# REFLEXIVE RELATIONS AND MAL'TSEV CONDITIONS FOR CONGRUENCE LATTICE IDENTITIES IN MODULAR VARIETIES

## GÁBOR CZÉDLI AND ESZTER K. HORVÁTH

ABSTRACT. Based on a property of tolerance relations, it was proved in [3] that for an arbitrary lattice identity implying modularity (or at least congruence modularity) there exists a Mal'tsev condition such that the identity holds in congruence lattices of algebras of a variety if and only if the variety satisfies the corresponding Mal'tsev condition. However, the Mal'tsev condition constructed in [3] is not the simplest known one in general. Now we extend the result of [3] from tolerances to reflexive compatible relations. This leads to a construction of simpler Mal'tsev conditions for lattice identities implying modularity. Notice that Day terms and Jónsson terms, as Mal'tsev conditions, are just particular cases of the general construction.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It is an old problem if all congruence lattice identities are equivalent to Mal'tsev (=Mal'cev) conditions. In other words, we say that a lattice identity $\lambda$ can be characterized by a Mal'tsev condition, or $\lambda$ has a Mal'tsev condition, if there exists a Mal'tsev condition $M$ such that, for any variety $\mathcal{V}$, $\lambda$ holds in congruence lattices of all algebras in $\mathcal{V}$ if and only if $M$ holds in $\mathcal{V}$; and the problem is if all lattice identities can be characterized this way. This problem was raised first in Grätzer [10], where the notion of a Mal'tsev condition was defined and its importance was pointed out. A *strong Mal'tsev condition* for varieties is a condition of the form "there exist terms $h_0, \ldots, h_k$ satisfying a set $\Sigma$ of identities" where $k$ is fixed and the form of $\Sigma$ is independent of the type of algebras considered. By a *Mal'tsev condition* we mean a condition of

the form "there exists a natural number $n$ such that $P_n$ holds" where the $P_n$ are strong Mal'tsev conditions and $P_n$ implies $P_{n+1}$ for every $n$. The condition "$P_n$ implies $P_{n+1}$" is usually expressed by saying that a Mal'tsev condition must be weakening in its parameter. (For a more precise definition of Mal'tsev conditions cf. Taylor [24].) The problem was repeatedly asked by several authors, including Taylor [24], Jónsson [18] and Freese and McKenzie [7].

Certain lattice identities have known characterizations by Mal'tsev conditions. The first two results of this kind are Jónsson's characterization of (congruence) distributivity by the existence of Jónsson terms, cf. Jónsson [17], and Day's characterization of (congruence) modularity by the existence of Day terms, cf. Day [4]. Since Day's result will be needed in the sequel, we formulate it now. For $n \geq 2$ let $(\mathbf{D}_n)$ denote the strong Mal'tsev condition "there are quaternary terms $m_0, \ldots, m_n$ satisfying the identities

$$m_0(x, y, z, u) = x, \qquad m_n(x, y, z, u) = u,$$
$$m_i(x, y, y, x) = x \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \ldots, n,$$
$$m_i(x, x, y, y) = m_{i+1}(x, x, y, y) \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad i \text{ even},$$
$$m_i(x, y, y, z) = m_{i+1}(x, y, y, z) \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \quad i \text{ odd}".$$

Now Day's celebrated result says that a variety $\mathcal{V}$ is congruence modular iff the Mal'tsev condition "$(\exists n)(\mathbf{D}_n)$" holds in $\mathcal{V}$.

Jónsson terms and Day terms were soon followed by some similar characterizations for other lattice identities, given for example by Gedeonová [9] and Mederly [20], but Nation [21] and Day [5] showed that these Mal'tsev conditions are equivalent to the existence of Day terms or Jónsson terms; the reader is referred to Jónsson [18] and Freese and McKenzie [7] (Chapter XIII) for more details.

The next milestone is Chapter XIII in Freese and McKenzie's book [7]. Let us call a lattice identity $\lambda$ in $n^2$ variables a *frame identity* if $\lambda$ implies modularity and $\lambda$ holds in a modular lattice iff it holds for the elements of every (von Neumann) $n$-frame of the lattice. Freese and McKenzie showed that frame identities can be characterized by Mal'tsev conditions. Their approach is based on commutator theory. Although that time there was a hope that their method combined with [16] gives a Mal'tsev condition for each $\lambda$ that implies modularity, cf. [7] (page 155), Pálfy and Szabó [22] destroyed this expectation.

The next step, motivated by Gumm's Shifting Principle [11], is based on elementary properties of tolerance relations. To formulate the result we recall a notion from Jónsson [18]. A lattice identity $\lambda$ is said to imply modularity in congruence varieties, in notation $\lambda \models_c$ modularity, if for

any variety $\mathcal{V}$ if all the congruence lattices $\mathrm{Con}(A)$, $A \in \mathcal{V}$, satisfy $\lambda$ then all these lattices are modular. If $\lambda$ implies modularity in the usual lattice theoretic sense then of course $\lambda \models_c$ modularity as well. However, it was a great surprise by Nation [21] that $\lambda \models_c$ modularity is possible even when $\lambda$ does not imply modularity in the usual sense. Jónsson [18] gives an overview of similar results. We mention that there is an algorithm to test if $\lambda \models_c$ modularity, cf. [1], which is based on Day and Freese [6].

