Časopis pro pěstování matematiky

Ivan Chajda; Bohdan Zelinka

Compatible relations on algebras

Časopis pro pěstování matematiky, Vol. 100 (1975), No. 4, 355--360

Časopis pro pěstování matematiky, roč. 100 (1975), Praha

COMPATIBLE RELATIONS ON ALGEBRAS

IVAN CHAJDA, Přerov, and BOHDAN ZELINKA, Liberec

(Received May 8, 1974)

The concept of tolerance relation compatible with a given algebra is studied in [3], [4], [5]. A tolerance relation is (according to [1], [2]) a reflexive and symmetric binary relation. Here we shall extend the definition of compatibility onto relations which are not tolerances in general.

Let an algebra $\mathfrak{A} = \langle A, \mathscr{F} \rangle$ with finitary operations be given. (Here A denotes the set of elements of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathscr{F}$ denotes the set of operations.) Let ϱ be a binary relation on A. We say that ϱ is compatible with the algebra $\mathfrak{A}$, if and only if the following condition is satisfied: If $f \in \mathscr{F}$ is an n-ary operation (n is a positive integer), $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ are elements of A, $(x_i, y_i) \in \varrho$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, then $(f(x_1, \ldots, x_n), f(y_1, \ldots, y_n)) \in \varrho$.

We shall prove several theorems; some of them are generalizations of the results from [3] and [4]. When we speak about an algebra, we always mean an algebra in which all operations are finitary.

Even an empty relation on A can be considered a relation compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$. If ϱ is a binary relation on a set A, then by ϱ^* we denote the relation $\{(y, x) \mid x \in A, y \in A, (x, y) \in \varrho\}$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathfrak{A} = \langle A, \mathscr{F} \rangle$ be an algebra, let ϱ_1, ϱ_2 be two relations on A compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$. Then $\varrho_1 \cap \varrho_2$, ϱ^* are relations compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathscr{F}$ be an n-ary operation, let $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n$ be elements of A such that $(x_i, y_i) \in \varrho_1 \cap \varrho_2$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. As $(x_i, y_i) \in \varrho_1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we have $(f(x_1, \ldots, x_n), f(y_1, \ldots, y_n)) \in \varrho_1$. As $(x_i, y_i) \in \varrho_2$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we have $(f(x_1, \ldots, x_n), f(y_1, \ldots, y_n)) \in \varrho_2$. Thus $(f(x_1, \ldots, x_n), f(y_1, \ldots, y_n)) \in \varrho_1 \cap \varrho_2$ and $\varrho_1 \cap \varrho_2$ is a relation compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$. The assertion for ϱ^* is evident.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathfrak{A} = \langle A, \mathscr{F} \rangle$ be an algebra, let ϱ be a reflexive relation on A compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$. Then $\varrho \cap \varrho^*$ is a tolerance compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$.*

Proof. The reflexivity and the symmetry of $\varrho \cap \varrho^*$ is evident. Its compatibility with $\mathfrak{A}$ follows from Theorem 1.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathfrak{A} = \langle A, \mathscr{F} \rangle$ be an algebra, let ϱ be a reflexive and transitive relation (i.e. a quasi-ordering) on A compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$. Then $\varrho \cap \varrho^*$ is a congruence on $\mathfrak{A}$.*

Proof is analogous to that of Theorem 2.

Let the product $\varrho_1\varrho_2$ of two binary relations ϱ_1, ϱ_2 on the same set A be defined so that $(x, y) \in \varrho_1\varrho_2$ for $x \in A$, $y \in A$, if and only if there exists $z \in A$ such that $(x, z) \in \in \varrho_1$, $(z, y) \in \varrho_2$. We can define also the n-th power of a binary relation ϱ so that $\varrho^n = \varrho$ for $n = 1$ and $\varrho^n = \varrho\varrho^{n-1}$ for $n \geqq 2$.

