CALCULUS OF MULTILINEAR DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS, OPERATOR $L_\infty$-ALGEBRAS AND IBL$_\infty$-ALGEBRAS
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ABSTRACT. Motivated by the study of deformations of Lie bialgebraic structures, we generalize the construction of the well-known big bracket of Lecomte–Roger to encompass the case of homotopy involutive Lie bialgebras. As a byproduct and a nontrivial technical tool, we propose a new systematic framework for working with collections of multilinear differential operators. This allows us to treat in a uniform way algebraic structures with operations being multilinear differential operators.
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The deformation complex of a Lie bialgebra $V$ admits a particularly simple description in terms of a certain graded Lie structure, known in the literature as the big bracket, supported on the shifted Grassmann algebra $\wedge^*(V \oplus V^*)$ [2], cf. [17, 18, 22, 24]. Geometrically, the latter can be identified with an odd Poisson bracket on the shifted cotangent bundle $T^*V[-1]$ and thus can be constructed from as little input data as a pairing between $V$ and $V^*$. One of the points of our interest for the present work is an analogous construction for a particular class of Lie bialgebras, namely involutive Lie bialgebras, characterized by an additional property of the form $[-,-] \circ \delta = 0$, where $[-,-]: V \otimes V \to V$ and $\delta: V \to V \otimes V$ are the bracket and the cobracket of a Lie bialgebra $V$ respectively. Some of the most notable examples of such algebras include the Goldman–Turaev Lie bialgebra on the vector space of non-trivial free homotopy classes of loops on an oriented surface [4] and, more generally, the Chas–Sullivan Lie bialgebra on the string homology of a compact oriented manifold [5]. Furthermore, as shown by K. Cieliebak and J. Latschev [3], the linearized homology of an augmented strongly homotopy Batalin–Vilkovisky algebra (or a $BV_{\infty}$-algebra), which is free as a strictly commutative algebra, comes equipped with an involutive Lie bialgebra structure. As an application, this gives rise to an involutive Lie bialgebra structure on the linearized contact homology of a closed contact manifold with respect to an exact symplectic filling.

The problem of devising an appropriate homotopy counterpart of involutive Lie bialgebras arises in context of the string field theory. While the classical (genus zero) open-closed string field theory is encoded by a certain splice of $A_\infty$ and $L_\infty$-algebras, comprising what is commonly known as the open-closed homotopy algebra [13], an enhanced structure - that of a homotopy involutive Lie bialgebra (or $IBL_{\infty}$-algebra) - is needed to set up the full BV master equation in the quantum case (arbitrary genus). As per general theory, constructing such a homotopy algebraic structure involves building a minimal resolution for the PROP of involutive Lie bialgebras. While that was accomplished by R. Campos, S. Merkulov and T. Willwacher [3], our motivation for the present work was to elucidate on a Lie-algebraic structure, akin to the big bracket, present on the corresponding deformation complex.

As it turns out, constructing such an analog of the big bracket subsumes bypassing a certain no-go result concerning differential-operator properties of Lie brackets. Namely, the well-known results of A. Kirillov [15] and J. Grabowski [10] state that given an algebra $A$ of smooth functions on a smooth manifold or, more generally, a reduced commutative ring $A$, and a Lie bracket $[-,-]: A \otimes A \to A$ that happens to be a differential operator of order $n < \infty$ with respect to each of the arguments, then the order $n$ cannot exceed 1, yielding, for instance, the classical case of Poisson or Jacobi structures.
One may attempt to overcome this by introducing nilpotents (thus considering infinitesimal deformations of Lie algebras), by relaxing the antisymmetry condition on the bracket (thus arriving to Leibniz-type algebras, cf. Example 73) or, as we undertake in the present work, by considering Lie brackets comprised as formal infinite series of bilinear differential operators of ongoingly increasing order

\[
[-, -] = [-, -]_1 + [-, -]_2 h + [-, -]_3 h^2 + \cdots.
\]

Formalizing the latter concept has lead us to a more general notion of a multilinear differential operator algebra, which in turn required extrapolating the basic notions of the differential calculus and D-modules from the realm of associative algebras to the case of operads. In particular, a sufficiently flexible analog of the notion of a filtration of an associative algebra for linear operads was deemed necessary. Indeed, one may recall that differential operators on a commutative \( k \)-algebra \( A \), where \( k \) is a field, are defined in terms of a filtration

\[
\text{Diff}^{-1}(A) := 0 \subset \text{Diff}^0(A) \subset \text{Diff}^1(A) \subset \cdots \subset \text{End}(A)
\]

of the linear endomorphism algebra \( \text{End}(A) \) compatible with the standard commutator bracket in the sense that

\[
[\text{Diff}^k(A), \text{Diff}^l(A)] \subset \text{Diff}^{k+l-1}(A), \quad k, l \geq 0.
\]

A proposed notion of a \textit{multifiltration} of a linear operad (cf. Definition 20) is meant to provide an \( n \)-ary analog of this concept. Specifically, it is defined in terms of a poset of \( k \)-linear subspaces of a given \( k \)-linear operad \( \mathcal{P} \) controlled by the combinatorics of integer-valued multiindices reflecting, in our case, the differential-operator orders of the individual inputs of a \( k \)-linear mapping \( O : A \otimes \cdots \otimes A \to A \). The corresponding combinatorial data is encoded by a certain set-valued operad \( MZ \), similarly to how \( \mathbb{Z} \)-graded filtrations of associative algebras are defined in terms of the monoid \( (\mathbb{Z}, +) \). It is worth noting that in this generalized \( n \)-ary setting the commutator bracket gets replaced by a double-indexed family of operadic commutators \([-, -]_{ij}\). A multilinear differential \textit{operator algebra} is then defined, just as in case of an ordinary algebra over an operad, in terms of a structure morphism into the endomorphism operad \( \mathcal{E}nd_A \) or \( \mathcal{E}nd_A[[h]] \), where \( h \) is a formal parameter, but this time both come equipped with some extra data in the form of differential operator multifiltrations.

Due to the specifics of the original problem, we pay a particular attention to the case of \textit{operator} \( L_\infty \)-algebras, the latter being \( L_\infty \)-algebras supported on (graded) commutative algebras and with the structure operations representable as formal infinite series of differential operators of certain orders. The big bracket and the IBL\(_\infty\)-algebras arise as particular examples of such algebras. We generalize the former by introducing the \textit{superbig} bracket. The term is meant to indicate that it ‘contains’ the big bracket while, as noticed by Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach, the big bracket itself produces several simpler brackets relevant for deformation theory. The interest is
further reinforced by Theorem 52 that singles out Lie-related operads as the ones satisfying a
certain minimality condition with respect to their multifiltrations.

We will call operads satisfying that minimal condition \textit{tight} operads. They are characterized
by the property that the axioms of their operator algebras are represented by operators of the
same type as their structure operations. Let us explain this phenomenon on the operad \textit{Lie}-
governing Lie algebras. Particular examples of operator Lie algebras are Poisson algebras which are,
by definition, Lie algebras supported on a commutative associative algebra \( A \), whose bracket
\( \{-, -\} : A \otimes A \to A \) is a derivation in each variable. It can easily be proved that then also the
Jacobiator \( \text{Jac} : A \otimes A \otimes A \to A \) of the bracket is a derivation in each of its three variables.

The analogous property does not hold e.g. for associative algebras. Having an associative
multiplication \( \ast : A \otimes A \to A \) which is a (first order) derivation in each variable, its associator
\( \text{Ass} : A \otimes A \otimes A \to A \) is an \textit{order two} derivation in its three variables. And, indeed, the operad \( \text{Ass} \) for associative algebras is not tight.

The property of tightness thus determines the nature of the related operator algebras. While
operator algebras over tight operads are easier to handle and admit nice structure theorems
and recursive constructions, algebras over operads that are not tight are much less friendly.
This is best illustrated by the highly nontrivial Kontsevich deformation quantization of Poisson
manifolds which is, in our terminology, a formal operator \( \text{Ass} \)-algebra.

\textbf{Layout of the paper}

The paper is divided into two parts. In Section 1 of Part 1 we collect some basic facts concern-
ing differential operators on commutative associative algebras. That section claims no original-
ity whatsoever, but we pay a particular attention to the non-unital setting, keeping in mind the
case of algebras of smooth functions with finite support on non-compact manifolds.

Section 2 features a proposed operadic framework for working with multilinear differential
operators, where the notion of a multifiltration of a \( k \)-linear operad is introduced. Particular
attention is paid to the case of \( D \)-multifiltrations that formalize the compositional properties of
multilinear differential operators. As the main technical tool to construct \( D \)-multifiltrations we
generalize the notion of a standard filtration of associative algebras to \( k \)-linear operads. Explicit
examples of standard multifiltrations are to be found in Section 3. Finally, in Section 4, operator
and a formal operator algebras are introduced and the first examples are given.

Part 2 systematically treats examples of concrete multilinear differential operator algebraic
structures. Sections 5 and 6 are devoted to operator \( L_\infty \)-algebras and their particular examples
– \( IBL_\infty \)-algebras, commutative \( BV_\infty \)-algebras, operator Lie algebras and Poisson algebras. In
Section 7 we formulate a couple of structure theorems for operator Lie algebras whose under-
lying algebra is free, having in mind the advent of the big and superbig bracket in Section 8.
The last section presents structures that do not fit exactly in the framework of this article, but which still deserve to be mentioned, since their structure operations are multilinear differential operators of specific orders. We cover in particular operator Leibniz algebras, double Poisson algebras, F-manifolds and Terilla’s quantization of the completed polynomial algebra. We tried to keep the second part of the paper as independent of the operadic lingo as possible.

Conventions. In our paper, \( \mathbb{k} \) will denote a field of characteristic 0. All algebraic objects will live in the symmetric monoidal category of graded \( \mathbb{k} \)-vector spaces. We will use the notation \( \uparrow V \), resp. \( \downarrow V \) for the suspension, resp. the desuspension, of a graded vector space \( V \), instead of the well established but poorly chosen \( V[-1] \) resp. \( V[1] \). By \( \Sigma_n \) we denote the symmetric group of \( n \) elements, and by \( 1_n \in \Sigma_n \) its unit. The Jacobiator, i.e. one side of the Jacobi identity in Lie algebras, is usually defined as
\[
\text{Jac}(a, b, c) = [a, [b, c]] + [b, [c, a]] + [c, [a, b]]
\]
while in the context of \( L_\infty \)-algebras the form
\[
\text{Jac}(a, b, c) = [[a, b], c] + [[b, c], a] + [[c, a], b]
\]
is preferred. Since the difference is only an overall sign which plays no rôle in our theory, we will freely use, depending on the context, both conventions.

Part 1. Calculus of (multi)linear differential operators

1. Higher order derivations and differential operators

In this section we present some necessary terminology and results concerning higher order differential operators and derivations. While standard citations \[19, 37, 11, 29, 31, 34\] assume the existence of a unit in the underlying algebra, we need to work in a nonunital setup. This requires particular care since some concepts of the unital case do not translate directly. The main results here are Propositions \[3, 5\] and \[6\]. Their proofs are given at the end of this section.

Throughout this section, we suppose that \( A \) is a graded commutative associative, not necessary unital, algebra and \( \nabla : A \to A \), possibly decorated with indices, a homogeneous linear map. As in \[29\], we define inductively, for each \( n \geq 1 \), the deviations \( \Phi^n_\nabla : A^\otimes n \to A \) by
\[
\begin{align*}
\Phi^1_\nabla(a) & := \nabla(a), \\
\Phi^2_\nabla(a, b) & := \nabla(ab) - \nabla(a)b - (-1)^{|\nabla||a|}a\nabla(b), \\
\vdots \\
\Phi^{n+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}) & := \Phi^n_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_n a_{n+1}) - \Phi^n_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_n) a_{n+1} \\
& \quad - (-1)^{|a_n||a_{n+1}|} \Phi^n_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}, a_{n+1}) a_n.
\end{align*}
\]
A non-inductive formula for $\Phi^n_V$ can be found in [29, page 373]. In statistics, $\Phi^{n+1}_V$ is called the $n$th infinitesimal cumulant of $\nabla$ with respect to the multiplication of $A$.

**Definition 1.** A linear map $\nabla : A \to A$ is a derivation of order $\leq r$ if $\Phi^{r+1}_V$ is identically zero. We denote by $\text{Der}^r(A)$, $r \geq 0$, the linear space of derivations of order $\leq r$.

Notice that $\text{Der}^0(A) = 0$ while $\text{Der}^1(A)$ is the space of usual derivations of the algebra $A$. It follows from [29] that if $\Phi^{r+1}_V$ identically vanishes, then so does $\Phi^{r+2}_V$, thus $\text{Der}^r(A) \subset \text{Der}^{r+1}(A)$. For homogeneous linear maps $\nabla_1, \nabla_2 : A \to A$ we denote, as usual, by

$$[\nabla_1, \nabla_2] := \nabla_1 \circ \nabla_2 - (-1)^{|\nabla_1||\nabla_2|} \nabla_2 \circ \nabla_1$$

their graded commutator.

**Definition 2.** The space $\text{Diff}^r(A)$, $r \geq 0$, of differential operators of order $\leq r$ is defined inductively as follows:

(i) $\text{Diff}^0(A) := \{ L_a : A \to A \mid a \in A \}$, where $L_a : x \mapsto ax$ is the operator of left multiplication by $a \in A$, and

(ii) $\text{Diff}^r(A) := \{ \nabla \mid [\nabla, L_a] \in \text{Diff}^{r-1}(A) \text{ for all } a \in A \}$, $r \geq 1$.

Furthermore, as a convenient convention we set $\text{Diff}^{-1}(A) := 0$. This is consistent with the above definition, since $[\nabla, L_a] = 0 \in \text{Diff}^{-1}(A)$ for any $\nabla \in \text{Diff}^0(A)$. To complete the picture, we recall still another definition of differential operators that can be found in the literature. It uses the derived $k$-linear mappings

$$\Psi^n_V(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) := \ldots[[[\nabla, L_{a_1}], L_{a_2}], \ldots L_{a_n}] : A \to A, \ a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A.$$ 

As a definition, we set $\Psi^0_V := \nabla$. In particular, the first few iterations read

$$\Psi^0_V(x) = \nabla(x),$$

$$\Psi^1_V(a)(x) = \nabla(a_1 x) - (-1)^{|a_1||\nabla|} a_1 \nabla(x),$$

$$\Psi^2_V(a_1, a_2)(x) = \nabla(a_1 a_2 x) - (-1)^{|a_1||\nabla|} a_1 \nabla(a_2 x)$$

$$- (-1)^{|a_2||\nabla|} a_2 \nabla(a_1 x) + (-1)^{|a_1| + |a_2||\nabla|} a_1 a_2 \nabla(x), \ &c.$$ 

For $r \geq -1$ we define

$$(2) \quad \text{Diff}^r(A) := \{ \nabla \mid \Psi^{r+1}_V(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1}) = 0 \text{ for all } a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1} \in A \}.$$

Below we formulate the main results of this section, Propositions 3, 5 and 6. Their proofs are to be found at the end of this section. The first one specifies the relation between the above three definitions.
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Proposition 3. For arbitrary \( r \geq 0 \), \( \text{Der}^r(A) \subset \text{Diff}^r(A) \subset \overline{\text{Diff}}^r(A) \). If \( A \) has a unit \( 1 \in A \), then \( \text{Diff}^r(A) = \overline{\text{Diff}}^r(A) \) and, moreover,

\[
\text{Der}^r(A) = \{ \nabla \in \text{Diff}^r(A) \mid \nabla(1) = 0 \}.
\]

Corollary 4. If \( A \) has a unit, then there exists a canonical isomorphism

\[
\text{Diff}^r(A) \cong \text{Der}^r(A) \oplus A, \quad r \geq 0.
\]

Proof. Notice that the operator of left multiplication \( L_a : A \to A \) belongs to \( \text{Diff}^r(A) \) for any \( r \geq 0 \). Thus \( \nabla - L_{\nabla(1)} \in \text{Diff}^r(A) \) and, since it clearly annihilates the unit, \( \nabla - L_{\nabla(1)} \in \text{Der}^r(A) \) by (3). Thus the correspondence

\[
\nabla \mapsto (\nabla - L_{\nabla(1)}) \oplus \nabla(1)
\]

defines a map \( \text{Diff}^r(A) \to \text{Der}^r(A) \oplus A \) whose inverse is given by \( \theta \oplus a \mapsto \theta + L_a \). \( \square \)

For subspaces \( S_1, S_2 \) of the space \( \text{Lin}_k(A, A) \) of \( k \)-linear endomorphisms \( A \to A \) denote

\[
S_1 \circ S_2 := \{ \nabla_1 \circ \nabla_2 \mid \nabla_1 \in S_1, \nabla_2 \in S_2 \}
\]

and \( [S_1, S_2] := \{ [\nabla_1, \nabla_2] \mid \nabla_1 \in S_1, \nabla_2 \in S_2 \} \).

One then has

Proposition 5. Under the above notation, the following inclusions hold for arbitrary \( m, n \geq 0 \):

\[
(i) \quad \text{Der}^m(A) \circ \text{Der}^n(A) \subset \text{Der}^{m+n}(A),
\]

\[
(ii) \quad \text{Diff}^m(A) \circ \text{Diff}^n(A) \subset \text{Diff}^{m+n}(A), \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
(iii) \quad \overline{\text{Diff}}^m(A) \circ \overline{\text{Diff}}^n(A) \subset \overline{\text{Diff}}^{m+n}(A).
\]

Likewise, for the graded commutators one has

\[
(iv) \quad [\text{Der}^m(A), \text{Der}^n(A)] \subset \text{Der}^{m+n-1}(A), \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
(v) \quad [\text{Diff}^m(A), \text{Diff}^n(A)] \subset \text{Diff}^{m+n-1}(A).
\]

Remark. Notice that, for a general non-unital algebra \( A \), the inclusion

\[
[\overline{\text{Diff}}^m(A), \overline{\text{Diff}}^n(A)] \subset \overline{\text{Diff}}^{m+n-1}(A)
\]

analogous to (iv) and (v) above, need not hold. As an example, take \( A \) to be a \( d \)-dimensional \( k \)-vector space with trivial multiplication. Then \( \Psi^1_{\nabla} = 0 \) for arbitrary \( \nabla \), so \( \overline{\text{Diff}}^0(A) \) is, by definition, the space of all linear endomorphisms \( A \to A \), i.e. the algebra of \( d \times d \) matrices \( M_d(k) \). If \( d \geq 2 \), \( M_d(k) \) is non-commutative, therefore

\[
0 \neq [M_d(k), M_d(k)] = [\overline{\text{Diff}}^0(A), \overline{\text{Diff}}^0(A)] \subsetneq \overline{\text{Diff}}^{-1}(A) = 0.
\]

The last of the main statements of this section is
Proposition 6. For a arbitrary $r \geq 0$, both $\text{Diff}^r(A)$ and $\overline{\text{Diff}}^r(A)$ are sub-bimodules of the space $\text{Lin}_k(A, A)$ of linear maps $A \to A$ with its natural $A$-$A$-bimodule structure

$$(b, \nabla) \mapsto L_b \circ \nabla, \quad (\nabla, b) \mapsto \nabla \circ L_b.$$  

Moreover, $\text{Der}^r(A)$ is a left submodule of $\text{Lin}_k(A, A)$ with respect to the action $(b, \nabla) \mapsto L_b \circ \nabla$.

Remark. The subspaces $\text{Der}^r(A) \subset \text{Lin}_k(A, A)$ are not, in general, right submodules with respect to the action $(\nabla, a) \mapsto \nabla \circ L_a$, not even when $A$ is unital. Assume, for instance, that $\nabla \in \text{Der}^1(A)$, i.e. that $\Phi^2_{\nabla} (a_1, a_2) = 0$ for each $a_1, a_2 \in A$. It is easy to check that then

$$\Phi^2_{\nabla \circ L_a} (a_1, a_2) = -\nabla(a) a_1 a_2.$$ 

Now take $A$ to be the polynomial ring $k[x]$, $\nabla := \frac{d}{dx}$ the standard derivation and $a \in k[x]$ any non-constant polynomial. While $\nabla \in \text{Der}^1(A)$, $\Phi^2_{\nabla \circ L_a} \neq 0$, so $\nabla \circ L_a \notin \text{Der}^1(A)$.

The relations between the various subspaces of $\text{Lin}_k(A, A)$ introduced above are summarized in the diagram

$$0 = \text{Der}^0(A) \hookrightarrow \text{Der}^1(A) \hookrightarrow \text{Der}^2(A) \hookrightarrow \cdots \hookrightarrow \text{Lin}_k(A, A)$$

in which the top row consists of inclusions of left $A$-modules and the remaining two rows of inclusions of $A$-$A$-bimodules. The vertical inclusions between the upper two rows are inclusions of left $A$-modules, the inclusions between the bottom ones are that of $A$-$A$-bimodules. If $A$ possesses a unit, the bottom two rows are isomorphic. The rest of this section is devoted to the proofs of the above propositions and necessary auxiliary results, some of them being of independent interest.

Convention. For clarity of formulas we assume that all objects are of degree 0. In the graded case, the formulas can easily be decorated by straightforward Koszul signs.

Let $R$ be a (noncommutative) ring and let $[x, y]$ denote the commutator $xy - yx$ for all $x, y \in R$. Then clearly

$$[x y, z] = x y z - z x y = x y z - x z y + x z y - z x y = x[y, z] + [x, z] y.$$ 

Applying this to $R = \text{Lin}_k(A, A)$ with the standard composition as the multiplication, $x = L_a$, $y = \nabla_1$ and $z = \nabla_2$, where $\nabla_1, \nabla_2$ are arbitrary $k$-linear endomorphisms of $A$, we get

$$(4a) \quad [\nabla_1 \circ \nabla_2 , L_a] = \nabla_1 \circ [\nabla_2 , L_a] + [\nabla_1 , L_a] \circ \nabla_2.$$
Similarly, for any \( \nabla \in \text{Lin}_k(A, A) \), \( a_1, a_2 \in A \),

\[
(4b) \quad [\nabla, L_{a_1} \circ L_{a_2}] = [\nabla, L_{a_1}] \circ L_{a_2} + L_{a_1} \circ [\nabla, L_{a_2}].
\]

Furthermore, the Jacobi identity for the commutator reads

\[
[ [\nabla_1, \nabla_2], \nabla_3 ] = [ [\nabla_1, \nabla_3], \nabla_2 ] - [ [\nabla_2, \nabla_3], \nabla_1 ].
\]

A simple formula

\[
(4c) \quad L_{a_1} \circ L_{a_2} = L_{a_1 a_2}
\]

that holds for any \( a_1, a_2 \in A \), will also be useful. We will also need the following supersimple

**Lemma 7.** Assume that \( A \) is unital. Then a map \( \Delta : A \rightarrow A \) commutes with the operator \( L_a \) of left multiplication for any \( a \in A \) if and only if it is itself an operator of left multiplication.

**Proof.** By definition, \( [\Delta, L_a] = 0 \) means that \( \Delta(a u) = a \Delta(u) \) for all \( u \in A \). Taking \( u = 1 \) gives \( \Delta(a) = a \Delta(1) = \Delta(1)a \), so \( \Delta \) is the operator of left multiplication by \( \Delta(1) \).

The following statement is also an easy observation.

**Lemma 8.** Assume that \( \nabla \in \text{Lin}_k(A, A) \) is such that \( \nabla(1) = 0 \). For each \( n \geq 1 \), \( \Phi^n_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = 0 \) if at least one of its variables equals \( 1 \).

**Proof.** The claim is obvious for \( n = 1 \). For \( n > 2 \) it follows from defining formulas (1) by simple induction.

For an associative commutative (unital or nonunital) algebra \( A \) denote by \( \tilde{A} \) the original algebra with an artificially added unit, i.e. \( \tilde{A} = A \oplus k \) as \( k \)-vector spaces, and the multiplication given by

\[
(a' \oplus \gamma')(a'' \oplus \gamma'') = (a' a'' + \gamma' a'' + \gamma'' a') \oplus (\gamma' \gamma'')
\]

for \( a', a'' \in A \), \( \gamma', \gamma'' \in k \). Notice that if \( A \) was unital, its unit does not coincide with the newly added unit \( \tilde{1} \) of \( \tilde{A} \). Lemma 8 will be used in the proof of

**Lemma 9.** Let \( \nabla \in \text{Lin}_k(A, A) \) and \( \tilde{\nabla} \in \text{Lin}_k(\tilde{A}, \tilde{A}) \) be its extension by \( \tilde{\nabla}(\tilde{1}) := 0 \). Then \( \nabla \in \text{Der}^r(A) \) if and only if \( \tilde{\nabla} \in \text{Der}^r(\tilde{A}) \).

