Equational Theories

Contributors of the Equational Theories Project

October 20, 2024

Chapter 1

Basic theory of magmas

Definition 1.1 (Magma)**.** A *magma* is a set G equipped with a binary operation $\diamond : G \times G \to G$. A *homomorphism* $\varphi : G \to H$ between two magmas is a map such that $\varphi(x \diamond y) = \varphi(x) \diamond \varphi(y)$ for all $x, y \in G$. An *isomorphism* is an invertible homomorphism.

Groups, semi-groups, and monoids are familiar examples of magmas. However, in general we do not expect magmas to have any associative properties. In some literature, magmas are also known as groupoids, although this term is also used for a slightly different object (a category with inverses).

A magma is called *empty* if it has cardinality zero, *singleton* if it has cardinality one, and *non-trivial* otherwise.

The number of magma structures on a set G of cardinality n is of course n^{n^2}, which is [1]

$$1, 1, 16, 19683, 4294967296, 298023223876953125, \ldots$$

(OEIS A002489). Up to isomorphism, the number of finite magmas of cardinality n up to isomorphism is the slightly slower growing sequence

$$1, 1, 10, 3330, 178981952, 2483527537094825, 14325590003318891522275680, \ldots$$

(OEIS A001329).

Definition 1.2 (Free Magma)**.** The *free magma* M_X generated by a set X (which we call an *alphabet*) is the set of all finite formal expressions built from elements of X and the operation $\diamond$. An element of M_X will be called a *word* with alphabet X. The *order* of a word is the number of $\diamond$ symbols needed to generate the word. Thus for instance X is precisely the set of words of order 0 in M_X.

For sake of concreteness, we will take the alphabet X to default to the natural numbers $\mathbb{N}$ if not otherwise specified.

For instance, if $X = \{0, 1\}$, then M_X would consist of the following words:

- 0, 1 (the words of order 0);

- $0 \diamond 0$, $0 \diamond 1$, $1 \diamond 0$, $1 \diamond 1$ (the words of order 1);

---

[1] All sequences start from $n = 0$ unless otherwise specified.

- $0 \diamond (0 \diamond 0)$, $0 \diamond (0 \diamond 1)$, $0 \diamond (1 \diamond 0)$, $0 \diamond (1 \diamond 1)$, $1 \diamond (0 \diamond 0)$, $1 \diamond (0 \diamond 1)$, $1 \diamond (1 \diamond 0)$, $1 \diamond (1 \diamond 1)$, $(0 \diamond 0) \diamond 0$, $(0 \diamond 0) \diamond 1$, $(0 \diamond 1) \diamond 0$, $(0 \diamond 1) \diamond 1$, $(1 \diamond 0) \diamond 0$, $(1 \diamond 0) \diamond 1$, $(1 \diamond 1) \diamond 0$, $(1 \diamond 1) \diamond 1$ (the words of order 2);

- etc.

Lemma 1.3. *For a finite alphabet X, the number of words of order n is $C_n |X|^{n+1}$, where C_n is the nth Catalan number and X is the cardinality of X.*

Proof. Follows from standard properties of Catalan numbers. $\qquad\square$

The first few Catalan numbers are

$$1, 1, 2, 5, 14, 42, 132, ...$$

(OEIS A000108).

Definition 1.4 (Induced homomorphism). Given a function $f : X \to G$ from an alphabet X to a magma G, the *induced homomorphism* $\varphi_f : M_X \to G$ is the unique extension of f to a magma homomorphism. Similarly, if $\pi \colon X \to Y$ is a function, we write $\pi_* \colon M_X \to M_Y$ for the unique extension of π to a magma homomorphism.

For instance, if $f : \{0, 1\} \to G$ maps $0, 1$ to x, y respectively, then

$$\varphi_f(0 \diamond 1) = x \diamond y$$

$$\varphi_f(1 \diamond (0 \diamond 1)) = y \diamond (x \diamond y)$$

and so forth. If $\pi \colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is the map $\pi(n) := n + 1$, then

$$\pi_*(0 \diamond 1) = 1 \diamond 2$$

$$\pi_*(1 \diamond (0 \diamond 1)) = 2 \diamond (1 \diamond 2)$$

and so forth.

Definition 1.5 (Law). Let X be a set. A *law* with alphabet X is a formal expression of the form $w \simeq w'$, where $w, w' \in M_X$ are words with alphabet X (thus one can identify laws with alphabet X with elements of $M_X \times M_X$). A magma G *satisfies* the law $w \simeq w'$ if we have $\varphi_f(w) = \varphi_f(w')$ for all $f : X \to G$, in which case we write $G \vDash w \simeq w'$.

Thus, for instance, the commutative law

$$0 \diamond 1 \simeq 1 \diamond 0 \tag{1.1}$$

is satisfied by a magma G if and only if

$$x \diamond y = y \diamond x \tag{1.2}$$

for all $x, y \in G$. We refer to Equation (1.2) as the *equation* associated to the law Equation (1.1). One can think of equations as the "semantic" interpretation of a "syntactic" law. However, we shall often abuse notation and identify a law with its associated equation. In particular, we shall (somewhat carelessly) also refer to Equation (1.2) as "the commutative law" (rather than "the commutative equation").

Definition 1.6 (Models). A *theory* is a set Γ of laws. Given a theory Γ, a magma G is a *model* of Γ with the (overloaded) notation $G \vDash \Gamma$ if $G \vDash w \simeq w'$ for every $w \simeq w'$ in Γ; we also say that G *obeys* Γ. Given a law E, we write $\Gamma \vDash E$ if every magma G that models Γ, also models E.

Definition 1.7 (Derivation). Given a theory Γ and a law $w \simeq w'$ over a fixed alphabet X, we say that Γ *derives* $w \simeq w'$, and write $\Gamma \vdash w \simeq w'$, if the law can be obtained using a finite number of applications of the following rules:

1. if $w \simeq w' \in \Gamma$, then $\Gamma \vdash w \simeq w'$.

2. $\Gamma \vdash w \simeq w$ for any word w.

3. if $\Gamma \vdash w \simeq w'$, then $\Gamma \vdash w' \simeq w$.

4. if $\Gamma \vdash w \simeq w'$ and $\Gamma \vdash w' \simeq w''$, then $\Gamma \vdash w \simeq w''$.

5. if $\Gamma \vdash w \simeq w'$, then $\Gamma \vdash \varphi_f(w) \simeq \varphi_f(w')$ for every $f : X \to M_X$.

6. if $\Gamma \vdash w_1 \simeq w_2$ and $\Gamma \vdash w_3 \simeq w_4$, then $\Gamma \vdash w_1 \diamond w_3 \simeq w_2 \diamond w_4$.

This definition is useful because of the following theorem:

Theorem 1.8 (Birkhoff's completeness theorem). *For any theory Γ and words w, w' over a fixed alphabet*
$$\Gamma \vdash w \simeq w' \text{ iff } \Gamma \vDash w \simeq w'.$$

Proof. (Sketch) The 'only if' component is soundness, and follows from verifying that the rules of inference in Definition 1.7 holds for $\vDash$. The 'if' part is completeness, and is proven by constructing the magma of words, quotiented out by the relation $\Gamma \vdash w \simeq w'$, which is easily seen to be an equivalence relation respecting the magma operation. $\square$

Corollary 1.9 (Compactness theorem). *Let Γ be a theory, and let E be a law. Then $\Gamma \vDash E$ if and only if there exists a finite subset Γ' of Γ such that $\Gamma' \vDash E$.*

Proof. The claim is obvious for $\vdash$, and the claim then follows from Theorem 1.8. $\square$

Lemma 1.10 (Pushforward). *Let $w \simeq w'$ be a law with some alphabet X, G be a magma, and $\pi : X \to Y$ be a function. If $G \vDash w \simeq w'$, then $G \vDash \pi_*(w) \simeq \pi_*(w')$. In particular, if π is a bijection, the statements $G \vDash w \simeq w'$ and $G \vDash \pi_*(w) \simeq \pi_*(w')$ are equivalent.*

Proof. Trivial. $\square$

If π is a bijection, we will call $\pi_*(w) \simeq \pi_*(w')$ a *relabeling* of the law $w \simeq w'$. Thus for instance
$$5 \diamond 7 \simeq 7 \diamond 5$$
is a relabeling of the commutative law Equation (1.1). By the above lemma, relabeling does not affect whether a given magna satisfies a given law.

Lemma 1.11 (Equivalence). *Let G be a magma and X be an alphabet. Then the relation $G \vDash w \simeq w'$ is an equivalence relation on M_X.*

Proof. Trivial. $\square$

Define the total order of a law $w \simeq w'$ to be the sum of the orders of w and w'.

Lemma 1.12 (Counting laws up to relabeling)**.** *Up to relabeling, the number of laws $w \simeq w'$ of total order n is $C_{n+1}B_{n+2}$.*

Proof. Follows from the properties of Catalan and Bell numbers. □

The first few Bell numbers are

$$1, 1, 2, 5, 15, 52, 203, ...$$

(OEIS A000110).

The sequence in Lemma 1.12 is

$$2, 10, 75, 728, 8526, 115764, ...$$

(OEIS A289679).

Now we would also like to count laws up to relabeling and symmetry.

Lemma 1.13 (Counting laws up to relabeling and symmetry)**.** *Up to relabeling and symmetry, the number of laws $w \simeq w'$ of total order n is*

$$C_{n+1}B_{n+2}/2$$

when n is odd, and

$$(C_{n+1}B_{n+2} + C_{n/2}(2D_{n+2} - B_{n+2}))/2$$

when n is even, where D_n is the number of partitions of $[n]$ up to reflection.

Proof. Elementary counting. □

The sequence D_n is

$$1, 1, 2, 4, 11, 32, 117, ...$$

(OEIS A103293), and the sequence in Lemma 1.13 is

$$2, 5, 41, 364, 4294, 57882, 888440, ...$$

(OEIS A376620).

We can also identify all laws of the form $w \simeq w$ with the trivial law $0 \simeq 0$. The number of such laws of total order n is zero if n is odd, and $C_{n/2}B_{n/2+1}$ if n is even. We conclude:

Lemma 1.14 (Counting laws up to relabeling, symmetry, and triviality)**.** *Up to relabeling, symmetry, and triviality, the number of laws of total order n is*

$$C_{n+1}B_{n+2}/2$$

if n is odd, 2 if $n = 0$, and

$$(C_{n+1}B_{n+2} + C_{n/2}(2D_{n+2} - B_{n+2}))/2 - C_{n/2}B_{n/2+1}$$

if $n \geq 2$ is even.

Proof. Routine counting. □

4

This sequence is

$$2, 5, 39, 364, 4284, 57882, 888365, ...$$

(OEIS A376640).

In particular, up to relabeling, symmetry, and triviality, there are exactly $2 + 5 + 39 + 364 + 4284 = 4694$ laws of total order at most 4. A list can be found here. A script for generating them may be found here. The list is sorted first by the total number of operations, then by the number of operations on the LHS. Within each such class we define an order on expressions by lexical order on variables (ordered x, y, z, w, u, v). The equations are arranged to be minimal with respect to this sorting order, thus the LHS either has fewer operations than the RHS or else it has the same number of operations and occurs earlier in lexical order than the RHS.

Chapter 2

Selected laws

In this project we study the 4694 laws (up to symmetry and relabeling) of total order at most 4. Selected laws of interest are listed below, as well as in this file.

Definition 2.1 (Equation 1)**.** Equation 1 is the law $0 \simeq 0$ (or the equation $x = x$).

This is the trivial law, satisfied by all magmas. It is self-dual.

Definition 2.2 (Equation 2)**.** Equation 2 is the law $0 \simeq 1$ (or the equation $x = y$).

This is the singleton law, satisfied only by the empty and singleton magmas. It is self-dual.

Definition 2.3 (Equation 3)**.** Equation 3 is the law $0 \simeq 0 \diamond 0$ (or the equation $x = x \diamond x$).

This is the idempotence law. It is self-dual.

Definition 2.4 (Equation 4)**.** Equation 4 is the law $0 \simeq 0 \diamond 1$ (or the equation $x = x \diamond y$).

This is the left absorption law.

Definition 2.5 (Equation 5)**.** Equation 5 is the law $0 \simeq 1 \diamond 0$ (or the equation $x = y \diamond x$).

This is the right absorption law (the dual of Definition 2.4).

Definition 2.6 (Equation 6)**.** Equation 6 is the law $0 \simeq 1 \diamond 1$ (or the equation $x = y \diamond y$).

This law is equivalent to the singleton law.

Definition 2.7 (Equation 7)**.** Equation 7 is the law $0 \simeq 1 \diamond 2$ (or the equation $x = y \diamond z$).

This law is equivalent to the singleton law.

Definition 2.8 (Equation 8)**.** Equation 8 is the law $0 \simeq 0 \diamond (0 \diamond 0)$ (or the equation $x = x \diamond (x \diamond x)$).

Definition 2.9 (Equation 14)**.** Equation 14 is the law $0 \simeq 1 \diamond (0 \diamond 1)$ (or the equation $x = y \diamond (x \diamond y)$).

Appears in Problem A1 from Putnam 2001. See Theorem 5.2.

Definition 2.10 (Equation 16)**.** Equation 16 is the law $0 \simeq 1 \diamond (1 \diamond 0)$ (or the equation $x = y \diamond (y \diamond x)$).

Definition 2.11 (Equation 23)**.** Equation 23 is the law $0 \simeq (0 \diamond 0) \diamond 0$ (or the equation $x = (x \diamond x) \diamond x$).

This is the dual of Definition 2.8.

Definition 2.12 (Equation 29)**.** Equation 29 is the law $0 \simeq (1 \diamond 0) \diamond 1$ (or the equation $x = (y \diamond x) \diamond y$).

Appears in Problem A1 from Putnam 2001. Dual to Definition 2.9. See Theorem 5.2.

Definition 2.13 (Equation 38)**.** Equation 38 is the law $0 \diamond 0 \simeq 0 \diamond 1$ (or the equation $x \diamond x = x \diamond y$).

This law asserts that the magma operation is independent of the second argument.

Definition 2.14 (Equation 39)**.** Equation 39 is the law $0 \diamond 0 \simeq 1 \diamond 0$ (or the equation $x \diamond x = y \diamond x$).

This law asserts that the magma operation is independent of the first argument (the dual of Definition 2.13).

Definition 2.15 (Equation 40)**.** Equation 40 is the law $0 \diamond 0 \simeq 1 \diamond 1$ (or the equation $x \diamond x = y \diamond y$).

This law asserts that all squares are constant. It is self-dual.

Definition 2.16 (Equation 41)**.** Equation 41 is the law $0 \diamond 0 \simeq 1 \diamond 2$ (or the equation $x \diamond x = y \diamond z$).

This law is equivalent to the constant law, Definition 2.20.

Definition 2.17 (Equation 42)**.** Equation 42 is the law $0 \diamond 1 \simeq 0 \diamond 2$ (or the equation $x \diamond y = x \diamond z$).

Equivalent to Definition 2.13.

Definition 2.18 (Equation 43)**.** Equation 43 is the law $0 \diamond 1 \simeq 1 \diamond 0$ (or the equation $x \diamond y = y \diamond x$).

The commutative law. It is self-dual.

Definition 2.19 (Equation 45)**.** Equation 45 is the law $0 \diamond 1 \simeq 2 \diamond 1$ (or the equation $x \diamond y = z \diamond y$).

This is the dual of Definition 2.17.

Definition 2.20 (Equation 46)**.** Equation 46 is the law $0 \diamond 1 \simeq 2 \diamond 3$ (or the equation $x \diamond y = z \diamond w$).

The constant law: all products are constant. It is self-dual.

Definition 2.21 (Equation 63)**.** Equation 63 is the law $0 \simeq 1 \diamond (0 \diamond (0 \diamond 1))$ (or the equation $x = y \diamond (x \diamond (x \diamond y)))$.

The "Dupont" law, studied further in Section 7.5.

Definition 2.22 (Equation 65)**.** Equation 65 is the law $0 \simeq 1 \diamond (0 \diamond (1 \diamond 0))$ (or the equation $x = y \diamond (x \diamond (y \diamond x)))$.

The "Asterix" law, studied further in Section 7.2.

Definition 2.23 (Equation 168)**.** Equation 168 is the law $0 \simeq (1 \diamond 0) \diamond (0 \diamond 2)$ (or the equation $x = (y \diamond x) \diamond (x \diamond z))$.

The law of a central groupoid. It is self-dual.

Definition 2.24 (Equation 206)**.** Equation 206 is the law $0 \simeq (0 \diamond (0 \diamond 1)) \diamond 1$ (or the equation $x = (x \diamond (x \diamond y)) \diamond y$).

Our project located this law as one member of an "Austin pair"; see Chapter 3. The infinite counterexample is constructed using the infinite 3-regular tree.

Definition 2.25 (Equation 381). Equation 381 is the law $0 \diamond 1 \simeq (0 \diamond 2) \diamond 1$ (or the equation $x \diamond y = (x \diamond z) \diamond y$).

Appears in Putnam 1978, Problem A4, part (b).

Definition 2.26 (Equation 387). Equation 387 is the law $0 \diamond 1 \simeq (1 \diamond 1) \diamond 0$ (or the equation $x \diamond y = (y \diamond y) \diamond x$).

Introduced in MathOverflow. See Theorem 5.1

Definition 2.27 (Equation 477). Equation 477 is the law $0 \simeq 1 \diamond (0 \diamond (1 \diamond (1 \diamond 1)))$ (or the equation $x = y \diamond (x \diamond (y \diamond (y \diamond y))))$.

An example of a confluent law; see Theorem 10.8.

Definition 2.28 (Equation 953). Equation 953 is the law $0 = 1 \diamond ((2 \diamond 0) \diamond (2 \diamond 2))$ (or the equation $x = y \diamond ((z \diamond x) \diamond (z \diamond z)))$.

An example of a trivial law; see Theorem 5.7.

Definition 2.29 (Equation 1491). Equation 1491 is the law $0 \simeq (1 \diamond 0) \diamond (1 \diamond (1 \diamond 0))$ (or the equation $x = (y \diamond x) \diamond (y \diamond (y \diamond x)))$.

The "Obelix" law, studied further in Section 7.2.

Definition 2.30 (Equation 1571). Equation 1571 is the law $0 \simeq (1 \diamond 2) \diamond (1 \diamond (0 \diamond 2))$ (or the equation $x = (y \diamond z) \diamond (y \diamond (x \diamond z)))$.

