

Multi-algebras as tolerance quotients of algebras

G. GRÄTZER AND R. QUACKENBUSH

ABSTRACT. If A is an algebra and τ is a tolerance on A , then A/τ is a multi-algebra in a natural way. We give an example to show that not every multi-algebra arises in this manner. We slightly generalize the construction of A/τ and prove that every multi-algebra arises from this modified construction.

1. Tolerance quotients

Let M be a nonempty set. Denote by $\text{Pow } M$ the set of all subsets of M and by $\text{Pow}_+ M$ the set of all nonempty subsets of M . A *multi-operation* f on M (of *arity* n) is a function $f: M^n \rightarrow \text{Pow}_+ M$. A *multi-algebra* $(M; F)$ is a nonempty set M with a set F of multi-operations on M .

If $(A; F)$ is an algebra and α is a congruence on A , then the congruence classes of α form an algebra $(A/\alpha; F) = (A; F)/\alpha$. A congruence α is a reflexive, symmetric, and transitive binary relation on A with the Substitution Property (so α is a subalgebra of $(A; F)^2$). If we drop the Substitution Property, $(A/\alpha; F) = (A; F)/\alpha$ becomes a multi-algebra. The converse was proved in G. Grätzer [3]: every multi-algebra can be obtained (up to isomorphism) in this fashion; for additional results in this direction, see G. Grätzer and G. H. Wenzel [5], H. Höft and P. E. Howard [6].

What happens if we drop the transitivity of τ ? Define a *tolerance* τ on an algebra $(A; F)$ as a reflexive and symmetric binary relation on A with the Substitution Property. For an overview of tolerances in algebra, see I. Chajda [2].

Let τ be a binary relation on the set A . As in graph theory, we call a subset $B \subseteq A$ a *clique* if $B^2 \subseteq \tau$; we call B a *maximal clique* if B is maximal with respect to the property $B^2 \subseteq \tau$. By Zorn's Lemma, every clique is contained in a maximal clique. A *covering* of a nonempty set A is a collection \mathcal{C} of pairwise incomparable subsets of A whose union is A . It is easy to see that a reflexive and symmetric binary relation τ on A is equivalent to a covering, \mathcal{C}_τ , of A where the sets in the covering are the maximal cliques of τ . For a tolerance τ on an algebra $(A; F)$, we call a maximal clique a *tolerance block*.

Conversely, a covering \mathcal{C} of A *induces* a reflexive and symmetric binary relation τ on A defined by $(a, b) \in \tau$ iff there is an $S \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $a, b \in S$. It is easy to see that each $S \in \mathcal{C}$ is a clique of τ ; however, $S \in \mathcal{C}$ need not be

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary: 06A05. Secondary: 06B68.

Key words and phrases: multi-algebra; tolerance relation; clique; covering.

a maximal clique of τ , and even if each $S \in \mathcal{C}$ is a maximal clique of τ , there may be maximal cliques of τ that do not belong to \mathcal{C} .

Example 1.1. Let $|A| \geq 3$.

(1) Let \mathcal{C}_2 be the set of all 2-element subsets of A . Then \mathcal{C}_2 induces the full relation $\tau = A^2$ on A , and A is its unique maximal clique.

(2) On $\text{Pow}_+ A$ define the *non-disjointness* relation ν by

$$(X, Y) \in \nu \quad \text{iff} \quad X \cap Y \neq \emptyset. \quad (1)$$

Then every ultrafilter U on A is a maximal clique of ν . But these are not the only maximal cliques of ν . Let $\{a, b, c\}$ be a 3-element subset of A ; then the set

$$\{\{a, b\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}\}$$

is a clique of ν , but is contained in no ultrafilter of A . Hence, there is a maximal clique of ν which is not an ultrafilter. Notice that ν is induced by the set of all principal ultrafilters of A . The non-disjointness relation is well-studied in the combinatorics of set systems, usually under the name *intersecting families* of sets; see [1].

Construction 1.2. Given a tolerance τ on the algebra $(A; F)$, we construct a multi-algebra $(M; F)$. Let \mathcal{B}_τ be the covering of A consisting of all tolerance blocks of τ . For $f \in F$ of arity n and $B_1, \dots, B_n \in \mathcal{B}_\tau$, define f on \mathcal{B}_τ by

$$f(B_1, \dots, B_n) = \{B \in \mathcal{B}_\tau \mid f(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B \text{ for all } b_i \in B_i \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

Since τ is a tolerance, if $f(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B$ for some $b_i \in B_i$, then $f(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B$ for all $b_i \in B_i$. We denote by $(A; F)/\tau$ this multi-algebra defined on \mathcal{B}_τ and call it the *tolerance quotient* induced by the tolerance τ on the algebra $(A; F)$.

It is natural to wonder how general this construction is. As the next example shows, it is not completely general.