**Proof.** If \( \nabla \in \text{Der}^r(A) \), \( \Phi_\nabla^{r+1} \) is identically zero by definition, and the same is true also for \( \Phi_\tilde{\nabla}^{r+1} \). Indeed, if all \( a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1} \) belong to \( A \), then

\[
\Phi_\nabla^{r+1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1}) = \Phi_\tilde{\nabla}^{r+1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1}) = 0
\]

since \( \nabla \in \text{Der}^r(A) \). If at least one of \( a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1} \) equals the added unit \( \tilde{1} \), then \( \Phi_\nabla^{r+1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1}) \) vanishes by Lemma 8. The opposite implication is clear, since the restriction of a differential operator to a subalgebra is a differential operator again.
The next lemma provides an inductive formula for iterated left multiplications of the same spirit as (1).

**Lemma 10.** For any \( n \geq 1 \) and any \( a_1, a_2 \ldots a_{n+1} \in A \),

\[
\Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}) = \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}a_{n+1}) - a_n \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}, a_{n+1}) - a_{n+1} \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}).
\]

**Proof.** First note that, by the noncommutative Leibniz identity (14), we have

\[
[\Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}), L_{a_n} \circ L_{a_{n+1}}] = [\Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}), L_{a_n}] \circ L_{a_{n+1}} + L_{a_n} \circ [\Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}), L_{a_{n+1}}] = \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}) \circ L_{a_{n+1}} + a_n \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}, a_{n+1}).
\]

Invoking (4c), we also have

\[
[\Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}), L_{a_n} \circ L_{a_{n+1}}] = [\Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}), L_{a_n}, a_{n+1}] = \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}a_{n+1})
\]

which, combined with the previous display, gives

\[
\Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}) \circ L_{a_{n+1}} = \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}a_{n+1}) - a_n \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}).
\]

Substituting this into

\[
\Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}) = [\Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}), L_{a_{n+1}}] = \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}) \circ L_{a_{n+1}} - L_{a_n} \circ [\Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}), a_{n+1}] = \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}) \circ L_{a_{n+1}} - a_n \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n})
\]

yields the required result. \( \square \)

**Corollary.** For any \( n \geq 1 \), \( \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}) \) is symmetric as a function of \( a_1, \ldots, a_{n} \in A \).

**Proof.** Induction on \( n \), using Lemma 10. \( \square \)

An intriguing and important relation between \( \Psi^n_{-1}, \Phi^n_{-1} \) and \( \Phi^{n+1}_{-1} \) is given in

**Proposition 11.** Let \( \nabla : A \to A \) be a \( k \)-linear mapping. Then, for \( n \geq 1 \) and any \( x, a_1, \ldots, a_{n} \in A \),

\[
(5) \quad \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n})(x) = \Phi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}, x) + x \Phi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}).
\]

**Proof.** For the base case \( n = 1 \), we have

\[
\Psi^1_{-1}(a)(x) = \nabla(ax) - a \nabla(x) = \nabla(ax) - a \nabla(x) - x \nabla(a) + x \nabla(a) = \Phi^2_{-1}(a, x) + x \Phi^1_{-1}(a).
\]

For \( n \geq 1 \), we begin by noting that, by definition,

\[
\Psi^{n+1}_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1})(x) = [\Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n}), L_{a_{n+1}}](x)
\]

\[
= \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n})(a_{n+1}x) - a_{n+1} \Psi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n})(x).
\]

By induction, the two terms in the right-hand side are equal to

\[
\Phi^{n+1}_{-1}(a_1, \ldots a_{n}, a_{n+1}x) + a_{n+1}x \Phi^n_{-1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n})
\]
and

\[-a_{n+1}\Phi^{n+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_n, x) - a_{n+1}x\Phi^0_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_n),\]

respectively. Hence,

\[\Psi^{n+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1})(x) = \Phi^{n+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_n, a_{n+1}x) - a_{n+1}\Phi^{n+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_n, x)\]

\[= \Phi^{n+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_n, a_{n+1}x) - a_{n+1}\Phi^{n+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_n, x)\]

\[-x\Phi^{n+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}) + x\Phi^{n+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1})\]

\[\text{by } (6) \quad \Phi^{n+2}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}, x) + x\Phi^{n+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1})\]

as desired. \(\square\)

Notice that (5) with \(x = 1\) combined with Lemma 8 gives the well-known equation

(6) \[\Psi^n_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_n)(1) = \Phi^n_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_n).\]

**Lemma 12.** Assume that \(\nabla : A \to A\) is a \(\mathbb{k}\)-linear mapping. Then \(\nabla \in \text{Diff}^r(A)\) for some \(r \geq 1\) if and only if, for arbitrary \(a_1, \ldots, a_r \in A,\)

(7a) \[\Psi^r_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in \text{Diff}^0(A).\]

If \(A\) is unital, the above condition is equivalent to

(7b) \[\Psi^{r+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1}) = 0\]

for any \(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1} \in A.\)

**Proof.** Let \(\nabla \in \text{Diff}^r(A).\) Then, as it follows directly from the definition, for any \(0 < k \leq r + 1\) and \(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k \in A,\)

\[\Psi^k_\nabla(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k) = [\ldots[[\nabla, L_{a_1}], L_{a_2}], \ldots, L_{a_k}] \in \text{Diff}^{r-k}(A).\]

This with \(r = k\) gives (7a).

To get the converse direction, consider first the base case \(r = 1.\) Namely, let \(\nabla : A \to A\) be such that for any \(a \in A,\) \(\Psi^1_\nabla(a) = [\nabla, L_a] \in \text{Diff}^0(A).\) Then \(\nabla\) is a differential operator of order one by its very definition.

Now, let \(r > 1\) and \(\nabla\) be such that \(\Psi^r_\nabla(a, a_1, \ldots, a_{r-1}) \in \text{Diff}^0(A)\) for any \(a, a_1, \ldots, a_{r-1} \in A.\) We have

\[\Psi^{r-1}_\nabla[L_a\nabla](a_1, \ldots, a_{r-1}) = \Psi^r_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_{r-1}, a) \in \text{Diff}^0(A).\]

Then, by induction, \([\nabla, L_a] \in \text{Diff}^{r-1}(A).\) Hence, \(\nabla \in \text{Diff}^r(A)\) which finishes the proof of the first part of the lemma.

Let us move to the second part assuming that \(A\) is unital. If \(\nabla \in \text{Diff}^r(A),\) we already know that \(\Psi^r_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in \text{Diff}^0(A).\) Since \([\Delta, L_a] = 0\) for any \(\Delta \in \text{Diff}^0(A)\) and \(a \in A,\)

\[\Psi^{r+1}_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1}) = [\Psi^r_\nabla(a_1, \ldots, a_r), L_{a_{r+1}}] = 0,\]
which is (7a).

On the other hand, the vanishing (7b) means that \( \Psi'_V(a_1, \ldots, a_{r-1}) \) commutes with the operator \( L_a \) for any \( a \in A \) so it is, by Lemma 4, an operator of left multiplication, i.e. (7a) holds. Thus \( \nabla \in \text{Diff}^r(A) \) by the first part of the lemma. \( \square \)

**Remark.** Note that, without the unitality assumption on \( A \), the statement of the second part of Lemma 2 is false. Indeed, let \( A \) be a vector space with trivial multiplication. Since the operators of left multiplication are trivial as well, \( \Psi'_V(a) = [\nabla, L_a] = 0 \) for any \( a \in A \) and \( \nabla : A \to A \), yet \( \nabla \) is a differential operator in \( \text{Diff}^0(A) \) as per Definition 2 only if \( \nabla = 0 \).

**Proof of Proposition 3.** As in the proof of the first part of Lemma 2, we inductively establish that \( \nabla \in \overline{\text{Diff}}^r(A) \) if and only if \( \Psi'^{r+1}_V(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1}) = 0 \) for each \( a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1} \in A \). If \( \nabla \in \text{Diff}^r(A) \), \( \Psi'^r_*(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in \text{Diff}^0(A) \) by (7a), so

\[
\Psi'^{r+1}_V(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1}) = [\Psi'_V(a_1, \ldots, a_r), L_{a_{r+1}}] = 0,
\]

thus \( \nabla \in \overline{\text{Diff}}^r(A) \). This proves the inclusion \( \text{Diff}^r(A) \subseteq \overline{\text{Diff}}^r(A) \).

Assume that \( \nabla \in \text{Der}^r(A) \). By definition, \( \Phi'^{r+1}_V(a_1, \ldots, a_r, x) = 0 \) for arbitrary \( a_1, \ldots, a_r, x \) so, by (5) with \( n = r \),

\[
\Psi'_V(a_1, \ldots, a_r)(x) = \Phi'_V(a_1, \ldots, a_r)(x).
\]

Thus \( \Psi'_V(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \) is the operator of left multiplication by \( \Phi'_V(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in A \), meaning that

\[
\Psi'_V(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in \text{Diff}^0(A)
\]

thus \( \nabla \in \text{Diff}^r(A) \) by Lemma 2. Therefore \( \text{Der}^r(A) \subseteq \text{Diff}^r(A) \), finishing the proof of the first part of the proposition.

Assume that \( A \) has a unit. By Lemma 4, \( \Psi'_V(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \) commutes with the operator \( L_a \) for any \( a \in A \) if and only if it is an operator of left multiplication. This proves that \( \text{Diff}^r(A) = \overline{\text{Diff}}^r(A) \).

Let \( \nabla \in \text{Diff}^r(A) \) be such that \( \nabla(1) = 0 \). By (6), if \( \Psi^{r+1}_V(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1}) \) vanishes, and so does \( \Phi^{r+1}_V(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1}) \). Thus \( \nabla \in \text{Der}^r(A) \).

On the other hand, if \( \nabla \in \text{Der}^r(A) \), \( \Phi^{r+1}_V \) vanishes by definition, and so does \( \Psi^{r+1}_V(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1}) \) for all \( a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1} \) by (5) with \( n = r + 1 \). Therefore \( \nabla \in \text{Diff}^r(A) \). It remains to prove that \( \nabla(1) = 0 \). Taking \( a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = 1 \) in (6) gives

\[
(8) \quad \Phi'_V(1, \ldots, 1) = -\Phi'^{n+1}_V(1, \ldots, 1)
\]

for any \( n \geq 1 \). Since \( \nabla \) is a derivation of order \( \leq r \), \( \Phi'^{r+1}_V(1, \ldots, 1) = 0 \) thus \( \Phi'_V(1) = \nabla(1) = 0 \) by iterating (6). This finishes the proof. \( \square \)
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**Proof of Proposition** 5. We start by proving item (ii), by induction on \( m+n \). Let \( \nabla_1 \) and \( \nabla_2 \) belong to \( \text{Diff}^0(A) \) which by definition means that they are both operators of left multiplication. By (1C), their composition \( \nabla_1 \circ \nabla_2 \) is an operator of left multiplication as well, so \( \nabla_1 \circ \nabla_2 \in \text{Diff}^0(A) \).

Suppose that (ii) been established for all \( m+n \leq k \). Consider the case \( m+n = k+1 \). For any \( a \in A \), in equation (1A), \( [\nabla_1, L_a] \) is of order \( < m - 1 \) and \( [\nabla_2, L_a] \) is of order \( < n - 1 \). Then by the inductive assumption, each of the summands, and hence the left hand side of (1A), is a differential operator of order \( < m + n - 1 \), thus \( \nabla_1 \circ \nabla_2 \) is of order \( < m + n \), as desired.

The proof of (iii) differs from that of (ii) only in the first inductive step. If \( \nabla_1, \nabla_2 \in \text{Diff}^0(A) \), by definition, for any \( a \in A \), we have \( [\nabla_1, L_a] = [\nabla_2, L_a] = 0 \). Hence, by (1A), \( [\nabla_1 \circ \nabla_2, L_a] = 0 \), and thus \( \nabla_1 \circ \nabla_2 \in \text{Diff}^0(A) \). We then proceed inductively as before.

It follows from (1) combined with already proven cases that (i) holds for derivations annihilating the unit of an unital algebra. Let \( A \) be an arbitrary, not necessarily unital, algebra, and \( \nabla_1, \nabla_2 \) derivations of orders \( < m \) and \( < n \), respectively. Their extensions \( \tilde{\nabla}_1, \tilde{\nabla}_2 \) to the unital algebra \( \tilde{A} \) are derivations of the same respective orders by Lemma 9, so \( \tilde{\nabla}_1 \circ \tilde{\nabla}_2 \) is a derivation of order \( < m + n \) by the above reasoning related to the unital case. Notice that the composition \( \tilde{\nabla}_1 \circ \tilde{\nabla}_2 \) annihilates the unit \( 1 \) of \( \tilde{A} \) and extends \( \nabla_1 \circ \nabla_2 \), so the later is a derivation of order \( < m + n \) by Lemma 9 again.

The proof of the remaining items is similar except that instead of (1A) we use the Jacobi identity (1D). Let us prove (v) by induction on \( m+n \). The base case is \( m = n = 0 \) when \( \nabla_1 = L_a, \nabla_2 = L_b \) for some \( a, b \in A \). Then \( [\nabla_1, \nabla_2] = [L_a, L_b] = 0 \) as expected.

Suppose that the statement has been established for \( m+n \leq k \). Consider the case \( m+n = k+1 \). In (1B), \( [L_a, \nabla_1] \) is of order \( \leq m - 1 \) and \( [L_a, \nabla_2] \) is of order \( \leq n - 1 \). Then by the inductive assumption, each of the summands, and hence the left hand side of (1B), is a differential operator of order \( \leq m + n - 2 \). Thus \( [\nabla_1, \nabla_2] \) is of order \( \leq m + n - 1 \), as desired. Item (iv) can be easily derived from (v) by the extension trick employed in the proof of (i).

**Proof of Proposition** 6. The invariance of all spaces with respect to the left action follows from the obvious equations

\[
\Phi^n_{L_b \circ \nabla} = b \cdot \Phi^n_{\nabla}, \quad \Psi^n_{L_b \circ \nabla} = b \cdot \Psi^n_{\nabla}, \quad b \in A,
\]

and (1C) which proves the invariance of \( \text{Diff}^0(A) \). The invariance under the right action can be proved inductively, using the equation

\[
[\nabla \circ L_b, L_a] = \nabla \circ [L_b, L_a] + [\nabla, L_a] \circ L_b = [\nabla, L_a] \circ L_b.
\]

The details can be safely left to the reader.
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2. Multitude of multilinear differential operators

The section proposes a framework for dealing with algebraic structures, whose operations are represented by multilinear differential operators. We ought to warn the reader that the term ‘operator algebra’ that we are about to introduce is a shortcut for a ‘multilinear differential operator algebra’ and is not directly related to the homonymous, but more elaborate, functional analytic concept.

In the rest of the first part we need the language of operads. The standard references for operads are [33, 30] or more recent [26]. All operads in the rest of this article will be unital, \( k \)-linear and connected, meaning that \( P(0) = 0 \).

2.1. Filtrations of algebras. In this subsection we recall some notions related to filtrations of associative algebras. In the next subsection we extrapolate them to \( k \)-linear operads. Recall that an increasing \( \mathbb{Z} \)-filtration \( \{F_i A\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \) on an associative \( k \)-linear algebra \( A \) is a collection of \( k \)-subspaces

\[
\cdots \subseteq F_{-1} A \subseteq F_0 A \subseteq F_1 A \subseteq F_2 A \subseteq \cdots \subseteq A
\]

such that \( F_i A \cdot F_j A \subseteq F_{i+j-1} A \) for all \( i, j \in \mathbb{Z} \). If \( A \) is unital, we moreover assume that its unit belongs to \( F_0 A \). All filtrations on \( A \) are naturally ordered by the componentwise inclusion and form a poset \( \text{Filt}(A) \).

An additional requirement that \( [F_i A, F_j A] \subseteq F_{i+j-1} A \) for all \( i, j \in \mathbb{Z} \) characterizes almost commutative algebras. Note that such a condition implies in particular that \( F_1 A \) with the commutator bracket is a Lie algebra. The following standard example is of particular relevance for us.

Example 13. Let \( C \) be a commutative associative \( k \)-algebra and \( A := \text{End}(C) \) be the associative algebra of \( k \)-linear endomorphisms of \( C \) with the multiplication given by the usual composition of linear maps. Proposition\ref{prop:1} implies that the subspaces

\[
F_k A := \text{Diff}^k(C) = \{ O : C \to C \mid O \text{ is a differential operator of order } \leq k \}, \ k \in \mathbb{Z}
\]
or, alternatively,

\[
F_k A := \text{Der}^k(A)(C) = \{ O : C \to C \mid O \text{ is a derivation of order } \leq k \}, \ k \in \mathbb{Z}
\]

comprise well-defined filtrations of \( A \) and furthermore indicate that \( A \) is almost commutative.

Example 14. Given a Lie algebra \( \mathfrak{g} \), the monomial degrees inherited by the universal enveloping algebra \( A = U(\mathfrak{g}) \) from the tensor algebra \( T(\mathfrak{g}) \) induce a filtration \( F_k A := \{ p \in A \mid \deg p \leq k \} \) that enjoys the following additional properties:

(i) \( [F_i A, F_j A] \subseteq F_{i+j-1} A \) for all \( i, j \in \mathbb{Z} \). That is, \( U(\mathfrak{g}) \) is almost commutative.

(ii) The space \( \mathfrak{g} \) of generators is a subset of \( F_1 A \), and
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(iii) \( F_iA \cdot F_iA = F_{i+1}A \) for all \( i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \).

One may find it instructive to consider the special case of \( \mathfrak{g} \) being the free Lie algebra \( \mathfrak{L}(E) \) on a generator space \( E \), in which case \( U(\mathfrak{L}(E)) \cong T(E) \). The filtration \( \{F_iT(E)\}_{i \geq 0} \) of \( T(E) \) obtained in this way is evidently different from the canonical filtration of \( T(E) \) by the monomial degrees. The following construction is a useful generalization of the filtration of Example \([14]\).

**Example 15.** Let \( A \) be an associative unital \( \mathbb{k} \)-algebra. Then the choice of a generating set \( S \) for \( A \) induces a filtration on \( A \) by inductively setting \( F_0A := \mathbb{k}, F_1A := \mathbb{k} + E, \) where \( E := \text{Span}(S) \), and \( F_kA := F_{k-1}A \cdot F_1A \) for all \( k > 1 \).

**Example 16.** Consider the tensor algebra \( T(E) \) on the graded generator space \( E = \text{Span}(\Delta) \) with \( \Delta \) being of an odd degree. If \( \{F_p T(E)\}_{p \geq 0} \) is the filtration of \( T(E) \) as per Example \([14]\) and \( \{T^q(E)\}_{q \geq 0} \) is the standard grading of the same algebra by the monomial degrees, then

\[
F_p T(E) = \bigoplus_{k \leq p} T^{2k}(E).
\]

Interpreting the associative unital algebra \( \mathcal{D}g := T(E)/(\Delta^2) \) as an operad concentrated in arity one, \( \mathcal{D}g \)-algebras are differential graded (dg) vector spaces.

An index-free description of the filtration data can be obtained as follows. Given a vector space \( A \), let \( \text{Sub}(A) \) denote the modular lattice of all linear subspaces \( V \subset A \) with the meet and the join operations being the subspace intersection and the subspace sum respectively. As a poset, \( \text{Sub}(A) \) carries a natural category structure. Assume now that \( A \) is equipped with a \( \mathbb{k} \)-bilinear operation \( \vartheta : A \otimes A \rightarrow A \). For \( V', V'' \in \text{Sub}(A) \) define

\[
\vartheta(V', V'') := \{\vartheta(v', v'') \in A \mid v' \in V', v'' \in V''\} \in \text{Sub}(A).
\]

**Lemma 17.** The assignment \( V', V'' \rightarrow \vartheta(V', V'') \) defines a functor (denoted by the same symbol)

\[
\vartheta : \text{Sub}(V) \times \text{Sub}(V) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(V).
\]

We omit an elementary verification and note that the obvious analog of Lemma \([17]\) holds also for arbitrary multilinear maps \( \vartheta : A^{\otimes n} \rightarrow A \).

**Example 18.** Let \( A \) be a unital associative algebra. Its multiplication \( \cdot : A \otimes A \rightarrow A \) induces on \( \text{Sub}(A) \) a monoid structure in the cartesian category \( \text{Cat} \) of small categories, whose unit is \( \text{Span}(e) \), the linear span of the algebra unit \( e \in A \). Likewise, the graded commutator bracket \([-, -] : A \otimes A \rightarrow A \) given by \([a', a''] := a' \cdot a'' - (-1)^{|a'||a''|} a'' \cdot a'\) induces a symmetric bifunctor (denoted by the same symbol) \([-, -] : \text{Sub}(A) \times \text{Sub}(A) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(A)\).
Let \( \mathbb{Z} \) be the integers, \(+ : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}\) the standard addition and \([-,-] : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}\) the operation given by \([p,q] := p + q - 1\) for \(p,q \in \mathbb{Z}\). If we consider \( \mathbb{Z} \) as a small category with the category structure given by its standard order, then \((\mathbb{Z},+)\) and \((\mathbb{Z},[-,-])\) are commutative monoids in \(\text{Cat}\), with the units being 0 and 1 respectively. The following proposition refers to the structures introduced in Example [8].

**Proposition 19.** Let \( \mathcal{A} \) be a unital associative algebra. A functor \( \mathcal{F} : \mathbb{Z} \to \text{Sub}(\mathcal{A})\) which is a lax monoidal morphism \((\mathbb{Z},+) \to (\text{Sub}(\mathcal{A}),\cdot)\) and simultaneously a lax magma morphism \((\mathbb{Z},[-,-]) \to (\text{Sub}(\mathcal{A}),[-,-])\) is the same as a \(\mathbb{Z}\)-filtration

\[
\cdots \subseteq F_{-1} \mathcal{A} \subseteq F_0 \mathcal{A} \subseteq F_1 \mathcal{A} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathcal{A}
\]

of \( \mathcal{A} \) such that \([F_p \mathcal{A}, F_q \mathcal{A}] \subseteq F_{p+q-1} \mathcal{A}\).

**Proof.** Given such a functor \( \mathcal{F} : \mathbb{Z} \to \text{Sub}(\mathcal{A})\), let us denote \(F_p \mathcal{A} := \mathcal{F}(p), p \in \mathbb{Z}\). The functoriality of \( \mathcal{F} \) is equivalent to \(F_p \mathcal{A} \subseteq F_q \mathcal{A}\) whenever \(p \leq q\). Furthermore, for \( \mathcal{F} \) to be a lax morphism \((\mathbb{Z},+) \to (\text{Sub}(\mathcal{A}),\cdot)\) means, by definition, the existence of natural morphisms

\[
\mathcal{F}(p) \cdot \mathcal{F}(q) \to \mathcal{F}(p+q), \quad p, q \in \mathbb{Z}
\]

and \(\mathcal{F}((\text{Span}(e)) \to \mathcal{F}(0)\)

in \(\text{Sub}(\mathcal{A})\). In terms of the filtration determined by \( \mathcal{F} \) it means that \(F_p \mathcal{A} \cdot F_q \mathcal{A} \subseteq F_{p+q} \mathcal{A}\) and \(e \in F_0 \mathcal{A}\). By the same argument we verify that \( \mathcal{F} \) is a lax morphism \((\mathbb{Z},[-,-]) \to (\text{Sub}(\mathcal{A}),[-,-])\) if and only if \([F_p \mathcal{A}, F_q \mathcal{A}] \subseteq F_{p+q-1} \mathcal{A}\). \(\square\)

2.2. **Mulfiltrations of operads.** We are going to generalize the notions recalled in the previous subsection to \(\kappa\)-linear operads. Given such an operad \( \mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{n \geq 1}\), the rôle of the poset \(\text{Sub}(\mathcal{A})\) will be played by the collection \(\text{Sub}(\mathcal{P}) := \{\text{Sub}(\mathcal{P}(n))\}_{n \geq 1}\) of subspaces of \(\mathcal{P}(n)\) with the componentwise poset structure. Analogously to the case of associative algebras, the structure operations

\[
\circ_i : \mathcal{P}(m) \times \mathcal{P}(n) \to \mathcal{P}(m+n-1), \quad n \geq 1, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m,
\]

with the symmetric group action make \(\text{Sub}(\mathcal{P})\) an operad in \(\text{Cat}\) with unit \(\text{Span}(e) \in \text{Sub}(\mathcal{P})(1)\), \(e \in \mathcal{P}(1)\) being the unit of \(\mathcal{P}\).