It is easy to prove the following

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathfrak{A} = \langle A, \mathscr{F} \rangle$ be an algebra, let ϱ_1, ϱ_2 be two relations on A compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$. Then their product $\varrho_1\varrho_2$ is compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$.*

Now we shall prove

Theorem 5. *Let $\mathfrak{A} = \langle A, \mathscr{F} \rangle$ be an algebra, let $\{\varrho_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of compatible relations on $\mathfrak{A}$ such that $\varrho_j \subseteq \varrho_{j+1}$ for every positive integer j. Then $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \varrho_j = \varrho$ is compatible relation on $\mathfrak{A}$.*

Proof. Let $f \in F$ be an n-ary operation, let $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n$ be elements of A such that $(x_i, y_i) \in \varrho$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Then for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$ we have $(x_i, y_i) \in \varrho_{j(i)}$ for a positive integer $j(i)$. Let $j = \max_{1 \leqq i \leqq n} j(i)$. Then $(x_i, y_i) \in \varrho_j$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and thus $(f(x_1, \ldots, x_n), f(y_1, \ldots, y_n)) \in \varrho_j \subseteq \varrho$.

Theorem 6. *Let $\mathfrak{A} = \langle A, \mathscr{F} \rangle$ be an algebra, let ϱ be a reflexive relation on A compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$. Then the transitive hull ϱ_T of ϱ is compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$.*

Proof. We have $\varrho_T = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \varrho^j$. According to Theorem 4 the relation ϱ^j is compatible with A for every positive integer j. As ϱ is reflexive, we have $\varrho^j \subseteq \varrho^{j+1}$ for every positive integer j. Thus according to Theorem 5 the relation $\varrho_T = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \varrho^j$ is compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$.

Example 1. This example will show us that:

1) the reflexive hull and the symmetric hull of a relation compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$ need not be compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$;

2) the union of two relations compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$ need not be compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$.

Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be the semigroup with elements a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h given by the following Cayley table:

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
a	a	e	h	h	e	h	h	h
b	e	b	f	h	e	f	h	h
c	h	f	c	g	h	f	g	h
d	h	h	g	d	h	h	g	h
e	e	e	h	h	e	h	h	h
f	h	f	f	h	h	f	h	h
g	h	h	g	g	h	h	g	h
h	h	h	h	h	h	h	h	h

Let $\varrho = \{(a, c), (b, d), (e, g)\}$. This is a compatible relation on $\mathfrak{A}$. The reflexive hull ϱ_R of ϱ is not compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$; we have $(a, c) \in \varrho_R$, $(c, c) \in \varrho_R$, $ac = h$, $cc = c$, but $(h, c) \notin \varrho_R$. This is also an example that the union of two compatible relations on $\mathfrak{A}$ need not be a compatible relation on $\mathfrak{A}$, because the reflexive hull of ϱ is the union of ϱ and of the relation of equality on A which is evidently also compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$. Also the symmetric hull $\varrho \cup \varrho^* = \{(a, c), (c, a), (b, d), (d, b), (e, g), (g, e)\}$ is not compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$. We have $(a, c) \in \varrho \cup \varrho^*$, $(d, b) \in \varrho \cup \varrho^*$, $ad = h$, $cb = f$, but $(h, f) \notin \varrho \cup \varrho^*$.

Example 2. This example will show that the reflexivity of ϱ in Theorem 6 is substantial.

Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be the semigroup with elements a, b, c, d, e, f given by the following Cayley table:

	a	b	c	d	e	f
a	a	d	f	d	f	f
b	d	b	e	d	e	f
c	f	e	c	f	e	f
d	d	d	f	d	f	f
e	f	e	e	f	e	f
f	f	f	f	f	f	f

Let $\varrho = \{(a, b), (b, c), (d, e)\}$. This is a compatible relation on A, evidently not reflexive. The transitive hull of ϱ is $\varrho_T = \{(a, b), (b, c), (a, c), (d, e)\}$. We have $(a, b) \in \varrho_T$, $(a, c) \in \varrho_T$, $aa = a$, $bc = e$, but $(a, e) \notin \varrho_T$. Thus ϱ_T is not compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$.