Introduced in [10]. As shown in Theorem 5.6, this law characterizes abelian groups of exponent two.

Definition 2.31 (Equation 1648). Equation 1648 is the law $0 \simeq (0 \diamond 1) \diamond ((0 \diamond 1) \diamond 1)$ (or the equation $x = (x \diamond y) \diamond ((x \diamond y) \diamond y))$.

The golden ratio is a coefficient of the linearization of this law.

Definition 2.32 (Equation 1657). Equation 1657 is the law $0 \simeq (0 \diamond 1) \diamond ((1 \diamond 1) \diamond 0)$ (or the equation $x = (x \diamond y) \diamond ((y \diamond y) \diamond x))$.

Definition 2.33 (Equation 1659). Equation 1659 is the law $0 \simeq (0 \diamond 1) \diamond ((1 \diamond 1) \diamond 2)$ (or the equation $x = (x \diamond y) \diamond ((y \diamond y) \diamond z))$.

Definition 2.34 (Equation 1661). Equation 1661 is the law $0 \simeq (0 \diamond 1) \diamond ((1 \diamond 2) \diamond 1)$ (or the equation $x = (x \diamond y) \diamond ((y \diamond z) \diamond y))$.

These two laws admit infinite models on the natural numbers arising from the modified base model construction. See Section 7.4.

Definition 2.35 (Equation 1689). Equation 1689 is the law $0 \simeq (1 \diamond 0) \diamond ((0 \diamond 2) \diamond 2)$ (or the equation $x = (y \diamond x) \diamond ((x \diamond z) \diamond z))$.

Mentioned in [4]. See Theorem 5.5.

Definition 2.36 (Equation 1701). Equation 1701 is the law $0 \simeq (1 \diamond x) \diamond ((2 \diamond 0) \diamond 0)$ (or the equation $x = (y \diamond x) \diamond ((z \diamond x) \diamond x))$.

This law admits infinite models on the natural numbers arising from the modified base model construction. See Section 7.4.

Definition 2.37 (Equation 2662)**.** Equation 2662 is the law $0 \simeq ((0 \diamond 1) \diamond (0 \diamond 1)) \diamond 0$ (or the equation $x = ((x \diamond y) \diamond (x \diamond y)) \diamond x$).

Appears in [10].

Definition 2.38 (Equation 3167)**.** Equation 3167 is the law $0 \simeq (((1 \diamond 1) \diamond 2) \diamond 2) \diamond 0$ (or the equation $x = (((y \diamond y) \diamond z) \diamond z) \diamond x$).

Definition 2.39 (Equation 3588)**.** Equation 3588 is the law $0 \diamond 1 \simeq 2 \diamond ((0 \diamond 1) \diamond 2)$ (or the equation $x \diamond y = z \diamond ((x \diamond y) \diamond z)$).

Our project located this law as one member of an "Austin pair"; see Chapter 3.

Definition 2.40 (Equation 3722)**.** Equation 3722 is the law $0 \diamond 1 \simeq (0 \diamond 1) \diamond (0 \diamond 1)$ (or the equation $x \diamond y = (x \diamond y) \diamond (x \diamond y)$).

Appears in Putnam 1978, Problem A4, part (a). It is self-dual.

Definition 2.41 (Equation 3744)**.** Equation 3744 is the law $0 \diamond 1 \simeq (0 \diamond 2) \diamond (3 \diamond 1)$ (or the equation $x \diamond y = (x \diamond z) \diamond (w \diamond y)$).

This law is called a "bypass operation" in Putnam 1978, Problem A4. It is self-dual. See Theorem 5.4.

Definition 2.42 (Equation 3994)**.** Equation 3994 is the law $0 \diamond 1 \simeq (2 \diamond (0 \diamond 1)) \diamond 2$ (or the equation $x \diamond y = (z \diamond (x \diamond y)) \diamond z$).

Our project located this law as one member of an "Austin pair"; see Chapter 3.

Definition 2.43 (Equation 4315)**.** Equation 4315 is the law $0 \diamond (1 \diamond 0) \simeq 0 \diamond (1 \diamond 2)$ (or the equation $x \diamond (y \diamond x) = x \diamond (y \diamond z)$).

Definition 2.44 (Equation 4512)**.** Equation 4512 is the law $0 \diamond (1 \diamond 2) \simeq (0 \diamond 1) \diamond 2$ (or the equation $x \diamond (y \diamond z) = (x \diamond y) \diamond z$).

The associative law. It is self-dual.

Definition 2.45 (Equation 4513)**.** Equation 4513 is the law $0 \diamond (1 \diamond 2) \simeq (0 \diamond 1) \diamond 3$ (or the equation $x \diamond (y \diamond z) = (x \diamond y) \diamond w$).

Definition 2.46 (Equation 4522)**.** Equation 4522 is the law $0 \diamond (1 \diamond 2) \simeq (0 \diamond 3) \diamond 4$ (or the equation $x \diamond (y \diamond z) = (x \diamond w) \diamond u$).

Dual to Definition 2.48.

Definition 2.47 (Equation 4564)**.** Equation 4564 is the law $0 \diamond (1 \diamond 2) \simeq (3 \diamond 1) \diamond 2$ (or the equation $x \diamond (y \diamond z) = (w \diamond y) \diamond z$).

Dual to Definition 2.45.

Definition 2.48 (Equation 4579)**.** Equation 4579 is the law $0 \diamond (1 \diamond 2) \simeq (3 \diamond 4) \diamond 2$ (or the equation $x \diamond (y \diamond z) = (w \diamond u) \diamond z$).

Dual to Definition 2.46.

Definition 2.49 (Equation 4582)**.** Equation 4582 is the law $0 \diamond (1 \diamond 2) \simeq (3 \diamond 4) \diamond 5$ (or the equation $x \diamond (y \diamond z) = (w \diamond u) \diamond v$).

This law asserts that all triple constants (regardless of bracketing) are constant.

2.1 Equations of order greater than 4

We note some selected laws of order more than 5, which are used in some later chapters of the blueprint.

Definition 2.50 (Equation 5105)**.** Equation 5105 is the law $0 \simeq 1 \diamond (1 \diamond (1 \diamond (0 \diamond (2 \diamond 1))))$ (or the equation $x = y \diamond (y \diamond (y \diamond (x \diamond (z \diamond y))))$).

This law of order 5 was mentioned in [4]. See Theorem 3.3.

Definition 2.51 (Equation 26302)**.** Equation 26302 is the law $0 \simeq (1 \diamond ((2 \diamond 0) \diamond 3)) \diamond (0 \diamond 3)$ (or the equation $x = (y \diamond ((z \diamond x) \diamond w)) \diamond (x \diamond w)$).

A law that characterizes natural central groupoids; see Theorem 5.9.

Definition 2.52 (Equation 28770)**.** Equation 28770 is the law $0 \simeq (((1 \diamond 1) \diamond 1) \diamond 0) \diamond (1 \diamond 2)$ (or the equation $x = (((y \diamond y) \diamond y) \diamond x) \diamond (y \diamond z)$).

This law of order 5 was introduced by Kisielewicz [5]. See Theorem 3.2.

Definition 2.53 (Equation 345169)**.** Equation 345169 is the law $0 \simeq (1 \diamond ((0 \diamond 1) \diamond 1)) \diamond (0 \diamond (2 \diamond 1))$ (or the equation $x = (y \diamond ((x \diamond y) \diamond y)) \diamond (x \diamond (z \diamond y))$).

This law of order 6 was shown in [9] to characterize the Sheffer stroke in a boolean algebra; see Theorem 5.8.

Definition 2.54 (Equation 374794)**.** Equation 374794 is the law $0 \simeq (((1 \diamond 1) \diamond 1) \diamond 0) \diamond ((1 \diamond 1) \diamond 2)$ (or the equation $x = (((y \diamond y) \diamond y) \diamond x) \diamond ((y \diamond y) \diamond z)$).

This law of order 6 was introduced by Kisielewicz [5]; see Theorem 3.1.

Chapter 3

Infinite models

In this chapter we consider non-implications which are refuted only on infinite models, as those are more challenging to prove—they can't be proved by directly giving an operation table and checking which laws it satisfies.

The singleton or empty magma obeys all equational laws. One can ask whether an equational law admits nontrivial finite or infinite models. An *Austin law* is a law which admits infinite models, but no nontrivial finite models. Austin [1] established the first such law, namely the order 9 law

$$(((1 \diamond 1) \diamond 1) \diamond 0) \diamond (((1 \diamond 1) \diamond ((1 \diamond 1) \diamond 1)) \diamond 2) \simeq 0.$$

A shorter Austin law of order 6 was established in [5]:

Theorem 3.1 (Kisielewicz's first Austin law)**.** *Definition 2.54 is an Austin law.*

Proof. First we show that every finite model of Definition 2.54 is trivial. Write $y^2 := y \diamond y$ and $y^3 := y^2 \diamond y$. For any y, z, introduce the functions $f_y : x \mapsto y^3 \diamond x$ and $g_{yz} : x \mapsto x \diamond (y^2 \diamond z)$. Definition 2.54 says that $g_{yz}(f_y(x)) = x$, hence by finiteness $g_{yz} = f_y^{-1}$, showing that g_{yz} does not depend on the value of z. Since

$$f_y(y^2 \diamond z) = g_{yz}(y^3),$$

it follows that $f_y(y^2 \diamond z) = f_y(y^3)$ which by injectivity of f_y implies that $z \mapsto y^2 \diamond z$ is a constant function (with y fixed). Substituting y^2 for y shows that the same is true for $z \mapsto (y^2 \diamond y^2) \diamond z$, and since

$$f_y(z) = (y^2 \diamond y) \diamond z = (y^2 \diamond y^2) \diamond z$$

we conclude that f_y is also a constant function. But this function is already known to be injective, thus there do not exist distinct elements in its domain, showing that the model must be trivial.

To construct an infinite model, consider the magma of positive integers $\mathbb{Z}^+$ with the operation $x \diamond y$ defined by

$$x \diamond y = \begin{cases} 2^y, & x = y \\ 3^y, & x = 1, \ y \neq 1 \\ z, & x = 3^z, \ y \neq x \\ 1, & else \end{cases}.$$

Then $y \diamond y = 2^y$ and $(y \diamond y) \diamond y = 1$ for all y. If $x \neq 1$ we have that

$$((y \diamond y) \diamond y) \diamond x = 3^x,$$

and since $(y \diamond y) \diamond z$ is a power of two for all y, z it follows that

$$3^x \diamond ((y \diamond y) \diamond z) = x.$$

The case $x = 1$ requires a further argument: observe that $w = (y \diamond y) \diamond z$ evaluates to one unless $z = 2^y$, in which case it evaluates to 2^{2^y} (which is greater than or equal to four). In particular, w never takes the value two. Thus

$$(((y \diamond y) \diamond y) \diamond 1) \diamond ((y \diamond y) \diamond z) = 2 \diamond w = 1,$$

concluding our proof that this magma is a model of Definition 2.54 □

An even shorter law (order 5) was obtained by the same author in a follow-up paper [4]:

Theorem 3.2 (Kisielewicz's second Austin law). *Definition 2.52 is an Austin law.*

Proof. Using the y^2 and y^3 notation as before, the law reads

$$x = (y^3 \diamond x) \diamond (y \diamond z). \tag{3.1}$$

In particular, for any y, the map $T_y \colon x \mapsto y^3 \diamond x$ is injective, hence bijective in a finite model G. In particular we can find a function $f : G \to G$ such that $T_y f(y) = y^3$ for all y Applying Equation (3.1) with $x = f(y)$, we conclude

$$T_y(y \diamond z) = y^3 \diamond (y \diamond z) = f(y)$$

and thus $y \diamond z$ is independent of z by injectivity of T_y. Thus, the left-hand side of Equation (3.1) does not depend on x, and so the model is trivial. This shows there are no non-trivial finite models.

To establish an infinite model, use $\mathbb{N}$ with $x \diamond y$ defined by requiring

$$y \diamond y = 2^y; \quad 2^y \diamond y = 3^y$$

and

$$3^y \diamond x = 3^y 5^x$$

for $x \neq 3^y$, and

$$(3^y 5^x) \diamond z = x$$

for $z \neq 3^y 5^x$. Finally set

$$2^{3^y} \diamond z = 3^y$$

for $z \neq 3^y, 2^{3^y}$. All other assignments of $\diamond$ may be made arbitrarily. It is then a routine matter to establish Equation (3.1). □

In that paper a computer search was also used to show that no law of order four or less is an Austin law.

An open question is whether Definition 2.50 is an Austin law. We have the following partial result from [4]:

Theorem 3.3 (Equation 5105 has no non-trivial finite models). *Definition 2.50 has no non-trivial finite models.*

Proof. From Definition 2.50 we see that the map $w \mapsto y \diamond w$ is onto, hence injective in a finite model. Using this injectivity four times in Definition 2.50, we see that $z \diamond y$ does not depend on z, hence the expression $x \diamond (z \diamond y)$ does not depend on x. By Definition 2.50 again, this means that x does not depend on x, which is absurd in a non-trivial model. □

12

We also have such a non-implication involving two laws of order 4:

Theorem 3.4 (3994 implies 3588 for finite models). *All finite magmas which satisfy Definition 2.42 also satisfy Definition 2.39.*

Proof. For a finite magma M, consider the set $S = \{x \diamond y | x, y \in M\}$. Now $f_z : x \mapsto z \diamond x$ and $g_z : x \mapsto x \diamond z$. They both map S to S, and due to the hypothesis $g_z \diamond f_z$ is the identity on S, so because S is finite f_z and g_z must be inverse bijections on it, and therefore they commute. $\qquad\square$

Theorem 3.5 (3994 does not imply 3588 for infinite models). *There exists a magma which satisfies Definition 2.42 and not Definition 2.39.*

Proof. Consider $\mathbb{N}$, with $x \diamond y$ defined as $x \oplus y$ (bitwise XOR) if x and y are even, $y + 2$ if only y is even, $x \dot{-} 2$ if only x is even, and 0 if both are odd. Note that the range of the operation is the set of even naturals. Definition 2.42 is satisfied, because for even z we get $z \oplus (x \diamond y) \oplus z = x \diamond y$ and for odd z we get $(x \diamond y) + 2 \dot{-} 2 = x \diamond y$. Setting $x = y = z = 1$, Definition 2.39 isn't satisfied. $\qquad\square$

The following result was established in [2]:

Theorem 3.6 (Austin's finite model theorem). *Any law with at most two variables has a non-trivial finite model.*

Proof. If neither side of the law is a single variable then the zero law $x \diamond y = 0$ will work, so one can assume the law takes the form $x = f(x, y)$. Consider a finite field F with the operation $x \diamond y := ax + by$ for some coefficients $a, b \in F$. Then the law becomes a pair of equations $P(a, b) = 0$, $Q(a, b) = 1$ in the coefficients for some polynomials P, Q with integer coefficients, which one can verify to not divide each other (they have the same degree, and do not have the same set of non-zero monomials). From Bezout's theorem, this equation has a solution in some field, and hence by the Lefschetz principle it has a solution in a finite field. $\qquad\square$

Chapter 4

General implications

We will be interested in seeing which laws imply which other laws, in the sense that magmas obeying the former law automatically obey the latter. We will also be interested in *anti-implications* showing that one law does *not* imply another, by producing examples of magmas that obey the former law but not the latter. Here is a formal definition.

Definition 4.1 (Implication). A law E is said to *imply* another law E' if $\{E\} \vDash E'$, or equivalently:

$$G \vDash w \simeq w' \implies G \vDash w'' \simeq w''' \text{ for all magmas } G$$

Two laws are said to be *equivalent* if they imply each other.

Lemma 4.2 (Pre-order). *If we define $E \leq E'$ if E implies E', then this is a pre-order on the set of laws, and equivalence is an equivalence relation.*

Note that we view the stronger law as less than or equal to the weaker law. This is because the class of magmas that obey the stronger law is a subset of the class of magmas that obey the weaker law. It is also consistent with the conventions of Lean's Mathlib.

Proof. Trivial. □

Implications between the laws from Chapter 2 are depicted in Figure 4.1.

Lemma 4.3 (Maximal element). *The law $0 \simeq 0$ is the maximal element in this pre-order.*

Proof. Trivial. □

Lemma 4.4 (Minimal element). *The law $0 \simeq 1$ is the minimal element in this pre-order.*

Proof. Trivial. □

Every magma G has a *reversal* G^{op}, formed by by replacing the magma operation $\diamond$ with its opposite $\diamond^{\mathrm{op}} : (x, y) \mapsto y \diamond x$. There is a natural isomorphism between these magmas, which induces an involution $w \mapsto w^{\mathrm{op}}$ on words $w \in M_X$. Every law $w \simeq w'$ then has a *dual* $w^{\mathrm{op}} \simeq (w')^{\mathrm{op}}$.

For instance, the dual of the law $0 \diamond 1 = 0 \diamond 2$ is $1 \diamond 0 = 2 \diamond 0$, which after relabeling is $0 \diamond 1 = 2 \diamond 1$. A list of equations and their duals can be found here. Of the 4694 equations under consideration, 84 are self-dual, leaving 2305 pairs of dual equations.

The pre-ordering on laws has a duality symmetry:

Figure 4.1: Implications between the above equations, displayed as a Hasse diagram.

Lemma 4.5 (Duality of laws)**.** *The law $w \simeq w'$ implies $w'' \simeq w'''$, if and only if $w^{\mathrm{op}} \simeq (w')^{\mathrm{op}}$ implies $w''^{\mathrm{op}} \simeq (w''')^{\mathrm{op}}$.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that a magma G satisfies a law $w \simeq w'$ if and only if G^{op} satisfies $w^{\mathrm{op}} \simeq (w')^{\mathrm{op}}$. $\qquad\square$

Some equational laws can be "diagonalized":

Theorem 4.6 (Diagonalization)**.** *An equational law of the form*

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = G(y_1, \dots, y_m), \tag{4.1}$$

where $x_1, \dots, x_n$ and $y_1, \dots, y_m$ are distinct elements of the alphabet, implies the diagonalized law

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = F(x'_1, \dots, x'_n).$$

where $x'_1, \dots, x'_n$ are distinct from $x_1, \dots, x_n$ In particular, if $G(y_1, \dots, y_m)$ can be viewed as a specialization of $F(x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$, then these two laws are equivalent.

