that $\langle \phi(I_1 \& I_2) \rangle = \langle \phi(I_1) \rangle \& \langle \phi(I_2) \rangle$. Since $I_1 \& I_2 \preceq I_1$ and $I_1 \& I_2 \preceq I_2$, we immediately obtain that $\langle \phi(I_1 \& I_2) \rangle \preceq \langle \phi(I_1) \rangle \& \langle \phi(I_2) \rangle$. For the other inclusion, let $x \in \langle \phi(I_1) \rangle \& \langle \phi(I_2) \rangle$. This implies $x = x_1 \& x_2$ for some $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $x_1 \preceq \bigvee_{i=1}^n a_i$ and $x_2 \preceq \bigvee_{j=1}^m b_j$, where $a_i \in \mathcal{Q} \& \phi(I_1)$ and $b_j \in \mathcal{Q} \& \phi(I_2)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$. So,

$$x = x_1 \& x_2 \preceq \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n a_i \right) \& \left(\bigvee_{j=1}^m b_j \right) = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \bigvee_{j=1}^m a_i \& b_j,$$

where

$$a_i \& b_j \in \mathcal{Q} \& \phi(I_1) \& \mathcal{Q} \& \phi(I_2) = \mathcal{Q} \& \phi(I_1) \& \phi(I_2) = \mathcal{Q} \& \phi(I_1) \& \phi(I_2).$$

Therefore, $x \in \langle \phi(I_1 \& I_2) \rangle$. Now, $(I_1 \& I_2)^e = \langle \phi(I_1 \& I_2) \rangle = \langle \phi(I_1) \rangle \& \langle \phi(I_2) \rangle = I_1^e \& I_2^e$.

5(c) By Proposition 2.1.6(11) and 5(b), we obtain

$$(I_1 : I_2)^e \& I_2^e = ((I_1 : I_2) \& I_2)^e \preceq I_1^e.$$

6. The proofs are similar to (5). □

2.2. Prime and semiprime ideals. — In this section, our objective is to present the concept of prime and semiprime ideals in the context of a quantale. We shall demonstrate that their definitions based on elements are equivalent to the definitions rooted in ideals. Additionally, we shall explore the topic of radical ideals and delve into their some basic properties.

DEFINITION 2.2.1. — Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale.

- (1) A proper ideal P of \mathcal{Q} is called *prime* if $x \& y \in P$ implies $x \in P$ or $y \in P$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$. By $\text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, we denote the set of all prime ideals in \mathcal{Q} . An ideal P of \mathcal{Q} is called *minimal prime* if P is both a minimal ideal and a prime ideal.
- (2) A proper ideal P of \mathcal{Q} is called *semiprime* if $x^2 \in P$ implies that $x \in P$ for all $x \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (3) Two ideals I and J of \mathcal{Q} is said to be *coprime* if $I \vee J = \mathcal{Q}$.
- (4) \mathcal{Q} is called *Noetherian* if every ascending chain of ideals in \mathcal{Q} is eventually stationary.

PROPOSITION 2.2.1. — *Let \mathcal{Q} be quantale.*

- (1) *An ideal $P \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ if and only if $I \& J \preceq P$ implies $I \preceq P$ or $J \preceq P$, for all $I, J \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$.*
- (2) *Any prime ideal P of \mathcal{Q} contains a prime ideal P' such that $S \preceq P'$.*
- (3) *If I is a proper ideal in a Noetherian quantale \mathcal{Q} , then \mathcal{Q} has only a finite number of minimal prime ideals over I .*
- (4) *An ideal I of \mathcal{Q} is semiprime if and only if $J \& J \preceq I$ implies $J \preceq I$, for all $J \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$.*
- (5) *Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale. If I and J are coprime ideals in \mathcal{Q} , then $I \wedge J = IJ$.*

Proof. — (1) Suppose P is a prime ideal, and $I \& J \preceq P$ with $J \neq P$. This implies the existence of an element $j \in J$ such that $j \notin P$. For any $i \in I$, we then have $i \& j \in P$ and based on the assumption, this implies $i \in P$. Since i was chosen arbitrarily from I , we conclude that $I \preceq P$, as required. Conversely, suppose $I \& J \preceq P$ implies either $I \preceq P$ or $J \preceq P$. Now consider $x \& y \in P$ for some $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let $a \& b \in \langle x \rangle \& \langle y \rangle$, where $a \in \langle x \rangle$ and $b \in \langle y \rangle$. This implies that

$$a \& b \preceq \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n x_i \right) \& \left(\bigvee_{j=1}^m y_j \right) = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \left(\bigvee_{j=1}^m (x_i \& y_j) \right),$$

where $x_i \& y_j \in (x \& y)\mathcal{Q}$, for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$. Thus, $x_i \& y_j \in P$, and hence $a \& b \in P$, implying that $\langle x \rangle \& \langle y \rangle \preceq P$. By the assumption, this implies either $\langle x \rangle \preceq P$ or $\langle y \rangle \preceq P$; in other words, either $x \in P$ or $y \in P$.

(2) Suppose $\Omega = \{P' \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}} \mid S \preceq P' \preceq P\}$. Since $P \in \Omega$, the set Ω is nonempty. Consider a subset $\{P'_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of decreasing chain of prime ideals of Ω . Then by Zorn's lemma, there exists a minimal element $\bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} P'_\lambda$ of that chain, and this minimal element is our desired prime ideal.

(3) First we show that every ideal containing I contains a finite product of prime ideals each containing I . Suppose that this is not the case, and let S be the set of ideals containing I which do not contain a finite product of prime ideals each containing I . By hypothesis, S is not empty. Let C be a chain in S . As \mathcal{Q} is Noetherian, C has a maximum element. From Zorn's lemma, S has a maximal element M . As \mathcal{Q} has a prime ideal containing I , $M \neq \mathcal{Q}$. Also, M is not prime. There exist $a, b \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $a \& b \in M$ and $a \notin M, b \notin M$. Setting

$$A = \langle M, a \rangle, \quad B = \langle M, b \rangle,$$

we obtain $A \& B \preceq M$, with A and B strictly included in M . Since M is maximal, A and B both contain a finite product of prime ideals each containing I , hence so does M , which contradicts the fact that $M \in S$. It follows that every ideal containing I contains a finite product of prime ideals each containing I . We now apply this result to the ideal I : there exist prime ideals P_1, \dots, P_n , each containing I , whose product is contained in I . We claim that any minimal prime P over I is among the P_i . Indeed,

$$P_1 \& \dots \& P_n \preceq I \preceq P.$$

We deduce that $P_i \preceq P$, for some i . However, P is minimal, so $P_i = P$ and it follows that there is only a finite number of minimal prime ideals over I .

