

Alfred Hoblitzelle Clifford; D. D. Miller

Union and symmetry preserving endomorphisms of the semigroup of all binary relations on a set

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 20 (1970), No. 2, 303–314

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/100967>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1970

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://dml.cz>

UNION AND SYMMETRY PRESERVING ENDOMORPHISMS
OF THE SEMIGROUP OF ALL BINARY RELATIONS ON A SET*)

A. H. CLIFFORD, New Orleans and D. D. MILLER, Knoxville

(Received March 19, 1969)

The familiar theorem that every automorphism of a symmetric group of finite degree is inner has undergone several successive generalizations. In 1937, SCHREIER [8] extended it to the group of all permutations of any set X (*i.e.*, all one-to-one mappings of X onto X). In 1952, MALCEV [7] further extended it to the semigroup of all transformations of a set. (See also LJAPIN [5], p. 302.) In 1959, GLUSKIN [3] extended it in turn to the semigroup of all partial transformations of a set. In 1964, CRESTEY [2] extended it to the semigroup \mathcal{B}_X of all binary relations on a set X , except that he imposed the hypothesis that the automorphism of \mathcal{B}_X preserve finite unions. In 1965, ZARECKIĀ [9] proved it for the semigroup of all binary relations on X having domain and range both equal to X , with no restriction on the automorphism. Finally, in 1966, MAGILL [6] showed that every automorphism (without restriction) of \mathcal{B}_X is inner. Independently, Gluskin [4] in 1967 obtained the same result for \mathcal{B}_X and for two of its subsemigroups.

In the present paper we begin the study of the endomorphisms of \mathcal{B}_X , and determine all those that preserve arbitrary unions and map symmetric relations onto symmetric relations (Theorem 3 in §2). Theorem 1 in §1 determines all such endomorphisms that preserve the empty relation. In §3 we give a somewhat simplified proof of Magill's Theorem, and in §4 we consider the case X finite.

1. ENDOMORPHISMS PRESERVING UNIONS, SYMMETRY,
AND THE EMPTY RELATION

A (binary) relation on a set X is just a subset of the cartesian product $X \times X$. The product $\alpha \circ \beta$ of two relations α and β on X is defined to be the relation

$$\alpha \circ \beta = \{(x, y) \in X \times X : \exists z \in X \text{ such that } (x, z) \in \alpha \text{ and } (z, y) \in \beta\}.$$

*) The research for this paper was supported in part by grant GP 6218 from the National Science Foundation to Tulane University.

This operation is associative, and hence the set \mathcal{B}_X of all relations on X is a semigroup. Since \mathcal{B}_X is the set of all subsets of $X \times X$, it is closed under set-theoretical union \cup and intersection \cap . For the elementary properties of \mathcal{B}_X , the reader is referred to [1], §1.4. To avoid trivialities, we assume throughout that X has more than one element.

The converse α^{-1} of a relation α will be denoted by $\alpha\sigma$, and we shall regard σ as the transformation of \mathcal{B}_X which takes α into $\alpha\sigma = \alpha^{-1}$. A relation is symmetric if and only if it is taken into itself by σ . By the domain of a relation α we mean the set

$$D(\alpha) = \{x \in X : (x, y) \in \alpha \text{ for some } y \in X\},$$

and the range of α is defined to be $R(\alpha) = D(\alpha\sigma)$.

An endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X is a transformation θ of \mathcal{B}_X satisfying $(\alpha \circ \beta)\theta = \alpha\theta \circ \beta\theta$ (all α, β in \mathcal{B}_X). Any transformation θ of \mathcal{B}_X will be said to *preserve unions* if, for any subset $\{\alpha_i : i \in I\}$ of \mathcal{B}_X ,

$$(\cup\{\alpha_i : i \in I\})\theta = \cup\{\alpha_i\theta : i \in I\}.$$

We shall say that θ *preserves symmetry* if it maps symmetric relations into symmetric relations. We shall say that θ *preserves converses* if it commutes with σ . If θ preserves converses then it preserves symmetry. For if $\theta\sigma = \sigma\theta$, and α is symmetric, i.e., $\alpha\sigma = \alpha$, then $(\alpha\theta)\sigma = (\alpha\sigma)\theta = \alpha\theta$, i.e., $\alpha\theta$ is symmetric. Regarding the converse assertion, see Lemma 3 below and the remark following it.

Throughout this paper, the relation consisting of the single pair (x, y) in $X \times X$ will be denoted by $\Phi_{x,y}$. The empty relation will be denoted by \emptyset . Clearly

$$(1) \quad \Phi_{x,y} \circ \Phi_{x',y'} = \begin{cases} \Phi_{x,y'} & \text{if } y = x', \\ \emptyset & \text{if } y \neq x'. \end{cases}$$

Let θ be any endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X such that $\theta\emptyset = \emptyset$. Let $\eta_{x,y} = \Phi_{x,y}\theta$. From (1) we obtain

$$(2) \quad \eta_{x,y} \circ \eta_{x',y'} = \begin{cases} \eta_{x,y'} & \text{if } y = x', \\ \emptyset & \text{if } y \neq x'. \end{cases}$$

Any system $\{\eta_{x,y} : x, y \in X\}$ of elements of \mathcal{B}_X (indexed by $X \times X$) satisfying (2) will be called a *matricial family*.

