

## INDEPENDENCE IN SEPARABLE VARIABLES ALGEBRAS

BY

S. FAJTLOWICZ AND K. GŁĄZEK (WROCLAW)

In this note we shall mean by an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  a pair  $\langle A; F \rangle$ , where  $A$  is a non-empty set and  $F$  is a class of *fundamental* operations. Every  $f$  from  $F$  is a function of several variables which associates with each system  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  of elements of  $A$  an element  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in A$ .  $C(E)$  denotes the subalgebra generated by a set  $E \subset A$ . By  $A(\mathcal{A})$  (or briefly  $A$ ) we shall denote the class of all algebraic functions, i.e. the smallest class of operations containing trivial operations

$$e_k^{(n)}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = x_k \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots, n; n = 1, 2, \dots)$$

and closed under compositions with the fundamental operations. The subclass of all  $n$ -ary algebraic operations will be denoted by  $A^{(n)}$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . Further, by  $A^{(0)}$  or  $C(\emptyset)$  we shall denote the set of all values of constant algebraic operations. Elements belonging to  $A^{(0)} = C(\emptyset)$  will be called *algebraic constants*. We say that the elements of a set  $I$  ( $I \subset A$ ) are *independent* if for each system of  $n$  different elements  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$  from  $I$  and for each pair of operations  $f, g \in A^{(n)}$  the equation

$$f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) = g(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$$

implies that  $f$  and  $g$  are identical in  $\mathcal{A}$ . We shall denote the class of all independent sets of an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  by  $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ . The above definitions in a more detailed form and theorems concerning them are given in [4] and [5].

In the present paper a condition fulfilled in separable variables algebras (condition JIS) will be defined, and its connection with exchange of independent sets property will be examined.

**Definition 1.** An algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  is called an *algebra with separable  $k$  variables* ( $k \geq 1$ ) if for every pair  $f, g \in A^{(n)}$ ,  $n > k$ , there exist functions  $f_0 \in A^{(k)}$  and  $g_0 \in A^{(n-k)}$  such that the equation

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = g(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$$

is equivalent to the equation

$$f_0(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = g_0(x_{k+1}, x_{k+2}, \dots, x_n).$$

An algebra with separable  $k$  variables for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  will be called, briefly, a *separable variables algebra*. The class of separable variables algebras will be denoted by SV.

This notion was introduced by Marczewski in [3]. Obviously, Abelian groups and linear spaces belong to SV. Generally, one can prove that a group with multiple operators is separable variables algebra if it is an Abelian group with multiple operators (the reader will find suitable definitions in [2]); hence, in particular, it follows that among rings only rings with zero-multiplication belong to SV. Other examples of separable variables algebras are given in [1], where also the representation theorem for these algebras is proved. Separable variables algebras coincide with the so-called quasi-linear algebras, as well as with algebras with separable  $k$  variables (see [1]).

In [3] it was proved that separable variables algebras have the exchange of independent sets property (EIS).

**Definition 2.** An algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  has the *exchange of independent sets property* ( $\mathcal{A} \in \text{EIS}$ ) if for any three subsets  $P, Q, R \subset A$  such that  $R, P \cup Q \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $P \cap Q \neq \emptyset$  and  $R \subset C(Q)$ , we have  $P \cup R \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ .

For example: Abelian groups, Boolean algebras (and, more generally, the so-called Post algebras [6]), linear spaces, and  $v^*$ -algebras have EIS-property (see [3]). Moreover, one can prove that every finite algebra generated independently by one or two elements has the EIS property.

The property given below is stronger than the EIS-property.

**Definition 3.** An algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  has the *JIS-property* (*joining independent sets property*) if for any two independent sets  $P$  and  $Q$  such that  $C(P) \cap C(Q) = C(P \cap Q)$  we have  $P \cup Q \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ .

We shall prove that this property is equivalent to the following one:

**Definition 4.** An algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  has the *JIS\*-property* if for any two independent sets  $P$  and  $Q$  such that  $C(P) \cap C(Q) = C(\emptyset)$  we have  $P \cup Q \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ .

The classes of algebras having the last defined properties will be denoted by JIS and JIS\*, respectively.