In analogy with the associative algebra case, operadic compositions (9a) induce a family of commutators:

\[
[-, -]_{ij} : \mathcal{P}(m) \times \mathcal{P}(n) \to \mathcal{P}(m+n-1), \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n,
\]

Namely, for \(a \in \mathcal{P}(m)\) and \(b \in \mathcal{P}(n)\), we set

\[
[a,b]_{ij} := (a \circ_i b) \cdot (\tau_{i-1,j-1} \times \cdot 1_{m+n-i-j+1}) - (-1)^{|a||b|} (b \circ_j a) \cdot (\cdot 1_{i+j-1} \times \cdot \tau_{m-i,n-j}),
\]

where \(\tau_{i-1,j-1} \times \cdot 1_{m+n+i+j+1} \in \Sigma_{m+n-1}\) is the permutation that exchanges the first \(i-1\) symbols with the next \(j-1\) symbols and leaves the remaining symbols unchanged, while \(\cdot 1_{i+j-1} \times \cdot \tau_{m-j,n-i}\) [August 24, 2021]
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The operadic commutator \([a, b]_{i j}\) has an analogous similar meaning, cf. Figure 1 for a flow diagram illustrating the idea of \([a, b]_{i j}\). By Lemma 17, operations (10) induce bifunctors (denoted by the same symbol)

\[
[-, -]_{i j} : \text{Sub}(\mathcal{P}(m)) \times \text{Sub}(\mathcal{P}(n)) \to \text{Sub}(\mathcal{P}(m + n - 1)), 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n.
\]

Filtrations of associative algebras are described using the ordered monoid of integers \(\mathbb{Z}\). Similarly, filtrations of operads are to be controlled via a collection \(M\mathbb{Z} = \{M\mathbb{Z}(n)\}_{n \geq 1}\) of posets of multiindices with a certain additional operadic structure. Specifically, the \(n\)th component

\[
M\mathbb{Z}(n) := \{ (p_1, \ldots, p_n) \mid p_i \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq i \leq n \},
\]

of the collection \(M\mathbb{Z}\) is partially ordered via

\[
(p'_1, \ldots, p'_n) \preceq (p''_1, \ldots, p''_n) \text{ if and only if } p'_i \leq p''_i \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n.
\]

With the obvious right permutation action of the symmetric groups \(\Sigma_n\), the unit \((0) \in M\mathbb{Z}(1)\) and the structure operations

\[
\circ_i : M\mathbb{Z}(m) \times M\mathbb{Z}(n) \to M\mathbb{Z}(m + n - 1), n \geq 1, 1 \leq i \leq m,
\]

given for \((a_1, \ldots, a_m) \in M\mathbb{Z}(m)\) and \((b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in M\mathbb{Z}(n)\) by

\[
(a_1, \ldots, a_m) \circ_i (b_1, \ldots, b_m) := (a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, b_1 + a_i, \ldots, b_n + a_i, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_m),
\]

\(M\mathbb{Z}\) forms an operad in the cartesian category \(\text{Cat}\) of small categories.

Furthermore, for each \(n \geq 1\), \(M\mathbb{Z}(n)\) is a lattice with the join and the meet operations being

\[
(p'_1, \ldots, p'_n) \vee (p''_1, \ldots, p''_n) := (\max(p'_1, p''_1), \ldots, \max(p'_n, p''_n))
\]

and

\[
(p'_1, \ldots, p'_n) \wedge (p''_1, \ldots, p''_n) := (\min(p'_1, p''_1), \ldots, \min(p'_n, p''_n))
\]

respectively. Finally, for \(\bar{p} = (p_1, \ldots, p_n) \in M\mathbb{Z}(n)\), we denote the maximum of \(p_1, \ldots, p_n\) by

\[
\max \bar{p} \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]
In what follows, given \( \vec{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_m) \) and an index \( 1 \leq i \leq m \), we will use a shorthand notation \( \vec{a}_L := (a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}) \), \( \vec{a}_R := (a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_m) \) and write \( \vec{a} = (\vec{a}_L, a_i, \vec{a}_R) \). Now, for \( \vec{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \), equation (12) reads

\[
\vec{a} \circ_i \vec{b} := (\vec{a}_L, \vec{b} + a_i, \vec{a}_R),
\]

where \( \vec{b} + a_i := (b_1 + a_i, \ldots, b_n + a_i) \). Next, we introduce the commutators

\[
[-,-]_{ij} : M\mathcal{Z}(m) \times M\mathcal{Z}(n) \rightarrow M\mathcal{Z}(m + n - 1), \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n,
\]

by setting

\[
[\vec{a}, \vec{b}]_{ij} := (\vec{b}_L + a_i, \vec{a}_L + b_j, a_i + b_j - 1, \vec{b}_R + a_i, \vec{a}_R + b_j),
\]

for \( \vec{a} = (\vec{a}_L, a_i, \vec{a}_R) \in M\mathcal{Z}(m) \) and \( \vec{b} = (\vec{b}_L, b_j, \vec{b}_R) \in M\mathcal{Z}(n) \). Notice that \( (M\mathcal{Z}(1), +, [-,-]_{11}) \) equals \( (\mathbb{Z}, +, [-,-]) \).

**Definition 20.** An (increasing) multifiltration \( F\mathcal{P} = \{F_{\vec{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{\vec{p} \in M\mathcal{Z}(n), n \geq 1} \) of a \( k \)-linear operad \( \mathcal{P} \) is a collection of \( k \)-subspaces of \( F_{\vec{p}}\mathcal{P}(n) \subset \mathcal{P}(n) \) indexed by the elements \( \vec{p} \in M\mathcal{Z}(n) \) for all \( n \geq 1 \) subject to the following conditions:

(i) Monotonicity: \( F_{\vec{p}}\mathcal{P}(n) \subseteq F_{\vec{p}'}\mathcal{P}(n) \) if \( \vec{p}' \preceq \vec{p}'' \).

(ii) Equivariance: \( F_{\vec{p}}\mathcal{P}(n) \cdot \sigma = F_{\vec{p}_\sigma}\mathcal{P}(n) \), where \( \sigma \in \Sigma_n \) acts on \( \vec{p} = (p_1, \ldots, p_n) \) via

\[
\vec{p} \cdot \sigma = (p_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, p_{\sigma(n)}).
\]

(iii) Compositional compatibility: \( F_{\vec{a}}\mathcal{P}(m) \circ_i F_{\vec{b}}\mathcal{P}(n) \subseteq F_{\vec{a} \circ_i \vec{b}}\mathcal{P}(m + n - 1) \) for all \( \vec{a} \in M\mathcal{Z}(m) \), \( \vec{b} \in M\mathcal{Z}(n) \) and \( 1 \leq i \leq m \).

(iv) Unitality: If \( e \in \mathcal{P}(1) \) is the operadic unit, then \( e \in F_{(0)}\mathcal{P}(1) \).

We say that a multifiltration as above is a \( D \)-multifiltration if, moreover,

(v) \( \{F_{\vec{a}}\mathcal{P}(m), F_{\vec{b}}\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{ij} \subseteq F_{[\vec{a}, \vec{b}]_{ij}}\mathcal{P}(m + n - 1) \) for all \( \vec{a} \in M\mathcal{Z}(m), \vec{b} \in M\mathcal{Z}(n), 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n \).

Multifiltration \( F\mathcal{P} \) is exhausting if

\[
\mathcal{P}(n) = \bigcup_{\vec{p} \in M\mathcal{Z}(n)} F_{\vec{p}}\mathcal{P}(n), \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.
\]

In the rest of the paper we will tacitly assume that all multifiltrations are \( D \)-multifiltrations, i.e. satisfy condition (v) above. We will also usually write \( \{F_{\vec{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{\vec{p} \in M\mathcal{Z}(n), n \geq 1} \) instead of much longer \( \{F_{\vec{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{\vec{p} \in M\mathcal{Z}(n), n \geq 1} \) when no confusion is possible. Multifiltrations of \( \mathcal{P} \) form a poset \( \text{MFilt}(\mathcal{P}) \), where \( \mathcal{F}' \preceq \mathcal{F}'' \) if and only if \( F_{\vec{p}'}\mathcal{P}(n) \subseteq F_{\vec{p}''}\mathcal{P}(n) \) for all \( \vec{p} \in M\mathcal{Z}(n) \) and \( n \geq 1 \).

**Example 21.** Any \( k \)-linear operad \( \mathcal{P} \) possesses the multifiltration with \( F_{\vec{p}}\mathcal{P}(n) := \mathcal{P}(n) \) for all \( \vec{p} \in M\mathcal{Z}(n) \) and \( n \geq 1 \). It is the largest element of \( \text{MFilt}(\mathcal{P}) \).
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Example 22. Any associative almost commutative \( k \)-algebra \( A \) with the corresponding filtration \( FA = \{ F_p A \}_p \) gives rise to a multifiltered operad \( M_A \), where \( M_A(n) = A^{\otimes n}, n \geq 1, \) and

\[
\circ_i : M_A(m) \otimes M_A(n) \to M_A(m + n - 1)
\]

\[
(a_1, \ldots, a_m) \otimes (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \mapsto (a_1, \ldots, a_i \cdot b_1, \ldots, a_i \cdot b_n, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_m)
\]

for all \( m, n \geq 1 \) and \( 1 \leq i \leq m \). The filtration \( FA \) induces a multifiltration \( FM_A \) of \( M_A \) given by

\[
F_{\bar{p}} M_A(n) = F_{(p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n)} M_A(n) := F_{p_1} A \otimes \cdots \otimes F_{p_n} A, \quad \bar{p} \in M \mathbb{Z}(n), \quad n \geq 1.
\]

Example 23. Let \( A \) be an associative commutative \( k \)-algebra and \( \mathcal{E}nd_A \) be the endomorphism operad on the underlying vector space. Generalizing Example [13], we equip \( \mathcal{E}nd_A \) with a multifiltration \( F\mathcal{E}nd_A \) by taking \( F_{(p_1, \ldots, p_n)} \mathcal{E}nd_A(n) \) to be the space of all \( k \)-linear maps \( O : A^{\otimes n} \to A \) that are differential operators of order \( \leq p_i \) in the \( i \)-th variable, for each \( 1 \leq i \leq n \).

Example 24. Let \( A[[h]] := A \otimes \mathbb{k}[[h]] \). A ‘formally deformed’ version of the previous example is the multifiltration \( F\mathcal{E}nd_A[[h]] \) of \( \mathcal{E}nd_A[[h]] \) whose \( (p_1, \ldots, p_n) \)-th component is comprised of all \( \mathbb{k}[[h]] \)-multilinear maps \( O : A[[h]]^{\otimes n} \to A[[h]], n \geq 1, \) such that, for \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A \),

\[
(14) \quad O(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = O_0(a_1, \ldots, a_n) + O_1(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \cdot h + O_2(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \cdot h^2 + \cdots,
\]

where \( O_s(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \) is a differential operator of order \( \leq p_i + s \) with respect to the \( i \)-th argument, for each \( 1 \leq i \leq n \).

The multifiltration in Example [21] is exhausting while the multifiltration \( FM_A \) in Example [22] is exhausting if and only if \( FA \) is an exhausting filtration of \( A \). The multifiltrations \( F\mathcal{E}nd_A \) and \( F\mathcal{E}nd_A[[h]] \) of Examples [23] and [24] are, for a general algebra \( A \), not exhausting.

2.3. Saturated multifiltrations. If \( O : A^{\otimes n} \to A \) is a differential operator of order \( \leq p_i' \) in the \( i \)th variable and simultaneously of order \( \leq p_i'' \) in the same variable, then it is, tautologically, of order \( \leq \min(p_i', p_i'') \) in that variable, \( 1 \leq i \leq n \). The property introduced below is an abstraction of this salient feature of differential operators for multifiltrations of \( k \)-linear operads.

Definition 25. A multifiltration \( F\mathcal{P} = \{ F_{\bar{p}} \mathcal{P}(n) \}_\bar{p}, n \) is saturated if

\[
(15) \quad F_{\bar{p}} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap F_{\bar{p}'} \mathcal{P}(n) \subseteq F_{\bar{p} \wedge \bar{p}'} \mathcal{P}(n), \quad \text{for all } \bar{p}', \bar{p}'' \in M \mathbb{Z}(n).
\]

Due to monotonicity (i) of Definition [20], inclusion (15) is actually equivalent to the equality

\[
F_{\bar{p}'} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap F_{\bar{p}''} \mathcal{P}(n) = F_{\bar{p}' \wedge \bar{p}''} \mathcal{P}(n), \quad \text{for all } \bar{p}', \bar{p}'' \in M \mathbb{Z}(n).
\]

We note that for associative algebras, regarded as linear operads concentrated in arity 1, condition (15) is automatic. All multifiltrations in Examples [21]-[24] are saturated.
**Definition 26.** The saturation $\overline{F^\mathcal{P}}$ of a multifiltration $F^\mathcal{P}$ is the smallest saturated multifiltration containing $F^\mathcal{P}$.

The saturation $\overline{F^\mathcal{P}}$ exists and is unique. This follows from the obvious fact that the componentwise intersection of saturated multifiltrations is again a saturated multifiltration, and that a saturated multifiltration containing $F^\mathcal{P}$ exists, cf. the maximal multifiltration in Example 21. Thus $\overline{F^\mathcal{P}}$ equals the componentwise intersection of all saturated multifiltrations containing $F^\mathcal{P}$.

Our next task will be to identify the saturation with the colimit of suitable intermediate steps. Given a multifiltration $F^\mathcal{P} = \{F^\mathcal{P}_{\bar{p}}(n)\}_{\bar{p},n}$ of a $k$-linear operad $\mathcal{P}$, its presaturation is the family of subspaces $\{F^\prime\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{\bar{p},n}$ with

$$F^\prime\mathcal{P}(n) := \bigoplus_{k \geq 1} \bigoplus_{\bar{p}_1 \cdots \bar{p}_k = \bar{p}} F_{\bar{p}_1} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F_{\bar{p}_k} \mathcal{P}(n), \quad \text{for } n \geq 1. \quad (16)$$

**Lemma 27.** The family $F^\prime\mathcal{P} = \{F^\prime\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{\bar{p},n}$ is a multifiltration of $\mathcal{P}$. Moreover

$$F^\prime\mathcal{P}(n) \cap F_{\bar{q}}\mathcal{P}(m) \subset F^\prime_{\bar{p} \wedge \bar{q}}\mathcal{P}(n + m - 1), \text{ for each } n \geq 1, \bar{p}, \bar{q} \in \text{MZ}(n). \quad (17)$$

**Proof.** Equation (17) immediately follows from the definition of the presaturation. Let us prove that (16) indeed defines a multifiltration of $\mathcal{P}$. Monotonicity, unitality and equivariance of $\{F^\prime\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{\bar{p},n}$ are straightforward, so it remains to prove that for any $\bar{p} \in \text{MZ}(m), \bar{q} \in \text{MZ}(n), 1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$,

$$\begin{align*}
F^\prime_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{P}(m) \circ_i F^\prime_{\bar{q}}\mathcal{P}(n) & \subset F^\prime_{\bar{p} \circ_i \bar{q}}\mathcal{P}(m + n - 1), \quad \text{and} \\
[F^\prime_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{P}(m), F^\prime_{\bar{q}}\mathcal{P}(n)]_{ij} & \subset F^\prime_{\bar{p} \circ_i \bar{q}}\mathcal{P}(m + n - 1) \quad (18a, 18b)
\end{align*}$$

Regarding (18a), by the $k$-linearity of the $\circ_i$-compositions it suffices to show that

$$(F_{\bar{p}_1} \mathcal{P}(m) \cap \cdots \cap F_{\bar{p}_k} \mathcal{P}(m)) \circ_i (F_{\bar{q}_1} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F_{\bar{q}_l} \mathcal{P}(n)) \subset F^\prime_{\bar{p} \circ_i \bar{q}}\mathcal{P}(m + n - 1)$$

for all $\bar{p}_1, \ldots, \bar{p}_k \in \text{MZ}(m), \bar{q}_1, \ldots, \bar{q}_l, n$, such that $\bar{p}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{p}_k = \bar{p}$ and $\bar{q}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{q}_l = \bar{q}$. To this end, observe first that

$$\bar{p} \circ_i \bar{q} = (\bar{p}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{p}_k) \circ_i (\bar{q}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{q}_l) = \bigwedge_{u,v} (\bar{p}_u \circ_i \bar{q}_v), \quad (19)$$

where, in the rightmost term, $u$ runs between 1 and $k$, and $v$ between 1 and $l$. Then

$$\begin{align*}
(F_{\bar{p}_1} \mathcal{P}(m) \cap \cdots \cap F_{\bar{p}_k} \mathcal{P}(m)) \circ_i (F_{\bar{q}_1} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F_{\bar{q}_l} \mathcal{P}(n)) & \subset \bigcap_{u,v} (F_{\bar{p}_u} \mathcal{P}(m) \circ_i F_{\bar{q}_v} \mathcal{P}(n)) \\
& \subset \bigcap_{u,v} F_{\bar{p}_u \circ_i \bar{q}_v} \mathcal{P}(m + n - 1) \subset F^\prime_{\bigwedge_{u,v} (\bar{p}_u \circ_i \bar{q}_v)} \mathcal{P}(m + n - 1) = F^\prime_{\bar{p} \circ_i \bar{q}}\mathcal{P}(m + n - 1)
\end{align*}$$

The proof of (18b) is analogous, except that it relies upon the identity

$$[\bar{p}, \bar{q}]_{ij} = [\bar{p}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{p}_k, \bar{q}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{q}_l]_{ij} = \bigwedge_{u,v} [\bar{p}_u, \bar{q}_v]_{ij}$$

in place of (19). \qed
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Given a multifiltration $F^{\mathcal{P}} = \{F^{\mathcal{P}}_\bar{p}(n)\}_{\bar{p},n}$, define the multifiltration $F^{(s)}{\mathcal{P}} = \{F^{(s)}{\mathcal{P}}_\bar{p}(n)\}_{\bar{p},n}$ as the presaturation of $F^{\mathcal{P}}$ iterated $s$ times.

**Proposition 28.** The components of the saturation of $F^{\mathcal{P}}$ are given by

\[ F^{\mathcal{P}}_\bar{p}(n) := \bigcup_{s \geq 1} F^{(s)}{\mathcal{P}}_\bar{p}(n), \quad \bar{p} \in M\mathbb{Z}(n), \quad n \geq 1. \]  

In other words, $F^{\mathcal{P}} = \text{colim} F^{(s)}{\mathcal{P}}$ in the poset $\text{MFilt}(\mathcal{P})$.

**Proof.** The colimit of $F^{(s)}{\mathcal{P}}$ is a saturated multifiltration by Lemma 27. Each saturated multifiltration containing $F^{\mathcal{P}}$ clearly contains also $F^{s}{\mathcal{P}}$ and thus also $F^{(s)}{\mathcal{P}}$ for each $s \geq 1$. It therefore contains also the union of iterated presaturations, thus (20) indeed defines the smallest saturated multifiltration containing $F^{\mathcal{P}}$. \hfill \square

**Definition 29.** Let $n, N \geq 1$ be natural numbers. We say that a multifiltration $F^{\mathcal{P}} = \{F^{\mathcal{P}}_\bar{p}(n)\}_{\bar{p},n}$ stabilizes in arity $n$ at $N$ if, for each $\bar{p} \in M\mathbb{Z}(n)$,

\[ F^{\mathcal{P}}_\bar{p}(n) = F^{\mathcal{P} \wedge (N,\ldots,N)}_\bar{p}(n). \]  

The multifiltration $F^{\mathcal{P}}$ is *stable* if it stabilizes in each arity $n \geq 1$ at some $N_n \geq 1$.

Notice that condition (21) implies that $F^{\mathcal{P}}_\bar{p}(n) \subset F^{\mathcal{P} \wedge (N,\ldots,N)}_\bar{p}(n)$. For saturated multifiltrations, the two conditions are equivalent. The following useful proposition shows that the stability implies a concise explicit formula for the (pre)saturation.

**Proposition 30.** Suppose that a multifiltration $F^{\mathcal{P}} = \{F^{\mathcal{P}}_\bar{p}(n)\}_{\bar{p},n}$ stabilizes in arity $n$ at $N$. Then, for each $\bar{p} = (a_1,\ldots,a_n) \in M\mathbb{Z}(n)$,

\[ F^{\mathcal{P}}_\bar{p}(n) = F^{\mathcal{P} \wedge (a_1,\ldots,a_n)}_\bar{p}(n). \]  

**Proof.** For $\bar{p} \in M\mathbb{Z}(n)$ denote $\hat{p} := \hat{p} \wedge (N,\ldots,N)$. The stability implies that $F^{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{p}}(n) = F^{\hat{p}}_{\hat{p}}(n)$. Indeed, for an arbitrary term $F^{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{p}_1}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F^{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{p}_k}(n)$ in formula (16) for the presaturation we have

\[ F^{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{p}_1}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F^{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{p}_k}(n) = F^{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{p}_1}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F^{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{p}_k}(n) \]

while clearly $\hat{p}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{p}_k = \hat{p}$. Thus $F^{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{p}}(n) \subset F^{\hat{p}}_{\hat{p}}(n)$, so $F^{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{p}}(n) = F^{\hat{p}}_{\hat{p}}(n)$ by monotonicity.

We can therefore assume that all components $a_1,\ldots,a_n$ of the vector $\bar{p}$ in (22) are $\leq N$. Consider again an arbitrary term $F^{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{p}_1}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F^{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{p}_k}(n)$ in (16) and assume that

\[ \hat{p}_i = (u^i_1,\ldots,u^i_n), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k. \]
Notice that \( \vec{p}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \vec{p}_k = \vec{p} \) implies that \( u^i_j \geq a_j \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq n \). Put \( \vec{u}_i := (\vec{u}_i^1, \ldots, \vec{u}_i^n) \), \( 1 \leq i \leq k \), where

\[
\vec{u}_i^j := \begin{cases} a_j & \text{if } u^i_j = a_j, \\ N & \text{if } u^i_j > a_j. \end{cases}
\]

Due to the stability and monotonicity,

\[
F_{\vec{p}_1} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F_{\vec{p}_k} \mathcal{P}(n) \subseteq F_{\vec{u}_1} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F_{\vec{u}_k} \mathcal{P}(n). \tag{23}
\]

Since clearly \( \vec{p} = \vec{p}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \vec{p}_k \), the term on the right of (23) also occurs in the sum (16) and absorbs the term in the left of (23).

We may therefore assume that all terms in (16) are of the form \( F_{\vec{p}_1} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F_{\vec{p}_k} \mathcal{P}(n) \) such that the components of the vectors \( \vec{p}_i, 1 \leq i \leq k \), are either \( N \) or \( a_j \) at the \( j \)th place, \( 1 \leq j \leq n \). We show that we may further reduce (16) so that it contains only the terms as above such that moreover some \( a_j \) less than \( N \) occurs in each \( \vec{p}_i \) at most once.

Assume for instance that \( \vec{p}_1 = (a_1, a_2, N, \ldots, N) \). Then, by the monotonicity again

\[
F_{\vec{p}_1} \mathcal{P}(n) \subseteq F_{(a_1, N, N, \ldots, N)} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap F_{(N, a_2, N, \ldots, N)} \mathcal{P}(n),
\]

therefore

\[
F_{\vec{p}_1} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F_{\vec{p}_k} \mathcal{P}(n) \subseteq F_{(a_1, N, N, \ldots, N)} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap F_{(N, a_2, N, \ldots, N)} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap F_{\vec{p}_2} \mathcal{P}(n) \cap \cdots \cap F_{\vec{p}_k} \mathcal{P}(n),
\]

thus the term in the left hand side can be absorbed, in (16), by the term in the right hand side.

It is clear how to use the above scheme to eliminate all vectors \( \vec{p}_i \) with multiple occurrences of \( a_j \)'s. This proves (22) for the presaturation. It follows from that formula applied twice that \( F_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(n) = F_{\vec{p}}'' \mathcal{P}(n) \) so, by (20), \( \overline{F_{\vec{p}}} \mathcal{P}(n) = \overline{F_{\vec{p}}} \mathcal{P}(n) \).

