

Partial algebras and implications of (weak) matrix properties

Michael Hoefnagel^{a,d,e} and Pierre-Alain Jacqmin^{*b,c,d}

^aMathematics Division, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Stellenbosch University, Private Bag X1
Matieland 7602, South Africa

^bInstitut de Recherche en Mathématique et Physique, Université catholique de Louvain, Chemin du
Cyclotron 2, B 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

^cDepartment of Mathematics, Royal Military Academy, Brussels, Belgium

^dCentre for Experimental Mathematics, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Stellenbosch University,
Private Bag X1 Matieland 7602, South Africa

^eNational Institute for Theoretical and Computational Sciences (NITheCS), South Africa

Abstract

Matrix properties are a type of property of categories which includes the ones of being Mal'tsev, arithmetical, majority, unital, strongly unital and subtractive. Recently, an algorithm has been developed to determine implications $M \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} N$ between them. We show here that this algorithm reduces to construct a partial term corresponding to N from a partial term corresponding to M . Moreover, we prove that this is further equivalent to the corresponding implication between the weak versions of these properties, i.e., the one where only strong monomorphisms are considered instead of all monomorphisms.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 03B35, 18E13, 08A55, 08B05, 18-08, 18B15, 18A20.

Keywords: matrix property, proof reduction, (weakly) Mal'tsev category, arithmetical category, majority category, (weakly) unital category.

Introduction

A pointed variety \mathbb{V} of universal algebras is said to be *subtractive* in the sense of [30] if its theory contains a binary term $x - y$ (called a *subtraction*) satisfying the equations

$$\begin{cases} x - 0 = x \\ x - x = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where 0 is the unique constant in the theory of \mathbb{V} . From such a term, one can construct a ternary term $p(x, y, z)$ satisfying the equations

$$\begin{cases} p(x, x, x) = x \\ p(x, x, 0) = 0 \\ p(0, x, x) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

*The second author is grateful to the FNRS for its generous support.

by setting

$$p(x, y, z) = x - (y - z).$$

Indeed, one can check that

$$\begin{cases} p(x, x, x) = x - (x - x) = x - 0 = x \\ p(x, x, 0) = x - (x - 0) = x - x = 0 \\ p(0, x, x) = 0 - (x - x) = 0 - 0 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

In addition, from a subtraction $x - y$, one can also construct a 4-ary term $q(x, y, z, w)$ satisfying the equations

$$\begin{cases} q(x, 0, 0, 0) = x \\ q(x, x, y, y) = 0 \\ q(x, y, x, y) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

by setting

$$q(x, y, z, w) = (x - y) - (z - w).$$

To see this, it suffices to compute

$$\begin{cases} q(x, 0, 0, 0) = (x - 0) - (0 - 0) = x - 0 = x \\ q(x, x, y, y) = (x - x) - (y - y) = 0 - 0 = 0 \\ q(x, y, x, y) = (x - y) - (x - y) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Although these two proofs look very similar, let us now explain a fundamental difference between them which has deep consequences in Category Theory.

The first proof (the construction of the term $p(x, y, z)$ from the subtraction $x - y$) can be extended to the context of partial algebras in the following sense, while the second cannot. Let us consider a pointed set $(A, 0)$ equipped with a *partial subtraction*, i.e., a partial function $- : A^2 \dashrightarrow A$ such that the existential equations

$$\begin{cases} x - 0 =^e x \\ x - x =^e 0 \end{cases}$$

hold, meaning that, for every $a \in A$, both $a - 0$ and $a - a$ are defined and they are equal to $a - 0 = a$ and $a - a = 0$ respectively. For such a *partial subtractive algebra* A , one can construct the ternary partial operation $p : A^3 \dashrightarrow A$ by setting $p(x, y, z) = x - (y - z)$ for $x, y, z \in A$ for which $y - z$ and $x - (y - z)$ are defined (and $p(x, y, z)$ is not defined for the other triples $(x, y, z) \in A^3$). This partial operation satisfies the existential equations

$$\begin{cases} p(x, x, x) =^e x \\ p(x, x, 0) =^e 0 \\ p(0, x, x) =^e 0 \end{cases}$$

which can be seen using a proof completely analogous to the one in (3), with the extra care of checking that every expression which appears is indeed defined.

For the second proof (i.e., the construction of $q(x, y, z, w)$ from the subtraction $x - y$), this is no longer the case. One can still define the 4-ary partial operation $q : A^4 \dashrightarrow A$ by setting $q(x, y, z, w) = (x - y) - (z - w)$ exactly for those $x, y, z, w \in A$ for which $x - y$, $z - w$ and $(x - y) - (z - w)$ are defined, but now the existential equation

$$q(x, y, x, y) =^e 0$$

can no longer be shown to hold in A analogously as in (5) since $x - y$ is in general not defined for all $x, y \in A$.

Let us now explain the consequences that this difference implies in Category Theory. Let us first see how the algebraic condition that a pointed variety of universal algebras has a subtraction in its theory extends to the context of a finitely complete pointed category. The first thing one can think of is to require that any object X is naturally equipped with an internal subtraction $s: X^2 \rightarrow X$ satisfying the internal version of the axioms $s(x, 0) = x$ and $s(x, x) = 0$. However, this is in general too strong of a condition; even the category of *subtractive algebras* (i.e., pointed sets equipped with a subtraction $-$) does not have such an internal operation since $-: A^2 \rightarrow A$ is not a homomorphism in general. The ‘right’ approach has been proposed in [21] and generalized in [22] to all Mal’tsev conditions of a similar form to those appearing in (1), (2) and (4). The idea is, instead of looking at the equations (1) line by line, to look at them ‘components by components’. In other words, if we write the equations (1) in the form of an (extended) matrix

$$\text{Sub} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} x & 0 & x \\ x & x & 0 \end{array} \right],$$

the columns of this matrix give a condition on the relations in a pointed variety \mathbb{V} . Indeed, writing elements of A^2 as column vectors, the ‘matrix condition’ corresponding to Sub requires that, for any homomorphic binary relation $R \subseteq A^2$ in \mathbb{V} , we have

$$\left\{ \left[\begin{array}{c} a \\ a \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ a \end{array} \right] \right\} \subseteq R \implies \left[\begin{array}{c} a \\ 0 \end{array} \right] \in R$$

for every $a \in A$. Using generalized elements, this condition can be extended to the context of finitely complete pointed categories. Such a category for which each binary relation satisfies this condition is called a *subtractive category* [21]. Using a similar technique introduced in [22], we can extend the conditions of having a ternary term p satisfying the equations (2) and of having a 4-ary term q satisfying the equations (4) from the pointed varietal context to the finitely complete pointed context using the matrices

$$P = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} x & x & x & x \\ x & x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x & x & 0 \end{array} \right]$$

and

$$Q = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|c} x & 0 & 0 & 0 & x \\ x & x & y & y & 0 \\ x & y & x & y & 0 \end{array} \right]$$

respectively. The fact that one can construct a partial term p satisfying the equations (2) from a partial subtraction is equivalent to the fact that each subtractive category satisfies the property corresponding to the matrix P , which we denote by $\text{Sub} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} P$. This equivalence is part of our main Theorem 2.3. In addition, still according to this theorem, this implication is also equivalent to the implication where the weak versions of these properties are involved, that is, the properties only requiring that the strong relations satisfy the matrix properties. Strong relations (or in general strong monomorphisms) are those which are orthogonal to epimorphisms. We denote this implication by $\text{Sub} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*}^{\text{strong}} P$, meaning that any *weakly subtractive category* has strong P -closed relations (i.e., has weakly the property corresponding to P).

Besides, as we noted above, the proof that any subtractive variety admits in its theory a 4-ary term q satisfying the equations (4) cannot be extended to the partial algebraic context. We can

actually show that, even using another construction, it is not possible to construct a partial term q satisfying the equations (4) existentially from a partial subtraction. In view of our Theorem 2.3, this thus means that the implications $\text{Sub} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} Q$ and $\text{Sub} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*}^{\text{strong}} Q$ do *not* hold.

The proof of Theorem 2.3 relies on two main ingredients. On one hand, we make use of the embedding theorem from [19] in which each finitely complete pointed category satisfying the weak property corresponding to an extended matrix M as above is fully faithfully embedded in a power of the category of partial algebras determined by M . On the other hand, we use the algorithms developed in [13, 16] to decide whether an implication $M \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} N$ holds for extended matrices M and N as above. Using a computer implementation of these algorithms, it has been shown in [13] that the implication $\text{Sub} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} Q$ does indeed *not* hold (see Figure 8 in that paper), proving in view of our Theorem 2.3 that a partial 4-ary term q satisfying the equations (4) existentially cannot be constructed from a partial subtraction.

As classical examples of properties induced by matrices, let us mention the ones of being *subtractive* [21], *unital* [6] and *strongly unital* [6]. Since our results are also formulated in the non-pointed context, let us also mention the properties of being *Mal'tsev* [8, 9], *majority* [12] and *arithmetical* [28, 16]. Among their weak versions, the ones of being *weakly Mal'tsev* [26, 27] and *weakly unital* [26] have already been studied.

The rest of the paper is divided in two sections. In the first one, we essentially recall the needed concepts and results from the literature. Among others, we remind the reader with the matrix properties and the algorithms from [13, 16] to decide implications between them. We also briefly recall the theory of partial algebras and the embedding theorem established in [19]. In the second section, we first extend the characterizations found in the literature of *trivial matrices* (i.e., those inducing properties that can be satisfied only by preorders) using the language of partial algebras (Theorem 2.1). We then come to our main theorem (Theorem 2.3) characterizing when a matrix property (or rather a set of matrix properties) implies another one. As explained above, we prove that the implication $M \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} N$ is equivalent to $M \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*}^{\text{strong}} N$ and also to the condition that one can construct a partial term corresponding to N from one corresponding to M . A similar characterization is also established in the non-pointed context. As a corollary (Corollary 2.7), we also give a characterization of *anti-trivial matrices*, i.e., those inducing a property satisfied by any finitely complete pointed category. Let us finally mention that in all these characterizations, we also consider the property on a finitely complete (pointed) category induced by a matrix M in which only relations in a specified class of monomorphisms \mathcal{M} are required to be M -closed. This class \mathcal{M} is asked to be stable under pullbacks, closed under composition and containing the regular monomorphisms.