Theorem 7. *Let $\mathfrak{A} = \langle A, \mathscr{F} \rangle$ be an algebra, let ϱ be a relation on A compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$. Let e be an idempotent element of $\mathfrak{A}$ (i.e. such an element that $f(e, e, \ldots, e) =$*

$= e$ *for each* $f \in \mathscr{F}$). *The set* A_e *of all elements* $x \in A$ *such that* $(e, x) \in \varrho$ *forms a subalgebra of* $\mathfrak{A}$.

Proof. For $i = 1, \ldots, n$ let $x_i \in A_e$, this means $(e, x_i) \in \varrho$. If $f \in F$ is an n-ary operation, then $(e, f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) = (f(e, \ldots, e), f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) \in \varrho$, because ϱ is compatible with $\mathfrak{A}$. This means $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in A_e$. As the elements $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and the operation f were chosen arbitrarily, A_e forms a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Corollary 1. *Let* L *be a lattice (or semilattice), let* ϱ *be a compatible relation on* L. *Then for each* $x \in L$ *the set* L_x *of all elements* $y \in L$ *such that* $(x, y) \in \varrho$ *forms a sublattice (or subsemilattice respectively) of* L.

Remark. Theorem 7 implies immediately Theorem 11 from [3].

Theorem 8. *Let* G *be a group, let* ϱ *be a compatible relation on* G. *Let* ϱ *be reflexive. The set* N *of all* $x \in G$ *satisfying* $(e, x) \in \varrho$ *is a normal subgroup of* G. (*The symbol* e *denotes the unit of* G.)

Proof. From Theorem 7 it follows that set N is a subgroup of G. Let $x \in N$, i.e. $(e, x) \in \varrho$. From the reflexivity of ϱ we obtain $(z, z) \in \varrho$ and $(z^{-1}, z^{-1}) \in \varrho$ for arbitrary $z \in G$. From the compatibility of ϱ we obtain finally $(e, z^{-1}xz) = (z^{-1}ez, z^{-1}xz) \in \varrho$, thus $z^{-1}xz \in N$. Therefore N is a normal subgroup of G.

Remark. In [4] it is proved that each compatible relation on a group which is reflexive and symmetric is also transitive, i.e., it is a congruence.

Theorem 9. *Let* G *be an involutory group (i.e.* $x^2 = e$ *for each* $x \in G$, *where* e *is the unit of* G), *let* ϱ *be a reflexive compatible relation on* G. *Then* ϱ *is a congruence relation on* G.

Proof. Let $(x, y) \in \varrho$ for $x \in G$, $y \in G$. From the reflexivity of ϱ we have $(x^{-1}, x^{-1}) \in \varrho$, $(y^{-1}, y^{-1}) \in \varrho$ and from the compatibility of ϱ we have $(e, x^{-1}y) = (x^{-1}x, x^{-1}y) \in \varrho$ and thus $(y^{-1}, x^{-1}) = (ey^{-1}, x^{-1}yy^{-1}) \in \varrho$. But G is an involutory group; this means $y^{-1} = y$, $x^{-1} = x$, thus $(x, y) \in \varrho$ implies $(y, x) \in \varrho$. By the theorem in [4] quoted in the above remark ϱ is a congruence on G.

Theorem 10. *Let* $L(\vee)$ *be a complete* $\vee$*-semilattice, let* ϱ *be a compatible relation on* $L(\vee)$. *Denote* $M(x) = \bigvee_{(x,y) \leqq \varrho} y$ *for* $x \in L(\vee)$. *The mapping* M *which assigns the element* $M(x)$ *to any* $x \in L(\vee)$ *is an isotone mapping of* $L(\vee)$ *into itself.*

Proof. Let $x \in L(\vee)$, let ϱ be a compatible relation on $L(\vee)$. The existence of $M(x)$ for each $x \in L(\vee)$ follows from the completeness of $L(\vee)$. Let $x \leqq y$, i.e. $x \vee y = y$. From the definition of $M(x)$ we have $(x, M(x)) \in \varrho$, $(y, M(y)) \in \varrho$ (because $L(\vee)$ is complete) and from the compatibility of ϱ we obtain $(x \vee y,$

$M(x) \vee M(y)) \in \varrho$ therefore $M(x) \vee M(y)$ is one factor in the join $\bigvee_{(x \vee y, z) \in \varrho} z =$ $= M(x \vee y)$. This means $M(x) \vee M(y) \leqq M(x \vee y)$. But $x \vee y = y$ and thus $M(x) \vee M(y) \leqq M(y)$, which means $M(x) \leqq M(y)$.

