Relation algebras, idempotent semirings and generalized bunched implication algebras

Peter Jipsen

Chapman University
Center of Excellence in Computation, Algebra and Topology (CECAT)

May 18, 2017
Relational and Algebraic Methods in Computer Science
École Normale Supérieure de Lyon

Outline

- Idempotent semirings
- Involutive residuated lattices
- Generalized bunched implication algebras
- Weakening relations and WGBI
- Independence of Tarski's axioms
- Groupoid semantics

Introduction

An **idempotent semiring** (ISR) is of the form $(A, \vee, \cdot, 1)$ where

- $(A, \vee)$ is a **semilattice** (i.e., $\vee$ is assoc., comm., idempotent)
- $(A, \cdot, 1)$ is a **monoid**
- $x(y \vee z) = xy \vee xz$ and $(x \vee y)z = xz \vee yz$

Kleene algebras (KA) are ISRs expanded with $\bot, ^*$

Residuated lattices (RL) are ISRs expanded with $\wedge, \backslash, /$

Involutive residuated lattices (InRL) are RLs expanded with $0, \sim, -$ such that $\sim x = x\backslash 0$, $-x = 0/x$ and $-\sim x = x = \sim -x$

Cyclic residuated lattices are InRLs that satisfy $\sim x = -x$

Generalized bunched implication algebras are RLs expanded with $\to$

Residuated monoids (RM) are Boolean residuated lattices

Relations algebras are RMs with $x^\smile = \neg\sim x,\ (xy)^\smile = y^\smile x^\smile$

Varieties of partially ordered algebras



Varieties of partially ordered algebras



Residuated lattices

A ***residuated lattice*** is of the form $\mathbf{A} = (A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, 1, \backslash, /)$ where $(A, \wedge, \vee)$ is a lattice, $(A, \cdot, 1)$ is a monoid and $\backslash, /$ are the **left** and **right residuals** of $\cdot$, i.e., for all $x, y, z \in A$

$$xy \leq z \iff y \leq x\backslash z \iff x \leq z/y.$$

The previous formula is equivalent to the following 4 identities:

$$x \leq y\backslash(yx \vee z) \qquad x((x\backslash y) \wedge z) \leq y$$

$$x \leq (xy \vee z)/y \qquad ((x/y) \wedge z)y \leq x$$

so residuated lattices form a variety.

For an **arbitrary constant** 0 in a residuated lattice define the ***linear negations*** $\sim x = x\backslash 0$ and $-x = 0/x$

An ***involutive residuated lattice*** is a residuated lattice s.t. $\sim -x = x = -\sim x$

Involutive residuated lattices

Alternatively, $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, 1, 0, \sim, -)$ is an **involutive residuated lattice** if $(A, \wedge, \vee)$ is a lattice, $(A, \cdot, 1)$ is a monoid, $\sim -x = x = -\sim x$, $0 = -1$ and $x \leq -y \iff xy \leq 0$.

It follows that $x \backslash y = \sim(-y \cdot x)$ and $x/y = -(y \cdot \sim x)$.

An involutive residuated lattice is ***cyclic*** if $\sim x = -x$

E.g. a **relation algebra** $(A, \wedge, \vee, \neg, \cdot, ^{\smile}, 1)$ is a **cyclic involutive residuated lattice** if one defines $x \backslash y = \neg(x^{\smile} \cdot \neg y)$, $x/y = \neg(\neg x \cdot y^{\smile})$ and $0 = \neg 1$, and omits the operations $\neg, ^{\smile}$ from the signature

The **cyclic linear negation** is given by $\sim x = \neg(x^{\smile}) = (\neg x)^{\smile}$

The variety of **(cyclic) involutive residuated lattices** has a **decidable equational theory** while this is not the case for relation algebras

Generalized coupled semirings

For two algebras $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$ with the same signature, an *anti-isomorphism* $\alpha\colon \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{B}$ is like an isomorphism, except that for all binary operations $*$ we have

$$\alpha(x *^{\mathbf{A}} y) = \alpha(y) *^{\mathbf{B}} \alpha(x)$$

A *generalized coupled semiring* is a triple $((A, \vee, \cdot, 1), (A, \wedge, +, 0), \alpha)$ such that

(i) $(A, \vee, \cdot, 1)$ and $(A, \wedge, +, 0)$ are idempotent semirings
(ii) $(A, \wedge, \vee)$ is a lattice (with order denoted by $\leq$)
(iii) α is an anti-isomorphism from $(A, \vee, \cdot, 1)$ to $(A, \wedge, +, 0)$
(iv) $x \leq y$ if and only if $1 \leq \alpha(x) + y$

