

# Stationary subsets of functional Menger $\cap$ -algebras of multiplace functions

Wiesław A. Dudek and Valentin S. Trokhimenko

## Abstract

A functional Menger  $\cap$ -algebra is a set of  $n$ -place functions containing  $n$  projections and closed under the so-called Menger's compositions of  $n$ -place functions and the set-theoretic intersection of functions. We give the abstract characterization for these subsets of functional Menger  $\cap$ -algebras which contain functions with fixed points.

## 1 Introduction

Investigation of multiplace functions by algebraic methods plays a very important role in modern mathematics where we consider various operations on sets of functions which are naturally defined. The basic operation for functions is superposition (composition), but there are some other naturally defined operations, which are also worth of consideration. For example, the operation of set-theoretic intersection and the operation of projections (see for example [1, 2, 3, 7, 8]). In this study the central role play sets of functions with fixed points. The study of such sets for functions of one variable was initiated by B. M. Schein in [5] and [6]. Then it was continued by V. S. Trokhimenko (see [9, 10, 11]) and W.A. Dudek [4] for sets of functions of  $n$  variables.

In this paper, we consider the sets of  $n$ -place functions containing  $n$ -projections and closed under the so-called Menger's composition and set-theoretic intersection of  $n$ -place functions. For such functional Menger  $\cap$ -algebras we give the abstract characterization for subsets of functions with fixed points.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $A^n$  be the  $n$ -th Cartesian product of a set  $A$ . Any partial mapping from  $A^n$  into  $A$  is called an  *$n$ -place function* on  $A$ . The set of all such mappings is denoted by  $\mathcal{F}(A^n, A)$ . On  $\mathcal{F}(A^n, A)$  we define one  $(n+1)$ -ary superposition  $\mathcal{O}: (f, g_1, \dots, g_n) \mapsto f[g_1 \dots g_n]$ , called the *Menger's composition*, and  $n$  unary

operations  $\mathcal{R}_i: f \mapsto \mathcal{R}_i f$ ,  $i \in \overline{1, n} = \{1, \dots, n\}$  putting

$$f[g_1 \dots g_n](a_1, \dots, a_n) = f(g_1(a_1, \dots, a_n), \dots, g_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_i f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = a_i, \text{ where } (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \text{pr}_1 f, \quad (2)$$

for  $f, g_1, \dots, g_n \in \mathcal{F}(A^n, A)$ ,  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A^n$ , where  $\text{pr}_1 f$  denotes the domain of a function  $f$ . It is assumed the left and right hand side of equality (1) are defined, or not defined, simultaneously. Algebras of the form  $(\Phi, \mathcal{O}, \cap, \mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_n)$ , where  $\Phi \subseteq \mathcal{F}(A^n, A)$  and  $\cap$  is a set-theoretic intersection, are called *functional Menger  $\cap$ -algebras of  $n$ -place functions*. In the literature such algebras are also called *functional Menger  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebras* (see [1] and [11]). The set of functions from  $\Phi$  for which there exists fixed point, i.e., the set

$$\mathbf{St}(\Phi) = \{f \in \Phi \mid (\exists a \in A) f(a, \dots, a) = a\},$$

is called the *stationary subset* of  $\Phi$ .

Let  $(G, o)$  be a nonempty set with one  $(n+1)$ -ary operation

$$o: (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto x_0[x_1 \dots x_n].$$

An algebra  $\mathcal{G} = (G, o, \wedge, R_1, \dots, R_n)$  of type  $(n+1, 2, 1, \dots, 1)$  where  $(G, \wedge)$  is a semilattice and for all  $i, k \in \overline{1, n}$  it satisfies the following axioms:

- A<sub>1</sub>:**  $x[y_1 \dots y_n][z_1 \dots z_n] = x[y_1[z_1 \dots z_n] \dots y_n[z_1 \dots z_n]],$
- A<sub>2</sub>:**  $x[R_1 x \dots R_n x] = x,$
- A<sub>3</sub>:**  $x[\bar{u} \mid_i z][R_1 y \dots R_n y] = x[\bar{u} \mid_i z[R_1 y \dots R_n y]],$
- A<sub>4</sub>:**  $R_i x[R_1 y \dots R_n y] = (R_i x)[R_1 y \dots R_n y],$
- A<sub>5</sub>:**  $x[R_1 y \dots R_n y][R_1 z \dots R_n z] = x[R_1 z \dots R_n z][R_1 y \dots R_n y],$
- A<sub>6</sub>:**  $R_i x[y_1 \dots y_n] = R_i((R_k x)[y_1 \dots y_n]),$
- A<sub>7</sub>:**  $(R_i x)[y_1 \dots y_n] = y_i[R_1(x[y_1 \dots y_n]) \dots R_n(x[y_1 \dots y_n])],$
- A<sub>8</sub>:**  $x \wedge y[R_1 z \dots R_n z] = (x \wedge y)[R_1 z \dots R_n z],$
- A<sub>9</sub>:**  $x \wedge y = x[R_1(x \wedge y) \dots R_n(x \wedge y)],$
- A<sub>10</sub>:**  $(x \wedge y)[z_1 \dots z_n] = x[z_1 \dots z_n] \wedge y[z_1 \dots z_n],$

where  $x[\bar{u} \mid_i z]$  means  $x[u_1 \dots u_{i-1} z u_{i+1} \dots u_n]$ , is called a *functional Menger  $\wedge$ -algebra of rank  $n$* .

Any Menger algebra of rank  $n$ , i.e., an abstract groupoid  $(G, o)$  with an  $(n+1)$ -ary operation satisfying **A<sub>1</sub>**, is isomorphic to some set of  $n$ -place functions closed under Menger's composition [7]. Functional Menger  $\wedge$ -algebras are isomorphic to some functional Menger  $\cap$ -algebras of  $n$ -place functions (see [1]). Each homomorphism of such abstract algebras into corresponding algebras of  $n$ -place functions is called a *representation by  $n$ -place functions*. Representations which are isomorphisms are called *faithful*.

Let  $(P_i)_{i \in I}$  be the family of representations of a Menger algebra  $(G, o)$  of rank  $n$  by  $n$ -place functions defined on sets  $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ , respectively. By the *union*

of this family we mean the mapping  $P: g \mapsto P(g)$ , where  $g \in G$ , and  $P(g)$  is an  $n$ -place function on  $A = \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$  defined by

$$P(g) = \bigcup_{i \in I} P_i(g).$$

If  $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$  for all  $i, j \in I$ ,  $i \neq j$ , then  $P$  is called the *sum* of  $(P_i)_{i \in I}$  and is denoted by  $P = \sum_{i \in I} P_i$ . It is not difficult to see that the sum of representations is a representation, but the union of representations may not be a representation (see for example [1] – [8]).

Let  $\mathcal{G} = (G, o, \wedge, R_1, \dots, R_n)$  be an functional Menger  $\wedge$ -algebra of rank  $n$ . We shall say that a nonempty subset  $H$  of  $G$  is called

- *$\wedge$ -quasi-stable*, if for all  $x \in G$

$$x \in H \longrightarrow x[x \dots x] \wedge x \in H,$$

- an  *$l$ -ideal*, if for all  $x, y_1, \dots, y_n \in G$

$$(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in G^n \setminus (G \setminus H)^n \longrightarrow x[y_1 \dots y_n] \in H.$$

A binary relation  $\rho \subseteq G \times G$  is called

- *stable*, if

$$(x, y), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n) \in \rho \longrightarrow (x[x_1 \dots x_n], y[y_1 \dots y_n]) \in \rho$$

for all  $x, y, x_i, y_i \in G$ ,  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ ,

- *$l$ -regular*, if

$$(x, y) \in \rho \longrightarrow (x[z_1 \dots z_n], y[z_1 \dots z_n]) \in \rho$$

for all  $x, y, z_i \in G$ ,  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ ,

- *$v$ -regular*, if

$$(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n) \in \rho \longrightarrow (z[x_1 \dots x_n], z[y_1 \dots y_n]) \in \rho$$

for all  $x_i, y_i, z \in G$ ,  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ ,

- *$i$ -regular*, where  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ , if

$$(x, y) \in \rho \longrightarrow (u[\bar{w} \mid_i x], u[\bar{w} \mid_i y]) \in \rho$$

for all  $x, y, u \in G$ ,  $\bar{w} \in G^n$ ,

- *$v$ -negative*, if

$$(x[y_1 \dots y_n], y_i) \in \rho$$

for all  $x, y_1, \dots, y_n \in G$  and  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ .

On  $\mathcal{G}$  we define two binary relations  $\zeta$  and  $\chi$  putting

$$(x, y) \in \zeta \longleftrightarrow x = y[R_1x \dots R_nx], \quad (x, y) \in \chi \longleftrightarrow (R_1x, R_1y) \in \zeta.$$

The first relation is a stable order, the second is an  $l$ -regular and  $v$ -negative quasi-order containing  $\zeta$  (see [8]). For these two relations the following conditions are valid:

$$\begin{aligned} x \leq y &\longrightarrow R_ix \leq R_iy, \quad i \in \overline{1, n}, & x \sqsubset y &\longleftrightarrow R_ix \leq R_iy, \quad i \in \overline{1, n}, \\ x \sqsubset y &\longleftrightarrow x[R_1y \dots R_ny] = x, & (R_ix)[y_1 \dots y_n] &\leq y_i, \quad i \in \overline{1, n}, \\ x[R_1y_1 \dots R_ny_n] &\leq x, & R_ix &= R_iR_kx, \quad i, k \in \overline{1, n}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $x \leq y \longleftrightarrow (x, y) \in \zeta$ , and  $x \sqsubset y \longleftrightarrow (x, y) \in \chi$ .

Let  $W$  be the empty set or an  $l$ -ideal which is an  $\mathcal{E}$ -class of a  $v$ -regular equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}$  defined on a Menger algebra  $(G, o)$  of rank  $n$ . Denote by  $(H_a)_{a \in A_{\mathcal{E}}}$  the family of all  $\mathcal{E}$ -classes (uniquely indexed by elements of some set  $A_{\mathcal{E}}$ ) such that  $H_a \neq W$ . Next, for every  $g \in G$  we define on  $A_{\mathcal{E}}$  an  $n$ -place function  $P_{(\mathcal{E}, W)}(g)$  putting

$$P_{(\mathcal{E}, W)}(g)(a_1, \dots, a_n) = b \longleftrightarrow g[H_{a_1} \dots H_{a_n}] \subseteq H_b, \quad (3)$$

where  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \text{pr}_1 P_{(\mathcal{E}, W)}(g) \longleftrightarrow g[H_{a_1} \dots H_{a_n}] \cap W = \emptyset$ , and  $H_b$  is an  $\mathcal{E}$ -class containing all elements of the form  $g[h_1 \dots h_n]$ ,  $h_i \in H_{a_i}$ ,  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ . It is not difficult to see [3] that the mapping  $P_{(\mathcal{E}, W)}: g \mapsto P_{(\mathcal{E}, W)}(g)$  satisfies the identity

$$P_{(\mathcal{E}, W)}(g[g_1 \dots g_n]) = P_{(\mathcal{E}, W)}(g)[P_{(\mathcal{E}, W)}(g_1) \dots P_{(\mathcal{E}, W)}(g_n)], \quad (4)$$

i.e.,  $P_{(\mathcal{E}, W)}$  is a representation of  $(G, o)$  by  $n$ -place functions. This representation will be called *simplest*.

### 3 Stationary subsets

The important properties of the stationary subset  $\mathbf{St}(\Phi)$  of the algebra  $(\Phi, \mathcal{O})$ , where  $\Phi \subseteq \mathcal{F}(A^n, A)$ , are presented in the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** *The stationary subset  $\mathbf{St}(\Phi)$  of the algebra  $(\Phi, \mathcal{O})$  has the fol-*

lowing properties:

$$f \subseteq g \wedge f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi) \longrightarrow g \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi), \quad (5)$$

$$f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi) \longrightarrow f[f \dots f] \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi), \quad (6)$$

$$f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi) \longrightarrow \mathcal{R}_i f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi), \quad (7)$$

$$f[g \dots g] = g \wedge g \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi) \longrightarrow f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi), \quad (8)$$

$$f[g \dots g] = g \neq \mathbf{0} \longrightarrow f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi), \quad (9)$$

$$f[g \dots g] \neq \mathbf{0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{R}_i f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi), \quad (10)$$

$$f[g \dots g] \cap g \neq \mathbf{0} \longrightarrow f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi), \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{0} \notin \mathbf{St}(\Phi) \longrightarrow \mathcal{R}_i \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (12)$$

where  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ ,  $f, g \in \Phi$  and  $\mathbf{0}$  is a zero of  $(\Phi, \mathcal{O})$ .

*Proof.* If  $f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi)$ , then  $f(a, \dots, a) = a$ , whence, by  $f \subseteq g$ , we obtain  $g(a, \dots, a) = a$ . Thus  $g \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi)$ . This proves (5).