Now it was proved in [3] that if $\lambda$ is a lattice identity such that $\lambda \models_c$ modularity then $\lambda$ can be characterized by a $Mal'tsev$ condition. The proof of this fact is relatively elementary and easy but the Mal'tsev conditions are far from being optimal in most of those cases where Mal'tsev conditions were previously known.

The purpose of this paper is to give an algorithm which associates essentially better Mal'tsev conditions with lattice identities implying modularity in congruence varieties. The price we pay for better Mal'tsev conditions is that the present approach is a bit more complicated than that in [3]. The starting point of our investigation is that not only tolerances but also reflexive compatible relations have a nice property in congruence modular varieties.

## 2. The Wille–Pixley algorithm

Let $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k\}$ be a fixed set of variables. (Later these variables will be substituted by reflexive compatible relations.) Let $C_k$ denote the set of terms in operations $\cap$ (intersection) and $\circ$ (composition of relations) on the variables $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$. Given $p$ in $C_k$, we define a sequence $F_0(p)$, $F_1(p)$, $\ldots$ of sets of formulas. Each of these formulas will be of the form $(x_i, x_j) \in r$ for some $r \in C_k$ where $x_i$ and $x_j$ belong to a new set $\{x_i : i \geq 1\}$ of variables. If $r$ is a variable, i.e., if $r \in \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k\}$ then $(x_i, x_j) \in r$ will be called a *final formula*. Notice that the $x_i$ will represent elements of algebras later.

Now $F_0(p)$ is the singleton consisting of $(x_1, x_2) \in p$. For $j > 0$, if all formulas in $F_{j-1}(p)$ are final then let $F_j(p) = F_{j-1}(p)$. Otherwise choose a formula $(x_i, x_\ell) \in r$ in $F_{j-1}(p)$ which is not final[1], and the definition of $F_j(p)$ depends on the form of $r$. If $r = r_1 \cap r_2$ then

$$F_j(p) := \Big( F_{j-1}(p) \setminus \{(x_i, x_\ell) \in r\} \Big) \cup \{(x_i, x_\ell) \in r_1, \ (x_i, x_\ell) \in r_2\}.$$

---

[1]There can be several formulas which are not final but, up to equivalence (namely, up to the order of terms and their variables), any choice leads to the same Mal'tsev condition.

If $r = r_1 \circ r_2$ then let $m$ be the smallest positive integer such that $x_m$ does not occur in any formula of $F_{j-1}(p)$ and define

$$F_j(p) := \Big( F_{j-1}(p) \setminus \{(x_i, x_\ell) \in r\} \Big) \cup \{(x_i, x_m) \in r_1, (x_m, x_\ell) \in r_2\}.$$

Clearly, there is a smallest $t$ such that $F_t(p) = F_{t+1}(p)$ and we define $F(p) = F_t(p)$.

*Example* 1. If $k = 3$ and $p = \alpha_1 \cap (\alpha_2 \circ (\alpha_1 \cap \alpha_3) \circ \alpha_2)$, then $F(p) = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \alpha_1, (x_1, x_3) \in \alpha_2, (x_3, x_4) \in \alpha_1, (x_3, x_4) \in \alpha_3, (x_4, x_2) \in \alpha_2\}$.

Given an algebra $A$, the set $\mathrm{Rel}_r(A)$ of all reflexive and compatible relations on $A$ (in other words, all subalgebras of $A^2$ including the diagonal subalgebra) has intersection, inverse and composition operations as usual: for $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ in $\mathrm{Rel}_r(A)$, $(x, y) \in \Phi \circ \Psi$ iff there exists a $z \in A$ with $(x, z) \in \Phi$ and $(z, y) \in \Psi$, and $(x, y) \in \Phi^{-1}$ iff $(y, x) \in \Phi$. Now let $p, q \in C_k$. The inclusion formula (more precisely, the $\{\cap, \circ\}$-*inclusion*) $p \subseteq q$ is said to be satisfied for congruences of $A$ if $p \subseteq q$ holds in $\mathrm{Rel}_r(A)$ whenever congruences $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k \in \mathrm{Con}(A)$ replace the variables $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$, respectively. If this is the case for all algebras $A$ in a given variety $\mathcal{V}$ then we say that $p \subseteq q$ holds for congruences of $\mathcal{V}$. The Mal'tsev condition $U(p \subseteq q)$ we are going to define will characterize this property of $\mathcal{V}$.

Compute $F(p)$ and $F(q)$, and modify $F(q)$ to obtain $\hat{F}(q)$ by replacing each variable $x_i$ by the variable $f_i$ in every formula belonging to $F(q)$. Suppose that $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ and $\{f_1, \ldots, f_s\}$ are the sets of variables appearing in the formulas of $F(p)$ and $\hat{F}(q)$, respectively, excluding the variables $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ of $C_k$. Clearly, $m$ equals two plus the number of composition operators in $p$, and similarly for $s$.