Theorem

Let $\mathbf{A} = (A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, 1, \backslash, /, 0)$ *be an involutive residuated lattice with linear negations* ${\sim}x = x\backslash 0$, $-x = 0/x$ *and define* $x + y = {\sim}((-y) \cdot (-x))$. *Then* $((A, \vee, \cdot, 1), (A, \wedge, +, 0), {\sim})$ *is a generalized coupled semiring.*

Involutive residuated lattices as coupled semirings

Theorem

Let $((A, \vee, \cdot, 1), (A, \wedge, +, 0), \alpha)$ *be a generalized coupled semiring and define* $x\backslash y = \alpha(\alpha^{-1}(y) \cdot x)$, $x/y = \alpha^{-1}(y \cdot \alpha(x))$. *Then* $\mathbf{A} = (A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, 1, \backslash, /, 0)$ *is an involutive residuated lattice and* $\alpha(x) = {\sim}x$. *If* $\alpha = \alpha^{-1}$ *then* $\mathbf{A}$ *is cyclic.*

Theorem

An algebra $(A, \vee, \cdot, 1, \sim, -)$ *is an involutive residuated lattice if and only if:*

- $(x \vee y) \vee z = x \vee (y \vee z), \quad x \vee y = y \vee x$
- $x(y \vee z) = xy \vee xz, \quad (x \vee y)z = xz \vee yz$
- $(xy)z = x(yz), \quad x1 = x$
- ${\sim}{-}x = x = -{\sim}x$
- ${\sim}(-(x \vee y) \vee -x) = x = {\sim}((-x) \vee -y) \vee x$ *(absorption laws)*
- $1 \leq {\sim}(x({\sim}x)), \quad x({\sim}(yx)) \leq {\sim}y$ *(equiv. to* $x \leq y \Leftrightarrow 1 \leq {\sim}(-yx)$*).*

Generalized bunched implication algebras

A **generalized bunched implication algebra** $(A, \wedge, \vee, \to, \top, \bot, \cdot, 1, \backslash, /)$ is a **residuated lattice** $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, 1, \backslash, /)$ such that $(A, \wedge, \vee, \to, \top, \bot)$ is a **Heyting algebra**, i.e., $\top, \bot$ are top and bottom elements and

$$x \wedge y \le z \iff y \le x \to z$$

or equivalently the following 2 identities hold

$$x \le y \to ((x \wedge y) \vee z) \qquad x \wedge (x \to y) \le y$$

Theorem (Galatos and J.)

*The variety **GBI** of generalized bunched implication algebras has the finite model property, hence a decidable equational theory*

The intuitionistic negation is defined as $\neg x = x \to \bot$

RA = cyclic involutive **GBI** $\cap$ Mod$(\neg\neg x = x, \neg{\sim}(xy) = (\neg{\sim}y)(\neg{\sim}x))$

Number of nonisomorphic algebras

Number of elements: $n =$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Residuated lattices	1	1	3	20	149	1488	18554	295292
GBI-algebras	1	1	3	20	115	899	7782	80468
Bunched impl. algebras	1	1	3	16	70	399	2261	14358
Involutive resid. lattices	1	1	2	9	21	101	284	1464
Cyclic resid. lattices	1	1	2	9	21	101	279	1433
Invol. GBI-algebras	1	1	2	9	8	43	49	282
Cyclic GBI-algebras	1	1	2	9	8	43	48	281
Invol. BI-algebras	1	1	2	9	8	42	46	263
Bool. invol. BI-algebras	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	25
Relation algebras	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	13

Weakening relations

Recall that RA and RRA both have **undecidable** equational theories

I. Nemeti [1987] proved that **removing associativity** from the basis of RA the resulting variety NRA of **nonassociative relation algebras** has a **decidable** equational theory

N. Galatos and J. [2012] showed that if **classical negation** in RA is weakened to a **De Morgan negation** then the resulting variety qRA of **quasi relation algebras** has a **decidable** equational theory

However there are **no natural models using binary relations**

Let $\mathbf{P} = (P, \sqsubseteq)$ be a **partially ordered** set

Let $Q \subseteq P^2$ be an **equivalence relation** that contains $\sqsubseteq$, and define the set of ***weakening relations*** on $\mathbf{P}$ by $\mathrm{Wk}(\mathbf{P}, Q) = \{\sqsubseteq \circ R \circ \sqsubseteq \,:\, R \subseteq Q\}$

Since $\sqsubseteq$ is **transitive and reflexive** $\mathrm{Wk}(\mathbf{P}, Q) = \{R \subseteq Q : \sqsubseteq \circ R \circ \sqsubseteq = R\}$