For  $f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi)$  we have also

$$f[f \dots f](a, \dots, a) = f(f(a, \dots, a), \dots, f(a, \dots, a)) = f(a, \dots, a) = a.$$

This implies  $f[f \dots f] \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi)$ . So, (6) is valid too. The proof of (7) is analogous.

If  $g \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi)$  and  $f[g \dots g] = g$ , then, for some  $a \in A$ , we have  $g(a, \dots, a) = a$ . Consequently,  $f(a, \dots, a) = f(g(a, \dots, a), \dots, g(a, \dots, a)) = f[g \dots g](a, \dots, a) = g(a, \dots, a) = a$ . Thus  $f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi)$ . This proves (8).

Let now  $f[g \dots g] = g \neq \mathbf{0}$ , where  $\mathbf{0}$  is a zero of  $(\Phi, \mathcal{O})$ . Then  $g \neq \emptyset$ . Thus there exists  $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \text{pr}_1 g$ . Therefore  $f(g(\bar{a}) \dots g(\bar{a})) = f[g \dots g](\bar{a}) = g(\bar{a})$ , which implies  $f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi)$ . The condition (9) is proved. Similarly we can prove (10) and (11).

Observe that

$$\mathbf{0} \neq \emptyset \longleftrightarrow \mathbf{St}(\Phi) = \Phi. \quad (13)$$

Indeed, if  $\mathbf{0} \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\mathbf{0}(\bar{a}) = b$  for some  $\bar{a} \in A^n$  and  $b \in A$ . Since  $\mathbf{0} = f[\mathbf{0} \dots \mathbf{0}]$  for every  $f \in \Phi$ , we have  $b = \mathbf{0}(\bar{a}) = f(\mathbf{0}(\bar{a}), \dots, \mathbf{0}(\bar{a})) = f(b, \dots, b)$ . Thus  $f \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi)$ . Consequently,  $\mathbf{St}(\Phi) = \Phi$ . Conversely, if  $\mathbf{St}(\Phi) = \Phi$ , then  $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi)$ . Therefore  $\mathbf{0}(a, \dots, a) = a$  for some  $a \in A$ . So,  $\mathbf{0} \neq \emptyset$ .

Using just proved equivalence we can see that in the case  $\mathbf{0} \notin \mathbf{St}(\Phi)$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{St}(\Phi) \neq \Phi$ , must be  $\mathbf{0} = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{R}_i \mathbf{0} = \mathcal{R}_i \emptyset = \emptyset = \mathbf{0}$  for every  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ . This proves (12) and completes the proof of Proposition 1.  $\square$

Note that in a functional Menger  $\cap$ -algebra  $(\Phi, \mathcal{O}, \cap, \mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_n)$  of  $n$ -place functions without a zero  $\mathbf{0}$  the subset  $\mathbf{St}(\Phi)$  coincides with  $\Phi$ . Indeed, in this algebra  $f \neq \emptyset$  for any  $f \in \Phi$ . Consequently,  $f \cap g[f \dots f] \neq \emptyset$  for all  $f, g \in \Phi$ . Hence,  $g[f \dots f](\bar{a}) = f(\bar{a})$ , i.e.,  $g(f(\bar{a}), \dots, f(\bar{a})) = f(\bar{a})$  for some  $\bar{a} \in A^n$ . This

means that  $g \in \mathbf{St}(\Phi)$ . Thus,  $\Phi \subseteq \mathbf{St}(\Phi) \subseteq \Phi$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{St}(\Phi) = \Phi$ . Therefore, below we will consider only functional Menger  $\cap$ -algebras with a zero.

Let  $\mathcal{G} = (G, o, \wedge, R_1, \dots, R_n)$  be a functional Menger  $\wedge$ -algebra of rank  $n$ .

**Definition 1.** A nonempty subset  $H$  of  $G$  is called a *stationary subset* of a functional Menger  $\wedge$ -algebra  $\mathcal{G}$  of rank  $n$  if there exists its faithful representation  $P$  by  $n$ -place functions such that

$$g \in H \longleftrightarrow P(g) \in \mathbf{St}(P(G)) \quad (14)$$

for every  $g \in G$ , where  $P(G) = \{P(g) \mid g \in G\}$ .