Proof. From two applications of Equation (4.1) one has

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = G(y_1, \dots, y_m)$$

and

$$F(x'_1, \dots, x'_n) = G(y_1, \dots, y_m)$$

whence the claim. $\qquad\square$

Thus for instance, Definition 2.7 is equivalent to Definition 2.2.

Theorem 4.7 (Laws implied by the constant law)**.** *If w, w' each have order at least one, then the law $w \simeq w'$ is implied by the constant law (Definition 2.20). If exactly one of w, w' has order zero, and the law $w \simeq w'$ is not implied by the constant law.*

15

Proof. Routine. □

Theorem 4.8 (Criterion for implication)**.** *If $w \simeq w'$ is such that every variable appears the same number of times in both w and w', and $w \simeq w'$ implies another law $w'' \simeq w'''$, then every variable appears the same number of times in both w'' and w'''.*

Proof. Consider the magma MS of multisets over an arbitrary set A (which can be seen as finitely supported maps $A \to \mathbb{N}$), with the multiset addition law $+$. By hypothesis, this magma obeys $w \simeq w'$, and hence $w'' \simeq w'''$, giving the claim by comparing the orders of the elements of A appearing in w'' and w''' in this magma. □

Chapter 5

Implications between selected laws

We collect here some notable implications between the the selected laws in Chapter 2. By Theorem 1.8, every implication can basically be established by a finite number of rewrites. In most cases, the sequence of rewrites is quite straightforward, and the implication is very easy, but we record some less obvious examples.

Theorem 5.1 (387 implies 43). *Definition 2.26 implies Definition 2.18.*

Proof. (From MathOverflow). By Definition 2.26, one has the law

$$(x \diamond x) \diamond y = y \diamond x. \tag{5.1}$$

Specializing to $y = x \diamond x$, we conclude

$$(x \diamond x) \diamond (x \diamond x) = (x \diamond x) \diamond x$$

and hence by another application of Definition 2.26 we see that $x \diamond x$ is idempotent:

$$(x \diamond x) \diamond (x \diamond x) = x \diamond x. \tag{5.2}$$

Now, replacing x by $x \diamond x$ in Equation (5.1) and then using Equation (5.2) we see that

$$(x \diamond x) \diamond y = y \diamond (x \diamond x)$$

so in particular $x \diamond x$ commutes with $y \diamond y$:

$$(x \diamond x) \diamond (y \diamond y) = (y \diamond y) \diamond (x \diamond x). \tag{5.3}$$

Also, from two applications of Equation (5.1) one has

$$(x \diamond x) \diamond (y \diamond y) = (y \diamond y) \diamond x = x \diamond y.$$

Thus Equation (5.3) simplifies to $x \diamond y = y \diamond x$, which is Definition 2.18. $\square$

Theorem 5.2 (29 equivalent to 14). *Definition 2.12 is equivalent to Definition 2.9.*

This result was posed as Problem A1 from Putnam 2001.

17

Proof. By Lemma 4.5 it suffices to show that Definition 2.12 implies Definition 2.9. From Definition 2.12 one has

$$x = ((x \diamond y) \diamond x) \diamond (x \diamond y)$$

and also

$$y = (x \diamond y) \diamond x$$

giving $x = y \diamond (x \diamond y)$, which is Definition 2.9. □

Theorem 5.3 (14 implies 29). *Definition 2.9 implies Definition 2.12.*

This result was posed as Problem A1 from Putnam 2001.

Proof. □

The following result was Problem A4 on Putnam 1978.

Theorem 5.4 (3744 implies 3722, 381). *Definition 2.41 implies Definition 2.40 and Definition 2.25.*

Proof. By hypothesis, one has

$$x \diamond y = (x \diamond z) \diamond (w \diamond y)$$

for all x, y, z, w. Various specializations of this give

$$x \diamond y = (x \diamond z) \diamond (y \diamond y) \tag{5.4}$$
$$x \diamond z = (x \diamond z) \diamond (x \diamond z) \tag{5.5}$$
$$(x \diamond z) \diamond y = ((x \diamond z) \diamond (x \diamond z)) \diamond (y \diamond y). \tag{5.6}$$

Equation (5.5) gives Definition 2.40, while Equation (5.4), Equation (5.5), Equation (5.6) gives

$$x \diamond y = (x \diamond z) \diamond y$$

which is Definition 2.25. □

Theorem 5.5 (1689 is equivalent to 2). *Definition 2.35 is equivalent to Definition 2.2.*

Proof. The implication of Definition 2.35 from Definition 2.2 is trivial. The converse is a surprisingly long chain of implications; see pages 326–327 of [4]. The initial law

$$x = (y \diamond x) \diamond ((x \diamond z) \diamond z)$$

is used to obtain, in turn,

$$x \diamond ((((x \diamond y) \diamond y) \diamond z) \diamond z) = (x \diamond y) \diamond y,$$

$$(x \diamond (y \diamond z)) \diamond (z \diamond ((z \diamond w) \diamond w)) = y \diamond z,$$

$$x \diamond (y \diamond ((y \diamond z) \diamond z)) = (x \diamond y) \diamond y,$$

$$((x \diamond (y \diamond z)) \diamond z) \diamond z = y \diamond z,$$

$$(x \diamond (y \diamond (z \diamond w))) \diamond (z \diamond w) = y \diamond (z \diamond w),$$

$$(x \diamond (y \diamond z)) \diamond (y \diamond z) = x \diamond (y \diamond z),$$

$$((x \diamond y) \diamond ((y \diamond z) \diamond z)) \diamond ((y \diamond z) \diamond z) = y,$$

$$((x \diamond y) \diamond ((y \diamond z) \diamond z)) \diamond ((y \diamond z) \diamond z) = ((x \diamond ((x \diamond y) \diamond ((y \diamond z) \diamond z))) \diamond ((y \diamond z) \diamond z)) \diamond ((y \diamond z) \diamond z),$$

$$x \diamond ((x \diamond y) \diamond y) = x,$$

$$x \diamond (x \diamond (y \diamond z)) = x,$$

$$(x \diamond y) \diamond y = x \diamond y,$$

$$(x \diamond x) \diamond x = x,$$

$$(x \diamond y) \diamond y = y,$$

$$x \diamond y = y.$$

$\square$

The following result was established in [10].

Theorem 5.6 (Consequences of 1571). *Magmas obeying Definition 2.30 also obey Definition 2.37, Definition 2.15, Definition 2.11, Definition 2.8, Definition 2.10, Definition 2.9, Definition 2.18, and Definition 2.44, and are in fact abelian groups of exponent two. Conversely, all abelian groups of exponent two obey Definition 2.30.*

Proof. Suppose that a magma G obeys Definition 2.30, thus

$$x = (y \diamond z) \diamond (y \diamond (x \diamond z)). \tag{5.7}$$

$$x = ((x \diamond y) \diamond (x \diamond y)) \diamond ((x \diamond y) \diamond (x \diamond (x \diamond y)))$$

and

$$x = (x \diamond y) \diamond (x \diamond (x \diamond y))$$

whence

$$x = ((x \diamond y) \diamond (x \diamond y)) \diamond x$$

which is Definition 2.37. This gives

$$y = ((y \diamond z) \diamond (y \diamond z)) \diamond y$$

while from Equation (5.7) one has

$$(y \diamond z) \diamond (y \diamond z) = (x \diamond y) \diamond (x \diamond ((y \diamond z) \diamond (y \diamond z) \diamond y))$$

whence

$$(x \diamond y) \diamond (x \diamond y) = (y \diamond z) \diamond (y \diamond z).$$

This implies that $(x \diamond y) \diamond (x \diamond y)$ does not depend on x, or on y, hence is equal to some constant e:

$$(x \diamond y) \diamond (x \diamond y) = e.$$

From Equation (5.7) the magma operation is surjective, hence

$$x \diamond x = e \tag{5.8}$$

which gives Definition 2.15. Applying Equation (5.7) with $x = y = z$ we conclude

$$x = e \diamond (x \diamond e)$$

19

while if we instead take $y = z = e$ we have

$$x = e \diamond (e \diamond (x \diamond e))$$

hence

$$x = e \diamond x$$

and then also

$$x = x \diamond e$$

from which we readily conclude Definition 2.11, Definition 2.8; thus e is an identity element. From Equation (5.7) with $z = e$ we now have

$$x = y \diamond (y \diamond x) \tag{5.9}$$

which is Definition 2.10. If instead we take $y = e$ we have

$$x = z \diamond (x \diamond z) \tag{5.10}$$

which is Definition 2.9. So if we substitute $z = x \diamond y$ and use Equation (5.9) we obtain

$$x = (x \diamond y) \diamond y$$

and hence

$$y \diamond x = y \diamond ((x \diamond y) \diamond y) = x \diamond y$$

thanks to Equation (5.10). This gives Definition 2.18, thus G is now commutative. From Equation (5.7) once more one has

$$x \diamond (y \diamond z) = (y \diamond x) \diamond (z \diamond ((x \diamond (y \diamond z)) \diamond x))$$

which one can simplify using commutativity and Equation (5.9) (or Equation (5.10)) to eventually obtain

$$x \diamond (y \diamond z) = (x \diamond y) \diamond z$$

which is Definition 2.44. G is now commutative and associative, and every element is its own inverse and of exponent 2, hence is an abelian group thanks to Equation (5.8), so G is an abelian group of exponent 2 as claimed. The converse is easily verified. $\square$

Theorem 5.7 (953 is equivalent to 2). *Definition 2.28 is equivalent to Definition 2.2.*

Proof. It suffices to show that Definition 2.28 implies Definition 2.2. Pick an element 0 of G and define $1 = 0 \diamond 0$ and $2 = 1 \diamond 1$ (we do not require $0, 1, 2$ to be distinct). From Definition 2.28 with $x = z = 0$ we have

$$0 = y \diamond 2.$$

If we then apply Definition 2.28 with $z = 1$ we conclude that

$$x = y \diamond 0$$

for all x, y, from which one concludes $x = x'$ for any $x, x' \in G$, giving Definition 2.2. $\square$

Theorem 5.8 (Sheffer stroke axiom). *Definition 2.53 axiomatizes the Sheffer stroke operation $x \diamond y = \overline{xy}$ in a Boolean algebra.*

Proof. See [9]. In fact this is the shortest law with this property.

A sketch of proof follows. One can easily verify that the Sheffer stroke operation obeys this law. Conversely, if this law holds, then automated theorem provers can show that the three Sheffer axioms

$$(x \diamond x) \diamond (x \diamond x) = x$$

$$x \diamond (y \diamond (y \diamond y)) = x \diamond x$$

$$(x \diamond (y \diamond z)) \diamond (x \diamond (y \diamond z)) = ((y \diamond y) \diamond x) \diamond ((z \diamond z) \diamond x)$$

are satisfied. A classical result of Sheffer [11] then allows one to conclude. $\square$

A *natural central groupoid* is, up to isomorphism, a magma with carrier $S \times S$ for some set S and operation

$$(a, b) \diamond (c, d) = (b, c).$$

These are examples of central groupoids (Definition 2.23).

Theorem 5.9 (Natural central groupoid axiom)**.** *Definition 2.51 characterizes natural central groupoids.*

Proof. See [6, Theorem 5]. The proof is quite lengthy; a sketch is as follows. It is easy to see that natural central groupoids obey Definition 2.51. Conversely, if this law holds, then

$$(y \diamond z) \diamond (z \diamond w) = ((x \diamond ((w \diamond (y \diamond z)) \diamond w)) \diamond ((y \diamond z) \diamond w)) \diamond (z \diamond w)$$
$$= z$$

so we have a central groupoid. Setting $y = (t \diamond t) \diamond t$, $z = t \diamond (t \diamond t)$, $w = t \diamond t$ in Definition 2.51 we also obtain

$$(x \diamond t) \diamond t = (t \diamond t) \diamond t.$$

Using the notation

$$x^{(1)} := (x \diamond x) \diamond x, \quad x^{(2)} := x \diamond (x \diamond x)$$

we then have

$$x \diamond t = ((x \diamond x) \diamond (x \diamond t)) \diamond ((x \diamond t) \diamond t)$$
$$= x \diamond t^{(1)}.$$

A lengthy computer-assisted argument then gave the dual identity

$$t^{(2)} \diamond x = t \diamond x$$

Together, these give

$$x^{(2)} \diamond y^{(1)} = x \diamond y.$$

Multiplying on the left by $x = x^{(1)} \diamond x^{(2)}$, one can conclude that

$$x^{(2)} = x \diamond (x \diamond y).$$

One then has

$$(x \diamond y)^{(1)} = ((y \diamond x) \diamond (x \diamond y)) \diamond (x \diamond y)$$
$$= x \diamond (x \diamond y)$$
$$= x^{(2)}$$

21

and a similar argument gives
$$(x \diamond y)^{(2)} = y^{(1)}.$$

Since $(x \diamond x)^{(1)} = x^{(2)}$ and $(x \diamond x)^{(2)} = x^{(1)}$, we conclude that $x^{(1)}$ and $x^{(2)}$ are idempotent. Since $x = x^{(1)} \diamond x^{(2)}$, we see that every x is the product of two idempotents. One can show that this representation is unique, and gives a canonical identification with a natural central groupoid. $\square$

Chapter 6

Selected magmas

Each magma can be used to establish anti-implications: if Γ is the set of all laws obeyed by a magma G, then we have $\neg E \leq E'$ whenever $E \in \Gamma$ and $E' \notin \Gamma$. Large numbers of implications can already be obtained from

- All magmas of order at most 4, up to isomorphism (of which there are $178,985,294$);

- All commutative magmas of order 5, up to isomorphism **determine their count**;

- Cyclic groups $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ with $2 \leq N \leq 12$ and $x \circ y = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2 + dx + ey$ for randomly chosen a, b, c, d, e.

- There are only 1410 distinct cancellative magmas of order 5 (up to isomorphism), and Mace4 can generate all of them in under 20 seconds. A shell script to do this is available here. A magma is cancellative if $xy = xz$ implies $y = z$ and $yx = zx$ implies $y = z$.

Some other magmas have been used to establish counterexamples:

- The cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$ with the addition law.

- The natural numbers with law $x \circ y = x + 1$.

- The natural numbers with law $x \circ y = xy + 1$.

- The reals with $x \circ y = (x + y)/2$.

- The natural numbers with $x \circ x$ equal to x when $x = y$ and $x + 1$ otherwise.

- The set of strings with $x \circ y$ equal to y when $x = y$ or when x ends with yyy, or xy otherwise (see this Zulip thread).

- Vector spaces $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ over $\mathbb{F}_2$, which obey Definition 2.30 (and hence all the subsequent laws mentioned in Theorem 5.6).

- Knuth's construction [6] of a central groupoid (Definition 2.23) as follows. Let S be a (finite) set with a distinguished element 0, and a binary operation $*$ such that $x * 0 = 0$ and $0 * x = x$ for all x, and for each x, y there is a unique z with $x * z = y$. One can then define a central groupoid on $S \times S$ by defining $(a, b) \diamond (c, d)$ to equal (b, c) if $c, d \neq 0$; (b, e) if $b * e = c$ is non-zero and $d = 0$; and $(a * b, 0)$ if $c = 0$. One such example in [6] is when $S = \{0, 1, 2\}$ with $1 * 1 = 2 * 1 = 2$ and $1 * 2 = 2 * 2 = 1$.

- Cancellative magmas of orders 7 to 9, found by hand-guided search using various solvers.

- Two magmas of cardinality 8 were constructed by Z3.

- A large number of ad-hoc finite magmas were constructed using the Vampire theorem prover.

- Linear magmas $x \diamond y = ax + by$ on various fields, such as $\mathbb{F}_p$ for small primes p, have also been used to establish counterexamples. One such choice is $(p, a, b) = (11, 1, 7)$. See this discussion.

- A variation of the translation-invariant magma construction which resolved the Asterix / Obelix anti-implication is used to show that Definition 2.34 does not imply Definition 2.32.

Chapter 7

Infinite magma constructions

The need to construct infinite magmas primarily arises in the context of *Austin laws* and *Austin pairs*. An Austin law admits infinite models but no nontrivial finite ones, while an Austin pair consists of laws P and Q such that every finite model obeying the law P also obeys Q, but some infinite magma obeys P without also obeying Q. Examples are given in Chapter 3.

Here we survey techniques for constructing infinite magmas that serve as counterexamples for implications between laws. Many of the techniques presented trace their origins to the first analysis of the Asterix equation (Definition 2.22), reviewed in Section 7.2.

7.1 Translation-invariant magmas

A *translation-invariant magma* is a magma whose carrier G is an Abelian group $G = (G, +)$, and whose magma operation takes the form

$$y \diamond x = x + f(x - y)$$

for some function $f : G \to G$. Thus the translations on G become magma isomorphisms.

Example 1. *A magma G satisfying the left (Definition 2.4) or right (Definition 2.5) absorption laws is translation-invariant. Equip the carrier G with an Abelian group structure $(G, +, -, 0)$ and define $f : G \to G$ as either $f(x) = -x$ or $f(x) = 0$.*

Example 2. *Linear magmas $x \diamond y = ax + by$ on a field $(\mathbb{F}, +, -, \cdot, 0, 1)$ are translation-invariant if $a + b = 1$, since $(\mathbb{F}, +, -, 0)$ forms an Abelian group, and one can set $f(x) = bx$.*

Note that if an example of the latter sort suffices to refute the implication between P and Q then by the Lefschetz principle one can construct a counterexample where the field $\mathbb{F}$ is finite. Consequently, P and Q cannot constitute an Austin pair. However, these linear magmas can still serve as starting points for the *modified translation-invariant* models studied in Section 7.4.

7.2 The Asterix equation

Over translation-invariant magmas, equational laws simplify to univariate functional equations.

For instance, writing $x = y + h$, we have

$$y \diamond x = x + f(h)$$

25

$$x \diamond (y \diamond x) = x + f(h) + f^2(h)$$

$$y \diamond (x \diamond (y \diamond x)) = x + f(h) + f^2(h) + f(h + f(h) + f^2(h))$$

where $f^2 = f \circ f$, so the Asterix equation for such magmas simplifies to the univariant functional equation

$$f(h) + f^2(h) + f(h + f(h) + f^2(h)) = 0 \tag{7.1}$$

for $h \in G$.