**Corollary 31.** The presaturation of a stable multifiltration is already its saturation. It is stable again.

**Proof.** Both claims immediately follow from formula (22). \( \square \)

### 2.4. The standard multifiltration.

We are going to define, for each \( k \)-linear operad with a specified space of generators, a canonical multifiltration mimicking the properties of compositions of a bunch of multilinear differential operators of order one. A more general definition for arbitrary prescribed orders could also be given, but we will not need this generality.

**Definition 32.** Let \( \mathcal{P} \) be a \( k \)-linear operad generated by a collection \( E \). The **standard multifiltration with respect to** \( E \) is the smallest saturated multifiltration \( \overline{G} \mathcal{P} = \{ \overline{G_{\vec{p}}} \mathcal{P}(n) \}_{\vec{p}, n} \) of \( \mathcal{P} \) such that \( E(n) \subseteq \overline{G_{(1, \ldots, 1)}} \mathcal{P}(n) \) for each \( n \geq 1 \).
The existence and uniqueness of $G_P$ can be easily justified using the arguments in the paragraph after Definition 26. In practice we describe the standard multifiltration as the saturation of the prestandard multifiltration, defined as the smallest (not necessarily saturated) multifiltration $G_P = \{G_{\bar{p}}(n)\}_{\bar{p}, n}$ of $P$ such that $E(n) \subset G_{(1,\ldots,1)}(n)$ for all $n \geq 1$. Indeed:

**Lemma 33.** The saturation of the prestandard multifiltration is the standard multifiltration.

The proof is simple and we leave it as an exercise. We are going to give below an explicit inductive recipe for the prestandard multifiltration of simply connected $k$-linear operads, i.e. operads $P$ such that $P(0) = 0$ and that $P(1)$ is one-dimensional, spanned by the operad unit.

Let $P$ be such an operad, generated by a $k$-linear $\Sigma$-module $E = \{E(n)\}_{n \geq 2}$. We define a family $G_P$ of linear subspaces $\{G_{\bar{p}}(n) \subset P(n)\}_{\bar{p}, n}$ as follows. If $n \geq 1$ and $\bar{p} \in MZ(n)$ is such that $\bar{p} \not\in (1,\ldots,1)$ we put $G_{\bar{p}}(n) := 0$. If $\bar{p} \geq (1,\ldots,1)$ we proceed inductively as follows.

(i) For $\bar{p} \in MZ(2)$, $G_{\bar{p}}(2) := E(2)$.

(ii) For $n > 2$ and $\bar{p} \in MZ(n)$,

\[
G_{\bar{p}}(n) := E(n) + \sum_{i,\bar{p}',\bar{p}'',k,l,\sigma} (G_{\bar{p}'}(k) \circ_i G_{\bar{p}''}(l)) \cdot \sigma + \sum_{i,j,\bar{p}',\bar{p}'',k,l,\sigma} [G_{\bar{p}'}(k), G_{\bar{p}''}(l)]_{ij} \cdot \sigma.
\]

Both summations in (24) run over $k, l \geq 2, k + l = n + 1$. The first summation is moreover taken over all $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\bar{p}' \in MZ(k)$, $\bar{p}'' \in MZ(l)$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$ such that $(\bar{p}' \circ_i \bar{p}'') \sigma \leq \bar{p}$, and the second one over all $1 \leq i \leq k$, $1 \leq j \leq l$, $\bar{p}' \in MZ(k)$, $\bar{p}'' \in MZ(l)$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$ such that $[\bar{p}', \bar{p}'']_{ij} \sigma \leq \bar{p}$.

Additionally, we set

\[
G_{(p)}(1) := \begin{cases} k \cdot e & \text{if } p \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}
\]

for $e \in P(1)$ the operad unit. The simple connectivity of $P$ guarantees that the right hand side of (24) contains terms that have already been defined.

**Proposition 34.** The family $G_P = \{G_{\bar{p}}(n)\}_{\bar{p}, n}$ described above is the prestandard multifiltration of a simply connected operad $P$. In arity $n \geq 1$ it stabilizes at $n - 1$.

**Proof.** We start by proving that the collection $G_P$ is a multifiltration. Its monotonicity and unitality $G_0$ is immediate. Its equivariance follows from the compatibility of the operadic compositions with the symmetric group actions. Given $\bar{a} \in MZ(x)$, $\bar{b} \in MZ(y)$ with $x + y = n + 1$ and $1 \leq s \leq k$, equation (24) for $\bar{p} := \bar{a} \circ_s \bar{b}$, yields

\[
G_{\bar{a} \circ_s \bar{b}}(n) = E(n) + \sum_{i,\bar{p}',\bar{p}'',k,l,\sigma} (G_{\bar{p}'}(k) \circ_i G_{\bar{p}''}(l)) \cdot \sigma + \sum_{i,j,\bar{p}',\bar{p}'',k,l,\sigma} [G_{\bar{p}'}(k), G_{\bar{p}''}(l)]_{ij} \cdot \sigma
\]

\[
\supset G_{\bar{a}}(x) \circ_s G_{\bar{b}}(y),
\]
where the inclusion follows upon taking \( k = x, l = y, \vec{p}' = \vec{a}, \vec{p}'' = \vec{b} \), \( i = s \) and \( \sigma = \mathbb{1}_n \), the unit of \( \Sigma_n \), in the first sum. In a similar way we get, using (24) again,

\[
G_{(\vec{a}, \vec{b})_{st}} \mathcal{P}(n) \supseteq [G_{\vec{a}} \mathcal{P}(x), G_{\vec{b}} \mathcal{P}(y)]_{st}
\]

for all \( x, y, \vec{a}, \vec{b}, s, t \) for which the above expression makes sense. This finishes the verification that \( G \mathcal{P} \) is a multifiltration of \( \mathcal{P} \).

The minimality of \( G \mathcal{P} \) is proven as follows. Let \( F \mathcal{P} = \{ F_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(n) \}_n \) be a multifiltration of \( \mathcal{P} \) such that \( E(n) \subset F_{(1, \ldots, 1)} \mathcal{P}(n) \) for \( n \geq 2 \). We must prove that

\[
(25) \quad G_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(n) \subset F_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(n), \quad \text{for each } n \geq 1, \vec{p} \in M \mathbb{Z}(n).
\]

Since, by definition, \( G_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(n) = 0 \) if \( \vec{p} \not\in (1, \ldots, 1) \), we may assume that \( \vec{p} \geq (1, \ldots, 1) \).

Inclusion (25) is clear for \( n = 1 \). For \( n = 2 \) it follows from \( G_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(2) = E(2) \subset F_{(1, \ldots, 1)} \mathcal{P}(n) \subset F_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(n) \). For \( n > 2 \) we proceed by induction. Assuming that \( G_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(m) \subset F_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(m) \) for all \( m < n, \vec{p} \in M \mathbb{Z}(m) \), we get

\[
G_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(n) = E(n) + \sum_{i, \vec{p}', \vec{p}'', k, l, \sigma} (G_{\vec{p}'} \mathcal{P}(k) \circ_i G_{\vec{p}''} \mathcal{P}(l)) \cdot \sigma + \sum_{i, j, \vec{p}', \vec{p}'', k, l, \sigma} [G_{\vec{p}'} \mathcal{P}(k), G_{\vec{p}''} \mathcal{P}(l)]_{ij} \cdot \sigma
\]

\[
\subset E(n) + \sum_{i, \vec{p}', \vec{p}'', k, l, \sigma} (F_{\vec{p}'} \mathcal{P}(k) \circ_i F_{\vec{p}''} \mathcal{P}(l)) \cdot \sigma + \sum_{i, j, \vec{p}', \vec{p}'', k, l, \sigma} [F_{\vec{p}'} \mathcal{P}(k), F_{\vec{p}''} \mathcal{P}(l)]_{ij} \cdot \sigma
\]

\[
\subset F_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(n)
\]

for all \( \vec{p} \in M \mathbb{Z}(n) \), which proves the induction step.

Let us attend to the stabilization. Since, by definition, \( G_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(n) = 0 \) if \( \vec{p} \not\in (1, \ldots, 1) \), we may assume that \( \vec{p} \geq (1, \ldots, 1) \). The stabilization at arity 1 is clear. For a given \( n \geq 2 \) and \( \vec{p} \in M \mathbb{Z}(n) \) denote \( \hat{\vec{p}} := \vec{p} \wedge (n - 1, \ldots, n - 1) \). As \( n \geq 2 \) by assumption, \( \vec{p} \geq (1, \ldots, 1) \) if and only if \( \hat{\vec{p}} \geq (1, \ldots, 1) \). We must therefore prove that

\[
(26) \quad G_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(n) \subset G_{\hat{\vec{p}}} \mathcal{P}(n) \quad \text{for all } n \geq 2 \text{ and } \vec{p} \in M \mathbb{Z}(n),
\]

because the opposite inclusion and thus the equality would follow from the monotonicity. We proceed by the induction on the arity.

The base case \( n = 2 \) is implied by \( G_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(2) = E(2) = G_{\hat{\vec{p}}} \mathcal{P}(2) \). For the induction step consider formula (24) defining \( G_{\vec{p}} \mathcal{P}(n) \) and compare it with the formula

\[
(27) \quad G_{\hat{\vec{p}}} \mathcal{P}(n) := E(n) + \sum_{i, \vec{q}', \vec{q}'', k, l, \sigma} (G_{\vec{q}'} \mathcal{P}(k) \circ_i G_{\vec{q}''} \mathcal{P}(l)) \cdot \sigma + \sum_{i, j, \vec{q}', \vec{q}'', k, l, \sigma} [G_{\vec{q}'} \mathcal{P}(k), G_{\vec{q}''} \mathcal{P}(l)]_{ij} \cdot \sigma
\]

in which \( (\vec{q}' \circ_i \vec{q}'') \sigma \leq \hat{\vec{p}} \) in the first sum, and \( [\vec{q}', \vec{q}'']_{ij} \sigma \leq \hat{\vec{p}} \) in the second one. Since the term \( E(n) \) occurs in both formulas, it remains to prove that all terms of the first and the second sum of (24) occur also in (27).

[August 24, 2021]
Consider an arbitrary term \((G_{\bar{p}', \bar{p}''}P(k) \circ_i G_{\bar{p}', \bar{p}''}P(l)) \cdot \sigma\) of the first sum in (24) in which, of course, \((\bar{p}' \circ_i \bar{p}'') \sigma \preceq \bar{p}\). By the induction assumption,

\[(28) \quad (G_{\bar{p}', \bar{p}''}P(k) \circ_i G_{\bar{p}', \bar{p}''}P(l)) \cdot \sigma = (G_{\hat{\bar{p}}', \hat{\bar{p}}''}P(k) \circ_i G_{\hat{\bar{p}}', \hat{\bar{p}}''}P(l)) \cdot \sigma.\]

At this point, one needs to verify that

\[(29a) \quad \bar{p}' \circ_i \bar{p}'' \preceq \bar{p} \text{ implies } \hat{\bar{p}}' \circ_i \hat{\bar{p}}'' \preceq \hat{\bar{p}},\]

thus the term in (28) indeed occurs in the first sum of (27), with \(q' := \bar{p}'\) and \(q'' := \bar{p}''\). The discussion of the second summations is similar, with the help of the implications

\[(29b) \quad [\bar{p}', \bar{p}'']_{ij} \preceq \bar{p} \text{ implies } [\hat{\bar{p}}', \hat{\bar{p}}'']_{ij} \preceq \hat{\bar{p}}\]

instead. Both (29a) and (29b) can be verified directly, using the elementary inequalities

\[
\min(x, k) + \min(y, l) \leq \min(x + y, k + l), \quad \text{and} \\
\min(x - 1, k) \leq \min(x, k) - 1
\]

that hold for arbitrary \(x, y, k, l \in \mathbb{Z}\).

Since the prestandard multifiltration of a simply connected operad is stable, its saturation which, in the light of Lemma 33, equals its standard multifiltration, is given by the simple formula in Proposition 30.

**Remark 35.** The stability estimate of Proposition 34 can be improved. Denote by \(k \geq 2\) the smallest number such that \(E(k) \neq 0\). Then \(\{G_{\bar{p}}P(n)\}_{\bar{p}, n}\) stabilizes in arity \(n \geq 2\) at \(N := \left[\frac{n-1}{k}\right]\), the integral part of the fraction. We leave the verification, which is an easy exercise on the stabilization part of the proof of Proposition 34, as an exercise.

We will close this subsection by a couple of useful auxiliary statements about the functoriality of (pre)standard multifiltrations that will be invoked later.

**Lemma 36.** Let \(\phi : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{Q}\) be a surjective morphism of \(\mathbb{k}\)-linear operads and \(K_{\mathcal{P}} = \{K_{\bar{p}}P(n)\}_{\bar{p}, n}\) a multifiltration of \(\mathcal{P}\). Then the system \(\phi(K)\mathcal{Q} = \{\phi(K)_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{Q}(n)\}_{\bar{p}, n}\) of subspaces of \(\mathcal{Q} = \{\mathcal{Q}(n)\}_n\), where

\[\phi(K)_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{Q}(n) := \phi(K_{\bar{p}}P(n)),\]

is a multifiltration of \(\mathcal{Q}\). Furthermore, for any \(n \geq 1\) and \(\bar{p} \in M\mathbb{Z}(n)\), one has

\[(30) \quad \phi(K_{\bar{p}}P(n)) \subset \overline{\phi(K)\mathcal{Q}(n)},\]

or, in shorthand, \(\phi(K)\mathcal{Q} \preceq \overline{\phi(K)\mathcal{Q}}\). The equality \(\phi(K)\mathcal{Q} = \overline{\phi(K)\mathcal{Q}}\) holds if and only if \(\phi(K)\mathcal{Q}\) is saturated. If \(K\mathcal{P}\) is stable, then \(\phi(K)\mathcal{Q}\) is stable as well.

[superbig.tex]  
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Proof. The monotonicity and unitality of $\phi(K)\overline{Q}$ are automatic. The equivariance of $\phi(K)\overline{Q}$ follows from $\phi$ being an operad morphism and thus compatible with the symmetric group action.

To check the compositional compatibility with the $\circ_i$-products, assume that $\alpha \in \phi(K)\overline{Q}(m)$, $\beta \in \phi(K)\overline{Q}(n)$. By the definition of $\phi(K)\overline{Q}$, there are $\alpha' \in K_{\hat{a}}\mathcal{P}(m)$ and $\beta' \in K_{\hat{b}}\mathcal{P}(n)$ such that $\phi(\alpha') = \alpha$ and $\phi(\beta') = \beta$, and thus

$$\alpha \circ_i \beta = \phi(\alpha') \circ_i \phi(\beta') = \phi(\alpha' \circ_i \beta') \in \phi(K_{\hat{a}i\hat{b}}\mathcal{P}(m+n-1)) = \phi(K_{\hat{a}i\hat{b}}\mathcal{P}(m+n-1),$$

yielding the desired inclusion $\phi(K)\overline{Q}(m) \circ_i \phi(K)\overline{Q}(n) \subset \phi(K)\overline{Q}(m+n-1)$. The compositional compatibility with the $[-, -]_{ij}$-brackets follows by a similar argument, upon recalling that the latter are defined in terms of the $\circ_i$-products and the symmetric group action as per (10).

Finally, for $n \geq 1$ and $\vec{p} \in M\mathcal{Z}(n)$, we get from the definition of the presaturation (16),

$$\phi(K')\overline{Q}(n) = \phi(K'_{\hat{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\hat{p}_1, \ldots, \hat{p}_k \geq 1} \phi(K_{\hat{p}_1}\mathcal{P}(n)) \cap \cdots \cap K_{\hat{p}_k}\mathcal{P}(n)$$

yielding the desired inclusion $\phi(K)\overline{Q}(m) \circ_i \phi(K)\overline{Q}(n) \subset \phi(K)\overline{Q}(m+n-1)$. The compositional compatibility with the $[-, -]_{ij}$-brackets follows by a similar argument, upon recalling that the latter are defined in terms of the $\circ_i$-products and the symmetric group action as per (10).

The inclusion $\phi(K'_{\hat{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)) \subset \phi(K)\overline{Q}(n)$ we have just proved along with formula (20) implies the inclusion (20) of the saturations.

Notice that both $\phi(K)\overline{Q}$ and $\overline{\phi(K)\overline{Q}}$ contain the multiltration $\phi(K)\overline{Q}$. Thus, if $\phi(K)\overline{Q}$ is saturated, $\phi(K)\overline{Q} \succeq \overline{\phi(K)\overline{Q}}$ by the minimality of $\overline{\phi(K)\overline{Q}}$. This, together with the already proven relation $\phi(K)\overline{Q} \subset \phi(K)\overline{Q}$ implies $\phi(K)\overline{Q} = \phi(K)\overline{Q}$. The claim about the stability is obvious.  

Lemma 37. Let $G\mathcal{P} = \{G_{\hat{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{\hat{p}, n}$ be the prestandard multiltration of $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to the generating collection $E = \{E(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$, $\phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ a surjective morphism and $F := \phi(E)$ the subcollection of $\mathcal{Q}$ with components $F(n) := \phi(E(n))$, $n \geq 1$. Then the image $\phi(G)\overline{Q}$ of the prestandard multiltration $G\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathcal{P}$ is the prestandard multiltration of $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}$ with respect to the generators $F$, that is $G\overline{Q} = \phi(G)\overline{Q}$.

Proof. It is simple to verify that, given a multiltration $F\overline{Q}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}$, the collection

$$\phi^{-1}(F)\mathcal{P} = \{\phi^{-1}(F)_{\hat{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{\hat{p}, n}$$

with the components

$$\phi^{-1}(F)_{\hat{p}}\mathcal{P}(n) := \phi^{-1}(F_{\hat{p}}\overline{Q}(n)), \ \hat{p} \in M\mathcal{Z}(n), \ n \geq 1,$$

is a multiltration of $\mathcal{P}$. Suppose that $F\overline{Q}$ is such that

$$(31a) \quad F(n) \subset F_{\{1, \ldots, i\}}\overline{Q}(n) \text{ for each } n \geq 1,$$
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and that, moreover, \( F\mathcal{Q} \not\cong \phi(G)\mathcal{Q} \). It is simple to verify, using the fact that \( \phi \) is a componentwise epimorphism, that then \( \phi^{-1}(F)\mathcal{P} \not\cong G\mathcal{P} \). On the other hand, one clearly has

\[
E(n) \subset \phi^{-1}(F)_{1,...,1}(n) \quad \text{for each } n \geq 1,
\]

thus \( \phi^{-1}(F)\mathcal{P} \geq G\mathcal{P} \) by the minimality of \( G\mathcal{P} \) among the multifiltrations satisfying (31b). We therefore conclude that each multifiltration \( F\mathcal{Q} \) satisfying (31a) fulfills \( F\mathcal{Q} \geq \phi(G)\mathcal{Q} \), therefore \( \phi(G)\mathcal{Q} \) is minimal, so \( \phi(G)\mathcal{Q} = G\mathcal{Q} \).

**Corollary 38.** In the situation of Lemma 37, the standard multifiltrations of the operads \( \mathcal{P} \) resp. \( \mathcal{Q} \) satisfy

\[
\phi(G_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)) = G_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{Q}(n), \quad \bar{p} \in MZ(n), \quad n \geq 1.
\]

**Proof.** By Lemma 37, the prestandard multifiltrations of \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( \mathcal{Q} \) are related by

\[
G_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{Q}(n) = \phi(G_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)), \quad \bar{p} \in MZ(n), \quad n \geq 1.
\]

Equation (32) is thus a direct consequence of (31) and Lemma 33.

The inclusion (32) might be proper in general, as illustrated in Example 46.

**Proposition 39.** Assume that \( \alpha : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow S \) is a not necessarily surjective morphism of operads, \( \overline{G}\mathcal{P} = \{G_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)\}_{\bar{p},n} \) the standard multifiltration of \( \mathcal{P} \) with respect to the generating collection \( E = \{E(n)\}_{n\geq2} \), and \( F\mathcal{S} = \{F_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{S}(n)\}_{\bar{p},n} \) a saturated multifiltration of \( \mathcal{S} \) such that

\[
\alpha(E(n)) \subset F_{1,...,1}\mathcal{S}(n),
\]

for each \( n \geq 2 \). Then

\[
\alpha(G_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)) \subset F_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{S}(n),
\]

for each \( \bar{p} \in MZ(n), \quad n \geq 1 \).

**Proof.** Denote by \( \mathcal{Q} \subset S \) the image of \( \alpha \) so that \( \alpha \) factorizes as \( \mathcal{P} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{Q} \hookrightarrow S \). Then \( \mathcal{Q} \) is a suboperad of \( S \) bearing two saturated multifiltrations. The first one is the restriction \( F\mathcal{Q} \) of \( F\mathcal{S} \) to \( \mathcal{Q} \), and the second one is the image \( \phi(G)\mathcal{Q} \) of the prestandard multifiltration of \( \mathcal{P} \) which equals, by Lemma 37, the prestandard multifiltration \( G\mathcal{Q} \) of \( \mathcal{Q} \) with respect to the generators \( \alpha(E) \).

Since \( \alpha(E(n)) \subset F_{1,...,1}\mathcal{S}(n) \) and thus also \( \alpha(E(n)) = \phi(E(n)) \subset F_{1,...,1}\mathcal{Q}(n) \) by assumption, \( G_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{Q}(n) \subset F_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{Q}(n) \) for each \( \bar{p} \in MZ(n), \quad n \geq 1, \) by the minimality of the prestandard multifiltrations established in Proposition 34. Since \( F\mathcal{Q} \) is saturated, we also have \( G_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{Q}(n) \subset F_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{Q}(n) \) for the same \( \bar{p} \) and \( n \). Summing up and invoking (32) we get

\[
\alpha(G_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)) = \phi(G_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{P}(n)) \subset G_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{Q}(n) \subset F_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{Q}(n) = F_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{S}(n),
\]

for each \( \bar{p} \in MZ(n), \quad n \geq 1, \) as claimed. \( \square \)
3. Standard Multifiltrations – Examples and Calculations

This section provides some useful results and examples of standard multifiltrations. We will omit the explicit reference to the generating collection $E$, if its nature is clear from the context. The proposition below addresses the standard multifiltration of the free operad $\mathbb{F}(E)$ when its generating collection $E$ is spanned by a single fully symmetric or fully antisymmetric $n$-ary operation, $n \geq 2$, of the multifiltration level $(1, \ldots, 1)$ and degree of the same parity as $n$.

**Proposition 40.** For the standard multifiltration $\mathcal{F}(E)$ of the free operad $\mathbb{F}(E)$, the following properties hold in arity $2n - 1$:

(i) $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{p}(\mathbb{F}(E))(2n - 1) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{p} \wedge (2, \ldots, 2)}(\mathbb{F}(E))(2n - 1)$ for each $\mathcal{p} \in M\mathbb{Z}(2n - 1)$,

(ii) $\mathcal{F}_{(2, 2, \ldots, 2)}(\mathbb{F}(E))(2n - 1) = \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1)$, thus $\dim \mathcal{F}_{(2, 2, \ldots, 2)}(\mathbb{F}(E))(2n - 1) = \binom{2n - 1}{n}$, and

(iii) $\dim \mathcal{F}_{(1, 2, \ldots, 2)}(\mathbb{F}(E))(2n - 1) = \binom{2n - 2}{n} + \frac{1}{2} \binom{2n - 2}{n - 1}$.

(iv) If $E$ is generated by one $n$-ary antisymmetric operation $[\cdots, -]$, $\mathcal{F}_{(1, 1, \ldots, 1)}(\mathbb{F}(E))(n)$ contains the Jacobiator

\begin{equation}
\text{Jac}_n := \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}_{n-1}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \cdot [\sigma(1), \ldots, \sigma(n)], \sigma(n + 1), \ldots, \sigma(2n - 1)] \in \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1),
\end{equation}

with the summation over all $(n, n - 1)$-shuffles, i.e. permutations $\sigma \in \Sigma_{2n-1}$ such that $\sigma(1) < \cdots < \sigma(n)$ and $\sigma(n + 1) < \cdots < \sigma(2n - 1)$.

In (33), $[[\sigma(1), \ldots, \sigma(n)], \sigma(n + 1), \ldots, \sigma(2n - 1)]$ denotes the operation

$\left([-\cdots, -] \circ_1 [-\cdots, -]\right) \in \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1)$

acted on by $\sigma \in \Sigma_{2n-1}$. We will use the same type of notation for the action of the symmetric group also in the rest of the paper.