**Theorem 1.** For a nonempty subset  $H$  of  $G$  to be a stationary subset of a functional Menger  $\wedge$ -algebra  $\mathcal{G}$  with a zero  $\mathbf{0}$ , it is necessary and sufficient to be a  $\wedge$ -quasi-stable subset satisfying for all  $x, y \in G$  and  $i \in \overline{1, n}$  the following three conditions:

$$\mathbf{0} \notin H \longrightarrow R_i \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (15)$$

$$x[y \dots y] = y \in H \longrightarrow x \in H, \quad (16)$$

$$x[y \dots y] \wedge y \neq \mathbf{0} \longrightarrow x \in H. \quad (17)$$

*Proof.* The necessity of these conditions is a consequence of our Proposition 1, therefore we shall prove only their sufficiency. For this assume that a nonempty subset  $H$  of  $G$  satisfies all the conditions of the theorem and consider on  $G$  a binary relation  $\mathcal{E}_g$  and a subset  $W_g$  defined in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_g &= \{(x, y) \in G \times G \mid g \sqsubset x \wedge y \vee x, y \notin \chi(g)\}, \\ W_g &= \{x \in G \mid x \notin \chi(g)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $g \in G$  is fixed. Such defined relation  $\mathcal{E}_g$  is a  $v$ -regular equivalence for which each nonempty  $W_g$  is an  $\mathcal{E}_g$ -class and an  $l$ -ideal simultaneously (for details see [1]). Thus the pair  $(\mathcal{E}_g, W_g)$  determines the simplest representation  $P_g = P_{(\mathcal{E}_g, W_g)}$  of  $(G, o)$  by  $n$ -place functions. In [1] it is proved, that  $P_g$  is also a representation of  $\mathcal{G}$ , because it satisfies, except (4), the equalities

$$P_g(x \wedge y) = P_g(x) \cap P_g(y), \quad P_g(R_i x) = \mathcal{R}_i P_g(x)$$

for all  $x, y \in G$  and  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ . Hence  $P = \sum_{h \in G_0} P_h$ , where  $G_0 = G \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  if  $\mathbf{0} \notin H$ , and  $G_0 = G$ , if  $\mathbf{0} \in H$ , is a representation of  $\mathcal{G}$  also. We must only prove that  $P$  is faithful representation, which satisfies the condition (14).

First we shall show that  $H$  satisfies the condition

$$\mathbf{0} \in H \longrightarrow H = G. \quad (18)$$

Indeed, let  $g \in G$  be any element of algebra  $\mathcal{G}$ , then  $g[\mathbf{0} \dots \mathbf{0}] = \mathbf{0} \in H$ , from where by axiom (16) we obtain  $g \in H$ . So,  $G \subseteq H \subseteq G$ , hence,  $H = G$ . The condition (18) is proved.

Now we shall prove that  $H$  is its stationary subset of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Let  $g \in H$  and  $P_0 = P_{(\mathcal{E}_0, W_0)}$ . If  $\mathbf{0} \in H$ , then  $G_0 = G = H$ , whence  $\mathbf{0} \in G_0$ . Since  $g \notin W_g$  for every  $g \in G$ , we have  $\mathbf{0} \notin W_0$ . Let  $X$  be this  $\mathcal{E}_0$ -class, indexed by  $a$ , which contains  $\mathbf{0}$ . Clearly  $X \neq W_0$ . From  $g[\mathbf{0} \dots \mathbf{0}] = \mathbf{0}$ , applying the  $v$ -regularity of  $\mathcal{E}_0$ , we obtain  $g[X \dots X] \subseteq X$ . Consequently,  $P_0(g)(a, \dots, a) = a$ . Hence,  $P(g)(a, \dots, a) = a$ , which proves  $P(g) \in \mathbf{St}(P(G))$ .

Now let  $\mathbf{0} \notin H$ . Then  $G_0 = G \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  and  $h = g \wedge g[g \dots g] \in H$  for every  $g \in H$ , because  $H$  is  $\wedge$ -quasi-stable. Thus  $h \neq \mathbf{0}$ , whence  $h \in G_0$ . We shall consider the representation  $P_h$ . Since  $h \notin W_h$ , we have  $g \wedge g[g \dots g] \notin W_h$ . Consequently,  $g \equiv g[g \dots g](\mathcal{E}_h)$ . Moreover, from