Now construct partitions $\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_k$ of $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ corresponding to the variables $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ of $p$ and $q$ as follows: for each $\ell$, $1 \leq \ell \leq k$, $\Theta_\ell$ is the smallest partition of $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ such that $x_i$ and $x_j$ belong to the same block of $\Theta_\ell$ for every formula $(x_i, x_j) \in \alpha_\ell$ belonging to $F(p)$. If $\alpha_\ell$ does not occur in $p$ then $\Theta_\ell$ is the discrete partition $\{\{x_i\} : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$. For any partition $\Theta$ of $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $\hat{\Theta}(x_i)$ denote $x_j$ where $j$ is the smallest integer such that $x_j$ and $x_i$ belongs to the same block of $\Theta$.

*Example* 1 (continued). If $p$ is as before then $\Theta_1 = \{\{x_1, x_2\}, \{x_3, x_4\}\}$, $\Theta_2 = \{\{x_1, x_3\}, \{x_2, x_4\}\}$ and $\Theta_3 = \{\{x_3, x_4\}, \{x_1\}, \{x_2\}\}$.

Now let $U(p \subseteq q)$ stand for the following strong Mal'tsev condition: "there exist $m$-ary terms $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_s$ satisfying the identities

$$f_1(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m) = x_1, \quad f_2(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m) = x_2,$$

and for each formula $(f_i, f_j) \in \alpha_\ell$ in $\hat{F}(q)$ the identity

$$f_i(\hat{\Theta}_\ell(x_1), \ldots, \hat{\Theta}_\ell(x_m)) = f_j(\hat{\Theta}_\ell(x_1), \ldots, \hat{\Theta}_\ell(x_m)).\text{"}$$

*Example 1 (continued).* If $p$ is as before and $q = (\alpha_1 \cap \alpha_2) \circ (\alpha_1 \cap \alpha_3)$ then $U(p \subseteq q)$ is the following condition: "There are quaternary terms $f_1, f_2, f_3$ satisfying the identities

$$f_1(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = x_1, \quad f_2(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = x_2,$$
$$f_1(x_1, x_1, x_3, x_3) = f_3(x_1, x_1, x_3, x_3),$$
$$f_1(x_1, x_2, x_1, x_2) = f_3(x_1, x_2, x_1, x_2)$$
$$f_3(x_1, x_1, x_3, x_3) = f_2(x_1, x_1, x_3, x_3),$$
$$f_3(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_3) = f_2(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_3).\text{"}$$

**Theorem 1.** *(Wille [25] and Pixley [23]) Given an $\{\cap, \circ\}$-inclusion $p \subseteq q$ and a variety $\mathcal{V}$, $p \subseteq q$ holds for congruences of $\mathcal{V}$ if and only if $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies the strong Mal'tsev condition $U(p \subseteq q)$.*

Now let $p$ be a lattice term on the variables $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$, and let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. We define a term $p^{(k)}$ in $C_k$ via induction as follows. If $p = \alpha_i$, a variable, then let $p^{(k)} = p$. If $p = r \wedge s$ then let $p^{(k)} = r^{(k)} \cap s^{(k)}$. Finally, if $p = r \vee s$ then let $p^{(k)} = r^{(k)} \circ s^{(k)} \circ r^{(k)} \circ s^{(k)} \circ \cdots$ (with $k$ factors on the right).

**Theorem 2.** *(Wille [25] and Pixley [23]) Suppose $p$ is an $\{\cap, \circ\}$-term and $q$ is a lattice term on the variables $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$. Then for any variety $\mathcal{V}$, the inclusion $p \subseteq q$ holds for congruences of $\mathcal{V}$ if and only if $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies the Mal'tsev condition "there exist an integer $k \geq 2$ such that $U(p \subseteq q^{(k)})$ holds".*

Notice that $(\exists k)\,(U(p \subseteq q^{(k)}))$ is indeed a Mal'tsev condition, for $U(p \subseteq q^{(k)})$ implies $U(p \subseteq q^{(k+1)})$ for any $k \geq 2$.

## 3. Reflexive relations in congruence modular varieties

Given an algebra $A$ and $\Phi \in \mathrm{Rel}_r(A)$, the least congruence of $A$ containing $\Phi$ will be denoted by $\mathrm{con}(\Phi)$. Similarly, $\Phi^*$ will stand for the least transitive relation containing $\Phi$. It is easy to see that

$$\Phi^* = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{N}} (\Phi \circ \Phi \circ \cdots) \quad (k \text{ factors}) \text{ belongs to } \mathrm{Rel}_r(A) \qquad (1)$$

and

$$\mathrm{con}(\Phi) = (\Phi \circ \Phi^{-1})^* = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{N}} ((\Phi \circ \Phi^{-1}) \circ (\Phi \circ \Phi^{-1}) \circ \cdots). \qquad (2)$$