We can in fact prove that in (iv), $\mathcal{F}_{(1, 1, \ldots, 1)}(\mathbb{F}(E))(2n - 1)$ is one-dimensional, spanned by the Jacobiator (33). We however decided not to include a combinatorially involved proof, since this fact would play no rôle in this article. The particular case of $n = 2$ is addressed in Example 42.

**Proof of Proposition 40.** Item (i) says that the the standard multifiltration of $\mathbb{F}(E)$ stabilizes in arity $2n - 1$ at 2. This follows from Proposition 34, resp. from its enhancement spelled out in Remark 35.

Since all the results of the proposition concern pieces of arity $2n - 1$, we will not specify, in the rest of this proof, that arity explicitly where it is clear from the context. Let $\omega$ be a fully symmetric or fully antisymmetric operation of arity $n$ spanning $E$. It is obvious that the expressions

\begin{equation}
\omega(\omega(\sigma(1), \ldots, \sigma(n)), \sigma(n + 1), \ldots, \sigma(2n - 1)), \sigma \in \text{Sh}_{n,n-1},
\end{equation}

act as Jacobiators for $\mathcal{F}_{(1, 1, \ldots, 1)}(\mathbb{F}(E))(n)$.
form a basis of \( \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1) \). Since all terms above are obtained from \( \omega \circ_1 \omega \) by the action of an element \( \sigma \) of \( \Sigma_{2n-1} \) such that \( ((1,1,\ldots,1) \circ_1 (1,1,\ldots,1)) \cdot \sigma \preceq (2,2,\ldots,2) \), they all belong to \( G_{(2,2,\ldots,2)} \mathbb{F}(E) \) by (24), and thus
\[
G_{(2,2,\ldots,2)} \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1) = \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1).
\]
The equality in (ii) then follows from the inclusions
\[
G_{(2,2,\ldots,2)} \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1) \subset \overline{G_{(2,2,\ldots,2)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1) \subset \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1).
\]
The second part of item (ii) expresses that there are exactly \( \binom{2n-1}{n} \) shuffles in \( Sh_{n,n-1} \).

Let us attend to (iii). It is straightforward to verify, using the (anti)symmetry of the generating operation, that in arity \( 2n - 1 \), equation (24) for \( G_{(1,2,\ldots,2)} \mathbb{F}(E) \) reduces to
\[
(35) \quad G_{(1,2,\ldots,2)} \mathbb{F}(E) := \sum_{\sigma} (E(n) \circ_2 E(n)) \cdot \sigma + \sum_{\sigma} [E(n), E(n)]_{11} \cdot \sigma.
\]
The first sum in (35) generates the vectors
\[
(36) \quad \omega\{1, \omega(\sigma(2), \ldots, \sigma(n + 1), \sigma(n + 2), \ldots, \sigma(2n - 1))\},
\]
where \( \sigma \) is a permutation of the set \( \{2, \ldots, 2n - 1\} \) such that
\[
(37) \quad \sigma(2) < \cdots < \sigma(n + 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(n + 2) < \cdots < \sigma(2n - 1).
\]
The second sum in (35) generates the vectors
\[
(38) \quad \omega\{\omega(1, \sigma(2), \ldots, \sigma(n)), \sigma(n + 1), \ldots, \sigma(2n - 1)\} - (-1)^n \omega\{\omega(1, \sigma(n + 1), \ldots, \sigma(2n - 1)), \sigma(2), \ldots, \sigma(n)\},
\]
where \( \sigma \) is a permutation of the set \( \{2, \ldots, 2n - 1\} \) such that
\[
(39) \quad \sigma(2) < \cdots < \sigma(n), \quad \sigma(n + 1) < \cdots < \sigma(2n - 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(2) < \sigma(2n - 1).
\]
It is simple to show that the vectors in (36) and (38) are linearly independent, thus they form a basis of \( G_{(1,2,\ldots,2)} \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1) \). Moreover, by (22) with \( N = 2 \),
\[
\overline{G_{(1,2,\ldots,2)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1) = G_{(1,2,\ldots,2)} \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1).
\]
The formula in (iii) then simply expresses the total number of the vectors in (36) and (38).

Let us finally turn our attention to (iv). By formula (22) with \( N = 2 \),
\[
\overline{G_{(1,1,\ldots,1)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1) = \bigcap G_{(2,\ldots,2)} \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1)
\]
where the intersection runs over all positions of 1 in the multiindex. We thus need to show that \( Jac_n \in G_{(2,\ldots,2)} \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1) \) for each position of 1. Since \( Jac_n \) is stable under cyclic permutations, it suffices to establish that \( Jac_n \in G_{(1,2,\ldots,2)} \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1) \). To this end we decompose [superbig.tex]
\[ \Jac_n = A_n + B_n, \]

where

\[
A_n := \sum_\sigma \text{sgn}(\sigma) \left\{ \left[ [1, \sigma(2), \ldots, \sigma(n)], \sigma(n + 1), \ldots, \sigma(2n - 1) \right] \right.
\]

\[
- (-1)^n \left[ [1, \sigma(n + 1), \ldots, \sigma(2n - 1)], \sigma(2), \ldots, \sigma(n) \right] \}
\]

where \( \sigma \) runs over all permutations as in (39), and

\[
B_n := (-1)^n \sum_\sigma \text{sgn}(\sigma) \left[ [(\sigma(2), \ldots, \sigma(n + 1)], 1, \sigma(n + 2), \ldots, \sigma(2n - 1) \right] \)
\]

\[
= (-1)^{n+1} \sum_\sigma \text{sgn}(\sigma) \left[ [1, (\sigma(2), \ldots, \sigma(n + 1)], \sigma(n + 2), \ldots, \sigma(2n - 1) \right] ,
\]

with \( \sigma \) running over permutations in (37). Now it suffices to notice that \( A_n \) is a linear combination of the vectors (38), while \( B_n \) is combination of the vectors (36), thus both \( A_n \) and \( B_n \) belong to \( G_{(1,2,\ldots,2)} \mathbb{F}(E)(2n - 1) \). The decomposition \( \Jac_n = A_n + B_n \) is an abstract version of a similar trick used in the proof of Proposition 59.

\[ \square \]

**Example 41.** Let \( \mathbb{F}(E) \) be the free operad on a collection of, possibly several, binary operations \( E \).

For the standard multifiltration \( \overline{G_p} \mathbb{F}(E)(n) \), we have from definition in the lowest nontrivial arity

\[
\overline{G_{(p_1,p_2)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(2) = \begin{cases} E(2) & \text{if } p_1, p_2 \geq 1, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\]

Furthermore, the standard multifiltration of \( \mathbb{F}(E) \) stabilizes at 2 in arity 3 by Proposition 34, and its components form the lattice

(40)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\overline{G_{(2,2,2)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \mathbb{F}(E)(3) \\
\overline{G_{(1,2,2)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) \quad \overline{G_{(2,2,1)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) \\
\overline{G_{(2,1,2)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) \quad \overline{G_{(2,1,1)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) \\
\overline{G_{(1,1,2)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) \quad \overline{G_{(1,1,1)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) \\
\end{array}
\]

**Example 42.** We formulate explicitly the special case of Proposition 40 for one antisymmetric operation of arity 2 and prove, moreover, that \( \overline{G_{(1,1,1)}} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) \) is one-dimensional, spanned by the Jacobian (41). We denote the generating operation of the collection \( E = E(2) \) by \([-, -]; \) its
antisymmetry is expressed as \([1, 2] = -[2, 1]\). The pieces in the the top two tiers of \(40\) equal
\[
\begin{align*}
\overline{G}_{(2,2,2)} & \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \text{Span}\left([1, [2, 3]], [2, [3, 1]], [3, [1, 2]]\right) = \mathbb{F}(E)(3), \\
\overline{G}_{(1,2,2)} & \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \text{Span}\left([1, [2, 3]], [2, [3, 1]] + [3, [1, 2]]\right), \\
\overline{G}_{(2,1,2)} & \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \text{Span}\left([2, [3, 1]], [3, [1, 2]] + [1, [2, 3]]\right), \text{ and} \\
\overline{G}_{(2,2,1)} & \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \text{Span}\left([3, [1, 2]], [1, [2, 3]] + [2, [3, 1]]\right).
\end{align*}
\]

Let us describe the remaining ones. Assume that \(\mu \in \overline{G}_{(1,1,2)} = G_{(1,2,2)} \cap \overline{G}_{(2,1,2)}\). Using the above explicit descriptions, we see that there must exist \(c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2 \in k\) such that
\[
\mu = c_1 [1, [2, 3]] + c_2 ([2, [3, 1]] + [3, [1, 2]]) = d_1 [2, [3, 1]] + d_2 ([3, [1, 2]] + [1, [2, 3]]).
\]
The above equation is equivalent to \(c_1 = c_2 = d_1 = d_2\). Setting the common value of the coefficients to 1 produces \(\mu = \overline{\text{Jac}}_3\), where
\[
\overline{\text{Jac}}_3 := [1, [2, 3]] + [2, [3, 1]] + [3, [1, 2]]
\]
is the abstract Jacobian. Thus \(\overline{G}_{(1,1,2)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \text{Span} \{\overline{\text{Jac}}_3\}\). Since we already know from (iv) of Proposition 40 that \(\overline{\text{Jac}}_3 \in \overline{G}_{(1,1,1)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3)\), we easily conclude that
\[
\overline{G}_{(1,1,1)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \overline{\text{Jac}}_3.
\]

**Example 43.** Let the generating collection of \(\mathbb{F}(E)\) be spanned by one symmetric binary operation \((-,-)\). That is, \((1,2) = (2,1)\) in terms of the shorthand notation of Example 42. The free operad \(\mathbb{F}(E)(3)\) has a basis consisting of \((1,(2,3)),(2,(3,1))\) and \((3,(1,2))\). We easily verify that in \(40\)
\[
\begin{align*}
\overline{G}_{(2,2,2)} & \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \text{Span}\left([1, (2,3)], (2, (3,1)), (3, (1,2))\right) = \mathbb{F}(E)(3), \\
\overline{G}_{(1,2,2)} & \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \text{Span}\left([1, (2,3)], (2, (3,1)) - (3, (1,2))\right), \\
\overline{G}_{(2,1,2)} & \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \text{Span}\left([2, (3,1)], (3, (1,2)) - (1, (2,3))\right), \text{ and} \\
\overline{G}_{(2,2,1)} & \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \text{Span}\left([3, (1,2)], (1, (2,3)) - (2, (3,1))\right).
\end{align*}
\]

In contrast with the situation of Example 42, the remaining pieces of the poset \((11)\) are trivial,
\[
\overline{G}_{(2,1,1)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \overline{G}_{(1,2,1)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \overline{G}_{(1,1,2)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = \overline{G}_{(1,1,1)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = 0.
\]

Indeed, by the saturation property,
\[
\begin{align*}
\overline{G}_{(2,1,1)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = & \overline{\text{Jac}}_3, \\
\overline{G}_{(1,2,1)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = & \overline{\text{Jac}}_3, \\
\overline{G}_{(1,1,2)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3) = & \overline{\text{Jac}}_3
\end{align*}
\]

whereas the intersections on the right hand sides are all trivial by a simple linear algebra.
**Example 44.** Consider finally the case when $E$ is spanned by a single binary operation $(-,-)$ with no symmetry. Then $F(E)(3)$ has the basis consisting of 12 vectors

$$\{ (\sigma(1), (\sigma(2), \sigma(3))), ((\sigma(1), \sigma(2)), \sigma(3)) \}_{\sigma \in \Sigma_3}.$$  

Just as before, we observe that $G_{(1,2,2)}F(E)(3)$, $G_{(2,1,2)}F(E)(3)$ and $G_{(2,2,1)}F(E)(3)$ have their respective bases

$$\begin{align*}
&\{ (1, (2,3)), (2, (3,1)), (1, (3,2)), (3, 2), 1, \\
&\{ (2, (3,1)) - (3, (2,1)), ((1,2), 3) - ((1,3), 2), (3, (1,2)) - ((3,1), 2), (2, (1,3)) - ((2,1), 3) \}.
\end{align*}$$

Then $G_{(1,1,2)}F(E)(3) = G_{(1,2,2)}F(E)(3) \cap G_{(2,1,2)}F(E)(3)$ is 4-dimensional, spanned by

$$\begin{align*}
&\{ (1, (2,3)) + ((1,3), 2) - ((1,2), 3), (2, (1,3)) + ((2,3), 1) - ((2,1), 3), \\
&\{ (1, (3,2)) + ((3,1), 2) - ((3,1), 2), (2, (3,1)) + ((3,2), 1) - ((3,2), 1) \}.
\end{align*}$$

Finally, $G_{(1,1,1)}F(E)(3) = G_{(1,2,2)}F(E)(3) \cap G_{(2,2,1)}F(E)(3)$ turns out to be one-dimensional, with the basis vector

$$\begin{align*}
&(1, (2,3)) + ((1,3), 2) - ((1,2), 3) - (2, (1,3)) - ((2,3), 1) + ((2,1), 3) \\
&- (1, (3,2)) - ((3,1), 2) + (3, (1,2)) + (2, (3,1)) + (3, (2,1)) - (3, (2,1)).
\end{align*}$$

The above vector can be conveniently rewritten using the associator

$$\text{Ass}(1, 2, 3) := ((1,2), 3) - (1, (2,3)) \in F(E)(3)$$

of the operation $(-,-)$. Namely, it is

$$\text{LieAdm}(1, 2, 3) := \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_3} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \text{Ass}(\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \sigma(3))$$

making up a relation characterizing Lie admissible algebras [32, Example 6].

**Example 45.** Let $\mathcal{Lie}$ be the operad governing Lie algebras, presented as the quotient of the free operad $F(E)$ in Example 44 modulo the Jacobian [11], and $\phi : F(E) \to \mathcal{Lie}$ the natural projection. We are going to describe the standard multifiltration of $\mathcal{Lie}$ with respect to the generator $\phi([-,-]) \in \mathcal{Lie}(2)$. Let us single out the following elements of $\mathcal{Lie}(3)$,

$$e := \phi([1,[2,3]]), f := \phi([2,[3,1]]), g := \phi([3,[1,2]])$$

related by the Jacobi identity $e + f + g = 0$. We choose $\{e, f\}$ as a basis of $\mathcal{Lie}(3)$. Thanks to Lemma 57, we may describe the relevant pieces of the prestandard multifiltration of $\mathcal{Lie}(3)$ as...
the image of the same pieces of the prestandard multifiltration of $\mathbb{F}(E)$. The result is
\[
G_{(2,2,2)} \text{Lie}(3) = \text{Span}(e, f) = \text{Lie}(3),
\]
\[
G_{(1,2,2)} \text{Lie}(3) = \text{Span}(e), \quad G_{(2,1,2)} \text{Lie}(3) = \text{Span}(f) \quad \text{and} \quad G_{(2,2,1)} \text{Lie}(3) = \text{Span}(e + f).
\]

By Lemma 37 the prestandard multifiltration $G \text{Lie}$ stabilizes, so we may use formula (22) combined with Corollary 31 to describe the standard multifiltration of $\text{Lie}(3)$. The result is
\[
\overline{G}_{(2,2,2)} \text{Lie}(3) = \text{Span}(e, f) = \text{Lie}(3),
\]
\[
\overline{G}_{(1,2,2)} \text{Lie}(3) = \text{Span}(e), \quad \overline{G}_{(2,1,2)} \text{Lie}(3) = \text{Span}(f), \quad \overline{G}_{(2,2,1)} \text{Lie}(3) = \text{Span}(e + f),
\]
\[
\overline{G}_{(1,1,2)} \text{Lie}(3) = \overline{G}_{(1,2,1)} \text{Lie}(3) = \overline{G}_{(2,1,1)} \text{Lie}(3) = \overline{G}_{(1,1,1)} \text{Lie}(3) = 0.
\]

The lattice analogous to (40) for the standard multifiltration of $\text{Lie}(3)$ thus looks as

```
\[
\text{Lie}(3) \quad \overline{\text{Span}(e)} \quad \overline{\text{Span}(f)} \quad \overline{\text{Span}(e + f)}
\]
```

The configuration of $\overline{G}_{(1,2,2)} \text{Lie}(3)$, $\overline{G}_{(2,1,2)} \text{Lie}(3)$ and $\overline{G}_{(2,2,1)} \text{Lie}(3)$ in $\text{Lie}(3)$ is portrayed in:

```
\[
\overline{G}_{(2,2,2)} \text{Lie}(3) \quad \quad \quad \overline{G}_{(2,1,2)} \text{Lie}(3) \quad \quad \quad \overline{G}_{(2,2,1)} \text{Lie}(3)
\]
```

It is clear from that picture that the intersection $\overline{G}_{(1,1,1)} \text{Lie}(3)$ of the three one-dimensional subspaces equals 0.

Notice that in this case the image $\phi(\overline{G}_{\bar{p}} \mathbb{F}(E)(3))$ equals $\overline{G}_{\bar{p}} \text{Lie}(3)$ for each $\bar{p} \in \text{MZ}(3)$. One may in fact prove that, more generally, if $\mathcal{P}$ is a binary quadratic operad with the quadratic presentation $\mathbb{F}(E)/(R)$ such that $R \subset \overline{G}_{(1,1,1)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3)$, then $\overline{G}_{(1,1,1)} \mathcal{P}(3)$ coincides with the image of $\overline{G}_{(1,1,1)} \mathbb{F}(E)(3)$ under the canonical projection $\mathbb{F}(E) \to \mathcal{P}$.
Example 46. Let $\mathcal{Com}$ be the operad for commutative associative algebras, presented as the quotient of the free operad $\mathcal{F}(E)$ of Example 43 modulo the associativity $(1, (2, 3)) = ((1, 2), 3)$. Denoting by $\phi : \mathcal{F}(E) \to \mathcal{Com}$ the canonical projection and 

$$a := \phi(1, (2, 3)), \quad b := \phi(2, (3, 1)), \quad c := \phi(3, (1, 2)),$$

the vector space $\mathcal{Com}(3)$ is isomorphic to $\text{Span}(a)$, and $a = b = c$ in $\mathcal{Com}(3)$. Using the pattern of Example 45, we calculate

$$G^{(2,2,2)}(\mathcal{Com}(3)) = G^{(1,2,2)}(\mathcal{Com}(3)) = G^{(2,1,2)}(\mathcal{Com}(3)) = G^{(2,2,1)}(\mathcal{Com}(3)) = \text{Span}(a) = \mathcal{Com}(3).$$

From this we conclude that $G^{\vec{p}}(\mathcal{Com}(3)) = \mathcal{Com}(3)$ for each $\vec{p} \in M\mathbb{Z}(3)$. All entries of the lattice analogous to (40) equal $\mathcal{Com}(3)$. The standard multfiltration of $\mathcal{Com}$ is strictly bigger than the image of the standard multfiltration of $\mathcal{F}(E)$ under the projection $\phi : \mathcal{F}(E) \to \mathcal{Com}$.

**Example.** A 3-Lie algebra, aka Filipov algebra [7], consists of a vector space $V$ together with a trilinear antisymmetric bracket $[-, -, -]$ satisfying the ‘fundamental identity’

$$[1, 2, [3, 4, 5]] = [[1, 2, 3], 4, 5] + [3, [1, 2, 4], 5] + [3, 4, [1, 2, 5]].$$

We leave as an exercise to verify that, if $\mathcal{F}(E)$ is the free operad generated by one antisymmetric trilinear operation, then the fundamental identity belongs to $G^{(2,2,1,1,1)}(\mathcal{F}(E))$.

Example 47. For non-simply connected operads the nice explicit inductive formula (24), the stability of Proposition 34 and the related formula (22) are not available, yet some information about their standard multfiltrations could still be obtained. To illustrate, consider the free operad $\mathcal{F}(E)$ whose generating collection $E$ is the span of an odd-degree unary operation $\Delta$. Since $\Delta \in G^{(1)}(\mathcal{F}(E))(1)$ by the definition of the standard multfiltration,

$$\Delta^2 = \frac{1}{2}[\Delta, \Delta]_{11} \in G^{(1)}(\mathcal{F}(E))(1)$$

by item (v) of Definition 20. We leave as an exercise to describe the entire canonical multfiltration of $\mathcal{F}(E)$ and the one of the related quotient $\mathcal{D}g = \mathcal{F}(E)/\langle \Delta \rangle$, cf. also Example 16.

### 4. Operator Algebras

Throughout this section, $A$ will be a graded commutative associative $k$-algebra. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a $k$-linear operad and $F\mathcal{E}nd_A = \{F_{\vec{p}}\mathcal{E}nd_A(n)\}_{\vec{p}, n}$ the multfiltration of Example 23. Then the collection $\mathcal{D}iff_A := \{\mathcal{D}iff_A(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$, where

$$\mathcal{D}iff_A(n) := \bigcup_{\vec{p}, n} F_{\vec{p}}\mathcal{E}nd_A(n), \quad n \geq 1,$$

is, by Proposition 5, a multfiltered suboperad of the endomorphism operad $\mathcal{E}nd_A$. It has a multfiltered suboperad $\mathcal{D}er_A = \{\mathcal{D}er_A(n)\}_n$ such that $F_{\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}}\mathcal{D}er_A(n)$ consists of $k$-linear maps $O : A^{\otimes n} \to A$ that are derivations of order $\leq p_i$ in the $i$-th variable, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. 
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Definition 48. An operator $\mathcal{P}$-algebra $A$ is an operad morphism $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \to \text{Diff}_{A}$. We say that it is of order $k \geq 0$, if $\mathcal{P}$ is generated by a collection $E = \{E(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that

$$\alpha(E(n)) \subset F_{(k, \ldots, k)} \text{Diff}_{A}(n), \text{ for all } n \geq 1.$$ 

Operator algebras whose structure map factorizes through the inclusion $\text{Der}_{A} \hookrightarrow \text{Diff}_{A}$ will be of particular importance for us. An operator $\mathcal{P}$-algebra is simultaneously a $\mathcal{P}$-algebra in the ordinary operadic sense, via the composition $\mathcal{P} \to \text{Diff}_{A} \hookrightarrow \text{End}_{A}$.

Example. Commutative associative algebras are operator algebras of order 0.

Example. A Jacobi structure on a manifold $M$ is an operator Lie algebra on $C^\infty(M)$. A well-known [15, 10] structure theorem gives a precise characterization of the only non-trivial bracket $[-, -]_1$. Namely,

$$[f, g]_1 = \Pi(df, dg) + \xi(f dg - gd)$$

for a 2-vector field $\Pi$ and a 1-vector field $\xi$ on $M$ subject to the compatibility conditions

$$[\xi, \Pi] = 0, \quad [\Pi, \Pi] = 2\xi \wedge \Pi.$$ 

Example. The classical Poisson algebra is, by definition, a Lie algebra whose underlying space is a commutative associative algebra, say $A$, such that the Lie bracket is a derivation in each variable. It is thus the same as an operad map $\text{Lie} \to \text{Der}_{A}$ that sends the generator of $\text{Lie}(2)$ into an antisymmetric operation $A^\otimes 2 \to A$ which is an order 1 derivation in each variable. It is thus an operator algebra of order 1. The situation is summarized by the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Lie} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}oiss} & \text{End}_{A} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{Der}_{A} & \xrightarrow{\text{Diff}_{A}} & \text{Diff}_{A}
\end{array}$$

of operad morphisms in which $\text{Poiss}$ is the operad governing Poisson algebras.

Example. Let $\mathcal{D}g$ be the operad treated in Examples 16 and 47. A Batalin-Vilkovisky algebra with the underlying commutative associative algebra $A$ is given by an operad morphism $\mathcal{D}g \to \text{Der}_{A}$ that sends the generator of $\mathcal{D}g(1)$ to a derivation of order 2 and degree $-1$ with respect to the grading of $A$. Batalin-Vilkovisky algebras are therefore operator algebras of order 2. The situation is expressed by the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{D}g & \xrightarrow{\text{Der}_{A}} & \text{Diff}_{A} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{BV} & \xrightarrow{\text{End}_{A}} & \text{End}_{A}
\end{array}$$

where $\text{BV}$ is the operad governing Batalin-Vilkovisky algebras.
We are going to introduce a ‘quantized’ version of the multifiltered operads $\mathcal{D}iff_A$ and $\mathcal{D}er_A$. Let $h$ be a formal parameter of an even degree and $\mathcal{E}nd_{A[[h]]}$ be the endomorphism operad of the $\mathbb{k}[[h]]$-module $A[[h]]$ with the multifiltration $\mathcal{F}\mathcal{E}nd_{A[[h]]} = \{F_p\mathcal{E}nd_{A[[h]]}(n)\}_{p,n}$ of Example 22. The collection $\mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]] := \{\mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]](n)\}_{n \geq 1}$, where $$\mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]](n) := \bigcup_{p \in \mathbb{MZ}(n)} F_p\mathcal{E}nd_{A[[h]]}(n), \ n \geq 1,$$ form a multifiltered suboperad of the endomorphism operad $\mathcal{E}nd_{A[[h]]}$. Analogously we define a multifiltered suboperad $\mathcal{D}er_A[[h]]$ of $\mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]]$, requiring that the multilinear maps $O_0, O_1, O_2, \ldots$ in (14) are derivations in each of its variables of the indicated degrees.