1 Preliminaries

Matrix properties

Given integers $n > 0$ and $m, k \geq 0$, we denote as in [13] by $\text{matr}_*(n, m, k)$ the set of (extended) matrices

$$M = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} x_{11} & \dots & x_{1m} & x_{1m+1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_{n1} & \dots & x_{nm} & x_{nm+1} \end{array} \right]$$

with n rows, m left columns, one right column and whose entries lie in the set $\{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ (i.e., the free pointed set on k variables x_1, \dots, x_k). Each such matrix $M \in \text{matr}_*(n, m, k)$ determines a property on n -ary (internal) relations $r: R \rightarrow X_1 \times \dots \times X_n$ in finitely complete pointed

categories \mathbb{C} . Such a relation is given by a subobject of the n -fold product $X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n$ and is represented by a monomorphism r . To describe the property determined by M on such relations, we need the concept of row-wise interpretations. Given pointed sets $(S_1, *_1), \dots, (S_n, *_n)$, a *row-wise interpretation* of M of type $((S_1, *_1), \dots, (S_n, *_n))$ is an extended matrix

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} f_1(x_{11}) & \cdots & f_1(x_{1m}) & f_1(x_{1m+1}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ f_n(x_{n1}) & \cdots & f_n(x_{nm}) & f_n(x_{nm+1}) \end{array} \right]$$

whose entries are obtained by applying to the elements of the i^{th} row of M (for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$) a *pointed function* $f_i: (\{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\}, *) \rightarrow (S_i, *_i)$, i.e., a function $f_i: \{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\} \rightarrow S_i$ such that $f_i(*) = *_i$. Viewing each hom-set $\mathbb{C}(X, Y)$ of a finitely complete pointed category \mathbb{C} as a pointed set where the distinguished element is the zero morphism $0: X \rightarrow Y$, we say that an n -ary relation $r: R \rightrightarrows X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n$ in \mathbb{C} is *strictly M-closed* [22] if, for any object Z of \mathbb{C} , each row-wise interpretation

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} g_{11} & \cdots & g_{1m} & h_1 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ g_{n1} & \cdots & g_{nm} & h_n \end{array} \right]$$

of M of type $(\mathbb{C}(Z, X_1), \dots, \mathbb{C}(Z, X_n))$ is *compatible* with r , i.e., if, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the morphism $(g_{1j}, \dots, g_{nj}): Z \rightarrow X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n$ induced by the j^{th} left column factors through r , then the morphism $(h_1, \dots, h_n): Z \rightarrow X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n$ induced by the right column also factors through r .

For a pointed set $(S, *)$, a (non-row-wise) *interpretation* of M of type $(S, *)$ is a row-wise interpretation of M of type $((S, *), \dots, (S, *))$ for which $f_1 = \cdots = f_n$. We say that a relation $r: R \rightrightarrows X^n$ in \mathbb{C} is *M-closed* [22] if, for any object Z of \mathbb{C} , each interpretation of M of type $\mathbb{C}(Z, X)$ is compatible with r .

We denote by $\text{matr}(n, m, k)$ the subset of *non-pointed matrices* of $\text{matr}_*(n, m, k)$, i.e., those matrices not containing $*$ as an entry. For a non-pointed matrix $M \in \text{matr}(n, m, k)$, we define analogously as above the concepts of row-wise interpretations of M of type (S_1, \dots, S_n) and interpretations of M of type S where S_1, \dots, S_n, S are mere sets. This gives rise to the concepts of *strictly M-closed relations* $r: R \rightrightarrows X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n$ and of *M-closed relations* $r: R \rightrightarrows X^n$ in a (non necessarily pointed) finitely complete category \mathbb{C} . We also denote by matr and matr_* the unions

$$\text{matr} = \bigcup_{\substack{n > 0 \\ m \geq 0 \\ k \geq 0}} \text{matr}(n, m, k) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{matr}_* = \bigcup_{\substack{n > 0 \\ m \geq 0 \\ k \geq 0}} \text{matr}_*(n, m, k).$$

Given a class of monomorphisms \mathcal{M} stable under pullbacks in a finitely complete category \mathbb{C} (respectively in a finitely complete pointed category \mathbb{C}) and a matrix $M \in \text{matr}(n, m, k)$ (respectively $M \in \text{matr}_*(n, m, k)$), we say that \mathbb{C} has *M-closed \mathcal{M} -relations* if any relation $r: R \rightrightarrows X^n$ in \mathcal{M} is M -closed (since \mathcal{M} is stable under pullbacks, it is in particular closed under pre-composition with isomorphisms and therefore, a relation is said to be in \mathcal{M} if one (thus all) representing monomorphism of the relation is in \mathcal{M}). Using (the internal version of) Proposition 1.9 in [22], we immediately get the following proposition, which slightly generalizes Theorem 2.4 of that paper.

Proposition 1.1. *Let $n > 0$ and $m, k \geq 0$ be integers, $M \in \text{matr}(n, m, k)$ (respectively $M \in \text{matr}_*(n, m, k)$), \mathbb{C} a finitely complete category (respectively a finitely complete pointed category) and \mathcal{M} a class of monomorphisms in \mathbb{C} stable under pullbacks. Then the following statement are equivalent:*

- \mathbb{C} has *M-closed \mathcal{M} -relations*, i.e., any relation $r: R \rightrightarrows X^n$ in \mathcal{M} is M -closed;

- \mathbb{C} has strictly M-closed \mathcal{M} -relations, i.e., any relation $r : R \rightarrow X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n$ in \mathcal{M} is strictly M-closed.

If one takes \mathcal{M} to be the class \mathcal{M}_{all} of all monomorphisms, one gets back the notion of (pointed) finitely complete categories with M-closed relations introduced in [22] and extensively studied in [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23]. Before giving some examples, let us recall the characterization of (finitary one-sorted) varieties of universal algebras with M-closed relations. We first remind the reader that a variety \mathbb{V} is a pointed category if and only if it has a nullary term 0 and any two nullary terms are equal in its theory. Note that, although the notion of M-closed relations is defined via the columns of M, the characterization of varieties with M-closed relations reads each row of the matrix as an equation.

Theorem 1.2. [22] *Let $n > 0$ and $m, k \geq 0$ be integers and*

$$M = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} x_{11} & \cdots & x_{1m} & x_{1m+1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_{n1} & \cdots & x_{nm} & x_{nm+1} \end{array} \right]$$

be a matrix in $\text{matr}(n, m, k)$ (respectively in $\text{matr}_*(n, m, k)$), whose entries thus lie in $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ (respectively in $\{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\}$). A variety \mathbb{V} (respectively a pointed variety \mathbb{V}) has M-closed (\mathcal{M}_{all} -)relations if and only if its theory contains an m -ary term p such that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the equation

$$p(x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im}) = x_{im+1}$$

holds in \mathbb{V} (where x_1, \dots, x_k are interpreted as different variables and, in the pointed case, $*$ is interpreted as the unique constant of \mathbb{V}).

Examples

We first focus on examples where $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}$. For the matrix

$$\text{Mal} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} x_1 & x_2 & x_2 & x_1 \\ x_2 & x_2 & x_1 & x_1 \end{array} \right]$$

in $\text{matr}(2, 3, 2)$, a finitely complete category with Mal-closed (\mathcal{M}_{all} -)relations is a *Mal'tsev category* [9], generalizing the notions of regular Mal'tsev categories [8] and of Mal'tsev varieties [25] to the left exact context. Making explicit the definition for this matrix, it turns out that a finitely complete category is a Mal'tsev category (i.e., has Mal-closed relations) if and only if, for any binary relation $r : R \rightarrow X^2$ and any pair of morphisms $z_1, z_2 : Z \rightarrow X$, if the three induced morphisms (z_1, z_2) , (z_2, z_2) and $(z_2, z_1) : Z \rightarrow X^2$ factor through r , so does the morphism $(z_1, z_1) : Z \rightarrow X^2$. Using Proposition 1.1, this is equivalent to the condition that any binary relation $r : R \rightarrow X_1 \times X_2$ is *difunctional* [29], i.e., given morphisms $z_1, z_2 : Z \rightarrow X_1$ and $z'_1, z'_2 : Z \rightarrow X_2$ such that the morphisms (z_1, z'_2) , (z_2, z'_2) and $(z_2, z'_1) : Z \rightarrow X_1 \times X_2$ factor through r , so does the morphism $(z_1, z'_1) : Z \rightarrow X_1 \times X_2$. In this case, Theorem 1.2 gives back Mal'tsev's theorem [25], i.e., that a variety \mathbb{V} of universal algebras is a Mal'tsev category if and only if there exists a ternary term $p(x, y, z)$ in the theory of \mathbb{V} such that the identities

$$\begin{cases} p(x_1, x_2, x_2) = x_1 \\ p(x_2, x_2, x_1) = x_1 \end{cases}$$

hold in \mathbb{V} .

If we denote by Maj the matrix

$$\text{Maj} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} x_1 & x_1 & x_2 & x_1 \\ x_1 & x_2 & x_1 & x_1 \\ x_2 & x_1 & x_1 & x_1 \end{array} \right]$$

in $\text{matr}(3, 3, 2)$, we get the notion of *majority categories* as introduced in [12], i.e., finitely complete categories with Maj-closed relations. A category which is both a majority category and a Mal'tsev category is called an *arithmetical category* in [16], extending the terminology of [28]. These are finitely complete categories with Ari-closed relations, where $\text{Ari} \in \text{matr}(3, 3, 2)$ is the matrix

$$\text{Ari} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} x_1 & x_2 & x_2 & x_1 \\ x_2 & x_2 & x_1 & x_1 \\ x_1 & x_2 & x_1 & x_1 \end{array} \right].$$

In the pointed context, we consider the matrices

$$\text{Uni} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} x_1 & * & x_1 \\ * & x_1 & x_1 \end{array} \right]$$

in $\text{matr}_*(2, 2, 1)$ and

$$\text{StrUni} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} x_1 & * & * & x_1 \\ x_2 & x_2 & x_1 & x_1 \end{array} \right]$$

in $\text{matr}_*(2, 3, 2)$. A finitely complete pointed category with Uni-closed relations (respectively with StrUni-closed relations) is a *unital category* (respectively a *strongly unital category*), both notions being introduced in [6]. One can also consider the matrix

$$\text{Sub} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} x_1 & * & x_1 \\ x_1 & x_1 & * \end{array} \right]$$

in $\text{matr}_*(2, 2, 1)$. *Subtractive categories* (i.e., finitely complete pointed categories with Sub-closed relations) have been introduced in [21] where it is shown that a unital subtractive category is nothing else than a strongly unital category. In order to again illustrate the definitions of categories with M-closed relations, let us make explicit the definition of subtractive categories here. A finitely complete pointed category is subtractive if and only if, for each binary relation $r: R \rightarrow X^2$ and each morphism $z: Z \rightarrow X$, if the two induced morphisms (z, z) and $(0, z): Z \rightarrow X^2$ factor through r , so does the morphism $(z, 0): Z \rightarrow X^2$. Using Proposition 1.1, this is equivalent to the condition that for each binary relation $r: R \rightarrow X_1 \times X_2$ and every morphisms $z: Z \rightarrow X_1$ and $z': Z \rightarrow X_2$, if the morphisms (z, z') and $(0, z'): Z \rightarrow X_1 \times X_2$ factor through r , so does the morphism $(z, 0): Z \rightarrow X_1 \times X_2$. In this case, Theorem 1.2 gives us that a pointed variety \mathbb{V} is a subtractive category if and only if it is a subtractive variety in the sense of [30], i.e., that its theory contains a binary term $s(x, y)$ such that the identities

$$\begin{cases} s(x, 0) = x \\ s(x, x) = 0 \end{cases}$$

hold in its theory (where 0 is the unique constant of \mathbb{V}).