(4) Suppose I is a semiprime ideal in \mathcal{Q} . Let $j \in J$. Then $j^2 \in J \& J \preceq I$. This implies that $j^2 \in I$ and since I is semiprime, $j \in I$, i.e., $J \preceq I$. For the converse, we first show that $\langle x \rangle \& \langle x \rangle \preceq \langle x^2 \rangle$, for any $x \in \mathcal{Q}$. Suppose $l \in \langle x \rangle \& \langle x \rangle$. In particular, this implies that $l \preceq x^2$, and hence $l \in \langle x^2 \rangle$. Now, let $x^2 \in I$. Then

$$\langle x \rangle \& \langle x \rangle \preceq \langle x^2 \rangle \preceq I.$$

By assumption, this means $x \in \langle x \rangle \preceq I$. Hence, I is a semiprime ideal.

(5) Notice that

$$(I \vee J) \& (I \wedge J) = I \& (I \wedge J) \vee J(I \wedge J) \preceq (I \wedge (I \& J)) \vee ((I \& J) \wedge J) \preceq I \& J,$$

where the equality is obtained by Definition 2.1.1(3), and the first inclusion follows from Proposition 2.1.6(7). If $I \vee J = \mathcal{Q}$, then by Proposition 2.1.6(3), $\mathcal{Q}(I \wedge J) = I \wedge J \preceq I \& J$. \square

The following proposition is adapted from the realm of rings (see [5, Lemma 3.19]).

PROPOSITION 2.2.2 (Prime avoidance lemma). — *Let I be a subset in a quantale \mathcal{Q} that is stable under join and the operation $\&$. Let P_1, \dots, P_n be ideals in \mathcal{Q} such that $P_3, \dots, P_n \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}}$. If $I \not\subseteq P_j$ for all j , then there is an $x \in I$ such that $x \notin P_j$ for all j .*

Proof. — We prove the claim by induction. If $n = 1$, the claim is trivially true. Suppose $n \geq 2$ and suppose for every i , there exists an $x_i \in I$ such that $x_i \notin P_j$ for all $j \neq i$. Assume that $x_i \in P_i$ for all i . If $n = 2$, then $x_1 \vee x_2 \notin P_j$ for $j = 1, 2$. Indeed, $x_2 \preceq x_1 \vee x_2 \in P_1$ implies $x_2 \in P_1$, a contradiction, and similarly, $x_1 \preceq x_1 \vee x_2 \in P_2$ implies $x_1 \in P_2$, a contradiction. For $n \geq 3$,

$$(x_1 \& \dots \& x_{n-1}) \vee x_n \notin P_j.$$

For the case, $n = j$, we have $x_n \in P_n$ and since P_n is a prime ideal, $x_k \in P$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, a contradiction. For, $j < n$, $x_n \in P_j$, again leads to a contradiction. \square

Our following aim is to explore the radicals of ideals and their associations with prime and semiprime ideals.

DEFINITION 2.2.2. — The *radical* of an ideal I in a quantale \mathcal{Q} is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}(I) = \{x \in \mathcal{Q} \mid x^n \in I, \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

An ideal I is said to be *radical ideal* if $\mathcal{R}(I) = I$.

The following proposition gives an equivalent definition of radical of an ideal and it extends Proposition 1.14 of [6].

PROPOSITION 2.2.3. — *If I is an ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} , then $\mathcal{R}(I) = \bigwedge_P \{P \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}} \mid I \preceq P\}$.*

Proof. — Let $l \in \mathcal{R}(I)$. Then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $l^n \in I$, and also $l^n \in P$, for all $P \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ with $I \preceq P$. This implies that $l \in P$ for all such $P \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Hence $l \in \bigwedge_P \{P \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}} \mid I \preceq P\}$. Conversely, assume that $l \notin \mathcal{R}(I)$, for some $l \in \mathcal{Q}$. Consider the set

$$\Omega = \{J \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}} \mid I \preceq J \text{ and } l^n \notin J, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

It is easy to see that Ω is nonempty and by Zorn's lemma (Ω, \leq) has a maximal element, say P such that $I \preceq P$. It suffices to show that P is a prime ideal. Suppose $x, y \notin P$ for some $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$. This implies $\langle x, P \rangle \notin \Omega$, $\langle y, P \rangle \notin \Omega$, which followingly implies $\langle x \& y, P \rangle \notin \Omega$. Hence $x \& y \notin P$. \square

In the next lemma, we compile some elementary properties of the radical of an ideal in a quantale.

LEMMA 2.2.4. — *For any ideals $I, J, \{I_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ in a quantale \mathcal{Q} , the following hold.*

- (1) $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is an ideal containing I .
- (2) If $I \preceq J$, then $\mathcal{R}(I) \preceq \mathcal{R}(J)$.
- (3) $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(I)) = \mathcal{R}(I)$.
- (4) $\mathcal{R}(I) = \mathcal{R}(I \& \cdots \& I)$ (repeated n -times).
- (5) $\mathcal{R}(I \wedge J) = \mathcal{R}(I) \wedge \mathcal{R}(J) = \mathcal{R}(I \& J)$.
- (6) $\bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{R}(I_\lambda) \preceq \mathcal{R}\left(\bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} I_\lambda\right)$.
- (7) $\mathcal{R}(I) = \mathcal{Q}$ if and only if $I = \mathcal{Q}$.
- (8) $\mathcal{R}(I \vee J) = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(I) \vee \mathcal{R}(J))$.

Proof. — (1) By taking $n = 1$, it follows that $I \preceq \mathcal{R}(I)$. To show $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is an ideal, let $x \in \mathcal{R}(I)$ and let $y \preceq x$, for some $y \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then $x^n \in I$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 2.1.2(2), this implies $y^n \preceq x^n$, and since I is an ideal, we obtain that $y^n \in I$. Hence $y \in \mathcal{R}(I)$, showing that the condition (2) of Definition 2.1.2 holds. To check condition (1) of Definition 2.1.2, let $x, y \in \mathcal{R}(I)$. Then $x^n, y^m \in I$ for some $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. It suffices to show that $(x \vee y)^{m+n} \in I$. Applying formula (2.1), we obtain

$$(x \vee y)^{m+n} = \bigvee_{k=0}^{m+n} \binom{m+n}{k} x^{m+n-k} \& y^k.$$

Since $0 \leq k \leq m+n$, we have two possibilities: either $n \leq k$, in which case, $x^i \in I$ (since $x^n \in I$); or $m \leq n+k-i$, in which case $y^{n+m-i} \in I$ (since $y^m \in I$). This proves that $(x \vee y)^{m+n} \in I$.

(2) Follows from Proposition 2.2.3.

(3) Applying 2. on $I \preceq \mathcal{R}(I)$ (which follows from (1)) gives $\mathcal{R}(I) \preceq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(I))$. Conversely, suppose that $x \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(I))$. This implies $x^n \in \mathcal{R}(I)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which further implies that $(x^n)^m \in I$, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. However, $(x^n)^m = x^{nm} \in I$. Hence $x \in \mathcal{R}(I)$.

(4) Since $I \& \cdots \& I \preceq I$, by (2), we have $\mathcal{R}(I \& \cdots \& I) \preceq \mathcal{R}(I)$. If $x \in \mathcal{R}(I)$, then $x^m \in I$, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. But then $x^{mn} = (x^m)^n \in I \& \cdots \& I$, implying that $x \in \mathcal{R}(I \& \cdots \& I)$.