**Definition 49.** A formal operator $\mathcal{P}$-algebra is an operad morphism $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]]$. Such an algebra is of order $k \geq 0$, if $\mathcal{P}$ admits a generating collection $E = \{E(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that $$\alpha(E(n)) \subset F_{(k, \ldots, k)}\mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]](n), \ \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$ Expanding this definition, we note that a formal operator $\mathcal{P}$-algebra $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]]$ of order $k$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-algebra supported on $A[[h]]$ and such that its $n$-ary generating operations are of the form $$O(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = O_0(a_1, \ldots, a_n) + O_1(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \cdot h + O_2(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \cdot h^2 + \ldots$$ where each $O_s$ is a multilinear differential operator of order $\leq k + s$ with respect to each of its arguments. In particular, any formal operator algebra of order $k$ is automatically a formal operator algebra of order $l$ for any $l > k$. The canonical inclusion $A \to A[[h]]$ and the reduction $A[[h]] \to A \mod h$ determines an operad morphism $\mathcal{E}nd_{A[[h]]} \to \mathcal{E}nd_A$, which restricts to a morphism of suboperads $\pi : \mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]] \to \mathcal{D}iff_A$.

**Definition 50.** The semiclassical limit of a formal operator algebra $\mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]]$ is an operator $\mathcal{P}$-algebra whose structure map is the composition $$\mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]] \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{D}iff_A.$$ The semiclassical limit of a formal operator algebra of order $k$ is clearly an operator algebra of the same order.

**Example.** An example of a formal operator $\mathcal{P}$-algebra of order 0 for $\mathcal{P}$ the associative operad $\mathcal{A}ss$ is provided by Terilla’s quantization [39] recalled in Subsection 9.4 of the present article. Its semiclassical limit is the commutative associative algebra $\hat{\mathbb{S}}(V \oplus V^*)$. Another example of the same type is the celebrated Kontsevich deformation quantization of a Poisson manifold $M$ [16]. Its semiclassical limit is the algebra $C^\infty(M)$ of smooth functions on $M$. [August 24, 2021] [superbig.tex]
Operator, resp. formal operator algebras of order 1 are abundant in Nature, and many structures relevant for physics are of this type. Below we introduce a class of operads whose order 1 (formal) operator algebras are particularly amenable to study.

**Definition 51.** A $k$-linear operad $P$ with a generating collection $E$ is **tight** if it admits a **tight presentation**, by which we mean a presentation $P = \mathbb{F}(E)/(R)$ such that the collection $R = \{R(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ generating the operadic ideal $(R)$ satisfies

$$R(n) \subseteq \overline{G}_{(1,\ldots,1)}\mathbb{F}(E)(n), \text{ for each } n \geq 1. \quad (44)$$

Here, $\overline{G}_{(1,\ldots,1)}\mathbb{F}(E)$ refers to the standard multifiltration of Definition 32, cf. also Proposition 40 addressing the particular case of free operads.

Notice that for operads with at least quadratic relations, the expected ‘generic relation’ is $R(n) \subseteq \overline{G}_{\vec{p}}\mathbb{F}(E)(n)$ for some $\vec{p} > (1,\ldots,1)$, $\vec{p} \neq (1,\ldots,1)$ instead of (44). The adjective ‘tight’ therefore refers to the fact that the relations $R$ are confined to a small subcollection of $\mathbb{F}(E)$.

**Theorem 52.** The only tight quadratic operads generated by one binary operation are the free operad, the operad $\mathcal{L}ie$ for Lie algebras, and the operad $\mathcal{L}ie\text{Adm}$ for Lie admissible algebras.

**Proof.** The result follows from the analysis carried out in Examples 42-44. If the generating collection of the quadratic operad $P = \mathbb{F}(E)/(R)$ is spanned by one antisymmetric operation, then $\overline{G}_{(1,1,1)}\mathbb{F}(E)(3)$ is the one-dimensional span of the Jacobiator by (12). Thus either $R = 0$, in which case $P$ is free, or $R = \text{Span}(Jac_3)$, in which case $P$ is the operad for Lie algebras.

If the generating operation is commutative, then $\overline{G}_{(1,1,1)}\mathbb{F}(E)(3) = 0$ by (13), thus $P$ must be free. If the generating operation has no symmetry, then either $P$ is free or $P = \mathcal{L}ie\text{Adm}$ by the result of Example 44. □

**Remark.** It is evident that the coproduct $P' \sqcup P''$ of tight operads is tight again. As argued in [32, Example 6], the operad $\mathcal{L}ie\text{Adm}$ is the coproduct

$$\mathcal{L}ie\text{Adm} \cong \mathcal{L}ie \sqcup \mathbb{F}(\tilde{\omega})$$

of the operad for Lie algebras with the free operad on one commutative binary operation $\tilde{\omega}$. Thus the tightness of $\mathcal{L}ie\text{Adm}$ is corroborated by the tightness of the operads at the right hand side of the above display.

**Remark.** Theorem 52 indicates that the tightness is a fairly restrictive property, yet some meaningful examples of tight operads generated by multiple operations or operations of arities other than two are available. A rather simple one is the operad $\mathcal{D}g$ whose algebras are differential graded vector spaces, which is generated by an odd-degree square-zero operation $\Delta$, as established in Example 47. A more complex one is the operad $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ governing $L_\infty$ (strongly homotopy
Lie) algebras in the category of non-dg graded vector spaces. Its tightness is established in the proof of Proposition 53.

The promised practical implication of the defining property of tight operads is the fact that, if the generating operations of their algebras are (formal) differential operators living in the \((1, \ldots, 1)\)-piece of an appropriate multifiltration, then their defining axioms automatically live in the same piece:

**Theorem 53.** Let \(A\) be a commutative \(k\)-algebra with a generating set \(S\) and \(P\) be a tight \(k\)-linear operad with a tight presentation \(P = F(E)/\langle R \rangle\), where \(E = \{E(n)\}_n\) is a generating collection and \(R = \{R(n)\}_n\) generates the operadic ideal \(\langle R \rangle\). If \(\alpha : F(E) \to \mathcal{D}iff_A\) is an operad morphism such that
\[
\alpha(E(n)) \subset F_{(1, \ldots, 1)}\mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]](n) \text{ for all } n \geq 1,
\]
then
\[
\alpha(R(n)) \subset F_{(1, \ldots, 1)}\mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]](n) \text{ for all } n \geq 1.
\]
The analogous statements hold also for \(\mathcal{D}er_A, \mathcal{D}iff_A\) resp. \(\mathcal{D}er_A[[h]]\) in place of \(\mathcal{D}iff_A\).

**Proof.** One has \(\alpha(R(n)) \subset \alpha(F_{(1, \ldots, 1)}F(E(n))) \subset F_{(1, \ldots, 1)}\mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]](n)\), where the second inclusion follows from Proposition 39 with \(P = F(E)\) and \(S = \mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]]\).

Order 1 operator algebras over tight operads are so important and omnipresent that we coined a name for them:

**Definition 54.** Let \(P\) be a tight operad with a tight presentation \(F(E)/\langle R \rangle\), and \(Q\) a multifiltered operad. An operad morphism \(\rho : P \to Q\) is **wide** if
\[
\rho(E(n)) \subset F_{(1, \ldots, 1)}Q(n), \text{ for all } n \geq 1.
\]
An operator, resp. formal operator \(P\)-algebra is **wide** if its structure morphism is wide.

In other words, wide (formal) operator algebras are (formal) operator algebras of order 1 over a tight operad. It follows from the definition and Theorem 53 that, if the generating operations of a wide algebra are (ordinary) derivations in each of its variables, then its axioms enjoy the same property. We thus have:

**Corollary.** Let \(P = F(E)/\langle R \rangle\) be a tight presentation and \(\alpha : P \to \mathcal{D}er_A\) a wide operator algebra. Then \(O \in \alpha(R)(n)\) vanishes on \(A^\otimes n\) if and only if \(O(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0\) for generators \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\) of \(A\).

**Proof.** The statement follows from the obvious fact that an (ordinary) derivation on \(A\) vanishes if and only if it vanishes on the generators of \(A\).
The practical and very useful implication of the Corollary is that it suffices to verify axioms of wide operator algebras, whose structure operations are derivations in each variable, for the generators of the underlying commutative associative algebra only. We will see tricks of this type at several places of the second part of this article.

Part 2. Concrete structures

5. OPERATOR $L_\infty$-ALGEBRAS AND THEIR SIBLINGS

This and the following section are devoted to operator $L_\infty$-algebras and their particular examples – IBL$_\infty$-algebras, commutative BV$_\infty$-algebras, operator Lie algebras and Poisson algebras. All these structures are, in the terminology of Part 1, wide operator algebras over tight quadratic operads, and many of their nice and useful properties follow from that. We will however keep the exposition independent of the operadic lingo, just referring to the relevant results of Part 1 at appropriate places. The reader may safely skip all ‘operadic’ material.

5.1. Formal operator $L_\infty$-algebras. For graded indeterminates $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and a permutation $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$, the Koszul sign $\epsilon(\sigma) = \epsilon(\sigma; x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \{-1, +1\}$ is defined by

$$x_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_n = \epsilon(\sigma; x_1, \ldots, x_n) \cdot x_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge x_{\sigma(n)},$$

which has to be satisfied in the free graded polynomial algebra $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Denote also

$$\chi(\sigma) = \chi(\sigma; x_1, \ldots, x_n) := \text{sgn}(\sigma) \cdot \epsilon(\sigma; x_1, \ldots, x_n).$$

Recall the classical:

**Definition 55** ([23, Definition 2.1]). An $L_\infty$-algebra is a $k$-linear graded vector space $L$ equipped with $k$-linear maps $l_k : \bigotimes^k L \to L$, $k \geq 1$, of degree $k-2$ which are antisymmetric, i.e.

$$l_k(\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, \lambda_{\sigma(k)}) = \chi(\sigma)l_k(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k)$$

for all permutations $\sigma \in \Sigma_k$ and $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k \in L$. Moreover, the following generalized form of the Jacobi identity is required for any $k \geq 0$:

$$\text{Jac}_k(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k) := \sum \chi(\sigma)(-1)^{i(j-1)}l_j(l_i(\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, \lambda_{\sigma(i)}), \lambda_{\sigma(i+1)}, \ldots, \lambda_{\sigma(k)}) = 0,$$

with the summation over all $i, j \geq 1$ with $i + j = k + 1$, and all $(i, k-i)$-shuffles $\sigma \in \Sigma_k$.  

In the following central notion of this subsection, $A$ is a graded commutative associative algebra.
Definition 56. A formal operator $L_\infty$-algebra is an $L_\infty$-algebra as in Definition 55 whose underlying vector space $L$ equals $A[[h]] := A \otimes k[[h]]$, whose structure operations are $k[[h]]$-linear and such that, for each $a_1, \ldots, a_k \in A \subset A[[k]]$,

\begin{equation}
\ell_k(a_1, \ldots, a_k) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \ell_{k,n}(a_1, \ldots, a_k) \cdot h^{n-1},
\end{equation}

where $\ell_{k,n} : A^\otimes k \to A$ is a differential operator of order $\leq n$ in each variable.

Example 57. If the underlying algebra $A$ is a graded vector space with the trivial multiplication, differential operators of order one are just $k$-linear maps. Thus the usual $L_\infty$-algebras are particular cases of formal operator $L_\infty$-algebras whose structure operations $\ell_{k,n}$ vanish for $n > 2$. In Example 58 we however describe a less trivial embedding of the category of $L_\infty$-algebras into the category of formal operator $L_\infty$-algebras.

Example 58. Assume that $A$ has a unit $1 \in A$. A formal operator $L_\infty$-algebra whose all structure operations except $\ell_1 : A[[h]] \to A[[h]]$ vanish and $\ell_1(1) = 0$, is the same as a commutative BV$_\infty$-algebra [27, Definition 7]. Moreover, if $A = \mathcal{S}(V)$, the free commutative associative algebra generated by a graded vector space $V$, we recover the definition of an IBL$_\infty$-algebra [36, Subsection 4.2], cf. also [34, Example 9].

Remark. A special case of a formal operator $L_\infty$-algebra, with $\ell_{k,n} = 0$ for $n > 1$ and $\ell_{k,0}$’s derivations in each of its $k$ variables has been studied by L. Vitagliano [40] under the name of multi-derivation $L_\infty$-algebras.

The interplay between the orders of differential operators in (48) and the powers of $h$ was motivated by the notion of IBL$_\infty$-algebras mentioned in Example 58. IBL$_\infty$-algebras fit into the scheme of binary QFT algebras of Park [39]. They are, by definition, graded commutative associative algebras over $k[[h]]$ with a differential $D$ whose deviation $\Phi_D^{n+1}$ is divisible by $h^n$, for each $n \geq 0$. The deviations of the operators in (48) share the same divisibility property.

Using the $k[[h]]$-linearity of the structure operations $\ell_k$ and decomposition (48), one sees that the condition $\text{Jac}_k(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k) = 0$ for $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k \in A[[h]]$ is equivalent to the conditions

\begin{equation}
\text{Jac}_{k,n}(a_1, \ldots, a_k) := \sum \chi(\sigma)(-1)^{i(j-1)} l_{j,s}(i, i(\sigma(1), \ldots, a_{\sigma(i)}), a_{\sigma(i+1)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(k)}) = 0,
\end{equation}

where $i, j$ and $\sigma$ runs over the same sets as in (17) and $s, t \geq 1$ runs over all couples such that $s + t = n + 1$, required for each $n \geq 1$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_k \in A$.

Proposition 59. The multilinear map $\text{Jac}_{k,n} : A^\otimes k \to A$ defined in (49) is a differential operator of order $\leq n$ in each of its variables.
Proof. Since Jac\(_{k,n}\) is graded cyclically symmetric, it is enough to establish that Jac\(_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k)\) is a differential operator of order \(\leq n\) in \(a_1\). We start by decomposing

\[
\text{Jac}_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) = A_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) + B_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k),
\]

where

\[
A_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) := \sum \chi(\sigma)(-1)^{l(j-1)} l_{i,j}(l_{i,1}(a_1, a_{\sigma(2)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(i)}), a_{\sigma(i+1)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(k)}),
\]

in which the sum in \((49)\) is restricted to shuffles with \(\sigma(1) = a_1\), and

\[
B_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) := \sum \chi(\sigma)(-1)^{l(j-1)} l_{i,j}(l_{i,1}(a_{\sigma(1)},\ldots,a_{\sigma(i)}), a_1, a_{\sigma(i+2)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(k)}),
\]

where we take shuffles with \(\sigma(i+1) = a_1\).

Notice that all the constituents of the multilinear map \(B_{k,n}\) are differential operators of order \(\leq n\) in \(a_1\) since each \(l_{j,s}\) is a differential operator of order \(\leq s\) in all its variables, and \(s \leq n\). Thus \(B_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k)\) is a differential operator of order \(\leq n\) in \(a_1\) as well.

Regarding \(A_{k,n}\), our trick will be to represent it as a sum of commutators of differential operators of appropriate orders. Let us write

\[
A_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) = A'_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) + A''_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) + A'''_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k),
\]

where \(A'_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k)\) is the sum of terms of \(A_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k)\) with \(i = j = 1\), \(A''_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k)\) is the sum of terms where either \(i\) or \(j\), but not both, equals 1, and \(A'''_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k)\) the sum of the remaining terms. Clearly \(A'_{k,n}\) is nontrivial only for \(k = 1\) in which case

\[
A'_{1,n}(a_1) = \sum_{s+t=n+1} l_{1,s}(l_{1,t}(a_1)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s+t=n+1, s \leq t} [l_{1,s}; l_{1,t}](a_1).
\]

The rightmost term is the graded commutator of differential operators, which is a differential operator of order \(\leq s + t + 1 = n\) by \((29)\) Proposition 1]. Equally easily one sees

\[
A''_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) = \sum_{s+t=n+1} l_{1,s}(l_{k,t}(a_1,\ldots,a_k)) - (-1)^k l_{k,t}(l_{1,s}(a_1), a_2,\ldots,a_k)
\]

\[
= \sum_{s+t=n+1} [l_{1,s}; l_{k,t}(a_1,\ldots,a_k)](a_1),
\]

where \(l_{k,t}(a_1,\ldots,a_k)\) is the differential operator \(a \mapsto (-1)^{|a||a_2|+\cdots+|a_k|} l_{k,t}(a, a_2,\ldots,a_k)\). Thus \(A''_{k,n}\) is a differential operator of order \(\leq n\) in \(a_1\) by \((29)\) Proposition 1] again. To finish the proof, we decompose

\[
A'''_{k,n}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) = A_{k,n}^{\leq}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) + A_{k,n}^{\geq}(a_1,\ldots,a_k)
\]

where

\[
A_{k,n}^{\leq}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) := \sum \chi(\sigma)(-1)^{l(j-1)} l_{j,s}(l_{i,1}(a_1, a_{\sigma(2)},\ldots,a_{\sigma(i)}), a_{\sigma(i+1)},\ldots,a_{\sigma(k)}),
\]

with the summation restricted to shuffles with \(\sigma(2) < \sigma(i+1)\), while

\[
A_{k,n}^{\geq}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) := \sum \chi(\sigma)\chi(\tau)(-1)^{l(i-1)} l_{i,s}(a_1, a_{\sigma(i+1)},\ldots,a_{\sigma(k)}), a_{\sigma(2)},\ldots,a_{\sigma(i)}
\]
with the same summation range and $\tau$ the permutation

$$a_{\sigma(2)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(i)}, a_{\sigma(i+1)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(k)} \mapsto a_{\sigma(i+1)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(k)}, a_{\sigma(2)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(i)}.$$ 

It is not difficult to show now that $A''_{k,n}(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ is a sum of commutators

$$[l_{j,k}(-, a_{\sigma(i+1)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(k)}); l_{i,1}(-, a_{\sigma(2)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(i)})](a_1)$$

with appropriate signs; we leave the details to the reader. This finishes the proof.  \[\square\]

In the terminology of Definition 49 of Part I, formal operator $L_\infty$-algebras are order-one formal operator $P$-algebras for $P = L_\infty$, the operad governing $L_\infty$-algebras in the category of non-dg graded vector spaces. The operad $L_\infty$ is the quotient $F(E)/ (R)$, where the collection $E = \{ E(k) \}_{k \geq 1}$ is such that $E(k)$ is the one-dimensional signum representation of the symmetric group $\Sigma_k$ generated by $\ell_k$ and $R = \{ R(k) \}_{k \geq 1}$ has its piece $R(k)$ generated by

$$\text{Jac}_k := \sum_{i+j=k+1} \chi(\sigma)(-1)^{i(j-1)} \ell_j \circ_1 \ell_i.$$ 

**Proposition 60.** The operad $L_\infty$ is tight quadratic, and formal operator $L_\infty$-algebras are wide algebras over that operad.

**Proof.** To establish the first part, we need to show that, if each generator $\ell_k$ is declared to belong to the piece $\overline{G}_{(1, \ldots, 1)}F(E)(k)$ of the canonical multifiltration, then $\text{Jac}_k \in \overline{G}_{(1, \ldots, 1)}F(E)(k)$ as well, for each $k \geq 1$. This can be easily established with the help of the decomposition used in the proof of Proposition 59, cf. also item (iv) of Proposition 40 for the particular case of only one nontrivial operation.

To prove the second part, observe that a formal operator $L_\infty$-algebra in Definition 56 is the same as an operad morphism $\alpha : L_\infty \to \mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]]$ determined by declaring

$$\alpha(\ell_k) := \sum_{n \geq 1} l_{k,n} \cdot h^{n-1}, \quad k \geq 1.$$ 

Clearly, $\alpha(\ell_k) \in F_{(1, \ldots, 1)}\mathcal{D}iff_A[[h]](k)$ for all $k \geq 1$, meaning that $L_\infty$-algebras are wide formal operator algebras.  \[\square\]

**Remark 61.** It is a standard fact that the individual structure operations $l_k : \bigotimes^k L \to L$, $k \geq 1$, of an $L_\infty$-algebra can be assembled into a degree $-1$ coderivation $\delta$ on the cofree conilpotent cocommutative coassociative coalgebra $\mathbb{S}^\epsilon(\bigcirc L)$ cogenerated by the suspension of the underlying vector space $L$. The infinite number of axioms [47] is then equivalent to the single equation $\delta^2 = 0$, cf. [23, Theorem 2.3].

Likewise, the structure operations of a formal operator $L_\infty$-algebra in Definition 56 assemble into a coderivation $\delta_h$ of $\mathbb{S}^\epsilon(\bigcirc L)[[h]]$ that squares to 0. We however do not know how to express conveniently the required decomposition [48] in terms of $\delta_h$.  
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A (weak) morphism of $L_\infty$-algebras that are represented in the compact language of Remark 61 by the dg coalgebras by $(S^c(\uparrow L'), \delta')$ resp. $(S^c(\uparrow L''), \delta'')$ is, by definition, a dg coalgebra morphism
\begin{equation}
F : (S^c(\uparrow L'), \delta') \longrightarrow (S^c(\uparrow L''), \delta'').
\end{equation}
It turns out that (50) is the same as a system $f_k : \otimes^k L' \to L''$, $k \geq 1$, of degree $k-1$ graded anti-symmetric linear maps that satisfy an infinite system of equations listed e.g. in [8, Section 7.3]. We are going to indicate briefly how to define morphisms of formal operator $L_\infty$-algebras.

Let us assume that we are given two formal operator $L_\infty$-algebras with the underlying commutative associative algebras $A'$ resp. $A''$. An appropriate notion of differential operators of the form $\nabla : A' \to A''$ requires an auxiliary morphism $\beta : A' \to A''$. With the aid of this morphism, the inductive formula for $\Phi^\beta_n$ shall be modified into
\[
\Phi^\beta_{n+1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}) := \Phi^\beta_n(a_1, \ldots, a_n a_{n+1}) - \Phi^\beta_n(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \beta(a_{n+1}) - (-1)^{|a_n||a_{n+1}|} \Phi^\beta_n(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}, a_{n+1}) \beta(a_n)
\]
and the notion of the operator of left multiplication modified in the similar manner. A morphism of formal operator $L_\infty$-algebras then will be given by multilinear maps $f_{k,n} : A^{\otimes k} \to A''$, $k, n \geq 1$, such that each $f_{k,n}$ is a differential operator of order $\leq n$ in each variable, and such that the $\mathbb{k}[[h]]$-linear maps $f_k : A^{\otimes k}[[h]] \to A''[[h]]$ defined by
\[
f_k(a_1, \ldots, a_k) := \sum_{n \geq 1} f_{k,n}(a_1, \ldots, a_k) \cdot h^{n-1}, \quad a_1, \ldots, a_k \in A',
\]
satisfy the axioms for components of a morphism of $L_\infty$-algebras. An analog of Proposition 59 can be formulated and proven also for the (unspelled) axioms for morphisms. Since we do not have any immediate applications, we will not give it here.