Lemma 1. *Let $\{\eta_{x,y} : x, y \in X\}$ be a matricial family of relations on a set X . If one member of the family is empty, then every member is empty. In the following, assume that at least one, and hence every, $\eta_{x,y}$ is not empty. Let D_x be the domain, and R_x the range, of $\eta_{x,x}$. Then the domain of $\eta_{x,y}$ is D_x , and its range is R_y ; and, for all x, y in X , $D_x \cap R_y = \emptyset$ if and only if $x \neq y$.*

Proof. Suppose $\eta_{u,v} = \emptyset$ for some u, v in X . Then $\eta_{x,y} = \eta_{x,u} \circ \eta_{u,v} \circ \eta_{v,y} = \emptyset$ for every (x, y) in $X \times X$. From $\eta_{x,y} = \eta_{x,x} \circ \eta_{x,y}$ and $\eta_{x,x} = \eta_{x,y} \circ \eta_{y,x}$ we see that

$D(\eta_{x,y}) = D_x$, and the proof that $R(\eta_{x,y}) = R_y$ is similar. From $\eta_{x,x} \circ \eta_{x,x} = \eta_{x,x} \neq \emptyset$ and $\eta_{y,y} \circ \eta_{x,x} = \emptyset$ for $x \neq y$, we conclude that $R_x \cap D_x \neq \emptyset$ and that $R_y \cap D_x = \emptyset$ for $x \neq y$.

Lemma 2. *If θ is a union preserving transformation of \mathcal{B}_X , and if we set $\eta_{x,y} = \Phi_{x,y} \theta(x, y \in X)$, then, for any $\alpha \neq \emptyset$ in \mathcal{B}_X ,*

$$(3) \quad \alpha\theta = \bigcup \{ \eta_{x,y} : (x, y) \in \alpha \}.$$

Hence if two union preserving transformations of \mathcal{B}_X agree on the one-element relations $\Phi_{x,y}$ and on \emptyset then they are equal.

Proof. The proof is immediate from $\alpha = \bigcup \{ \Phi_{x,y} : (x, y) \in \alpha \}$ and the hypothesis that θ preserves unions.

Lemma 3. *Let θ be an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X . If θ preserves converses, then it preserves symmetry. If θ preserves unions, symmetry, and the empty relation, then it preserves converses.*

Remark. It follows from Theorem 3 below that the hypothesis $\emptyset\theta = \emptyset$ in the second assertion can be omitted. We do not know if the hypothesis that θ preserve unions can likewise be omitted.

Proof. The first assertion has already been shown. Assume that θ preserves unions, symmetry, and \emptyset . Let $\eta_{x,y} = \Phi_{x,y}\theta$, and let $x \neq y$ in X . Since $\Phi_{x,y} \cup \Phi_{y,x}$ is symmetric, and θ preserves unions and symmetry, it follows that $\eta_{x,y} \cup \eta_{y,x} = (\Phi_{x,y} \cup \Phi_{y,x})\theta$ is symmetric. Let $(v, u) \in \eta_{x,y}$. Then $(v, u) \in \eta_{x,y} \cup \eta_{y,x}$. Since $u \in D_x$ and $v \in R_y$ by Lemma 1, and $D_x \cap R_y = \emptyset$ by the same lemma, we conclude that $(v, u) \notin \eta_{y,x}$, and hence $(v, u) \in \eta_{x,y}$. Thus $\eta_{x,y}\sigma \subseteq \eta_{y,x}$. Interchanging x and y , $\eta_{y,x}\sigma \subseteq \eta_{x,y}$, and hence $\eta_{y,x} = \eta_{y,x}\sigma\sigma \subseteq \eta_{x,y}\sigma$. Thus $\eta_{x,y}\sigma = \eta_{y,x}$, and

$$\Phi_{x,y}\theta\sigma = \eta_{x,y}\sigma = \eta_{y,x} = \Phi_{y,x}\theta = \Phi_{x,y}\sigma\theta.$$

Since θ and σ preserve unions and \emptyset , so do $\theta\sigma$ and $\sigma\theta$. By Lemma 2, $\theta\sigma = \sigma\theta$.

By a *partial equivalence* we mean a symmetric, transitive relation.

Theorem 1. *Let X be a set. Let E be any non-empty subset of X , let π be a partial equivalence on X with domain E , and let μ be a mapping of E onto X satisfying*

$$(4) \quad \pi \circ \mu = E \times X.$$

Define $\theta : \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_X$ by

$$(5) \quad \alpha\theta = \pi \cap (\mu \circ \alpha \circ \mu^{-1}) \quad (\text{all } \alpha \text{ in } \mathcal{B}_X).$$

Then θ is a non-zero endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X which preserves unions and symmetry, and maps \emptyset onto \emptyset .

Conversely, every such endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X is obtained in this way.

Remark 1. The zero endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X (which maps every element of \mathcal{B}_X onto \emptyset) can be included in the formula (5) if we allow E to be empty, and do not require μ to be onto. If $E \neq \emptyset$, condition (4) forces μ to be onto.