Full weakening relation algebras

If $Q = P \times P$ write $\mathrm{Wk}(\mathbf{P})$ and call it the ***full weakening relation algebra***

Weakening relations are the **analogue of binary relations** when the category **Set** of sets and functions is replaced by the category **Pos** of partially ordered sets and order-preserving functions

Since sets can be considered as **discrete posets** (i.e. ordered by the identity relation), **Pos** contains **Set** as a full subcategory, which implies that weakening relations are a **substantial generalization** of binary relations

However, weakening relations do not allow $\neg$ or $\smile$ as operations

They have applications in **sequent calculi**, **proximity lattices/spaces**, **order-enriched categories**, **cartesian bicategories**, **bi-intuitionistic modal logic**, **mathematical morphology** and **program semantics**, e.g. via **separation logic**

A small example

Let $C_2 = \{0, 1\}$ be the two element chain with $0 \sqsubseteq 1$



Figure: The full weakening relation algebra $\mathbf{Wk}(\mathbf{C}_2)$

Operations on weakening relations

$\mathsf{Wk}(\mathbf{P}, Q)$ is a **complete** and **perfect** distributive lattice under $\cup, \cap$

$\implies$ can expand $\mathsf{Wk}(\mathbf{P}, Q)$ to a **Heyting algebra** by adding $\to$

Weakening relations are closed under **composition**: for $R, S \in \mathsf{Wk}(\mathbf{P}, Q)$

$R \circ S = (\sqsubseteq \circ R \circ \sqsubseteq) \circ (\sqsubseteq \circ S \circ \sqsubseteq) = \sqsubseteq \circ (R \circ \sqsubseteq \circ S) \circ \sqsubseteq \in \mathsf{Wk}(\mathbf{P}, Q)$

$\sqsubseteq$ is an **identity element** for composition: $R \circ \sqsubseteq = R = \sqsubseteq \circ R$

$\circ$ distributes over arbitrary unions, so we can add **residuals** $\backslash, /$

So $\mathsf{Wk}(\mathbf{P}, Q)$ is a **distributive residuated lattice** with Heyting implication

Representable intuitionistic relation algebras

Theorem

$\mathbf{Wk}(\mathbf{P}, Q) = (\mathrm{Wk}(\mathbf{P}, Q), \cap, \cup, \to, Q, \emptyset, \circ, \sqsubseteq, \sim)$ *is a* ***cyclic involutive GBI-algebra****.*

In particular, $\top = Q, \qquad \bot = \emptyset,$

$R \to S = (\sqsupseteq \circ (R \cap S') \circ \sqsupseteq)'$ *where* $S' = Q - S$*,*

and $\sim R = R^{\smile\prime} = R^{\prime\smile}$*.*

In $\mathbf{Wk}(\mathbf{P})$, if $R \neq \bot$ then $\top \circ R \circ \top = \top$

If $\mathbf{P}$ is a discrete poset then $\mathbf{Wk}(\mathbf{P}) = \mathbf{Rel}(P)$ is the full representable relation algebra on the set P

So algebras of weakening relations are like representable relation algebras

Define the class WGBI of ***weakening GBI-algebras*** as all algebras that are **embedded** in a weakening algebra $\mathbf{Wk}(\mathbf{P}, Q)$ for some poset $\mathbf{P}$ and equivalence relation Q that contains $\sqsubseteq$

In fact the variety RRA is a finitely axiomatizable subvariety of WGBI

Theorem

1. WGBI *is a **discriminator variety** with* $x \leftrightarrow y = (x \to y) \wedge (y \to x)$
   $t(x, y, z) = (x \wedge \top(\sim(x \leftrightarrow y)\top) \vee (z \wedge \sim\top(\sim(x \leftrightarrow y)\top)$
2. RRA *is the subvariety of* WGBI *defined by* $\neg\neg x = x$
3. WGBI *is not finitely axiomatizable relative to the variety* GBI

Interlude: Independence of (R1)-(R10)

(R1) $x \vee y = y \vee x$
(R2) $x \vee (y \vee z) = (x \vee y) \vee z$
(R3) $\neg(\neg x \vee y) \vee \neg(\neg x \vee \neg y) = x$
(R4) $x;(y;z) = (x;y);z$
(R5) $x;1 = x$
(R6) $x^{\smile\smile} = x$
(R7) $(xy)^{\smile} = y^{\smile}x^{\smile}$
(R8) $(x \vee y);z = x;z \vee y;z$
(R9) $(x \vee y)^{\smile} = x^{\smile} \vee y^{\smile}$
(R10) $x^{\smile};\neg(x;y) \vee \neg y = \neg y$