This equation has some degenerate solutions, for instance we can take $f(h) = c$ for any constant c of order 3 in G. It is challenging to construct more interesting solutions to this equation; however, we can do this if $G = \mathbb{Z}$ by a greedy algorithm. We need the following technical definition.

Definition 7.1. A *partial solution* (E_0, E_1, E_2, f) to (7.1) consists of nested finite sets

$$E_0 \subset E_1 \subset E_2 \subset \mathbb{Z}$$

together with a function $f : E_1 \to E_2$ with the following properties:

(a) If $h \in E_0$, then $f(h) \in E_1$, so that $f^2(h)$ is well-defined as an element of E_2; furthermore, $h + f(h) + f^2(h)$ lies in E_1, so that the left-hand side of (7.1) makes sense; and (7.1) holds.

(b) The function f is a bijection from $E_1 \backslash E_0$ to $E_2 \backslash E_1$.

We partially order the space of partial solutions to (7.1) by writing $(E_0, E_1, E_2, f) \leq (E_0', E_1', E_2', f')$ if the following properties hold:

- $E_i \subset E_i'$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

- f agrees with f' on E_0.

When this occurs we say that the partial solution (E_0', E_1', E_2', f') *extends* the partial solution (E_0, E_1, E_2, f).

We define the *empty partial solution* (E_0, E_1, E_2, f) by setting $E_0 = E_1 = E_2$ to be the empty set, and f to be the empty function; it is the minimal element of the above partial order.

We have the following iterative construction, that lets us add arbitrary elements to the core domain E_0:

Lemma 7.2 (Enlarging a partial solution). *Let* (E_0, E_1, E_2, f) *be a partial solution to* (7.1), *and let h be an element of $\mathbb{Z}$ that does not lie in E_0. Then there exists a partial solution* (E_0', E_1', E_2', f') *to* (7.1) *that extends* (E_0, E_1, E_2, f), *such that $h \in E_0'$.*

Proof. Because f maps $E_1 \backslash E_0$ bijectively to $E_2 \backslash E_1$, there are three cases:

- h is equal to an element h_0 of $G \backslash E_2$.

- h is equal to an element h_0 of $E_1 \backslash E_0$.

- h is equal to $h_1 = f(h_0)$ for some $h_0 \in E_1 \backslash E_0$, so that $h_1 \in E_2 \backslash E_1$.

We deal with these three cases in turn.

First suppose that $h = h_0 \in G \backslash E_2$. We perform the following construction.

- Choose an element $h_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ that does not lie in $E_2 \cup \{h_0\}$; this is possible because E_2 is finite.

- Choose an element $h_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h_2, h_0 + h_1 + h_2$, and $-h_1 - h_2$ are all distinct from each other and lie outside of $E_2 \cup \{h_0, h_1\}$; this is possible because E_2 is finite.

- Promote h_0 to E_0, promote $h_1, h_0 + h_1 + h_2$ to E_1, and promote $h_2, -h_1 - h_2$ to E_2, creating new sets

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_0' &:= E_0 \cup \{h_0\} \\
E_1' &:= E_1 \cup \{h_0, h_1, h_0 + h_1 + h_2\} \\
E_2' &:= E_2 \cup \{h_0, h_1, h_0 + h_1 + h_2, h_2, -h_1 - h_2\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Clearly we still have nested finite sets $E_0' \subset E_1' \subset E_2'$.

- Extend $f : E_1 \to E_0$ to a function $f' : E_1' \to E_0'$ by defining

$$
\begin{aligned}
f'(h_0) &:= h_1 \\
f'(h_1) &:= h_2 \\
f'(h_0 + h_1 + h_2) &:= -h_1 - h_2
\end{aligned}
$$

while keeping $f'(h) = f(h)$ for all $h \in E_1$.

It is then a routine matter to verify that (E_0', E_1', E_2', f') is a partial solution to (7.1) extending (E_0, E_1, E_2, f) and that E_0' contains h_0, as required.

Now suppose that $h = h_0 \in E_1 \backslash E_0$, then the quantity $h_1 := f(h_0)$ lies in $E_2 \backslash E_1$. We perform the following variant of the above construction:

- Choose an element $h_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h_2, h_0 + h_1 + h_2$, and $-h_1 - h_2$ are all distinct and lie outside of E_2. This is possible because E_2 is finite.

- Promote h_0 to E_0, promote h_1 and $h_0 + h_1 + h_2$ to E_1, and promote $h_2, -h_1 - h_2$ to E_2, thus creating new sets

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_0' &:= E_0 \cup \{h_0\} \\
E_1' &:= E_1 \cup \{h_1, h_0 + h_1 + h_2\} \\
E_2' &:= E_2 \cup \{h_0 + h_1 + h_2, h_2, -h_1 - h_2\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Clearly we still have nested finite sets $E_0' \subset E_1' \subset E_2'$.

- Extend $f : E_1 \to E_0$ to a function $f' : E_1' \to E_0'$ by defining

$$
\begin{aligned}
f'(h_1) &:= h_2 \\
f'(h_0 + h_1 + h_2) &:= -h_1 - h_2
\end{aligned}
$$

while keeping $f'(h) = f(h)$ for all $h \in E_1$.

It is then a routine matter to verify that (E_0', E_1', E_2', f') is a partial solution to (7.1) extending (E_0, E_1, E_2, f) and that E_0' contains h_0, as required.

Finally, suppose that $h = h_1 = f(h_0)$ for some $h_0 \in E_1 \backslash E_0$, so that $h_1 \in E_2 \backslash E_1$. Then we perform the following algorithm.

- Choose an element $h_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h_2, h_0 + h_1 + h_2$, and $-h_1 - h_2$ are all distinct and lie outside of E_2. This is possible because E_2 is finite.

- Choose an element $h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h_3, h_1 + h_2 + h_3$, and $-h_2 - h_3$ are all distinct and lie outside of $E_2 \cup \{h_2, h_0 + h_1 + h_2, -h_1 - h_2\}$. This is possible because E_2 is finite.

- Promote h_0, h_1 to E_0, promote $h_2, h_0 + h_1 + h_2, h_1 + h_2 + h_3$ to E_1, and promote $h_3, -h_1 - h_2, -h_2 - h_3$ to E_2, creating new sets

$$E_0' := E_0 \cup \{h_0, h_1\}$$
$$E_1' := E_1 \cup \{h_1, h_2, h_0 + h_1 + h_2, h_1 + h_2 + h_3\}$$
$$E_2' := E_2 \cup \{h_2, h_3, h_0 + h_1 + h_2, h_1 + h_2 + h_3, -h_1 - h_2, -h_2 - h_3\}.$$

  Clearly we still have nested finite sets $E_0' \subset E_1' \subset E_2'$.

- Extend $f : E_1 \to E_0$ to a function $f' : E_1' \to E_0'$ by defining

$$f'(h_1) := h_2$$
$$f'(h_0 + h_1 + h_2) := -h_1 - h_2 \qquad f'(h_2) \qquad\qquad := h_3$$
$$f'(h_1 + h_2 + h_3) := -h_2 - h_3$$

  while keeping $f'(h) = f(h)$ for all $h \in E_1$.

It is then a routine matter to verify that (E_0', E_1', E_2', f') is a partial solution to (7.1) extending (E_0, E_1, E_2, f) and that E_0' contains h_0, as required. $\qquad\square$

Corollary 7.3. *Every partial solution (E_0, E_1, E_2, f) to (7.1) can be extended to a full solution $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. If we arbitrarily well-order the integers, and iterate Lemma 7.2 to add the least element of $\mathbb{Z} \backslash E_0$ in this well-ordering to E_0, we obtain an increasing sequence $(E_0^{(n)}, E_1^{(n)}, E_2^{(n)}, f^{(n)})$ of partial solutions to (7.1), where the $E_0^{(n)}$ exhaust $\mathbb{Z}$: $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_0^{(n)} = \mathbb{Z}$. Taking limits, we obtain a full solution $\tilde{f}$. $\qquad\square$

Corollary 7.4. *There exists a solution $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ to (7.1) such that the map $h \mapsto h + f(h)$ is not injective.*

Proof. Select integers $h_0, h_1, h_2, h_0', h_1', h_2'$ such that the quantities

$$h_0, h_1, h_2, h_0 + h_1 + h_2, -h_1 - h_2, h_0', h_1', h_2', h_0' + h_1' + h_2', -h_1' - h_2'$$

are all distinct, but such that

$$h_0 + h_1 = h_0' + h_1'$$

(there are many assignments of variables that accomplish this). Then set

$$E_0 := \{h_0, h_0'\}$$
$$E_1 := E_0 \cup \{h_1, h_1', h_0 + h_1 + h_2, h_0' + h_1' + h_2'\}$$
$$E_2 := E_2 \cup \{-h_1 - h_2, -h_1' - h_2'\}$$

and define $f : E_1 \to E_2$ by the formulae

$$f(h_0) := h_1$$
$$f(h_1) := h_2$$
$$f(h_0 + h_1 + h_2) := -h_1 - h_2$$
$$f(h_0') := h_1'$$
$$f(h_1') := h_2'$$
$$f(h_0' + h_1' + h_2') := -h_1' - h_2'.$$

One can then check that (E_0, E_1, E_2, f) is a partial solution to (7.1), and by construction $h \mapsto h + f(h)$ is not injective on E_1. Using Lemma 7.2 to extend this partial solution to a full solution, we obtain the claim. $\qquad\square$

Corollary 7.5 (Asterix does not imply Obelix). *There exists a magma obeying the Asterix law (Definition 2.22) with carrier $\mathbb{Z}$ such that the left-multiplication maps $L_y : x \mapsto y \diamond x$ are not injective for any $y \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular, it does not obey the Obelix law (Definition 2.29).*

Proof. Note that $L_y(y + h) = y + h + f(h)$, so the injectivity of the left-multiplication maps is equivalent to the injectivity of the map $h \mapsto h + f(h)$. The non-injectivity then follows from Corollary 7.4. Note that the Obelix law clearly expresses x as a function of y and $L_y x = y \diamond x$, forcing injectivity of left-multiplication, so the Obelix law fails. $\qquad\square$

On the other hand, for finite magmas the situation is different:

Proposition 7.6 (Asterix implies Obelix for finite magmas). *Any finite magma obeying the Asterix law (Definition 2.22) also is left-cancellative and obeys the Obelix law (Definition 2.29).*

Proof. From Definition 2.22 we see the map $z \mapsto y \diamond z$ is surjective, hence injective on a finite magma; thus the magma is left-cancellative. Replacing x by $y \diamond x$ in this law, we see that

$$y \diamond x = y \diamond ((y \diamond x) \diamond (y \diamond (y \diamond x)));$$

using injectivity, we conclude

$$x = (y \diamond x) \diamond (y \diamond (y \diamond x))$$

which is Definition 2.29. $\qquad\square$

A very similar argument shows that a finite magma that obeys the Obelix law has $z \mapsto y \diamond z$ injective, hence surjective, and then obeys the Asterix law.

7.3 Greedy algorithm constructions

In Section 7.2 a magma obeying one law and refuting another was obtained by using the fact that over translation-invariant magmas, equational laws simplify to univariate functional equations, and solving the resulting equation using a greedy algorithm.

One way to construct infinite magmas obeying specific laws is via a greedy algorithm construction not on a one-variable functional equation, but on the operation table of the magma itself.

Here, it is best to work with *partially defined magma operations* on some carrier G. These can be interpreted as ternary relations $R(x, y, z)$ in three variables $x, y, z \in G$ which pass the following "vertical line test":

(VLT) If $R(x, y, z)$ and $R(x, y, z')$ both hold for some $x, y, z, z' \in G$, then $z = z'$.

Such an operation is then associated (via a one-to-one correspondence) to a partially defined operation $\diamond : S \to G$ for some $S \subset G \times G$, with $R(x, y, z)$ holding if and only if $x \diamond y$ is well-defined (i.e., $(x, y) \in S$) and equal to z. By abuse of notation, we shall also refer to R as a partially defined magma operation. Genuine magmas then correspond to the special case where $S = G \times G$, that is to say $x \diamond y$ is well-defined for all $x, y \in G$.

Given a word $w(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ in variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ (so w is an element of the free magma on n generators), we can say that $w(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is *well-defined* with respect to a partially defined

magma operation R if it can be fully evaluated using R. For instance, the word $(x \diamond y) \diamond z$ is well-defined if there exists $w, u \in G$ such that $R(x, y, w)$ and $R(w, z, u)$ both hold, in which case $(x \diamond y) \diamond z$ evaluates to u. Note from the axiom (VLT) that this evaluation is unique, if it exists. Of course, in a genuine magma, all expressions are well-defined. We say that an expression $w(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is *almost well-defined* if all strict subexpressions of w are well-defined. For instance, $(x \diamond y) \diamond z$ is almost well-defined if there exists $w \in G$ such that $R(x, y, w)$ holds.

An equational law $w_1 \simeq w_2$ involving some variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is said to be *locally obeyed* by R if, whenever $w_1(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, $w_2(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ are almost well-defined, and one of the two expressions is well-defined and evaluates to some output y, then the other expression is also well-defined and evaluates to the same output y. For instance, in order for R to locally obey the associative law $(x \diamond y) \diamond z = x \diamond (y \diamond z)$ (Definition 2.44), we require the following two axioms:

(4512-1) If $R(x, y, w)$, $R(w, z, u)$, and $R(y, z, v)$, then $R(x, v, u)$.

(4512-2) If $R(y, z, w)$, $R(x, w, u)$, and $R(x, y, v)$, then $R(v, z, u)$.

If a law involves a single variable on one side, then we only need one axiom. For instance, the Asterix law (Definition 2.22) is locally obeyed by R if and only if the following axiom holds:

(65) If $R(y, x, z)$ and $R(x, z, u)$, then $R(y, u, x)$.

Note that if the relation R is associated to a genuine magma operation $\diamond$, then it locally obeys a law $w_1 \simeq w_2$ if and only if the magma operation $\diamond$ obeys the law $w_1 \simeq w_2$. For instance, the relation R associated to a globally defined magma operation $\diamond$ obeys (4512-1) and (4512-2) if and only if the magma is associative.

More generally, one can ask for a ternary relation R to obey some theory Γ of universal laws, using the language of one ternary relation R, the equality symbol $=$, and possibly some constants (we will shortly introduce three constants a, b, c for this purpose).

Suppose we have a relation R obeying some theory Γ (for instance, (VLT) together with (65)), but which is only finitely supported (there are only finitely many triples (x, y, z) for which $R(x, y, z)$ holds). Then one can find $a, b \in G$ such that $a \diamond b$ is currently undefined. If the carrier G is infinite (e.g., if $G = \mathbb{N}$), one can then find another element c which is *novel*: it is not equal to a, b, or any of the x, y, z for which $R(x, y, z)$ hold. In other words, the relation R and the constants a, b, c obey the following additional axioms:

(novel-1) $c \neq a$ and $c \neq b$.

(novel-2) If $R(x, y, z)$, then $c \neq x$, $c \neq y$, and $c \neq z$.

(undefined) $R(a, b, x)$ does not hold for any x.

Let us say that a theory Γ is *greedily extensible* if, whenever R is a finitely supported ternary relation obeying Γ, and a, b, c are constants obeying (novel-1), (novel-2), (undefined), then there exists an extension R' of R, thus

(extend) $R(x, y, z) \implies R'(x, y, z)$ for all x, y, z,

which is also finitely supported and obeys Γ, and which also obeys the additional axiom

(define) $R'(a, b, c)$.

Informally, R' is formed from R by "forcing" $a \diamond b = c$ and then adding other axioms as needed. (Indeed, our construction here can be viewed as a simple analogue of the forcing construction in set theory.)

Observe that if a theory Γ containing (VLT) is greedily extensible, then any finitely supported ternary relation R obeying Γ on a countably infinite carrier G can be extended to a globally defined relation obeying Γ, by iteratively selecting the first (a, b) (in some fixed enumeration of $G \times G$) for which $a \diamond b$ is undefined, and then selecting a novel element c to define as $a \diamond b$, and applying the greedily extensible property, and then taking a direct limit of the countable sequence of relations thus produced. This gives a flexible way to construct magmas that obey a given theory Γ, but which violate some other law $w_1 \simeq w_2$, as the task then reduces to just finding a partial solution R to Γ and some constants $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ for which the expressions $w_1(x_1, \ldots, x_n), w_2(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ are already well-defined, but not equal to each other.

Unfortunately, most theories are not greedily extensible without further modification. Consider for instance the theory Γ consisting of (VLT) and the Asterix law (65). Given a, b, c and a finitely supported R obeying Γ as well as (novel-1), (novel-2), (undefined), we would like to construct a finitely supported R' obeying Γ, (extend), (define). The naive guess would just be to take the minimal construction

$$R'(x, y, z) \text{ iff } R(x, y, z) \text{ or } (x, y, z) = (a, b, c).$$

This can work, but there is an obstruction: if $R(w, a, b)$ for some w, then (65) forces $R'(w, c, a)$. So one would have to enlarge the definition of $R'(x, y, z)$, to hold true if one of the following statements holds:

- $R(x, y, z)$ holds.

- $(x, y, z) = (a, b, c)$.

- $(x, y, z) = (w, c, a)$ for some w with $R(w, a, b)$.

This works more often, but there is then a second obstruction: if $R(b, a, b)$, then we now have $R'(b, c, a)$, and (65) then forces $R'(a, a, b)$. So we need to add a fourth item to the above list defining R':

- $(x, y, z) = (a, a, b)$, assuming $R(b, a, b)$ holds.

But now if we had $R(a, a, z)$ for some $z \neq b$, this would then create a violation of (VLT). To fix this, we need to extend Γ by adding an additional axiom:

- (65') If $R(y, x, y)$, then $R(x, x, y)$.

With this modification to Γ, if we run the above analysis, we now see that if $R(b, a, b)$ hold (so that $R(a, a, b)$ also holds), then (65) will force $R'(a, c, a)$, $R'(b, c, a)$, and $R'(c, c, a)$. So now the modified definition of R' is that $R'(x, y, z)$ holds if one of the following statements holds:

- $R(x, y, z)$ holds.

- $(x, y, z) = (a, b, c)$.

- $(x, y, z) = (w, c, a)$ for some w with $R(w, a, b)$.