Remark 2. Condition (4) is equivalent to: given t in X and y in E , there exists z in X such that $(y, z) \in \pi$ (hence $z \in E$) and $z\mu = t$.

Proof. Let E , π , and μ satisfy (4), and define θ by (5). The latter is equivalent to

$$(6) \quad \alpha\theta = \{(x, y) \in \pi : (x\mu, y\mu) \in \alpha\}.$$

For $(x, y) \in \mu \circ \alpha \circ \mu^{-1}$ if and only if there exist u, v in X such that

$$(x, u) \in \mu, \quad (u, v) \in \alpha, \quad (v, y) \in \mu^{-1}.$$

Since the first of these is equivalent to $x\mu = u$, and the third to $y\mu = v$, it follows that $(x, y) \in \mu \circ \alpha \circ \mu^{-1}$ if and only if $(x\mu, y\mu) \in \alpha$.

Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{B}_X$. We proceed to show that $\alpha\theta \circ \beta\theta = (\alpha \circ \beta)\theta$. Let $(x, y) \in \alpha\theta \circ \beta\theta$. Then there exists z in X such that $(x, z) \in \alpha\theta$ and $(z, y) \in \beta\theta$. Hence

$$(7) \quad (x, z) \in \pi, \quad (x\mu, z\mu) \in \alpha, \quad (z, y) \in \pi, \quad (z\mu, y\mu) \in \beta,$$

whence $(x, y) \in \pi, (x\mu, y\mu) \in \alpha \circ \beta$; that is, $(x, y) \in (\alpha \circ \beta)\theta$. Hence $\alpha\theta \circ \beta\theta \subseteq (\alpha \circ \beta)\theta$.

To show the converse inclusion, let $(x, y) \in (\alpha \circ \beta)\theta$. Then $(x, y) \in \pi$ and $(x\mu, y\mu) \in \alpha \circ \beta$. The latter implies $(x\mu, t) \in \alpha$ and $(t, y\mu) \in \beta$ for some t in X . By (4) and Remark 2, there exists z in E such that $(y, z) \in \pi$ and $z\mu = t$. We conclude that equations (7) hold, which imply $(x, z) \in \alpha\theta$ and $(z, y) \in \beta\theta$, hence $(x, y) \in \alpha\theta \circ \beta\theta$.

Since \circ distributes over arbitrary unions ([1], Exercise 1(b), p. 15), it is clear from (5) that θ preserves unions. It is clear from (6) that if α is symmetric, so is $\alpha\theta$; thus θ preserves symmetry. If $\omega = X \times X$, then $\omega\theta = \pi \neq \emptyset$, and so θ is not the zero endomorphism. It is also clear from (5) that $\emptyset\theta = \emptyset$.

Conversely, let θ be a non-zero endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X which preserves unions and symmetry, and maps \emptyset onto \emptyset . Let $\eta_{x,y} = \Phi_{x,y}\theta$. Since $\emptyset\theta = \emptyset$, equations (2) hold. If $\eta_{x,y} = \emptyset$ for every x, y in X , then θ is the zero endomorphism, by Lemma 2. Hence at least one $\eta_{x,y}$ is not empty, and, by Lemma 1, every $\eta_{x,y}$ is non-empty.

Since $\Phi_{x,x}$ is symmetric, and θ preserves symmetry, it follows that $\eta_{x,x}$ is symmetric, and so, in the notation of Lemma 1, $D_x = R_x$. Let us write $E_x = D_x = R_x$, and let $E = \bigcup\{E_x : x \in X\}$. By Lemma 1, the domain of $\eta_{x,y}$ is E_x , its range is E_y , $E_x \neq \emptyset$ for all x , and

$$(8) \quad E_x \cap E_y = \emptyset \quad \text{if} \quad x \neq y \quad (x, y \in X).$$

By Lemma 3, θ preserves converses, and so

$$(9) \quad \eta_{x,y}\sigma = \Phi_{x,y}\theta\sigma = \Phi_{x,y}\sigma\theta = \Phi_{y,x}\theta = \eta_{y,x}.$$

Let

$$(10) \quad \pi = \bigcup\{\eta_{x,y} : (x, y) \in X \times X\}.$$

By (9), π is symmetric, and by (2) it is transitive. Hence it is a partial equivalence on X with domain

$$\begin{aligned} \{u \in X : (u, u) \in \pi\} &= \{u \in X : (u, u) \in \eta_{x,y} \text{ for some } (x, y) \text{ in } X \times X\} = \\ &= \{u \in X : u \in E_x \text{ for some } x \text{ in } X\} = \bigcup\{E_x : x \in X\} = E. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$(11) \quad \eta_{x,y} = \pi \cap (E_x \times E_y).$$

For if $(u, v) \in \pi \cap (E_x \times E_y)$, then $(u, v) \in \eta_{x',y'}$ for some (x', y') in $X \times X$. Then $u \in E_x \cap E_{x'}$, and from (8) we conclude that $x = x'$. Similarly, $y = y'$, and hence $(u, v) \in \eta_{x,y}$. The converse inclusion is clear.

Let

$$(12) \quad \mu = \{(x, y) \in X \times X : x \in E_y\}.$$

Clearly μ is a (single-valued) mapping of E onto X .