Joint work with **H. Andreka, S. Givant** and **I. Nemeti** [to appear]

For each (Ri) show that (Ri) does not follow from the other identities

McKinsey [early 1940s] showed the independence of (R4)

Need to find an algebra A_i where (Ri) fails and the other identities hold

For example: for (R1) define $A_1 = (\{1, a\}, \vee, \neg, ;, ^{\smile}, 1)$ where 1 is an identity for ; distinct from a, $a;a = 1$, $x^{\smile} = \neg x = x$, and $x \vee y = x$

Check that (R1) fails: $1 \vee a = 1 \neq a = a \vee 1$ and (R2-R10) hold in A_1

A variant of Tarski's axioms

Theorem (Andreka, Givant, J., Nemeti)

The identities (R1)-(R10) *are an independent basis for RA.*

Somewhat surprisingly, it turns out that by modifying (R8) slightly, (R7) becomes redundant:

Let $\mathcal{R}$ = (R1)-(R6),(R9),(R10) plus (R8') $= x;(y \vee z) = x;y \vee x;z$

(R1) $x \vee y = y \vee x$
(R2) $x \vee (y \vee z) = (x \vee y) \vee z$
(R3) $\neg(\neg x \vee y) \vee \neg(\neg x \vee \neg y) = x$
(R4) $x;(y;z) = (x;y);z$
(R5) $x;1 = x$
(R6) $x^{\smile\smile} = x$
(R7) $(x;y)^{\smile} = y^{\smile};x^{\smile}$
(R8') $x;(y \vee z) = x;y \vee x;z$
(R9) $(x \vee y)^{\smile} = x^{\smile} \vee y^{\smile}$
(R10) $x^{\smile};\neg(x;y) \vee \neg y = \neg y$

Theorem (Andreka, Givant, J., Nemeti)

The identities $\mathcal{R}$ *are also an independent basis for RA.*

Another variant of Tarski's axioms

Let $\mathcal{S} =$ (R1)-(R6),(R8),(R8'),(R10)

(R1) $x \vee y = y \vee x$
(R2) $x \vee (y \vee z) = (x \vee y) \vee z$
(R3) $\neg(\neg x \vee y) \vee \neg(\neg x \vee \neg y) = x$
(R4) $x;(y;z) = (x;y);z$
(R5) $x;1 = x$

(R6) $x^{\smile\smile} = x$
(R7) $(x;y)^{\smile} = y^{\smile};x^{\smile}$
(R8) $(x \vee y);z = x;z \vee y;z$
(R8') $x;(y \vee z) = x;y \vee x;z$
(R9) $(x \vee y)^{\smile} = x^{\smile} \vee y^{\smile}$
(R10) $x^{\smile};\neg(x;y) \vee \neg y = \neg y$

Theorem (Andreka, Givant, J., Nemeti)

The identities $\mathcal{S}$ are also an independent basis for RA.

The independence models $A_1 - A_{10}$ are modified somewhat for these proofs.

All models are minimal in size and the paper also describes other models.

Poset semantics of weakening relations

Birkhoff showed that a finite distributive lattice $\mathbf{A}$ is determined by its poset $J(\mathbf{A})$ of completely join-irreducible elements (with the order induced by $\mathbf{A}$)

The result also holds for complete perfect distributive lattices

Conversely, if $\mathbf{Q} = (Q, \leq)$ is a poset, then the set of **downward-closed** subsets $D(\mathbf{Q})$ of $\mathbf{Q}$ forms a complete perfect distributive lattice under intersection and union

$D(\mathbf{Q})$ is a Heyting algebra, with $U \to V = Q - {\uparrow}(U - V)$ for any $U, V \in D(\mathbf{Q})$

For a poset $\mathbf{P}$, $\mathrm{Wk}(\mathbf{P})$ is complete and perfect and $J(\mathrm{Wk}(\mathbf{P})) \cong \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}^\partial$

The composition $\circ$ of $\mathbf{Wk}(\mathbf{P})$ is determined by its restriction to pairs of $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}^\partial$, where $\circ$ is a partial operation given by

$$(t, u) \circ (v, w) = \begin{cases} (t, w) & \text{if } u = v \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Semantics of relation algebras

For comparison, we first consider the case of relation algebras.

A complete perfect relation algebra has a complete atomic Boolean algebra as reduct, and the set of join-irreducibles is the set of atoms.

B. Jónsson and A. Tarski [1952] showed the operation of composition, restricted to atoms, is a partial operation precisely when the atoms form a **(Brandt) groupoid**, or equivalently a **small category with all morphism being invertible**.