- $(x, y, z) = (a, c, a), (b, c, a),$ or (c, c, a), assuming $R(b, a, b)$ holds.

One can then finally (for instance, with the assistance of a automated theorem prover) verify that if R is finitely supported and obeys $\Gamma = (VLT) + (65) + (65')$ and a, b, c obey (novel-1), (novel-2), (undefined), then the R' defined above is also finitely supported and obeys Γ, (extend), (define). This shows that the theory Γ is greedily extensible.

Using this, one can for instance find a magma obeying Definition 2.22 that fails the left-cancellative property

$$y \diamond x = y \diamond x' \implies x = x'$$

or in terms of ternary relations

$$R(y, x, z) \text{ and } R(y, x', z) \implies x = x' \tag{7.2}$$

simply by starting with a partial solution, say on the natural numbers in which (e.g.) $R(1, 2, 0)$, $R(1, 3, 0)$ are the only situations in which R holds. One can easily verify that this obeys (VLT) and (65), (65'), but not (7.2), and so any magma constructed by the above greedy construction will not be left-cancellative. Since the Obelix law Definition 2.29 forces left-cancellativity, this gives an alternate proof of Corollary 7.5.

7.4 A survey of examples

7.4.1 Translation-invariant models

The implication between the laws Definition 2.31 and Definition 2.24 can be refuted by a translation-invariant magma on the integers. Define the function $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } x > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } x < 0, \end{cases}$$

and consider the translation-invariant magma on $\mathbb{Z}$ given by the operation $x \diamond y = x + f(y - x)$.

The resulting magma satisfies Equation 1648: one can show this by a case analysis on $f(y-x)$. If $f(y - x) = 1$ we have $x \diamond y = x + f(y - x) = x + 1$, so

$$(x \diamond y) \diamond ((x \diamond y) \diamond y) = (x + 1) \diamond ((x + 1) \diamond y) = (x + 1) \diamond (x + 2) = (x + 1) - 1 = x.$$

Similar computations verify the other two cases.

However, setting $x = 0$ and $y = -1$ in Equation 206, we get

$$(x \diamond (x \diamond y)) \diamond y = (x \diamond 1) \diamond y = (-1) \diamond y = -1 \neq x$$

so the magma does not obey Definition 2.24. We can conclude

Theorem 7.7 (1648 does not imply 206)**.** *There exists a magma which satisfies Definition 2.31 and not Definition 2.24.*

There are variation of the translation-invariant constructions refuting implications: e.g. in some cases, similar constructions are carried out starting with a non-Abelian group. Translation-invariant models are also useful building blocks for the *modified base model* constructions explained below.

7.4.2 Modified base models

For some pairs of laws P and Q, it is possible to start with an infinite model $(M, \diamond)$ obeying both P and Q, then modify the operation $\diamond$ in a limited way, resulting in a model $(M, \diamond')$ of P that does not obey Q.

This works especially well when this *base model* $(M, \diamond)$ is a translation-invariant magma in which the function f takes finitely many different values. This is common: e.g. the translation-invariant model refuting the implication above is of the required sort!

The strategy is to first modify the magma operation in a naive way, by introducing a counterexample to the consequent Q. This generally yields one or more counterexamples to the antecedent P, but one can *trace* the effects of this initial modification and make further adjustments which restore the antecedent.

A model refuting the implication between the laws Definition 2.33 and Definition 2.43 can be constructed using the modified base model technique. Start with the infinite model $(\mathbb{Z}, \diamond)$ of Definition 2.33 given by the following operation:

$$x \diamond y = \begin{cases} x + 1 & \text{if } x, y \text{ have the same parity} \\ x - 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

A case analysis shows that the magma $(\mathbb{Z}, \diamond)$ satisfies both Definition 2.33 and Definition 2.43. We will eventually *modify* it by setting

$$x \diamond' y = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0, \ x, y \text{ have the same parity} \\ x + 1 & \text{if } x \neq 0, \ x, y \text{ have the same parity} \\ x - 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and checking that $(\mathbb{N}, \diamond')$ satisfies Definition 2.33 but refutes Definition 2.43.

One finds these modifications using the following strategy:

First, choose some element (tuple) of the carrier M that will constitute a counterexample to the consequent in the modified model. In this specific case, the consequent, Definition 2.43, can be written as

$$x \diamond (y \diamond x) = x \diamond (y \diamond z)$$

in equational form, which always holds when $x = z$. So let's choose the tuple $(0, 0, 1)$ to constitute the required counterexample. Computing $0 \diamond (0 \diamond 0) = 0 \diamond 1 = -1$ and similarly $0 \diamond (0 \diamond 1) = -1$ suggest that we could force this tuple to be a counterexample by defining a new operation $\diamond''$ and setting $0 \diamond'' 1$ to something other than -1. One seemingly has many choices here: should we take $0 \diamond'' 1 = 0$, $0 \diamond'' 1 = 1$, $0 \diamond'' 1 = 2$, or perhaps even $0 \diamond'' 1 = -1$?

It's easy to rule out some of the possibilities. For instance, setting $0 \diamond'' 1 = 1$ would yield $0\diamond''(0\diamond''0) = 0\diamond''1 = 0\diamond''(0\diamond''1)$ again. The simplest possibility which results in a counterexample to Definition 2.43 sets $0 \diamond'' 1 = 0$ and $x \diamond'' y = x \diamond y$ for any $x \neq 0, y \neq 1$.

Unfortunately, the resulting $(M, \diamond'')$ would not then obey Definition 2.33. For any $z \in M$, one would have

$$(0 \diamond'' 1) \diamond'' ((1 \diamond'' 1) \diamond'' z) = 0 \diamond'' (2 \diamond'' z)$$

which equals $0 \diamond'' 1 = 0$ as desired for even z, but equals $0 \diamond'' 3 = -1 \neq 0$ for odd z.

However, since f takes finitely many values in the base model, the breakage is tightly controlled: by considering what happens if $x \neq 0$ and $y \neq 1$, we see that all new counterexamples to Definition 2.43 have this form. The calculation now suggests defining yet another $\diamond'''$, where setting $0 \diamond''' 3 = 0$ would eliminate this counterexample. But doing that just moves the issue one level higher: one then has

$$(0 \diamond''' 3) \diamond''' ((3 \diamond''' 3) \diamond''' z) = 0 \diamond''' (4 \diamond''' z)$$

which equals $0 \diamond''' 3 = 0$ as desired for even z, but equals $0 \diamond''' 5 = -1 \neq 0$ for odd z.

Instead, the infinitely many counterexamples arising from the iterated redefinition can be eliminated all at once by setting:

$$x \diamond' y = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0, \ x, y \text{ do not have the same parity} \\ x + 1 & \text{if } x, y \text{ have the same parity} \\ x - 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

At this point one might as well truncate the model to $\mathbb{N}$ since the result of the $\diamond'$ operation is nonnegative whenever the operands are nonnegative. This finishes the construction and proves

Theorem 7.8 (1659 does not imply 4315). *There exists a magma which satisfies Definition 2.33 and not Definition 2.43.*

The result of a modified base model construction can be a finite modification (when $\diamond$ and $\diamond'$ differ in finitely many inputs) or one in which they differ in infinitely many coefficients. Note that if the base model $(M, \diamond)$ was obtained by a greedy construction, and $(M, \diamond')$ is a finite modification, then the modified model could also have been obtained using the same greedy construction. It is not surprising that more difficult refutations using this construction tend to require the latter sort of modification.

7.4.3 Greedy constructions

add a description of the greedy counterexample for 1703,3 here once issue 506 is resolved

7.5 The Dupont equation

Now we consider the Dupont equation, Definition 2.21, which can be treated by a greedy translation invariant construction that is more complicated than the one considered for the Asterix law in Section 7.2.

If we adopt a translation-invariant model

$$x \diamond y = x + f(y - x)$$

on some abelian group G, then with $y = x + h$, we have

$$x \diamond y = x + f(h)$$
$$x \diamond (x \diamond y) = x + f^2(h)$$
$$y \diamond (x \diamond (x \diamond y)) = y + f(f^2(h) - h)$$

and so the Dupont law $x = y \diamond (x \diamond (x \diamond y))$ becomes the functional equation

$$f(f^2(h) - h) = -h. \tag{7.3}$$

One way to solve this equation is to have an automorphism $T : G \to G$ that obeys the identity

$$T^3 - T = -I,$$

then one can just take $f(h) = T(h)$. For instance, if $G = \mathbb{Z}^3$, one can take the automorphism $T : \mathbb{Z}^3 \to \mathbb{Z}^3$ defined by

$$T(x, y, z) := (-z, x + z, y).$$

We now extend this greedily to $\mathbb{Z}^3 \times \mathbb{Z}$ as follows. Define a *partial solution* (E_1, E_2, f) to be a pair $\mathbb{Z}^3 \subset E_1 \subset E_2 \subset \mathbb{Z}^3 \times \mathbb{Z}$, and a function $f : E_2 \to E_1$ obeying the following axioms.

(a) The set $E_2 \backslash \mathbb{Z}^3$ is finite.

(b) For $h \in \mathbb{Z}^3$, $f(h) = Th$; in particular, f is a bijection on $\mathbb{Z}^3$.

(c) For $h \in E_1 \backslash \mathbb{Z}^3$, $f(h) \in E_1$. Also, $-h + f^2(h) \in E_1$ and $f(-h + f^2(h)) = -h$. Note that this (and (b)) implies that $-h \in E_1$, thus E_1 is symmetric around the origin.

(d) For $h \in E_2 \backslash E_1$, $f(h) \in E_1$.

(e) The elements $-h$, $h - f^2(h)$, and $f^2(h) - h$ for $h \in E_2 \backslash E_1$ are all distinct from each other, and all lie outside of E_2. In particular this forces $f^2(h) \neq 0$, hence $f(h) \neq 0$. It also forces $f^2(h) \neq h$, hence $f(h) \neq h$.

Thus for instance one can take $(\mathbb{Z}^3, \mathbb{Z}^3, T)$ as a partial solution. We say that a partial solution (E_1', E_2', f') is an *extension* of (E_1, E_2, f) if $E_1 \subset E_1'$, $E_2' \subset E_2$, and f' agrees with f on E_2.

Informally, E_1 represents the portion of $\mathbb{Z}^3 \times \mathbb{Z}$ where we have completely resolved the Dupont equation; the set $E_2 \backslash E_1$ represents the portion for which f (and all forward iterates of f) have been defined, but the Dupont equation has not yet been verified; and the elements $-h$, $h - f^2(h)$, and $f^2(h) - h$ for $h \in E_2 \backslash E_1$ are the portion where f is not yet defined, but for which one is ready to "promote" these elements to E_2 or E_1 by defining f appropriately.

The key lemmas are then

Lemma 7.9 (Promoting to E_1). *If (E_1, E_2, f) is a partial solution and $h \in E_2 \backslash E_1$, then there exists an extension (E_1', E_2', f') of (E_1, E_2, f) such that $h \in E_1'$.*

Proof. This will be a greedy construction, but we have to introduce a rather large number of additional elements to ensure that certain non-degeneracy conditions are maintained (in particular, the new elements h' introduced have to be such that $f^2(h') - h'$ avoids E_2 and hence $\mathbb{Z}^3$, which requires a certain amount of complexity in the construction).

Let $\tilde{E}_2$ denote the set E_2 together with all the elements of the form $-h'$, $h' - f^2(h')$, and $f^2(h') - h'$ for $h' \in E_2 \backslash E_1$; this is $\mathbb{Z}^3$ with a finite number of additional elements.

Let a be an element of $\mathbb{Z}^3$ such that the quantities

$$\pm Ta, \pm(Ta + a)$$

are distinct from each other and from

$$0, \pm h, \pm(h - f(h)), \pm(f^2(h) - h);$$

this is possible since $T, T + 1$ are invertible.

Next, we pick an $x \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \times \mathbb{Z}$ such that the quantities

$$\pm x, \pm x + Ta, \pm x - Ta, \pm 2x + Ta, \pm x + Ta + a, \pm(h + x), \pm(h - f(h) + x), \pm(f^2(h) - h + x + Ta)$$

are all distinct from each other and from $\tilde{E}_2$; indeed, from the choice of a (and the non-zero nature of h, $f(h)$, $h - f(h)$, and $f^2(h) - h$) there are only finitely many x for which a collision can occur between any pair of these expressions.

We now promote $\pm h, \pm x, \pm x + Ta, \pm x - Ta$ to E_1, and also promote $h + x$, $h - f^2(h)$, $\pm 2x + Ta$, $\pm x + Ta + a$ to E_2. That is to say, we define

$$E_1' := E_1 \cup \{\pm h, \pm x, \pm x + Ta, \pm x - Ta\}$$

and

$$E_2' := E_2 \cup \{-h, \pm x, \pm x + Ta, \pm x - Ta, h + x, h - f^2(h), \pm 2x + Ta\}.$$

35

We then define an extension f' of f to E_2' by setting

$$f'(\pm x) := a$$
$$f'(\pm x + Ta) := \pm x$$
$$f'(\pm x - Ta) := \mp x + Ta$$
$$f'(\pm x + Ta + a) := \pm x - Ta$$
$$f'(\pm 2x + Ta) := \pm x + Ta$$
$$f'(\pm x + Ta + a) := \pm x - Ta$$
$$f'(-h) := x + Ta$$
$$f'(h + x) := h$$
$$f'(h - f^2(h)) := -h.$$

It is easy to see that (E_1', E_2', f') obeys properties (a), (b), (d). By construction, we have

$$f'((f')^2(h') - h') = -h'$$

for

$$h' = \pm h, \pm x, \pm x + Ta, \pm x - Ta$$

giving property (c). By construction, the quantities

$$-h', h' - f^2(h'), f^2(h') - h'$$

are distinct from each other and lie outside of $\tilde{E}_2 \cup E_2'$ for

$$h' = h + x, h - f^2(h), \pm 2x + Ta, \pm x + Ta + a$$

while these quantities are distinct from each other and lie in $\tilde{E}_2 \backslash E_2'$ for $h' \in E_2 \backslash E_1'$ (note that this forces $h' \neq \pm h$). This gives property (e). $\qquad\square$

Lemma 7.10 (Promoting to E_2). *If (E_1, E_2, f) is a partial solution and $h \in (\mathbb{Z}^3 \times \mathbb{Z}) \backslash E_2$, then there exists an extension (E_1', E_2', f') of (E_1, E_2, f) such that $h \in E_2'$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{E}_2$ denote the set E_2 together with all elements of the form

$$-h', h' - f^2(h'), f^2(h') - h' \tag{7.4}$$

for some $h' \in E_2 \backslash E_1$; this is $\mathbb{Z}^3$ with a finite number of elements attached, and is symmetric around the origin.

First suppose that h lies outside of $\tilde{E}_2$. Then we can find $a \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ such that the quantities

$$-h, \pm(h - Ta)$$

are distinct from each other, and lie outside of $\tilde{E}_2$. We now promote h to E_2, thus setting

$$E_1' := E_1$$

and

$$E_2' := E_2 \cup \{h\}$$

and define an extension f' of f to E_2' by setting

$$f'(h) := a.$$

It is then a routine matter to check that (E_1', E_2', f') is an extension of (E_1, E_2, f).

Now suppose that h lies in $\tilde{E}_2$. Then h is of one of the forms (7.4) for some $h' \in E_2 \backslash E_1$. Suppose it is of the form $-h'$ or $f^2(h') - h'$. We invoke Lemma 7.9 to promote h' to E_1 by using a suitable extension (E_1', E_2', f'); and now h will lie in E_2', giving the claim. If instead h is of the form $h' - f^2(h')$, then this procedure might not place h in E_2'; but if it does not, it will be of the form $-h''$ for $h'' = f^2(h') - h' \in E_2' \backslash E_1'$. Applying Lemma 7.9 one more time to now promote h'' to E_1, we will obtain a larger extension (E_1'', E_2'', f'') with $h \in E_2''$, giving the claim. $\qquad \square$

Iterating these lemmas in the usual fashion, we can conclude that any partial solution can be completed to a global model of Definition 2.21.

Among other things, this permits one to generate models in which the function f is not injective. To see this, let a be a non-zero element of $\mathbb{Z}^3$, let x be an element of $\mathbb{Z}^3 \times \mathbb{Z}$ outside of $\mathbb{Z}^3$, and consider the partial solution $(\mathbb{Z}^3, \mathbb{Z}^3 \cup \{x\}, f)$ where $f(h) = Th$ for $h \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ and $f(x) = a$. One can check that this is a partial solution and is not injective, since $f(x) = f(T^{-1}a)$. This non-injectivity implies in particular that the model is not left-cancellative, and hence does not obey the law

$$x = (y \diamond x) \diamond ((y \diamond x) \diamond y)$$

(equation 1692).

7.5.1 Second construction

We now give a second construction, with works on the integers $G = \mathbb{Z}$.

We first define a seed solution $f_0 : E_0 \to \mathbb{Z}$ defined on the set $E_0 := \{-7, -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 3, 4, 6\}$ with

$$f(-7) = -4, f(-3) = 4, f(-2) = -3, f(-1) = -1, f(0) = 1, f(1) = 3, f(3) = 0, f(4) = -2, f(6) = 2.$$

In this construction, we define a partial solution to be a function $f : E \to \mathbb{Z}$ defined on a finite subset of E obeying the following axioms:

(i) E contains E_0, and f agrees with f_0 on E_0.

(ii) If $h \in E$ and $f(h) \in E$, then $f^2(h) - h$ is also in E, and $f(f^2(h) - h) = -h$.

(iii) If $h \in E$ and $h \neq 3$, then $f(h) \neq 0$.

(iv) If $a \neq a'$ are distinct elements of E with $f(a) = f(a')$, and $-a \in E$, then $a' \neq a + f(-a)$.

(v) If $a \neq a'$ are distinct elements of E with $f(a) = f(a')$, and $-a, -a' \in E$, then $a' + f(-a') \neq a + f(-a)$.

We say that a partial solution $f' : E' \to \mathbb{Z}$ *extends* another $f : E \to \mathbb{Z}$ if E' contains E and f' agrees with f on E.

