

# EVERY FINITE LATTICE IS THE CONGRUENCE LATTICE OF A FINITE PARTIAL ALGEBRA

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This notes starts with a proof in Section 2 of the result stated in the title. Bill Lampe informed us that this result has been known for a long time and subsequently explained to DeMeo a more general view of the result. That view is developed in Section 3 below.

## 2. A SIMPLE PROOF OF A WELL KNOWN RESULT

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $X$  be a finite set, and let  $\text{Eq}(X)$  denote the lattice of equivalence relations on  $X$ . If  $L \leq \text{Eq}(X)$  is a 0-1-sublattice, and  $\rho \in \text{Eq}(X)$  and  $\rho \notin L$ , then for some  $k < \omega$  there exists a partial operation  $f: X^k \rightarrow X$  that is compatible with  $L$  and incompatible with  $\rho$ .*

*Proof.* First we focus on the relations in  $L$  that are above  $\rho$ . Let  $\rho^\uparrow \cap L = \{\gamma \in L \mid \gamma \geq \rho\}$ . Since  $\rho \notin L$ , we have  $\gamma > \rho$  for all  $\gamma \in \rho^\uparrow \cap L$ . Now,  $\rho^\uparrow \cap L$  has a least element  $\rho^* = \bigwedge(\rho^\uparrow \cap L)$ . Clearly  $\rho^* \geq \rho$  and since  $\rho^* \in L$  we have  $\rho^* \neq \rho$ , so  $\rho^* > \rho$ . Therefore, there exists  $(u, v) \in \rho^* - \rho$ .

Next consider the elements of  $L$  that are not above  $\rho$ . For each such  $\alpha_i \in L - \rho^\uparrow$  there exists  $(x_i, y_i) \in \rho - \alpha_i$ . Let  $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k)$  be the list of all unique such pairs (i.e., each pair appears in the list exactly once). Define the partial function  $f: X^k \rightarrow X$  at only two points of  $X^k$ ; specifically, let

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_k) = u \quad \text{and} \quad f(y_1, \dots, y_k) = v.$$

Then, since  $(\forall i)(x_i, y_i) \in \rho$  and  $(u, v) \notin \rho$ ,  $f$  is incompatible with  $\rho$ . On the other hand,  $(u, v) \in \rho^* = \bigwedge(\rho^\uparrow \cap L)$ , so  $(u, v) \in \gamma$  for every  $\gamma \in \rho^\uparrow \cap L$ , so  $f$  is compatible with every  $\gamma \in \rho^\uparrow \cap L$ .

Finally, for each  $\alpha_i \in L$  not above  $\rho$  there is at least one pair  $(x_i, y_i) \notin \alpha_i$ . Therefore, it is impossible for  $f$  to be incompatible with any such  $\alpha_i$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $X$  be a finite set and let  $L \leq \text{Eq}(X)$  be a 0-1-sublattice. Then there exists a finite partial algebra  $\mathbb{X} = \langle X, F \rangle$  with  $\text{Con}(\mathbb{X}) = L$ .*

*Proof.* By the lemma, for each  $\rho \in \text{Eq}(X) - L$ , there exists  $k < \omega$  and  $f_\rho: X^k \rightarrow X$  such that  $f_\rho$  is compatible with every relation in  $L$  and incompatible with  $\rho$ . Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be the set  $\text{Eq}(X) - L$  of all equivalence relations on  $X$  that do not belong to  $L$ . Define,  $F = \{f_\rho \mid \rho \in \mathcal{R}\}$ . Evidently,  $\text{Con}\langle X, F \rangle = L$ .  $\square$

## 3. MORE GENERAL VIEW

First we recall some standard definitions.<sup>1</sup> A *closure system* on a set  $X$  is a collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of subsets of  $X$  that is closed under arbitrary intersection (including the empty intersection, so  $\bigcap \emptyset = X \in \mathcal{C}$ ). Thus a closure system is a complete meet semilattice with respect to subset inclusion ordering. Since every complete meet semilattice is automatically a complete lattice (see [1, Theorem 2.5]), the closed sets of a closure system form a complete lattice.

For us, some key examples of closure systems are the

- the order ideals of an ordered set
- the subalgebras of an algebra
- the equivalence relations on a set

---

*Date:* October 21, 2016.

<sup>1</sup>See J. B. Nation's notes [1], from which most of this section was directly lifted.

- the congruence relations of an algebra

A *closure operator* on a set  $X$  is a map  $\mathbf{C} : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$  satisfying, for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ ,

- (a)  $A \subseteq \mathbf{C}A$  (extensivity)
- (b)  $A \subseteq B$  implies  $\mathbf{C}A \subseteq \mathbf{C}B$  (monotonicity)
- (c)  $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{C}A = \mathbf{C}A$  (idempotence)

A fixed point of a closure operator is called a *closed set*. The collection of closed sets of a closure operator is closed under arbitrary intersection, hence forms a closure system. Indeed, let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a collection of fixed points of  $\mathbf{C}$ . For each  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  we have  $\bigcap \mathcal{A} \subseteq A$ , so  $\mathbf{C}(\bigcap \mathcal{A}) \subseteq A$  by monotonicity. Therefore,  $\bigcap \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\bigcap \mathcal{A}) \subseteq \bigcap \mathcal{A}$ , which proves that  $\bigcap \mathcal{A}$  is a fixed point of  $\mathbf{C}$ .

A closure operator  $\mathbf{C}$  is called *finitary* or *algebraic* iff

$$\mathbf{C}(A) = \bigcup \{ \mathbf{C}(F) \mid F \subseteq A, F \text{ finite} \}.$$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] J. B. Nation. “Notes on Lattice Theory”. Unpublished notes. 2007, 2016. URL: <http://www.math.hawaii.edu/~jb/>.

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

*E-mail address:* [williamdemeco@gmail.com](mailto:williamdemeco@gmail.com)

CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

*E-mail address:* [jipsen@chapman.edu](mailto:jipsen@chapman.edu)