

UNIFORMITIES, SUPEREQUIVALENCES, AND SUPERUNIFORMITIES OF ALGEBRAS IN CONGRUENCE-MODULAR VARIETIES

WILLIAM H. ROWAN

ABSTRACT. We introduce superequivalence and superuniform spaces, and prove that the lattices of compatible superequivalences and superuniformities on an algebra are modular when the algebra is in a congruence-modular variety.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to introduce (in Section 2) *superequivalences* and (in Section 3) *superuniformities*. Like a uniformity on a set, superequivalences and superuniformities are structures which satisfy versions of the reflexive, symmetric, and transitive laws. For a uniformity, that base structure is a filter of relations on the set; for a superequivalence, it is an ideal in the lattice of relations; for a superuniformity, it is an ideal in the lattice of filters of relations.

The thesis of [11], where compatible uniformities were first studied systematically in the context of Universal Algebra, is that compatible uniformities can be considered a generalization of congruences. Often, there is a reasonably direct translation of congruence-theoretic arguments into uniformity-theoretic ones. This philosophy can be applied as well to superequivalences and superuniformities. We find that the philosophy works even better for superequivalences and superuniformities than it does for uniformities, because of the fact that the lattices involved are algebraic.

The cases of compatible equivalence relations or congruences (see [4] regarding modularity) superequivalences (Section 2), uniformities ([11], Section 1), and superuniformities (Section 2) are shown in the following table having four rows, which could be extended to an infinite number of rows summarizing the principal answer of this paper with respect to arbitrary iterates of the functors Fil (filters) and Idl (ideals), applied to the lattices of relations on a set:

Date: April 21, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 08A99; Secondary: 08B99, 08C99.

Key words and phrases. superequivalence, superuniformity.

Lattice	Algebraic	Compatible Equivalence	Modular
Rel S	yes	congruence	yes
Idl Rel S	yes	compatible superequivalence	yes
Fil Rel S	no	compatible uniformity	no
Idl Fil Rel S	yes	compatible superuniformity	yes

where a *compatible equivalence* (third column) is an element of the lattice (first column) satisfying generalized versions of the reflexive, symmetric, and transitive laws, and also, compatible with the operations of the algebra.

Thus, this paper is essentially a study of the two new rows in the table. For a brief discussion of the general theorem hinted at by the table, see Section 4. As to the usefulness of this information, we discuss that briefly in Section 5, Conclusions.

PRELIMINARIES

In this section are some preliminaries providing some explanations of concepts which may be unfamiliar. The reader may also want to consult references about Universal Algebra such as [1] and [9].

Notation. The composition of relations R and R' will be denoted by $R \circ R'$. For associative operations such as \circ , we will often denote $R \circ R$ by $R^{\circ 2}$, $R \circ R \circ R$ by $R^{\circ 3}$, etc. The opposite of a relation R will be denoted by R^{-1} . The identity relation on a set S will be denoted by Δ_S , or simply Δ .

Category theory. We follow [7] in terminology and notation. In particular, 1_A will stand for the identity arrow on an object A in a category \mathbf{C} . For example, A could be an algebra, and \mathbf{C} could be the category of algebras in a variety \mathbf{V} containing A . (On the other hand, if 1 is a constant symbol for an algebra A of some type of algebras, we will denote the 1 element of A by 1^A .)

Lattice theory. The reader should be familiar with lattices. We use \top^L and \perp^L , or just \top and \perp , to denote the greatest and least elements of a lattice L , assuming they exist, and \wedge^L and \vee^L , or just \wedge and \vee , for the meet and join operations.

Compatible relations. Suppose A is an algebra, and R is a relation on $|A|$, the underlying set of A . We say that R is compatible if for every operation w of the algebra A , which is, say, n -ary, and every n -tuple of pairs $\langle x_i, y_i \rangle$ such that $x_i R y_i$, we have $w(x_1, \dots, x_n) R w(y_1, \dots, y_n)$.

Monotone Galois connections. A (monotone) Galois connection between lattices L_1 and L_2 is a pair of monotone functions $f : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$, $g : L_2 \rightarrow L_1$ such that $f(x) \leq y$ iff $x \leq g(y)$. We say that f is the *left adjoint* of g , and g is the *right adjoint* of f . We say

$$\langle f, g \rangle : L_1 \dashv\dashv L_2,$$

borrowing the notation used for pairs of adjoint functors. Note that unlike with adjoint functors, when we talk about monotone Galois connections, left adjoints are unique, as are right adjoints.

The left adjoint preserves all joins which exist in L_1 and the right adjoint preserves all meets which exist in L_2 . Conversely, if $f : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ is a monotone function which preserves all joins, and L_1 is complete, then we can define a right adjoint $g : L_2 \rightarrow L_1$ by $g : y \mapsto \bigvee_{f(x) \leq y} x$, and dually, given a monotone function $g : L_2 \rightarrow L_1$ that preserves all joins, and if L_2 is complete, we can define a left adjoint $f : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ by $f : x \mapsto \bigwedge_{x \leq g(y)} y$. This may be compared with the Special Adjoint Functor Theorem: [7, Theorem V.8.2].

A first example of a monotone Galois connection: given sets S and T and a function $f : S \rightarrow T$, we have

$$\langle [R \mapsto f(R)], [R \mapsto f^{-1}(R)] \rangle : \text{Rel } S \rightarrow \text{Rel } T;$$

and we will see many more examples in Sections 1, 2, and 3, where we have used the theory of monotone Galois connections as an organizing principle. See [2] for more about monotone Galois connections.

Filters. If L is a lattice, then a nonempty subset $F \subseteq L$ is called a *filter* if $y \geq x \in F$ implies $y \in F$ and $x, y \in F$ imply $x \wedge y \in F$.

If $S \subseteq L$ is a nonempty set, then the *filter generated by S* , denoted by $\text{Fg}^L S$ or simply $\text{Fg } S$, is the subset of elements of L that are greater than or equal to a finite meet of elements of S . An important special case, given $x \in L$, is $\text{Fg}\{x\}$, the *principal filter generated by x* , which is just the set of elements of L greater than or equal to x .

We order the set of filters by reverse inclusion (for formal consistency between the theories of congruences and compatible uniformities) and the filters in a nonempty lattice form a complete lattice. The meet of a tuple of filters F_i is given by $\bigwedge_i F_i = \text{Fg}(\bigcup_i F_i)$. The join of the tuple is the intersection: $\bigvee_i F_i = \bigcap_i F_i$.

If F is a filter, a *base* for F is a subset $B \subseteq F$ such that $x \in F$ implies $b \leq x$ for some $b \in B$. If L is a lattice, then a subset $B \subseteq L$ is a base for a filter of L , or *filter base*, iff given any $x, y \in B$, there is a $z \in B$ such that $z \leq x \wedge y$.

Ideals. The concept of an *ideal* in a lattice is dual to that of a filter. Thus, if L is a lattice, a nonempty subset $J \subseteq L$ is called an *ideal* if $x \geq y \in J$ implies $y \in J$ and $x, y \in J$ imply $x \vee y \in J$.

If $S \subseteq L$ is a nonempty set, then the *ideal generated by S* , denoted by $\text{Ig}^L S$ or simply $\text{Ig } S$, is the subset of elements of L that are less than or equal to a finite join of elements of S . An important special case, given $x \in L$, is $\text{Ig}\{x\}$, the *principal ideal generated by x* , which is just the set of elements of L less than or equal to x .

The set of ideals is ordered by inclusion and the ideals in a nonempty lattice form a complete lattice. The meet of a tuple of ideals F_i is given by $\bigwedge_i J_i = \bigcap_i F_i$. The join of the tuple is $\bigvee_i J_i = \text{Ig}\{\bigcup_i J_i\}$.

We call the notion, dual to a base for a filter, a *ceiling of an ideal*. Every *directed set* (set $S \subseteq L$ such that if $x, y \in S$, there is a $z \in S$ such that $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$) is a ceiling for an ideal.

Universal algebra. We assume familiarity with universal algebra, as explained for example in [1]. We prefer to allow an algebra to have an empty underlying set, however. We denote the underlying set of an algebra A by $|A|$.

If R is a binary relation on (the underlying set of) an algebra A , then we denote by $\text{Cg } R$ the smallest congruence $\alpha \in \text{Con } A$ such that $R \subseteq \alpha$.

We will call a compatible, reflexive, symmetric relation on an algebra a *tolerance*.

Congruence-permutable varieties. A variety of algebras \mathbf{V} is *congruence-permutable* (or, a *Mal'tsev variety*) if for every $A \in \mathbf{V}$, for every $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con } A$, $\alpha \circ \beta = \beta \circ \alpha$. A variety is congruence-permutable iff [8] there is a ternary term p , called a *Mal'tsev term*, satisfying the identities $p(x, x, y) = y$ and $p(x, y, y) = x$. For example, the variety of groups is congruence-permutable because it has the Mal'tsev term $p(x, y, z) = xy^{-1}z$.

Congruence-modular varieties. A variety of algebras \mathbf{V} is *congruence-modular* if for every algebra $A \in \mathbf{V}$, $\text{Con } A$ is a modular lattice. A theorem [3] states that a variety \mathbf{V} is congruence-modular iff there is a natural number \mathbf{d} and a sequence $m_0, \dots, m_{\mathbf{d}}$ of quaternary terms, called *Day terms*, satisfying the following identities:

- (D1) For all i , $m_i(x, y, y, x) = x$;
- (D2) $m_0(x, y, z, w) = x$;
- (D3) $m_{\mathbf{d}}(x, y, z, w) = w$;
- (D4) for even $i < \mathbf{d}$, $m_i(x, x, y, y) = m_{i+1}(x, x, y, y)$; and
- (D5) for odd $i < \mathbf{d}$, $m_i(x, y, y, z) = m_{i+1}(x, y, y, z)$.

Example 0.1. A congruence-permutable variety, with Mal'tsev term p , is necessarily congruence-modular, with one possible sequence of Day terms given by $\mathbf{d} = 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} m_0(x, y, z, w) &= x; \\ m_1(x, y, z, w) &= p(x, p(z, y, x), w); \\ m_2(x, y, z, w) &= w. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for the variety of groups, when we use the Mal'tsev term $p(x, y, z) = xy^{-1}z$, this gives $m_1(x, y, z, w) = yz^{-1}w$.