Lemma 7.11 (Seed solution). *$f_0 : E_0 \to \mathbb{Z}$ is a partial solution.*

Proof. Finite check. $\qquad \square$

Lemma 7.12 (Extension). *If $f : E \to \mathbb{Z}$ is a partial solution and $h_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, then there exists an extension $f' : E' \to \mathbb{Z}$ for which axiom (ii) applies, i.e., $h_0 \in E'$, $f'(h_0) \in E'$, $(f')^2(h_0) - h_0 \in E'$, and $f'((f')^2(h_0) - h_0) = -h_0$.*

37

Proof. We divide into cases.

Case 1: $h_0 \in E$ and $f(h_0) \in E$. In this case we are already done thanks to axiom (ii).

Case 2: $h_0 \in E$ but $f(h_0) \notin E$. This is the main case. Let H be the set of all $h \in E$ such that $f(h) = f(h_0)$; this is a finite set containing h_0. Let $H' \subset H$ be the set of all $h' \in H$ such that $-h' \in E$. We make the following observations:

(a) All elements h of H are non-zero. For if $h = 0$ then $f(h_0) = f(h) = 1 \in E$, contradicting the hypothesis $f(h_0) \notin E$.

(b) If $h' \in H'$ then $h' \neq h' + f(-h')$. Otherwise we would have $f(-h') = 0$, then by axiom (iii) we have $h' = -3$, hence $f(h_0) = f(h') = 4 \in E$ by axiom (i). But this again contradicts the hypothesis $f(h_0) \notin E$. (This is the main reason we take E_0 to be so large.)

(c) If $h_1 \in H$ and $h_2 \in H'$ are distinct then $h_1 \neq h_2 + f(-h_2)$. This follows from axiom (iv).

(d) If $h_1, h_2 \in H'$ are distinct then $h_1 + f(-h_1) \neq h_2 + f(-h_2)$. This follows from axiom (v).

From these observations, we see that if we take c to be a sufficiently large integer, the following claims hold:

1. The expressions $\pm c$, $\pm(c - h)$ for $h \in H$, and $\pm(c - h' - f(-h'))$ for $h \in H'$ are all distinct from each other.

2. c is not expressible as the sum of four or fewer elements of $\pm(E \cup f(E))$.

We select such a c. We then promote $f(h_0)$, $c - h$ for $h \in H$, and $-c + h' + f(-h')$ for $h' \in H'$, thus setting

$$E' := E \cup \{f(h_0)\} \cup \{c - h : h \in H\} \cup \{-c + h' + f(-h') : h' \in H'\}.$$

We then extend f to $f' : E' \to \mathbb{Z}$ by setting

$$f(f(h_0)) := c$$
$$f(c - h) := -h$$
$$f(-c + h' + f(-h')) := h' - c$$

for all $h \in H$ and $h' \in H'$. Axiom (i) is then obvious. Axiom (ii) needs to be verified for the new elements h_0 and $c - h'$, $h' \in H'$ of E' (the other elements will not obey the hypotheses of this axiom), but this is routine. In particular h_0 obeys the required conclusion of this lemma.

We need to verify (iii) for the new elements of E', but this is clear from property (a) and claim 2.

Now we need to verify (iv). It suffices to do so when at least one of $a, a', -a$ are new elements of E'. If neither of $a, -a$ are new, then the only new elements a' for which $f(a')$ could equal $f(a)$ take the form $c - h$ (thanks to claim 2), but then a' cannot equal $a + f(-a)$, again thanks to claim 2. If instead one of $a, -a$ is new, then from claim 1 the new element must be $f(h_0)$. There is no old element a' with $f(a') = c = f(f(h_0))$, so we must have $a = -f(h_0)$, but then $a + f(-a) = -f(h_0) + c$ will not equal a', again thanks to claim 2.

Finally, we need verify to (v). We may assume that at least one of $a, a', -a, -a'$ are new elements of E'. As before, this forces the new element to be $f(h_0)$, and this cannot be a or a', so without loss of generality we have $a = -f(h_0)$ and $a' \in E$. But then $a + f(-a) = -f(h_0) + c$ will not equal $a' + f(-a')$, again thanks to claim 2.

Case 3: $h_0 \notin E$ but $h_0 \in f(E)$. Here we can write $h_0 = f(h_1)$ where h_1 is of the form in Case 2. Applying the Case 2 construction, we can pass to an extension in which $f(h_1) = h_0$ lies in E, and so we are now in either Case 1 or Case 2, and so we can again conclude.

Case 4: $h_0 \notin E$ and $h_0 \notin f(E)$. We let c be an integer so large that it is not expressible as the sum of four or fewer elements of $\pm(E \cup f(E))$. We then promote h_0 to E by setting

$$E' := E \cup \{h_0\}$$

and define an extension $f' : E' \to \mathbb{Z}$ by setting $f'(h_0) := c$. Axioms (i)-(iii) are obvious. For axiom (iv), since $f'(h_0)$ is not equal to any other value of f', the only new case introduced is if $-a = h_0$, but then $a + f(-a) = -h_0 + c$ is distinct from a' by choice of c. A similar argument yields axiom (v). With this extension, we are now in Case 2, and so we repeat the previous analysis to conclude. $\square$

Iterating this lemma, we conclude

Corollary 7.13 (Greedy completion of Dupont). *Every partial solution $f : E \to \mathbb{Z}$ can be extended to a global solution $f' : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ of* (7.3).

Corollary 7.14 (Non-injective Dupont solution). *The Dupont equation admits non-injective solutions, and hence can violate Equation 1692.*

Proof. It suffices to find a partial solution that violates injectivity. This can be done for instance by adjoining $\{-13, 10\}$ to E_0 and defining $f(10) = -2 = f(4)$, $f(-13) = -10$, and performing a finite check to verify that this is still a partial solution. $\square$

7.6 An ad hoc model

Theorem 7.15. *There exists a magma which satisfies Equation 3342,*

$$x \diamond y = y \diamond (x \diamond (x \diamond x)),$$

but such that none of the laws

$$x \diamond x = x \diamond ((x \diamond x) \diamond x)$$
$$x \diamond y = x \diamond ((y \diamond y) \diamond y)$$
$$x \diamond x = ((x \diamond x) \diamond x) \diamond x$$
$$x \diamond y = ((x \diamond x) \diamond x) \diamond y.$$

hold.

Proof. We begin with some informal motivation. Writing

$$f(x) := x \diamond (x \diamond x), \tag{7.5}$$

we conclude that

$$x \diamond y = y \diamond f(x) \tag{7.6}$$

and hence on iteration

$$x \diamond y = f(x) \diamond f(y).$$

In particular, $x \diamond x = f(x) \diamond f(x)$, and

$$f(x) = x \diamond (x \diamond x) = (x \diamond x) \diamond f(x) = (f(x) \diamond f(x)) \diamond f(x).$$

39

If f is surjective, this would imply
$$x = (x \diamond x) \diamond x$$
and hence the four laws stated above would hold in this case.

This motivates the use of a non-surjective f. We will take G to be the space of polynomials $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ of one variable with integer coefficients, and let $f : G \to G$ be the multiplication by t map:
$$f(P) := tP.$$

This is of course non-surjective. The magma operation will be constructed as follows:

- If P is a polynomial with $P(0) \neq 0$, then $t^n P \diamond t^n P = t^n P \diamond t^{n+1} P = 2P$ for all $n \geq 0$, and $t^{n+m} P \diamond 2t^n P = 2t^n P \diamond t^{n+m+1} P = t^{m+1} P$ for all $n, m \geq 0$. (This is well-defined since the $t^n P$, $2t^n P$ are all distinct polynomials.)

- We define $P \diamond Q = 0$ if not covered by the above laws.

It is a routine matter to verify (7.5) and (7.6), so that equation 3342 holds. However, one can check that the four laws in the conclusion fail with $x = y = 1$. $\qquad\square$

Theorem 7.16 (3475 construction). *There exists a magma that obeys equation 3475,*
$$x \diamond x = y \diamond ((x \diamond y) \diamond y),$$
but does not obey equation 3659,
$$x \diamond x = (x \diamond x) \diamond (x \diamond x)$$

Proof. We will give a construction where $x \diamond x$ takes on only two values (and depends on the "sign" of x), while $x \diamond y$ depends primarily on y and the sign of x.

We can rewrite 3475 as
$$x^2 = L_y R_y^2 x$$
where $x^2 = x \diamond x$, $L_y x = y \diamond x$, and $R_y x = x \diamond y$. Similarly, 3659 can be rewritten as $x^2 \diamond x^2 = x^2$.

For our model, we take G to be the non-zero integers $\mathbb{Z}^{\times}$. The operation $R_y x = x \diamond y$ is defined to equal

- $2y$ if x has the opposite sign to y,
- $\mathrm{sgn}(x)$ if $y = 3x$,
- $-\mathrm{sgn}(x)$ if $y = x, 2x, 5x$,
- $3y$ if $x = 2y$,
- $5y$ otherwise.

One can then see that x^2 is equal to $-\mathrm{sgn}(x)$ for all x. In particular,
$$x^2 \diamond x^2 = -\mathrm{sgn}(x^2) = \mathrm{sgn}(x) \neq -\mathrm{sgn}(x) = x^2$$
so that equation 3659, $x^2 = x^2 \diamond x^2$, fails.

Now we verify 3475. A routine case check shows that when x has the opposite sign to y, $R_y^2 x = 3y$; and when x has the same sign to y, $R_y^2 x$ is equal to $2y$ or $5y$. But then $L_y R_y^2 x$ is equal to $\mathrm{sgn}(y)$ if x has the opposite sign to y, and $-\mathrm{sgn}(y)$ if x has the same sign to y, giving 3475. $\qquad\square$

Chapter 8

Equivalence with the constant and singleton laws

85 laws have been shown to be equivalent to the constant law (Definition 2.20), and 815 laws have been shown to be equivalent to the singleton law (Definition 2.2).

These are the laws up to 4 operations that follow from diagonalization of Definition 2.2 and Definition 2.20.

To formalize these in Lean, a search was run on the list of equations to discover diagonalizations of these two specific laws: equations of the form $x = R$ where R doesn't include x, and equations of the form $x \circ y = R$ where R doesn't include x or y.

The proofs themselves all look alike, and correspond exactly to the two steps described in the proof of Theorem 4.6. The Lean proofs were generated semi-manually, using search-and-replace starting from the output of `grep` that found the diagonalized laws.

In the case of the constant law, Definition 2.16 ($x \circ x = y \circ z$) wasn't detected using this method. It was added manually to the file with the existing proof from the sub-graph project.

Chapter 9

Metatheorems from Invariants

For the purposes of this chapter, a *theorem* is a (true) statement about particular equations, for example '(387 implies 43)' is a theorem. A *metatheorem* is a general statement about implications; one can usually get many theorems from a single metatheorem. This chapter is all about generating many interesting metatheorems using a *meta-metatheorem*, called the fundamental property of invariants. If all this is making your head spin, don't worry. Look at the sections below for examples of metatheorems you can probably agree are both concrete and interesting. Once you have done that, come back here and we will show you how to prove these and other metatheorems using *invariants*.

9.1 Invariants

Let E, E_1, and E_2 be equations. If $E \Rightarrow E_1$ and $E_1 \Rightarrow E_2$, then $E \Rightarrow E_2$. Very trivial. Rephrasing this, we see that if $E \Rightarrow E_1$ and $E \not\Rightarrow E_2$, then $E_1 \not\Rightarrow E_2$.

Extending this idea, suppose we compute the set of all equations which are implied by E; we will call this set $\mathcal{Y}(E)$ (we use $\mathcal{Y}$ because this is an example of a Yoneda embedding). Then $\mathcal{Y}(E)$ is upwards closed, or closed under forward implication: no equation in $\mathcal{Y}(E)$ can imply an equation not in $\mathcal{Y}(E)$. If we know $\mathcal{Y}(E)$ well, this already settles a potentially large number of implications in the negative.

While computing $\mathcal{Y}(E)$ for an arbitrary equation E may seem daunting, for some nice equations we can find *invariants*, which makes the task manageable. An *invariant* for E is some sort of data associated with expressions w so that

$$\mathcal{Y}(E) = \{w = w' \mid \text{Invariant}(w) = \text{Invariant}(w')\}$$

If we can find an invariant which is computable for each term w, then we can easily describe $\mathcal{Y}(E)$. The fact that $\mathcal{Y}(E)$ is upwards closed is rephrased as follows; this is called **the fundamental property of invariants**. Remember that an invariant is a function taking expressions and outputting some data.

Meta-metatheorem 9.1 (Fundamental property of invariants)**.** *Let I be an invariant of E. If $w = w'$ implies $w'' = w'''$ and $I(w) = I(w')$ (that is, E implies $w = w'$), then $I(w'') = I(w''')$.*

More succinctly, for an invariant I of E we must have

$$(w = w' \Rightarrow w'' = w''') \implies (I(w) = I(w') \Rightarrow I(w'') = I(w''')).$$

When using this result, we commonly take the contrapositive: if $I(w) = I(w')$ and $I(w'') \neq I(w''')$, then $w = w'$ cannot imply $w'' = w'''$. Note that the conclusion is independent of the equation E; all we need to know is that I is an invariant.

Note for category theorists. Let Π denote the preorder of magma equations ordered by implication. If I is an invariant then define

$$I(w = w') := \begin{cases} \texttt{true} & \text{if } I(w) = I(w') \\ \texttt{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

(In programming languages we would say $I(w = w') := I(w) == I(w')$). Let $\mathbf{Bool} = \{\texttt{true}, \texttt{false}\}$ be the poset where $\texttt{false} \leq \texttt{true}$. Then I becomes a function $\Pi \to \mathbf{Bool}$, and the fundamental property of invariants just says that this function is monotone, i.e. functorial. Thus for every invariant I we obtain a functor $\Pi \to \mathbf{Bool}$.

Question 1: Does every functor $\Pi \to \mathbf{Bool}$ come from an invariant?

Question 2: What can we say about the category of functors $\Pi \to \mathbf{Bool}$? Give a nice interpretation of natural transformations between invariants. $\qquad\square$

The fundamental property of invariants is not a theorem, nor a metatheorem: it is a meta-metatheorem, in the sense that it will allow us to get a metatheorem for every invariant we find.

Example: absorption law

Let E be the equation $x \diamond y = x$. Intuitively, we must have

$$\mathcal{Y}(E) = \{w = w' \mid \text{the leftmost variable is the same for } w \text{ and } w'\}.$$

We will talk about proving statements like this one (say in Lean) later on; take it as given for now. The invariant is clear: we define $I(w)$ to be the leftmost variable of w. Instantiating this invariant in the fundamental property of invariants, we get the following metatheorem.

Metatheorem 9.2. *Let $w = w'$ be an equation such that the leftmost variable of w is the same as the leftmost variable of w'. Then $w = w'$ cannot imply an equation that does not have the property from the last sentence.*

Example: associativity

For a more complicated example, let E be the associativity equation $x \diamond (y \diamond z) = (x \diamond y) \diamond z$. Intuitively, we must have

$$\mathcal{Y}(E) = \{\text{equations that, when we remove all parentheses, are of the form } w = w\}.$$

There is an invariant lurking behind: it is the (ordered) list of variables appearing in an expression, counting repetitions. More formally, we define $I(w)$ to be the tuple of variables appearing in w, listed from left to right, say. Again, from the fundamental property of invariants we get the following.

Metatheorem 9.3. *Let $w = w'$ be an equation such that the variables appearing in w, taking into account order and repetitions, are the same ones that appear in w'. Then $w = w'$ cannot imply an equation that does not have the property from the last sentence.*

If we were coding a computer program that computes $I(w)$ given w, one could take the string of symbols that is w, ignore all parentheses, replace all symbols $\diamond$ by commas, and surround with an appropriate delimiter. (I imagine one could easily do this using regular expressions.

We can compute other examples, but the invariant can get complicated even for simple equations. Exercise: what is the invariant for commutativity? Answer: To compute $I(w)$ from w replace all parentheses with curly braces and all symbols $\diamond$ with commas, and interpret the result as nested sets.

9.2   Expanding the language

The method of invariants really shines when we expand our formal language. Right now our language consists of variables, parentheses, the equal sign, and $\diamond$ (there is also an implicit use of $\forall$ but let's ignore that for now). Let Π denote the preorder of equations (built from the language described) ordered by implication.

We will add the symbol $\wedge$ ('and') to our language. Then we consider a bigger preorder $\Pi' \supseteq \Pi$ which includes equations and also conjunctions of equations. Even if we only care about Π it will be apparent that studying invariants in Π' gives us useful metatheorems about Π. Equations and conjunctions of equations are examples of *formulas* (or formulae, according to taste).

If φ is a formula, we can define $\mathcal{Y}(\varphi)$ to be the set of all formulae implied by φ; this agrees with our previous definition. Now define an invariant of φ to be a function I on terms such that

$$\mathcal{Y}(\varphi) \cap \Pi = \{w = w' \mid I(w) = I(w')\}.$$

Again, this clearly agrees with our previous definition. Although $\mathcal{Y}(\varphi) \cap \Pi$ might not be upwards closed in Π', it is upwards closed in Π, which is enough to get the fundamental property of invariants *verbatim*. This leads to more metatheorems we didn't have access to before.

Example: associativity and idempotency

Let φ be the conjunction of the associative law and the idempotency law ($x \diamond x = x$). Again, we will rely on our intuition, which says that an invariant I defined by taking $I(w)$ to be the set of all variables appearing in w, works. The corresponding metatheorem is the following

Metatheorem 9.4. *Let $w = w'$ be an equation such that the set of variables appearing in w is equal to the set of variables appearing on w'. Then $w = w'$ cannot imply an equation that does not have the property from the last sentence.*

Example: associativity and commutativity

For a similar example, we can let φ be the conjunction of the associative and the commutative laws. Here we can define $I(w)$ to be the multiset of variables appearing in w. We obtain the following metatheorem.

Metatheorem 9.5. *Let $w = w'$ be an equation such that the variables appearing in w, taking into account multiplicity, are the same ones that appear in w'. Then $w = w'$ cannot imply an equation that does not have the property from the last sentence.*

Trivia: this was the first example of a metatheorem obtained by use of an invariant.

Example: associativity and commutativity with a twist

We can keep expanding our language if it helps us express more intricate invariants. For instance, we can add the symbol '1' to our language. Let φ be the conjunction of associativity, commutativity, the equations $1 \diamond x = x$, and

$$\underbrace{x \diamond x \diamond \cdots \diamond x}_{m \text{ times}} = 1,$$

for some fixed positive integer m. Pause to guess the invariant before we move on.