$$\begin{aligned} h[R_1 g \dots R_n g] &= (g \wedge g[g \dots g])[R_1 g \dots R_n g] \\ &\stackrel{\mathbf{A}_8}{=} g \wedge g[g \dots g][R_1 g \dots R_n g] \\ &\stackrel{\mathbf{A}_1}{=} g \wedge g[g[R_1 g \dots R_n g] \dots g[R_1 g \dots R_n g]] \\ &\stackrel{\mathbf{A}_2}{=} g \wedge g[g \dots g] = h \end{aligned}$$

it follows  $h[R_1 g \dots R_n g] = h$ . Therefore  $h \sqsubset g$ , which means that  $g \notin W_h$ . Let  $Y$  denotes the  $\mathcal{E}_h$ -class containing  $g$ . Clearly,  $Y \neq W_h$  and  $g[Y \dots Y] \subseteq Y$ . Hence  $P_h(g)(b, \dots, b) = b$ , where  $b$  is an element used as index of  $Y$ . Thus  $P(g)(b, \dots, b) = b$ . This means that also in this case  $g \in H$  implies  $P(g) \in \mathbf{St}(P(G))$ .

To prove the converse implication let  $P(g) \in \mathbf{St}(P(G))$  for some  $g \in G$ . Because  $P = \sum_{h \in G_0} P_h$ , there exists  $h \in G$  such that  $P_h(g)$  has a fixed point. If  $\mathbf{0} \notin H$ , then  $G_0 = G \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  and  $h \neq \mathbf{0}$ . Let  $X = H_a$  be this  $\mathcal{E}_h$ -class for which  $P_h(g)(a, \dots, a) = a$ , i.e.,  $g[X \dots X] \subseteq X$ , where  $X \neq W_h$ . Obviously, for any  $x \in X$  we have  $g[x \dots x] \equiv x(\mathcal{E}_h)$ . This means that  $x \wedge g[x \dots x] \notin W_h$  for any  $x \in X$ . Therefore

$$h[R_1(x \wedge g[x \dots x]) \dots R_n(x \wedge g[x \dots x])] = h \neq \mathbf{0},$$

whence  $R_i(x \wedge g[x \dots x]) \neq \mathbf{0}$  for every  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ . This, in view of (15), gives  $x \wedge g[x \dots x] \neq \mathbf{0}$ . In the opposite case we have  $\mathbf{0} \in H$ , which is impossible. Applying (17) to  $x \wedge g[x \dots x] \neq \mathbf{0}$  we obtain  $g \in H$ . If  $\mathbf{0} \in H$ , then by the condition (18) we have  $H = G$  and therefore  $g \in H$ .

Thus we have proved that  $g$  satisfies (14). So,  $H$  is a stationary subset of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

For completeness of the proof we must show that the representation  $P$  is faithful. If  $P(g_1) = P(g_2)$ , then  $P(g_1) \subseteq P(g_2)$  and  $P(g_2) \subseteq P(g_1)$ , whence  $g_1 \leq g_2$  and  $g_2 \leq g_1$  (for details see [1]). This implies  $g_1 = g_2$ , because  $\leq$  is an order.  $\square$

Conditions formulated in the above theorem are not identical with the conditions used for a characterization of stationary subsets of restrictive Menger  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebras (see Theorem 8 in [11]). For example, the implication

$$x \leq y \wedge x \in H \longrightarrow y \in H$$

is omitted. Nevertheless, as it is proved below, stationary subsets of functional Menger  $\wedge$ -algebras with a zero have the same properties as stationary subsets of restrictive Menger  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebras.

**Theorem 2.** *For a stationary subset  $H$  of a functional Menger  $\wedge$ -algebra  $\mathcal{G}$  with a zero  $\mathbf{0}$  the following implications:*

$$\mathbf{0} \notin H \longrightarrow \mathbf{0} \leq x, \quad (19)$$

$$x \leq y \wedge x \in H \longrightarrow y \in H, \quad (20)$$

$$x \in H \longrightarrow x[x \dots x] \in H, \quad (21)$$

$$x \in H \longrightarrow R_i x \in H, \quad (22)$$

$$x[y \dots y] \neq \mathbf{0} \longrightarrow R_i x \in H, \quad (23)$$

$$x[y \dots y] = y \neq \mathbf{0} \longrightarrow x \in H, \quad (24)$$

$$x \in H \wedge x \sqsubset y \longrightarrow R_i y \in H, \quad (25)$$

$$\mathbf{0} \notin H \wedge x \sqsubset \mathbf{0} \longrightarrow x = \mathbf{0} \quad (26)$$

are valid for all  $x, y \in G$  and  $i = \overline{1, n}$ .