A key theorem utilizing Day terms is the following:

Theorem 0.2 ([4, Lemma 2.3]). *Let \mathbf{V} be a variety having a sequence \mathbf{m} of Day terms, and let $A \in \mathbf{V}$, $\gamma \in \text{Con } A$, and $a, b, c, d \in A$ with $b \gamma d$. Then $a \gamma c$ iff for all i , $m_i(a, a, c, c) \gamma m_i(a, b, d, c)$.*

It is not true that there is always just one set of Mal'tsev terms or one possible set of Day terms:

Example 0.3. Consider the variety \mathbf{V} having a type with two sets of group operations, and group identities within each set, but no identities connecting the basic operations of the two sets. There are many models, e.g. the set A of integers from 0 to 999 with two group structures: addition modulo 1000, and a randomly-chosen abelian group structure for a set of 1000 elements. It seems the usual Mal'tsev terms have little relation, at least, as operations on A , and the same is true of the Day terms based on them as given in Example 0.1.

Our treatments of uniformities, superequivalences, and superuniformities will not cover completion, which is a standard part of the theory of uniform spaces (and covered in [11]), because completion is not yet worked out completely for superequivalences and superuniformities. We hope to address this lack in the not-too-distant future, because completion of uniform spaces turns out to be the analog of formation of quotient algebras in ordinary Universal Algebra.

Uniform, superequivalence, and superuniform universal algebra. Universal algebra over the base category \mathbf{Unif} of uniform spaces, as opposed to the category of sets, was first studied systematically in [11]. We introduce here the category \mathbf{SupEqv} of superequivalence spaces and the category $\mathbf{SupUnif}$ of superuniform spaces, and do a bit of Universal Algebra in those categories. It will be best if the reader has access to [11] while reading this paper, but we also devote the next section to some of the basic definitions and results about \mathbf{Unif} .

1. UNIFORMITIES

We denote the set of binary relations on a set S by $\text{Rel } S$. $\text{Rel } S$, ordered by inclusion, is a complete lattice.

Consider the conditions on a filter \mathcal{U} of relations on S :

- (U_r) if $U \in \mathcal{U}$, then $\Delta_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle s, s \rangle \mid s \in S \} \subseteq U$;
- (U_s) if $U \in \mathcal{U}$, then $U^{-1} \in \mathcal{U}$; and
- (U_t) if $U \in \mathcal{U}$, then $V^{\circ 2} \subseteq U$ for some $V \in \mathcal{U}$.

We say that \mathcal{U} is *reflexive* if it satisfies condition (U_r), *symmetric* if it satisfies condition (U_s), *transitive* if it satisfies condition (U_t), a *semiuniformity* if \mathcal{U} satisfies conditions (U_r) and (U_s), and a *uniformity* if it satisfies (U_r), (U_s), and (U_t).

Theorem 1.1. *A filter base \mathcal{B} of relations on a set S is a base for a uniformity iff*

- (BU_r) for all $U \in \mathcal{B}$, $\Delta_S \subseteq U$;
- (BU_s) for all $U \in \mathcal{B}$, there is a $V \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $V^{-1} \subseteq U$; and
- (BU_t) for all $U \in \mathcal{B}$, there is a $V \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $V^{\circ 2} \subseteq U$.

Theorem 1.2. *A filter \mathcal{U} satisfies (U_r) iff every relation in \mathcal{U} is reflexive.*

Theorem 1.3. *A filter \mathcal{U} satisfies (U_s) iff $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}^{-1}$, where $\mathcal{U}^{-1} = \{ U^{-1} \mid U \in \mathcal{U} \}$.*

Theorem 1.4. *If \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} are filters in $\text{Rel } S$, then $\{ U \circ V \mid U \in \mathcal{U}, V \in \mathcal{V} \}$ is a base for a filter $\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$ in $\text{Rel } S$.*

Note that for filters \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} of reflexive relations, $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} \leq \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$. Thus, $\mathcal{U} \leq \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{U}$ if \mathcal{U} satisfies (U_r) .

Theorem 1.5. *A filter \mathcal{U} satisfies (U_t) iff $\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{U} \leq \mathcal{U}$.*

Notation. If $U \in \mathcal{U}$, where \mathcal{U} satisfies (U_t) , and $n > 0$, then by induction we can show that there is a $V \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $V^{on} \subseteq U$. We denote such a V by nU . This notation must be used with care, particularly in relation to quantifiers; it is simply a shorthand for the statement that there exists such a V and that we will denote one such V by nU .

The categories Unif and SemiUnif. Suppose we consider pairs $\langle S, \mathcal{F} \rangle$ consisting of a set S and a filter of relations on that set. If $\langle S, \mathcal{F} \rangle, \langle T, \mathcal{F}' \rangle$ are two such pairs, and $f : S \rightarrow T$ is a function, then we denote by $f^{-1}(\mathcal{F}')$ the filter of relations $\text{Fg}\{f^{-1}(R) \mid R \in \mathcal{F}'\}$. We denote by $f(\mathcal{F})$ the filter of relations on T generated by the sets $f(R), R \in \mathcal{F}$, and we have $\langle [\mathcal{F} \mapsto f^{-1}(\mathcal{F})], [\mathcal{F} \mapsto f(\mathcal{F})] \rangle : \text{Fil Rel } S \rightarrow \text{Fil Rel } T$.

Definition 1.6. A *uniform space (semiuniform space)* is a pair $\langle S, \mathcal{U} \rangle$ such that \mathcal{U} is a uniformity (respectively, semiuniformity) on the set S .

Definition 1.7. If $\langle S, \mathcal{U} \rangle$ and $\langle T, \mathcal{V} \rangle$ are uniform (semiuniform) spaces, and $f : S \rightarrow T$, then we say that f is *uniform* if the two equivalent conditions $\mathcal{U} \leq f^{-1}(\mathcal{V}), f(\mathcal{U}) \leq \mathcal{V}$ are satisfied.

The uniform (semiuniform) spaces, and the uniform functions between them, form a category, **Unif** (respectively, **SemiUnif**).

Example 1.8. Suppose that S is a set, provided with a compact, hausdorff topology \mathcal{T} . Then there is a unique uniformity $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T})$ on S having \mathcal{T} as its topology.

Proof. Suppose $\langle S, \mathcal{U}_1 \rangle$ and $\langle S, \mathcal{U}_2 \rangle$ are two uniform spaces with underlying topology \mathcal{T} , and consider the identity function 1_S . It is continuous from $\langle S, \mathcal{T} \rangle$ to $\langle S, \mathcal{T} \rangle$, hence uniformly continuous from $\langle S, \mathcal{U}_1 \rangle$ to $\langle S, \mathcal{U}_2 \rangle$ and vice versa, because continuous functions are uniformly continuous on compact sets. Thus, $\mathcal{U}_1 \leq 1_S^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_2) = \mathcal{U}_2$, and similarly, $\mathcal{U}_2 \leq \mathcal{U}_1$. \square

The lattices Unif S and SemiUnif S . We denote the set of uniformities on a set S by $\text{Unif } S$, and the set of semiuniformities by $\text{SemiUnif } S$. We order these sets by reverse inclusion, i.e., the ordering inherited from $\text{Fil Rel } S$.

The join of a tuple of semiuniformities is simply the intersection, and $\text{SemiUnif } S$ is a distributive lattice. The theory of joins of uniformities is more difficult, as we shall see.

The meet of an arbitrary tuple of uniformities on S , in the lattice $\text{Fil Rel } S$, is a uniformity. Thus, the subset $\text{Unif } S \subseteq \text{Fil Rel } S$ is closed under arbitrary meets, and is a complete lattice with the inherited ordering. The same is true for $\text{SemiUnif } S$.

Ug \mathcal{F} . If \mathcal{F} is a filter of relations on a set S , then we define the *uniformity generated by \mathcal{F}* , as $\text{Ug } \mathcal{F} = \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{U} \in \text{Unif } S} \mathcal{U}$, and we have $\langle [\mathcal{F} \mapsto \text{Ug } \mathcal{F}], [\mathcal{U} \mapsto \mathcal{U}] \rangle : \text{Fil Rel } S \rightarrow \text{Unif } S$. (We may use the notation $\text{Ug}^S \mathcal{F}$ to emphasize that we want to consider the least *not-necessarily-compatible* uniformity on S larger than \mathcal{F} . We discuss *compatible* uniformities on an algebra a bit later.)

Permutability. Permutability of congruences is an important condition in Universal Algebra, and the theory of this condition generalizes easily to uniformities.

Lemma 1.9. *Let \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} be uniformities on a set S . Then: $\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V} \leq \mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U}$ iff $\mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U} \leq \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V} \leq \mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U} &\implies (\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V})^{-1} \leq (\mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U})^{-1} \\ &\implies \mathcal{V}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{U}^{-1} \leq \mathcal{U}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{V}^{-1} \\ &\implies \mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U} \leq \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}; \end{aligned}$$

the converse holds by symmetry. □

Definition 1.10. We say that filters of relations \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} *permute* if $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{F}$.

The join operation in the lattice of uniformities may be difficult to deal with in the general case, but the case where \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} permute is an easy and important one:

Theorem 1.11. *Let $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \text{Unif } S$. Then $\mathcal{U} \vee \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$ iff \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} permute.*

Proof. (\Leftarrow): It is trivial that $\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$ is a filter and satisfies (U_r) . If $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and $V \in \mathcal{V}$, then since $\mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U} \leq \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$, there are $\bar{U} \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\bar{V} \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\bar{V} \circ \bar{U} \subseteq U \circ V$. But, $\bar{V} \circ \bar{U} = ((\bar{U}^{-1}) \circ (\bar{V}^{-1}))^{-1}$. Thus, $\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$ also satisfies (U_s) . Finally, $(\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}) \circ (\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{U} \circ (\mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U}) \circ \mathcal{V} \leq (\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{U}) \circ (\mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{V}) \leq \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$, verifying (U_t) . Thus, $\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$ is a uniformity. Since $\mathcal{U} \leq \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{V} \leq \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$, we have $\mathcal{U} \vee \mathcal{V} \leq \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$. However, $\mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V} \leq \mathcal{U} \vee \mathcal{V}$ by (U_t) .

(\Rightarrow): If $\mathcal{U} \vee \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$, then $\mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{U} \leq \mathcal{U} \vee \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V}$, implying by Lemma 1.9 that \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} permute. □

Ug \mathcal{S} when \mathcal{S} is a semiuniformity. Based on [12, Theorem 2.2], we want to present a formula for Ug \mathcal{S} when \mathcal{S} is a semiuniformity. First, a notation;

Notation (See [12, Notation 2.1]). If $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ is a sequence of relations on a set S , then let

$$[U_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+] = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_n} U_{\gamma(1)} \circ \dots \circ U_{\gamma(n)},$$

where Γ_n denotes the set of permutations of $\{1 \dots n\}$.

Theorem 1.12. *Let \mathcal{S} be a semiuniformity on a set S . Then the sets*

$$[U_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+],$$

where $U_n \in \mathcal{S}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, form a base for the uniformity Ug \mathcal{S} .

Proof. It is clear that the given set of relations is a filter base.