Another class of monomorphisms \mathcal{M} in a category \mathbb{C} of interest for this paper is the class $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ of *strong monomorphisms*, i.e., those monomorphisms $m: X \rightarrow Y$ which are orthogonal to

every epimorphism, meaning that for each commutative square made of plain arrows

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{e} & B \\ f \downarrow & \dashrightarrow d & \downarrow g \\ X & \xrightarrow{m} & Y \end{array}$$

where the top morphism $e: A \twoheadrightarrow B$ is an epimorphism, there is a (unique) dotted diagonal morphism $d: B \rightarrow X$ retaining the commutativity of the diagram. This class $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ of strong monomorphisms is stable under pullbacks. As it will be of importance later, let us also mention that it is closed under composition and that it contains *regular monomorphisms*, i.e., equalizers. Categories with M-closed \mathcal{M} -relations have already been considered for $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ and a general M in [19] (and implicitly, even for a general \mathcal{M}).

Weakly Mal'tsev categories have been introduced in [26, 27] and characterized in [24]. In the finitely complete context and using the terminology of the present paper, they can be described as finitely complete categories with Mal-closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations. They thus form a natural weakening of the notion of Mal'tsev categories. We can also see this weakening as follows. From [6], we know that a finitely complete category \mathbb{C} is a Mal'tsev category if and only if, for all pullbacks

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p_Y} \\ \dashrightarrow r_Y \end{array} & Y \\ p_X \downarrow \lrcorner l_X & & \downarrow g \lrcorner t \\ X & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f} \\ \dashrightarrow s \end{array} & Z \end{array}$$

of split epimorphisms where $fs = 1_Z = gt$, the induced morphisms $l_X = (1_X, tf)$ and $r_Y = (sg, 1_Y)$ are *jointly strongly epimorphic*, i.e., they do not factorize through a common proper subobject of P . Besides, a finitely complete category is weakly Mal'tsev if and only if for all such pullbacks, the morphisms l_X and r_Y are *jointly epimorphic*, i.e., for any pair of morphisms $u, v: P \rightarrow W$ such that $ul_X = vl_X$ and $ur_Y = vr_Y$ one has $u = v$. The characterization of varieties which form weakly Mal'tsev categories also gives rise to a Mal'tsev condition but more complicated than in the case $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}$. It has recently been obtained in [10].

Weakly unital categories have been introduced in [26] as (finitely complete) pointed categories such that, for any two objects X, Y , the induced morphisms $(1_X, 0): X \twoheadrightarrow X \times Y$ and $(0, 1_Y): Y \twoheadrightarrow X \times Y$ are jointly epimorphic.

$$X \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p_X} \\ \dashrightarrow (1_X, 0) \end{array} X \times Y \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p_Y} \\ \dashrightarrow (0, 1_Y) \end{array} Y$$

In [19], they have been characterized as finitely complete pointed categories with Uni-closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations. For the comparison, let us mention that unital categories can be described [6] as finitely complete pointed categories such that, for each pair of objects X, Y , the morphisms $(1_X, 0)$ and $(0, 1_Y)$ are jointly strongly epimorphic.

In view of the above two examples, categories with M-closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations were also called *categories weakly with M-closed relations* in [19].

To conclude this tour of examples, let us mention that, denoting the class of regular monomorphisms in a category by \mathcal{M}_{reg} , finitely complete categories with Mal-closed \mathcal{M}_{reg} -relations are considered in [10]. The class \mathcal{M}_{reg} is stable under pullbacks, but in general it fails to be closed under composition.

The algorithm for deciding implications of matrix properties

As in [13, 16], we call a *matrix set* a subset of matr_* . A matrix set S is said to be *non-pointed* if $S \subseteq \text{matr}$. Given a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ (respectively $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$), a finitely complete category \mathbb{C} (respectively a finitely complete pointed category \mathbb{C}) and a class \mathcal{M} of monomorphisms in \mathbb{C} stable under pullbacks, we say that \mathbb{C} has *S -closed \mathcal{M} -relations* if \mathbb{C} has M -closed \mathcal{M} -relations for all M in S .

Extending the notation established in [14], given a non-pointed matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ and a matrix $N \in \text{matr}$, we write $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}}^{\text{all}} N$, or simply $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} N$, if any finitely complete category with S -closed relations has also N -closed relations. The abbreviation ‘lex’ here stands for ‘left exact’, another name for ‘finitely complete’. Similarly, we write $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}}^{\text{strong}} N$ to mean that any finitely complete category with S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations has also N -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations. In the pointed case, i.e., given $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$ and $N \in \text{matr}_*$, we write $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*}^{\text{all}} N$, or simply $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} N$, to mean that any finitely complete pointed category with S -closed relations has also N -closed relations. Finally, we write $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*}^{\text{strong}} N$ if any finitely complete pointed category with S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations has also N -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations. In all these abbreviations, if $S = \{M\}$ is a singleton, we sometimes write M instead of $\{M\}$, e.g., $M \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} N$ instead of $\{M\} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} N$.

In [16], an algorithm was presented to decide whether $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} N$ for a non-pointed matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ and a matrix $N \in \text{matr}$. In [13], this algorithm was adapted to the pointed context to decide whether $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} N$ for a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$ and a matrix $N \in \text{matr}_*$. Note that, in the original papers [13, 16], it was required that S is finite to be able to implement these algorithms on a computer. Since this will not be our concern in the present paper, we can omit this assumption here. Actually, from the results of [13, 16], we can deduce the following (which can also be deduced from the algorithms recalled below since the number of columns that one can possibly add to N is finite).

Proposition 1.3. *Given $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ and $N \in \text{matr}$, one has $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} N$ if and only if there is a finite subset $S' \subseteq S$ such that $S' \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} N$. Analogously, given $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$ and $N \in \text{matr}_*$, one has $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} N$ if and only if there is a finite subset $S' \subseteq S$ such that $S' \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} N$.*

As they will be needed, let us now recall these algorithms. In each case, the first step of the algorithm is to deal with trivial matrices. A matrix $M \in \text{matr}$ is said to be *trivial* [16] if every finitely complete category with M -closed (\mathcal{M}_{all} -)relations is a *preorder*, i.e., for any two objects X, Y in the category, there is at most one morphism $X \rightarrow Y$. Similarly, a matrix $M \in \text{matr}_*$ is said to be *trivial* [13] if every finitely complete pointed category with M -closed (\mathcal{M}_{all} -)relations is a preorder (which in that case will contain only one isomorphism class of objects). Since $\text{matr} \subset \text{matr}_*$, it is sensible to ask whether these two definitions agree if $M \in \text{matr}$. As proved in [13], they indeed do. In [13, 16], it is shown how to efficiently recognize whether a matrix is trivial. As this will not be needed here, we do not enter into the details and refer the interested reader to those papers. However, some theoretical characterizations from these papers are recalled in Theorem 2.1 where new characterizations are also proved. Given a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$, we say that S is *trivial* if it contains a trivial matrix.

Now, given a non-pointed non-trivial matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ and a matrix $N \in \text{matr}(n, m, k)$ for integers $n > 0$ and $m, k \geq 0$, the algorithm from [16] to decide whether $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} N$ says the following:

Keep expanding the set of left columns of N , until it is not possible anymore, with the right column of a row-wise interpretation B of type $(\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}, \dots, \{x_1, \dots, x_k\})$ of a matrix $M' \in \text{matr}(n, m', k')$ whose rows are rows of a common matrix $M \in S$ such that the left columns of B , but not its right column, can be found among the left

columns of the expanding N . One has the implication $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} N$ if and only if the right column of N can be found among the left columns of this expanded N .

In the pointed case, given a non-trivial matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$ and a matrix $N \in \text{matr}_*(n, m, k)$ for integers $n > 0$ and $m, k \geq 0$, the algorithm from [13] to decide whether $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} N$ says the following (where the pointed set $\{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ is again considered with $*$ as distinguished element):

First, add to N a left column of $*$'s. Then, keep expanding the set of left columns of N , until it is no more possible, with the right column of a row-wise interpretation B of type $(\{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\}, \dots, \{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\})$ of a matrix $M' \in \text{matr}_*(n, m', k')$ whose rows are rows of a common matrix $M \in S$ such that the left columns of B , but not its right column, can be found among the left columns of the expanding N . One has the implication $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} N$ if and only if the right column of N can be found among the left columns of this expanded N .

Categories of partial algebras

In Universal Algebra, a (*finitary one-sorted*) *signature* Σ is a set of operation symbols σ , each of them being equipped with an integer $n \geq 0$ called its arity. Given such a signature Σ and a set of variables X , we define the set $T_\Sigma(X)$ of Σ -terms in the variables from X inductively as follows:

- the elements of X are terms (i.e., $X \subseteq T_\Sigma(X)$);
- given an n -ary operation symbol $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and n terms $t_1, \dots, t_n \in T_\Sigma(X)$, then $\sigma(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is also a term in $T_\Sigma(X)$.

Every element of $T_\Sigma(X)$ is constructed using only those two rules. A Σ -equation in the variables from X is then a pair (t, t') of terms in $T_\Sigma(X)$. A Σ -equation is then nothing else than a Σ -equation in the variables from some set X .

For a signature Σ , a Σ -partial algebra A is a set (also denoted A by abuse of notation) equipped with, for each n -ary operation symbol $\sigma \in \Sigma$, a *partial* function $\sigma^A: A^n \dashrightarrow A$, i.e., a (total) function from a subset of A^n to A . In a Σ -partial algebra A , each Σ -term t in the variable from a set X gives rise to a partial function $t^A: A^X \dashrightarrow A$ defined inductively as follows:

- if $t \in X$ is a variable, then t^A is a total function given by the corresponding projection $A^X \rightarrow A: (a_x)_{x \in X} \mapsto a_t$;
- if $t = \sigma(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ for some n -ary $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and Σ -terms $t_1, \dots, t_n \in T_\Sigma(X)$, then t^A is defined on the element $(a_x)_{x \in X} \in A^X$ if and only if t_1^A, \dots, t_n^A are all defined on $(a_x)_{x \in X}$ and σ^A is defined on $(t_1^A((a_x)_{x \in X}), \dots, t_n^A((a_x)_{x \in X}))$, in which case

$$t^A((a_x)_{x \in X}) = \sigma^A(t_1^A((a_x)_{x \in X}), \dots, t_n^A((a_x)_{x \in X})).$$

Following the terminology from [7], given a Σ -equation (t, t') in the variables from X , we say that A satisfies the *existence equation* $t =^e t'$ (or simply that the equation $t =^e t'$ holds in A) if $t^A((a_x)_{x \in X})$ and $t'^A((a_x)_{x \in X})$ are both defined for any element $(a_x)_{x \in X} \in A^X$ and they are equal:

$$t^A((a_x)_{x \in X}) = t'^A((a_x)_{x \in X}).$$

Although there are other kind of equations that can be defined for partial algebras, in this paper we will only consider existence equations.