Now let $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}_X$. Since θ is union preserving, Lemma 2 holds. From (3), (11), and (12), we see that $(u, v) \in \alpha\theta$ if and only if there exists (x, y) in $X \times X$ such that (in turn) each of the following equivalent assertions holds:

$$\begin{aligned} (u, v) \in \eta_{x,y} \quad \text{and} \quad (x, y) \in \alpha, \\ (u, v) \in \pi, \quad u \in E_x, \quad v \in E_y, \quad \text{and} \quad (x, y) \in \alpha, \\ (u, v) \in \pi, \quad (u, x) \in \mu, \quad (x, y) \in \alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad (y, v) \in \mu^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $(u, v) \in \alpha\theta$ if and only if both $(u, v) \in \pi$ and $(u, v) \in \mu \circ \alpha \circ \mu^{-1}$; that is, if and only if (5) holds.

Finally, we prove (4), as stated in Remark 2. Let $t \in X$, $y \in E$. By definition of E , $y \in E_x$ for some x in X . Since E_x is the domain of $\eta_{x,t}$, there exists z in X such that $(y, z) \in \eta_{x,t}$. By (11), $(y, z) \in \pi$ and $z \in E_t$.

Example 1. Let X be the set of positive integers, let E be the even integers, and let π be congruence modulo 4. Let $\mu : E \rightarrow X$ be defined by $n\mu^{-1} = E_n = \{4n - 2, 4n\}$, for every n in X . Then $\eta_{m,n}$ is the two-element relation consisting of the pairs $(4m - 2, 4n - 2)$ and $(4m, 4n)$.

2. ENDOMORPHISMS PRESERVING UNIONS AND SYMMETRY

In this section we remove the restriction that the endomorphism θ of \mathcal{B}_X map \emptyset onto \emptyset .

Lemma 4. *Let θ_1 and θ_2 be endomorphisms of \mathcal{B}_X , and let E_1 and E_2 be disjoint subsets of X , such that $\alpha\theta_i \subseteq E_i \times E_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) for all α in \mathcal{B}_X . Then $\theta_1 \cup \theta_2$, defined by*

$$\alpha(\theta_1 \cup \theta_2) = \alpha\theta_1 \cup \alpha\theta_2 \quad (\text{all } \alpha \text{ in } \mathcal{B}_X)$$

is an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X . The endomorphism $\theta_1 \cup \theta_2$ preserves unions or symmetry or the empty relation if and only if both θ_1 and θ_2 do the same, respectively.

Proof. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{B}_X$. Then $\alpha\theta_2 \circ \beta\theta_1 \subseteq (E_2 \times E_2) \circ (E_1 \times E_1) = \emptyset$, and similarly, $\alpha\theta_1 \circ \beta\theta_2 = \emptyset$. Since \circ distributes over \cup ,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\theta_1 \cup \theta_2) \circ \beta(\theta_1 \cup \theta_2) &= (\alpha\theta_1 \cup \alpha\theta_2) \circ (\beta\theta_1 \cup \beta\theta_2) = (\alpha\theta_1 \circ \beta\theta_1) \cup (\alpha\theta_2 \circ \beta\theta_2) = \\ &= (\alpha \circ \beta)\theta_1 \cup (\alpha \circ \beta)\theta_2 = (\alpha \circ \beta)(\theta_1 \cup \theta_2). \end{aligned}$$

The last assertion of the lemma is evident.

Lemma 5. *If $\{\eta_{x,y} : x, y \in X\}$ is a matricial family, and if we define $\theta : \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_X$ by $\theta\emptyset = \emptyset$ and*

$$(13) \quad \alpha\theta = \bigcup \{ \eta_{x,y} : (x, y) \in \alpha \}, \quad (\emptyset \neq \alpha \in \mathcal{B}_X),$$

then θ is an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X that preserves unions (and \emptyset). Moreover, θ preserves symmetry if and only if

$$(14) \quad \eta_{x,y}\sigma = \eta_{y,x} \quad (\text{all } x, y \in X).$$

Proof. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{B}_X$, and let $(u, v) \in \alpha\theta \circ \beta\theta$. Then there exists w in X such that $(u, w) \in \alpha\theta$ and $(w, v) \in \beta\theta$. This implies that there exist x, y, s, t in X such that

$$(x, y) \in \alpha, \quad (u, w) \in \eta_{x,y}, \quad (s, t) \in \beta, \quad (w, v) \in \eta_{s,t}.$$

Hence $(u, v) \in \eta_{x,y} \circ \eta_{s,t}$, which implies $y = s$, and then $(u, v) \in \eta_{x,t}$; and $y = s$ also implies $(x, t) \in \alpha \circ \beta$. We conclude that $(u, v) \in (\alpha \circ \beta)\theta$.

Conversely, let $(u, v) \in (\alpha \circ \beta)\theta$. Then $(u, v) \in \eta_{x,t}$ for some $(x, t) \in \alpha \circ \beta$. The latter implies that there exists y in X such that $(x, y) \in \alpha$ and $(y, t) \in \beta$. Since $\eta_{x,t} = \eta_{x,y} \circ \eta_{y,t}$, the former implies that there exists w in X such that $(u, w) \in \eta_{x,y}$ and $(w, v) \in \eta_{y,t}$. Hence $(u, w) \in \alpha\theta$ and $(w, v) \in \beta\theta$, so that $(u, v) \in \alpha\theta \circ \beta\theta$.

