

## A division algorithm for the free left distributive algebra

Richard Laver<sup>1</sup>  
University of Colorado, Boulder

In this paper we extend the normal form theorem, for the free algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  on one generator  $x$  satisfying the left distributive law  $a(bc) = (ab)(ac)$ , which was proved in [5]. As part of the proof that an algebra of elementary embeddings from set theory is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{A}$ , facts about  $\mathcal{A}$  itself were established. Theorem 1 summarizes some known facts about  $\mathcal{A}$ , including P. Dehornoy's independent work on the subject. After that the main theorem, about putting members of  $\mathcal{A}$  into "division form," will be proved with the help of versions of lemmas of [5] and one of the normal forms of [5].

Let  $\cdot$  denote the operation of  $\mathcal{A}$ . These forms take place not in  $\mathcal{A}$  but in a larger algebra  $\mathcal{P}$  which involves additionally a composition operation  $\circ$ . Let  $\Sigma$  be the set of laws  $\{a \circ (b \circ c) = (a \circ b) \circ c, (a \circ b)c = a(bc), a(b \circ c) = ab \circ ac, a \circ b = ab \circ a\}$ .  $\mathcal{P}$  is the free algebra on the generator  $x$  satisfying  $\Sigma$ .  $\Sigma$  implies the left distributive law, and  $\Sigma$  is a conservative extension of the left-distributive law (if two terms in the language of  $\mathcal{A}$  can be proved equal using  $\Sigma$ , then they can be proved equal using just the left-distributive law). So we may identify  $\mathcal{A}$  as a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{P}$  restricted to  $\cdot$ . If  $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathcal{P}$ , write  $p_0 p_1 \cdots p_n$  (respectively,  $p_0 p_1 \cdots p_{n-1} \circ p_n$ ) for  $((p_0 p_1) p_2) \cdots p_{n-1} p_n$  (respectively,  $((p_0 p_1) p_2) \cdots p_{n-1} \circ p_n$ ). Write  $w = p_0 p_1 \cdots p_{n-1} * p_n$  to mean that either  $w = p_0 p_1 \cdots p_n$  or  $w = p_0 p_1 \cdots p_{n-1} \circ p_n$ . Make these conventions also for other algebras on operations  $\cdot$  and  $\circ$ .

For  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  let  $p^1 = p$ ,  $p^{n+1} = p \circ p^n$ ; let  $p^{(0)} = p$ ,  $p^{(n+1)} = pp^{(n)}$ . Then  $p^{(n+1)} = p^{(i)} p^{(n)}$  for all  $i \leq n$ , by induction using the left-distributive law.

For  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$  let  $p < q$  if  $q$  can be written as a term of length greater than one in the operations  $\cdot$  and  $\circ$ , involving members of  $\mathcal{P}$  at least one of which is  $p$ . Write  $p <_L q$  if  $p$  occurs on the left of such a product:  $q = p a_0 a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} * a_n$  for some  $n \geq 0$ . Then  $<_L$  and  $<$  are transitive. If  $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $a <_L b$  in the sense of  $\mathcal{P}$ ,

then  $a <_L b$  in the sense of  $\mathcal{A}$ ; and similarly for  $<$ .

In [5] it was shown, via the existence of normal forms for the members of  $\mathcal{P}$ , that  $<_L$  linearly orders  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ . The proof of part of that theorem, that  $<_L$  is irreflexive, used a large cardinal axiom (the existence, for each  $n$ , of an  $n$ -huge cardinal). Dehornoy ([1], [2]) by a different method independently proved in ZFC that for all  $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$  at least one of  $a <_L b$ ,  $a = b$ ,  $b <_L a$  holds. Recently ([3]) he has found a proof of the irreflexivity of  $< -L$  in ZFC. Dehornoy's theorem has the consequence that facts about  $\mathcal{P}$  (Theorem 1 below (parts (v)–(viii)), and the normal and division forms in [5] and this paper) which have previously been known from a large cardinal assumption (that is, from irreflexivity), are provable in ZFC.

For  $u, v$  terms in the language of  $\cdot$  in the variable  $x$ , let  $u \rightarrow v$  ([1]) mean that  $u$  can be transformed into  $v$  by a finite number of substitutions, each consisting of replacing a term of the form  $a(bc)$  by  $(ab)(ac)$ .

For  $\lambda$  a limit ordinal, let  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  be the set of elementary embeddings  $j; (V_\lambda, \epsilon) \rightarrow (V_\lambda, \epsilon)$ ,  $j$  not the identity. For  $j, k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ , let  $jk = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} j(k \cap V_\alpha)$  and let  $j \circ k$  be the composition of  $j$  and  $k$ . Then the existence of a  $\lambda$  such that  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda \neq \emptyset$  is a large cardinal axiom, if  $j, k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ , then  $jk, j \circ k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ , and  $(\mathcal{E}_\lambda, \cdot, \circ)$  satisfies  $\Sigma$ . For  $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$  let  $\mathcal{A}_j$  be the closure of  $\{j\}$  under  $\cdot$  and let  $\mathcal{P}_j$  be the closure of  $\{j\}$  under  $\cdot$  and  $\circ$ .