Notice that the condition formulated in definition 3 is a conversion of the multiplicativity of operation  $C$  on the subsets of the independent set proved by Marczewski (cf. [5], p. 56). Namely

$$(M) \quad \text{if } P, Q \subset I \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}), \text{ then } C(P) \cap C(Q) = C(P \cap Q).$$

We shall prove successively a few results on the just defined properties.

$$(i) \text{ JIS} = \text{JIS}^*.$$

Proof. Let  $\mathcal{A} \in \text{JIS}$  and let  $C(P) \cap C(Q) = C(\emptyset)$ , where  $P$  and  $Q$  are independent sets of  $\mathcal{A}$ . From the obvious inclusion

$$(1) \quad C(P \cap Q) \subset C(P) \cap C(Q)$$

we immediately get  $C(P \cap Q) = C(\emptyset) = C(P) \cap C(Q)$ , which implies  $P \cup Q \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$  and shows that  $\text{JIS}$  implies  $\text{JIS}^*$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\mathcal{A} \in \text{JIS}^*$ ,  $P, Q \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $C(P \cap Q) = C(P) \cap C(Q)$ . By virtue of (1) it suffices to prove that  $C(P) \cap C(Q \setminus P) \subset C(\emptyset)$ . Let  $x \in C(P) \cap C(Q \setminus P)$ . Evidently,  $x$  must belong to  $C(P) \cap C(Q) = C(P \cap Q)$ . Since  $x \in C(Q \setminus P)$  and  $P \cap Q$  and  $Q \setminus P$  are disjoint subsets of the independent set  $Q$ , we infer by virtue of (M) that  $x \in C(\emptyset)$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}$  has  $\text{JIS}^*$ -property,  $C(P) \cap C(Q \setminus P) = C(\emptyset)$ , and  $P$  and  $Q$  are independent sets, their union  $P \cup Q$  is an independent set too. Hence  $\mathcal{A} \in \text{JIS}$ .

Next we shall prove that joining independent sets property is stronger than exchange of independent sets property:

(ii)  $\text{JIS}^* \subset \text{EIS}$ .

Proof. Suppose that  $P \cup Q, R \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $P \cap Q = \emptyset$  and  $R \subset C(Q)$ . From (M) and from the independence of  $P \cup Q$  it follows that  $C(P) \cap C(Q) = C(\emptyset)$ . Since, evidently,  $C(R) \subset C(Q)$ , we also have  $C(P) \cap C(R) = C(\emptyset)$ . Taking into account that  $P, R \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\mathcal{A} \in \text{JIS}^*$ , we have  $P \cup R \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$  and thus  $\mathcal{A}$  has the exchange of independent sets property.

Now we shall show that separable variables algebras have joining independent sets property:

(iii)  $\text{SV} \subset \text{JIS}^*$ .

Proof. Assume that  $P, Q \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $C(P) \cap C(Q) = C(\emptyset)$  (whence, by (1),  $P \cap Q = \emptyset$ ). One needs to prove that  $P \cup Q$  is an independent set. Obviously, it suffices to consider finite sets  $P$  and  $Q$ . Let  $P = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\}$  and  $Q = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}$ . Suppose that  $P \cup Q \notin \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ , i.e. that there are different algebraic operations  $f$  and  $g$  such that

$$(2) \quad f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) = g(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n).$$

Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is a separable variables algebra, there are algebraic operations  $f_0 \in \mathbf{A}^{(m)}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $g_0 \in \mathbf{A}^{(n)}(\mathcal{A})$  such that the equation

$$(3) \quad f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) = g(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$$

is equivalent to the equation

$$(4) \quad f_0(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) = g_0(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n).$$

Thus from (2) we obtain

$$(5) \quad f_0(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m) = g_0(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n).$$

Denoting the last element by  $c$  we have  $c \in \mathbf{C}(P) \cap \mathbf{C}(Q)$ , whence, in virtue of the assumption,  $c \in \mathbf{C}(\emptyset)$ . In view of independence of  $P$  and  $Q$  we infer that

$$f_0(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) = g_0(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) = c$$

for every  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n \in A$ . Equation (4) is therefore always satisfied for any elements of  $A$ , and consequently equation (3) is too. This contradicts the assumption that  $f \neq g$ , which completes the proof.

The following theorem is a simple consequence of (i), (iii) and (M):

**THEOREM.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a separable variables algebra and let  $P$  and  $Q$  be its independent subsets. The union  $P \cup Q$  is independent if and only if  $\mathbf{C}(P \cap Q) = \mathbf{C}(P) \cap \mathbf{C}(Q)$ .*