If $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Rel_r}(A)$ happens to be symmetric, which means $\Gamma^{-1} = \Gamma$, in other words, if $\Gamma$ belongs to $\mathrm{Tol}(A)$, the set of tolerance relations of the algebra $A$, then the formula simplifies:

$$\mathrm{con}(\Gamma) = \Gamma^* = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{N}} (\Gamma \circ \Gamma \circ \cdots) \quad (k \text{ factors.}) \tag{3}$$

There are straightforward but useful connections among $\vee$, taken in the congruence lattice $\mathrm{Con}(A)$ of $A$, $\circ$ and $\mathrm{con}(\ )$, namely, for any $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathrm{Rel_r}(A)$ we have

$$\mathrm{con}(\Phi \circ \Psi) = \mathrm{con}(\Phi \circ \Psi \circ \Phi^{-1}) = \mathrm{con}(\Phi) \vee \mathrm{con}(\Psi). \tag{4}$$

Unfortunately, there is no similar result for intersection. For example, even when $\mathrm{Con}(A)$ is a three element chain, $\alpha \in \mathrm{Con}(A)$ and $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Tol}(A)$, $\mathrm{con}(\alpha \cap \Gamma)$ may be different from $\mathrm{con}(\alpha) \cap \mathrm{con}(\Gamma)$, cf. [2]. Hence the following theorem is a little bit surprising.

**Theorem 3.** *Let $A$ be an algebra in a congruence modular variety, let $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Tol}(A)$ and $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathrm{Rel_r}(A)$. Then*

$$\mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi) = \mathrm{con}(\Gamma) \cap \mathrm{con}(\Phi), \quad and$$
$$\mathrm{con}((\Phi \circ \Phi^{-1}) \cap \Psi) = \mathrm{con}(\Phi \cap (\Psi \circ \Psi^{-1})) = \mathrm{con}(\Phi) \cap \mathrm{con}(\Psi).$$

*Proof.* Since $A$ belongs to a congruence modular variety, we have Day terms, i.e., quaternary terms $m_0, \ldots, m_n$ satisfying the identities given in the introduction. We can assume that $n$ is even. First we show that

$$\Gamma \cap (\Phi \circ \Phi^{-1}) \subseteq \mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi). \tag{5}$$

Suppose $(a, b) \in \Gamma \cap (\Phi \circ \Phi^{-1})$, then there exists an element $c \in A$ with $(a, c), (b, c) \in \Phi$ and, of course, $(a, b), (b, a) \in \Gamma$. We define elements $d_i = m_i(a, c, c, b)$ and $e_i = m_i(a, a, b, b)$, $0 \le i \le n$. Then $(e_i, d_i) \in \Phi$ for all $i$. Using the trick

$$e_i = m_i(a, a, b, b) = m_i(m_i(a, c, c, a), a, b, m_i(b, c, c, b)) \; \Gamma$$
$$m_i(m_i(a, c, c, b), a, a, m_i(a, c, c, b)) = m_i(a, c, c, b) = d_i,$$

we obtain $(e_i, d_i) \in \Gamma$ for all $i$. Hence $(e_i, d_i) \in \Gamma \cap \Phi$ and $(e_i, d_i), (d_i, e_i) \in \mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi)$. On the other hand, $e_i = e_{i+1}$ for $i$ even and $d_j = d_{j+1}$ for $j$ odd. Hence all the pairs

$$(a, e_0) = (d_0, e_0) = (a, e_1), \; (e_1, d_1) = (e_1, d_2), \; (d_2, e_2) = (d_2, e_3),$$
$$(e_3, d_3) = (e_3, d_4), \; (d_4, e_4) = (d_4, e_5), \; (e_5, d_5) = (e_5, d_6), \; \ldots \; ,$$
$$(d_{n-2}, e_{n-2}) = (d_{n-2}, e_{n-1}), \; (e_{n-1}, d_{n-1}) = (e_{n-1}, d_n) = (e_{n-1}, b)$$

belongs to $\mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi)$. So $(a, b) \in \mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi)$ by transitivity. This proves (5).

Now we define $\Phi_1 = \Phi \circ \Phi^{-1}$ and $\Phi_{j+1} = \Phi_j \circ \Phi_j^{-1}$ for $j > 1$. We claim that, for all $j \geq 1$,

$$\Gamma \cap \Phi_j \subseteq \mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi). \tag{6}$$

For $j = 1$ this is just (5). If (6) holds for some $j$ then, by (5) for $\Phi_j$ instead of $\Phi$ and (6) for this $j$, we obtain

$$\Gamma \cap \Phi_{j+1} = \Gamma \cap (\Phi_j \circ \Phi_j^{-1}) \subseteq \mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi_j) \subseteq$$
$$\mathrm{con}(\mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi)) = \mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi),$$

proving (6) for $j + 1$. Thus (6) holds for all $j$. Clearly, $\Phi_j^{-1} = \Phi_j$ for $j \geq 1$. Hence $\Phi_j = \Phi_1 \circ \Phi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \Phi_1$, with $2^{j-1}$ factors on the right, for all $j \geq 1$, and we obtain from (2) that $\mathrm{con}(\Phi) = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} \Phi_j$. Hence we conclude from (6) that

$$\Gamma \cap \mathrm{con}(\Phi) = \Gamma \cap \bigcup_{j \geq 1} \Phi_j = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} (\Gamma \cap \Phi_j) \subseteq \mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi),$$

i.e.,

$$\Gamma \cap \mathrm{con}(\Phi) \subseteq \mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi). \tag{7}$$