We prove the conditions (Theorem 1.1) for this set to be a base for a uniformity:

(BU_r) : Since every $U \in \mathcal{S}$ is reflexive by (U_r) , so is every relation of the form $[U_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+]$ for a sequence $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ of relations $U_n \in \mathcal{S}$.

(BU_s): Given $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$, we have the sequence $\{U_n^{\text{op}}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$, with $U_n^{\text{op}} \in \mathcal{S}$ by (U_s), and we have

$$[U_n^{\text{op}} : n \in \mathbb{N}_+]^{\text{op}} \subseteq [U_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+].$$

(BU_t): Given $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$, with $U_n \in \mathcal{S}$, we let $V = [U_{2n} \cap U_{2n-1} : n \in \mathbb{N}_+]$; we have $V^{\circ 2} \subseteq [U_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+]$.

Thus, the formula gives a uniformity \mathcal{U} . We have $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{U}$, because given a sequence $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$, we have $U_1 \subseteq [U_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+]$. Suppose then that \mathcal{V} is a uniformity with $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{V}$, and let $V \in \mathcal{V}$. Then $V \in \mathcal{S}$; let $V_0 = V, \dots, V_n = {}^3V_{n-1}$. We have $[V_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+] \subseteq V$, showing that $\mathcal{U} \leq \mathcal{V}$. \square

Joins. The formula for $\text{Ug } \mathcal{S}$ can be applied to give a formula for the join of a tuple of uniformities, since if \mathcal{U}_i are uniformities, $\bigcap_i \mathcal{U}_i$ will be a semiuniformity:

Theorem 1.13. *If $\mathcal{U}_i, i \in I$ are elements of $\text{Unif } S$, then $\bigvee_i \mathcal{U}_i = \text{Ug}(\bigcap_i \mathcal{U}_i)$.*

Compatible uniformities. If R is a relation on an algebra A , we say that R is *compatible* (with the operations of A) if $\mathbf{a} R \mathbf{a}'$ implies $\omega^A(\mathbf{a}) R \omega^A(\mathbf{a}')$ for each operation symbol ω , where $\mathbf{a} R \mathbf{a}'$ means that $a_i R a'_i$ for all i .

We say that a filter \mathcal{U} of reflexive relations on an algebra A is *compatible* if for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$, and each basic operation symbol ω , there is a $\bar{U} \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\omega(\bar{U}) = \{\langle \omega(\mathbf{x}), \omega(\mathbf{y}) \rangle \mid x_i \bar{U} y_i \text{ for all } i\} \subseteq U$. In this case, for any term t , given $U \in \mathcal{U}$, there is a $\bar{U} \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $t(\bar{U}) \subseteq U$.

If A is an algebra, then by $\text{Unif } A$ ($\text{SemiUnif } A$) we will mean the lattice of compatible uniformities (respectively, semiuniformities). If instead we want to talk about the lattice of not-necessarily compatible uniformities or semiuniformities, we will say $\text{Unif } |A|$ or $\text{SemiUnif } |A|$. An arbitrary meet of compatible uniformities (semiuniformities) is compatible. Thus, the subset of $\text{Unif } |A|$ of compatible uniformities is a complete lattice,

$\text{Ug}^A \mathcal{F}$. If A is an algebra, and \mathcal{F} is a filter of relations on A , we define $\text{Ug}^A \mathcal{F} = \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \in \text{Unif } A} \mathcal{U}$, and we then have $\langle [\mathcal{F} \mapsto \text{Ug}^A \mathcal{F}], [\mathcal{U} \mapsto \mathcal{U}] \rangle : \text{Fil Rel } S \rightarrow \text{Unif } A$.

Theorem 1.14. *Let A be an algebra. The meet and join (in the lattice of uniformities on the set $|A|$) of a tuple of compatible uniformities are compatible.*

Proof. See [11, Theorem 5.3] (for the join; we discussed the meet above) or [12, Corollary 2.4]. \square

Thus, $\text{Unif } A$ is a complete sublattice of $\text{Unif } |A|$.

As we mentioned previously, $\text{SemiUnif } A$ is also a complete lattice.

Examples of compatible uniformities.

Example 1.15. Suppose $\langle A, \mathcal{T} \rangle$ is a topological algebra, which as a topological space is compact and hausdorff. We assume that \mathcal{T} is compatible with the operations of A . The unique uniformity $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T})$ giving rise to \mathcal{T} (Example 1.8) is compatible.

Proof. Continuous operations are uniformly continuous on compact sets. \square

Example 1.16. Suppose $\mathcal{R} = \text{Fg}\{\alpha\}$ where $\alpha \in \text{Con } A$. Then $\text{Ug}^A \mathcal{R} = \text{Fg}^{\text{Rel } A}\{\alpha\}$.

Example 1.17. More generally, suppose $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{F}$, where \mathcal{F} is a filter in $\text{Con } A$. In this case, $\text{Ug } \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{F}$. We call uniformities of this form *congruential uniformities*.

Example 1.18. Let A be an algebra and \mathcal{S} a compatible semiuniformity. Then $\text{Ug}^{|A|} \mathcal{S}$ is a compatible uniformity.

Proof. Theorem 1.8 gives a formula for $\text{Ug } \mathcal{S}$. Given a sequence $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ with $U_n \in \mathcal{S}$ for all n , and a basic operation ω , there exists a $V_n \in \mathcal{S}$ for each n such that $\omega(V_n) \subseteq U_n$. We have

$$[V_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+] \subseteq [U_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_+],$$

because for all n ,

$$\omega \left(\bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_n} V_{\gamma(1)} \circ \dots \circ V_{\gamma(n)} \right) = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_n} \omega(V_{\gamma(1)}) \circ \dots \circ \omega(V_{\gamma(n)}) \subseteq \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_n} U_{\gamma(1)} \circ \dots \circ U_{\gamma(n)}.$$

□

Example 1.19. If $\mathcal{U} \in \text{Unif } A$, then $\bigcap \mathcal{U} \in \text{Con } A$. We may consider this as a mapping from $\text{Unif } A$ to $\text{Unif } A$, where we map \mathcal{U} to $\text{Fg}\{\bigcap \mathcal{U}\}$; more generally, we can map \mathcal{U} to the filter of κ -fold intersections of relations in \mathcal{U} , for κ some given infinite cardinal. The result will be a compatible uniformity \mathcal{V} such that \mathcal{V} admits κ -fold intersections of its elements. We say that \mathcal{V} *satisfies the κ -fold intersection property*.

Uniformities and homomorphisms.

Theorem 1.20. *Let A, B be algebras, and $f : B \rightarrow A$ a homomorphism. We have*

- (1) *If \mathcal{U} is a compatible uniformity (compatible semiuniformity) on A , then $f^{-1}(\mathcal{U})$ is a compatible uniformity (respectively, compatible semiuniformity) on B .*
- (2) *The mapping $\mathcal{U} \mapsto f^{-1}(\mathcal{U})$ preserves arbitrary meets.*

Theorem 1.21. *Let A and B be algebras, and $f : A \rightarrow B$ a homomorphism. Then the mapping $\mathcal{U} \mapsto \text{Ug}(f(\mathcal{U}))$ preserves arbitrary joins.*

Remark. In [11, Section 11], there is an incorrect statement about the procedure for finding the colimit of a diagram $F : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}[\mathbf{Unif}]$, in the category $\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{Unif}]$ of algebra objects in the category \mathbf{Unif} and satisfying the identities of \mathbf{V} . The uniformity of the colimit is the smallest *compatible* uniformity greater than or equal to all of the $\iota_d(\mathcal{U}(d))$, where ι_d is the insertion of $F(d)$ into the colimit and $\mathcal{U}(d)$ is the uniformity on $F(d)$.

Compatible uniformities on algebras in congruence-permutable algebras. We recall ([11, Theorems 6.4 and 6.2]) that if A is an algebra in a congruence-permutable variety, and $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \text{Unif } A$, then \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} permute, and that $\text{Unif } A$ is modular.

Compatible uniformities on algebras in congruence-modular varieties. Contrary to what one might (and indeed, we did) conjecture from Day's Theorem[3], and the success in generalizing Mal'tsev's Theorem to congruence-permutable algebras with a compatible uniformity, an algebra A in a congruence-modular variety can have a lattice $\text{Unif } A$ of compatible uniformities that is not modular. Indeed:

Example 1.22 ([12, Example 2.4]). Let C be an infinite chain, i.e., an infinite lattice which is totally ordered. Then $\text{Unif } C$ is not modular. For details, we refer the reader to the discussion of this example in [12]. Note that the author gives lattices of uniformities the reverse ordering of the one we use, thus, interchanging the meet (inf) and join (sup) operations.

2. SUPEREQUIVALENCES

Notation. If $\mathcal{I} \in \text{Idl Rel } S$ for some set S , then \mathcal{I}^{op} will denote the ideal $\{\mathcal{R}^{\text{op}} \mid R \in \mathcal{I}\}$. If $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}' \in \text{Idl Rel } S$, then $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I}'$ will denote the ideal $\text{Ig}\{R \circ R' \mid R \in \mathcal{I}, R' \in \mathcal{I}'\}$.

Definition 2.1. Consider conditions on $\mathcal{I} \in \text{Idl Rel } S$:

- (SE_r) $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{I}$;
- (SE_s) $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^{\text{op}}$;
- (SE_t) $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{I}$,

We say that \mathcal{I} is *reflexive* if it satisfies condition (SE_r), *symmetric* if it satisfies condition (SE_s), *transitive* if it satisfies condition (SE_t), a *semisuperequivalence* if it satisfies (SE_r) and (SE_s), and a *superequivalence* if it satisfies (SE_r), (SE_s), and (SE_t).

Theorem 2.2. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal of relations on a set S . The following are equivalent:

- (1) \mathcal{I} is a superequivalence;
- (2) \mathcal{I} is generated, as an ideal, by symmetric relations, and closed under composition of relations;
- (3) \mathcal{I} is generated, as an ideal, by symmetric relations, and closed under relational powers.

If $f : S \rightarrow T$ is a function from S to another set T , then there is an inverse image mapping along f from $\text{Idl Rel } T$ to $\text{Idl Rel } S$, given by

$$\mathcal{I} \mapsto f^{-1}(\mathcal{I}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Ig}\{f^{-1}(R) \mid R \in \mathcal{I}\},$$

and a direct image mapping along f from $\text{SupEqv } S$ to $\text{SupEqv } T$, given by

$$\mathcal{I} \mapsto f(\mathcal{I}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f(R) \mid R \in \mathcal{I}\};$$

and we have $\langle [\mathcal{I} \mapsto f(\mathcal{I})], [I' \mapsto f^{-1}(I')] \rangle : \text{Idl Rel } S \rightarrow \text{Idl Rel } T$.

Definition 2.3. If S is a set and \mathcal{I} is a superequivalence (semisuperequivalence) then we say that $\langle S, \mathcal{I} \rangle$ is a *superequivalence space* (respectively, *semisuperequivalence space*).