Given a pair (Σ, E) where Σ is a signature and E a set of existence Σ -equations, a (Σ, E) -*partial algebra* is Σ -partial algebra which satisfies all equations of E . A homomorphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ of (Σ, E) -partial algebras is a (total) function $f : A \rightarrow B$ such that, for each n -ary operation symbol $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and every $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$, if $\sigma^A(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is defined in A , then $\sigma^B(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n))$ is defined in B and the equality

$$f(\sigma^A(a_1, \dots, a_n)) = \sigma^B(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n)) \quad (6)$$

holds. These form the category $\text{Part}(\Sigma, E)$ of (Σ, E) -partial algebras. All small limits in such a category of partial algebras exist and are computed as in the category Set of sets and functions. More specifically, given a small category \mathbb{J} and a diagram $D : \mathbb{J} \rightarrow \text{Part}(\Sigma, E)$, the limit of D is constructed as the set

$$L = \{(a_J \in D(J))_{J \in \mathbb{J}} \mid D(j)(a_J) = a_{J'}, \forall j : J \rightarrow J' \in \mathbb{J}\}$$

and, given any n -ary $\sigma \in \Sigma$,

$$\sigma^L((a_{1J})_{J \in \mathbb{J}}, \dots, (a_{nJ})_{J \in \mathbb{J}})$$

is defined if and only if $\sigma^{D(J)}(a_{1J}, \dots, a_{nJ})$ is defined for all object $J \in \mathbb{J}$, and is equal in that case to

$$\sigma^L((a_{1J})_{J \in \mathbb{J}}, \dots, (a_{nJ})_{J \in \mathbb{J}}) = (\sigma^{D(J)}(a_{1J}, \dots, a_{nJ}))_{J \in \mathbb{J}}.$$

The legs of the limit are just the projections. Let us also mention that these categories of partial algebras are *essentially algebraic* [1, 2], i.e., *locally presentable* [11]. As we will need it later on, for a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ and a matrix $N \in \text{matr}$ (respectively a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$ and a matrix $N \in \text{matr}_*$), we write $S \Rightarrow_{\text{ess alg}}^{\text{strong}} N$ (respectively $S \Rightarrow_{\text{ess alg}_*}^{\text{strong}} N$) to mean that any essentially algebraic category (respectively essentially algebraic pointed category) with S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations has also N -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations.

Inspired by Theorem 1.2, we now give our main example of a category of partial algebras. Given a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ (respectively $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$), we consider the signature Σ^S which is constituted of, for each $M \in S$ with m left columns, an m -ary operation symbol p^M (respectively, the signature Σ_*^S which is constituted of a nullary operation symbol 0 and, for each $M \in S$ with m left columns, an m -ary operation symbol p^M). The set E^S (respectively E_*^S) is constituted by one existence equation for each row of each $M \in S$, namely

$$p^M(x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im}) =^e x_{im+1}$$

in the variables from $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ for the i^{th} row of M if this row is

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} x_{i1} & \dots & x_{im} & x_{im+1} \end{array} \right]$$

where the x_{ij} 's are in $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ (respectively, in the pointed case, the x_{ij} 's are in $\{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and in this case $*$ is interpreted as 0 in the above equation; we moreover add $0 =^e 0$ to E_*^S to force 0 to be defined). We denote the category of (Σ^S, E^S) -partial algebras (respectively of (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebras) by Part^S (respectively by Part_*^S).

In the pointed case $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$, for each $M \in S$, since M has at least one row, this implies that the existence equation

$$p^M(0, \dots, 0) =^e 0$$

holds in any (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra. This shows that, in the pointed case, the category Part_*^S is pointed.

Let us remark that for a non-pointed $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ which contains a matrix M with no left columns, p^M is then a constant term and $p^M =^e x$ is an equation of E^S . This equation means that, for any element a of a (Σ^S, E^S) -partial algebra A , p^M is defined and equal to a . This does *not* prevent A to be empty. In that case, Part^S is thus a preorder with exactly two isomorphism classes of objects.

As it will be useful later on, for a set X , we denote by $T^S(X)$ (respectively by $T_*^S(X)$) the set of terms $T_{\Sigma^S}(X)$ (respectively $T_{\Sigma_*^S}(X)$). If $S = \{M\}$ is a singleton, we make the usual abbreviations $\Sigma^M := \Sigma^{\{M\}}$, $\Sigma_*^M := \Sigma_*^{\{M\}}$, $E^M := E^{\{M\}}$, $E_*^M := E_*^{\{M\}}$, $\text{Part}^M := \text{Part}^{\{M\}}$, $\text{Part}_*^M := \text{Part}_*^{\{M\}}$, $T^M(X) := T^{\{M\}}(X)$ and $T_*^M(X) := T_*^{\{M\}}(X)$. The categories Part^M and Part_*^M have been introduced in [19]. We conclude this subsection by mentioning an important property of Part^M and Part_*^M , that we will generalize to the case of a matrix set in the next subsection.

Proposition 1.4. [19] *Let $M \in \text{matr}$ (respectively $M \in \text{matr}_*$). The category Part^M (respectively Part_*^M) has M -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations (in general, it does not have M -closed \mathcal{M}_{all} -relations).*

Free partial algebras

Let us now fix two matrix sets $S' \subseteq S \subseteq \text{matr}$ (respectively $S' \subseteq S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$). We denote by $U^{S,S'} : \text{Part}^S \rightarrow \text{Part}^{S'}$ (respectively $U_*^{S,S'} : \text{Part}_*^S \rightarrow \text{Part}_*^{S'}$) the corresponding forgetful functor. In view of the description of small limits in categories of partial algebras recalled above, this functor preserves these small limits. Moreover, it is easy to construct its left adjoint. Given a $(\Sigma^{S'}, E^{S'})$ -partial algebra A (respectively a $(\Sigma_*^{S'}, E_*^{S'})$ -partial algebra A), we distinguish two cases to construct the universal (Σ^S, E^S) -partial algebra $F^{S,S'}(A)$ (respectively the universal (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra $F_*^{S,S'}(A)$):

- In this first case, we suppose that A has at least two elements but there is no (Σ^S, E^S) -partial algebra (respectively (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra) with at least two elements (i.e., S is trivial anticipating the equivalences of Theorem 2.1). In that case, $F^{S,S'}(A)$ (respectively $F_*^{S,S'}(A)$) is the terminal object, that is, it has exactly one element and any m -ary operation symbol of Σ^S (respectively of Σ_*^S) is defined on the unique element of $F^{S,S'}(A)^m$ (respectively of $F_*^{S,S'}(A)^m$). The reflection of A along $U^{S,S'}$ (respectively along $U_*^{S,S'}$) is then given by the unique function $A \rightarrow U^{S,S'}(F^{S,S'}(A))$ (respectively $A \rightarrow U_*^{S,S'}(F_*^{S,S'}(A))$).
- Otherwise, $F^{S,S'}(A)$ (respectively $F_*^{S,S'}(A)$) is obtained by keeping the same underlying $(\Sigma^{S'}, E^{S'})$ -partial algebra A (respectively the same underlying $(\Sigma_*^{S'}, E_*^{S'})$ -partial algebra A) and defining, for each $M \in S \setminus S'$, p^M only where it is required by the existence equations related to M . It is not hard to see that, in this case, these definitions do not contradict each other. The identity function $A \rightarrow U^{S,S'}(F^{S,S'}(A))$ (respectively $A \rightarrow U_*^{S,S'}(F_*^{S,S'}(A))$) gives the reflection of A along $U^{S,S'}$ (respectively $U_*^{S,S'}$).

We have therefore an adjunction $F^{S,S'} \dashv U^{S,S'}$ (respectively $F_*^{S,S'} \dashv U_*^{S,S'}$). Moreover, we can see from the above construction of the left adjoint that, if S is not trivial, this adjunction is actually a *co-reflection*, i.e., the unit is an isomorphism. If $S' = \emptyset$ is empty, $\text{Part}^{S'}$ is (equivalent to) the category Set of sets (respectively $\text{Part}_*^{S'}$ is (equivalent to) the category Set_* of pointed sets). We therefore have a left adjoint $F^S := F^{S,\emptyset}$ (respectively $F_*^S := F_*^{S,\emptyset}$) for the forgetful functor $U^S := U^{S,\emptyset} : \text{Part}^S \rightarrow \text{Set}$ (respectively $U_*^S := U_*^{S,\emptyset} : \text{Part}_*^S \rightarrow \text{Set}_*$).

It is a classical result that right adjoints preserve strong monomorphisms (see e.g. Proposition 4.3.9 in [5]). We therefore immediately have the following.

Proposition 1.5. *Let $S' \subseteq S \subseteq \text{matr}$ (respectively $S' \subseteq S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$) be two matrix sets. The forgetful functor $U^{S,S'} : \text{Part}^S \rightarrow \text{Part}^{S'}$ (respectively $U_*^{S,S'} : \text{Part}_*^S \rightarrow \text{Part}_*^{S'}$) preserves strong monomorphisms.*

Due to this proposition, we can extend Proposition 1.4 to matrix sets.

Proposition 1.6. *Let $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ (respectively $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$) be a matrix set. The category Part^S (respectively Part_*^S) has S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations.*

Proof. Let $M \in S \cap \text{matr}_*(n, m, k)$ for integers $n > 0$ and $m, k \geq 0$. Let also $r : R \rightarrow X^n$ be a $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relation in Part^S (respectively in Part_*^S) and

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} g_{11} & \cdots & g_{1m} & h_1 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ g_{n1} & \cdots & g_{nm} & h_n \end{array} \right]$$

be an interpretation of M of type $\text{Part}^S(Z, X)$ (respectively of type $\text{Part}_*^S(Z, X)$) such that, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the morphism $(g_{1j}, \dots, g_{nj}) : Z \rightarrow X^n$ factors through r . We must show that the morphism $(h_1, \dots, h_n) : Z \rightarrow X^n$ also factors through r , i.e., that the pullback r' of r along (h_1, \dots, h_n) is an isomorphism. Since the forgetful functor $U^{S,M} := U^{S,\{M\}}$ (respectively $U_*^{S,M} := U_*^{S,\{M\}}$) preserves limits and strong monomorphisms, and since Part^M (respectively Part_*^M) has M -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations by Proposition 1.4, we know that $U^{S,M}(r')$ (respectively $U_*^{S,M}(r')$) is an isomorphism. This thus means that r' is surjective and, being a $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relation, it is an isomorphism. \square

Closed sub-partial algebras

Given a signature Σ and a set E of existence Σ -equations, the monomorphisms in $\text{Part}(\Sigma, E)$ are exactly the injective homomorphisms. A *sub-partial algebra* of a (Σ, E) -partial algebra B is thus given by a (Σ, E) -partial algebra A where the underlying set of A is included in that of B and such that, for any n -ary operation symbol $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and any $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$, if $\sigma^A(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is defined in A , then $\sigma^B(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is defined in B and $\sigma^B(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \sigma^A(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Note that in general, if $\sigma^B(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is defined in B , there is no reason for which $\sigma^A(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is defined in A . A sub-partial algebra for which this reverse implication holds is said to be *closed* [18]. More generally, a homomorphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ in $\text{Part}(\Sigma, E)$ is said to be *closed* if, for each n -ary operation symbol $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and every $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$, if $\sigma^B(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n))$ is defined in B , then $\sigma^A(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is defined in A (and therefore the identity (6) holds).

Let us recall from [19] that in most cases, closed monomorphisms in Part^M and Part_*^M coincide with strong monomorphisms.

Proposition 1.7. [19] *For a matrix $M \in \text{matr}_*$, closed monomorphisms in Part_*^M coincide with strong monomorphisms. For a matrix $M \in \text{matr}$, strong monomorphisms in Part_*^M are closed monomorphisms and the converse is true if there exists a partial algebra in Part_*^M with at least two elements.*

The condition that Part_*^M contains a partial algebra with at least two elements in the above proposition will be rephrased as ‘ M is not trivial’, see the equivalence (12) \Leftrightarrow (19) in Theorem 2.1.