Some facts relating  $\mathcal{P}$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ , such as the conservativeness of  $\Sigma$  over the left-distributive law, may be found in [5].

**Theorem 1.** (i) *If  $r <_L s$ , then  $pr <_L p \circ r <_L ps$ .*

(ii)  *$x \leq_L p$  for all  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $<_L$  is not well founded.*

(iii) *For all  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$  there is an  $n$  with  $p^{(n)} > q$ .*

(iv) *The rewriting rules for  $\mathcal{A}$  are confluent, i.e., if  $u, v$  are terms in the language of  $\cdot$  in the variable  $x$ , and  $u \equiv v$  via the left distributive law, then for some  $w$ ,  $u \rightarrow w$  and  $v \rightarrow w$ .*

(v)  *$<_L$  is a linear ordering of  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}$ .*

(vi) *For  $p, q, r \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $pq = pr \Leftrightarrow q = r$ ,  $pq <_L pr \Leftrightarrow q <_L r$ .*

(vii) *The word problems for  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  are decidable.*

(viii)  $<_L = <$  on  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}$ .

(ix) For no  $k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$  ( $n > 0$ ) is  $k_0 = k_0 k_1 \cdots k_{n-1} * k_n$ .

(x) For all  $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_j \cong \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_j \cong \mathcal{P}$ .

**Remarks.** (i)–(iii) are quickly proved; for (iii), it may be seen that  $p^{(n)} \geq x^{(n)}$  and for sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $x^{(n)} \geq q$ . (iv) is Dehornoy’s theorem in [2]. The linear orderings of  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  both have order type  $\omega \cdot (1 + \eta)$ . (v) immediately implies (vi) and (vii). In [5], (viii) is derived from the normal form theorem; McKenzie derived (viii) from (v). (ix) and (x) are proved in [5], (ix) plus (v) yields (x).

Results connected with critical points of members of  $\mathcal{A}_j$  appear in [4],[6] and [7].

For  $a, b \in \mathcal{P}$ , let the iterates  $I_n(a, b)$  of  $\langle a, b \rangle$  ( $n \geq 1$ ) be defined by  $I_1(a, b) = a$ ,  $I_2(a, b) = ab$ ,  $I_{n+2}(a, b) = I_{n+1}(a, b)I_n(a, b)$ .

Call a term  $b_0 b_1 \cdots b_{n-1} * b_n$ , with each  $b_i \in \mathcal{P}$ , prenormal (with respect to a given ordering  $<$ ) if  $b_2 \preceq b_0$ ,  $b_3 \preceq b_0 b_1$ ,  $b_4 \preceq b_0 b_1 b_2, \dots, b_n \preceq b_0 b_1 \cdots b_{n-2}$ , and in the case  $* = \circ$  and  $n \geq 2$ ,  $b_n \prec b_0 b_1 \cdots b_{n-1}$ .

The main theorem is that for each  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $q$  can be expressed in “ $p$ -division form,” the natural fact suggested by the normal forms of [5]. For  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  the set of  $p$ -division form representations of members of  $\mathcal{P}$ , and its lexicographic linear ordering, are defined as follows.

**Lemma 2.** For each  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  there is a unique set  $p - DF$  of terms in the language of  $\cdot$  and  $\circ$ , in the alphabet  $\{q \in \mathcal{P} : q \leq p\}$ , and a linear ordering  $<_{\text{Lex}}$  of  $p - DF$ , such that

- (i) For each  $q \leq_L p$ ,  $q$  (as a term of length one) is in  $p - DF$ , and for  $q, r \leq_L p$ ,  $q <_{\text{Lex}} r$  if and only if  $q <_L r$ .
- (ii)  $w \in p - DF$  iff either  $w \leq_L p$ , or  $w = pa_1 a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} * a_n$ , where each  $a_i \in p - DF$ , is prenormal with respect to  $<_{\text{Lex}}$ .
- (iii) For  $w \in p - DF$  define the associated sequence of  $w$  to be  $\langle w \rangle$  if  $w \leq_L p$ , to be  $\langle p, a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle$  if  $w = pa_0 a_1 \cdots a_n$ , and, if  $w = pa_0 a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n$ , to be (let-

that is, the sequence beyond  $a_n$  is  $\langle I_m(u, a_n) : m \geq 1 \rangle$ . Then for  $w, v \in DF$  with associated sequences  $\langle w_i : i < \alpha \rangle, \langle v_i : i < \beta \rangle$  ( $\alpha, \beta \leq \omega$ ),  $w <_{\text{Lex}} v$  iff either  $\langle w_i : i < \alpha \rangle$  is a proper initial segment of  $\langle v_i : i < \beta \rangle$  or there is a least  $i$  with  $w_i \neq v_i$ , and  $w_i <_{\text{Lex}} v_i$ .