Recapitulating, we have shown that

$$\text{SV} \subset \text{JIS} = \text{JIS}^* \subset \text{EIS}.$$

Examples of a trivial algebra and a Boolean algebra show that neither the first nor the second sign of inclusion can be replaced by that of equality.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] S. Fajtlowicz, K. Głazek and K. Urbanik, *Separable variables algebras*, Colloquium Mathematicum 15 (1966), p. 161-171.
- [2] P. J. Higgins, *Groups with multiple operators*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society 6 (1956), p. 366-416.
- [3] A. Hulanicki, E. Marczewski and J. Mycielski, *Exchange of independent sets in abstract algebras, I*, Colloquium Mathematicum 14 (1966), p. 203-215.
- [4] E. Marczewski, *A general scheme of the notions of independence in mathematics*, Bulletin de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences, Série des sciences mathématiques, astronomiques et physiques, 6 (1958), p. 731-736.
- [5] — *Independence and homomorphisms in abstract algebras*, Fundamenta Mathematicae 50 (1961), p. 45-61.
- [6] T. Traczyk, *Some theorems on independence in Post algebras*, Bulletin de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences, Série des sciences mathématiques, astronomiques et physiques, 11 (1963), p. 3-8.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE WROCLAW UNIVERSITY

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 18. 9. 1965*

ON A NEW NOTION OF INDEPENDENCE  
IN UNIVERSAL ALGEBRAS

BY

G. GRÄTZER (UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA, U.S.A.)

**1. Introduction.** Two different notions of independence are used in abelian group theory. The classical notion is the following: the elements  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  of an abelian group are independent if

$$(1.1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k n_i a_i = 0 \text{ implies } n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_k = 0;$$

hence a single element  $a$  is independent if and only if it is torsion free.

In recent papers a new notion of independence (introduced by T. Szele) has frequently been used:

the elements  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  are independent if

$$(1.2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k n_i a_i = 0 \text{ implies } n_1 a_1 = \dots = n_k a_k = 0.$$

Hence a single element  $a$  is always independent (see e.g. [2]).

The first notion is connected with the notion of free abelian groups.

The notion of a free universal algebra was introduced by Birkhoff [1] and based on this Marczewski [4] gave a general notion of independence in universal algebras.

In this note an attempt will be made to generalize Marczewski's notion of independence in such a way that when applied to abelian groups it should be identical with (1.2).

This will be achieved by defining the order of an element in a universal algebra.

The basic notions are given in § 2, the order of an element is defined in § 3 while in § 4 the new notion of independence is given. The characterization theorem of weak independence is proved in § 5. Some of its consequences and several unsolved problems are listed in § 6.

It should be noted that all the notions introduced in § 2 are standard ones and are given here only for completeness sake. However, the

notion of the order of an element — however evident it is — seems to be new.

Most of the results of this paper were contained in my mimeographed note [3], which had a limited distribution in 1962.

**2. Some notions and notation.** An *algebra* is a couple  $(A; F)$  where  $A$  is a set and  $F$  is a collection of fundamental operations. Every operation  $f \in F$  is finitary,  $f = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  ( $n$  is an integer and depends on  $f$ ), which means that if  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  is an  $n$ -tuple of elements of  $A$ , then  $f(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  is a well defined element of  $A$ .

Let  $B \subseteq A$ ; we call  $(B; F)$  a *subalgebra* of  $(A; F)$  if  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in B$  and  $f = f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in F$  imply  $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in B$ .

Let  $(A; F)$  and  $(B; F)$  be algebras and  $h: x \rightarrow xh$  a many-one mapping of  $A$  into  $B$ . The mapping  $h$  is called a *homomorphism* if

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n)h = f(x_1h, \dots, x_nh)$$

holds identically for every  $f \in F$ . Accordingly, an *isomorphism*  $h$  is a homomorphism which is one-to-one and onto ( $Ah = B$ ); an *endomorphism* is a homomorphism of  $(A; F)$  into itself, an *automorphism* is an isomorphism of  $(A; F)$  with itself.

A congruence relation  $\Theta$  on  $(A; F)$  is an equivalence relation on  $A$  which has the substitution property:

(SP) if  $a_i \equiv b_i(\Theta)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , then  $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) \equiv f(b_1, \dots, b_n)(\Theta)$  for every  $f \in F$ .

Let  $A/\Theta$  denote the set of equivalence classes modulo  $\Theta$  and  $a/\Theta$  ( $a \in A$ ) the equivalence class represented by  $a$ . Then  $(A/\Theta; F)$  is an algebra where for every  $f \in F$  we put

$$f(a_1/\Theta, \dots, a_n/\Theta) = f(a_1, \dots, a_n)/\Theta.$$

The set of all congruence relations on  $(A; F)$  is denoted by  $C(A; F)$ .

Let  $\Theta_1, \Theta_2 \in C(A; F)$ . We put  $\Theta_1 \leq \Theta_2$  if  $x \equiv y(\Theta_1)$  implies  $x \equiv y(\Theta_2)$ . This makes  $C(A; F)$  a partially ordered set; it can be easily proved that the l.u.b.:  $\Theta_1 \cup \Theta_2$  and g.l.b.:  $\Theta_1 \cap \Theta_2$  always exist.  $\mathfrak{C}(A; F) = (C(A; F); \cup, \cap)$  is a lattice, it is called the *congruence lattice* of  $(A; F)$ .