(5) For the first equality, $\mathcal{R}(I \wedge J) \preceq \mathcal{R}(I) \wedge \mathcal{R}(J)$ follows from (2). If $x \in \mathcal{R}(I) \wedge \mathcal{R}(J)$, then $x^n \in \mathcal{R}(I)$ and $x^m \in \mathcal{R}(J)$ for some $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $k = \max\{n, m\}$. Then $x^k \in I \wedge J$, and hence $x \in \mathcal{R}(I \wedge J)$. For the second equality, note that

$$(I \wedge J) \& (I \wedge J) \preceq I \& J \preceq I \wedge J.$$

Therefore, by (2) and (4), we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}((I \wedge J) \& (I \wedge J)) = \mathcal{R}(I \wedge J) \preceq \mathcal{R}(I \& J) \preceq \mathcal{R}(I \wedge J).$$

(6) Follows from (2).

(7) Follows from Proposition 2.2.3.

(8) By (2) and (3), it follows that

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(I) \vee \mathcal{R}(J)) \preceq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(I \vee J)) = \mathcal{R}(I \vee J).$$

Since by (1), $I \preceq \mathcal{R}(I)$ and $J \preceq \mathcal{R}(J)$, we obtain $I \vee J \preceq \mathcal{R}(I) \vee \mathcal{R}(J)$, and applying (2), we get the desired inclusion. \square

Expanding upon the previously introduced definition of the radical of an ideal in a quantale, we shall now introduce two additional types of radicals specific to quantales: nilradicals and Jacobson radicals. Additionally, we shall explore the relationships that exist among these distinct types of radicals.

DEFINITION 2.2.3. — Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale.

- (1) An element x of \mathcal{Q} is called *nilpotent* if $x^n = \perp$ for some positive integer n . The set $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q})$ of all nilpotent elements of a quantale \mathcal{Q} is called the *nilradical* of \mathcal{Q} . A quantale \mathcal{Q} is called *reduced* if $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q}) = 0$.
- (2) The *Jacobson radical* $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{Q})$ of a quantale \mathcal{Q} is defined as the intersection of all maximal ideals in \mathcal{Q} .
- (3) A *zero-divisor* of \mathcal{Q} is an element x of \mathcal{Q} for which there exists an element $y (\neq \perp)$ in \mathcal{Q} such that $x \& y = \perp$. If $\perp \neq \top$ in \mathcal{Q} and if \mathcal{Q} does not have any nonzero zero-divisor, then \mathcal{Q} is called a *quantale domain* (QD). Note that a quantale \mathcal{Q} is a QD if and only if 0 is a prime ideal.

PROPOSITION 2.2.5. — Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale. Then the following hold.

- (1) $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q}) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ and it is the intersection of prime ideals in \mathcal{Q} . Moreover, $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q}) \preceq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{Q})$.
- (2) \mathcal{Q} is reduced and has only one minimal prime ideal if and only if \mathcal{Q} is a QD.

Proof. — (1) First we show $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q})$ is an ideal in \mathcal{Q} . Suppose $x \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q})$ and $y \preceq x$. Then $x^n = 0$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and by Lemma 2.1.2(3), $y^n \preceq x^n = 0$, implying that $y^n = 0$, and hence, $y \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q})$. Now, let $x, y \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q})$. This implies $x^n = 0$ and $y^m = 0$ for some $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that $(x \vee y)^{m+n-1}$ is the join of integer multiples of elements $x^r \& y^s$ (see proof of Lemma 2.2.4(1)), where $r + s = m + n - 1$. Since we cannot have both $r < m$ and $s < n$, each of these terms vanishes, and hence

$$(x \vee y)^{m+n-1} = 0.$$

The fact that $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q})$ is the intersection of prime ideals in \mathcal{Q} follows from Proposition 2.2.3. Suppose $x \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q})$. Then there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $x^n = \perp$. Let M be a maximal ideal in \mathcal{Q} . Then $x^n \in M$ and M is prime, $x \in M$, proving that $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q}) \preceq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{Q})$.

- (2) Suppose \mathcal{Q} is reduced. Then $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Q}) = 0$. By Proposition 2.2.3, this implies

$$0 = \bigwedge_{P \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}}} P.$$

Then by Lemma 2.2.1(2) and hypothesis, there exists a prime ideal P such that $P = 0$. Hence \mathcal{Q} is a QD. The converse follows from the fact that \mathcal{Q} is a QD if and only if 0 is a prime ideal in \mathcal{Q} . \square

Our next objective is to establish the equivalence between semiprime ideals and radical ideals within a quantale. This equivalence is well-known in the realm of (noncommutative) rings. However, in the noncommutative scenario, the concepts of m -systems and n -systems in rings are necessary. On the other hand, when dealing with ideals in quantale (or commutative rings), the presence of multiplicatively closed subsets alone suffices. To demonstrate this equivalence, we shall first proceed by presenting a series of lemmas.

LEMMA 2.2.6. — *An ideal P in a quantale \mathcal{Q} is prime if and only if the complement of P in \mathcal{Q} forms a multiplicatively closed subset of \mathcal{Q} . Here, a subset S of \mathcal{Q} is considered multiplicatively closed if it satisfies two conditions: $\top \in S$, and for any $x \in S$ and $y \in S$, implies $x \& y \in S$.*

Proof. — Suppose that P is a prime ideal in \mathcal{Q} and $x, y \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus P$. Then by Lemma 2.2.1(1), $x \& y \notin P$, and hence $x \& y \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus P$. Conversely, suppose $x, y \notin P$. This implies that $x, y \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus P$. Since $\mathcal{Q} \setminus P$ is multiplicatively closed, $x \& y \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus P$, and hence $x \& y \notin P$, proving that P is a prime ideal. \square

LEMMA 2.2.7. — *Let S be a multiplicatively closed subset in a quantale \mathcal{Q} . Suppose $P \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ such that it is maximal with respect to the property: $P \cap S = \emptyset$. Then $P \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}}$.*

Proof. — Suppose $x \notin P$ and $y \notin P$ for some $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$. By the property on P , this implies that the ideals $\langle x, P \rangle$ and $\langle y, P \rangle$ both intersect with S . Hence, there exist $l, l' \in \mathcal{Q}$, $p, p' \in P$, and $s, s' \in S$ such that $(x \& l) \vee (p \& s) \in S$ and $(y \& l') \vee (p' \& s') \in S$. Since S is a multiplicatively closed set, we must have $((x \& l) \vee (p \& s)) \& ((y \& l') \vee (p' \& s')) \in S$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & ((x \& l) \vee (p \& s)) \& ((y \& l') \vee (p' \& s')) \\ &= (x \& y \& l \& l') \vee (p' \& (x \& l \& s')) \vee (p \& (y \& l' \& s)) \vee (p \& p' \& (s \& s')) \in \langle x \& y, P \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $x \& y \notin P$. Hence P is a prime ideal. \square

LEMMA 2.2.8. — *Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale. For every $I \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is equal to the set*

$$T = \{l \in \mathcal{Q} \mid \text{every multiplicatively closed subset containing } l \text{ intersects } I\}.$$