*Proof.* As in [5, Lemma 8], one builds up  $p - DF$  and  $<_{\text{Lex}}$  by induction; a term  $pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n$  is put in the set  $p - DF$  (and its lexicographic comparison with terms previously put in is established) only after all the iterates  $I_m(pa_0 \cdots a_{n-1}, a_n)$ ,  $m \geq 1$  have been put in the set.

**Remarks.** The members of  $p - DF$  are terms, and  $p - DF$  is closed under subterms (for  $w \leq_L p$ ,  $w$  is the only subterm of  $w$ , and for  $w = pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} * a_n$ , the subterms of  $w$  are  $w$  and the subterms of  $pa_0 \cdots a_{n-1}, a_n$ ). We will associate these terms without comment with the members of  $\mathcal{P}$  they stand for, when no confusion should arise. If  $w \in p - DF$  and  $u$  is a proper subterm of  $w$ , then  $u <_{\text{Lex}} w$ . Terms of the form  $(u \circ v)w$  or  $(u \circ v) \circ w$  are never in  $p - DF$ . When using phrases such as “ $uv \in p - DF$ ,” “ $u \circ v \in p - DF$ ,” it is assumed that  $u = pa_0 \cdots a_{n-1}, v = a_n$  are as in the definition of  $p - DF$  — isolated exceptions where  $uv$  or  $u \circ v$  are  $\leq_L p$  and are to be considered as singleton terms, will be noted.

If  $u \circ v \in p - DF$ , then  $u \circ v$  is the  $<_{\text{Lex}}$ -supremum of  $\{I_n(u, v) : n \geq 1\}$ .

**Lemma 3.** *The transitivization of the relation  $\{\langle u, v \rangle : u, v \in p - DF \text{ and either } u \text{ a proper subterm of } v, \text{ or } v = a \circ b \text{ and } u \text{ is an } I_k(a, b)\}$  is a well-founded partial ordering  $\prec^p$  of  $p - DF$ .*

*Proof.* Otherwise there would be a sequence  $\langle u_n : n < \omega \rangle$  with, for each  $n$ , either  $u_{n+1}$  a proper subterm of  $u_n$ , or  $u_{n+1}$  an iterate of  $\langle a, b \rangle$  with  $u_n = a \circ b$ , such that no proper subterm of  $u_0$  begins such a sequence. Then  $u_0 = r \circ s$ ,  $u_1$  is an iterate of  $\langle r, s \rangle$ , and by the nature of such iterates, some  $u_n$  must be a subterm of  $r$  or of  $s$ , a contradiction.

(i) If  $w, a, b_0, b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $wb_0b_1 \cdots b_{n-1} * b_n$  is prenormal with respect to  $<_L$ , and  $b_0 <_L a$ , then  $wb_0b_1 \cdots b_{n-1} * b_n <_L wa$ .

(ii) For  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $u, v \in p - DF$ ,  $u <_{\text{Lex}} v$  iff  $u <_L v$ .

*Proof.* (i) By induction on  $i$  we show  $wa >_L wb_0b_1 \cdots b_{i-1} \circ b_i$ . For  $i = 0$ , it is Theorem 1(i). For  $i = k + 1$ ,  $wa = (wb_0 \cdots b_{k-1} \circ b_k)u_0 \cdots u_{m-1} * u_m \geq_L wb_0 \cdots b_{k-1}(b_k u_0) = wb_0 \cdots b_{k-1}b_k(wb_0 \cdots b_{k-1}u_0) \geq_L wb_0 \cdots b_{k-1}b_k (b_{k+1}r)$  for some  $r$  (since