We have thus shown that θ is an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X . Now let $\{\alpha_i : i \in I\}$ be any subset of \mathcal{B}_X . Then

$$\left(\bigcup_i \alpha_i\right) \theta = \bigcup_{x,y} \{\eta_{x,y} : (x,y) \in \bigcup_i \alpha_i\} = \bigcup_i \bigcup_{x,y} \{\eta_{x,y} : (x,y) \in \alpha_i\} = \bigcup_i (\alpha_i \theta).$$

Hence θ preserves unions. That $\emptyset \theta = \emptyset$ is part of the definition of θ .

We note that $\Phi_{x,y} \theta = \eta_{x,y}$. If θ preserves symmetry, then it preserves converses, by Lemma 3, and (14) follows from (9). Conversely, assume (14), and let α be a symmetric element of \mathcal{B}_X . Let $(u, v) \in \alpha \theta$, so that $(u, v) \in \eta_{x,y}$ for some $(x, y) \in \alpha$. Then $(v, u) \in \eta_{x,y} \theta = \eta_{y,x}$, and since $(y, x) \in \alpha$, we conclude that $(v, u) \in \alpha \theta$. Hence θ preserves symmetry.

Theorem 2. *Let X be a set. Let ζ be a partial equivalence on X with domain F . Let θ be an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X mapping \emptyset onto \emptyset and having the property that there exists a subset E of X , disjoint from F , such that $\alpha \theta \subseteq E \times E$ for all α in \mathcal{B}_X . Define $\theta' : \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_X$ by*

$$(15) \quad \alpha \theta' = \alpha \theta \cup \zeta \quad (\text{all } \alpha \text{ in } \mathcal{B}_X).$$

Then θ' is an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X mapping \emptyset onto ζ .

If θ preserves unions and symmetry, so does θ' . Conversely, every endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X that preserves unions and symmetry is obtained in this way.

Proof. If we define $\theta'' : \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_X$ by $\alpha \theta'' = \zeta$ for all α in \mathcal{B}_X , then (since $\zeta \circ \zeta = \zeta$) θ'' is an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X . The transformation θ' of \mathcal{B}_X is just $\theta \cup \theta''$ as defined in Lemma 4, and is an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X , since $E \cap F = \emptyset$. Moreover, $\emptyset \theta' = \emptyset \theta \cup \zeta = \emptyset \cup \zeta = \zeta$. That θ' preserves unions and symmetry if θ does, also follows from Lemma 4.

Conversely, let θ' be an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X which preserves unions and symmetry. Let $\zeta = \emptyset \theta'$, and let $\eta'_{x,y} = \Phi_{x,y} \theta'$, $(x, y \in X)$. By Lemma 2,

$$(16) \quad \alpha \theta' = \bigcup \{\eta'_{x,y} : (x, y) \in \alpha\}, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \neq \emptyset \text{ in } \mathcal{B}_X.$$

Now $\zeta \circ \zeta = \zeta$, and $\zeta \sigma = \zeta$ since θ' preserves symmetry; hence ζ is a partial equivalence on X . Let F be the domain of ζ . If $\zeta = \emptyset$, there is nothing to prove. Consequently we may assume $\zeta \neq \emptyset$, and hence $F \neq \emptyset$.

Similarly, $\eta'_{x,x}$ is a partial equivalence on X , for each x in X . Let E'_x be the domain of $\eta'_{x,x}$. Since θ' preserves unions, it preserves inclusion, and so $\zeta \subseteq \eta'_{x,x}$ for all x in X . In particular, $F \subseteq E'_x$. Since θ' is an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X , we have:

$$(17) \quad \eta'_{x,y} \circ \eta'_{s,t} = \begin{cases} \eta'_{x,t} & \text{if } y = s, \\ \zeta & \text{if } y \neq s; \end{cases}$$

$$(18) \quad \eta'_{x,y} \circ \zeta = \zeta \circ \eta'_{x,y} = \zeta.$$

From $\eta'_{x,x} \circ \eta'_{x,y} = \eta'_{x,y}$ and $\eta'_{x,y} \circ \eta'_{y,x} = \eta'_{x,x}$, we see that the domain of $\eta'_{x,y}$ is E'_x , and similarly we can show that its range is E'_y .

We observe next that if $u \in F$ and $(u, v) \in \eta'_{x,y}$, then $(u, v) \in \zeta$. For, let z be any element of X such that $z \neq x$. Since $u \in F \subseteq E'_z$, and E'_z is the domain of the partial equivalence $\eta'_{z,z}$, it follows that $(u, u) \in \eta'_{z,z}$. From this and $(u, v) \in \eta'_{x,y}$, we conclude from (17) that $(u, v) \in \eta'_{z,z} \circ \eta'_{x,y} = \zeta$.