Now, using (7) first for $\mathrm{con}(\Phi)$ and $\Gamma$ and then for $\Gamma$ and $\Phi$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{con}(\Gamma) \cap \mathrm{con}(\Phi) = \mathrm{con}(\Phi) \cap \mathrm{con}(\Gamma) \subseteq \mathrm{con}(\mathrm{con}(\Phi) \cap \Gamma) =$$
$$\mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \mathrm{con}(\Phi)) \subseteq \mathrm{con}(\mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi)) = \mathrm{con}(\Gamma \cap \Phi).$$

The converse inclusion comes from the fact that con is a monotone operator. This proves the first formula of Theorem 3. Since $\Psi \circ \Psi^{-1} \in \mathrm{Tol}(A)$ and $\mathrm{con}(\Psi) = \mathrm{con}(\Psi \circ \Psi^{-1})$, and similarly for $\Phi$ instead of $\Psi$, the rest of Theorem 3 follows evidently. $\qquad\square$

## 4. How to get rid of joins?

In order to make use of Theorem 2 for a lattice identity $p \leq q$, we have to get rid of joins in $p$. This can be done in various ways, and this freedom is built in the following definition.

Let $C_k$ be the set of $\{\cap, \circ\}$-terms on the variables $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$, as before. For $p \in C_k$ we define $p^{-1} \in C_k$ via induction as follows. (The idea is that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ will be substituted by symmetric relations.) If $p$ is a variable then $p^{-1} = p$. If $p = r \cap s$ then $p^{-1} = r^{-1} \cap s^{-1}$. If $p = r \circ s$ then $p^{-1} = s^{-1} \circ r^{-1}$. This way $p^{-1}$ is defined and belongs to $C_k$ for each $p \in C_k$.

Now, for any lattice term $p$ on the variables $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ we define a subset $R(p)$ of $C_k$. The idea is that (4) and Theorem 3 should be

applicable for members of $R(p)$. If $p$ is a variable then $R(p) = \{p\}$. If $p = r \wedge s$ then

$$R(p) = R(r \wedge s) = \{\tilde{r} \cap \tilde{s} : \tilde{r} \in R(r), \ \tilde{s} \in R(s) \text{ and } \tilde{r}^{-1} = \tilde{r}\} \cup$$
$$\{\tilde{r} \cap \tilde{s} : \tilde{r} \in R(r), \ \tilde{s} \in R(s) \text{ and } \tilde{s}^{-1} = \tilde{s}\} \cup$$
$$\{\tilde{r} \cap (\tilde{s} \circ \tilde{s}^{-1}) : \tilde{r} \in R(r), \ \tilde{s} \in R(s)\} \cup$$
$$\{(\tilde{r} \circ \tilde{r}^{-1}) \cap \tilde{s} : \tilde{r} \in R(r), \ \tilde{s} \in R(s)\}.$$

If $p = r \vee s$ then

$$R(p) = R(r \vee s) = \{\tilde{r} \circ \tilde{s} : \tilde{r} \in R(r) \text{ and } \tilde{s} \in R(s)\} \cup$$
$$\{\tilde{r} \circ \tilde{s} \circ \tilde{r}^{-1} : \tilde{r} \in R(r) \text{ and } \tilde{s} \in R(s)\} \cup$$
$$\{\tilde{s} \circ \tilde{r} \circ \tilde{s}^{-1} : \tilde{r} \in R(r) \text{ and } \tilde{s} \in R(s)\}.$$

Notice that if $R(r) \cup R(s)$ contains a symmetric term then so do $G(r \wedge s)$ and $G(r \vee s)$. Since variables are symmetric, we conclude that $R(p)$ contains a symmetric term for any lattice term $p$. We will prefer the shortest members of $R(p)$. Somehow the whole question is about symmetry, for symmetric subterms allow shorter formulas, but longer formulas are needed to produce symmetric subterms. Notice also that $p^{(3)} \in R(p)$ holds for any lattice term $p$.

## 5. MAIN THEOREM

In this section we formulate and prove our main result, while the last section will be devoted for examples and comparison with previous results.