Using a similar same proof than in [19], we can generalize the above proposition to the case of matrix sets, giving rise to the following where we use Theorem 2.1 by anticipation to reformulate the condition.


Proposition 1.8. *For a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$, closed monomorphisms in Part_*^S coincide with strong monomorphisms. For a non-pointed matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}$, strong monomorphisms in Part_*^S are closed monomorphisms and the converse is true if S is not trivial.*

The embedding theorem


We now recall the embedding theorem from [19] which will be of crucial importance in the proof of our results. The notation \mathbb{C}^{op} stands for the dual of the category \mathbb{C} and, for a category \mathbb{D} , the notation $\mathbb{D}^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$ denotes the category of functors $\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ and natural transformations between them.

Theorem 1.9. [19] *Given a matrix $M \in \text{matr}$ (respectively $M \in \text{matr}_*$), a small finitely complete category \mathbb{C} (respectively a small finitely complete pointed category \mathbb{C}) and \mathcal{M} a class of monomorphisms in \mathbb{C} stable under pullbacks, closed under composition and containing the regular monomorphisms, if \mathbb{C} has M -closed \mathcal{M} -relations, then there exists a fully faithful embedding $\varphi: \mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow (\text{Part}^M)^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$ (respectively $\varphi: \mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow (\text{Part}_*^M)^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$) which preserves and reflects finite limits and such that, for every monomorphism $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and every object $X \in \mathbb{C}$, $\varphi(f)_X$ is a closed monomorphism in Part^M (respectively in Part_*^M).*

The embedding φ can be constructed as a factorization of the Yoneda embedding $Y: \mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow \text{Set}^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$ (respectively $Y_*: \mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow \text{Set}_*^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$) through the functor $(U^M)^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$ (respectively $(U_*^M)^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$) induced by post-composition with $U^M := U^{\{M\}, \emptyset}$ (respectively with $U_*^M := U_*^{\{M\}, \emptyset}$).




Given a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ (respectively $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$), the category Part^S (respectively Part_*^S) together with the forgetful functors U^S and $U^{S,M}$ for each $M \in S$ (respectively U_*^S and $U_*^{S,M}$ for each $M \in S$) has the universal property of the limit of the diagram constituted of one occurrence of Set (respectively of Set_*) and, for each $M \in S$, the forgetful functor U^M (respectively U_*^M) to that occurrence of Set (respectively of Set_*).



In view of this, the above embedding theorem immediately generalizes for a matrix set as follows.

Theorem 1.10. *Given a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ (respectively $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$), a small finitely complete category \mathbb{C} (respectively a small finitely complete pointed category \mathbb{C}) and \mathcal{M} a class of monomorphisms in \mathbb{C} stable under pullbacks, closed under composition and containing the regular monomorphisms, if \mathbb{C} has S -closed \mathcal{M} -relations, then there exists a fully faithful embedding $\varphi: \mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow (\text{Part}^S)^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$ (respectively $\varphi: \mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow (\text{Part}_*^S)^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$) which preserves and reflects finite limits, such that, for every monomorphism $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and every object $X \in \mathbb{C}$, $\varphi(f)_X$ is a closed monomorphism in Part^S (respectively in Part_*^S) and which makes the diagram*



respectively

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & (\text{Part}_*^S)^{\text{COP}} & \\
 \swarrow \varphi & \downarrow (U_*^S)^{\text{COP}} & \\
 \mathbb{C} & \xrightarrow{Y_*} & \text{Set}_*^{\text{COP}}
 \end{array}$$

commute.

2 Main results

We can now state and prove our results reinforcing the links between categories of partial algebras and matrix properties involving a general class \mathcal{M} of monomorphisms.

Trivial matrix sets

Let us start by studying trivial matrix sets. We extend here the characterizations of trivial matrices that can already be found in [13, 15, 16]. In addition of recalling some known characterizations, we add many new ones. We however omit to recall here many other characterizations found in those papers which allow to effectively recognize when a matrix is trivial. In the following theorem, Bool denotes the category of Boolean algebras and $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the category with a unique object and the identity on it as unique morphism. A category is said to be *regular* [3] if it has finite limits, coequalizers of kernel pairs and such that regular epimorphisms are stable under pullbacks. Note that the following theorem can be used with $S = \{M\}$ a singleton, giving rise to some characterizations of trivial matrices (instead of trivial matrix sets), some of those already appearing in [13, 15, 16].

Theorem 2.1. *For a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *every finitely complete pointed category with S -closed relations is equivalent to the single morphism category $\mathbf{1}$;*
- (2) *S is trivial, that is, S contains a trivial matrix M , i.e., such that every finitely complete pointed category with M -closed relations is equivalent to the single morphism category $\mathbf{1}$;*
- (3) *every finitely complete pointed category with S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations is equivalent to the single morphism category $\mathbf{1}$;*
- (4) *for every finitely complete pointed category \mathbb{C} and every class \mathcal{M} of monomorphisms in \mathbb{C} stable under pullbacks, closed under composition, containing all regular monomorphisms and such that \mathbb{C} has S -closed \mathcal{M} -relations, \mathbb{C} is equivalent to the single morphism category $\mathbf{1}$;*
- (5) *any regular pointed category with S -closed relations is equivalent to the single morphism category $\mathbf{1}$;*
- (6) *any essentially algebraic pointed category with S -closed relations is equivalent to the single morphism category $\mathbf{1}$;*
- (7) *any pointed variety with S -closed relations is equivalent to the single morphism category $\mathbf{1}$, i.e., the equation $x = 0$ holds in its theory for a constant term 0 ;*
- (8) *Part_*^S is equivalent to the single morphism category $\mathbf{1}$;*

(9) every (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra has exactly one element;

(10) Set_*^{op} does not have S -closed relations.

If $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ is non-pointed, these are further equivalent to the following conditions:

(11) every finitely complete category with S -closed relations is a preorder;

(12) S contains a trivial matrix M , i.e., such that every finitely complete category with M -closed relations is a preorder;

(13) every finitely complete category with S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations is a preorder;

(14) for every finitely complete category \mathbb{C} and every class \mathcal{M} of monomorphisms in \mathbb{C} stable under pullbacks, closed under composition, containing all regular monomorphisms and such that \mathbb{C} has S -closed \mathcal{M} -relations, \mathbb{C} is a preorder;

(15) any regular category with S -closed relations is a preorder;

(16) any essentially algebraic category with S -closed relations is a preorder;

(17) any variety with S -closed relations is a preorder, i.e., the equation $x = y$ holds in its theory;

(18) Part^S is a preorder;

(19) every (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra has at most one element;

(20) Set^{op} does not have S -closed relations;

(21) Bool does not have S -closed relations.

Proof. We first consider the general case where $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$. The implication (2) \Rightarrow (1) is obvious while (1) \Rightarrow (10) follows from the fact that Set_*^{op} is not equivalent to 1. If (10) holds, S contains a matrix M for which Set_*^{op} does not have M -closed relations. Using Theorem 3.1 in [13], this means that M is trivial. We have therefore already proved the equivalences (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (10). The implication (4) \Rightarrow (3) follows from the fact that the class of strong monomorphisms in a category is stable under pullbacks, closed under composition and contains regular monomorphisms. The implications (3) \Rightarrow (1) \Rightarrow (5) are obvious, as well as (5) \Rightarrow (7) since varieties of universal algebras form regular categories. Since essentially algebraic categories are complete and varieties are essentially algebraic categories, the implications (1) \Rightarrow (6) \Rightarrow (7) are also straightforward. Concerning the implication (7) \Rightarrow (9), suppose A is a (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra. Note that A cannot be empty since 0 needs to be defined in A . For each matrix $M \in S$ with m left columns, the m -ary operation symbol $p^M \in \Sigma_*^M$ can be extended to a total operation $(p^M)^A$ on A by defining it to be 0 on any m -tuple in A^m on which it is not yet defined. Doing so, A becomes a total (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -algebra. Using Theorem 1.2, the variety of total (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -algebras has S -closed relations. If (7) holds, this means that A has a unique element, proving the implication (7) \Rightarrow (9). To prove the equivalence (9) \Leftrightarrow (8), it suffices to notice that any (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra A with a unique element is isomorphic to the terminal object of Part_*^S since 0 has to be defined as well as $(p^M)^A(0, \dots, 0)$ for each $M \in S$. We conclude the first part of the proof with the implication (9) \Rightarrow (4). Let us suppose (9) holds and let \mathbb{C} be a finitely complete pointed category and \mathcal{M} a class of monomorphisms in \mathbb{C} stable under pullbacks, closed under composition, containing all regular monomorphisms and such that \mathbb{C} has S -closed \mathcal{M} -relations. We shall prove that \mathbb{C} is equivalent to 1. Since \mathbb{C} has a terminal object, it is not empty and thus it remains to prove that given any two objects X, Y in \mathbb{C} , 0 is

the unique morphism $X \rightarrow Y$. If \mathbb{C} is a small category, one can use the Embedding Theorem 1.10 to obtain a fully faithful embedding $\varphi: \mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow (\text{Part}_*^S)^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$. If there were two different morphisms $f, g: X \rightarrow Y$, then $\varphi(f) \neq \varphi(g)$ and so $\varphi(f)_Z \neq \varphi(g)_Z$ for some object $Z \in \mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}$. However, this is not possible since Part_*^S is supposed to be equivalent to 1. If \mathbb{C} is not small, one can extract from the proof of the Embedding Theorem 1.9 in [19] a (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebraic structure on $\mathbb{C}(X, Y)$ and conclude by (9) that it contains only the zero morphism.

Let us now suppose that $S \subseteq \text{matr}$. The equivalence (20) \Leftrightarrow (21) can be found in [15] while the equivalence (2) \Leftrightarrow (12) is established in [13]. The remaining implications are proved similarly as above except that (20) \Rightarrow (12) follows now from Theorem 2.3 in [16] and (18) \Rightarrow (19) can be proved as follows. For any element a in a (Σ^S, E^S) -partial algebra A , one has that, for each $M \in S$, $(p^M)^A(a, \dots, a)$ is defined and equal to a (since M has at least one row). Such an element thus determines a morphism from the terminal (Σ^S, E^S) -partial algebra to A , sending the unique element in the domain to a . If Part^S is a preorder, this implies that A cannot have more than one element. \square

In [13, 16], for a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ (respectively $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$), we denoted by $\text{mclex}S$ (respectively by mclex_*S) the collection of finitely complete (respectively finitely complete pointed) categories with S -closed relations. Similarly, we denote here by $\text{mclex}^{\text{strong}}S$ (respectively $\text{mclex}_*^{\text{strong}}S$) the collection of finitely complete (respectively finitely complete pointed) categories with S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations.