Similarly we can show that if $v \in F$ and $(u, v) \in \eta'_{x,y}$, then $(u, v) \in \zeta$. We conclude that if $(u, v) \in \eta'_{x,y}$, then either $(u, v) \in \zeta$ or $(u, v) \in E_x \times E_y$, where $E_x = E'_x \setminus F$. In other words, if we set

$$(19) \quad \eta_{x,y} = \eta'_{x,y} \cap (E_x \times E_y),$$

then

$$(20) \quad \eta'_{x,y} = \eta_{x,y} \cup \zeta.$$

Here $\eta_{x,y}$ and ζ are disjoint in the strong sense that both their domains and their ranges are disjoint. Consequently

$$(21) \quad \eta'_{x,y} \circ \eta'_{s,t} = (\eta_{x,y} \circ \eta_{s,t}) \cup \zeta.$$

From (17) and (20) we conclude when $y = s$ that the left side of (21) is equal to $\eta_{x,t} \cup \zeta$; and from the strong disjointness we infer that $\eta_{x,y} \circ \eta_{y,t} = \eta_{x,t}$. If $y \neq s$, then the left side of (21) is equal to ζ , and we infer that $\eta_{x,y} \circ \eta_{s,t} = \emptyset$. Hence $\{\eta_{x,y} : (x, y) \in X \times X\}$ is a matricial family.

By Lemma 5, the transformation θ of \mathcal{B}_X defined by (13) and $\emptyset\theta = \emptyset$ is an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X . For every α in \mathcal{B}_X , $\alpha\theta \subseteq E \times E$, where $E = \bigcup\{E_x : x \in X\}$. Since each E_x is disjoint from F , so is E . (15) now follows from (13), (16), and (20) for $\alpha \neq \emptyset$; and it is clear for $\alpha = \emptyset$ since $\emptyset\theta' = \zeta$ and $\emptyset\theta = \emptyset$.

We combine Theorems 1 and 2 into the following, which is the main result of the paper.

Theorem 3. *Let X be a set, and let E and F be disjoint subsets of X . Let π and ζ be partial equivalences on X with domains E and F , respectively. Let μ be a mapping of E into X satisfying $\pi \circ \mu = E \times X$. Define $\theta : \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_X$ by*

$$(22) \quad \alpha\theta = [\pi \cap (\mu \circ \alpha \circ \mu^{-1})] \cup \zeta, \quad (\alpha \in \mathcal{B}_X).$$

Then θ is an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X preserving unions and symmetry; and, conversely, every such endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X is obtained in this way.

3. AUTOMORPHISMS OF \mathcal{B}_X

The purpose of this section is to give an alternative proof of Magill's Theorem that every automorphism of \mathcal{B}_X is inner.

Let λ be a permutation of X , and let $\bar{\lambda} : \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_X$ be the corresponding inner automorphism of \mathcal{B}_X , that is,

$$(23) \quad \alpha\bar{\lambda} = \lambda^{-1} \circ \alpha \circ \lambda \quad (\alpha \in \mathcal{B}_X).$$

We note that

$$(24) \quad \Phi_{x,y}\bar{\lambda} = \Phi_{x\lambda,y\lambda} \quad (x, y \in X).$$

For $(u, v) \in \lambda^{-1} \circ \Phi_{x,y} \circ \lambda$ if and only if $(u, x) \in \lambda^{-1}$ and $(y, v) \in \lambda$; that is, if and only if $u = x\lambda$ and $v = y\lambda$.

Lemma 6. (1) *Let θ be an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X which leaves fixed the empty relation \emptyset and every one-element relation $\Phi_{x,y}$. Then θ is the identity automorphism of \mathcal{B}_X .*

(2) *If two endomorphisms θ_1 and θ_2 of \mathcal{B}_X leave \emptyset fixed and agree on all the $\Phi_{x,y}$, and one of them is an automorphism, then $\theta_1 = \theta_2$.*

Proof.

(1) Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}_X$. Then, for any x, y in X ,

$$\Phi_{x,x} \circ \alpha \circ \Phi_{y,y} = \begin{cases} \Phi_{x,y} & \text{if } (x, y) \in \alpha, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } (x, y) \notin \alpha. \end{cases}$$

Applying θ and using the hypothesis that $\Phi_{x,y}\theta = \Phi_{x,y}$, etc., and $\emptyset\theta = \emptyset$, we get

$$\Phi_{x,x} \circ \alpha\theta \circ \Phi_{y,y} = \begin{cases} \Phi_{x,y} & \text{if } (x, y) \in \alpha, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } (x, y) \notin \alpha. \end{cases}$$

But

$$\Phi_{x,x} \circ \alpha\theta \circ \Phi_{y,y} = \begin{cases} \Phi_{x,y} & \text{if } (x, y) \in \alpha\theta, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } (x, y) \notin \alpha\theta. \end{cases}$$

Hence $(x, y) \in \alpha$ if and only if $(x, y) \in \alpha\theta$, that is, $\alpha\theta = \alpha$.

(2) Suppose θ_1 is an automorphism. Then $\theta_2\theta_1^{-1}$ leaves \emptyset and every $\Phi_{x,y}$ fixed, so $\theta_2\theta_1^{-1}$ is the identity automorphism of \mathcal{B}_X , by (1), whence $\theta_2 = \theta_1$.