**Theorem 4.** *Let $\lambda : p \leq q$ be a lattice identity such that $\lambda \models_c$ modularity, and let $\tilde{p} \in R(p)$. Then for any variety $\mathcal{V}$ the following two conditions are equivalent.*

*(a) For all $A \in \mathcal{V}$, $\lambda$ holds in the congruence lattice of $A$.*

*(b) $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies the Mal'tsev condition "there is an $n \geq 2$ such that $U(\tilde{p} \subseteq q^{(n)})$ and $\mathbf{D}_n$ hold".*

*Proof.* Suppose (a). A straightforward induction on the length of $p$ shows that for any $A \in \mathcal{V}$ and any $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k \in \mathrm{Con}(A)$, $\tilde{p}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k) \subseteq p(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$. Hence the inclusion $\tilde{p} \subseteq q$ holds for congruences of $\mathcal{V}$ and Theorem 2 gives an integer $n_1 \geq 2$ such that $U(\tilde{p} \subseteq q^{(n_1)})$ holds in $\mathcal{V}$. Since $\lambda \models_c$ modularity, $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies $\mathbf{D}_{n_2}$ for some $n_2 \geq 2$ by Day's result. Therefore (b) holds with $n = \max\{n_1, n_2\}$.

Suppose (b). By Day's result, $\mathcal{V}$ is congruence modular. It follows from Theorem 2 that the inclusion $\tilde{p} \subseteq q$ holds for congruences

of $\mathcal{V}$. This means that for any $A \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \mathrm{Con}(A)$, $\tilde{p}(\alpha_1 \dots, \alpha_k) \subseteq q(\alpha_1 \dots, \alpha_k)$, in short $\tilde{p}(\vec{\alpha}) \subseteq q(\vec{\alpha})$. Hence

$$\mathrm{con}(\tilde{p}(\vec{\alpha})) \subseteq \mathrm{con}(q(\vec{\alpha})).$$

Since $\mathrm{con}(q(\vec{\alpha})) = q(\vec{\alpha})$, it suffices to show that, for any lattice term $p$ and any $\tilde{p} \in R(p)$,

$$\mathrm{con}(\tilde{p}(\vec{\alpha})) = p(\vec{\alpha}). \tag{8}$$

We verify (8) via induction on the length of $p$. If $p$ is a variable then (8) is trivial.

If $p = r \wedge s$ then there are several cases. If, say, $\tilde{r} \in R(r)$ is symmetric and $\tilde{p} = \tilde{r} \cap \tilde{s}$ then using Theorem 3, the induction hypothesis for $r$ and $s$, and the easy fact that symmetric terms in $C_k$ give symmetric relations in $\mathrm{Rel}_{\mathrm{r}}(A)$ when congruences are substituted for variables we conclude

$$\mathrm{con}(\tilde{p}(\vec{\alpha})) = \mathrm{con}(\tilde{r}(\vec{\alpha}) \cap \tilde{s}(\vec{\alpha})) = \mathrm{con}(\tilde{r}(\vec{\alpha})) \cap \mathrm{con}(\tilde{s}(\vec{\alpha})) =$$
$$r(\vec{\alpha}) \cap s(\vec{\alpha}) = p(\vec{\alpha}),$$

indeed. When $\tilde{p} = (\tilde{r} \circ \tilde{r}^{-1}) \cap \tilde{s}$ and in other cases of $p = r \wedge s$ Theorem 3 applies similarly.

If $p = r \vee s$ then (4) and the induction hypothesis applies easily; for example, if $\tilde{p} = \tilde{r} \circ \tilde{s} \circ \tilde{r}^{-1}$ then

$$\mathrm{con}(\tilde{p}(\vec{\alpha})) = \mathrm{con}(\tilde{r}(\vec{\alpha}) \circ \tilde{s}(\vec{\alpha}) \circ \tilde{r}(\vec{\alpha})^{-1}) = \mathrm{con}(\tilde{r}(\vec{\alpha})) \vee \mathrm{con}(\tilde{s}(\vec{\alpha})) =$$
$$r(\vec{\alpha}) \vee r(\vec{\alpha}) = p(\vec{\alpha}).$$

This proves (8) and the Theorem. $\qquad\qquad\square$

## 6. APPLICATIONS AND COMMENTS

**Corollary 1.** *(Jónsson [17]) A variety $\mathcal{V}$ is congruence distributive if and only if there is an $n \geq 2$ and there are ternary $\mathcal{V}$-terms $t_0, \dots, t_n$ satisfying the identities $t_0(x, y, z) = x$, $t_n(x, y, z) = z$, $t_i(x, y, x) = x$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$, $t_i(x, x, z) = t_{i+1}(x, x, z)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, $i$ even, and $t_i(x, z, z) = t_{i+1}(x, z, z)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, $i$ odd.*

*Proof.* The distributive law is $\alpha_1 \wedge (\alpha_2 \vee \alpha_3) \leq (\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2) \vee (\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_3)$. Take $\tilde{p} = \alpha_1 \cap (\alpha_2 \circ \alpha_3) \in R(\alpha_1 \wedge (\alpha_2 \vee \alpha_3))$, apply Theorem 3 and interchange the last two variables in all terms. This way we obtain that the conjunction of the existence of Jónsson terms and the existence of Day terms characterizes distributivity. However, if we have Jónsson terms, then we automatically have Day terms; indeed, Jónsson terms trivially give Gumm terms, cf. Theorem 7.4 in Gumm [11], therefore $\mathcal{V}$ is congruence modular, so we have Day terms. $\qquad\square$