*Proof.* If  $\mathbf{0} \notin H$ , then, by (15), we obtain  $R_i \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{0} = x[\mathbf{0} \dots \mathbf{0}] = x[R_1 \mathbf{0} \dots R_n \mathbf{0}]$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{0} = x[R_1 \mathbf{0} \dots R_n \mathbf{0}]$  for any  $x \in G$ . So,  $\mathbf{0} \leq x$ . This proves (19).

Now, let the premise of (20) be satisfied, i.e.,  $x \leq y$  and  $x \in H$  for some  $x, y \in G$ . If  $\mathbf{0} \in H$ , then  $H = G$  by (18). Therefore  $y \in H$ . If  $\mathbf{0} \notin H$ , then, according to (19), for every  $x \in G$  we have  $\mathbf{0} \leq x$ . Since  $x \in H$ , the  $\wedge$ -quasi-stability of  $H$  implies  $x[x \dots x] \wedge x \in H$ . Hence  $x[x \dots x] \wedge x \neq \mathbf{0}$ , because  $\mathbf{0} \notin H$ . From  $x \leq y$ , by the stability of  $\leq$ , we conclude  $x[x \dots x] \leq y[x \dots x]$ . Consequently,  $x[x \dots x] \wedge x \leq y[x \dots x] \wedge x$ . However  $\mathbf{0} \leq x[x \dots x] \wedge x$ , therefore

$$\mathbf{0} \leq x[x \dots x] \wedge x \leq y[x \dots x] \wedge x.$$

Since  $x[x \dots x] \wedge x \neq \mathbf{0}$ , the above gives  $y[x \dots x] \wedge x \neq \mathbf{0}$ , because in the opposite case, by antisymmetry of  $\leq$ , we obtain  $x[x \dots x] \wedge x = \mathbf{0}$ , which is impossible. So,  $y[x \dots x] \wedge x \neq \mathbf{0}$ , whence, according to (17), we conclude  $y \in H$ . This completes the proof of (20).

To prove (21) observe that for  $x \in H$ , by the  $\wedge$ -quasi-stability, we also have  $x[x \dots x] \wedge x \in H$ , which in view of  $x[x \dots x] \wedge x \leq x[x \dots x]$  and (20) implies  $x[x \dots x] \in H$ . So, (21) is valid too.

Now, we shall verify (22). Let  $x \in H$ . If  $\mathbf{0} \in H$  then, as it was proved in the proof of Theorem 1,  $H = G$ . Thus, in this case,  $R_i x \in H$  for every  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ . If  $\mathbf{0} \notin H$ , then, evidently,  $x \neq \mathbf{0}$ . Consequently,  $R_i x \neq \mathbf{0}$  for every  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ , because in the opposite case from **A<sub>2</sub>** it follows  $x = \mathbf{0}$ . This, together with (21), gives  $x[x \dots x] \neq \mathbf{0}$  and  $R_i x[x \dots x] \neq \mathbf{0}$ . Now, applying **A<sub>6</sub>**, we obtain  $\mathbf{0} \neq R_i((R_k x)[x \dots x])$ , whence, by (15), we deduce  $(R_k x)[x \dots x] \neq \mathbf{0}$  for every



$k \in \overline{1, n}$ . Since  $(R_k x)[x \dots x] \leq x$ , we have

$$(R_k x)[x \dots x] \wedge x = (R_k x)[x \dots x] \neq \mathbf{0},$$

which, by (17), implies  $R_k x \in H$  for all  $k \in \overline{1, n}$ . The condition (22) is proved.

The proof of (23) is similar to the proof of (22). Namely, let  $x[y \dots y] \neq \mathbf{0}$  for some  $x, y \in G$ . If  $\mathbf{0} \in H$ , then, as in the previous case,  $H = G$ . Hence  $R_i x \in H$  for every  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ . If  $\mathbf{0} \notin H$ , then  $R_i x[y \dots y] \neq \mathbf{0}$  for all  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ , because in the case  $R_i x[y \dots y] = \mathbf{0}$ , by **A**<sub>2</sub>, we obtain  $x[y \dots y] = x[y \dots y][R_1 x[y \dots y] \dots R_n x[y \dots y]] = \mathbf{0}$  which contradicts to our assumption. Next, applying **A**<sub>6</sub>, we get  $\mathbf{0} \neq R_i x[y \dots y] = R_i((R_k x)[y \dots y])$ , whence we deduce  $(R_k x)[y \dots y] \neq \mathbf{0}$  for each  $k \in \overline{1, n}$ . In fact, from the above, for  $(R_k x)[y \dots y] = \mathbf{0}$  it follows  $R_i \mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{0}$ . This contradicts to (15). Further,  $(R_k x)[y \dots y] \leq y$  gives