Proof. — Suppose that $r \in T$ and $P \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ such that $I \preceq P$. Then by Lemma 2.2.6, $\mathcal{Q} \setminus P$ is a multiplicatively closed subset of \mathcal{Q} and $l \notin \mathcal{Q} \setminus P$. Hence $l \in P$. Conversely, let $l \notin T$. This implies that there exists a multiplicatively closed subset S of \mathcal{Q} such that $l \in S$ and $S \wedge I = \emptyset$. By Zorn's lemma, there exists an ideal P containing I and maximal with respect to the property that $P \wedge S = \emptyset$. By Lemma 2.2.7, P is a prime ideal with $l \notin P$. \square

LEMMA 2.2.9. — *Suppose I is a semiprime ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} and suppose $x \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus I$. Then there exists a multiplicatively closed subset S of \mathcal{Q} such that $x \in S \preceq \mathcal{Q} \setminus I$.*

Proof. — Define the elements of $S = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \dots\}$ inductively as follows: $x_1 := x$; $x_2 := x_1 \& x_1$; \dots ; $x_n := x_{n-1} \& x_{n-1}$; \dots . Obviously $x \in S$ and it is also easy to see that $x_i, x_j \in S$ implies that $x_i \& x_j \in S$. \square

THEOREM 2.2.10. — *For any ideal I in a quantale \mathcal{Q} , the following are equivalent.*

- (1) I is semiprime.
- (2) I is an intersection of prime ideals in \mathcal{Q} .
- (3) I is a radical ideal.

Proof. — From Proposition 2.2.3, it follows that (3) \Rightarrow (2). Since the intersection of semiprime ideals is a semiprime ideal, (2) \Rightarrow (1) follows. What remains is to show that (1) \Rightarrow (3) and for that, it is sufficient to show $\mathcal{R}(I) \preceq I$. Suppose that $x \notin I$. Then $x \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus I$ and by Lemma 2.2.9, there exists a multiplicatively closed subset S of \mathcal{Q} such that $x \in S \preceq \mathcal{Q} \setminus I$. But $S \wedge I = \emptyset$ and hence by Lemma 2.2.8, $x \notin \mathcal{R}(I)$. \square

COROLLARY 2.2.11. — *If $I \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, then $\mathcal{R}(I)$ is the smallest semiprime ideal in \mathcal{Q} containing I .*

Next we wish to consider saturation of a subset of a quantale and relate with prime ideals.

DEFINITION 2.2.4. — Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale and S be a multiplicatively closed subset of \mathcal{Q} . We say S is *saturated* if for $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $x \& y \in S$ implies that $x, y \in S$. The *saturation* of S is defined as

$$\overline{S} = \{x \in \mathcal{Q} \mid \text{there exists } y \in \mathcal{Q} \text{ such that } x \& y \in S\}.$$

The following proposition shows that \overline{S} behaves as a closure operation. Moreover, it is related with prime ideals as expected, and extends Exercise 7 (from Chapter 3) of [6].

PROPOSITION 2.2.12. — *Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale and S be a multiplicatively closed subset of \mathcal{Q} . Then the following hold.*

- (1) \overline{S} is the smallest saturated multiplicatively closed subset in \mathcal{Q} containing S .
- (2) S is saturated if and only if $\mathcal{Q} \neg S$ is a join of prime ideals.

Proof. — (1) If $s \in S$, then $\top \& s = s \in \overline{S}$, and hence $S \preceq \overline{S}$. Suppose $x, y \in \overline{S}$. Then there exist $y', y'' \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $x \& y' \in S$ and $y \& y'' \in S$. Since S is a multiplicatively closed set,

$$(x \& y') \& (y \& y'') = (x \& y) \& (y' \& y'') \in S,$$

which implies that $x \& y \in \overline{S}$. Therefore, \overline{S} is a multiplicatively closed subset of \mathcal{Q} . To show \overline{S} is saturated, let $x \& y \in \overline{S}$ for some $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then there exists $z \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $x \& (y \& z) = (x \& y) \& z \in S$. This implies $x \in \overline{S}$. Similarly, $y \in \overline{S}$. Finally, let T be a saturated multiplicatively closed subset of \mathcal{Q} containing S . Suppose $s \in \overline{S}$. Then there exists $y \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $s \& y \in S \preceq T$. Since T is saturated, $s \in T$.

- (2) Suppose $\mathcal{Q} \neg S = \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \{P_\lambda \mid P_\lambda \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}}\}$. Let $x \& y \in S$ for some $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$ and if possible, let $x \notin S$.

This implies $x \preceq p_\lambda$ for some $p_\lambda \in P_\lambda$. Since P_λ is an ideal and $x \& y \preceq x \wedge y \preceq x \preceq p_\lambda \in P_\lambda$, we must have $x \& y \in P_\lambda$. This implies $x \& y \notin S$, a contradiction. This proves that S is saturated. Conversely, let S be a saturated subset of \mathcal{Q} . Let $a \in \mathcal{Q} \neg S$. It suffices to show that $a \in P_\lambda$ for some $P_\lambda \in \text{Spec}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ such that $P_\lambda \wedge S = \emptyset$. Suppose

$$\Omega = \{I \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}} \mid a \in I \text{ and } I \wedge S = \emptyset\}.$$

Observe that $\langle a \rangle \wedge S = \emptyset$. Indeed, $x_i \& a \preceq \bigvee_{i=1}^n x_i \& a$ for $x_i \in \mathcal{Q}$, implies $x_i \& a \in S$ and since S is saturated, this implies $a \in S$, contradiction. Hence $\langle a \rangle \in \Omega$, and thus $\Omega \neq \emptyset$. By Zorn's lemma, Ω has a maximal element, say P . We claim that P is a prime ideal and proof of this is already described in Proposition 2.2.3. \square

2.3. Primary ideals and primary decompositions. — The decomposition of an ideal into primary ideals holds a significant place in ideal theory of rings and is considered a traditional cornerstone. The objective of this section is to establish several classical uniqueness theorems for ideals for quantales, and hence extend the corresponding results of [6].

DEFINITION 2.3.1. — A proper ideal P in a quantale \mathcal{Q} is called *primary* if for $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $x \& y \in P$ imply that $x \in P$ or $y^n \in P$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If P' is a primary ideal in \mathcal{Q} and $\mathcal{R}(P') = P$, then we say P' is *P-primary*.

PROPOSITION 2.3.1. — *Let \mathcal{Q} be a quantale. Then the following hold.*

- (1) Every prime ideal in \mathcal{Q} is primary.

(2) Let P be a primary ideal in \mathcal{Q} . Then $\mathcal{R}(P)$ is the smallest prime ideal in \mathcal{Q} containing P .