The class  $A^{(n)}$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) of algebraic operation of  $n$ -variables is the smallest class satisfying the following two conditions:

(2.1) the trivial operations  $e_i^n$  defined by  $e_i^n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) are in  $A^{(n)}$ ;

(2.2) if  $g_1, \dots, g_k \in A^{(n)}$  and  $f = f(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in F$ , then  $f(g_1, \dots, g_k) = f(g_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, g_k(x_1, \dots, x_n))$  is also in  $A^{(n)}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a fixed class of algebras  $(A; F)$ .

An equivalence relation on  $A^{(n)}$  is defined as follows: let  $f, g \in A^{(n)}$ ; we write  $f \equiv g$  if  $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = g(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  for every  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ ,  $(A; F) \in \mathcal{K}$ .

Let  $A_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}$  describe the equivalence classes under this equivalence relation. We can define the operations on  $A_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}$  in a natural way; formula (2.2) shows that  $(A_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}; F)$  is an algebra; this will be denoted by  $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}$ .

We put  $A^{(\omega)} = A^{(0)} \cup A^{(1)} \cup A^{(2)} \cup \dots$  and we define an equivalence: by  $j \equiv g$  ( $f \in A^{(k)}, g \in A^{(l)}$ ) if for every  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{\max(k,l)} \in A$ ,  $(A; F) \in \mathcal{K}$  the equality  $f(a_1, \dots, a_k) = g(a_1, \dots, a_l)$  holds. The equivalence classes will be denoted by  $A_{\mathcal{K}}^{(\omega)}$  and the corresponding algebra  $(A_{\mathcal{K}}^{(\omega)}; F)$  by  $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(\omega)}$ .

Let  $H \subseteq A$ ; we define the subset  $[H]$  of  $A$  by  $a \in [H]$  if there exists an integer  $n$ , and  $f \in A^{(n)}$  and  $h_1, \dots, h_n \in H$  such that  $f(h_1, \dots, h_n) = a$ .

Then  $([H]; F)$  is a subalgebra of  $(A; F)$ ; it is the subalgebra generated by  $H$ .

If  $A, B$  are sets,  $A - B$  denotes the set theoretical difference.  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$  denotes the set whose elements are  $a_1, \dots, a_n$ . The notation  $[\{a_1, \dots\}]$  is replaced by  $[a_1, \dots]$ .

**3. The order of an element.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a class of algebras,  $(A; F) \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $a \in A$ . The order of  $a$  is defined as follows:

Consider the mapping

$$e_1^1 \rightarrow a;$$

this has a unique extension to a homomorphism  $h$  of  $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}$  into  $(A; F)$ ; let  $O(a)$  denote the congruence relation induced by  $h$ ; we call  $O(a)$  the *order* of  $a$ .

It is obvious that  $O(a)$  is uniquely determined by  $a$ ,  $(A; F)$  and  $\mathcal{K}$ . Further,  $O(a) \in C(A_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}; F) = C(\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)})$ .

We first give a few examples:

**3.1.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the class of all additive groups. Then  $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}$  is isomorphic to the group  $\mathfrak{I}$  of integers, let  $e_1^1 \rightarrow 1$  under this isomorphism. Let  $\mathfrak{G} \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $a \in G$ . Then the mapping  $1 \rightarrow a$  has a unique extension to a homomorphism of  $\mathfrak{I}$  into  $\mathfrak{G}$ . It is easy to see,  $O(a)$  is the congruence modulo  $n$ , where  $n$  is the least integer with  $na = 1$ . This  $O(a)$  is completely described if we give this  $n$ , which is usually called the order of  $a$ .

**3.2.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the class of all semi-groups. Now  $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{N}$ , the (additive) semi-group of positive integers, again  $e_1^1 \rightarrow 1$  under this isomorphism. In this case  $O(a)$  can be described by a pair of non-negative integers  $(m, n)$  as follows:  $x \equiv y$  ( $O(a)$ ) ( $x, y \in I$ ) if and only if  $x = y$  or  $x > m, y > m$  and  $n$  divides  $x - y$ .

**3.3.**  $\mathcal{K}$  is the class of all right modules over a ring  $(R; +, \cdot)$ . This may also be included in the above discussion in the usual way by making every element  $r \in R$  correspond to a unary operation  $f_r$  and put  $F$

$= \{+, f_r\}_{r \in R}$  and considering a right-module  $M$  as an algebra  $(M; F)$ . Then  $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^{(1)}$  is isomorphic to  $(R; F)$  and  $O(a)$  may be identified with the class containing the zero of  $\mathfrak{R}$ , which is an ideal  $I_a$ . Usually, this ideal  $I_a$  is called the order of  $a$ .