Definition 2.4. If $\langle S, \mathcal{I} \rangle$ and $\langle T, \mathcal{I}' \rangle$ are superequivalence (semisuperequivalence) spaces, a function $f : S \rightarrow T$ is a *superequivalent function* if the equivalent conditions $f(\mathcal{I}) \leq \mathcal{I}'$, $\mathcal{I} \leq f^{-1}(\mathcal{I}')$ are satisfied, which happens iff $R \in \mathcal{I} \implies f(R) \in \mathcal{I}'$.

Superequivalence spaces, and the superequivalent functions between them, form a category, which we denote by **SupEqv**. Similarly, we have the category **SemiSupEqv** of semisuperequivalence spaces.

The category-theoretic product of superequivalence or semisuperequivalence spaces $\langle S, \mathcal{I} \rangle$ and $\langle T, \mathcal{I}' \rangle$ is

$$\langle S, \mathcal{I} \rangle \times \langle T, \mathcal{I}' \rangle = \langle S \times T, \text{Ig}\{R \times \mathcal{R}' \mid \mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{R}' \in \mathcal{I}'\} \rangle.$$

Example 2.5. Let S be a set, and α an equivalence relation on S . Then $\langle S, \text{Ig}\{\alpha\} \rangle$ is a superequivalence space.

Example 2.6. Let S be a set, and α a symmetric relation on S . Then $\langle S, \text{Ig}^\circ\{\alpha\} \rangle$ is a superequivalence space, where $\text{Ig}^\circ \mathcal{R}$, for a set of relations \mathcal{R} , is the ideal generated by the set of finite compositions of relations in \mathcal{R} .

Example 2.7. Let S be a set, and let \mathcal{R} be the set of reflexive, symmetric relations on S that relate only a finite number of off-diagonal pairs $s \neq s'$. Then $\langle S, \text{Ig}^\circ \mathcal{R} \rangle$ is a superequivalence space, which we denote by $\Xi(S)$.

[add = $\text{SEg} \bigvee^{\text{Idl Rel } S} \bigcup_i \mathcal{I}_i$ - make def of SEg]

The lattices $\text{SupEqv } S$ and $\text{SemiSupEqv } S$. We denote the set of superequivalences on a set S by $\text{SupEqv } S$ and the set of semisuperequivalences by SemiSupEqv . They admit complete meet operations given by intersection of ideals, and complete join operations given by

$$\bigvee_i^{\text{SupEqv}} \mathcal{I}_i = \text{Ig}^\circ \left\{ \bigcup_i \mathcal{I}_i \right\},$$

and

$$\bigvee_i^{\text{SemiSupEqv}} \mathcal{I}_i = \text{Ig} \left\{ \bigcup_i \mathcal{I}_i \right\}.$$

$\text{SEg } \mathcal{I}$, the **superequivalence generated by an ideal \mathcal{I}** . Since $\text{SupEqv } S$ is a subset of $\text{Idl Rel } S$ closed under arbitrary meets, we can define $\text{SEg } \mathcal{I}$, for any ideal of relations \mathcal{I} , as $\bigwedge_{\mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{J} \in \text{SupEqv } S} \mathcal{J}$, and we then have $\langle [\mathcal{I} \mapsto \text{SEg } \mathcal{I}], \mathcal{J} \mapsto \mathcal{J} \rangle : \text{Idl Rel } S \rightarrow \text{SupEqv } S$.

Permutability for superequivalences.

Definition 2.8. We say that two superequivalences $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'$ on a set S *permute* if $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I}' = \mathcal{I}' \circ \mathcal{I}$.

Theorem 2.9. *Superequivalences \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}' permute iff $\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{I}' = \mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I}'$.*

Proof. We have $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I}' \leq \mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{I}'$ for any superequivalences \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}' , because $\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{I}'$ contains \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}' and satisfies (SU_t) . If \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}' permute, then $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I}'$ is a superequivalence, being an ideal of relations closed under composition, and so, it is the join. For, $\text{Ig}\{\Delta\} \leq \mathcal{I}$, which implies $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I}' \leq \mathcal{I}'$, and similarly, $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I}' \leq \mathcal{I}$.

Conversely, if $\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{I}' = \mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I}'$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I}' &= \mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{I}' \\ &= (\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{I}')^{\text{op}} \\ &= (\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I}')^{\text{op}} \\ &= (\mathcal{I}')^{\text{op}} \circ (\mathcal{I})^{\text{op}} \\ &= \mathcal{I}' \circ \mathcal{I}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.10. *Let L be a sublattice of $\text{SupEqv } S$ for some set S . If the elements of L permute pairwise, then L is modular.*

Proof. It suffices to show, given $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}', \mathcal{I}'' \in \text{SupUnif } A$ such that $\mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{I}''$, that

$$(\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{I}') \wedge \mathcal{I}'' \leq \mathcal{I} \vee (\mathcal{I}' \wedge \mathcal{I}''),$$

as the opposite inequality holds in any lattice. The left-hand side is generated by relations $(R \circ R') \cap R''$ such that $R \in \mathcal{I}$, $R' \in \mathcal{I}'$, and $R'' \in \mathcal{I}''$, so let $(R \circ R') \cap R''$ be such a relation. Consider $R \circ ((R' \wedge (R^{-1} \circ R'')) \in \mathcal{I} \circ (\mathcal{I}' \wedge \mathcal{I}'')$. If $a R b R' c$ and $a R'' c$, then $a R b$ and $b R' \cap (R^{-1} \circ R'') c$, showing that $(R \circ R') \wedge R'' \leq R \circ (R' \wedge (R^{-1} \circ R''))$. □

Lemma 2.11. *If $\pi : A \rightarrow B$ is an onto function, and $\{\mathcal{I}_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a tuple of superequivalences on B , then*

$$\pi^{-1}\left(\bigvee_i \mathcal{I}_i\right) = \bigvee_i \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{I}_i).$$

Proof. (\geq ;) By monotonicity of inverse image.

(\leq ;) Let $R \in \pi^{-1} \text{Ig}^\circ\{\bigcup_i \mathcal{I}_i\}$. Then for some finite tuple ι_1, \dots, ι_n where each $\iota_j \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R &\leq \pi^{-1}(R_1 \circ \dots \circ R_n) \text{ where each } R_j \in \mathcal{I}_{\iota_j} \\ &= \pi^{-1}(R_1) \circ \dots \circ \pi^{-1}(R_n) \\ &\in \text{Ig}^\circ\left\{\bigcup_i \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{I}_i)\right\} \\ &= \bigvee_i \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{I}_i). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $R \in \bigvee_i \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{I}_i)$. □

Theorem 2.12. *For any set S , $\text{SupEqv } S$ and $\text{SemiSupEqv } S$ are algebraic lattices.*

Remark. Algebraicity is a very important property. For lack of algebraicity of $\text{SemiUnif } A$ for an algebra A in a congruence-modular variety, we were only able to give a partial proof of modularity of the lattice $\text{Unif } A$ in [11]. (Indeed, see Example 1.22.)

Algebraicity of $\text{SupEqv } S$ plays a crucial role in the proof of the following theorem:

Theorem 2.13. *The category SupEqv is cartesian closed.*

Proof. Let the cartesian closedness adjunction for \mathbf{Set} , parameterized by the set b , be

$$\alpha^b : \mathbf{Set}(a \times b, c) \cong \mathbf{Set}(a, c^b)$$

for sets a and c . For every $\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle, \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle$ in \mathbf{SupEqv} , we define $\langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle} = \langle c^b, (\mathcal{I}'')^{\mathcal{I}'} \rangle$ where

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{I}'')^{\mathcal{I}'} &= \text{SEg} \left(\bigvee_{f \in \mathbf{SupEqv}(\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle, \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle)} \text{Idl Rel } c^b \quad \alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I}) \right), \\ &= \left(\bigvee_{f \in \mathbf{SupEqv}(\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle, \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle)} \text{Idl Rel } c^b \quad \text{SEg}(\alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I})) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and the adjunction $\alpha^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle}$ by

$$\alpha^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle}(f) = \alpha^b(f).$$

Our first task is to show that our formula for the function space is functorial in $\langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle$. This means that if $g : \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle \rightarrow \langle c', \mathcal{I}''' \rangle$, we want $g^b \in \mathbf{SupEqv}(\langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle}, \langle c', \mathcal{I}''' \rangle^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle})$, or in other words, that

$$g^b((\mathcal{I}'')^{\mathcal{I}'}) = g^b \left(\bigvee_{f \in \mathbf{SupEqv}(\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle, \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle)} \text{Idl Rel } c^b \quad \alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I}) \right) \leq (\mathcal{I}''')^{\mathcal{I}'}$$

However, forward image preserves joins. Thus it suffices to prove that if $f : \langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle \rightarrow \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle$, then $g^b(\alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I})) \leq \alpha^b(g \circ f)(\mathcal{I})$. This is true because by the naturality of α^b , $g^b \circ \alpha^b(f) = \alpha^b(g \circ f)$.

The unit natural transformation $\eta_{\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle}^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle} : \langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle \rightarrow (\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle)^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle}$ is just the arrow $\eta_a^b : a \rightarrow (a \times b)^b$, i.e., the unit natural transformation for the underlying adjunction in \mathbf{Set} , and is an element of $\mathbf{SupEqv}(\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle, (\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle)^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle})$ because $\eta_a^b = \alpha^b(1_{a \times b}) = \alpha^b(1_{\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle})$.

The counit natural transformation $\varepsilon_{\langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle}^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle} : \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle} \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle \rightarrow \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle$ is the underlying counit arrow $\varepsilon_c^b : c^b \times b \rightarrow c$, and is an element of $\mathbf{SupEqv}(\langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle} \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle, \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle)$. For, if we take the product of the arrow $\alpha^b(f)$ and 1_b , and then compose the resulting element of $\mathbf{Set}(a \times b, c^b \times b)$ with ε_c^b , we get back f , showing that for any single $f \in \mathbf{SupEqv}(\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle}, \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle)$, $\varepsilon_c^b(\text{Eqv}(\alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I}))) \leq \text{Eqv}(\varepsilon_c^b(\alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I}''))) = \text{Eqv}(f(\mathcal{I})) \leq \mathcal{I}''$.