For Heyting relation algebras we have a similar result using **partially-ordered groupoids**

Groupoids and partially ordered groupoids

A ***groupoid*** is defined as a **partial** algebra $\mathbf{G} = (G, \circ, ^{-1})$ such that $\circ$ is a **partial** binary operation and $^{-1}$ is a (total) unary operation on G that satisfy:

1. $(x \circ y) \circ z \in G$ or $x \circ (y \circ z) \in G \implies (x \circ y) \circ z = x \circ (y \circ z)$,
2. $x \circ y \in G \iff x^{-1} \circ x = y \circ y^{-1}$,
3. $x \circ x^{-1} \circ x = x$ and $x^{-1-1} = x$.

These axioms imply $(x \circ y)^{-1} = y^{-1} \circ x^{-1}$

Typical examples of groupoids are **disjoint unions of groups** and the ***pair-groupoid*** $(X \times X, \circ, ^{\smile})$

Partially ordered groupoid semantics

A ***partially-ordered groupoid*** $(G, \leq, \circ, ^{-1})$ is a groupoid $(G, \circ, ^{-1})$ such that $(G, \leq)$ is a poset and $\circ, ^{-1}$ are order-preserving:

- $x \leq y$ and $x \circ z, y \circ z \in G \implies x \circ z \leq y \circ z$
- $x \leq y \implies y^{-1} \leq x^{-1}$
- $x \leq y \circ y^{-1} \implies x \leq x \circ x^{-1}$

If $\mathbf{P} = (P, \leq)$ a poset then $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}^{\partial} = (P \times P, \leq, \circ, ^{\smile})$ is a partially-ordered groupoid with $(a, b) \leq (c, d) \iff a \leq c$ and $d \leq b$.

Theorem

Let $\mathbf{G} = (G, \leq, \circ, ^{-1})$ be a partially-ordered groupoid. Then $D(\mathbf{G})$ is a cyclic involutive GBI-algebra.

Semantics for full weakening relation algebras

In fact for a poset $\mathbf{P} = (P, \sqsubseteq)$ the weakening relation algebra $\mathbf{Wk}(\mathbf{P})$ is obtained from the partially-ordered pair-groupoid $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}^\partial$

For example, the 3-element chain $\mathbf{C}_3$ gives a 9-element partially ordered groupoid, and $\mathbf{Wk}(\mathbf{C}_3)$ has 20 elements



Figure: The weakening relation $\mathbf{Wk}(\mathbf{C}_3)$ and its po-pair-groupoid

Cardinality of $\mathbf{Wk}(\mathbf{C}_n)$

Theorem

For an n-element chain $\mathbf{C}_n$ *the weakening relation algebra* $\mathbf{Wk}(\mathbf{C}_n)$ *has cardinality* $\binom{2n}{n}$.

Proof.

This follows from the observation that $D(\mathbf{C}_m \times \mathbf{C}_n)$ has cardinality $\binom{m+n}{n}$
For $n = 1$ this holds since an m-element chain has $m + 1$ down-closed sets
Assuming the result holds for n, note that $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{C}_m \times \mathbf{C}_{n+1}$ is the disjoint union of $\mathbf{C}_m \times \mathbf{C}_n$ and $\mathbf{C}_m$, where we assume the additional m elements are not below any of the elements of $\mathbf{C}_m \times \mathbf{C}_n$
The number of downsets of $\mathbf{P}$ that contain an element a from the extra chain $\mathbf{C}_m$ as a maximal element is given by $\binom{k+n}{n}$ where k is the number of elements above a
Hence the total number of downsets of $\mathbf{P}$ is $\sum_{k=0}^{m} \binom{k+n}{n} = \binom{m+n+1}{n+1}$. □

Some References

H. Andreka, S. Givant, P. Jipsen, I. Nemeti, *On Tarski's axiomatic foundations of the calculus of relations*, to appear in Review of Symbolic Logic

N. Galatos and P. Jipsen, *Relation algebras as expanded FL-algebras*, Algebra Universalis, 69(1) 2013, 1–21

N. Galatos and P. Jipsen, *Distributive residuated frames and generalized bunched implication algebras*, to appear in Algebra Universalis

N. Galatos, P. Jipsen, T. Kowalski, H Ono, *Residuated Lattices: An Algebraic Glimpse at Substructural Logics*, No. 151 Studies in Logic and Foundations of Mathematics, Elsevier 2007

B. Jónsson, *Varieties of relation algebras*, Algebra Universalis, 15, 1982, 273–298

B. Jónsson and A. Tarski, *Boolean algebras with operators, Part II*, American Journal of Mathematics, 74 (1952), 127–162

Thank You