Remark 2.2. Let $M \in \text{matr}(n, m, k)$ for integers $n > 0$ and $m, k \geq 0$. If $m = 0$, then M is automatically trivial and $\text{mclex}\{M\}$ is the collection of categories equivalent to 1. If M is trivial but $m > 0$, $\text{mclex}\{M\}$ is then the bigger collection of finitely complete preorders. Trivial matrix sets determine thus two different collections of categories when looking at $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{all}}$. Although the equivalence (11) \Leftrightarrow (13) holds in the above theorem, trivial matrix sets determine only one collection of categories when looking at $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$. Indeed, if S is trivial, $\text{mclex}^{\text{strong}}S$ is always the collection of finitely complete preorders. This is due to the fact that in finitely complete preorders, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ is the class of isomorphisms and therefore they all have S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations even if S contains a matrix with no left columns. This distinction disappears in the pointed case because if $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$ is a trivial matrix set, both mclex_*S and $\text{mclex}_*^{\text{strong}}S$ are the collection of categories equivalent to 1.

Implications of matrix properties

We now come to our main result.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$ be a matrix set and $N \in \text{matr}_*$ be a matrix such that N has $m \geq 0$ left columns. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} N$;
- (2) $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*}^{\text{strong}} N$;
- (3) $S \Rightarrow_{\text{ess alg}_*}^{\text{strong}} N$;
- (4) *for every finitely complete pointed category \mathbb{C} and every class \mathcal{M} of monomorphisms in \mathbb{C} stable under pullbacks, closed under composition and containing all regular monomorphisms, if \mathbb{C} has S -closed \mathcal{M} -relations, then it has also N -closed \mathcal{M} -relations;*
- (5) Part_*^S has N -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations;

(6) there exists an m -ary term $q \in T_*^S(\{y_1, \dots, y_m\})$ such that, for any (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra A , $q^A: A^m \dashrightarrow A$ makes A a (Σ_*^N, E_*^N) -partial algebra.

Moreover, if $S \subseteq \text{matr}$, $N \in \text{matr}$ and $m > 0$, these are further equivalent to the following conditions:

(7) $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} N$;

(8) $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}}^{\text{strong}} N$;

(9) $S \Rightarrow_{\text{ess alg}}^{\text{strong}} N$;

(10) for every finitely complete category \mathbb{C} and every class \mathcal{M} of monomorphisms in \mathbb{C} stable under pullbacks, closed under composition and containing all regular monomorphisms, if \mathbb{C} has S -closed \mathcal{M} -relations, then it has also N -closed \mathcal{M} -relations;

(11) Part^S has N -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations;

(12) there exists an m -ary term $q \in T^S(\{y_1, \dots, y_m\})$ such that, for any (Σ^S, E^S) -partial algebra A , $q^A: A^m \dashrightarrow A$ makes A a (Σ^N, E^N) -partial algebra.

Proof. We first consider the general case where $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$ and $N \in \text{matr}_*$. To fix dimensions, we suppose that $N \in \text{matr}_*(n, m, k)$ for integers $n > 0$ and $m, k \geq 0$. The implications (4) \Rightarrow (1) and (4) \Rightarrow (2) are obvious since the classes \mathcal{M}_{all} and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ in any finitely complete category are closed under composition, stable under pullbacks and contain all regular monomorphisms. The implication (2) \Rightarrow (3) is trivial since essentially algebraic categories are complete. The implication (3) \Rightarrow (5) follows immediately from Proposition 1.6 and the fact that Part_*^S is an essentially algebraic pointed category. To prove the implication (5) \Rightarrow (4), let us suppose that Part_*^S has N -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations and let us consider a finitely complete pointed category \mathbb{C} and a class of monomorphisms \mathcal{M} in \mathbb{C} as in (4). We suppose that \mathbb{C} has S -closed \mathcal{M} -relations and we must show it has N -closed \mathcal{M} -relations. Let $r: R \rightrightarrows X^n$ be a relation in \mathcal{M} , Z be an object of \mathbb{C} and

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} g_{11} & \cdots & g_{1m} & h_1 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ g_{n1} & \cdots & g_{nm} & h_n \end{array} \right]$$

be an interpretation of N of type $\mathbb{C}(Z, X)$. We suppose that, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the morphism $(g_{1j}, \dots, g_{nj}): Z \rightarrow X^n$ factors through r and we must show that $(h_1, \dots, h_n): Z \rightarrow X^n$ also factors through r . If \mathbb{C} is a small category, by the Embedding Theorem 1.10, there exists a fully faithful embedding $\varphi: \mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow (\text{Part}_*^S)^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$ which preserves and reflects finite limits and such that, for every monomorphism $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and every object $A \in \mathbb{C}$, $\varphi(f)_A$ is a closed monomorphism in Part_*^S . By Proposition 1.8, $\varphi(r)_A$ is a strong relation for every object $A \in \mathbb{C}$. Since Part_*^S is supposed to have N -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations, this means that $\varphi((h_1, \dots, h_n))_A$ factors through $\varphi(r)_A$ for every $A \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore, the pullback of $\varphi(r)$ along $\varphi((h_1, \dots, h_n))$ is an isomorphism since each of its component is. Thus, since φ is fully faithful and preserves finite limits, the pullback of r along (h_1, \dots, h_n) in \mathbb{C} is an isomorphism, proving that (h_1, \dots, h_n) factors through r . If \mathbb{C} is not small, a similar argument can still be applied. Indeed, looking at the proof in [19] of Theorem 1.9, we can still construct (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebraic structures on $\mathbb{C}(Z, X)$, $\mathbb{C}(Z, X^n)$ and $\mathbb{C}(Z, R)$. This can be done in such a way that $\mathbb{C}(Z, X^n)$ is isomorphic as (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra to the n -fold power of $\mathbb{C}(Z, X)$ via the canonical isomorphism $\mathbb{C}(Z, X^n) \cong \mathbb{C}(Z, X)^n$ and such that composition with r gives a closed monomorphism $\mathbb{C}(Z, R) \rightrightarrows \mathbb{C}(Z, X^n)$. We can thus see $\mathbb{C}(Z, R)$ as a closed sub-partial algebra of $\mathbb{C}(Z, X)^n$ containing $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in \mathbb{C}(Z, X)^n$ if and only if the morphism

$(g_1, \dots, g_n): Z \rightarrow X^n$ factors through r . By Proposition 1.8, this thus defines a strong n -ary relation in Part_*^S . Therefore this relation is N -closed by assumption. Considering the free (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra $F_*^S(\{*, x\})$ on the one element set (notice that $\{*, x\}$ is the free pointed set on the one element set $\{x\}$), we get an interpretation

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} g'_{11} & \cdots & g'_{1m} & h'_1 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ g'_{n1} & \cdots & g'_{nm} & h'_n \end{array} \right]$$

of N of type $\text{Part}_*^S(F_*^S(\{*, x\}), \mathbb{C}(Z, X))$ where $g'_{ij}(x) = g_{ij}$ and $h'_i(x) = h_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Since (g_{1j}, \dots, g_{nj}) factors through r for each $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we know that the morphisms $(g'_{1j}, \dots, g'_{nj}): F_*^S(\{*, x\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}(Z, X)^n$ factor through $\mathbb{C}(Z, R)$. We conclude from this that (h'_1, \dots, h'_n) also factors through $\mathbb{C}(Z, R)$ meaning that (h_1, \dots, h_n) factors through r as required. We have therefore already proved the implications $(2) \Leftrightarrow (3) \Leftrightarrow (4) \Leftrightarrow (5) \Rightarrow (1)$.

Let us now prove $(1) \Rightarrow (6)$. If S is trivial, by the equivalence $(2) \Leftrightarrow (9)$ of Theorem 2.1, it suffices to choose q to be the constant term 0. If S is not trivial, we rely on the algorithm to decide $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} N$ from [13] recalled in Section 1. We denote the entries of the matrix N as in

$$N = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} x_{11} & \cdots & x_{1m} & x_{1m+1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_{n1} & \cdots & x_{nm} & x_{nm+1} \end{array} \right]$$

where the x_{ij} 's belong to $\{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. To each left column c of N (the original ones and the ones added by the algorithm), we associate an m -ary term $q_c \in T_*^S(\{y_1, \dots, y_m\})$ such that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the equation

$$q_c(x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im}) =^e c_i$$

holds in any (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra, where c_i is the i^{th} entry of c and $*$ is interpreted as 0. For the j^{th} original left column c^j of N (for $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$), we simply let q_{c^j} be y_j . For the first added column c^{j+1} of $*$'s, we take $q_{c^{j+1}}$ to be the term 0. Now, suppose at some point of the algorithm, we have defined q_c for all the left columns of the current N and we are adding the right column $c^{B, m'+1}$ of a row-wise interpretation B of type $(\{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\}, \dots, \{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\})$ of a matrix $M' \in \text{matr}_*(n, m', k')$ whose rows are rows of a common matrix $M \in S \cap \text{matr}_*(n', m', k')$ (for integers $n' > 0, m', k' \geq 0$) and such that the left columns $c^{B, j}$ of B (for each $j \in \{1, \dots, m'\}$), but not its right column $c^{B, m'+1}$, can be found among the left columns of N . We then define

$$q_{c^{B, m'+1}} = p^M(q_{c^{B, 1}}, \dots, q_{c^{B, m'}}).$$

For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the i^{th} row of B is of the form

$$\left[f(x'_{i'1}) \quad \cdots \quad f(x'_{i'm'}) \quad \mid \quad f(x'_{i'm'+1}) \right]$$

for a pointed function $f: \{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\} \rightarrow \{*, x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and an $i' \in \{1, \dots, n'\}$ and where

$$\left[x'_{i'1} \quad \cdots \quad x'_{i'm'} \quad \mid \quad x'_{i'm'+1} \right]$$

is the i'^{th} row of M . Thus, in any (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra, the equations

$$\begin{aligned} c_i^{B, m'+1} &=^e f(x'_{i'm'+1}) \\ &=^e p^M(f(x'_{i'1}), \dots, f(x'_{i'm'})) \\ &=^e p^M(c_i^{B, 1}, \dots, c_i^{B, m'}) \\ &=^e p^M(q_{c^{B, 1}}(x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im}), \dots, q_{c^{B, m'}}(x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im})) \\ &=^e q_{c^{B, m'+1}}(x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im}) \end{aligned}$$

hold, completing the construction of the q_c 's. But this immediately proves (1) \Rightarrow (6) since, if $S \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} N$ holds, the algorithm says that the right column of N has been added by the algorithm to its left columns.

To conclude the first list of equivalences, it remains to show (6) \Rightarrow (5). Supposing (6), we get a forgetful functor $U: \text{Part}_*^S \rightarrow \text{Part}_*^N$. In view of the construction of small limits in categories of partial algebras, it is routine to show that U preserves them. In order to prove (5), let us consider a strong monomorphism $r: R \rightarrow X^n$ in Part_*^S , a (Σ_*^S, E_*^S) -partial algebra Z and an interpretation

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} g_{11} & \cdots & g_{1m} & h_1 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ g_{n1} & \cdots & g_{nm} & h_n \end{array} \right]$$

of N of type $\text{Part}_*^S(Z, X)$. Let us suppose that for each $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the morphism $(g_{1j}, \dots, g_{nj}): Z \rightarrow X^n$ factors through r . Since by Proposition 1.4, Part_*^N has N -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations, applying the functor U , we get that

$$(U(h_1), \dots, U(h_n)): U(Z) \rightarrow U(X)^n$$

(which is (isomorphic to) $U((h_1, \dots, h_n)): U(Z) \rightarrow U(X^n)$) factors through $U(r)$. Therefore, the pullback r' of r along (h_1, \dots, h_n) is sent by U to an isomorphism, and so it is bijective. So r' is an epimorphism which, being a pullback of the strong monomorphism r , is also a strong monomorphism. It is thus an isomorphism, which shows that (h_1, \dots, h_n) factors through r as desired.