The set of $\alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I})$ is directed, because given $f : \langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle \rightarrow \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle$ and $\hat{f} : \langle \hat{a}, \hat{\mathcal{I}} \rangle \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle \rightarrow \langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle$, we have

$$\alpha^b(f) \cup \alpha^b(\hat{f}) \in \text{SupEqv}(\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle \amalg \langle \hat{a}, \hat{\mathcal{I}} \rangle, \langle c^b, (\mathcal{I}'')^{\mathcal{I}'} \rangle),$$

where \amalg denotes the coproduct. If $\iota_{\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle}$ and $\iota_{\langle \hat{a}, \hat{\mathcal{I}} \rangle}$ are the insertions of $\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{a}, \hat{\mathcal{I}} \rangle$ into the coproduct, then the superequivalence $\mathcal{I} \amalg \hat{\mathcal{I}}$ of the coproduct is $\text{SEg} \left(\iota_{\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle}(\mathcal{I}) \vee \iota_{\langle \hat{a}, \hat{\mathcal{I}} \rangle}(\hat{\mathcal{I}}) \right)$, and we have

$$\alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I}) \vee \alpha^b(\hat{f})(\hat{\mathcal{I}}) \leq (\alpha^b(f) \cup \alpha^b(\hat{f}))(\mathcal{I} \amalg \hat{\mathcal{I}}).$$

Since SEg is a monotone operation, the set of $\text{SEg}(\alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I}))$ is also directed. From Lemma 2.11 and the fact that $\text{Idl Rel}(c^b \times b)$ is algebraic and thus meet-continuous, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{I}'')^{\mathcal{I}'} \times \mathcal{I}' &= \pi^{-1} \left(\bigvee_f \text{SEg}(\alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I})) \right) \wedge (\pi')^{-1}(\mathcal{I}') \\ &= \left(\bigvee_f \pi^{-1}(\alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I})) \right) \wedge (\pi')^{-1}(\mathcal{I}') \\ &= \bigvee_f (\pi^{-1}(\text{SEg}(\alpha^b(f)(\mathcal{I}))) \wedge (\pi')^{-1}(\mathcal{I}')) ; \end{aligned}$$

and it follows that $\varepsilon_{\langle c, \mathcal{I}'' \rangle}^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle}$ is a superequivalent function, as stated.

The unit $\eta_{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle}$ and counit $\varepsilon_{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle}$ inherit naturality and the equations

$$\left(\varepsilon_{\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle}^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle} \right)^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle} \circ \eta_{\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle}^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle} = 1_{\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle}^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle}, \quad \varepsilon_{\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle}^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle} \circ \left(\eta_{\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle}^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle} \times \langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle \right) = 1_{\langle a, \mathcal{I} \rangle}^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle}$$

([7, Equations IV.1(8)]), sufficient to demonstrate the adjunction $\alpha^{\langle b, \mathcal{I}' \rangle}$ by [7, Theorem IV.1.2], from the corresponding equations for the unit η^b and counit ε^b of α^b . \square

Compatible superequivalences.

Definition 2.14. A superequivalence \mathcal{I} on an algebra A is *compatible* if for every n -ary basic operation ω , for every n , we have $\omega(R_1, \dots, R_n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle \omega(a_1, \dots, a_n), \omega(b_1, \dots, b_n) \rangle \mid \langle a_i, b_i \rangle \in R_i \text{ for all } i \} \in \mathcal{I}$ for all $R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathcal{I}$.

Remark. In other words, a superequivalence \mathcal{I} on A is compatible with an n -ary operation w iff w is a superequivalent function from $\langle A, \mathcal{I} \rangle^n$ to $\langle A, \mathcal{I} \rangle$.

Notation. We denote the set of compatible superequivalences (semisuperequivalences) on an algebra A by $\text{SupEqv } A$ (respectively, $\text{SemiSupEqv } A$).

Notation (Continuation of Example 2.7). If R is a ring, then $\Xi(A) \notin \text{SupEqv } A$.

Example 2.15. If A is an algebra, the set of congruences on A which are finitely generated (i.e., which as equivalence relations, are generated by a finite number of pairs of elements) is a directed set, and thus a ceiling of a compatible superequivalence on A .

Proof. The set of such congruences is directed because if S_1 and S_2 are finite sets of pairs, then

$$\text{Cg } S_1 \circ \text{Cg } S_2 \subseteq \text{Cg } S_1 \vee \text{Cg } S_2 \subseteq \text{Cg}(S_1 \cup S_2).$$

□

Theorem 2.16. *The meet and join of tuples of superequivalences compatible with an operation w are compatible with w .*

Proof. Let \mathcal{I}_i be superequivalences on A compatible with an n -ary operation w . We have $\bigwedge_i \mathcal{I}_i = \bigcap_i \mathcal{I}_i$. We must show that if $R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathcal{I}_i$ for all i , then $w(R_1, \dots, R_n) \in \mathcal{I}_i$ for all i . However, each \mathcal{I}_i is compatible with w .

On the other hand, we have $\bigvee_i \mathcal{I}_i = \text{Ig}^\circ \{ \bigcup_i \mathcal{I}_i \}$. Given $R_1, \dots, R_n \in \bigvee_i \mathcal{I}_i$, we need to have $w(R_1, \dots, R_n) \in \bigvee_i \mathcal{I}_i$. However, each R_j is contained in a finite composition of relations $R'_{j,k}$ for some relations $R'_{j,k} \in \mathcal{I}_k$, and $w(R_1, \dots, R_n)$ is thus a finite composition of relations of the form $w(\Delta, \dots, \Delta, R'_{j,k}, \Delta, \dots, \Delta)$, which is a relation in \mathcal{I}_k because \mathcal{I}_k is compatible with w . Thus, $w(R_1, \dots, R_n)$ is contained in a finite composition of elements of $\bigcup_i \mathcal{I}_i$. □

$\text{SEg}^A \mathcal{I}$ and $\text{SEg}^{|A|} \mathcal{I}$. As a corollary, given an ideal of relations \mathcal{I} on A , we can define

$$\text{SEg}^A \mathcal{I} = \bigwedge_{\mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{J} \in \text{SupEqv } A} \mathcal{J},$$

and we have $\langle [\mathcal{I} \mapsto \text{SEg}^A \mathcal{I}], [\mathcal{J} \mapsto \mathcal{J}] \rangle : \text{Idl Rel } A \rightarrow \text{SupEqv } A$.

As with Ug , we differentiate between $\text{SEg}^A \mathcal{I}$ and $\text{SEg}^{|A|} \mathcal{I}$.

Lemma 2.17. *If \mathcal{I} is a symmetric ideal of relations on A , then*

$$\text{SEg}^{|A|} \mathcal{I} = \text{Ig}^\circ \left\{ \bigcup_i \mathcal{I}_i \right\}.$$

Compatible superequivalences of congruence-permutable algebras. As with **Unif**, Mal'tsev's Theorem generalizes easily:

Theorem 2.18. *Let A be an algebra with a Mal'tsev term p . Then any two compatible superequivalences on A permute.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'$ be compatible superequivalences on A . It suffices to show $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{I}' \leq \mathcal{I}' \circ \mathcal{I}$. Thus it suffices to show, if $R \in \mathcal{I}, R' \in \mathcal{I}'$, then $R \circ R' \in \mathcal{I}' \circ \mathcal{I}$.

Δ belongs to every superequivalence, by (SE_r) . Thus we have

$$p(\Delta, \Delta, R') \circ p(R, \Delta, \Delta) \in \mathcal{I}' \circ \mathcal{I}$$

since \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}' are compatible with the term operation p . $a R b R' c$ then implies

$$a = p(a, b, b) p(\Delta, \Delta, R') p(a, b, c) p(R, \Delta, \Delta) p(b, b, c) = c,$$

proving that $R \circ R' \leq p(\Delta, \Delta, R') \circ p(R, \Delta, \Delta) \in \mathcal{I}' \circ \mathcal{I}$. □

Corollary 2.19. *Let A be an algebra with a Mal'tsev term. Then $\text{SupEqv } A$ is modular.*

Example 2.20. Let A be an algebra with a Mal'tsev term. Then an ideal in $\text{Con } A$ is a compatible superequivalence, because if $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}$, then $\alpha \circ \beta = \alpha \vee \beta \in \mathcal{I}$.

Compatible superequivalences of algebras in congruence-modular varieties. The above results show that existence of a Mal'tsev term, in a variety containing an algebra A , influences the structure of the lattice $\text{SupEqv } A$ in the same way it influences that of $\text{Con } A$. We are led to ask whether (unlike the situation for algebra objects in **Unif**) the existence of a sequence of Day terms in a variety \mathbf{V} forces $\text{SupEqv } A$ to be modular when $A \in \mathbf{V}$.

Notation. In connection with Day terms, given a relation R on an algebra A , we will define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}(R) &= \bigcup_i m_i(R, R, R, R) \\ &= \bigcup_i \{ \langle m_i(a, b, c, d), m_i(a', b', c', d') \rangle \mid a R a', b R b', c R c', \text{ and } d R d' \}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.21. *We have*

- (1) $R \subseteq \mathbf{m}(R)$.
- (2) *If a superequivalence \mathcal{I} is compatible with the operations m_i , and $R \in \mathcal{I}$, then $\mathbf{m}(R) \in \mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. (1): $m_i(a, a, a, a) = a$ for all i and all $a \in A$.

(2): The tuple \mathbf{m} is finite. Since \mathcal{I} is compatible, $m_i(R) \in \mathcal{I}$ for each i , but \mathcal{I} is an ideal of relations. □

For the following discussion, \mathbf{V} will be a congruence-modular variety, $m_i, i = 0, \dots, \mathbf{d}$ will be a sequence of Day terms for \mathbf{V} , and A will be an algebra in \mathbf{V} . Our first goal will be to prove a generalization of the Shifting Lemma [5].

Lemma 2.22. *Let $\mathcal{I} \in \text{SupEqv } A$. If $R \in \mathcal{I}$, and $Y = \mathbf{m}(R')^{2\mathbf{d}}$, the relational composition of $2\mathbf{d}$ copies of the relation $\mathbf{m}(R')$, where $R' = R \cup R^{\text{op}}$, then if $a, b, c, d \in A$ with $b R d$ and $m_i(a, a, c, c) R m_i(a, b, d, c)$ for all i , we have $a Y c$.*

Proof. Let $u_i = m_i(a, b, d, c)$ and $v_i = m_i(a, a, c, c)$ for all i . If $b R d$ and $m_i(a, a, c, c) R m_i(a, b, d, c)$ for all i , then for even $i < \mathbf{d}$, we have $u_i \mathbf{m}(R') v_i = v_{i+1} \mathbf{m}(R') u_{i+1}$, while for odd $i < \mathbf{d}$, we have $u_i \mathbf{m}(R') m_i(a, b, b, c) = m_{i+1}(a, b, b, c) \mathbf{m}(R') u_{i+1}$.