$$(R_k x)[y \dots y] \wedge y = (R_k x)[y \dots y] \neq \mathbf{0},$$

whence, by (17), we obtain  $R_k x \in H$ . This completes the proof of (23).

If  $x[y \dots y] = y \neq \mathbf{0}$  for some  $x, y \in G$ , then  $x[y \dots y] \wedge y = x[y \dots y] \neq \mathbf{0}$ , whence, according to (17), we have  $x \in H$ . This proves (24).

Now let  $x \sqsubset y$  for some  $x \in H$  and  $y \in G$ . Then, obviously,  $R_i x \leq R_i y$  for each  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ . From this, applying (22) and (20), we obtain  $R_i y \in H$ . So, (25) is valid too.

At last, let  $\mathbf{0} \notin H$  and  $x \sqsubset \mathbf{0}$ . Then  $\mathbf{0} \leq x$ , by (19), and  $\mathbf{0} = R_i \mathbf{0}$ , by (15). Thus  $\mathbf{0} = R_i \mathbf{0} \leq R_i x$  for each  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ . But from  $x \sqsubset \mathbf{0}$  we have also  $R_i x \leq R_i \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$ . Therefore  $R_i x = \mathbf{0}$  for every  $i \in \overline{1, n}$ . Consequently,  $x = x[R_1 x \dots R_n x] = x[\mathbf{0} \dots \mathbf{0}] = \mathbf{0}$ . This completes the proof of (26) and the proof of Theorem 2.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Dudek W. A., Trokhimenko V. S.: *Functional Menger  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebras*, Commun. Algebra, 30 (2002), 5921 – 5931.
- [2] Dudek W. A., Trokhimenko V. S.: *Representations of Menger  $(2, n)$ -semigroups by multiplace functions*, Commun. Algebra, 34 (2006), 259 – 274.
- [3] Dudek W. A., Trokhimenko V. S.: *Menger algebras of multiplace functions*, (Russian), Centrul Ed. USM, Chişinău 2006.
- [4] Dudek W. A., Trokhimenko V. S.: *Stabilizers of functional Menger systems*, ArXiv: math. GM/0701364, <http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/>
- [5] Schein B. M.: *Stationary subsets, stabilizers and transitive representations of semigroups*, Dissertationes Math., 77 (1970), 3 – 36.
- [6] Schein B. M.: *Lectures on semigroups of transformations*, Amer. Math. Soc. Translat. (2), 113 (1979), 123 – 181.

- [7] Schein B. M., Trokhimenko V. S.: *Algebras of multiplace functions*, Semigroup Forum, 17 (1979), 1 – 64.
- [8] Trokhimenko V. S.: *Menger's function systems*, (Russian), Izv. Vyssh. Uchebn. Zaved. Matematika, 11 (1973), 71 – 78.
- [9] Trokhimenko V. S.: *Stationary subsets of ordered Menger algebras*, Sov. Math. **27** (1983), 106 – 108 (translation from Izv. Vyssh. Uchebn. Zaved. Matematika, 8 (1983), 82 – 84).
- [10] Trokhimenko V. S.: *Stabilizers of ordered Menger algebras*, Sov. Math. **30** (1986), 112 – 114 (translation from Izv. Vyssh. Uchebn. Zaved. Matematika, 6 (1986), 74 – 76).
- [11] Trokhimenko V. S.: *Stationary subsets and stabilizers of restrictive Menger  $\mathcal{P}$ -algebras of multiplace functions*, Algebra Universalis, 44 (2000), 129 – 142.

Dudek W. A.  
 Institute of Mathematics and  
 Computer Science  
 Wroclaw University of Technology  
 50-370 Wroclaw  
 Poland  
 E-mail: dudek@im.pwr.wroc.pl

Trokhimenko V. S.  
 Department of Mathematics  
 Pedagogical University  
 21100 Vinnitsa  
 Ukraine  
 E-mail: vtrokhim@sovamua.com