Let us now consider the case where $S \subseteq \text{matr}$, $N \in \text{matr}$ and $m > 0$. The equivalence (1) \Leftrightarrow (7) has been proved in [13] using the assumption $m > 0$. The other equivalences can be proved analogously as in the pointed case above. For the proof of (11) \Rightarrow (10), we separate it in two cases. It is analogous to the one of (5) \Rightarrow (4) if S is not trivial (to be able to apply Proposition 1.8). If S is trivial, (10) is always true since $m > 0$ (see Theorem 2.1 and Remark 2.2). For the implication (7) \Rightarrow (12), it is analogous to (1) \Rightarrow (6) if S is not trivial. If S is trivial, since $m > 0$ and in view of the equivalence (2) \Leftrightarrow (19) of Theorem 2.1, one can choose q to be the term y_1 . \square

Remark 2.4. Let us now say a word on the case where $S \subseteq \text{matr}$, $N \in \text{matr}$ and $m = 0$ in the above theorem. Using Theorem 2.1 and Remark 2.2, the statements (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (8), (9) and (11) of Theorem 2.3 are in that case all equivalent to the condition that S is trivial. Besides, the statements (7), (10) and (12) of Theorem 2.3 are in that case equivalent to the condition that S contains a matrix with no left columns.

Open question 2.5. We leave open the question whether the statements of Theorem 2.3 are further equivalent to $S \Rightarrow_{\text{ess alg}_*} N$ (in the general case) and to $S \Rightarrow_{\text{ess alg}} N$ (in the case $S \subseteq \text{matr}$, $N \in \text{matr}$ and $m > 0$) with the obvious meaning of these notations. The fact that we have been unable yet to prove or disprove this reduction is closely linked with the fact that we do not know yet if the property of being Mal'tsev (or having M -closed relations for a general matrix M) is stable under the pro-completion of a finitely complete (pointed) category, see [20].

As a consequence of Theorem 2.3, one can now write proofs of implications of matrix properties in another way. In [13, 16], lex -tableaux and lex_* -tableaux were used to represent such proofs. For instance, if Ari and Maj are the arithmetical and majority matrices from Section 1, a

proof of the implication $\text{Ari} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} \text{Maj}$ can be displayed as the following lex-tableau:

x_1	x_2	x_2	x_1	x_1	x_1	x_2	x_1
x_2	x_2	x_1	x_1	x_1	x_2	x_1	x_1
x_1	x_2	x_1	x_1	x_2	x_1	x_1	x_1
x_2	x_1	x_1	x_2	x_2			
x_1	x_1	x_2	x_2	x_2			
x_1	x_2	x_1	x_1	x_1			
x_1	x_2	x_2	x_1	x_1			
x_2	x_2	x_1	x_1	x_1			
x_1	x_1	x_1	x_1	x_1			

The first block on the left represents the matrix Ari, while the first block on the right represents the matrix Maj. Below each horizontal line, a step of the algorithm to decide $\text{Ari} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} \text{Maj}$ is displayed. So, for the second block, a row-wise interpretation of a matrix whose rows are rows of Ari (the matrix Ari itself in this case) is drawn, where each left column belongs to the left columns of Maj but not its right column. On the right, this right column is added to the extended Maj. In the third block, again a row-wise interpretation of Ari is displayed on the left and its right column is added to the extended Maj on the right. Since this is the right column of Maj, this concludes the proof of $\text{Ari} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} \text{Maj}$.

One can transform this proof into a ternary term $q \in T^{\text{Ari}}(\{y_1, y_2, y_3\})$ proving the implication $\text{Ari} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} \text{Maj}$ via the equivalence (7) \Leftrightarrow (12) of Theorem 2.3. To extract this term q from the above lex-tableau, one follows the proof of (7) \Rightarrow (12), analogous to the proof of (1) \Rightarrow (6). To the first three left columns of Maj, one associates the variables y_1, y_2, y_3 respectively. To the first added column

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_2 \\ x_2 \\ x_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

one associates the term $p(y_3, y_1, y_2)$ where $p = p^{\text{Ari}}$ is the term from Ari, i.e., partial algebras in Part^{Ari} satisfy the equations

$$\begin{cases} p(x_1, x_2, x_2) =^e x_1 \\ p(x_2, x_2, x_1) =^e x_1 \\ p(x_1, x_2, x_1) =^e x_1. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Finally, the term q , corresponding to the second added column is

$$q(y_1, y_2, y_3) = p(y_2, p(y_3, y_1, y_2), y_3).$$

At each step, the term is obtained applying p to the terms corresponding to the left columns of the row-wise interpretation. To prove $\text{Ari} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} \text{Maj}$ it is actually enough to check that, from the equations (7), one has the equations

$$q(x_1, x_1, x_2) =^e p(x_1, p(x_2, x_1, x_1), x_2) =^e p(x_1, x_2, x_2) =^e x_1,$$

$$q(x_1, x_2, x_1) =^e p(x_2, p(x_1, x_1, x_2), x_1) =^e p(x_2, x_2, x_1) =^e x_1$$

and

$$q(x_2, x_1, x_1) =^e p(x_1, p(x_1, x_2, x_1), x_1) =^e p(x_1, x_1, x_1) =^e x_1$$

corresponding to the matrix Maj.

Since both rows of Mal appear in Ari, it is straightforward to prove $\text{Ari} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} \text{Mal}$ using the above term proofs. As shown in [16], one also has $\{\text{Maj}, \text{Mal}\} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} \text{Ari}$. In the language of terms, this can be done by considering

$$q(x, y, z) = p^{\text{Mal}}(x, p^{\text{Maj}}(z, x, y), z)$$

where p^{Mal} and p^{Maj} are terms satisfying the existence equations from Mal and Maj respectively. This term q indeed satisfies the existence equations from Ari since

$$\begin{aligned} q(x, y, y) &=^e p^{\text{Mal}}(x, p^{\text{Maj}}(y, x, y), y) =^e p^{\text{Mal}}(x, y, y) =^e x \\ q(y, y, x) &=^e p^{\text{Mal}}(y, p^{\text{Maj}}(x, y, y), x) =^e p^{\text{Mal}}(y, y, x) =^e x \\ q(x, y, x) &=^e p^{\text{Mal}}(x, p^{\text{Maj}}(x, x, y), x) =^e p^{\text{Mal}}(x, x, x) =^e x. \end{aligned}$$

We have thus re-proved that an arithmetical category is the same thing as a Mal'tsev majority category. By the equivalence (8) \Leftrightarrow (12) of Theorem 2.3, this also shows that a finitely complete category is *weakly arithmetical* (i.e., has Ari-closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations) if and only if it is *weakly Mal'tsev* (i.e., has Mal-closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations) and *weakly majority* (i.e., has Maj-closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations).

To give an example in the pointed case, let us mention that in [13] we have shown that the matrix StrUni is equivalent to the matrix

$$\text{StrUni}' = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} x_1 & x_1 & * & x_1 \\ * & * & x_1 & x_1 \\ x_1 & * & x_1 & * \end{array} \right]$$

in the sense that $\text{StrUni} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} \text{StrUni}'$ and $\text{StrUni}' \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} \text{StrUni}$. Let us re-prove it here using (partial) terms. The term $p(x, y, z)$ corresponding to StrUni is associated to the equations

$$\begin{cases} p(x, 0, 0) =^e x \\ p(y, y, x) =^e x \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

while the term $q(x, y, z)$ corresponding to StrUni' is associated to the equations

$$\begin{cases} q(x, x, 0) =^e x \\ q(0, 0, x) =^e x \\ q(x, 0, x) =^e 0. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

From a term $p(x, y, z)$ satisfying the equations (8), we can construct the term

$$q(x, y, z) = p(z, p(x, y, 0), y)$$

satisfying the equations (9). Indeed,

$$\begin{cases} q(x, x, 0) =^e p(0, p(x, x, 0), x) =^e p(0, 0, x) =^e x \\ q(0, 0, x) =^e p(x, p(0, 0, 0), 0) =^e p(x, 0, 0) =^e x \\ q(x, 0, x) =^e p(x, p(x, 0, 0), 0) =^e p(x, x, 0) =^e 0 \end{cases}$$

already proving $\text{StrUni} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} \text{StrUni}'$. For the other implication, from a term $q(x, y, z)$ satisfying the equations (9), we can construct the term

$$p(x, y, z) = q(q(y, 0, x), q(y, 0, x), z)$$

satisfying the equations (8). Indeed,

$$\begin{cases} p(x, 0, 0) =^e q(q(0, 0, x), q(0, 0, x), 0) =^e q(x, x, 0) =^e x \\ p(y, y, x) =^e q(q(y, 0, y), q(y, 0, y), x) =^e q(0, 0, x) =^e x \end{cases}$$

proving $\text{StrUni}' \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}_*} \text{StrUni}$.

Remark 2.6. Let us make clear that in the above proofs, *partial* terms are considered. It was shown in [16] that matrix implications are context sensitive. In particular, given matrices $M, N \in \text{matr}$, if one proves that any variety with M -closed relations has N -closed relations, this does *not* imply that $M \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} N$ in general. An example of this phenomenon has already been shown in the Introduction. Let us show here an example in the non-pointed context. We consider the matrices

$$\text{Cube}_3^{\Delta^*} = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|c} x_1 & x_1 & x_1 & x_2 & x_2 & x_1 \\ x_1 & x_2 & x_2 & x_1 & x_1 & x_1 \\ x_2 & x_1 & x_2 & x_1 & x_2 & x_1 \end{array} \right]$$

and

$$\text{Edge}_3 = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|c} x_2 & x_2 & x_1 & x_1 & x_1 \\ x_2 & x_1 & x_2 & x_1 & x_1 \\ x_1 & x_1 & x_1 & x_2 & x_1 \end{array} \right].$$

It has been shown in [16] (using a computer implementation of the algorithm, see Figure 2 in [16]) that $\text{Edge}_3 \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} \text{Cube}_3^{\Delta^*}$ but $\text{Cube}_3^{\Delta^*} \not\Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} \text{Edge}_3$ (i.e., the implication $\text{Cube}_3^{\Delta^*} \Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} \text{Edge}_3$ does *not* hold). However, it was shown in [4] that varieties with $\text{Cube}_3^{\Delta^*}$ -closed relations also have Edge_3 -closed relations. According to Theorem 1.2, a variety \mathbb{V} has $\text{Cube}_3^{\Delta^*}$ -closed relations if and only if its theory has a 5-ary term p satisfying the equations

$$\begin{cases} p(x_1, x_1, x_1, x_2, x_2) = x_1 \\ p(x_1, x_2, x_2, x_1, x_1) = x_1 \\ p(x_2, x_1, x_2, x_1, x_2) = x_1. \end{cases}$$