Example 1.3. Let $M = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and define the multi-groupoid $(M; +)$ by

$$a + b = \{a, b\}$$

for all $a, b \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Let us assume that $(M; +)$ is isomorphic to the tolerance multi-groupoid induced by the tolerance τ on the groupoid $(A; +)$. Then τ has exactly 3 tolerance blocks: B, C, D . Further, $B + C = \{B, C\}$, $B + D = \{B, D\}$, and $C + D = \{C, D\}$. This means that there are $b_1, b_2 \in B$, $c_1, c_3 \in C$, and $d_2, d_3 \in D$ such that $b_1 + c_1 \in (B \cap C) - D$, $b_2 + d_2 \in (B \cap D) - C$, and $c_3 + d_3 \in (C \cap D) - B$. But then $\{b_1 + c_1, b_2 + d_2, c_3 + d_3\}$ is a 3-element clique in τ not contained in B , C , or D , so τ has at least 4 cliques. This is a contradiction, so there is no tolerance multi-groupoid isomorphic to the multi-groupoid $(M; +)$.

2. Full covering quotients

Let us re-examine the multi-groupoid $(M; +)$ of Example 1.3. We take $A = \text{Pow}_+ M$ and define ν to be the non-disjointness relation as in (1). Then ν has 4 maximal cliques:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \{\{1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}, \\ S_2 &= \{\{2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}, \\ S_3 &= \{\{3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}, \\ S &= \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $B, C \in A$. If $|B| = |C| = 1$, define $B+C$ to be $B \cup C$; otherwise, define $B+C$ to be $M = \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then ν is readily seen to be a tolerance on $(A; +)$. Form $(A; +)/\nu$. We hope that $(M; +)$ is isomorphic to the subalgebra of $(A; +)/\nu$ on the subset $\{S_1, S_2, S_3\}$. But it is not: $S_1 + S_2 = \{S_1, S_2, S\}$, which is not a subset of $\{S_1, S_2, S_3\}$.

So we have to get rid of that troublesome tolerance block S .

Construction 2.1. Let τ be a tolerance on the algebra $(A; F)$. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering of A consisting of some tolerance blocks of τ . If for $a, b \in A$, we have $(a, b) \in \tau$ iff there is some $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $a, b \in C$, then we call \mathcal{C} a *full covering*. For $f \in F$ of arity n and $C_1, \dots, C_n \in \mathcal{C}$, define

$$f(C_1, \dots, C_n) = \{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid f(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in C \text{ for all } c_i \in C_i \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

We denote this multi-algebra by $(A; F)/\mathcal{C}$ and call it the *full covering quotient* of the algebra $(A; F)$ induced by the full covering \mathcal{C} .

We shall now see that Construction 2.1 is completely general.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $(M; F)$ be a multi-algebra. Then there is an algebra $(A; F)$ and a full covering \mathcal{C} of $(A; F)$ that induces a tolerance τ on $(A; F)$ such that $(M; F)$ is isomorphic to $(A; F)/\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. Take $A = \text{Pow}_+ M$. For n -ary $f \in F$ and $m_1, \dots, m_n \in M$, define f on $\text{Pow}_+ M$ by:

$$f(\{m_1\}, \dots, \{m_n\}) = \{f(m_1, \dots, m_n)\},$$

and, otherwise,

$$f(B_1, \dots, B_n) = M.$$

For $m \in M$, let $M_m = \{S \subseteq M \mid m \in S\}$; then $\mathcal{C} = \{M_m \mid m \in M\}$ is a covering of A by the principal filters of M . As noted in Example 1.1 (2), \mathcal{C} induces ν on A . Each M_m is a maximal clique of ν .

To prove that ν is a tolerance, let $f \in F$ be n -ary and $(A_i, B_i) \in \nu$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$; we need to conclude that $(f(A_1, \dots, A_n), f(B_1, \dots, B_n)) \in \nu$. Note that $(M, N) \in \nu$ for all nonempty $N \subseteq M$; thus, our conclusion holds unless each A_i and each B_i is a 1-element subset of M . But for 1-element subsets A, B , we have $(A, B) \in \nu$ iff $A = B$. Because ν is reflexive, our conclusion

also holds in this case since then $A_i = B_i$ for all i . So ν is indeed a tolerance. Hence, \mathcal{C} is a full covering.

Now use Construction 2.1 to form $(A; F)/\mathcal{C}$. It is obvious from the definitions that $(A; F)/\mathcal{C}$ is isomorphic to $(M; F)$ via the map that sends M_m to m . \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Bollobas, B.: *Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1986)
- [2] Chajda, I.: *Algebraic theory of tolerance relations*. Univerzita Palackého v Olomouc (1991)
- [3] Grätzer, G.: A representation theorem for multi-algebras. *Arch. Math.* **13**, 452–456 (1962)
- [4] Grätzer, G. and Lakser H.: Identities for globals (complex algebras) of algebras. *Coll. Math.* **56**, 19–29 (1988)
- [5] Grätzer, G. and Wenzel, G. H.: Tolerances, covering systems, and the Axiom of Choice. *Arch. Math. (Brno)* **25**, 27–34 (1989)
- [6] Höft, H. and Howard P. E.: Representing multi-algebras by algebras, the axiom of choice, and the axiom of dependent choice. *Algebra Universalis* **13**, 69–77 (1981)

G. GRÄTZER

Department of Mathematics, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2, Canada