Proof. — (1) Suppose P is a prime ideal in \mathcal{Q} and $x \& y \in P$ for some $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then $x \in P$ or $y = y^1 \in P$,

(2) By Proposition 2.2.3, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{R}(P)$ is a prime ideal. Suppose $x \& y \in \mathcal{R}(P)$ for some $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then $(x \& y)^n \in P$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies that $x^n \in P$ or $y^{mn} \in P$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, $x \in \mathcal{R}(P)$ or $y \in \mathcal{R}(P)$. \square

When considering a finite intersection of primary ideals in a quantale, with the condition that all the ideals involved are P -primary for a given prime ideal P , the resulting intersection is indeed primary. To establish this claim, we first require a preliminary result.

LEMMA 2.3.2. — If I_1, \dots, I_n are ideals in a quantale \mathcal{Q} and $I = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n I_i$, then $\mathcal{R}(I) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}(I_i)$.

Proof. — Suppose $x \in \mathcal{R}(I)$. Then $x^n \in I$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies that $x^n \in I_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and hence $x \in \mathcal{R}(I_i)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, i.e., $x \in \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}(I_i)$. Now, to obtain the other inclusion, let $z \in \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}(I_i)$. This implies that $z^{m_i} \in \mathcal{R}(I_i)$, where $m_i \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Choose $m = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{m_i\}$. Then $z^m \in I_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and hence $z \in \mathcal{R}(I)$. \square

THEOREM 2.3.3. — If P is a prime ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} and if P_1, \dots, P_n are P -primary ideals in \mathcal{Q} , then $P' = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n P_i$ is also a P -primary ideal in \mathcal{Q} .

Proof. — By Lemma 2.2.4(5) and Lemma 2.3.2, we have

$$\mathcal{R}(P') = \mathcal{R}\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n P_i\right) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}(P_i) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n P = P.$$

What remains for us to prove is that P' is a primary ideal. Let $x \& y \in P'$. Then $x \& y \in P_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. If $x \notin P_j$ for some j , then $y^m \in P_j$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, because P_j is a primary ideal. It follows that $y \in \mathcal{R}(P_j) = P$. Since $\mathcal{R}(P') = P$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $y^n \in P'$. \square

PROPOSITION 2.3.4. — Suppose P is a prime ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} , P' is a P -primary ideal, and x is an element in \mathcal{Q} . Then the following hold.

- (1) If $x \in P'$ then $(P' : x) = \mathcal{Q}$.
- (2) If $x \notin P'$, then $(P' : x)$ is a P -primary ideal.
- (3) If $x \notin P$, then $(P' : x) = P'$.

Proof. — (1) If $x \in P'$, then $x \& 1 = x \in P'$, and hence $1 \in (P' : x)$, implying that $(P' : x) = \mathcal{Q}$.

(2) Let $x \notin P'$. If $y \in (P' : x)$, then $x \& y \in P'$. Since P' is a primary ideal and $x \notin P'$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $y^n \in P'$. Hence $y \in \mathcal{R}(P') = P$. Therefore, we have $P' \preceq (P' : x) \preceq P$, implying that

$$P = \mathcal{R}(P') \preceq \mathcal{R}(P' : x) \preceq \mathcal{R}(P) = P.$$

Hence $\mathcal{R}(P' : x) = P$. It remains for us to show that $(P' : x)$ is a primary ideal. Since $x \notin P'$, we have $\top \notin (P' : x)$, so $(P' : x) \neq \mathcal{Q}$, i.e. is a proper ideal in \mathcal{Q} . Let $a \& b \in (P' : x)$. If $b^m \notin P'$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $b \notin \mathcal{R}(P' : x) = P$. However, $a \& b \& x \in P'$ implies that $a \& x \in P'$ or $b^k \in P'$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, because P' is a primary ideal. If $b^k \in P'$, then $b \in \mathcal{R}(P') = P$, a contradiction. Therefore, $a \& x \in P'$, implying that $a \in (P' : x)$ whence $(P' : x)$ is a primary ideal.

(3) Let $x \notin P$. If $y \notin P'$ and $x \& y \in P'$, then $x^n \in P'$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, because P' is a primary ideal. Therefore, $x \in \mathcal{R}(P') = P$, a contradiction. Hence $x \& y \notin P'$. This implies that $y \notin (P' : x)$. By Proposition 2.1.6(12), $P' \preceq (P : x)$, and this we have $P' = (P' : x)$. \square

DEFINITION 2.3.2. — A *primary decomposition* of an ideal I in a quantale \mathcal{Q} is an expression:

$$(2.3) \quad I = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n P_i,$$

where P_i are primary ideals in \mathcal{Q} . The expression (2.3) is said to be *minimal* if

- (1) $\mathcal{R}(P_1), \dots, \mathcal{R}(P_n)$ are distinct.
- (2) $\bigwedge_{j \neq i} P_j \not\subseteq P_i$, for all i .

If an ideal I in \mathcal{Q} has a primary decomposition, then we say that I is *decomposable*.

PROPOSITION 2.3.5. — A *primary decomposition may be replaced by a minimal primary decomposition*.

Proof. — Consider a primary decomposition $I = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n P_i$, where P_i are primary ideal in \mathcal{Q} . If

$$\mathcal{R}(P_{i_1}) = \dots = \mathcal{R}(P_{i_k}) = P,$$

then by Theorem 2.3.3, $P' = \bigwedge_{j=1}^k P_{i_j}$ is a P -primary ideal. Therefore, we can replace P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_k} by P' , and continue the process to guarantee that the condition (1) of Definition 2.3.2 holds. If condition (2) of Definition 2.3.2 does not hold, then we can eliminate ideals until it does hold, without changing the overall intersection. \square

While primary decompositions, or minimal primary decompositions, may not be unique, they possess certain uniqueness properties, which are outlined in the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.3.6. — Let I be a decomposable ideal in a quantale and $I = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n P_i$, a minimal primary decomposition. Let $P'_i = \mathcal{R}(P_i)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the set $\{P'_1, \dots, P'_n\}$ is composed of the prime ideals P of \mathcal{Q} such that $P = \mathcal{R}((I : x))$, for some $x \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Proof. — Suppose $x \in \mathcal{Q}$. By Proposition 2.1.6(16) and Lemma 2.3.2, we have

$$\mathcal{R}((I : x)) = \mathcal{R}\left(\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n P_i : x\right)\right) = \mathcal{R}\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n (P_i : x)\right) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}((P_i : x)).$$

From (1) and (2) of Proposition 2.3.4, we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}((I : x)) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}((P_i : x)) = \bigwedge_{i, x \notin P_i} P'_i.$$

If the intersection of a finite set of ideals is a prime ideal, then the intersection is equal to one of the ideals; thus, if $\mathcal{R}(I : x)$ is a prime ideal, then

$$\mathcal{R}((I : x)) \preceq \{P'_i \mid x \notin P_i\} \preceq \{P'_1, \dots, P'_n\}.$$