Let us say that a Mal'tsev condition $U(\tilde{p} \subseteq q)$ is $m$-ary if the term symbols in it are $m$-ary. An easy induction shows that $m$ equals two plus the number of composition operators $\circ$ in $\tilde{p}$. For example, $\mathbf{D}_n$ is a 4-ary Mal'tsev condition. It is reasonable to say that Mal'tsev conditions with smaller arities are simpler. Now we compare the output of our algorithm with some classical results. Consider the following lattice terms:

$$p_1 = \beta \wedge \bigvee_{i=0}^{n} \alpha_i, \quad q_1 = \bigvee_{j=0}^{n} \Big( \beta \wedge \bigvee_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq j}}^{n} \alpha_i \Big)$$

$$p_2 = (\alpha \vee \beta_1) \wedge (\alpha \vee \beta_2), \quad q_2 = \alpha \vee \big( (\alpha \vee \beta_1) \wedge (\alpha \vee \beta_2) \wedge (\beta_1 \vee \beta_2) \big),$$

$$p_3 = \alpha \wedge \big( (\alpha \wedge \beta_1) \vee (\alpha \wedge \beta_2) \vee (\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2) \big), \quad q_3 = (\alpha \wedge \beta_1) \vee (\alpha \wedge \beta_2),$$

$$p_4 = \big( \alpha \vee (\beta \wedge \gamma) \big) \wedge \big( \gamma \vee (\alpha \wedge \beta) \big),$$

$$q_4 = \Big( \alpha \wedge \big( \gamma \vee (\alpha \wedge \beta) \big) \Big) \vee \Big( \gamma \wedge \big( \alpha \vee (\beta \wedge \gamma) \big) \Big),$$

and the lattice identities $\lambda_i : p_i \leq q_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Mal'tsev conditions for $\lambda_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ resp. for $i = 4$ were given by Mederly [20] resp. Gedeonová [9]. Notice that Mederly and Gedeonová use equality rather than inequality in these identities, but this does not make any difference modulo lattice theory. Notice also that $\lambda_1$ is the $n$-distributive law introduced by Huhn [14], $\lambda_2$ is called $\ell$-modularity introduced by McKenzie [19], $\lambda_3$ is the dual of $\lambda_2$, and $\lambda_4$, called $p$-modularity, is taken from Gedeonová [9]. The following statement is straightforward.

*Example* 2. (a) Since $p_1^{(2)} \in R(p_1)$, there is an $(n+2)$-ary Mal'tsev condition characterizing $n$-distributivity; Mederly [20] also gave an $(n+2)$-ary one.

(b) Since $(\alpha \circ \beta_1 \circ \alpha) \cap (\alpha \circ \beta_2) \in R(p_2)$, there is a 5-ary Mal'tsev condition characterizing $\ell$-modularity; Mederly [20] gave a 6-ary one.

(c) Since $\alpha \cap \big( (\alpha \cap \beta_1) \circ (\alpha \cap \beta_2) \circ (\beta_1 \cap \beta_2) \big) \in R(p_3)$, there is a 4-ary Mal'tsev condition characterizing dual $\ell$-modularity; Mederly [20] gave a 7-ary one.

(d) Since $\big( \alpha \cap (\beta \circ \gamma) \big) \cap \big( \gamma \circ (\alpha \cap \beta) \circ \gamma \big) \in R(p_4)$, there is a 5-ary Mal'tsev condition characterizing $p$-modularity; Gedeonová [9] gave a 6-ary one.

Let us emphasize that the above example is only to illustrate Theorem 4 and a much stronger statement is known. Namely, Nation [21] proved that a variety $\mathcal{V}$ is congruence $n$-distributive if and only if it is congruence distributive, Day [5], and Freese and Nation [8] showed that any of $\lambda_2$, $\lambda_3$ and $\lambda_4$ is equivalent to modularity in $\models_c$ sense. Hence,

thinking of Jónsson terms and Gumm terms, we can easily see that each of $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_4$ can be characterized by a ternary Mal'tsev condition.

For frame identities Theorem 4 does not give the best known result either. Let

$$p_5 = \big((\alpha \wedge \beta) \vee (\gamma \wedge \delta)\big) \wedge \big((\alpha \wedge \gamma) \vee (\beta \wedge \delta)\big).$$

*Example* 3. Let $q_5$ be any lattice term on the variables $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$. Then $p_5 \leq q_5$ can be characterized by a 4-ary Mal'tsev condition while the best Mal'tsev condition deduced from Theorem 4 is 5-ary.