Thus, for $i < \mathbf{d}$, $u_i \mathbf{m}(R') \circ \mathbf{m}(R') u_{i+1}$, and consequently, $a = u_0 Y u_{\mathbf{d}} = c$. □

Lemma 2.23 (A Shifting Lemma for Superequivalences). *Let $\mathcal{R} \in \text{Idl Rel } A$ satisfy (SE_r) and (SE_s) and be compatible, and let $\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2 \in \text{SupEqv } A$ be such that $\mathcal{R} \wedge \mathcal{I}_1 \leq \mathcal{I}_2 \leq \mathcal{I}_1$. Then $(\mathcal{R} \circ (\mathcal{I}_1 \wedge \mathcal{I}_2) \circ \mathcal{R}) \wedge \mathcal{I}_1 \leq \mathcal{I}_2$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that, given relations $R \in \mathcal{R}$, $F \in \mathcal{I}_1$, and $X \in \mathcal{I}_1 \wedge \mathcal{I}_2 = \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2$, there is a relation $Y \in \mathcal{I}_2$ such that

$$(R \circ X \circ R) \cap F \subseteq Y;$$

to prove this, it suffices to construct Y and show that $a R b X d R c$ and $a F c$ imply $a Y c$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that the given R , F , and X are symmetric, because \mathcal{R} , \mathcal{I}_1 , and \mathcal{I}_2 all satisfy (SE_s) .

Let $W = \mathbf{m}(X) \cup (\mathbf{m}(R) \cap (\mathbf{m}(F) \circ \mathbf{m}(F) \circ \mathbf{m}(X)))$. Since \mathcal{R} is compatible, \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 are compatible superequivalences, and $\mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{I}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{I}_2$, we have $W \in \mathcal{I}_2$.

If $a R b X d R c$ and $a F c$, then $m_i(a, a, c, c) \mathbf{m}(R) m_i(a, b, d, c)$ for all i , and $m_i(a, a, c, c) \mathbf{m}(F) m_i(a, a, a, a) = a = m_i(a, b, b, a) \mathbf{m}(F) m_i(a, b, b, c) \mathbf{m}(X) m_i(a, b, d, c)$ for all i . Thus, $m_i(a, a, c, c) W m_i(a, b, d, c)$ for all i . We also have $b W d$ because $b X d$. Then by Lemma 2.22, $a Y c$ where $Y = (W \cup W^{\text{op}})^{\text{d}}$. \square

Finally, we have

Theorem 2.24. *The lattice $\text{SupEqv } A$ is modular.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}', \mathcal{I}'' \in \text{SupUnif } A$ be such that $\mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{I}''$. Then

$$\mathcal{I} \vee (\mathcal{I}' \wedge \mathcal{I}'') \leq (\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{I}') \wedge \mathcal{I}'',$$

as this inequality holds in any lattice when $\mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{I}''$.

Define \mathcal{R}_k and \mathcal{R}'_k for every natural number k as $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}'_0 = \mathcal{I}'$, $\mathcal{R}_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}_k \circ \mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{R}_k$, and $\mathcal{R}'_k = \mathcal{R}'_k \circ (\mathcal{I}_1 \wedge \mathcal{I}_2) \circ \mathcal{R}'_k$ where $\mathcal{I}_1 = \mathcal{I}'$ and $\mathcal{I}_2 = \mathcal{I} \vee (\mathcal{I}' \wedge \mathcal{I}'')$. Since $\mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{I}_2 \leq \mathcal{I}_1$ we have for every k , $\mathcal{R}_k \leq \mathcal{R}'_k$. We also have $\mathcal{R}'_0 \wedge \mathcal{I}_1 = \mathcal{I}' \wedge \mathcal{I}'' \leq \mathcal{I}_2$. Then by Lemma 2.23 and induction on k , we have $\mathcal{R}'_k \wedge \mathcal{I}'' = \mathcal{R}'_k \wedge \mathcal{I}_1 \leq \mathcal{I}_2$ for all k . Since the lattice $\text{Idl Rel } A$ is algebraic, and the sequence \mathcal{R}'_k is increasing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{I}') \wedge \mathcal{I}'' &= \left(\bigcup_k \mathcal{R}_k \right) \wedge \mathcal{I}'' \\ &\leq \left(\bigcup_k \mathcal{R}'_k \right) \wedge \mathcal{I}'' \\ &= \bigcup_k (\mathcal{R}'_k \wedge \mathcal{I}'') \\ &\leq \mathcal{I}_2 \\ &= \mathcal{I} \vee (\mathcal{I}' \wedge \mathcal{I}''). \end{aligned}$$

\square

3. SUPERUNIFORMITIES

Notation. If $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Idl Fil Rel } S$ for some set S , then \mathcal{E}^{op} will denote the ideal $\{\mathcal{F}^{\text{op}} \mid \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{E}\}$. If $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}' \in \text{Idl Fil Rel } S$, then $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}'$ will denote the ideal $\text{Ig}\{\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}' \mid \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{E}'\}$.

Definition 3.1. Consider the following conditions on $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Idl Fil Rel } S$:

- (SU_r) $\text{Fg}\{\Delta_S\} \in \mathcal{E}$;
- (SU_s) $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^{\text{op}}$; and
- (SU_t) $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{E}$:

We say that \mathcal{E} is *reflexive* if it satisfies condition (SU_r) , *symmetric* if it satisfies condition (SU_s) , *transitive* if it satisfies condition (SU_t) , a *semisuperuniformity* if it satisfies (SU_r) and (SU_s) , and a *superuniformity* if it satisfies (SU_r) , (SU_s) , and (SU_t) .

Theorem 3.2. *Let \mathcal{E} be an ideal of filters of relations on a set S . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{E} is a superuniformity;
- (2) \mathcal{E} is generated, as an ideal, by semiuniformities, and closed under composition of filters of relations;
- (3) \mathcal{E} is generated, as an ideal, by semiuniformities, and closed under relational powers of filters.

If $f : S \rightarrow T$ is a function from S to another set T , then there is an inverse image mapping from $\text{Idl Fil Rel } T$ to $\text{Idl Fil Rel } S$, given by

$$\mathcal{E} \mapsto f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Ig}\{ f^{-1}(\mathcal{F}) \mid \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{E} \},$$

and a direct image mapping from $\text{Idl Fil Rel } S$ to $\text{Idl Fil Rel } T$, given by

$$\mathcal{E} \mapsto f(\mathcal{E}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Ig}\{ f(\mathcal{F}) \mid \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{E} \}.$$

We have $\langle [\mathcal{E} \mapsto f(\mathcal{E})], \mathcal{E}' \mapsto f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}') \rangle : \text{Idl Fil Rel } S \rightarrow \text{Idl Fil Rel } T$.

Definition 3.3. If S is a set and \mathcal{E} is a superuniformity (semisuperuniformity) then we say that $\langle S, \mathcal{E} \rangle$ is a *superuniform space* (respectively, *semisuperuniform space*).

Definition 3.4. If $\langle S, \mathcal{E} \rangle$ and $\langle T, \mathcal{E}' \rangle$ are superuniform (or semisuperuniform) spaces, a function $f : S \rightarrow T$ is *superuniform* if the equivalent conditions $\mathcal{E} \leq f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}')$, $f(\mathcal{E}) \leq \mathcal{E}'$ are satisfied.

Superuniform spaces, and the superuniform functions between them, form a category in an obvious manner, which we denote by **SupUnif**. The category-theoretic product of superuniform spaces $\langle S, \mathcal{E} \rangle$ and $\langle T, \mathcal{E}' \rangle$ is

$$\langle S, \mathcal{E} \rangle \times \langle T, \mathcal{E}' \rangle = \langle S \times T, \text{Ig}\{ \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}' \mid \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{E}' \} \rangle.$$

Example 3.5. Let $\langle S, \mathcal{U} \rangle$ be a uniform space. Then $\langle S, \text{Ig}\{ \mathcal{U} \} \rangle$ is a superuniform space.

Proof. $\text{Ig}\{ \mathcal{U} \}$ is generated by a set of uniformities, namely $\{ \mathcal{U} \}$, and is closed under composition of filters by (U_t) . \square

Example 3.6. Suppose S be a set, $\langle T, \mathcal{T} \rangle$ a hausdorff topological space, and $f : S \rightarrow T$ a function. For each compact subset $C \subseteq T$, and each entourage U of the unique uniformity on $\langle C, \mathcal{T}|_C \rangle$ giving rise to $\mathcal{T}|_C$, consider the relation

$$\{ \langle s, s' \rangle \mid f(s) = f(s') \text{ or } f(s), f(t) \in C \text{ and } f(s) U f(t) \}.$$

These relations form a filter \mathcal{S}_C of relations on S , which is a semiuniformity. The ideal of filters on S generated by the \mathcal{S}_C is closed under composition of filters, and is thus a superuniformity, which we denote by $\Phi(f, \mathcal{T})$.

The lattices $\text{SupUnif } S$ and $\text{SemiSupUnif } S$. We denote the set of superuniformities on a set S by $\text{SupUnif } S$ and the set of semisuperuniformities by SemiSupUnif . They admit complete meet operations given by intersection of ideals, and complete join operations given by

$$\bigvee_i^{\text{SupUnif}} \mathcal{E}_i = \text{Ig}^\circ \left\{ \bigcup_i \mathcal{E}_i \right\},$$

and

$$\bigvee_i^{\text{SemiSupUnif}} \mathcal{E}_i = \text{Ig} \left\{ \bigcup_i \mathcal{E}_i \right\},$$

where by Ig° of a set X of filters we mean the ideal generated by the set of all finite compositions of filters in X . The lattice $\text{SemiSupUnif } S$ is distributive.

Permutability for superuniformities.

Definition 3.7. We say that two superuniformities $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}'$ on a set S *permute* if $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E}' \circ \mathcal{E}$, where $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}' = \text{Ig} \{ \mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}' \mid \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{E} \text{ and } \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{E}' \}$.

Theorem 3.8. *Superuniformities \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}' permute iff $\mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}'$.*

Proof. We have $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}' \leq \mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}'$ for any superuniformities \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}' , because $\mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}'$ contains \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}' and satisfies (SU_t) . Similarly, $\mathcal{E}' \circ \mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}'$. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}'$ is a superuniformity, we have $\mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}' \leq \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}'$. For, $\text{Ig} \{ \text{Fg} \{ \Delta \} \} \leq \mathcal{E}$ by (SU_r) , which implies $\mathcal{E}' \leq \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}'$ by monadicity, and similarly, $\mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{E}' \circ \mathcal{E}$.