These examples show that the notion of an order of an element is a natural generalization of known concepts.

The following propositions show the usefulness of this notion:

**3.4.** *Let  $(A; F), (B; F) \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $h$  be a homomorphism of  $(A; F)$  into  $(B; F)$ ,  $a \in A$ .*

*Then*

$$(3.5) \quad O(a) \leq O(ah).$$

To prove this we consider the homomorphisms:

$$h_1: \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^{(1)} \rightarrow (A; F); e_1^1 \rightarrow a;$$

$$h_2: \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^{(1)} \rightarrow (B; F); e_1^1 \rightarrow ah.$$

Then

$$h_1 h = h_2,$$

which implies that  $x \equiv y(O(ah))$  if and only if  $xh_2 = yh_2$ , i.e. if  $(xh_1)h = (yh_1)h$ . Thus  $xh_1 = yh_1$ , implies  $xh_2 = yh_2$ , i.e.  $x \equiv y(O(a))$  implies  $x \equiv y(O(ah))$ .

A partial converse of 3.4 holds too:

**3.6.** *Let  $(A; F), (B; F) \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $a \in A$ ,  $b \in B$  and suppose  $O(a) \leq O(b)$ . Then there exists a homomorphism*

$$h: ([a]; F) \rightarrow ([b]; F),$$

*carrying  $a$  into  $b$  ( $b = ah$ ).*

To prove this consider the homomorphism:

$$h_1: \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^{(1)} \rightarrow (A; F), e_1^1 \rightarrow a;$$

$$h_2: \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{X}}^{(1)} \rightarrow (B; F), e_1^1 \rightarrow b.$$

We define  $h$  as follows: let  $a_1 \in [a]$ , then there exists an  $a_2 \in A_{\mathcal{X}}^{(1)}$  with  $a_1 = a_2 h_1$ ; let  $a_1 h = a_2 h_2$ .

First we have to prove that  $h$  is uniquely defined. Indeed, if  $a_2 h_1 = a_3 h_1$  ( $a_3 \in A_{\mathcal{X}}^{(1)}$ ), then  $a_2 \equiv a_3(O(a))$ , which implies  $a_2 \equiv a_3(O(b))$ , i.e.  $a_2 h_2 = a_3 h_2$ .

To show the substitution property let  $f \in F$ ,  $f = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , take  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in [a]$ ; then

$$a_i = p_i(a), \quad p_i \in A^{(1)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

We want to show

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n)h = f(a_1h, \dots, a_nh).$$

Let

$$a'_i \in A_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}, \quad a'_i h_1 = a_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

$$c \in A_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}, \quad ch_1 = f(a_1, \dots, a_n).$$

Then

$$c \equiv f(a'_1, \dots, a'_n)(O(a)),$$

thus

$$c \equiv f(a'_1, \dots, a'_n)(O(b)),$$

and also

$$ch_2 = f(a'_1, \dots, a'_n)h_2.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} f(a_1, \dots, a_n)h &= ch_2 = f(a'_1, \dots, a'_n)h_2 = f(a'_1h_2, \dots, a'_nh_2) \\ &= f(a_1h, \dots, a_nh). \end{aligned}$$

It should be noted that 3.6 is new only in this form. In fact it is a special case of the so called Second Isomorphism Theorem, which is a part of the folklore.

**3.7.** The order of an element  $(a, b)$ , in the direct product of  $(A; F)$  and  $(B; F)$ , can be computed as follows:

$$(3.8) \quad O(a, b) = O(a) \cap O(b),$$

if  $(A, F)$ ,  $(B, F)$  and  $(A \times B, F)$  are in  $\mathcal{K}$ .

Let  $p_1, p_2 \in A_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}$ . (3.8) means that  $p_1 \equiv p_2(O(a, b))$  if and only if  $p_1 \equiv p_2(O(a))$  and  $p_1 \equiv p_2(O(b))$ . Since  $p_1 \equiv p_2(O(a, b))$  means  $p_1((a, b)) = p_2((a, b))$  and so on, we get that we have to prove the following:  $p_1((a, b)) = p_2((a, b))$  if and only if  $p_1(a) = p_2(a)$  and  $p_1(b) = p_2(b)$ , which holds by definition.