The invariant $I(w)$ is the multiset of variables appearing in w but multiplicities are computed modulo m. Thus we have the pretty metatheorem:

Metatheorem 9.6. *Fix some positive integer m. Let $w = w'$ be an equation such that every variable appearing in w appears the same number of times in w' modulo m. Then $w = w'$ cannot imply an equation that does not have the property from the last sentence.*

9.3   Proving metatheorems from invariants in Lean

For the rest of this chapter we readopt the convention of calling 'theorem' an important result, not necessarily pertaining to specific equations.

An invariant is generally a *syntactic* property of an expression. However, invariants can also be described and calculated *semantically* through the notion of a *lifting magma family*, described below. The general idea is that the value of an invariant for an expression can be computed by substituting specific values for the variables in the expression and evaluating the result in a certain magma in the lifting magma family; additional requirements ensure that the fundamental property of invariants is satisfied.

Definition 9.7 (Lifting Magma Family)**.** A *lifting magma family* is a family of magmas $\{G_\alpha\}$, one for each type α, satisfying the following properties:

- For each type α, there is a function $\iota_\alpha : \alpha \to G_\alpha$.

- Given a function $f : \alpha \to G_\alpha$, there is a magma homomorphism lift $f : G_\alpha \to G_\alpha$ such that lift $f(\iota_\alpha(x)) = f(x)$ for all x in α.

Example 3. *The free Abelian groups form a lifting magma family. When the underlying set is finite, the groups are isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^n$.*

Example 4. *Lists form a lifting magma family.*

The key consequence of the Definition 9.7 is that it is significantly easier to check whether an equation is satisfied in a lifting magma family.

Theorem 9.8 (Evaluation theorem for lifting magma families)**.** *Suppose E is an equation involving a set of variables X, and let G be a lifting magma family.*

Determining whether E is satisfied by G_X is equivalent to checking that E is true with the specific substitution ι_X.

Proof. For the forward direction, suppose E is satisfied by G_X. Then, by definition, any substitution of the variables in E with elements of G_X will yield a true equation. In particular, substituting according to ι_X will yield a true equation.

For the reverse direction, suppose that E is true when evaluated with the substitution ι_X. Now, consider an arbitrary substitution of variables $f : X \to G_X$. By the lifting magma family

property, there is a magma homomorphism lift $f : G_X \to G_X$ such that lift $f(\iota_X(x)) = f(x)$ for all x in X. In other words, applying the substitution f is equivalent to first applying to substitution ι_X and then applying the homomorphism lift f. Since E is true when evaluated with the substitution ι_X, it is also true after applying the homomorphism lift f. Thus, E is satisfied by G_X. □

Theorem 9.9 (The fundamental property of invariants)**.** *Let E and E' be equations involving a set of variables X, and let G be a lifting magma family.*

If E is true with the substitution ι_X, and E implies E', then so is E'.

Proof. Applying the evaluation Theorem 9.8, we see that E is satisfied by G_X. Since E implies E', E' is also satisfied by G_X, and in particular, E' is true with the substitution ι_X. □

Remark 1. *The result of evaluating an expression along the function $\iota_X : X \to G_X$ is the invariant.*

In the case of Abelian groups, the result of evaluation is the variables in the expression with multiplicity. In the case of lists, the result of evaluation is the variables in the expression in the order they appear.

When the lifting magma family has good computational properties, calculating the invariant becomes easy.

Remark 2. *Given an equation ϕ in the language of magmas (possibly involving logical operations other than equality and universal quantification), the initial (i.e., most general) magmas satisfying ϕ (provided they exist) form a lifting magma family.*

However, for the purpose of generating invariants, we are interested in lifting magma families with convenient descriptions that are computationally tractable.

Remark 3. *Suppose S is a finite set of equations in the language of magmas that is a confluent term rewriting system under a certain ordering of the terms (in the sense of the Knuth-Bendix algorithm). Then the initial magmas satisfying S form a lifting magma family where equality of elements in the magma is decidable.*

This offers a way of generating examples of lifting magma families with good computational properties for computing invariants of expressions.

9.4 Generating laws from equations

The invariants defined in this chapter are properties of the *syntax* of the equations being considered. In other words, they are properties of the laws associated with the equations, rather than of the equations themselves. Proving non-implications using invariants requires a way to operate on the syntax of the equations and then translate the reasoning back to results about the original equations.

A magma law can be generated from an equation by accessing the syntax used in its definition and converting it to a declaration representing a magma law through metaprogramming. There is a choice in the variable set of the magma law – one one hand, it can be a finite set whose size matches the number of variables, and on the other hand, it can be the set of natural numbers. The advantage of the former is that one can generate proofs that the satisfiability of the magma law is equivalent to the satisfiability of the original equation (this only needs to be done for variable sets of size up to six, since that is the maximum size currently being considered in the project; it's convenient to prove individual lemmata for each variable set size establishing this equivalence). The advantage of the latter is that it bypasses the need to cast between various finite sets while constructing a model as a counter-example.

One approach is to generate both forms of the law, using the first to establish the equisatisfiability of the law and the equation and then transporting this result to the second form of the law. The conversion from the first form to the second is summarised in the lemma below.

Lemma 9.10. *[Compatibility between magma laws over finite sets and the natural numbers] Let E be a magma law defined over n variables and let $\tilde{E}$ be the same equation with variables ranging over the natural numbers (formally, $\tilde{E}$ is the image of E under the canonical map from the finite set with n elements to the natural numbers). Then any magma M satisfies E if and only if it satisfies $\tilde{E}$.*

Proof. In the forward direction, suppose $\phi : \mathbb{N} \to M$ is a substitution. Then the restriction of ϕ to the first n natural numbers is a substitution for the variables of E, and since M satisfies E, the law E is true in M under this substitution. Since $\tilde{E}$ is the same as E under the substitution ϕ, M satisfies $\tilde{E}$.

In the reverse direction, suppose $\phi : \{0, 2, \ldots, n-1\} \to M$ is a substitution. Then ϕ can be extended to a substitution $\tilde{\phi} : \mathbb{N} \to M$ by setting $\tilde{\phi}(i) = \phi(i)$ for $i \leq n$ and $\tilde{\phi}(i) = 0$ for $i \geq n$. Since M satisfies $\tilde{E}$ under the substitution $\tilde{\phi}$, it satisfies E under the restriction of $\tilde{\phi}$ to the first n natural numbers, which is precisely ϕ. The special case where $n = 0$ is in fact impossible, since there cannot be an expression with no variables. $\qquad\square$

9.5   Conclusion: Beyond Invariants

We are still lacking:

- A large collection of invariants.

- An estimate for how many implications the resulting metatheorems will settle.

- Algorithms (in Lean, Python, or otherwise) to compute known invariants.

- General results about lifting magmas.

- Formalization of the method of invariants and resulting metatheorems.

- Knowledge about the category-theoretic interpretation of invariants (see the questions in the note for category theorists).

Related to the last bullet point, we note the following. If all that matters about invariants is the fundamental property, we can apply the old French trick of turning a (meta-meta)theorem into a definition.

Q: If we were to define invariants as any functions satisfying the fundamental property, would anything change? (For those who read the note for category theorists: an equivalent redefinition is to consider invariants as functors $\Pi \to \mathbf{Bool}$).

Chapter 10

Some abstract nonsense

This is an alternate presentation of the material of the previous section, where we use the "abstract nonsense" of free magmas in the presence of a theory as the conceptual foundation.

Definition 10.1 (Free magma relative to a theory). Let Γ be a theory with an alphabet X. A *free magma* with alphabet X subject to the theory Γ is a magma $M_{X,\Gamma}$ together with a function $\iota_{X,\Gamma} : X \to M_{X,\Gamma}$, with the following properties:

(i) $M_{X,\Gamma}$ obeys the theory Γ: $M_{X,\Gamma} \vDash \Gamma$.

(ii) For any magma M obeying the theory Γ and any function $f : X \to M$, there exists a unique magma homomorphism $\tilde{f} : M_{X,\Gamma} \to M$ such that $\tilde{f} \circ \iota_{X,\Gamma} = f$.

Such magmas exist and are unique up to a suitable isomorphism:

Theorem 10.2 (Existence and uniqueness of free magmas). *Let Γ be a theory with alphabet X.*

(i) *There exists a free magma $M_{X,\Gamma}$ with alphabet X subject to the theory Γ.*

(ii) *If $M_{X,\Gamma}$ and $M'_{X,\Gamma}$ are two free magmas with alphabet X subject to the theory Γ, then there exists a unique magma isomorphism $\phi : M_{X,\Gamma} \to M'_{X,\Gamma}$ such that $\phi \circ \iota_{X,\Gamma} = \iota'_{X,\Gamma}$.*

We remark that the ordinary free magma M_X corresponds to the case when Γ is the empty theory.

Proof. For (i), we define $M_{X,\Gamma} = M_X / \sim$, where the equivalence relation $\sim$ is defined by requiring $w \sim w'$ if and only if $\Gamma \vDash w \simeq w'$; this is an equivalence relation thanks to Lemma 1.11, and from Theorem 1.8 we see that this relation respects the magma operations, so that $M_{X,\Gamma}$ is a magma. The map $\iota_{X,\Gamma} : X \to M_{X,\Gamma}$ is defined by setting $\iota_{X,\Gamma}(x)$ to be the equivalence class of x in $M_{X,\Gamma}$ for each $x \in X$.

We first check that $M_{X,\Gamma}$ obeys Γ. Let $w \simeq w'$ be a law in Γ, and let $f : X \to M_{X,\Gamma}$ be a function. We may lift this function to a function $\tilde{f} : X \to M_X$. From Definition 1.7, we have $\Gamma \vdash w \simeq w'$ and hence $\Gamma \vdash \varphi_{\tilde{f}}(w) \simeq \varphi_{\tilde{f}}(w')$. By Theorem 1.8, we conclude $\Gamma \vDash \varphi_{\tilde{f}}(w) \simeq \varphi_{\tilde{f}}(w')$. Quotienting by $\sim$, we conclude that $\varphi_f(w) = \varphi(w')$, giving the claim by Definition 1.6.

Now we check the universal property (ii). Let M be a magma obeying the theory Γ, and let $f : X \to M$ be a function, then we have a magma homomorphism $\varphi_f : M_X \to M$. If $w, w' \in M_X$ are such that $w \sim w'$, then $\Gamma \vDash w \simeq w'$ and hence $\varphi_f(w) = \varphi_f(w')$. Hence φ_f descends to a map $\tilde{f} : M_{X,\Gamma} \to M$, which one can check to be a magma homomorphism with $\tilde{f} \circ \iota_{X,\Gamma} = f$. By construction, $M_{X,\Gamma}$ is generated by $\iota_{X,\Gamma}(X)$, and so this homomorphism is unique. $\qquad\square$

Example 5 (Free associative magma). *Let Γ consist solely of the associative law, Definition 2.44 (so X contains $0, 1, 2$). Then one can take $M_{X,\Gamma}$ to be the set of nonempty strings with alphabet X, with magma operation given by concatenation, and $\iota_{X,\Gamma}(x)$ being the length one string x. It is a routine matter to verify that this obeys the axioms of a free magma subject to Γ.*

Example 6 (Free associative commutative magma). *Let Γ consist of the associative law (Definition 2.44) and the commutative law (Definition 2.18). Then one can take $M_{X,\Gamma}$ to be the free abelian monoid $\mathbb{N}_0^X \backslash 0$ of tuples $(n_x)_{x \in X}$ with the n_x natural numbers, not all zero, with all but finitely many of the n_x vanishing, with the magma operation given by vector addition, and with $\iota_{X,\Gamma}(x)$ being the standard generator of $\mathbb{N}^X$ associated to $x \in X$; one can think of this space as the space of formal non-empty commuting associating sums of X. It is a routine matter to verify that this obeys the axioms of a free magma subject to Γ.*

Example 7 (Free left absorptive magma). *Let Γ consist of the left absorptive law (Definition 2.4). Then one can take $M_{X,\Gamma}$ to be X with the law $x \diamond y = x$, and $\iota_{X,\Gamma}$ to be the identity map. It is easy to see that this is indeed a free magma subject to Γ.*

Example 8 (Free constant magma). *Let Γ consist of the constant law (Definition 2.20). Then one can take $M_{X,\Gamma}$ to be the disjoint union $X \uplus \{0\}$ of X and another object 0, with $\iota_{X,\Gamma}$ being the identity embedding, and with the zero magma law $x \diamond y = 0$ for all $x, y \in X \uplus \{0\}$.*

Free magmas can be used to characterize entailment by Γ in terms of a canonical invariant.

Theorem 10.3 (Canonical invariant). *Let Γ be a theory with some alphabet X, and let $M_{X,\Gamma}$ be a free magma with alphabet X subject to Γ, with associated map $\iota_{X,\Gamma} : X \to M_{X,\Gamma}$. Then for any $w, w' \in M_X$, we have*

$$\Gamma \vDash w \simeq w' \text{ if and only if } \varphi_{\iota_{X,\Gamma}}(w) = \varphi_{\iota_{X,\Gamma}}(w').$$

Proof. By Theorem 10.2 we may take $M_{X,\Gamma}$ to be the canonical free magma constructed in the proof of that theorem. The claim is then clear from expanding out definitions. $\square$

Every theory Γ then gives a metatheorem about anti-implication:

Corollary 10.4 (Criterion for anti-implication). *Let Γ be a theory with some alphabet X, and let $M_{X,\Gamma}$ be a free magma with alphabet X subject to Γ, with associated map $\iota_{X,\Gamma} : X \to M_{X,\Gamma}$. Let $w \simeq w'$ and $w'' \simeq w'''$ be laws with alphabet X. If one has*

$$\varphi_{\iota_{X,\Gamma}}(w) = \varphi_{\iota_{X,\Gamma}}(w')$$

but

$$\varphi_{\iota_{X,\Gamma}}(w'') \neq \varphi_{\iota_{X,\Gamma}}(w'''),$$

then the law $w \simeq w'$ cannot imply the law $w'' \simeq w'''$.

Proof. By Theorem 10.3, the hypothesis $\iota_{X,\Gamma}(w) = \iota_{X,\Gamma}(w')$ is equivalent to $\Gamma \vDash w \simeq w'$, and the hypothesis $\iota_{X,\Gamma}(w'') \neq \iota_{X,\Gamma}(w''')$ is equivalent to $\Gamma \nvDash w'' \simeq w'''$. The claim follows. $\square$

Example 9. *Let Γ be the associative and commutative law, so that we can take $M_{X,\Gamma} = \mathbb{N}_0^X \backslash 0$ as in Example 6. One can then check that for any word $w \in M_X$, that $\varphi_{\iota_{X,\Gamma}}(w)$ is the tuple that assigns to each letter x of the alphabet, the number of times x appears in w. We conclude that if w, w' have the same number of occurrences of each letter of the alphabet, but w'', w''' do not, then $w \simeq w'$ cannot imply $w'' \simeq w'''$. This recovers Theorem 4.8.*

Example 10. *Let Γ consist of the left absorption law, so we can take $M_{X,\Gamma} = X$ as in Example 7. Then $\varphi_{\iota_{X,\Gamma}}(w)$ is the first letter of w. We conclude that if w, w' have the same first letter, but w'', w''' do not, then $w \simeq w'$ cannot imply $w'' \simeq w'''$.*

Example 11. *Let Γ consist of the constant law, so we can take $M_{X,\Gamma} = X \uplus \{0\}$ as in Example 8. Then $\varphi_{\iota_{X,\Gamma}}(w)$ is x if w is just a letter x of the alphabet, and 0 otherwise. We conclude that if w, w', w''' have order at least one, but w'' has order zero, then $w \simeq w'$ cannot imply $w'' \simeq w'''$; this is basically Theorem 4.7.*

Example 12. *Let Γ be the theory consisting of the commutative and associative laws, and an additional law $x^n \simeq y^n$ for a fixed n, where x^n denotes the magma operation applied to n copies of x (the order is irrelevant thanks to associativity), then one can check (for finite X) that the free magma $M_{X,\Gamma}$ can be taken to be $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^X$ with the addition operation, and $\iota_{X,\Gamma}(x)$ being the standard generator associated to x. Then for any word w, $\varphi_{\iota_{X,\Gamma}}(w)$ corresponds to a tuple that assigns to each letter x of the alphabet, the number of times x occurs in w modulo n. We conclude that if w, w' have the same number of occurrences modulo n of each letter of the alphabet, but w'', w''' do not, then $w \simeq w'$ cannot imply $w'' \simeq w'''$. This is a stronger version of Theorem 4.8.*

10.1 Confluent theories

One promising source of theories Γ for which the free magma $M_{X,\Gamma}$ can be understood are the *confluent theories.*

Definition 10.5 (Confluent theory)**.** Let Γ be a theory. A word w can be *reduced* to another w' if one can get from w to w' by a series of substitutions of laws in Γ, where no substitution increases the length of the word **this is a working definition, might not be the best one to keep.**. A theory Γ is *confluent* if whenever a word w can be reduced to both w' and w'', then both w' and w'' can be reduced further to a common reduction $\tilde{w}$. As such, each word $w \in M_X$ should have a *unique simplification* to a reduced word w_Γ in some normal form, for instance the shortest reduction that is minimal with respect to some suitable ordering such as lexicographical ordering.

Example 13. *The associative law, Definition 2.44, appears to be confluent* **check this***.*

Example 14. *The theory consisting of both the associative and commutative laws, Definition 2.44, Definition 2.18, appears to be confluent* **check this***.*

Example 15. *The idempotent law, Definition 2.3, appears to be confluent* **check this***.*

The significance of confluent theories lies in

Theorem 10.6 (Free magma of a confluent theory)**.** *Let Γ be a confluent theory. Then the free magma $M_{X,\Gamma}$ subject to this theory can be described as the space of reduced words in M_X in normal form, where the operation $w \diamond_\Gamma w'$ on this magma is defined as the normal form reduction of $w \diamond w'$, and $\iota_{X,\Gamma}$ is the identity embedding (note that every single-letter word is already in normal form).*

Proof. Should just be a matter of expanding definitions properly. $\square$

Corollary 10.7 (Criterion for anti-implication)**.** *Let Γ be a confluent theory. Then a law $w \simeq w'$ is a consequence of Γ if and only if w, w' have the same normal form reduction. In particular, a law with this property cannot imply a law without this property.*

Proof. Follows from Corollary [10.4](). □

It is thus of interest to locate some confluent laws. Here is a non-trivial example:

Theorem 10.8 (477 confluent)**.** *Definition [2.27]() is confluent.*

Proof. See the notes here. A sketch of proof is as follows. We induct on the length of the term. As before we consider terms of the form XY. Also, in both sequences if a simplification is applied to the whole term, then we can assume the sequence is simply final.