For the converse, let $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Because the primary decomposition is minimal, for each i , there exists $x_i \in \left(\bigwedge_{j \neq i} P_j\right) \neg P_i$. If $y \in (P_i : x_i)$, then $y \& x_i \in P_i$. Therefore,

$$y \& x_i \in P_i \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{j \neq i} P_j\right) = I,$$

which implies that $y \in (I : x_i)$. Hence

$$(P_i : x_i) \preceq (I : x_i) \preceq (P'_i : x_i),$$

where the second inclusion follows from the fact that $I \preceq P_i$. Therefore, $(P_i : x_i) = (I : x_i)$. By Proposition 2.3.4(2), we have

$$\mathcal{R}((I : x_i)) = \mathcal{R}((P_i : x_i)) = P'_i.$$

From this it follows that P'_i form the set of those ideals $\mathcal{R}((I : x))$ which are prime ideals in \mathcal{Q} . \square

Suppose I is a decomposable ideal and $I = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n P_i$, a minimal primary decomposition. Let us denote $\mathcal{R}(P_i) = P'_i$. We say that the prime ideals P'_1, \dots, P'_n belong to I . The minimal elements of the set $S = \{P'_1, \dots, P'_n\}$ with respect to inclusion are said to be *isolated* prime ideals belonging to I , and the others are called *embedded* prime ideals. Define

$$I^{\uparrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{Q}} = \{P \in \text{Spec } \mathcal{Q} \mid P \supseteq I\}.$$

We shall show that the minimal elements of the set S are the minimal elements of the set $I^{\uparrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{Q}}$. To obtain that, we need the following result.

PROPOSITION 2.3.7. — *Let I be a decomposable ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} , $I = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n P_i$ a minimal primary decomposition, with S the set of prime ideals belonging to I . If $P \in I^{\uparrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{Q}}$, then P contains an isolated prime ideal P'_j .*

Proof. — Set $P'_i = \mathcal{R}(P_i)$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Applying Lemma 2.3.2, we obtain

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^n P'_i = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}(P_i) = \mathcal{R}(I) \preceq \mathcal{R}(P) = P.$$

However, if a prime ideal contains an intersection of ideals, then at least one of the ideals in the intersection is contained in the prime ideal, therefore $P'_j \preceq P$, for some j . The result now follows. \square

COROLLARY 2.3.8. — *The isolated prime ideals are the minimal elements in $I^{\uparrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{Q}}$.*

Proof. — In Proposition 2.3.7, we have observed that $S \preceq I^{\uparrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{Q}}$, so a fortiori if P'_j is an isolated prime in S , then $P_j \in I^{\uparrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{Q}}$. Suppose now that $P \in I^{\uparrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{Q}}$, with $P \preceq P'_j$. From Proposition 2.3.7, it follows that there exists an isolated prime ideal $P'_k \preceq P$, so $P'_k \preceq P'_j$. Since P'_j is isolated, $P'_k = P'_j$, hence $P = P'_j$, and it follows that P'_j is minimal in $I^{\uparrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{Q}}$. \square

Although the primary ideals in different minimal decompositions of an ideal are not necessarily the same, the primary ideals whose radicals are isolated are the same. We aim now to establish this.

LEMMA 2.3.9. — *Let I be a decomposable ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} and P_j an ideal in a minimal decomposition of I such that $\mathcal{R}(P_j)$ is an isolated prime ideal. Then P_j is composed of the elements $a \in \mathcal{Q}$ for which there exists $b \notin \mathcal{R}(P_j)$ with $a \&b \in I$.*

Proof. — Suppose $I = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n P_i$ is a minimal decomposition, with $\mathcal{R}(P_j)$ isolated. We claim that $P_i \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}(P_j)$, for $i \neq j$. If possible, let $P_i \preceq \mathcal{R}(P_j)$ and let $x \in \mathcal{R}(P_i)$; then $x^n \in P_i$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which implies that there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x^{nm} \in P_j$, because $P_i \preceq \mathcal{R}(P_j)$, hence $x \in \mathcal{R}(P_j)$. It follows that $\mathcal{R}(P_i) \preceq \mathcal{R}(P_j)$, which is impossible, because $\mathcal{R}(P_j)$ is isolated. Thus $P_i \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}(P_j)$, as claimed.

Now let $a \in P_j$. From what we have just seen, for $i \neq j$, there exists $b_i \in P_i \setminus \mathcal{R}(P_j)$. Set $b = \prod_{i \neq j} b_i$. As $\mathcal{R}(P_j)$ is a prime ideal, we have $b \notin \mathcal{R}(P_j)$. However, $a \&b \in P_i$, for $i \neq j$, because $b_i \in P_i$. Also, given that $a \in P_j$, we also have $a \&b \in P_j$ and so

$$a \&b \in \bigwedge_{i=1}^n P_i = I.$$

Therefore, a is an element in \mathcal{Q} for which there exists $b \notin \mathcal{R}(P_j)$ with $a \&b \in I$. We now consider the converse. Suppose that $a \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $b \notin \mathcal{R}(P_j)$ are such that $a \&b \in I$. Since $I \preceq P_j$, we have $a \&b \in P_j$. As P_j is primary and $b^n \notin P_j$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we must have $a \in P_j$. This concludes the proof. \square

COROLLARY 2.3.10. — *If I is a decomposable ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} , then the primary ideals in a minimal decomposition of I corresponding to isolated prime ideals are uniquely determined.*

2.4. Irreducible and strongly irreducible ideals. — The concept of strongly irreducible ideals, originally known as primitive ideals, was introduced in [19] for commutative rings. In [8, p. 301, Exercise 34], these ideals are referred to as quasi-prime. The term “strongly irreducible” was initially employed for noncommutative rings in [7]. Strongly irreducible ideals (of rings) is significant both from algebraic and topological aspects. For the detail, we refer our reader to [2, 7, 13, 16].

DEFINITION 2.4.1. — Suppose \mathcal{Q} is a quantale.

- (1) An ideal I of \mathcal{Q} is called *irreducible* if $J \wedge J' = I$ implies that either $J = I$ or $J' = I$ for all $J, J' \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$.
- (2) An ideal I of \mathcal{Q} is called *strongly irreducible* if $J \wedge J' \preceq I$ implies that either $J \preceq I$ or $J' \preceq I$ for all $J, J' \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$.

We shall use the notation $\text{Irr}(\mathcal{Q})$ to represent the set of irreducible ideals in \mathcal{Q} and $\text{Irr}^+(\mathcal{Q})$ to denote the set of strongly irreducible ideals in \mathcal{Q} .

The following result gives an equivalent definition of a strongly irreducible ideal in terms of elements of a quantale, and it extends Proposition 7.33 of [22] and Theorem 20 of [7].

PROPOSITION 2.4.1. — *An ideal I in a quantale \mathcal{Q} is strongly irreducible if and only if for all $a, b \in \mathcal{Q}$ satisfy the condition: $\langle a \rangle \wedge \langle b \rangle \preceq I$ implies either $a \in I$ or $b \in I$.*

Proof. — Suppose that I is a strongly irreducible ideal in \mathcal{Q} and $\langle a \rangle \wedge \langle b \rangle \preceq I$ for some $a, b \in \mathcal{Q}$. Since I is strongly irreducible, we must have either $a \in \langle a \rangle \preceq I$ or $b \in \langle b \rangle \preceq I$. For the converse, suppose that I is an ideal in \mathcal{Q} that is not strongly irreducible. Then there are ideals J and K of \mathcal{Q} satisfy $J \wedge K \preceq I$, but $J \not\preceq I$ and $K \not\preceq I$. This implies there exist $j \in J$ and $k \in K$ such that $\langle j \rangle \wedge \langle k \rangle \preceq I$, but neither $j \in I$ nor $k \in I$, a contradiction. \square

In Theorem 2.2.10, it was noted that a radical ideal could be presented as the intersection of prime ideals that contain it. Now, we aim to illustrate in the next proposition that any proper ideal can be expressed in a comparable fashion, albeit utilizing irreducible ideals instead. This result extends Proposition 7.35 of [22]. However, prior to advancing further, we must establish a lemma.