**4. Independence and weak independence.** Marczewski's notion of independence is defined as follows:

**4.1.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a class of algebras,  $(A; F) \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ . We say that the sequence  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is *independent* if

$$p_1(a_1, \dots, a_n) = p_2(a_1, \dots, a_n), \quad p_1, p_2 \in A^{(n)},$$

imply

$$p_1 \equiv p_2.$$

It may be remarked that Marczewski's definition is restricted to the case when  $\mathcal{K}$  consists only of  $(A; F)$ ; some of his results, however, remain true for an arbitrary class  $\mathcal{K}$ . The characterization theorem of independent sequences is the following:

**4.2.** *Let  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ ,  $(A; F) \in \mathcal{K}$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(4.2.1)  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is an independent sequence;

(4.2.2) let  $b_1, \dots, b_n \in B$ ,  $(B; F) \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $p: a_i \rightarrow b_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

*Then  $p$  can be extended to a homomorphism of  $([a_1, \dots, a_n]; F)$  into  $(B; F)$ ;*

(4.2.3) *the mapping  $p: e_i^n \rightarrow a_i$  can be extended to an isomorphism  $h$  of  $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}$  onto  $([a_1, \dots, a_n]; F)$ .*

The equivalence of (4.2.1) and (4.2.2) is stated in [4]; I am sure that Marczewski knows that they are equivalent to (4.2.3) as well, however, I cannot give a reference.

An important corollary of 4.2 (which is also due to Marczewski) is:

**4.3.** *If  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is independent, then so is  $a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}$ , where  $j \rightarrow i_j$  is any permutation of  $1, \dots, n$ .*

Thus we can speak of an independent set  $a_1, \dots, a_n$ , because the ordering does not matter.

**4.4.** *An element  $a$  is independent if and only if  $a$  is torsion free, i.e.  $O(a) = \omega$ .*

This is trivial by (4.2.3) and the definition of  $O(a)$ .

Now we give the definition of weak independence.

**4.5.** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ ,  $(A; F) \in \mathcal{K}$ . We say that the sequence  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is *weakly independent* if

$$(4.5.1) \quad p_1(a_1, \dots, a_n) = p_2(a_1, \dots, a_n), \quad p_1, p_2 \in A^{(n)},$$

imply

$$(4.5.2) \quad p_1(b_1, \dots, b_n) = p_2(b_1, \dots, b_n)$$

for every  $b_1, \dots, b_n \in B$ ,  $(B; F) \in \mathcal{K}$ , for which

$$(4.5.3) \quad O(a_i) \leq O(b_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

First, let us see some trivial consequences of this definition.

**4.6.** *Suppose  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  are torsion free elements. Then  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is independent if and only if it is weakly independent.*

The difference between independence and weak independence is condition (4.5.3). However, if  $O(a_1) = \dots = O(a_n) = \omega$ , then (4.5.3) is no restriction on the choice of the  $b_i$  and hence in this case the two notions are equivalent.

4.7. If  $\mathcal{K}$  is a subclass of lattices, independence and weak independence are equivalent.

Obviously, since in a lattice every element is torsion free.

5. Characterizations of weak independence. We would like to get a result analogous to 4.2. In order to achieve that we need some notation.

The algebra  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}$  is generated by  $e_1^n, \dots, e_n^n$ , and the subalgebra  $\mathcal{A}_i$  generated by  $e_i^n$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}$ . Suppose we are given  $n$  congruence relations  $\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_n$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}$ . Consider  $\Theta_i$  as a congruence relation on  $\mathcal{A}_i$ .

Take a congruence relations  $\Theta$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}$  having the following properties:

- (5.1) the restriction of  $\Theta$  to  $\mathcal{A}_i$  is  $\geq \Theta_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ );
- (5.2)  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}/\Theta$  is isomorphic to a subalgebra of an algebra in  $\mathcal{K}$ .

If there exists a congruence relation which is the smallest one having properties (5.1) and (5.2), then it will be denoted by  $\Sigma\Theta_i$ .

5.3. Let  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ ,  $(A; F) \in \mathcal{K}$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (5.3.1)  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is a weakly independent sequence;
- (5.3.2) let  $b_1, \dots, b_n \in B$ ,  $(B; F) \in \mathcal{K}$ , and  $O(a_i) \leq O(b_i)$ ; then the mapping  $p: a_i \rightarrow b_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) can be extended to a homomorphism of  $([a_1, \dots, a_n]; F)$  into  $(B; F)$ ;
- (5.3.3)  $\Sigma O(a_i)$  exists and

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)} / \Sigma O(a_i) \cong ([a_1, \dots, a_n]; F), \quad e_i^n / \Sigma O(a_i) \rightarrow a_i.$$

Suppose that  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is weakly independent and the  $p$  of (5.3.2) is given. Define  $h$  as follows:

$$q(a_1, \dots, a_n)h = q(b_1, \dots, b_n) \quad \text{for every } q \in A^{(n)}.$$

Obviously,  $h$  maps  $[a_1, \dots, a_n]$  into  $(B; F)$ . This mapping is well-defined since  $q_1(a_1, \dots, a_n) = q_2(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  ( $q_1, q_2 \in A^{(n)}$ ) implies by 4.5 that  $p(b_1, \dots, b_n) = q(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ .

The mapping  $h$  is an extension of  $p$  since  $a_i h = e_i^n(a_1, \dots, a_n)h = e_i^n(b_1, \dots, b_n) = b_i$ .

Finally,  $h$  is a homomorphism. The proof of this is very similar to 3.6, so it can be omitted.

Thus (5.3.1) implies (5.3.2).

Next suppose that (5.3.2) holds and consider the mapping  $e_i^n \rightarrow a_i$ ; this can be extended to a homomorphism  $h$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}$  into  $(A; F)$ . Let  $\Theta$  be the congruence relation induced by  $h$ . Then  $\Theta$  satisfies (5.1) and (5.2). Indeed, if we restrict  $h$  to  $\mathcal{A}_i$ , then we get a homomorphism of  $\mathcal{A}_i$  into  $(A; F)$  carrying  $e_i^n$  into  $a_i$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}_i \cong \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}$ , we get that the congruence

relation induced by the restriction of  $h$  on  $\mathcal{A}_i$  is  $\geq O(a_i)$ . Thus (5.1) is verified; (5.2) is obvious. Now we prove that  $\Theta$  is the smallest one satisfying (5.1) and (5.2). Indeed, if  $\Phi$  satisfies (5.1) and (5.2), then consider  $(B; F) \in \mathcal{K}$  of which  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}/\Phi$  is a subalgebra and let  $b_i$  denote the homomorphic image of  $e_i^n$ . Then by (5.1)  $O(b_i) \geq O(a_i)$ , Thus by (5.3.2) the mapping  $p: a_i \rightarrow b_i$  can be extended to a homomorphism  $k$ . Since the homomorphism which induces  $\Phi$  equals the product  $hk$ , it follows that  $\Theta \leq \Phi$ . Therefore  $\Theta = \Sigma O(a_i)$  and we arrive at the isomorphism statement of (5.3.3).

Finally, suppose that (5.3.3) holds and let  $p_1, p_2 \in A^{(n)}$ ,  $p_1(a_1, \dots, a_n) = p_2(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  and let  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  be given as in 4.5.

Let  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  be the homomorphisms induced by the mappings  $e_i^n \rightarrow a_i$  and  $e_i^n \rightarrow b_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ), respectively, and  $\Theta_1, \Theta_2$  the congruence relation of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}$  induced by  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  respectively.

Then by (5.5.3)  $\Theta_1 = \Sigma O(a_i)$  and (4.5.3) imply that  $\Theta_2$  satisfies (5.1) and, obviously, it satisfies (5.2) as well. Hence by the definition of  $\Sigma O(a_i)$  we get  $\Theta_1 \leq \Theta_2$ .

By the same argument as in 3.6 we get that there exists a homomorphism

$$h: ([a_1, \dots, a_n]; F) \rightarrow ([b_1, \dots, b_n]; F)$$

such that

$$a_i h = b_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, n).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} p_1(b_1, \dots, b_n) &= p_1(a_1 h, \dots, a_n h) = p_1(a_1, \dots, a_n) h \\ &= p_2(a_1, \dots, a_n) h = p_2(a_1 h, \dots, a_n h) = p_2(b_1, \dots, b_n), \end{aligned}$$

which was to be proved.

The proof of 5.3 is completed.

The only difficult notion involved in 5.3 is that of  $\Sigma \theta_i$ . It should be remarked that in case  $\mathcal{K}$  has special properties  $\Sigma \theta_i$  can be more simply characterized.

**5.4.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{K}$  contains the homomorphic images and subalgebras of algebras in  $\mathcal{K}$ . Then  $\Sigma \theta_i$  always exists.*

## 6. Consequences and problems.

**6.1.** *A single element  $a$  is always weakly independent.*

*Proof.* Use the characterization given by (5.3.3) and 3.6.

**6.2.** *The elements  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  of an abelian group are independent if and only if  $\Sigma k_i a_i = 0$  implies  $k_1 a_1 = \dots = k_n a_n = 0$ .*

In this case  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(n)}$  is the free abelian group on  $n$  generators, thus (5.5.3) gives the isomorphism:

$$([a_1, \dots, a_n]; +) = \sum ([a_i]; +),$$

which is equivalent to the statement of 6.2. The same result is true for an arbitrary module over a ring.