Now, if \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}' permute, then $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E}' \circ \mathcal{E}$ is a superuniformity, being an ideal of filters closed under composition, and so, $\mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}' \leq \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}' \leq \mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}'$.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}'$, then $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}'$ is a superuniformity, and $\mathcal{E}' \circ \mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}'$. Since $\mathcal{E}' \circ \mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}' &= (\mathcal{E}' \circ \mathcal{E})^{-1} \\ &\leq (\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}')^{-1} \\ &= \mathcal{E}' \circ \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.9. *Let L be a sublattice of $\text{SupUnif } S$ for some set S . If the elements of L permute pairwise, then L is modular.*

Proof. It suffices to show, given $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}', \mathcal{E}'' \in \text{SupUnif } A$ such that $\mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{E}''$, that

$$(\mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}') \wedge \mathcal{E}'' \leq \mathcal{E} \vee (\mathcal{E}' \wedge \mathcal{E}''),$$

as the opposite inequality holds in any lattice. The left-hand side is generated by filters $(\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{F}''$ such that $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{E}'$, and $\mathcal{F}'' \in \mathcal{E}''$ so let $(\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{F}''$ be such a filter. Consider $\mathcal{F} \circ ((\mathcal{F}' \wedge (\mathcal{F}^{\text{op}} \circ \mathcal{F}'')) \in \mathcal{E} \circ (\mathcal{E}' \wedge \mathcal{E}'')$. This filter is generated by relations $F \circ (F' \cap (\tilde{F}^{\text{op}} \circ F''))$ such that $F_1, \tilde{F} \in \mathcal{F}$, $F' \in \mathcal{F}'$, and $F'' \in \mathcal{F}''$. Consider the filter

$((F \cap \tilde{F}) \circ F') \cap F'' \in (\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}') \wedge \mathcal{F}''$. If $a F \cap \tilde{F} b F' c$ and $a F'' c$, then $a F b$ and $b F' \cap (\tilde{F}^{\text{op}} \circ F'')$ c , showing that $(\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}') \wedge \mathcal{F}'' \leq \mathcal{F} \circ (\mathcal{F}' \wedge (\mathcal{F}^{\text{op}} \circ \mathcal{F}''))$. \square

Theorem 3.10. *For any set S , $\text{SupUnif } S$ and $\text{SemiSupUnif } S$ are algebraic lattices.*

Example 3.11. Let $\langle S, \mathcal{I} \rangle$ be a superequivalence space. Then

$$Z(\mathcal{I}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Ig}\{\text{Fg}\{J\} \mid J \in \mathcal{I}\}$$

is a superuniformity on S . The mapping $\langle S, \mathcal{I} \rangle \mapsto \langle S, Z(\mathcal{I}) \rangle$ is a lattice homomorphism which preserves arbitrary joins.

Proof. By monotonicity of the mapping $\mathcal{I} \mapsto Z(\mathcal{I})$, we have $Z(\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{I}') \leq Z(\mathcal{I}) \wedge Z(\mathcal{I}')$. Let $\mathcal{F} \in Z(\mathcal{I}) \wedge Z(\mathcal{I}')$. Then $\mathcal{F} \leq \text{Fg}\{J\}$ for some $J \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{F} \leq \text{Fg}\{J'\}$ for some $J' \in \mathcal{I}'$. That is, there is an $R \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $R \subseteq J \cap J'$. Then since $J \cap J' \in \mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{I}'$, we have $\mathcal{F} \in Z(\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{I}')$.

Again by monotonicity, we have $\bigvee_i Z(\mathcal{I}_i) \leq Z(\bigvee_i \mathcal{I}_i)$. Suppose $\mathcal{F} \in Z(\bigvee_i \mathcal{I}_i)$. Then for some $J_1, \dots, J_n \in \mathcal{I}_{i_j}$, $\mathcal{F} \leq \text{Fg}\{K_1 \circ \dots \circ J_n\}$. However, $\text{Fg}\{J_1 \circ \dots \circ J_n\} = \text{Fg}\{J_1\} \circ \dots \circ \text{Fg}\{J_n\}$. Thus, $\mathcal{F} \in \bigvee_i Z(\mathcal{I}_i)$. \square

Theorem 3.12. *If $\pi : A \rightarrow B$ is an onto function, and $\{\mathcal{E}_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a tuple of superuniformities on B , then*

$$\pi^{-1}\left(\bigvee_i \mathcal{E}_i\right) = \bigvee_i \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_i).$$

Proof. (\geq ;) By monotonicity of inverse image.

(\leq ;) Let $\mathcal{F} \in \pi^{-1} \text{Ig}^\circ\{\bigcup_i \mathcal{E}_i\}$. Then for some finite tuple ι_1, \dots, ι_n where each $\iota_j \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} &\leq \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{F}_n) \text{ where each } \mathcal{F}_j \in \mathcal{E}_{\iota_j} \\ &= \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_1) \circ \dots \circ \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_n) \\ &\in \text{Ig}^\circ\left\{\bigcup_i \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_i)\right\} \\ &= \bigvee_i \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_i). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathcal{F} \in \bigvee_i \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_i)$. \square

Algebraicity of $\text{SupUnif } S$ is again crucial for the proof of the following:

Theorem 3.13. *The category $\mathbf{SupUnif}$ is cartesian closed.*

Proof. The proof is almost identical to the proof that \mathbf{SupEqv} is cartesian-closed (Theorem 2.13). \square

Compatible superuniformities.

Definition 3.14. A superuniformity \mathcal{E} on an algebra A is *compatible* if for every n -ary basic operation w , for every n , we have $w(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Fg}\{w(F_1, \dots, F_n) \mid F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, \dots, F_n \in \mathcal{F}_n\} \in \mathcal{E}$ for all $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n \in \mathcal{E}$.

Remark. In other words, a superuniformity \mathcal{E} on A is compatible with an n -ary operation w iff w is superuniform as a function from $\langle A, \mathcal{E} \rangle^n$ to $\langle A, \mathcal{E} \rangle$.

Lemma 3.15. *If w is an n -ary operation on a set S , and $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{F}'$ are filters of relations on S , then for each j such that $1 \leq j \leq n$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &w(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{j-1}, \mathcal{F}_j \circ \mathcal{F}', \mathcal{F}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n) \\ &\leq w(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n) \circ w(\text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \dots, \text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \mathcal{F}', \text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \dots, \text{Fg}\{\Delta\}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The left-hand side has a base of relations of the form

$$w(R_1, \dots, R_{j-1}, R_j \circ R', R_{j+1}, \dots, R_n),$$

and the right-hand side has a base of relations of the form

$$w(R_1, \dots, R_n) \circ w(\Delta, \dots, \Delta, R', \Delta, \dots, \Delta),$$

where $F_i \in \mathcal{F}_j$ and $R' \in \mathcal{R}'$. However,

$$w(R_1, \dots, R_{j-1}, R_j \circ R', R_{j+1}, \dots, R_n) \subseteq w(R_1, \dots, R_n) \circ w(\Delta, \dots, \Delta, R', \Delta, \dots, R_n). \quad \square$$

Theorem 3.16. *The meet and join of tuples of superuniformities compatible with an operation w are compatible with w .*

Proof. Let \mathcal{E}_i be superuniformities on A compatible with an n -ary operation w . We have $\bigwedge_i \mathcal{E}_i = \bigcap_i \mathcal{E}_i$. We must show that if $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n \in \mathcal{E}_i$ for all i , then $w(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n) \in \mathcal{E}_i$ for all i . However, each \mathcal{E}_i is compatible.

On the other hand, we have $\bigvee_i \mathcal{E}_i = \text{Ig}^\circ\{\bigcup_i \mathcal{E}_i\}$. Given w and $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n \in \bigvee_i \mathcal{E}_i$, we need to have $w(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n) \in \bigvee_i \mathcal{E}_i$. However, from Lemma 3.15, it follows that $w(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n)$ is \leq a finite composition of elements of $\bigcup_i \mathcal{E}_i$. \square

Example 3.17 (Continuation of Example 3.5). If \mathcal{U} is a compatible uniformity on an algebra A , then $\text{Ig}\{\mathcal{U}\}$ is a compatible superuniformity on A .

Example 3.18 (Continuation of Example 3.6). Let A be an algebra, $\langle B, \mathcal{T} \rangle$ be an algebra of the same type with a compatible topology, and $f : A \rightarrow B$ a homomorphism. Then $\Phi(f, \mathcal{T})$ is not necessarily a compatible superuniformity on A . For, consider $A = \mathbb{Q}$, the ring of rational numbers, $B = \mathbb{C}$, the ring of complex numbers, \mathcal{T} the usual topology on \mathbb{C} , and f the embedding. Let w be the basic operation of addition, $\mathcal{F} = f^{-1}(\{\langle x, y \rangle \mid |x - y| \leq \varepsilon\}) \cap \{U^2 \cap \Delta_{\mathbb{C}}\}$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ and U is the unit ball. Then $\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{F} \notin \Phi(f, \mathcal{T})$, because it relates x and $x + \varepsilon$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Q}$, and that is not contained in the inverse image of a compact set.

Example 3.19 (Continuation of Example 3.11). If \mathcal{I} is a compatible superequivalence on an algebra A , then $Z(\mathcal{I})$ is a compatible superuniformity on A .

Compatible superuniformities of congruence-permutable algebras. As with algebras with a compatible uniformity, or with a compatible superequivalence, Mal'tsev's Theorem generalizes:

Theorem 3.20. *Let A be an algebra with a Mal'tsev term p . Then any two compatible superuniformities on A permute.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}'$ be compatible superuniformities on A . It suffices to show $\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}' \leq \mathcal{E}' \circ \mathcal{E}$. Thus it suffices to show, if $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{E}'$, then $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{E}' \circ \mathcal{E}$.

$\text{Fg}\{\Delta\}$ belongs to every superuniformity, by (SU_r) . We have

$$p(\text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \mathcal{F}') \circ p(\mathcal{F}, \text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \text{Fg}\{\Delta\}) \in \mathcal{E}$$

since \mathcal{E} is compatible and satisfies (SU_t) .

If $X \in p(\text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \mathcal{F}') \circ p(\mathcal{F}, \text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \text{Fg}\{\Delta\})$, then for some $F \in \mathcal{F}, F' \in \mathcal{F}'$, we have

$$p(\Delta, \Delta, F') \circ p(F, \Delta, \Delta) \subseteq X;$$

$a F b F' c$ then implies

$$a = p(a, b, b) p(\Delta, \Delta, F') p(a, b, c) p(F, \Delta, \Delta) p(b, b, c) = c;$$

thus, $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}' \leq p(\text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \mathcal{F}') \circ p(\mathcal{F}, \text{Fg}\{\Delta\}, \text{Fg}\{\Delta\})$ and $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{E}' \circ \mathcal{E}$. \square

Corollary 3.21. *Let A be an algebra with a Mal'tsev term. Then $\text{SupUnif } A$ is modular.*

Compatible superuniformities on algebras in congruence-modular Varieties. The above results show that in the case of congruence-permutable varieties \mathbf{V} , the lattices $\text{SupUnif } A$ behave similarly to the lattices $\text{Con } A$, $\text{Unif } A$, and $\text{SupEqv } A$. Now we ask whether $\text{SupUnif } A$ is modular when $A \in \mathbf{V}$, when \mathbf{V} satisfies the weaker condition of congruence-modularity.