Corollary 2. *Let $L(\wedge)$ be a complete $\wedge$-semilattice, let ϱ be a compatible relation on $L(\wedge)$. Denote $m(x) = \bigwedge_{(x,y) \in \varrho} y$ for $x \in L(\wedge)$. The mapping m which assigns the element $m(x)$ to any $x \in L(\wedge)$ is an isotone mapping of $L(\wedge)$ into itself.*

Proof of Corollary 2 is dual to that of Theorem 10.

Corollary 3. *Let L be a complete lattice, let ϱ be a compatible relation on L. Let $M(x)$ and $m(x)$ be defined as in Theorem* 11 *and Corollary* 2. *The mappings $M : x \to M(x)$, $m : x \to m(x)$ are isotone mappings of L into itself.*

Theorem 11. *Let S be a semigroup, let ϱ be a compatible relation on S, let T be a subsemigroup of S. The set ϱT of all elements $x \in S$ such that $(x, x') \in \varrho$ for some $x' \in T$ is a subsemigroup of S.*

Proof. Let $x \in \varrho T$, $y \in \varrho T$. Then there exist elements $x' \in T$, $y' \in T$ such that $(x, x') \in$ $\in \varrho$, $(y, y') \in \varrho$. From the compatibility of ϱ we have $(xy, x'y') \in \varrho$. But $x'y' \in T$, because T is a subsemigroup of S, thus $xy \in \varrho T$ and ϱT is a subsemigroup of S.

Theorem 12. *Let S be a semigroup, let ϱ be a compatible relation on S. Let ϱ be reflexive. Let T be an ideal of S (right or left or two-sided). The set ϱT defined in Theorem* 11 *is an ideal of the semigroup S (right or left or two-sided, respectively).*

Proof. Let $x \in \varrho T$, let T be a left ideal of S. There exists $x' \in T$ such that $(x, x') \in \varrho$. Let $y \in S$; from the reflexivity of ϱ we have $(y, y) \in \varrho$. From $(x, x') \in \varrho$ and $(y, y) \in \varrho$ we obtain $(xy, x'y) \in \varrho$. But $x'y \in T$, because T is a left ideal of S. Therefore $xy \in \varrho T$ and ϱT is a left ideal of S. Analogously for right and two-sided ideals.

Theorem 13. *Let R be a ring, let ϱ be a compatible relation on R, let O be the zero element of R. Let ϱ be reflexive. The set R_0 of all $x \in R$ such that $(O, x) \in \varrho$ (or $(x, O) \in \varrho$) is an ideal of R.*

Proof follows immediately from Theorems 12, 8 and 1.

For a ring whose additive group is involutory, the assumption that ϱ is reflexive is unnecessary. We obtain

Corollary 4. *Let R be a ring whose additive group is involutory, let ϱ be a compatible relation on R. The set R_0 of all $x \in R$ for which $(O, x) \in \varrho$ (or $(x, O) \in \varrho$) holds (where O is the zero element of R) is a subring of the ring R.*

References

[1] *M. A. Arbib:* Tolerance Automata. Kybernetika *3* (1967), 223–233.

[2] *E. C. Zeeman:* The Topology of the Brain and Visual Perception. In: The Topology of 3-Manifolds. Ed. by M. K. Fort, pp. 240–256.

[3] *B. Zelinka:* Tolerance in Algebraic Structures. Czech. Math. J. *20* (1970), 179–183.

[4] *B. Zelinka:* Tolerance in Algebraic Structures II. Czech. Math. J. *25* (1975), 175–178.

[5] *I. Chajda* and *B. Zelinka:* Tolerance Relations in Lattices. Czech. Math. J. (to appear).

Authors' addresses: I. Chajda, 750 00 Přerov, tř. Lidových milicí 290, B. Zelinka, 461 17 Liberec 1, Komenského 2 (katedra matematiky VŠST).