Such a term has been called a Δ^* -special cube term in [4], explaining the notation $\text{Cube}_3^{\Delta^*}$. Analogously, a variety \mathbb{V} has Edge_3 -closed relations if and only if its theory has a 4-ary term q satisfying the equations

$$\begin{cases} q(x_2, x_2, x_1, x_1) = x_1 \\ q(x_2, x_1, x_2, x_1) = x_1 \\ q(x_1, x_1, x_1, x_2) = x_1. \end{cases}$$

Such a term has been called a 3-edge term in [4], justifying the notation Edge_3 . Although $\text{Cube}_3^{\Delta^*} \not\Rightarrow_{\text{lex}} \text{Edge}_3$, it was shown in [4] that one can construct a 3-edge term q from a Δ^* -special cube term p as follows:

$$q(x, y, z, w) = p(p(y, z, z, w, w), z, p(x, z, z, z, z), w, p(x, w, z, w, z)).$$

One can indeed compute

$$\begin{aligned} q(x_2, x_2, x_1, x_1) &= p(p(x_2, x_1, x_1, x_1, x_1), x_1, p(x_2, x_1, x_1, x_1, x_1), x_1, p(x_2, x_1, x_1, x_1, x_1)) \\ &= x_1, \end{aligned}$$


$$\begin{aligned}
q(x_2, x_1, x_2, x_1) &= p(p(x_1, x_2, x_2, x_1, x_1), x_2, p(x_2, x_2, x_2, x_2, x_2), x_1, p(x_2, x_1, x_2, x_1, x_2)) \\
&= p(x_1, x_2, x_2, x_1, x_1) \\
&= x_1
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
q(x_1, x_1, x_1, x_2) &= p(p(x_1, x_1, x_1, x_2, x_2), x_1, p(x_1, x_1, x_1, x_1, x_1), x_2, p(x_1, x_2, x_1, x_2, x_1)) \\
&= p(x_1, x_1, x_1, x_2, x_2) \\
&= x_1.
\end{aligned}$$

However, this proof does *not* extend to the partial context since in that case $p(x_2, x_1, x_1, x_1, x_1)$ in the first equation, and so $q(x_2, x_2, x_1, x_1)$, are not defined in general.

Another consequence of Theorem 2.3 is that one can completely describe the posets of collections of categories of the form $\text{mclex}^{\text{strong}}\{M\}$ or $\text{mclex}_*^{\text{strong}}\{M\}$ for matrices M of relatively small dimensions. We consider these posets ordered by inclusion. These posets are almost isomorphic to the ones where we consider \mathcal{M}_{all} instead of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$, the only difference concerns trivial matrices (see Remarks 2.2 and 2.4). One can thus use a computer implementation of the algorithms recalled in Section 1 to describe these posets. Several of these posets have been displayed in [13, 16] for the case \mathcal{M}_{all} . For instance, derived from Figure 1 in [13], here is the Hasse diagram of the poset of collections of categories of the form $\text{mclex}_*^{\text{strong}}\{M\}$ where M runs among the matrices in $\text{matr}_*(2, 3, 2)$.



In that diagram, a weakly unital category (respectively a weakly subtractive category, a weakly strongly unital category or a weakly Mal'tsev pointed category) is a finitely complete pointed category with M -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations where $M = \text{Uni}, \text{Sub}, \text{StrUni}, \text{Mal}$ respectively.

To conclude, let us mention that if one takes $S = \{[x_1|x_1]\}$ in Theorem 2.3, one obtains the following description of anti-trivial matrix sets. Extending the terminology from [13, 16], we say that a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$ is *anti-trivial* if all finitely complete pointed categories have S -closed relations.

Corollary 2.7. *For a matrix set $S \subseteq \text{matr}_*$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) S is anti-trivial, i.e., all finitely complete pointed categories have S -closed relations;
- (2) all matrices M in S are anti-trivial in the sense of [13], i.e., all finitely complete pointed categories have M -closed relations;

- (3) all finitely complete pointed categories have S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations;
- (4) all essentially algebraic pointed categories have S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations;
- (5) for every finitely complete pointed category \mathbb{C} and every class \mathcal{M} of monomorphisms in \mathbb{C} stable under pullbacks, \mathbb{C} has S -closed \mathcal{M} -relations;
- (6) Set_* has S -closed relations;
- (7) for all matrices $M \in S$, all the entries of the right column of M are $*$'s or this right column of M can be found among its left columns.

Moreover, if $S \subseteq \text{matr}$, these are further equivalent to the following conditions:

- (8) all finitely complete categories have S -closed relations;
- (9) all matrices M in S are anti-trivial in the sense of [16], i.e., all finitely complete categories have M -closed relations;
- (10) all finitely complete categories have S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations;
- (11) all essentially algebraic categories have S -closed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{strong}}$ -relations;
- (12) for every finitely complete category \mathbb{C} and every class \mathcal{M} of monomorphisms in \mathbb{C} stable under pullbacks, \mathbb{C} has S -closed \mathcal{M} -relations;
- (13) Set has S -closed relations;
- (14) for all matrices $M \in S$, the right column of M can be found among its left columns.

Proof. Let us first note that the equivalences $(2) \Leftrightarrow (6) \Leftrightarrow (7)$ have been proved in [13]. Moreover, if $S \subseteq \text{matr}$, $(2) \Leftrightarrow (9)$ has been shown also in [13] while $(9) \Leftrightarrow (13) \Leftrightarrow (14)$ were proved in [16]. In addition, we remark that $(1) \Leftrightarrow (2)$ and $(8) \Leftrightarrow (9)$ if $S \subseteq \text{matr}$ are obvious. In view of that, we can suppose without loss of generality that $S = \{N\}$ for some $N \in \text{matr}_*$.

Now, note that if $N \in \text{matr}$ and N has no left columns, all statements in the theorem are obviously false (and thus equivalent), so that we can exclude this case without loss of generality. Now it suffices to apply Theorem 2.3 with $S' = \{[x_1|x_1]\}$; it is straightforward to show that each of its equivalent conditions becomes (equivalent to) the statements listed above. For statements (6) (respectively (13)), it is easy to see that $\text{Part}_*^{S'}$ (respectively $\text{Part}^{S'}$) for that S' is equivalent to Set_* (respectively to Set) and any monomorphism is strong in those categories. Statements (5) and (12) many seem stronger than those coming from Theorem 2.3 due to the conditions on \mathcal{M} , but they can still be easily seen to be implied by (7) and (14) respectively. \square

References

- [1] J. ADÁMEK, H. HERRLICH AND J. ROSICKÝ, Essentially equational categories, *Cah. Topol. Géom. Différ. Catég.* **29** (1988), 175–192.
- [2] J. ADÁMEK AND J. ROSICKÝ, Locally presentable and accessible categories, *London Math. Soc.* **189** (1994).
- [3] M. BARR, P. A. GRILLET AND D.H. VAN OSDOL, Exact categories and categories of sheaves, *Lect. Notes Math.* **236** (1971).

- [4] J. BERMAN, P. IDZIAK, P. MARKOVIĆ, R. MCKENZIE, M. VALERIOTE AND R. WILLARD, Varieties with few subalgebras of powers, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **362** (2010), 1445–1473.
- [5] F. BORCEUX, Handbook of Categorical Algebra 1, *Encycl. Math. Appl. (Cambridge Uni. Press)* **50** (1994).
- [6] D. BOURN, Mal'cev categories and fibration of pointed objects, *Appl. Categ. Struct.* **4** (1996), 307–327.
- [7] P. BURMEISTER, Algebraic theory of quasivarieties of heterogeneous partial algebras, *Stud. Log.* **78** (2004), 129–153.
- [8] A. CARBONI, J. LAMBEK AND M.C. PEDICCHIO, Diagram chasing in Mal'cev categories, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **69** (1991), 271–284.
- [9] A. CARBONI, M.C. PEDICCHIO AND N. PIROVANO, Internal graphs and internal groupoids in Mal'cev categories, *CMS Conf. Proc.* **13** (1992), 97–109.
- [10] N. EGNER, P-A. JACQMIN AND N. MARTINS-FERREIRA, A syntactic characterization of weakly Mal'tsev categories, *to appear in Theory Appl. Categ.*.
- [11] P. GABRIEL AND P. ULMER, Lokal präsentierbare Kategorien, *Lect. Notes Math.* **221** (1971).
- [12] M. HOEFNAGEL, Majority categories, *Theory Appl. Categ.* **34** (2019), 249–268.
- [13] M. HOEFNAGEL AND P-A. JACQMIN, Matrix taxonomy and Bourn localization, *Appl. Categ. Struct.* **30** (2022), 1305–1340.
- [14] M. HOEFNAGEL AND P-A. JACQMIN, When a matrix condition implies the Mal'tsev property, *arXiv:2208.09516v1*.
- [15] M. HOEFNAGEL AND P-A. JACQMIN, A note on the atomicity of arithmeticity, *submitted for publication in Theory Appl. Categ.*.
- [16] M. HOEFNAGEL, P-A. JACQMIN AND Z. JANELIDZE, The matrix taxonomy of finitely complete categories, *Theory Appl. Categ.* **38** (2022), 737–790.
- [17] M. HOEFNAGEL, P-A. JACQMIN, Z. JANELIDZE AND E. VAN DER WALT, On binary matrix properties, *to appear in Quaest. Math.*.
- [18] H. HÖFT, A characterization of strong homomorphisms, *Coll. Math.* **28** (1973), 189–193.
- [19] P-A. JACQMIN, Partial algebras and embedding theorems for (weakly) Mal'tsev categories and matrix conditions, *Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle Catég.* **60** (2019), 365–403.
- [20] P-A. JACQMIN AND Z. JANELIDZE, On stability of exactness properties under the pro-completion, *Advances in Mathematics* **377** (2021), 107484.
- [21] Z. JANELIDZE, Subtractive categories, *Appl. Categ. Struct.* **13** (2005), 343–350.
- [22] Z. JANELIDZE, Closedness properties of internal relations I: A unified approach to Mal'tsev, unital and subtractive categories, *Theory Appl. Categ.* **16** (2006), 236–261.
- [23] Z. JANELIDZE, Closedness properties of internal relations II: Bourn localization, *Theory Appl. Categ.* **16** (2006), 262–282.

- [24] Z. JANELIDZE AND N. MARTINS-FERREIRA, Weakly Mal'tsev categories and strong relations, *Theory Appl. Categ.* **27** (2012), 65–79.
- [25] A.I. MAL'TSEV, On the general theory of algebraic systems, *Mat. Sbornik* **35** (1954), 3–20 (in Russian); English translation: *Amer. Math. Soc. Trans.* **27** (1963), 125–142.
- [26] N. MARTINS-FERREIRA, Low-dimensional internal categorical structures in weakly Mal'cev sesquicategories, *PhD Thesis, University of Cape Town* (2008).
- [27] N. MARTINS-FERREIRA, Weakly Mal'cev categories, *Theory Appl. Categ.* **21** (2008), 91–117.
- [28] M.C. PEDICCHIO, Arithmetical categories and commutator theory, *Appl. Categ. Structures* **4** (1996), 297–305.
- [29] J. RIGUET, Relations binaires, fermetures, correspondances de Galois, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **76** (1948), 114–155.
- [30] A. URSINI, On subtractive varieties, I, *Algebra Universalis* **31** (1994), 204–222.

Email: mhoefnagel@sun.ac.za
pierre-alain.jacqmin@uclouvain.be