LEMMA 2.4.2. — *Consider a quantale \mathcal{Q} . Assume that $\perp \neq x \in \mathcal{Q}$ and I is a proper ideal in \mathcal{Q} such that $x \notin I$. In this case, there exists an irreducible ideal J of \mathcal{Q} satisfying the conditions $I \preceq J$ and $x \notin J$.*

Proof. — Let $\{J_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be a chain of ideals in \mathcal{Q} such that $I \preceq J_\lambda$ and $x \notin J_\lambda$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then $I \preceq \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J_\lambda$ and $x \notin J_\lambda$, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. By Zorn's lemma, there exists a maximal element J of this chain. Suppose that $J = J_1 \wedge J_2$. By the maximality condition of J , we must have $x \in J_1$ and $x \in J_2$, and hence $x \in J_1 \wedge J_2 = J$, a contradiction. Therefore, J is the required irreducible ideal. \square

PROPOSITION 2.4.3. — *If I is a proper ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} , then $I = \bigwedge_{I \preceq J} \{J \mid J \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{Q})\}$.*

Proof. — By Lemma 2.4.2, there exists an irreducible ideal J of \mathcal{Q} such that $I \preceq J$. Let

$$J' = \bigwedge_{I \preceq J} \{J \mid J \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{Q})\}.$$

Then $I \preceq J'$. We claim that $J' = I$. If $J' \neq I$, then there exists an $x \in J' \setminus I$, and by Lemma 2.4.2, there exists an irreducible ideal J'' such that $x \notin J''$ and $I \preceq J''$, a contradiction. \square

In the context of a Noetherian ring, it is widely recognized that radicals can be expressed as a finite intersection of prime ideals. Expanding upon this idea, the following proposition extends this result to include any ideal by utilizing irreducible ideals. This result also extends Proposition 7.3 of [40]. We say a quantale *Noetherian* if every ascending chain of ideals eventually becomes stationary.

PROPOSITION 2.4.4. — *If \mathcal{Q} is a Noetherian quantale, then every ideal in \mathcal{Q} can be represented as the intersection of a finite number of irreducible ideals in \mathcal{Q} .*

Proof. — Suppose that

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ J \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{Q}) \mid J \neq \bigwedge_{j=1}^n I_j, I_j \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{Q}) \right\}.$$

It is sufficient to show that $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$. Since \mathcal{Q} is Noetherian, \mathcal{F} has a maximal element, say I . Since $I \in \mathcal{F}$, it is not a finite intersection of irreducible ideals in \mathcal{Q} . This implies that I is not irreducible. Hence, there are ideals J and K such that $I \preceq J$, $I \preceq K$, $I \neq J$, $I \neq K$, and $I = J \wedge K$. Since I is a maximal element of \mathcal{F} , we must have $J, K \notin \mathcal{F}$. Therefore, J and K are a finite intersection of irreducible ideals in \mathcal{Q} , which followingly implies that I is also a finite intersection of irreducible ideals in \mathcal{Q} , a contradiction. \square

The following proposition establishes the relationships between prime, semiprime, and strongly irreducible ideals, and it extends Proposition 7.36 of [22] and Theorem 2.1(i) of [2].

PROPOSITION 2.4.5. — *If P is a strongly irreducible ideal in \mathcal{Q} , then P is prime if and only if P is radical.*

Proof. — Notice that if P is prime, then obviously P is a radical ideal. For the converse, suppose that P is a radical ideal and $I \& J \preceq P$, for some $I, J \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Then

$$I \wedge J \preceq \mathcal{R}(I \wedge J) = \mathcal{R}(I \& J) \preceq \mathcal{R}(P) = P,$$

where the first inclusion and the first equality respectively follow from Lemma 2.2.4(1) and Lemma 2.2.4(5). Moreover, the second inclusion and the last equality respectively follow from Lemma 2.2.4(2) and the fact that P is a prime ideal. Since P is strongly irreducible, either $I \preceq P$ or $J \preceq P$. \square

In the context of commutative rings, it has been established (see [2, Theorem 2.1(ii)]) that every proper ideal is contained in a minimal strongly irreducible ideal. Remarkably, the same principle applies to strongly irreducible ideals in quantales.

PROPOSITION 2.4.6. — *Every proper ideal in a quantale is contained in a minimal strongly irreducible ideal.*

Proof. — Let I be a proper ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} and let

$$\mathcal{E} = \{J \mid I \preceq J, J \in \text{Irr}^+(\mathcal{Q})\}.$$

Note that every maximal ideal in \mathcal{Q} is prime and by Lemma 2.1.6(6), every prime ideal is strongly irreducible. Also, observe that by Theorem 2.1.9, every proper ideal is contained in a maximal ideal. Therefore, the set \mathcal{E} is nonempty. By Zorn's lemma, \mathcal{E} has a minimal element, which is our desired minimal strongly irreducible ideal. \square

The following result demonstrates the scenario in which all ideals in a quantale are strongly irreducible, and its proof is evident. This result extends Lemma 3.5 of [2].

PROPOSITION 2.4.7. — *Every ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} is strongly irreducible if and only if $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is totally ordered.*

We bring this subsection to a close with a theorem pertaining to arithmetic quantales, wherein the notions of irreducibility and strongly irreducibility align. The proof of this theorem is identical to that of [32, Theorem 3 and Theorem 7]

THEOREM 2.4.8. — *In an arithmetic quantale \mathcal{Q} , an ideal in \mathcal{Q} is irreducible if and only if it is strongly irreducible. Conversely, if an irreducible ideal in a quantale \mathcal{Q} is strongly irreducible, then \mathcal{Q} is arithmetic.*

COROLLARY 2.4.9. — *In an arithmetic quantale, any ideal is the intersection of all strongly irreducible ideals containing it.*

CONCLUDING REMARKS 2.4.10. — Building upon the framework of the “ideal theory of quantales” that we have begun to develop in this paper, we shall now provide a brief outline of our future work. In [24], our focus be on examining the properties of different ideals in relation to the quotient of a quantale. We shall also introduce the concept of localization for a quantale. Additionally, by considering modules over quantales, we shall extend some of the significant results in commutative algebra.