For subsets E, F of X , let $\Phi_{E,F}$ denote the relation $E \times F$ on X . We write $\Phi_{E,x}$ for $\Phi_{E,\{x\}}$, etc. Note that $\Phi_{E,F} = \emptyset$ if either $E = \emptyset$ or $F = \emptyset$. As pointed out by

Crestey [2], \mathcal{B}_X has a 0-minimal ideal M which is contained in all non-zero ideals of \mathcal{B}_X , namely $M = \{\Phi_{E,F} : E \subseteq X, F \subseteq X\}$. For if $\emptyset \neq \alpha \in \mathcal{B}_X$ then

$$\alpha \circ \Phi_{E,F} = \Phi_{E',F}, \quad \text{where } E' = \{x \in X : (x, y) \in \alpha \text{ for some } y \text{ in } E\},$$

$$\Phi_{E,F} \circ \alpha = \Phi_{E,F'}, \quad \text{where } F' = \{y \in X : (x, y) \in \alpha \text{ for some } x \text{ in } F\}.$$

Thus M is an ideal of \mathcal{B}_X . If A is any non-zero ideal of \mathcal{B}_X , and $\emptyset \neq \alpha \in A$, and if $(x, y) \in \alpha$, then A contains the element $\Phi_{E,x} \circ \alpha \circ \Phi_{y,F} = \Phi_{E,F}$, for any $E \subseteq X, F \subseteq X$.

Let N be the set of right non-zero-divisors in M , i.e.,

$$N = \{\alpha \in M : \gamma \circ \alpha = \emptyset \text{ implies } \gamma = \emptyset (\gamma \in \mathcal{B}_X)\}.$$

Clearly $\Phi_{E,F}$ is a right non-zero-divisor if and only if $E = X$ and $F \neq \emptyset$, and consequently $N = \{\Phi_{X,F} : F \subseteq X, F \neq \emptyset\}$.

We define a relation \leq on N as follows:

$$\alpha \leq \beta \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \beta \circ \gamma = \emptyset \quad \text{implies} \quad \alpha \circ \gamma = \emptyset (\alpha, \beta \in N; \gamma \in \mathcal{B}_X).$$

Note that $\Phi_{X,E} \leq \Phi_{X,F}$ if and only if $E \subseteq F$, so \leq is a partial order on N .

Now let θ be any automorphism of \mathcal{B}_X . Clearly $M\theta = M$ and $N\theta = N$. Since the relation \leq on N is defined in terms of \circ , it is preserved by θ . Thus θ maps the set of minimal elements of N onto itself; but this is just the set $\{\Phi_{X,y} : y \in X\}$. Similarly, θ maps the set $\{\Phi_{x,X} : x \in X\}$ onto itself. Since the same holds for θ^{-1} , we conclude that there exist permutations λ and μ of X such that $\Phi_{x,X}\theta = \Phi_{x\lambda,X}$ and $\Phi_{X,y}\theta = \Phi_{X,y\mu}$. Applying θ to $\Phi_{x,y} = \Phi_{x,X} \circ \Phi_{X,y}$, we obtain $\Phi_{x,y}\theta = \Phi_{x\lambda,X} \circ \Phi_{X,y\mu} = \Phi_{x\lambda,y\mu}$. Applying θ to $\Phi_{x,x} = \Phi_{x,x} \circ \Phi_{x,x}$ we obtain $\Phi_{x,x}\theta = \Phi_{x\lambda,x\mu} = \Phi_{x\lambda,x\mu} \circ \Phi_{x\lambda,x\mu}$. Since $\Phi_{x\lambda,x\mu} \neq \emptyset$ for every x in X , we conclude that $x\lambda = x\mu$, and hence that $\lambda = \mu$. We have thus shown that there is a permutation λ of X such that $\Phi_{x,y}\theta = \Phi_{x\lambda,y\lambda}$.

By (24), θ agrees with the inner automorphism $\bar{\lambda}$ of \mathcal{B}_X on $\{\Phi_{x,y} : x, y \in X\}$, and so $\theta = \bar{\lambda}$ by Lemma 6. Hence θ is inner, which concludes the proof of Magill's Theorem.

4. ENDOMORPHISMS OF \mathcal{B}_X WHEN X IS FINITE

In Theorem 3, if $E \neq \emptyset$, then μ must map E onto X . If X is finite, $E \neq \emptyset$ implies that $E = X$, that μ is a permutation of X , and that $F = \emptyset$, hence $\zeta = \emptyset$. Furthermore, the condition $\pi \circ \mu = E \times X = X \times X$, with μ a permutation of X , requires that $\pi = X \times X$. (22) thus reduces to $\alpha\theta = \mu \circ \alpha \circ \mu^{-1}$; that is, θ is an inner automorphism. On the other hand, if $E = \emptyset$, then $\pi = \emptyset$, and (22) reduces to $\alpha\theta = \zeta$. Thus the following is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.

Theorem 4. *Let X be a finite set. Every endomorphism θ of \mathcal{B}_X which preserves*

unions and symmetry is either an inner automorphism of \mathcal{B}_X , or else maps \mathcal{B}_X onto a single partial equivalence ζ .