**Example 62.** Consider an $L_\infty$-algebra whose structure operations $l_k : \otimes^k L \to L$, $k \geq 1$, are assembled into a coderivation $\delta$ of the coalgebra $S^c(\uparrow L)$ as in Remark 61. Clearly
\[
\delta = \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_3 + \cdots,
\]
where $\delta_k$, corresponding to $l_k$, takes $S^k(X)$ to $X$. It is simple to check that, under the canonical isomorphism $S^c(\uparrow L) \cong S(\uparrow L)$, each $\delta_k$ is a differential operator of order $\leq k$. Taking, in Definition 56, $A := S(\uparrow L)$, $l_k := 0$ for $k \geq 2$, and
\[
l_1 := \delta_1 + \delta_2 h + \delta_3 h^2 + \cdots,
\]
one represents the initial classical $L_\infty$-algebra as a formal operator $L_\infty$-algebra with the underlying associative commutative algebra $S(\uparrow L)$.
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Let us denote by \( \text{AssocCom} \), \( \text{Lie}_\infty \) and \( \text{operLie}_\infty \) the categories of associative commutative algebras, \( L_\infty \)-algebras and formal operator \( L_\infty \)-algebras, respectively. We clearly have a diagram of functors

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{AssocCom} & \xrightarrow{I} & \text{operLie}_\infty \\
\downarrow I' & & \downarrow I_0 \\
& \text{Lie}_\infty & \downarrow I_1
\end{array}
\]

in which \( I' \) forgets the \( L_\infty \)-structure and remembers the underlying commutative associative algebra only, while the functor \( I \) equips an commutative associative algebra with the trivial \( L_\infty \)-structure. The functor \( I_0 \) interprets an \( L_\infty \)-algebra as a formal operator \( L_\infty \)-algebra sitting on the trivial commutative associative algebra, while \( I_1 \) uses the embedding of Example 52.

Finally, \( I'' : \text{operLie}_\infty \rightarrow \text{Lie}_\infty \) forgets the underlying commutative associative algebra structure and remembers only the operations \( l_{n,k} \) with \( n = 1 \), cf. (48) for the notation. One is tempted to define another functor \( \text{operLie}_\infty \rightarrow \text{Lie}_\infty \) by putting \( h = 1 \) to (48), but the infinite sum thus obtained might not be well defined. Examples when this happens are easy to construct.

### 6. Operator and Derivation Lie algebras

In this section we analyze in detail formal operator Lie algebras, i.e. formal operator \( L_\infty \)-algebras of Definition 56 whose only nontrivial operation is

\[
[-,-] := l_2 : A^\otimes 2[[h]] \rightarrow A[[h]].
\]

Having in mind explicit examples, we also single out the case when the structure operations are actually higher-order derivations, not general differential operators. Let us spell out

**Definition 63.** A **formal operator Lie algebra** is an associative commutative algebra \( A \) equipped with a \( \mathbb{k}[[h]] \)-linear Lie bracket \( [-,-] \) on \( A[[h]] \) whose restriction to \( A \subset A[[h]] \) decomposes as

\[
[a',a''] = \sum_{n \geq 1} [a',a'']_n \cdot h^{n-1}, \quad a',a'' \in A,
\]

where \( [-,-]_n : A \otimes A \rightarrow A \) is a differential operator of order \( \leq n \) in both variables. A formal operator Lie algebra is a **formal derivation Lie algebra** if \( [-,-]_n \) is a derivation of order \( \leq n \) in both variables.

By Theorem 52 of Part 1, the operad \( \text{Lie} \) governing Lie algebras is tight. It is simple to verify, using the recipe of the proof of Proposition 60, that the structure morphism \( \alpha : \text{Lie} \rightarrow \text{Diff}_A[[h]] \) of a formal operator Lie algebra, resp. the structure morphism \( \alpha : \text{Lie} \rightarrow \text{Der}_A[[h]] \) of a formal derivation Lie algebra, is wide. Thus both structures in Definition 53 are wide formal operator algebras.
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Example 64. Formal derivation Lie algebras with \([-,-]_n\) vanishing for \(n \geq 2\) are equivalent to the standard \(k\)-linear Poisson algebras. If \(P\) is such a Poisson algebra with the bracket \([-,-]\), then \(P \otimes k[[h]]\) is a formal derivation Lie algebra with \([-,-]_1 := [\cdot,\cdot]\) and all other higher brackets vanishing. This correspondence is one-to-one.

Consider again a general formal operator Lie algebra in Definition 63. For \(a, b, c \in A\) and \(n \geq 1\) denote

\[
\text{Jac}_n(a, b, c) := \sum_{s+t=n+1} \left\{ (-1)^{|a||c|} [a, [b, c]] + (-1)^{|b||a|} [b, [c, a]] + (-1)^{|c||b|} [c, [a, b]] \right\}.
\]

Obviously, the Jacobi equation for \([-,-]\) is fulfilled if and only if

\[
\text{Jac}_n(a, b, c) = 0
\]

for each \(a, b, c \in A\) and \(n \geq 1\). Notice that \(\text{Jac}_1(a, b, c) = 0\) is the standard Jacobi identity for \([-,-]_1\).

Proposition 65. The expression \(\text{Jac}_n\) of a formal operator Lie algebra is a differential operator of order \(\leq n\) in each of its three variables. For a formal derivation Lie algebra it is a derivation of order \(\leq n\) in all its variables.

Proof. The proposition follows from rewriting the Jacobi identity as

\[
\text{Jac}(a, b, c) := (-1)^{|a||c|} [a, [b, c]] + (-1)^{|b||a|} [b, [c, a]] + (-1)^{|c||b|} [c, [a, b]]
\]

\[
= (-1)^{|a||b|} \text{ad}_{[b,c]}(a) + (-1)^{|a||b|} \{ \text{ad}_b \text{ad}_c (a) - (-1)^{|c||b|} \text{ad}_c \text{ad}_b (a) \}
\]

\[
= (-1)^{|a||b|} \text{ad}_{[b,c]}(a) + (-1)^{|a||b|} [\text{ad}_b, \text{ad}_c] (a) = 0
\]

and estimating the orders of the individual terms using Proposition 5. \(\square\)

Notice that the Jacobian in (53) equals, modulo sign, the Jacobian \(\text{Jac}_{3,n}\) of equation (49), so the operator case of the proposition follows from Proposition 59.

7. Structure theorems

In this section we focus on the case when the underlying commutative associative algebra \(A\) of a formal operator Lie algebra equals

\[
\mathcal{S}(X) := \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{S}^n(X),
\]

the free graded unital commutative associative algebra generated by a graded vector space \(X\), with \(\mathcal{S}^n(X)\) the subspace spanned by \(n\)-fold tensor products of elements of \(X\). We also denote

\[
\mathcal{S}^{\leq n}(X) := \bigoplus_{0 \leq k \leq n} \mathcal{S}^k(X) = k \oplus X \oplus \mathcal{S}^2(X) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{S}^n(X), \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
\mathcal{S}^{\leq n}_+(X) := \bigoplus_{1 \leq k \leq n} \mathcal{S}^k(X) = X \oplus \mathcal{S}^2(X) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{S}^n(X).
\]
Lemma 66. Derivations (resp. differential operators) of order \( \leq n \) on \( \mathbb{S}(X) \) are uniquely determined by their restriction to \( \mathbb{S}^{\leq n}(X) \) (resp. to \( \mathbb{S}^{\leq n}(X) \)).

Proof. The derivations part is [29, Proposition 3]. Having a differential operator \( \mathcal{V} \) of order \( \leq n \), we take, using Corollary [3], its unique decomposition \( \mathcal{V} = \theta + L_a \), where \( L_a \) is the operator of left multiplication by \( a := \mathcal{V}(1) \), and \( \theta \) a derivation of order \( \leq n \). The derivation \( \theta \) is uniquely determined by its restriction to \( \mathbb{S}^{\leq n}(X) \) by the first part of the lemma, while \( a \) is the value of \( \mathcal{V} \) at \( 1 \in \mathbb{K} \). □

Proposition [3] combined with Lemma [66] has an obvious:

Corollary 67. Assume that, in Definition 63, \( A = \mathbb{S}(X) \), and \( n \geq 1 \). Then (53) is satisfied for each \( a, b, c \in \mathbb{S}(X) \) if and only if it holds for each \( a, b, c \in \mathbb{S}^{\leq n}(X) \) in the case of formal operator Lie algebras, while for formal derivation Lie algebras it is enough to check it for \( a, b, c \in \mathbb{S}^{\leq n}(X) \).

Below we describe two kinds of data that can be used to determine the operations \([-,-]_n \) in (51) for formal derivation Lie algebras.

Proposition 68. Suppose we are given a family

\[
\{ \mathcal{Y}(-,-)^{ij} : \mathbb{S}^i(X) \otimes \mathbb{S}^j(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(X) \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n \}
\]

of linear maps such that

\[
\mathcal{Y}(a', a'')^{ij} = (-1)^{|a'||a''|} \cdot \mathcal{Y}(a'', a')^{ji}, \text{ for } a' \otimes a'' \in \mathbb{S}^i(X) \otimes \mathbb{S}^j(X).
\]

Then the formula

\[
[x_1^{i_1} x_2^{i_2} \cdots x_s^{i_s}, x_1''^{j_1} x_2''^{j_2} \cdots x_t''^{j_t}]_n := 
\sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \sum_{\sigma,\mu} e(\sigma)e(\mu)x_{\sigma(1)}^{i_1} \cdots x_{\sigma(s-i)}^{i_s} \mathcal{Y}(x_{\sigma(s-i+1)}^{j_1} \cdots x_{\sigma(s)}^{j_s}, x_{\mu(1)}^{j_1} \cdots x_{\mu(t)}^{j_t})_n x_{\mu(j+1)}^{j_t} \cdots x_{\mu(t)}^{j_t}
\]

where \( \sigma \) runs over \((s-i, i)\)-shuffles, \( \mu \) over \((j, t-j)\)-shuffles, \( x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_s^{i_s} \in \mathbb{S}^s(X), x_1''^{j_1} \cdots x_t''^{j_t} \in \mathbb{S}^t(X) \), defines a graded antisymmetric operation \([-,-]_n : \mathbb{S}(X) \otimes \mathbb{S}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(X) \) which is a derivation of order \( \leq n \) in each variable.

Proof. Direct verification, cf. the formula at the top of page 374 of [29]. □

Proposition 69. Any graded antisymmetric map \([-,-]_n : \mathbb{S}(X) \otimes \mathbb{S}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(X) \) which is a derivation of order \( \leq n \) in both variables is uniquely determined by its restrictions

\[
\{ [-,-]^{ij}_n : \mathbb{S}^i(X) \otimes \mathbb{S}^j(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(X) \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n \}
\]

to \( \mathbb{S}^i(X) \otimes \mathbb{S}^j(X) \). On the other hand, for each system (54) such that

\[
[a', a'']^{ij}_n = (-1)^{|a'||a''|} \cdot [a'', a']^{ji}_n, \text{ for } a' \otimes a'' \in \mathbb{S}^i(X) \otimes \mathbb{S}^j(X),
\]

there exist \([-,-]_n : \mathbb{S}(X) \otimes \mathbb{S}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(X) \) as above that restricts to it.
Firstly, we prove a corollary, which is neither deep nor surprising, but describes a situation frequently occurring in nature.

**Corollary 70.** A Poisson algebra with the underlying commutative associative algebra \(\mathcal{S}(X)\) is uniquely determined by a graded antisymmetric bilinear map \(\langle-,-\rangle : X \otimes X \to \mathcal{S}(X)\) whose extension \([-,-] : \mathcal{S}(X) \otimes \mathcal{S}(X) \to \mathcal{S}(X)\) into a derivation in each variable satisfies the Jacobi identity on \(X \otimes X \otimes X\).

**Proof.** The uniqueness part follows from the fact that a derivation of order \(\leq n\) on \(\mathcal{S}(X)\) is uniquely determined by its restriction to \(\mathcal{S}^{\leq n}(X)\) [29, Proposition 2]. The proof of the existence is analogous to that of [29, Proposition 3]. Suppose we are given a family \([\mathcal{S}(X) \otimes \mathcal{S}(X) \to \mathcal{S}(X)\] be the operator determined by that family as in (60) For its restrictions to \(\mathcal{S}(X) \otimes \mathcal{S}(X)\) we get the equations

\[
[x_1', x_2''_{11}] = Y(x_1', x_2'_{11}),
\]

\[
[x_1', x_2''_{21}] = Y(x_1', x_2'_{21}) + x_1 Y(x_2''_{11}) + (-1)^{1\cdot 1} Y(x_2'_{11}) x_1 Y(x_2''_{21}) + x_1 Y(x_2''_{12}) + Y(x_1', x_2''_{21}) x_2'' + (-1)^{1\cdot 1} Y(x_2'_{12}) x_2'' + x_1 Y(x_2''_{11}) x_2'' + (-1)^{1\cdot 1} Y(x_2'_{12}) x_2'' + x_1 Y(x_2''_{11}) x_2'' + \text{terms containing } Y(-,-)_{ij},
\]

so they could be inductively solved for \(Y(-,-)_{ij}\). Formula (56) then defines the requisite operation \([-,-] : \mathcal{S}(X) \otimes \mathcal{S}(X) \to \mathcal{S}(X)\) with the prescribed restrictions. \(\square\)

Having in mind Example 64, we formulate a corollary, which is neither deep nor surprising, but describes a situation frequently occurring in nature.

**Corollary 70.** A Poisson algebra with the underlying commutative associative algebra \(\mathcal{S}(X)\) is uniquely determined by a graded antisymmetric bilinear map \(\langle-,-\rangle : X \otimes X \to \mathcal{S}(X)\) whose extension \([-,-] : \mathcal{S}(X) \otimes \mathcal{S}(X) \to \mathcal{S}(X)\) into a derivation in each variable satisfies the Jacobi identity on \(X \otimes X \otimes X\).

**Proof.** The extension \([-,-] \text{ of } \langle-,-\rangle \text{ mentioned in the corollary is given by formula (56) with } \]

\[Y(-,-)_{ij} := \begin{cases} \langle-,-\rangle & \text{for } i = j = n = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \]

The only nontrivial Jacobian (52) is \(\text{Jac}_1(a, b, c)\), which is a derivation of order \(\leq 1\) (i.e. a standard derivation) in each variable by Proposition 63. It is thus enough to verify, by Corollary 67, its vanishing for \(a, b, c \in \mathcal{S}^{\leq 1}(X) = X\). \(\square\)

**Example.** The most basic example illustrating Corollary 70 is obtained by taking \(X\) to be a Lie algebra \(L\) with the Lie bracket \(\langle-,-\rangle\). Note that assignment \(L \mapsto \mathcal{S}(L)\) yields a left adjoint to the forgetful functor from the category of Poisson algebras to the category of Lie algebras.

[superbig.tex]  
[August 24, 2021]
In the graded setting, taking \( L := \Gamma(TM) \) to be the shifted graded Lie algebra of vector fields on a smooth manifold \( M \) with the standard Lie bracket \( \langle - , - \rangle : L \otimes L \to L \) now of degree \(-1\), gives rise to the well-known Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket on the exterior algebra of multivector fields \( \bigwedge^*(L) \cong \Gamma(\bigwedge^*(TM)) \).

Another example of application of Corollary 70 is the ‘big bracket’ discussed in Subsection 8.1.

**Remark 71.** Let us consider the complete topological algebra \( \hat{\mathbb{S}}(X) := \lim \mathbb{S}(X)/\mathbb{S}^{ \geq k}(X) \) where, \( \hat{\mathbb{S}}^{ \geq k}(X) := \bigoplus_{n \geq k} \mathbb{S}^n(X) \).

It is not difficult to prove that each differential operator \( \nabla \) of order \( \leq r \) defined on \( \mathbb{S}(X) \) uniquely extends into a continuous linear map \( \hat{\mathbb{S}}(X) \to \hat{\mathbb{S}}(X) \). Moreover, any algebraic equation that \( \nabla \) satisfies is, by continuity, satisfied also for its extension. In particular, any Poisson algebra with the underlying commutative algebra \( \mathbb{S}(X) \) determines a Poisson algebra with the underlying commutative algebra \( \hat{\mathbb{S}}(X) \).

8. \( L_\infty \)-BIALGEBRAS, IBL\(_\infty \)-ALGEBRAS, THE BIG AND SUPERBIG BRACKET

Before moving further, we need to recall some auxiliary facts, for which we were unable to find a suitable reference. Let \( W \) be a graded vector space, \( \uparrow W \) its suspension and \( \uparrow : W \to \uparrow W \) the obvious degree +1 isomorphism. The exterior (aka Grassmann) algebra generated by \( W \) is the quotient

\[
\bigwedge(W) := T(W)/J
\]

of the tensor algebra \( T(W) \) modulo the ideal \( J \) generated by the expressions

\[
w' \otimes w'' + (-1)^{|w'||w''|} w'' \otimes w'
\]

with homogeneous \( w', w'' \in W \). One has a sequence \( \{f_n\}_{n \geq 0} \) of linear degree \( n \) isomorphisms

\[
f_n : \bigwedge^n(W) \to \mathbb{S}^n(\uparrow W),
\]

between the components spanned by the products of generators of length \( n \), inductively defined by \( f_0 := 1_k, f_1(w) := \uparrow w \) for \( w \in W \) while

\[
f_{a+b}(u \wedge v) := (-1)^{|u||v|} f_a(u) \cdot f_b(v), \text{ for } u \in \bigwedge^a(W), v \in \bigwedge^b(W), a, b \geq 1.
\]

Notice that (57) expresses a morphism property of a non-homogeneous map. The family \( \{f_n\}_{n \geq 0} \) assembles into an isomorphism

\[
f : \bigwedge(W) \cong \mathbb{S}(\uparrow W)
\]

whose components satisfy (57). Likewise one defines a sequence \( \{g_n\}_{n \geq 0} \) of linear degree \( 2n \) isomorphisms

\[
g_n : \mathbb{S}^n(\uparrow W) \to \mathbb{S}^n(\uparrow W),
\]
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inductively by \( g_0 := 1_k, \ g_1(\vert w \rangle ) := \vert w \rangle \) for \( w \in W \), while
\[
g_{a+b}(u \cdot v) := g_a(u) \cdot g_b(v), \quad u \in S^a(\vert W \rangle ), \ v \in S^b(\vert W \rangle ), \ a, b \geq 1.
\]
The family \( \{ g_n \}_{n \geq 0} \) again gives rise to an isomorphism
\[
g : \mathbb{S}(\vert W \rangle ) \cong \mathbb{S}(\vert W \rangle ).
\]

8.1. \textbf{The big bracket.} Let \( V \) be a \( k \)-vector space, \( \vert V \rangle \) its suspension, and \( \vert V^* \rangle \) the desuspension of its linear dual. We will assume, as people traditionally do in this context, that \( V \) is finite-dimensional. This assumption can be relaxed using the compact-linear topology on dual spaces and completed tensor products \cite[Chapter 1]{27}, but since this generalization brings nothing conceptually new, we will stick to the finite-dimensional case. Take, in Corollary \ref{70}, \( X := \vert V \rangle \oplus \vert V^* \rangle \) and \( \langle , - , - \rangle : X \otimes X \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(X) \) given by
\[
\langle \alpha, u \rangle = -(-1)^{|u||\alpha|} \langle u, \alpha \rangle := \alpha(u) \in k = \mathbb{S}^0(X) \subset \mathbb{S}(X)
\]
for \( \alpha \in \vert V^* \rangle, \ u \in \vert V \rangle \), while \( \langle \vert V \rangle, \vert V^* \rangle \rangle = \langle \vert V^* \rangle, \vert V \rangle \rangle := 0 \). Notice that \( |u| \) must equal \( |\alpha| \) for \( \langle \alpha, u \rangle \) above to be nonzero. The assumptions of Corollary \ref{70} are easy to verify. Denote by \( \{ \mathbb{S}(\vert V \rangle \oplus \vert V^* \rangle), \langle -, -, - \rangle \} \) the resulting Poisson algebra.

Take \( B(V) := \mathbb{S}^2(\vert V \rangle \oplus \vert V^* \rangle) \) and equip \( B(V) \) with the Lie bracket \( \{- , - \} \) induced from the one on \( \mathbb{S}(\vert V \rangle \oplus \vert V^* \rangle) \) by the vector space isomorphism
\[
\mathbb{S}(\vert V \rangle \oplus \vert V^* \rangle) \cong \mathbb{S}(\vert V \rangle) \otimes \mathbb{S}(\vert V^* \rangle) \cong \mathbb{S}(\vert V \rangle \oplus \vert V^* \rangle) \cong \mathbb{S}(\vert V \rangle \oplus \vert V^* \rangle) \cong \mathbb{S}(\vert V \rangle \oplus \vert V^* \rangle) = B(V).
\]

Since the above isomorphism involves even degree shifts only, the related signs issues are trivial. The bracket \( \{- , - \} \) thus constructed is the \textit{big bracket} of \cite{24}. Applying \ref{59} gives its standard presentation
\[
\{ B(V)^*, \{- , - \} \} \cong \bigwedge^{*+2}(V \oplus V^*), \{- , - \},
\]
cf. \cite[Equation (2)]{22}.

Let \( B^p_q(V) \subset B(V) \) be the subspace of \( B(V) \) spanned, in the presentation \ref{31}, by the exterior products of \( p \) elements of \( V \) and \( q \) elements of \( V^* \). Maurer-Cartan elements in \( B^1_2(V) \oplus B^2_1(V) \) describe Lie bialgebras, and those in \( B^1_2(V) \oplus B^2_1(V) \oplus B^3_1(V) \) Lie quasi-bialgebras \cite[Section 3]{21}.

To make room for \( L_\infty \)-bialgebras, we define \( \mathfrak{g}_{bilie}(V) \) to be the Poisson subalgebra of \( B(V) \) with the underlying space
\[
\mathfrak{g}_{bilie}(V) := \bigoplus_{p, q \geq 1, \ p+q \geq 3} B(V)^p_q.
\]
Its closure \( \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{bilie}(V) \) in \( \mathbb{S}^2(\vert V \rangle \oplus \vert V^* \rangle) \) has an induced Poisson structure by Remark \ref{71}. Maurer-\textit{Cartan} elements in \( \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{bilie}(V) \) are known to describe \( L_\infty \)-\textit{bialgebras} \cite[Subsection 4.4]{21}.

Recall that \cite{28, 35} provide an explicit method of constructing \( L_\infty \)-algebras controlling deformations of algebraic structures starting with a cofibrant or, in lucky cases, minimal model of
the governing operad- or PROP-like object. For structures with quadratic axioms, the resulting $L_\infty$-algebra turns out to be actually a dg-Lie algebra. It is not difficult to show that $\hat{\text{biLie}}(V)$ is precisely the Lie algebra capturing deformations of Lie bialgebras constructed using the explicit minimal model of the dioperad $\mathcal{L}ie\mathcal{B}$ for Lie bialgebras realized as the cobar construction of its Koszul dual $\mathcal{L}ie\mathcal{B}_!$, cf. [3, Corollary 5.10].

We are going to give, following [3, Subsection 3.1], an interesting alternative description of $\hat{\text{biLie}}(V)$. Choose a basis $(e_1, e_2, \ldots)$ of $V$ and its dual basis $(\alpha^1, \alpha^2, \ldots)$ of $V^*$. Let

$$(\psi_1, \psi_2, \ldots) := (|e_1, |e_2, \ldots) \text{ resp. } (\eta^1, \eta^2, \ldots) := (|\alpha^1, |\alpha^2, \ldots)$$

be the corresponding bases of $V$ resp. $V^*$. Elements of $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}(|V \otimes |V^*)$ then appear as power series $f \in \k[[\psi, \eta]] := \k[[\psi_1, \psi_2, \eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots]]$. In this language, $\hat{\text{biLie}}(V)$ consists of power series $f \in \k[[\psi, \eta]]$ satisfying the boundary conditions

$$f(\psi, \eta) \in m^3, \ f(\psi, \eta)|_{\psi_i=0} = 0, \ f(\psi, \eta)|_{\eta_j=0} = 0, \ i, j = 1, 2, \ldots,$$

where $m$ is the maximal ideal of the complete local ring $\k[[\psi, \eta]]$, assigned the degree two less than the degree of $f$ in $\k[[\psi, \eta]]$. With this convention, the big bracket is expressed as

$$\{f, g\} := \sum_{i=1, 2, \ldots} \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \eta^i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \psi_i} - (-1)^{|f||g|} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \eta^i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \psi_i} \right).$$

The big bracket turns out to be the semiclassical limit, in the sense of Definition 50, Part 1, of the superbig bracket constructed in the following subsection.