*Proof.* It is proved in Herrmann and Huhn [12] that $p_5 \leq q_5$ is a so-called diamond identity. Combining Herrmann and Huhn [13], Lemma 1.7, and Huhn [15] we obtain that Huhn diamonds and von Neumann frames are equivalent in modular lattices. Hence, as one would expect, the method of Freese and McKenzie [7], Chapter XIII, works for $p_5 \leq q_5$ and we obtain that $p_5 \leq q_5$ holds for congruences of a variety if and only if $p_5^{(2)} \subseteq q_5$ holds, whence Theorem 2 gives a 4-ary Mal'tsev condition. $\square$

One may ask if $\mathrm{con}(\Phi \cap \Psi) = \mathrm{con}(\Phi) \cap \mathrm{con}(\Psi)$ hold for arbitrary $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathrm{Rel_r}(A)$ in a congruence modular variety since this improvement of Theorem 3 would lead to much better Mal'tsev conditions of the form $U(p^{(2)} \subseteq q)$. Unfortunately this is not the case. Indeed, if $\Phi$ denotes the usual order of a lattice $L$ and $\Psi = \Phi^{-1}$ then $0_L = \mathrm{con}(\Phi \cap \Psi) \neq \mathrm{con}(\Phi) \cap \mathrm{con}(\Psi) = 1_L$ though lattices form a congruence modular (in fact, a congruence distributive) variety.

## References

[1] G. Czédli and R. Freese: On congruence distributivity and modularity, *Algebra Universalis* **17** (1983), 216–219.

[2] G. Czédli and E. K. Horváth: Congruence distributivity and modularity permit tolerances, *Acta Univ. Palacki. Olomuc., Fac. Rer. Nat., Mathematica*, submitted.

[3] G. Czédli and E. K. Horváth: All congruence lattice identities implying modularity have Mal'tsev conditions, *Algebra Universalis*, submitted.

[4] A. Day: A characterization of modularity for congruence lattices of algebras, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **12** (1969), 167–173.

[5] A. Day: *p*-modularity implies modularity in equational classes, *Algebra Universalis* **3** (1973), 398–399.

[6] A. Day and R. Freese: A characterization of identities implying congruence modularity. I, *Canad. J. Math.* **32** (1980), 1140–1167.

[7] R. Freese and R. McKenzie: *Commutator theory for congruence modular varieties*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 125. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987. iv+227 pp.

[8] R. Freese and J. B. Nation: 3,3 Lattice inclusions imply congruence modularity, *Algebra Universalis* **7** (1977), 191–194.

[9] E. Gedeonová: A characterization of $p$-modularity for congruence lattices of algebras, *Acta Fac. Rerum Natur. Univ. Comenian. Math. Publ.* **28** (1972), 99–106.

[10] G. Grätzer: Two Mal'cev-type theorems in universal algebra, *J. Combinatorial Theory* **8** (1970), 334–342.

[11] H. P. Gumm: *Geometrical methods in congruence modular algebras*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **45** (1983) no. 286, viii+79 pp.

[12] C. Herrmann and A. P. Huhn: Zum Begriff der Charakteristik modularer Verbände, *Math. Z.* **144** (1975), 185–194.

[13] C. Herrmann and A. P. Huhn: Lattices of normal subgroups which are generated by frames, *Lattice Theory, Proc. Conf. Szeged 1974*, Coll. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai, vol. **12**, North-Holland, Amsterdam 1976, pp. 97–136.

[14] A. P. Huhn: Schwach distributive Verbände. I. (German), *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **33** (1972), 297–305.

[15] A. P. Huhn: On Grätzer's problem concerning automorphisms of a finitely presented lattice, *Algebra Universalis* **5** (1975), 65–71.

[16] G. Hutchinson and G. Czédli: A test for identities satisfied in lattices of submodules, *Algebra Universalis* **8** (1978), 269–309.

[17] B. Jónsson: Algebras whose congruence lattices are distributive, *Math. Scandinavica* **21** (1967), 110–121.

[18] B. Jónsson: Congruence varieties, *Algebra Universalis* **10** (1980), 355–394.

[19] R. McKenzie: Equational bases and nonmodular lattice varieties, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **174** (1972), 1–43.

[20] P. Mederly: Three Mal'cev type theorems and their application, *Mat. Časopis Sloven. Akad. Vied* **25** (1975), 83–95.

[21] J. B. Nation: Varieties whose congruences satisfy certain lattice identities, *Algebra Universalis* **4** (1974), 78–88.

[22] P. P. Pálfy and Cs. Szabó: An identity for subgroup lattices of abelian groups, *Algebra Universalis* **33** (1995), 191–195.

[23] A. F. Pixley: Local Malcev conditions, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **15** (1972), 559–568.

[24] W. Taylor: Characterizing Mal'cev conditions, *Algebra Universalis* **3** (1973), 351–397.

[25] R. Wille: *Kongruenzklassengeometrien*, in German, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. **113** Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1970, iii+99 pp.

BOLYAI INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED, SZEGED, ARADI VÉRTANÚK TERE 1, HUNGARY–6720

*E-mail address*: `czedli@math.u-szeged.hu`

BOLYAI INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED, SZEGED, ARADI VÉRTANÚK TERE 1, HUNGARY–6720

*E-mail address*: `horeszt@math.u-szeged.hu`