By Lemma [10.9](), if any of the two sequences is final, then right before the last step, the two factors of the outermost product are both simple. This is also true for the result of the non-final sequence. By the induction hypothesis, they can be identified correspondingly, so the two sequences are either both final or both non-final, and in the first case, the same simplification is applied to give the same result. □

Lemma 10.9 (477 lemma)**.** *If Z and W are simple, then $Z(W \cdots (WW))$ is simple.*

Proof. Assume the contrary. Then we have 2 cases.

Case 1: $W \cdots (WW)$ matches the pattern $y(x(y \cdots (yy)))$, with k occurrences of W ($k \leq n$). Since $|x(y \cdots (yy))| > n|y|$, but $|\cdots (WW)| \leq (n-1)|W|$, this is impossible.

Case 2: $Z(W \cdots (WW))$ matches the pattern $y(x(y \cdots (yy)))$. Since $n \geq 3$, we have $Z = y = W$, so $|W \cdots (WW)| = n|W| = n|Z|$, contradicting $|x(y \cdots (yy))| > n|y|$. □

Chapter 11

Rewriting theory

We briefly recall the basics of rewrite theory necessary to our exposition, following mostly Baader and Nipkow [3], and generally omitting proofs when they can be found there.

We first work in the abstract taking an arbitrary set A, with a given equivalence relation over it which we denote $\approx$. We consider a relation R over A.

Definition 11.1. We write $a \to b$ if $a \, R \, b$ holds in A, and say that a *rewrites to* (or *reduces to*) b. We further define

- $\to^+$ as the transitive closure of R.

- $\to^*$ as the reflexive transitive closure of R.

- $\leftrightarrow^*$ as the reflexive transitive and symmetric closure of R.

We sometimes write $b \leftarrow a$, (resp. $b \, {}^* \!\leftarrow a$ etc) to mean $a \to b$ (resp. $a \to^* b$ etc), and chain notations, e.g. $b_1 \leftarrow a \to b_2$.

Note that $\leftrightarrow^*$ is an equivalence relation and the hope is for it to be equal to $\approx$, in order to deduce properties of the latter.

One should first note that if even R is contained in $\approx$, then so are $\to^+, \to^*$ and $\leftrightarrow^*$ (as it is an equivalence relation), so we will focus on that case. Generally $a \to^* b$ can be seen as a way to *compute* the $\approx$ relation, as it is directed, in a way to constrain our search space.

However, in general, we cannot deduce the converse, so it may be the case that $a \approx b$ but neither $a \to^* b$ nor $b \to^* a$ nor even is there a single c such that $a \to^* c \, {}^* \!\leftarrow b$, as the number of "left-right alternations" may be arbitrarily large.

The following properties are going to be very useful to deduce exactly such a converse.

Definition 11.2. We say that R is *Church-Rosser* if whenever $a \leftrightarrow^* b$, there exists some c such that
$$a \to^* c \, {}^* \!\leftarrow b$$
We say that R is *confluent* if whenever $b_1 \, {}^* \!\leftarrow a \to^* b_2$ there exists some c such that $b_1 \to^* c \, {}^* \!\leftarrow b_2$.

We say that R is *locally confluent* if whenever $b_1 \leftarrow a \to b_2$ there exists some c such that $b_1 \to^* c \, {}^* \!\leftarrow b_2$.

We say that (an arbitrary) a is in *normal form* (or a is a normal form) if there is no $a' \neq a$ such that $a \to a'$, and that R is *weakly normalizing* if for every a, there is some a' such that $a \to^* a'$ and a' is in normal form.

We say that R is *strongly normalizing* if there are no infinite rewrite sequences $a_1 \rightarrow a_2 \rightarrow \ldots$. In particular, a strongly normalizing R is also weakly normalizing.

It turns out that if R is strongly normalizing and Church-Rosser, and effective (we can "compute" with it) then the problem of equivalence is decidable! This is because of the following lemma.

Lemma 11.3. *If R is Church-Rosser, then any normal form is* unique.

This means that, in this situation, a and b reduce to an identical normal form c *if and only if* $a \leftrightarrow^* b$! This means that we have the following algorithm to decide $a \leftrightarrow^* b$ (and therefore $a \approx b$ if these relations coincide):

1. Repeatedly apply R to a and b until normal forms a' and b' are found for them (this is possible because R is strongly normalizing).

2. Compare a' and b' for exact equality (sometimes called "syntactic equality").

3. If $a' = b'$, we can conclude $a \leftrightarrow^* b$.

4. If $a' \neq b'$ can can conclude that they are *not* equivalent due to the lemma.

Note that weak normalization does not change much here except at step 1, where we need to pick reductions which eventually bring the elements to normal forms.

The strategy is therefore, for a given $\approx$ to find an R which is (strongly) normalizing and Church-Rosser, and such that $\leftrightarrow^* = \approx$. This is roughly the goal of the entire field of *completion*. We call such an R *complete for $\approx$*.

The task is helped by the following facts, which we state here also without proof.

Theorem 11.4.   *1. R is Church-Rosser iff it is confluent.*

2. (Newman's lemma) if R is strongly normalizing, then R is confluent iff it is locally confluent.

This can be leveraged by looking at the particulars of the equivalence relation of interest, namely quantified equations over syntactic trees as in Chapter 10, and a theory Γ, which we will usually take to be finite (usually it will have a single equation!).

We will therefore consider relations over the set of elements of the free magma M_X, and the aim is to find a rewrite system R is complete for $\simeq$.

Certainly $\simeq$ is closed over substitutions, and be a *congruence*: if $a \simeq a'$ and $b \simeq b'$ under Γ, then $a \diamond b \simeq a' \diamond b'$ under Γ as well.

We therefore consider R to be both closed under substitutions and a congruence. A convenient way to represent this is via a *rewrite system*: simply a set of pairs of words $(l, r) \in M_X$ (we typically write $l \rightarrow r$) which represents the smallest congruence, closed by substitutions that contains those pairs.

Naturally, a set of laws $w \simeq w'$ can be seen, given a choice of orientation (left-to-right or right-to-left) for each law as such a rewrite system. In this case, it is very clear that the reflexive transitive closure $\leftrightarrow^*$ recovers the original equational theory $\Gamma \vDash \cdot \simeq \cdot$. However, it's clear that sometimes these systems will either be not strongly normalizing, or confluent, or both.

For example, it's clear that commutativity (the rule $x \cdot y \simeq y \cdot x$ cannot possibly be oriented. Here is a non-confluent example:

$$x \cdot (y \cdot z) \rightarrow y$$

53

We have $a \cdot (b \cdot (c \cdot d)) \to^* b$, but also $a \cdot (b \cdot (c \cdot d)) \to^* a \cdot c$ for any a, b, c, d (which are both in normal form).

Knuth and Bendix [7] described a technique by which a theory or set of equations Γ could be turned into a complete system. The crucial idea is the observation that the non-local-confluence of a rewrite system can be reduced to a finite (if the system is finite) set of "worst offenders" for confluence. If these pairs can be *joined* (reduced to the same term) then the system is confluent. It is possible to compute such pairs.

The high-level idea is therefore to identify such pairs, and add them as an unoriented equation, to be oriented if possible, and repeating until no un-joinable pairs exist. If this procedure succeeds and terminates, the system is successfully completed, and as a result the theory Γ is decidable, via the completed system as described above.

We use the intuitive notions of "position in a word" and "word at a position p". We denote by $w[w']_p$ the word w with w' inserted at position p.

Definition 11.5. Given a rewrite system R and two rules $\rho_1 : l_1 \to r_1$ and $\rho_2 : l_2 \to r_2$ in R, we say that (t, u) is a *critical pair* for ρ_1 and ρ_2 if there is some non-variable position p in l_1 such that l_2 unifies with the term at that position. We denote by σ the most general unifier thus obtained and have $t = r_1 \sigma$ and $u = l_1 \sigma[r_2 \sigma]_p$

Note that, in the above setting, $t \leftarrow l_1 \sigma \to u$, giving us a candidate for non-local-confluence. The next lemma states that these candidates are the most general ones.

Theorem 11.6. *Given a rewrite system R, if for every critical pair (t, u) of R, there is a term v such that $t \to^* v \,{}^* \leftarrow u$, then R is locally confluent.*

Note that building critical pairs of a finite system is computable. Therefore the only step of the completion process which require genuine creativity is the choice of the orientation of the equations, along with the proof that that orientation is strongly normalizing.

As a capper to this section we can note that even in the event that such an orientation is not found, one can still partially apply the completion procedure, using any well-founded order on terms that is stable by substitution and congruence, to obtain a semi-decision procedure for equality. This process is sometimes called *unfailing completion* and is at the core of the *superposition calculus* used in Vampire.

Chapter 12

Simple rewrites

53,905 implications were automatically generated by simple rewrites.

describe the process of automatically generating these implications here.

Chapter 13

Trivial auto-generated theorems

Approximately 4.5m transitive implications were proven by a transitive reduction of about 15k theorems. Most of these implications were derived from being the first automated run to connect the largest equivalence classes, hence creating a large set of transitively closed implications.

Scripts generated theorems to try simple combinations of equation rewrites to reach the desired goal for every unknown implication. The generated proof scripts were run with lean and the successful theorems were extracted. An example of the types of generated rewrites that were tested:

```
repeat intro
apply

repeat intro
try { rw [<-h] }
try { rw [<-h, <-h] }
try { rw [<-h, <-h, <-h] }
try { rw [<-h, <-h, <-h, <-h] }
try { rw [<-h, <-h, <-h, <-h, <-h] }
repeat rw [h]

repeat intro
try {
  nth_rewrite 1 [h]
  try { rw [h] }
  try { rw [<-h] }
}
try {
  nth_rewrite 2 [h]
  try { rw [h] }
  try { rw [<-h] }
}
try {
  nth_rewrite 3 [h]
  try { rw [h] }
  try { rw [<-h] }
}
```

```
try {
  nth_rewrite 4 [h]
  try { rw [h] }
  try { rw [<-h] }
}
try {
  nth_rewrite 1 [h]
  nth_rewrite 1 [h]
  try { rw [h] }
  try { rw [<-h] }
}
...
```

Chapter 14

Enumerating Small Finite Magmas

describe the process of automatically generating these implications here.

Chapter 15

Equation Search

Approximately 650k transitive implications were proven by a custom tool leveraging the implication graph. After previous brute force had derived many implications expressible as a small number of rewrites, this search tool uses substitutions implied by the implication graph to search further.

An example proof illustrates the logic it uses:

```
have eq3315 (x y : G) : x * y = x * (y * (x * x)) := by
  apply Apply.Equation12_implies_Equation11 at h
  apply RewriteHypothesis.Equation11_implies_Equation3323 at h
  apply Apply.Equation3323_implies_Equation3315 at h
  apply h
have eq52 (x y : G) : x = x * (y * (x * x)) := by
  apply Apply.Equation12_implies_Equation61 at h
  apply Apply.Equation61_implies_Equation54 at h
  apply Apply.Equation54_implies_Equation52 at h
  apply h
repeat intro
nth_rewrite 1 [eq3315]
nth_rewrite 1 [← eq52]
apply h
repeat assumption
```

Using the graph of implications and refutations, it identifies equivalence classes/strongly-connected components in the implication graph and possible goals by subtracting out the refutation graph. Iterating through all equivalence classes, it can perform a meet-in-the-middle graph search where it searches outwards from both hypotheses and goals by performing equation substitutions. Depending on the number of hypotheses versus goals, it dynamically adjusts the search depth on both sides based on a configured branching factor.

Due to it's naive implementation, it may only be able to perform certain substitutions in a round-about way and the graph size explodes faster than it must, so it's limited to fairly shallow search depths. Also, the tool may emit proofs without some information Lean may require, so some generated proofs have to be fixed-up afterwards.

Chapter 16

E-Graphs

For proving implications, we used another technique called equality saturation [12] with the `lean-egg` tactic, to automatically construct proofs.

A similar approach is being pursued in the MagmaEgg tool as well, which is a standalone program that only supports magma equalities, while the lean-egg tactic supports any Lean expression.

16.1 lean-egg

16.1.1 Methodology

The basic methodology of equality saturation is based on E-Graphs, a data structure that can store equivalence classes of terms efficiently. We used the `lean-egg` tactic (https://github.com/marcusrossel/lean-egg), based on equality saturation as a tactic, which (re)constructs a proof from the E-graph [8] in Lean. This means that we do not have to trust either the egg tool nor the tactic: if something goes wrong, Lean will not accept the constructed proof. In fact, we found issues with the proof reconstruction from the examples in this project.

The `lean-egg` tactic works for equational reasoning, i.e. proving equalities as consequences of other equalities (potentially universally quantified), which is exactly what we need to prove implications of laws in Magmas. In many cases, we have laws of the form $x = y$, where neither set of variables in the left- and right-hand-side of the law is a subset of each other. In this case the laws cannot be used as rewrite rules: it's not clear what it would be rewritten to, since there are unknowns on both sides of the equation. For these cases we used a simple heuristic, where we instantiate the variables with terms found in the (proof) context, as those are likely to be important for proving the equality.

16.1.2 Results

Out of the possible implications between the 34 equations considered in Chapter 2, this method found an additional 86 implications that were not found before. Some of these seem to be missing in the computation of the transitive closure of implications of the equalities (an investigation is in progress), but some of these are genuinely new theorems, and the `lean-egg` tactic finds good proofs of these (these can be rewritten using `calc` style with a different tactic, `calcify`: https://github.com/nomeata/lean-calcify). An example of this is the following proof, found by `lean-egg`:

Theorem 16.1 (14 implies 23). *Definition [2.9](#) is equivalent to Definition [2.11](#).*

Proof.
$$x = (x \diamond x) \diamond (x \diamond (x \diamond x)) = (x \diamond x) \diamond x$$

$\square$

It was also able to (re)prove Theorem [5.5](#), albeit with a manually-provided hint (guide, in the sense of [8]).

16.2 MagmaEgg

This is a simple but apparently at least somewhat effective Rust theorem prover based on egg `e-graph` library written for this project.

It proved 5574 of the 24283 implications in the `only_strongest.txt` file at the time.

The code was originally based on the `magma_search` pull request, but has been pretty much completely rewritten.

Currently search just uses the egg library in a basic fashion, except that in case there are extra variables not present in the LHS, it has code to instantiate them with all subexpressions of the original goal.

Exporting the proofs to Lean has turned out to be harder than finding the proofs, but a good solution has been implemented (modulo some issues in egg that require to sometimes turn off explanation optimization since it sometimes triggers stack overflows and assert failures) that directly produces proof terms using `let` / `have` and `Eq.refl`, `Eq.symm`, `Eq.trans`, `Magma.op`, a congruence lemma for `Magma.op` and variables and the hypothesis. I define one letter aliases for them to reduce verbosity.

Possible future work:

- Figure out which implications are important to prove and try it on them

- Replace the fork-based code with self-execution so that it works on Windows and is less of na hack

- Fork egg and fix the buggy and slow length optimization of explanations

- Maybe write Lean code directly instead of writing explanation sexps and converting to Lean code in a second run

- Fix the generation of extra variable values so it doesn't take too much time in pathological cases (i.e. goals with 4-6 variables)

- Determine whether it actually has some advantages compared to Vampire and `lean-egg`

- Support searching for multiple goal equations at once

- Write a custom elaborator for Lean to speed up elaboration

- If the Lean kernel turns out to be too slow for some large necessary proofs and thus the custom elaborator is not enough, write a custom verified typechecker

- Support having extra rewrite rules, such as other implications that have been found implied by the hypothesis, or simple equalities found by the egraph search itself

- Run it with massive computing resources if deemed useful and someone offers those, once it's a bit more mature

Chapter 17

Using the Vampire theorem prover

1,775 implications were proven using the Vampire theorem prover.

The Vampire proofs were found by iteratively trying to prove some of the remaining unknown implications, then taking the transitive closure including the newly proven theorems. At the end only the transitive reduction of the implications was kept.

The Vampire proofs were converted to Lean proofs using a term elaborator implementing the deduction step of superposition calculus.

Bibliography

[1] A. K. Austin. A note on models of identities. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 16:522–523, 1965.

[2] A. K. Austin. Finite models for laws in two variables. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 17:1410–1412, 1966.

[3] Franz Baader and Tobias Nipkow. *Term Rewriting and All That.* Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[4] A. Kisielewicz. Austin identities. *Algebra Universalis*, 38(3):324–328, 1997.

[5] Andrzej Kisielewicz. Varieties of algebras with no nontrivial finite members. In *Lattices, semigroups, and universal algebra (Lisbon, 1988)*, pages 129–136. Plenum, New York, 1990.

[6] Donald E. Knuth. Notes on central groupoids. *J. Combinatorial Theory*, 8:376–390, 1970.

[7] Donald E. Knuth and Peter B. Bendix. Simple word problems in universal algebras. In *Computational Problems in Abstract Algebra (Proc. Conf., Oxford, 1967)*, pages 263–297. Pergamon, Oxford-New York-Toronto, Ont., 1970.

[8] Thomas Koehler, Andrés Goens, Siddharth Bhat, Tobias Grosser, Phil Trinder, and Michel Steuwer. Guided equality saturation. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 8(POPL):1727–1758, 2024.

[9] William McCune, Robert Veroff, Branden Fitelson, Kenneth Harris, Andrew Feist, and Larry Wos. Short single axioms for Boolean algebra. *J. Automat. Reason.*, 29(1):1–16, 2002.

[10] N. S. Mendelsohn and R. Padmanabhan. Minimal identities for Boolean groups. *J. Algebra*, 34:451–457, 1975.

[11] Henry Maurice Sheffer. A set of five independent postulates for Boolean algebras, with application to logical constants. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 14(4):481–488, 1913.

[12] Max Willsey, Chandrakana Nandi, Yisu Remy Wang, Oliver Flatt, Zachary Tatlock, and Pavel Panchekha. egg: Fast and extensible equality saturation. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 5(POPL):1–29, 2021.