8.2. The superbig bracket. Continuing to use the notation of Subsection 3.1, we are going to define a particular data

$$\Upsilon: (\mathfrak{S}^i(X) \otimes \mathfrak{S}^j(X)) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{S}(X)$$

in (54) as follows. First, the only nontrivial $\Upsilon_{i_{\mathfrak{S}^i}}(X)$ will be those with $i = j = n, \ n \geq 1$. To define them, we invoke the canonical isomorphism

$$\mathfrak{S}^n(X) \cong \bigoplus_{p+q=n} \mathfrak{S}^p(|V) \otimes \mathfrak{S}^q(|V^*) \cong \bigoplus_{p+q=n} \mathfrak{S}^q(|V) \otimes \mathfrak{S}^p(|V^*)$$

and postulate that

$$\Upsilon(\mathfrak{S}^p(|V) \otimes \mathfrak{S}^q(|V^*)) = 0,$$

if $(p, q; s, t) \not\in \{(n, 0; 0, n), (0, n; n, 0)\}$, while

$$\Upsilon(1 \otimes \alpha, u \otimes 1) = (-1)^{|\alpha||u|} \Upsilon(\alpha \otimes 1, 1 \otimes \alpha)^{n} = \alpha(u) \in \k = \mathfrak{S}^0(X) \subset \mathfrak{S}(X),$$

for $\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}^n(|V^*), \ u \in \mathfrak{S}^n(|V)$. Notice that $\Upsilon(-, -)^1$ is the map $\langle - , - \rangle : X \otimes X \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(X)$ in (59). Formula (58) then defines a map $\langle - , - \rangle : \mathfrak{S}(X) \otimes \mathfrak{S}(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(X)$ which is a differential operator of order $\leq n$ in each variable. The main result of this subsection is
Theorem 72. Under the above notation, the formula

\[
[a', a''] := [a', a'']_1 + [a', a'']_2 \cdot h + [a', a'']_3 \cdot h^2 + \cdots, \quad a', a'' \in \mathcal{S}(X),
\]

equips the graded associative commutative algebra \( S(X)[[h]] = \mathcal{S}(|V| \oplus |V^*|)[[h]] \) with the structure of a formal operator Lie algebra.

Proof. The only property which is not obvious is the Jacobi identity for the bracket. Rather that verifying it directly, we identify \( \{ \mathcal{S}(X)[[h]], [-, -] \} \) with an innocuous generalization of a construction in [35].

For a pair of elements \( a' \) and \( a'' \) of a properad \( \mathcal{P} \), Merkulov and Vallette denoted, in [35, Subsection 2.2], by \( a' \circ a'' \) the sum of all possible compositions of \( a' \) by \( a'' \) in \( \mathcal{P} \) along any 2-leveled graph with two vertices. Then they proved that the commutator

\[
[a', a''] := a' \circ a'' - (-1)^{|a'| |a''|} a'' \circ a'
\]
is a Lie bracket on the total space \( \bigoplus \mathcal{P} := \bigoplus_{m, n \geq 0} \mathcal{P}(m, n) \), and that it induces a Lie bracket on the total space \( \bigoplus \mathcal{P}^\Sigma \) of invariants. Let us modify their definition of the \( \circ \)-operation into

\[
a' \circ_h a'' = a'_1 a'' + (a' \circ_2 a'') h + (a' \circ_3 a'') h^2 + \cdots
\]

where \( a' \circ_k a'' \), \( k \geq 1 \), is the sum of all possible compositions of \( a' \) by \( a'' \) along 2-leveled graphs with two vertices connected by \( k \) edges. The proof of [35, Theorem 8] can be easily modified to show that also the commutator \( [-, -]_h \) of the \( \circ_h \)-operation is a Lie bracket on the \( k[[h]] \)-linear extension \( \bigoplus \mathcal{P}[[h]] \) of the total space of \( \mathcal{P} \), which in turn induces a Lie algebra structure on the \( k[[h]] \)-linear extension \( \bigoplus \mathcal{P}^\Sigma[[h]] \) of the space of invariants.

Let us apply the above constructions to the endomorphism properad \( \mathcal{P} := \mathcal{E}nd_{|V} \) of the suspension of \( V \); recall that

\[
\mathcal{E}nd_{|V}(m, n) = Lin\left( \otimes^m |V|, \otimes^n |V| \right), \quad m, n \geq 0,
\]

the space of \( k \)-linear maps \( \otimes^m |V| \to \otimes^n |V| \). One has the canonical isomorphism

\[
Lin\left( \otimes^m |V|, \otimes^n |V| \right) \cong \otimes^m (|V|) \otimes \otimes^n (|V^*|)
\]

which translates the properadic composition of \( \mathcal{E}nd_{|V} \) into the contraction via the canonical pairing between \( |V| \) and \( |V^*| \). For the space of invariants one gets

\[
Lin\left( \otimes^m |V|, \otimes^n |V| \right)^{\Sigma_m \times \Sigma_n} \cong Lin\left( \mathcal{S}^m (|V|), \mathcal{S}^n (|V^*|) \right) \cong \mathcal{S}^m (|V|) \otimes \mathcal{S}^n (|V^*|)
\]

therefore

\[
\bigoplus \left( \mathcal{E}nd_{|V} \right)^{\Sigma} \cong \mathcal{S}(X).
\]

It is easy to check that, under the canonical isomorphism above, the commutator of the \( \circ_h \)-product in (64) becomes the bracket in Theorem 72. \( \square \)
Let us denote $B(V)[[h]] := l^2 \mathfrak{S}(V \oplus V^*)[[h]]$ with $h$ a formal variable of degree $+2$, and equip it with the Lie bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ induced from the one in (62) by the $h$-linearization of the isomorphism (60). We call $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ the superbig bracket.

**Remark.** The restriction of the superbig bracket to $B(V)$ clearly decomposes as

$$ \{\cdot, \cdot\} + \{\cdot, \cdot\} h + \{\cdot, \cdot\} h^2 + \cdots, $$

where $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ is the big bracket of Subsection 8.1 and $\{\cdot, \cdot\} h : B(V) \otimes B(V) \to B(V), n \geq 2$. It is obvious that for $a', a'' \in B(V), \{a', a''\} h = 0$ for $n$ big enough. The superbig bracket is therefore a global deformation of the big bracket.

Let us denote by $g_{IBL}(V)$ the Poisson subalgebra of $(B(V)[[h]], \{\cdot, \cdot\})$ given by

$$ g_{IBL}(V) := \bigoplus_{p, q \geq 1, p + q \geq 3} B(V)^p_q[[h]], $$

where $B(V)^p_q$ has the same meaning as in (62). Its closure $\widehat{g}_{IBL}(V)$ in the completed tensor product $l^2 \mathfrak{S}(V \oplus V^*) \hat{\otimes} \mathbb{k}[[h]]$ bears an induced Poisson structure by Remark 71.

The following description of $\widehat{g}_{IBL}(V)$ is taken almost verbatim from [8, Subsection 3.1]; the notation is the same as in the second half of Subsection 8.1. The authors of [8] interpreted the elements of $\widehat{g}_{IBL}(V)$ as power series $f \in \mathbb{k}[[\psi, \eta, h]] := \mathbb{k}[[\psi_1, \psi_2, \ldots, \eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots, h]]$ subject to the conditions

$$ f(\psi, \eta, h)|_{h=0} \in m^3, f(\psi, \eta, h)|_{\psi_i=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f(\psi, \eta, h)|_{\eta_i=0} = 0, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, $$

where $m$ is the maximal ideal in $\mathbb{k}[[\psi, \eta, h]]$. As in Subsection 8.1, such an $f$ is taken with degree two less than its actual degree in $\mathbb{k}[[\psi, \eta, h]]$. The induced superbig bracket can then be written as

$$ \{f, g\} = f \ast_h g - (-1)^{|f||g|} g \ast_h f $$

where

$$ f \ast_h g := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{h^{n-1}}{n!} \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_n} \epsilon \cdot \frac{\partial^n f}{\partial \eta^{i_1} \cdots \partial \eta^{i_n}} \frac{\partial^n g}{\partial \psi_{i_1} \cdots \partial \psi_{i_n}}, $$

with $\epsilon$ the Koszul sign of the permutation

$$ \eta^{i_1}, \ldots, \eta^{i_n}, \psi_{i_1}, \ldots, \psi_{i_n} \mapsto \eta^{i_1}, \psi_{i_1}, \ldots, \eta^{i_n}, \psi_{i_n}. $$

Notice that, unlike the authors of [8], we did not allow $n = 0$ in the above sum. The operation $\ast_h$ in (65) decomposes as

$$ f \ast_h g = f \ast_1 g + f \ast_2 g \cdot h + f \ast_3 g \cdot h^2 + \cdots, $$

where

$$ \ast_n := \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_n} \epsilon \cdot \frac{\partial^n f}{\partial \eta^{i_1} \cdots \partial \eta^{i_n}} \frac{\partial^n g}{\partial \psi_{i_1} \cdots \partial \psi_{i_n}}, \quad n \geq 1, $$
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is a differential operator of order \( \leq n \) in each variable, \( k \geq 1 \). The \( \ast_h \)-product can thus serve as a model example of a \textit{formal operator Lie-admissible algebra}. This provides an example of a wide algebra over the tight operad \( \text{Lie}_{Adm} \) for Lie-admissible algebras.

The Lie algebra \( \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{IBL}(V) \) is isomorphic to the Lie algebra controlling deformations of IBL-algebras (i.e. involutive Lie bialgebras), constructed using the recipe of [28, 35]. This expected but difficult-to-prove fact follows from the description of the minimal model of the properad \( \mathcal{L}ie^\circ \mathcal{B} \) for IBL-algebras given in [3, Subsection 2.3]. If \( V \) has a differential, then \( \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{IBL}(V) \) receives an induced differential \( \delta \), and the Maurer-Cartan elements in the dg-Lie algebra \( (\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{IBL}(V), \delta) \) are IBL\(_\infty\)-algebras.

9. Miscellany

In this section we present structures that do not fit exactly in the framework of this article, but whose nature is still very close to it.

9.1. \textbf{Operator Leibniz algebras}. Recall that a (left) \textit{Leibniz algebra} structure on a graded \( k \)-vector space \( V \), also known as a \textit{Loday algebra}, is a \( k \)-bilinear mapping \([-, -]: V \otimes V \to V\) subject to the (left) Leibniz rule

\[
[[a, b], c] = [a, [b, c]] + (-1)^{|a||b|} [b, [a, c]]
\]

for all \( a, b, c \in V \). In particular, any Lie algebra is trivially a Leibniz algebra, where the above bracket happens to be graded skew-symmetric. The concept was originally conceived as a non-skew-commutative analogue of a Lie algebra in [2] and was further elaborated in [25]. Some non-trivial, recent examples of such a structure arising in a physical setting can be found [20].

\textbf{Example 73}. The following construction, originally due to Kanatchikov [14], arises in the context of the De Donder–Weyl covariant Hamiltonian formulation of classical field theory. It might serve as an example of an operator Leibniz algebra. Let \( E \) be a smooth manifold, regarded as a \textit{polymomentum phase space}, equipped with a multisymplectic form \( \Omega \), that is, a closed \((k+1)\)-form subject to the non-degeneracy condition

\[
X \lrcorner \Omega = 0 \Rightarrow X = 0
\]

for any vector field \( X \) on \( E \). The special case of \( k = 1 \) corresponds to the ordinary symplectic setting.

Typically, \( E \) is to be thought of as the total space of a fiber bundle over an \( n \)-dimensional space-time manifold \( M \). Locally, \( \Omega \) provides a splitting of a sufficiently small coordinate chart on \( E \) into the \textit{horizontal} (the space-time coordinates) and the \textit{vertical} (the field variables and the corresponding polymomenta) directions. In particular, that enables one to single out the vertical component \( d^V \) of the de Rham differential \( d \) on \( E \). The crucial feature of this set-up is
that for any $p$-form $F$ on $E$, there is a vertical multivector-valued horizontal $1$-form $X_F$ satisfying $X_F \Omega = d^V F$. Now, taking $A$ to be the de Rham algebra $A^*_{dR}(E)$ with the exterior product and setting

$$[F, G] = (-1)^{|F|-|G|} X_F \cdot d^V G, \text{ for } G \in A^*_{dR}(E),$$

gives rise to an operator Leibniz algebra. A peculiar asymmetry of this bracket is manifest. Namely, the bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]_{ij}$ vanishes for $i > 1$, that is, it satisfies the Leibniz rule with respect to the first argument, and it is a differential operator $[F, \cdot]_{i,n-p}$ of order $n - p$ with respect to the second argument whenever $F$ is a $p$-form.

In absence of skew symmetry of the bracket the following serves as a generalization of Definition 53.

**Definition 74.** A formal operator Leibniz algebra is a graded associative commutative algebra $A$ with a $k[s, t]$-linear bracket $[-, -]$ on $A[[s, t]]$ subject to the Leibniz rule as above, and whose restriction to $A \subset A[[s, t]]$ decomposes as

$$(66) \quad [a', a''] = \sum_{m,n \geq 1} [a', a'']_{m,n} : s^{m-1} t^{n-1}, a', a'' \in A,$$

where $[-, -]_{m,n} : A \otimes A \to A$ is a differential operator of order $\leq m$ in the first argument and is of order $\leq n$ with respect to the second argument.

9.2. **Double Poisson algebras.** The following material is taken almost verbatim from [1, Section 2]. Let $A$ be a commutative associative algebra. We will equip its $n$th tensor power $A^\otimes n$, $n \geq 1$, with the ‘outer’ $A$-bimodule structure given by the formula

$$b(a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_n)c = ba_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_nc, \text{ for } a_1, \ldots, a_n, b, c \in A.$$ 

We will mention also the ‘inner’ bimodule structure on $A^\otimes n$ given by

$$b(a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_n)c = a_1 c \otimes \cdots b \otimes a_n, \text{ for } a_1, \ldots, a_n, b, c \in A.$$ 

A double bracket is a linear map $\ll\cdot, \cdot\rr : A^\otimes 2 \to A^\otimes 2$ which is a derivation in the second argument with respect to the outer bimodule structure and which is antisymmetric in the sense that

$$\ll a, b \rr = -\tau_{(21)} \ll b, a \rr,$$

where $\tau_{(21)} : A \otimes A \to A \otimes A$ swaps the tensor factors. The antisymmetry implies that $\ll \cdot, \cdot \rr$ is also a derivation in the first variable with respect to the inner bimodule structure of $A^\otimes 2$.

For $a \in A$, $b_1 \otimes b_2 \in A^\otimes 2$ denote $\ll a, b \rr_L := \ll a, b_1 \rr \otimes b_2$. M. Van den Bergh associated to $\ll \cdot, \cdot \rr$ a ternary operation $\ll \cdot, \cdot, \cdot \rr : A^\otimes 3 \to A^\otimes 3$ defined as

$$\ll a, b, c \rr := \ll a, \ll b, c \rr \rr_L + \tau_{(123)} \ll b, \ll c, a \rr \rr_L + \tau_{(132)} \ll c, \ll a, b \rr \rr_L, a, b, c \in A,$$
where \( \tau_{(123)} \) and \( \tau_{(132)} \) are the obvious permutations of the tensor factors. He then introduced double Poisson algebras as commutative associative algebras equipped with a double bracket satisfying the double Jacobi identity
\[
\{a, b, c\} = 0 \text{ for each } a, b, c \in A.
\]
Proposition 2.3.1 of [1] then states that \( \{ - , - , - \} \) is a derivation in the last variable with respect to the outer bimodule structure of \( A^{\otimes 3} \). Thus double Poisson algebras exhibit some features of wide operator algebras.

9.3. F-manifolds. An important generalizations of Poisson algebras is provided by the following algebraic abstraction of F-manifolds of Hertling and Manin [12]. What we mean is a commutative associative algebra \( A \) equipped with a Lie algebra product, but the standard derivation property
\[
0 = [a'_1, a'_2, a'''] - a'_1 [a'_2, a'''] - (-1)^{|a'_1||a'_2|} a'_2 [a'_1, a'''] - [a'_1 a'_2, a'_1 a''']
\]
of Poisson algebras replaced by
\[
0 = [a'_1, a'_2, a'''] - a'_1 [a'_2, a'''] - (-1)^{|a'_1||a'_2|} a'_2 [a'_1, a'''] - [a'_1 a'_2, a'''] - (-1)^{|a'_1||a'_2|} [a'_1 a'_2, a'_1 a''']
\]
(67)

The above condition says that the linear map \( [ - , - ] : A \otimes A \to A \) is a bidifferential operator in the sense we introduce below.

Let \( A \) be a commutative associative algebra and \( \nabla : A \otimes A \to A \) a linear map. To shorten the formulas, we will write \( \nabla(a', a'') \) for \( \nabla(a' \otimes a'') \). Inspired by the scheme (1), we define the bidiviations \( \Psi^n : A^{\otimes n} \otimes A^{\otimes n} \to A, n \geq 1 \) inductively as
\[
\Psi^1(a', a'') := \nabla(a', a''),
\]
while, for \( n \geq 2, \)
\[
\Psi^{n+1}(a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_{n+1}, a''_1, \ldots, a''_{n+1}) :=
\]
\[
+ a'_1 \Psi^n(a'_2, \ldots, a'_n, a''_1, \ldots, a''_{n+1}) + (-1)^{|a'_1||a'_2|} a'_2 \Psi^n(a'_1, a'_3, \ldots, a'_n, a''_1, \ldots, a''_{n+1})
\]
\[
+ \Psi^n(a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_{n+1}, a''_1, \ldots, a''_{n+1}) + (-1)^{|a''_1||a''_2|} \Psi^{n+1}(a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_{n+1}, a''_1, \ldots, a''_{n+1}, a'_1, a''_1, \ldots, a''_{n+1})
\]
\[
- a'_1 \Psi^n(a'_2, \ldots, a'_{n+1}, a''_1, \ldots, a''_{n+1}) + (-1)^{|a'_1||a'_2|} a'_2 \Psi^n(a'_1, a'_3, \ldots, a'_{n+1}, a''_1, \ldots, a''_{n+1})
\]
\[
- (-1)^{|a''_1||a''_2|} a''_1 \Psi^{n+1}(a'_{n+1}, a'_1, \ldots, a''_1, a''_1, \ldots, a''_{n+1})
\]
\[
- (-1)^{|a'_1||a'_2| + |a''_1||a''_2|} a'_1 a''_2 \Psi^n(a'_1, a'_3, \ldots, a'_{n+1}, a''_1, \ldots, a''_{n+1}, a''_1, \ldots, a''_{n+1}).
\]
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[1] Here and below, the possibly decorated symbol \( a \) will denote an element of \( A \).
symmetric algebra of ear maps $S$ translated into the language of the power series ring $\nu$ on $S$ on the free commutative associative algebra $\nabla$:

The proposition follows from the fact that the bideviation $\Psi$ is a differential operator of order $\leq n$. An immediate consequence of Proposition 75 is the well-known fact that the bracket of a Poisson algebra satisfies (67). One obviously can likewise introduce multidifferential operators $\nabla$.

Proposition 75. If a linear map $\nabla : A \otimes A \rightarrow A$ is a differential operator of order $\leq r$ in both variables, then it is a bidifferential operator of order $\leq r$.

Proof. For permutations $\sigma, \mu \in \Sigma_n$, elements $a_1, \ldots, a_n, a'_1, \ldots, a''_n \in A$ and $0 \leq i, j \leq n$ we define the linear maps $L_i(\sigma), R_j(\sigma) : A \rightarrow A$ by the formulas

$\begin{align*}
L_i(\sigma)(a) &= e(\sigma) \cdot a'_{(i)} \cdots a'_{(n)} \nabla(a_{(i)} \cdots a_{(n)}, a), \\
R_j(\sigma)(a) &= e(\mu) \cdot \nabla(a, a''_{(1)} \cdots a''_{(n)}) a''_{(j)} \cdots a''_{(n)}.
\end{align*}$

Notice that $\nabla$ is a differential operator of order $\leq r$ in both variables, then both $L_i(\sigma)$ and $R_j(\sigma)$ are differential operators of order $\leq r$.

The proposition follows from the fact that the bideviation $\Psi^n$ is, for each $n \geq 1$, a linear combinations of the deviations $\Phi^A_{L_i(\sigma)}$ and $\Phi^A_{R_j(\sigma)}$. Namely, one can verify that

$2\Psi^n(a'_1, \ldots, a'_n, a''_1, \ldots, a''_n) = \sum_{0 \leq i < n} (-1)^i \sum_{\sigma} \Phi^n_{L_i(\sigma)}(a'_1, \ldots, a'_n) + \sum_{0 < j < n} (-1)^j \sum_{\mu} \Phi^n_{R_j(\sigma)}(a'_1, \ldots, a'_n),$

where $\sigma$ runs over all $(i, r - i)$-shuffles and $\mu$ over all $(j, r - j)$-shuffles.

An immediate consequence of Proposition 75 is the well-known fact that the bracket of a Poisson algebra satisfies (67). One obviously can likewise introduce multidifferential operators $\nabla : A^k \rightarrow A$ for arbitrary $k$ and modify e.g. Definition 56 by requiring that the structure maps $l_k$’s are multilinear differential operators. On the other hand, multilinear differential operators on the free commutative associative algebra $S(\lambda X)$ are not necessarily determined by their values on $\lambda^n(X)$ for a finite $n$, so one cannot expect results as e.g. Corollary 57.

9.4. Terilla’s quantization. Terilla studied, in [39], the vector space $P := Lin(S(V), \hat{S}(V))$ of linear maps $S(V) \rightarrow \hat{S}(V)$ from the symmetric algebra of a graded vector space $V$ to the completed symmetric algebra of $V$. He constructed a canonical quantization of the natural associative commutative structure of $P$ given by ‘putting the morphisms in $P$ side by side.’ We describe his construction using the identification of $P$ with the completed polynomial ring $\hat{S}(V \oplus V^*)$.

Choose a basis $(e_1, e_2, \ldots)$ of $V$ and let $(\alpha^1, \alpha^2, \ldots)$ be the dual basis of $V^*$. Terilla’s product $\star$, translated into the language of the power series ring $k[[e, \alpha, h]] := k[[e_1, e_2, \ldots, \alpha^1, \alpha^2, \ldots, h]]$,

$f \star g := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{h^k}{k!} \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_k} e \cdot \frac{\partial^k f}{\partial \alpha^{i_1} \cdots \partial \alpha^{i_k}} \frac{\partial^k g}{\partial e_{i_1} \cdots \partial e_{i_k}},$
where $\epsilon$ is the Koszul sign of the permutation
\[
a^{i_1}, \ldots, a^{i_k}, e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_k} \mapsto a^{i_1}, e_{i_1}, \ldots, a^{i_k}, e_{i_k}.
\]

Notice that $f \star g$ is of the form
\[
(68) \quad f \star g = f \circ_0 g + f \circ_1 g \cdot h + f \circ_2 g \cdot h^2 + \cdots,
\]
where $f \circ_0 g$ is the standard multiplication of power series. Thus $\star$ is a deformation of the power series ring $\mathbb{k}[[e, \alpha]] = \mathbb{S}(V \oplus V^*)$.

Terilla's construction provides an example of an order 0 formal operator $\text{Ass}$-algebra, in the sense of Definition 49, Part 1, with $\text{Ass}$ being the operad governing associative algebras. Explicitly, such a structure consists of an associative commutative algebra $A$ bearing a $\mathbb{k}[[h]]$-linear associative multiplication $\star$ on $A[[h]]$ whose restriction to $A \subset A[[h]]$ decomposes as
\[
(69) \quad a' \star a'' = \sum_{n \geq 0} a' \star_n a'' \cdot h^n, \quad a', a'' \in A,
\]
where $\star_n : A \otimes A \to A$ is a differential operator of order $\leq n$ in both variables.

Notice that the interplay between the orders of $\star_n$ and the powers of $h$ differs from the one in (51) where the power series starts with the differential operator of degree $\leq 1$. The associator
\[
\text{Ass}(a, b, c) := a \star (b \star c) - (a \star) b \star c
\]
decomposes as
\[
\text{Ass}(a, b, c) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \text{Ass}_n(a, b, c) \cdot h^n,
\]
where
\[
(70) \quad \text{Ass}_n(a, b, c) := \sum_{s + t = n} a \star_s (b \star_t c) - (a \star_s b) \star_t c
\]
is a differential operator of order $\leq n$ by [29, Proposition 1].

Thus the decomposition of the associator is of the same type as that of the structure operation which is, in our opinion, a common feature of all sensible definitions of ‘formal operator algebras.’ We emphasize that the operad $\text{Ass}$ governing associative algebras is not tight, and formal operator associative algebras are not wide in the sense of Part 1. This explains why the power sums in (69) and (70) start with differential operators of degree $\leq 0$ not $\leq 1$ as in the case of formal operator Lie algebras, which are wide over tight operad $\mathcal{L}$ie.
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