Notation. Given a finite tuple \mathbf{m} of quaternary terms, and given a filter \mathcal{F} of relations on an algebra A , we define

$$\mathbf{m}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Fg}\{\mathbf{m}(R, R, R, R) \mid R \in \mathcal{F}\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}(R) &= \bigcup_i m_i(R, R, R, R) \\ &= \bigcup_i \{\langle m_i(a, b, c, d), m_i(a', b', c', d') \rangle \mid a R a', b R b', c R c', \text{ and } d R d'\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.22. $\mathcal{F} \leq \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{F})$.

Proof. $m_i(a, a, a, a) = a$ for all i and all $a \in A$. \square

For this discussion, \mathbf{V} will be a congruence-modular variety, m_i , $i = 0, \dots, \mathbf{d}$ will be a sequence of Day terms for \mathbf{V} , and A will be an algebra in \mathbf{V} . Our first goal will again be a generalization of the Shifting Lemma [5].

Lemma 3.23. *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \text{SupUnif } A$. If $\mathcal{W} \in \mathcal{E}$, and $Y \in \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{W}')^{2\mathbf{d}}$, the relational composition of $2\mathbf{d}$ copies of the filter $\mathbf{m}(\mathcal{W}')$, where $\mathcal{W}' = \mathcal{W} \vee \mathcal{W}^{\text{op}}$, then there is a $W \in \mathcal{W}$ such that if $a, b, c, d \in A$ with $b W d$ and $m_i(a, a, c, c) W m_i(a, b, d, c)$ for all i , then we have $a Y c$.*

Proof. If $Y \in \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{W}')^{2\mathbf{d}}$, then there are reflexive, symmetric $W_1, \dots, W_{2\mathbf{d}} \in \mathcal{W}'$ such that $\mathbf{m}(W_1) \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{m}(W_{2\mathbf{d}}) \subseteq Y$. Let $W = \bigcap_j W_j$ and note that if $b W d$, then $b \mathbf{m}(W) d$ by Lemma 3.22.

Let $u_i = m_i(a, b, d, c)$ and $v_i = m_i(a, a, c, c)$ for all i . If $b W d$ and $m_i(a, a, c, c) W m_i(a, b, d, c)$ for all i , then for even $i < \mathbf{d}$, we have $u_i \mathbf{m}(W) v_i = v_{i+1} \mathbf{m}(W) u_{i+1}$, while for odd $i < \mathbf{d}$, we have $u_i \mathbf{m}(W) m_i(a, b, b, c) = m_{i+1}(a, b, b, c) \mathbf{m}(W) u_{i+1}$.

Thus, for $i < \mathbf{d}$, $u_i \mathbf{m}(W) \circ \mathbf{m}(W) u_{i+1}$, and consequently, $a = u_0 Y u_{\mathbf{d}} = c$. \square

Lemma 3.24 (Shifting Lemma for Superuniformities). *Let $\mathcal{R} \in \text{Idl Fil Rel } A$ satisfy (SU_r) and (SU_s) and be compatible, and let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \in \text{SupUnif } A$ be such that $\mathcal{R} \wedge \mathcal{E}_1 \leq \mathcal{E}_2 \leq \mathcal{E}_1$. Then $(\mathcal{R} \circ (\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2) \circ \mathcal{R}) \wedge \mathcal{E}_1 \leq \mathcal{E}_2$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that, given filters $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{E}_1$, and $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2 = \mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$, there is a filter $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{E}_2$ such that

$$(\mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{X} \circ \mathcal{G}) \wedge \mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{Y};$$

to prove this, it suffices to construct \mathcal{Y} and show that given $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, there are $G \in \mathcal{G}$, $X \in \mathcal{X}$, and $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $(G \circ X \circ G) \cap F \subseteq Y$, or, in other words, that $a G b X d G c$ and $a F c$ imply $a Y c$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that the given \mathcal{G} , \mathcal{F} , and \mathcal{X} are symmetric (i.e., satisfy (U_s)), because \mathcal{R} , \mathcal{E}_1 , and \mathcal{E}_2 all satisfy (SU_s) .

Let $\mathcal{W} = \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{X}) \vee (\mathbf{m}(\mathcal{G}) \wedge (\mathbf{m}(\mathcal{F}) \circ \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{F}) \circ \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{X})))$. Since \mathcal{R} is compatible, \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are compatible superuniformities, and $\mathcal{R} \wedge \mathcal{E}_1 \leq \mathcal{E}_2$, we have $\mathcal{W} \in \mathcal{E}_2$.

Let $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{W}^{2\mathbf{d}}$ and let $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. By Lemma 3.23, there is a $W \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $b W d$ and $m_i(a, a, c, c) W m_i(a, b, d, c)$ for all i imply $a Y c$.

We have $\mathbf{m}(X) \cup (\mathbf{m}(G) \cap (\mathbf{m}(F) \circ \mathbf{m}(F) \circ \mathbf{m}(X))) \subseteq W$ for some $G \in \mathcal{G}$, $F \in \mathcal{F}$, and $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Since \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{F} satisfy (U_s) , we may assume G and F are symmetric, replacing them by $G \cap G^{\text{op}}$ and $F \cap F^{\text{op}}$ if necessary.

If $a G b X d G c$ and $a F c$, then $m_i(a, a, c, c) \mathbf{m}(G) m_i(a, b, d, c)$ for all i , and $m_i(a, a, c, c) \mathbf{m}(F) m_i(a, a, a, a) = a = m_i(a, b, b, a) \mathbf{m}(F) m_i(a, b, b, c) \mathbf{m}(X) m_i(a, b, d, c)$ for all i . Thus, $m_i(a, a, c, c) W m_i(a, b, d, c)$ for all i . We also have $b W d$ because $b X d$. Then by Lemma 3.23, $a Y c$. \square

Finally, we have

Theorem 3.25. *The lattice $\text{SupUnif } A$ is modular.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}', \mathcal{E}'' \in \text{SupUnif } A$ be such that $\mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{E}''$. Then

$$\mathcal{E} \vee (\mathcal{E}' \wedge \mathcal{E}'') \leq (\mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}') \wedge \mathcal{E}'',$$

as this inequality holds in every lattice when $\mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{E}''$.

Define \mathcal{R}_k and \mathcal{R}'_k for every natural number k as $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}'_0 = \mathcal{E}'$, $\mathcal{R}_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}_k \circ \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{R}_k$, and $\mathcal{R}'_k = \mathcal{R}_k \circ (\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2) \circ \mathcal{R}_k$ where $\mathcal{E}_1 = \mathcal{E}''$ and $\mathcal{E}_2 = \mathcal{E} \vee (\mathcal{E}' \wedge \mathcal{E}'')$. Since $\mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{E}_2 \leq \mathcal{E}_1$ we have for every k , $\mathcal{R}_k \leq \mathcal{R}'_k$. We also have $\mathcal{R}'_0 \wedge \mathcal{E}_1 = \mathcal{E}' \wedge \mathcal{E}'' \leq \mathcal{E}_2$. Then by Lemma 3.24 and induction on k , we have $\mathcal{R}'_k \wedge \mathcal{E}'' = \mathcal{R}'_k \wedge \mathcal{E}_1 \leq \mathcal{E}_2$ for all k . Since the lattice $\text{Idl Fil Rel } A$ is algebraic, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{E} \vee \mathcal{E}') \wedge \mathcal{E}'' &= \left(\bigcup_k \mathcal{R}_k \right) \wedge \mathcal{E}_1 \\ &\leq \left(\bigcup_k \mathcal{R}'_k \right) \wedge \mathcal{E}_1 \\ &= \bigcup_k (\mathcal{R}'_k \wedge \mathcal{E}_1) \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}_2 = \mathcal{E} \vee (\mathcal{E}' \wedge \mathcal{E}''). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark. Theorem 3.25 and the embedding of Example 3.11 give us an alternate proof of Theorem 2.24.

4. PATTERN

After seeing Sections 1, 2, and 3, including the theorems about modularity in Section 2 and 3, the reader may suspect that might be a general category-theoretic setting in which the modularity results can be proved, when, as in the case of superequivalences and superuniformities, there are suitable algebraicity assumptions. Indeed, we are preparing a paper ([10]) about such a setting.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The reader may also ask reasonably, are superequivalences and superuniformities useful? The answer is that they arise naturally in the theory of the categories $\mathbf{Ind}(\mathbf{Set})$ and $\mathbf{Ind}(\mathbf{Fil})$, where $\mathbf{Ind}(\mathbf{C})$ for a category \mathbf{C} is the category of small filtered diagrams in the category \mathbf{C} (see [7, Section IX.1] for the definition of a filtered category; a small filtered diagram is a functor $D : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ where \mathbf{D} is small and filtered), and \mathbf{Fil} is the category of filters and germs of admissible partial functions, as defined (with very minor differences to account for some boundary cases) in [6]. $\mathbf{Ind}(\mathbf{Set})$ and $\mathbf{Ind}(\mathbf{Fil})$ are both cartesian-closed categories, and we believe $\mathbf{Ind}(\mathbf{Fil})$ will have an important role in Topological Algebra because, in addition to being cartesian-closed, and unlike the category of compactly-generated spaces advocated by Mac Lane [7] and others, algebra objects in congruence-modular varieties have modular

quotient lattices. Of course, the reader needs details and these will be forthcoming in future papers.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Burris and H. P. Sankappanavar. *A Course in Universal Algebra*, volume 78 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1981.
- [2] B. A. Davey and H. A. Priestley. *Introduction to lattices and Order*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [3] A. Day. A characterization of modularity for congruence lattices of algebras. *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 12:167–173, 1969.
- [4] R. Freese and R. McKenzie. *Commutator Theory for Congruence-Modular Varieties*, volume 125 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [5] H. P. Gumm. An easy way to the commutator in modular varieties. *Arch. der Math.*, 34:220–228, 1980.
- [6] V. Koubek and J. Reiterman. On the category of filters. *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, 11:19–29, 1970.
- [7] S. Mac Lane. *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, volume 5 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1971.
- [8] A. I. Mal'tsev. On the general theory of algebraic systems. *Mat. Sb.*, 35:3–20, 1954.
- [9] R. N. McKenzie, G. F. McNulty, and W. F. Taylor. *Algebras, Lattices, Varieties*, volume 1. Wadsworth & Brooks/Cole, 1987.
- [10] W. H. Rowan. Elements of topological algebra: II. Generalized equivalences. *in preparation*.
- [11] W. H. Rowan. Algebras with a compatible uniformity. *Algebra Universalis*, 47:13–43, 2002.
- [12] H. Weber. On lattices of uniformities. *Order*, 24:249–276, 2007.

PO BOX 20161, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94620
E-mail address: william.rowan@ncis.org