**6.3.** *In lattices independence and weakly independence is the same.*  
This is true by 4.6.

**6.4.** *If  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is a weakly independent sequence, then  $a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}$  is also weakly independent, where  $i_1, \dots, i_n$  is any permutation of  $1, \dots, n$ .*

Thus we can speak of a weakly independent set  $I$ , which in the finite case means that any ordering of  $I$  gives a weakly independent sequence while in the infinite case it means that every finite subset of  $I$  is weakly independent.

A *basis*  $H$  of an algebra  $(A; F) \in \mathcal{K}$  is a set which is weakly independent and generates  $(A; F)$ .

**6.5.** *To every integer  $n$  there corresponds a class  $\mathcal{K}$  and an algebra  $(A; F) \in \mathcal{K}$  such that  $(A; F)$  has a basis of  $k$  elements if and only if  $k \leq n$ .*

Let  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n$  be distinct primes,  $\mathfrak{C}_i = (C_i; +)$  be the cyclic group of order  $p_i$ ,  $\mathfrak{C} = \sum \mathfrak{C}_i$ ,  $\mathcal{K} = \{\mathfrak{C}\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{K}$  is effective in 6.5.

One of the unpleasant surprises about weak independence is that it is possible that  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  be independent and  $a_1 \in [a_2, \dots, a_n]$  as it is shown by the following example:

**6.6.** Let  $A = \{a_1, a_2\}$ ,  $F = \{f, g\}$  and  $f(a_1) = a_1$ ,  $f(a_2) = a_1$ ;  $g(a_1) = a_2$ ,  $g(a_2) = a_2$ , and  $\mathcal{K} = \{(A, F)\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}$  consists of three elements  $x, y, z$  and  $f(x) = f(y) = f(z) = z$  and  $g(x) = g(y) = g(z) = y$ . It is easy to see that  $x \equiv z(O(a_1))$ , while  $x \not\equiv z(O(a_1))$  and  $x \equiv y(O(a_2))$  while  $x \not\equiv y(O(a_2))$ . Hence neither  $O(a_1) \leq O(a_2)$  nor  $O(a_1) \geq O(a_2)$  hold. Therefore, the only mapping  $p$  satisfying the assumption of (5.3.2) is  $p: a_1 \rightarrow a_1, a_2 \rightarrow a_2$ , whence  $a_1, a_2$  is an independent sequence and  $a_1 \in [a_2], a_2 \in [a_1]$ .

Some of the problems, which arise very naturally, are the following:

**PROBLEM 1.** Let  $n_1, n_2, \dots$  be a (finite or infinite) sequence of integers. Construct a class  $\mathcal{K}$  and an algebra  $(A; F) \in \mathcal{K}$  such that  $(A; F)$  has a basis of  $k$  elements if and only if  $k = n_i$  for some  $i$  (**P 602**).

**PROBLEM 2.** Let  $A$  be a set and  $J$  a hereditary family of finite subsets of  $A$  including all one element subsets. Prove the existence of an algebra  $(A; F)$  (with  $\mathcal{K} = \{(A; F)\}$ ) such that a subset in  $(A; F)$  is weakly independent if and only if it is contained in  $J$  (**P 603**).

PROBLEM 3. Is it possible that an algebra without constant algebraic operations has a finite and also an infinite basis? Even if  $F$  is finite (P 604)?

PROBLEM 4. Find sufficient conditions on the class  $\mathcal{K}$  under which  $a_1 \in [a_2, \dots, a_n]$  implies that  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is not independent and not all elements are torsion free (P 605).

PROBLEM 5. Prove that if  $\mathcal{K}$  is an equational class of algebras with a nullary operation that determines a one-element subalgebra in every algebra in  $\mathcal{K}$ , and  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is independent if and only if  $[a_1, \dots, a_n] = [a_1] \times \dots \times [a_n]$ , then  $\mathcal{K}$  is equivalent to the class of all modules over a ring. (If this is not the case, what additional conditions are needed?) (P 606)

PROBLEM 6. Work out the notion which corresponds to the notion of  $p$ -rank in Abelian groups (P 607).

Remark. The role of elements of order  $p$  should be taken by elements whose order  $O(a)$  is a dual atom in  $\mathfrak{C}(A_{\mathcal{K}}^{(1)}; F)$ .

#### REFERENCES

- [1] G. Birkhoff, *On the combination of subalgebras*, Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 29 (1933), p. 441-464.
- [2] L. Fuchs, *Abelian groups*, Budapest 1958.
- [3] G. Grätzer, *Some results on universal algebras*, mimeographed notes, August, 1962.
- [4] E. Marczewski, *A general scheme of the notions of independence in mathematics*, Bulletin de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences, Série des sciences math., astr. et phys., 6 (1958), p. 731-736.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 29. 9. 1964*