On the other hand, in [25], our objective be to establish lower topologies on distinguished classes of ideals in a quantale, and this extend the work done in [13] and [16] for rings. We shall investigate the topological properties of “quantale spaces,” including quasi-compactness, separation properties, connectedness, continuity, and spectral spaces (as defined in [30]). Specifically, we shall delve into the detailed

examination of quantale spaces associated with prime ideals, minimal prime ideals, maximal ideals, and strongly irreducible ideals in a quantale. These investigations respectively extend the work carried out in [27], [31], [42], and [2] for rings. Furthermore, we shall demonstrate that the quantale space of proper ideals is spectral, thereby generalizing the corresponding result presented in [23] for rings.

While our focus in this paper was on a commutative quantale with identity 1, it is worth noting that the developed theory can be further extended to a complete lattice $(L, \preceq, \perp, \top)$ equipped with an operation denoted as \odot that retains Axioms (1), (2), and (4) from Definition 2.1.1, as well as the condition:

$$x \odot (y \vee z) = (x \odot y) \vee (x \odot z),$$

for all x, y , and z in L .

The attentive reader may have observed that we have thus far assumed commutativity in our quantales. However, by relaxing the commutativity axiom, we naturally arrive at the concept of primitive ideals (as described in [34]) in quantales. In the forthcoming paper [26], our objective be to explore Jacobson's structure theory for quantales. Specifically, we shall formulate and prove the Jacobson-Cheveley Density Theorem for quantales. In line with [33], we shall also examine the Jacobson topology on the primitive ideals in a quantale.

References

- [1] D. D. Anderson, *Multiplicative lattices*, PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1974.
- [2] A. Azizi, Strongly irreducible ideals, *J. Aust. Math. Soc.*, 84 (2008), 145–154.
- [3] ——— and E. W. Johnson, Ideal theory in commutative semigroups, *Semigroup Forum*, 30 (1984), 127–158.
- [4] ———, C. Jayaram, and F. Alarcon, Some results on abstract commutative ideal theory, *Period. Math. Hungar.*, 30 (1995), 1–26.
- [5] A. Altman and S. Kleiman, A term of commutative algebra, *Worldwide center of mathematics, LLC*, 2013.
- [6] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald. *Introduction to commutative algebra*, Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- [7] R. L. Blair, Ideal lattices and the structure of rings, *Trans. the Amer. Math. Soc.*, 75 (1953), 136–153.
- [8] N. Bourbaki, *Elements of mathematics: Commutative Algebra*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1972.
- [9] R. G. Burton, Fractional elements in quantales, *Pacific J. Math.*, 56(1) (1975), 35–49.
- [10] F. B. Bergamaschi, A. O. Andrade, and R. H. N. Santiago, Prime ideals over noncommutative quantales, in Uncertainty modelling in knowledge engineering and decision making, 432–437 (2016), *World Scientific Proceedings Series on Computer Engineering and Information Science*.
- [11] R. P. Dilworth, Abstract commutative ideal theory, *Pacific J. Math.*, 12 (1962), 481–498.
- [12] ———, Abstract residuation over lattices, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 44 (1938), 262–268.
- [13] T. Dube and A. Goswami, Ideal spaces: An extension of structure spaces of rings, *J. Algebra Appl.*, (online) (2022).
- [14] M. Dickmann, N. Schwartz, and M. Tressel, *Spectral spaces*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2019.
- [15] A. Facchini, Algebraic structures from the point of view of complete multiplicative lattices, in *Algebra and coding theory*, 113–131, *Contemp. Math.*, 785, Amer. Math. Soc., 2023.
- [16] C. A. Finocchiaro, A. Goswami, and D. Spirito, Distinguished classes of ideal spaces and their topological properties, *Comm. Algebra*, 51(4), (2023), 1752–1760.
- [17] ———, C. A. Finocchiaro and G. Janelidze, Abstractly constructed prime spectra, *Algebra Universalis*, 83(8) (2022), 38 pp.
- [18] L. Fuchs, On primal ideals, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 1 (1950), 1–6.
- [19] ———, Über die Ideale arithmetischer Ringe, *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 23 (1949), 334–341.

- [20] ———, A condition under which an irreducible ideal is primary, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford*, 19 (1948), 235–237.
- [21] ———, W. Heinzer, and B. Olberding, Commutative ideal theory without finiteness conditions: primal ideals, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 357(7) (2004), 2771–2798.
- [22] J. S. Golan, *Semirings and their applications*, Springer, 1999.
- [23] A. Goswami, Proper spaces are spectral, *Appl. Gen. Topol.*, 24(1), (2023), 95–99.
- [24] ———, On ideals in quantales, II (in preparation).
- [25] ———, On ideals in quantales, III (in preparation).
- [26] ———, On primitive ideals in quantales (in preparation).
- [27] A. Grothendieck, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique I, Le langage des schémas*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math., No. 4., 1960.
- [28] G. Gierz, K. H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J. D. Lawson, M. Mislove, and D. S. Scott, *Continuous lattices and domains*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003.
- [29] D. Harris, Universal quasi-compact T_1 spaces, *General Topology and Appl.*, 3 (1973), 291–318.
- [30] M. Hochster, Prime ideal structure in commutative rings, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 142 (1969), 43–60.
- [31] M. Henriksen and M. Jerison, The space of minimal prime ideals in a commutative ring, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 115 (1965), 110–130.
- [32] K. Iséki, Ideal theory of semirings, *Proc. Japan. Acad.*, 32 (1956), 554–559.
- [33] N. Jacobson, *A topology for the set of primitive ideals in an arbitrary Novikov algebra*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sei. U.S.A., **31** (1945), 333–338.
- [34] ———, *Structure of rings*, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications, vol. 37, Providence, (1956)
- [35] W. Krull, *Idealtheorie*, Ergebnisse d. Math. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1935.
- [36] D. Kruml and J. Paseka, Algebraic and categorical aspects of quantales, in *Handbook of algebra*, vol. 5, Elsevier, 2008.
- [37] Q. Luo and G. Wang, Roughness and fuzziness in quantales, *Information sciences*, 271 (2014), 14–30.
- [38] D. J. Majcherek, *Multiplicative lattice versions of some results from Noetherian commutative rings*, PhD dissertation, University of California Riverside, 2014.
- [39] C. J. Mulvey, &, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2) Suppl.* No. 12 (1986), 99–104.
- [40] P. Nasehpour, Some remarks on ideals in commutative semirings, *Quasigroups and Related Systems*, 26 (2018), 281–298.
- [41] K. I. Rosenthal, *Quantales and their applications*, Pitman research notes in Math. No. 234, Longman, Scientific and Technical, 1990.
- [42] M. H. Stone, Applications of the theory of Boolean rings to general topology, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 41 (1937), 375–481.
- [43] S. Sarode and V. Joshi, \mathcal{X} -elements in multiplicative lattices—a generalization of J -ideals, n -ideals and r -ideals in rings, *Int. Electron. J. Algebra*, 32 (2022), 46–61.
- [44] M. Ward, Residuation in structures over which a multiplication is defined, *Duke Math. J.*, 3 (1937), 627–636.
- [45] ——— and R. P. Dilworth, Residuated lattices, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 45 (1939), 335–354.
- [46] L. Yang and L. Xu, Roughness in quantales, *Information sciences*, 220 (2013), 568–579.