We conclude with a theorem in which the properties of preserving unions and symmetry are not in the hypothesis, but (for finite X) are consequences of the conclusion. Since the two hypotheses of Theorem 5 are satisfied by any automorphism of \mathcal{B}_X , we get a simple proof of Magill's Theorem (for finite X), depending only on Lemma 1 and Lemma 6.

Theorem 4 shows that Theorem 5 would be false if we omitted the hypothesis (i). We give an example to show that we likewise cannot omit the hypothesis (ii).

Example 2. Let $\theta : \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_X$ map every unit $\bar{\lambda}$ of \mathcal{B}_X onto itself (λ a permutation of X), and let θ map every non-unit of \mathcal{B}_X onto \emptyset . (This works for X finite because the set of non-units of \mathcal{B}_X is an ideal of \mathcal{B}_X , which is not so if X is infinite.) It is clear that θ is an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X . This also affords us an example of an endomorphism preserving \emptyset and symmetry (in fact, converses), but not unions.

Theorem 5. *Let X be a finite set. Let θ be an endomorphism of \mathcal{B}_X satisfying (i) $\emptyset\theta = \emptyset$, and (ii) $\Phi_{x,y}\theta \neq \emptyset$ for at least one pair (x, y) in $X \times X$. Then θ is an inner automorphism of \mathcal{B}_X .*

Proof. Let $\eta_{x,y} = \Phi_{x,y}\theta$. By (i), $\{\eta_{x,y} : (x, y) \in X \times X\}$ is a matricial family. By (ii), $\eta_{x,y} \neq \emptyset$ for at least one pair (x, y) , and, by Lemma 1, $\eta_{x,y} \neq \emptyset$ for every pair (x, y) . Let D_x be the domain and R_x the range of $\eta_{x,x}$. By Lemma 1, the domain of $\eta_{x,y}$ is D_x and its range is R_y , and $D_x \cap R_y = \emptyset$ if and only if $x \neq y$. In particular, $E_x = D_x \cap R_x \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, if $x \neq y$, $E_x \cap E_y \subseteq D_x \cap R_y = \emptyset$.

Since X is finite, these facts imply that each E_x is a one-element set. Denoting the element of E_x by $x\lambda$, it follows that λ is a permutation of X . (λ is the inverse of the mapping μ defined by (12).)

It follows that R_x and D_x are also one-element sets. For suppose that R_x contained some element other than $x\lambda$. Since λ is a permutation, this additional element is $y\lambda$ for some $y \neq x$ in X . But $y\lambda \in E_y \subseteq D_y$, contradicting $R_x \cap D_y = \emptyset$. Thus $R_x = E_x = \{x\lambda\}$. Similarly, $D_x = E_x$ for each x in X . Since $\eta_{x,y} \subseteq D_x \times R_y$, it follows that $\eta_{x,y} = \Phi_{x\lambda,y\lambda}$. Thus $\Phi_{x,y}\theta = \Phi_{x\lambda,y\lambda}$.

Comparing with (24), θ and $\bar{\lambda}$ have the same effect on the one-element relations $\Phi_{x,y}$, and both map \emptyset onto \emptyset . By Lemma 6, they coincide. Thus the given endomorphism θ is equal to the inner automorphism $\bar{\lambda}$ of \mathcal{B}_X .

References

- [1] *A. H. Clifford and G. B. Preston*: The Algebraic Theory of Semigroups, Vol. 1, Amer. Math. Soc., Math. Surveys No. 7, 1961.
- [2] *Maurice Crestey*: Applications multiformes partielles, Collectanea Mathematica, Univ. of Barcelona 16 (1964), 111–126 (Math. Rev. 34, 262).
- [3] *L. M. Gluskin*: Ideals of semigroups of transformations (Russian), Mat. Sb. (N.S.) 47 (1959), 111–130 (Math. Rev. 21, 4197).
- [4] *L. M. Gluskin*: Automorphisms of semigroups of binary relations (Russian), Ural. Gos. Univ. Mat. Zap. 6, tetrad' 1, 44–54 (1967) (Math. Rev. 36, 1560).
- [5] *E. S. Ljapin*: Semigroups, Moscow 1960; Amer. Math. Soc. Translation, 1963.
- [6] *Kenneth D. Magill, Jr.*: Automorphisms of the semigroup of all relations on a set, Canad. Math. Bull. 9 (1966), 73–77 (Math. Rev. 34, 263).
- [7] *A. I. Malcev*: Symmetric groupoids (Russian), Mat. Sb. (N.S.) 31 (1952), 136–151 (Math. Rev. 14, 349).
- [8] *I. Schreier*: Über Abbildungen einer abstrakten Menge auf ihre Teilmenge, Fund. Math. 28 (1937), 261–264.
- [9] *K. A. Zareckii*: The semigroup of completely effective binary relations (Russian), Theory of Semigroups and Applications I (Russian), pp. 238–250, Izdat. Saratov. Univ., Saratov, 1965.

Author's addresses: *A. H. Clifford*, New Orleans, La., U.S.A. (Tulane University); *D. D. Miller*, Knoxville, Tenn., U.S.A. (University of Tennessee).