$$b_{k+1} \leq_L wb_0 \cdots b_{k-1}) >_L wb_0 \cdots b_k \circ b_{k+1}.$$

(ii) It suffices to show  $u <_{\text{Lex}} v \Rightarrow u <_L v$  (the other direction following from that, the linearity of  $<_{\text{Lex}}$  and the irreflexivity of  $<_L$ ). By induction on ordinals  $\alpha$ , suppose it has been proved for all pairs  $\langle u', v' \rangle$ ,  $u', v' \in p - DF$ , such that  $u'$  and  $v'$  have rank less than  $\alpha$  with respect to  $<^p$ . If either of  $u, v$  is  $\leq_L p$ , or if the associated sequence of  $u$  is a proper initial segment of the associated sequence of  $v$ , the result is clear. So, passing to a truncation  $p, a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n$  of  $u$ 's associated sequence if necessary, we have  $u \geq_{\text{Lex}} pa_0a_1 \cdots a_n$ ,  $v = pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1}v_nv_{n+1} \cdots v_{m-1} * v_m$ , some  $m \geq n$ , with  $v_n <_{\text{Lex}} a_n$  (the reason why  $v$  cannot be  $pa_0 \cdots a_{i-1} \circ a_i$  for some  $i < n$  is that  $a_n \leq_{\text{Lex}} v_n$  would then hold). Thus  $u \geq_L pa_0a_1 \cdots a_n$  (clear),  $v_n <_L a_n$  (by the induction hypothesis) and for each  $i$ ,  $v_{i+1} \leq_L pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1}v_n \cdots v_{i-1}$  (by the induction hypothesis). Then apply part (i) of this lemma.

Thus, for  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$ , to determine which of  $q <_L p$ ,  $q = p$ ,  $p <_L q$  holds, lexicographically compare  $|q|^x$  and  $|p|^x$ .

Write  $<_L$  for  $<_{\text{Lex}}$  below. ‘‘Prenormal,’’ below, will be with respect to  $<_L$ . For  $q, p \in \mathcal{P}$ , let  $|q|^p$  be the  $p - DF$  representation of  $q$ , if it exists.

Recall that the main theorem is that for all  $q, p \in \mathcal{P}$   $|q|^p$  exists. From Lemma 4, this may be stated as a type of division algorithm: if  $q, p \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $p <_L q$ , then there is a  $<_L$ -greatest  $a_0 \in \mathcal{P}$  with  $pa_0 \leq_L q$ , and if  $pa_0 <_L q$ , then there is a  $<_L$ -greatest  $a_1 \in \mathcal{P}$  with  $pa_0a_1 \leq_L q$ , etc., and for some  $n$ ,  $pa_0a_1 \cdots a_n = q$  or  $pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n = q$ . And, if this process is repeated for each  $a_i$ , getting either

tree is finite. The normal form theorems in [5] correspond to similar algorithms — they were proved there just for  $p \in \mathcal{A}$ , and the present form has their generalizations to all  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  as a corollary.

In certain cases on  $u, v \in p\text{-}DF$  (when “ $u \sqsupset^p v$ ”), the existence of  $|uv|^p, |u \circ v|^p$  can be proved directly. We define  $u \sqsupset^p v$  by induction: suppose  $u' \sqsupset^p w$  has been defined for all proper subterms  $u'$  of  $u$  and all  $w \in p\text{-}DF$ .

- (i) If  $u <_L p$ , then  $u \sqsupset^p v$  iff  $u >_L v$  and  $u \circ v \leq_L p$ .
- (ii)  $p \sqsupset^p v$  for all  $v$ .
- (iii)  $pa \sqsupset^p v$  iff  $v \leq_L p$  or  $v = pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} * a_n$  with  $a \sqsupset^p a_0$ ;  $p \circ a \sqsupset^p v$  for all  $v$ .
- (iv) For  $n \geq 1$ ,  $pa_0a_1 \cdots a_n \sqsupset^p v$  iff either  $v \leq_L pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1}$  or  
 $v = pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} v_n v_{n+1} \cdots v_{i-1} * v_i$  with  $a_n \sqsupset^p v_n$  and  $a_n \circ v_n \leq_L pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-2}$ . ■
- (v) For  $n \geq 1$ ,  $pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n \sqsupset^p v$  iff  $a_n \sqsupset^p v$  and  $a_n \circ v \leq_L pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-2}$ .

**Lemma 5.** *If  $u \sqsupset^p v$ ,  $w \in p\text{-}DF$ , and  $v \geq_L w$ , then  $u \sqsupset^p w$ .*

*Proof.* By induction on  $u$  in  $p\text{-}DF$ .

**Lemma 6.** *If  $u \sqsupset^p v$ , then  $|uv|^p$  and  $|u \circ v|^p$  exist, and  $|uv|^p \sqsupset^p u$ .*

*Proof.* Assume the lemma has been proved for all  $\langle u', w \rangle$ ,  $w \in p\text{-}DF$  and  $u'$  a proper subterm of  $u$ , and for all  $\langle u, v' \rangle$ ,  $v'$  a proper subterm of  $v$ . Suppose  $u \sqsupset^p v$ .

- (i)  $u <_L p$ . Then  $uv <_L u \circ v \leq_L p$ , so  $uv$  and  $u \circ v$ , as terms of length one, are in  $p\text{-}DF$ , and  $uv \circ u = u \circ v$ , so similarly  $uv \sqsupset^p u$ .
- (ii)  $u = p$ . Then  $|pv|^p = pv$ ,  $|p \circ v|^p = p \circ v$ , and  $pv \sqsupset^p p$ .
- (iii)  $u = pa$ . Then if  $v \leq_L p$  it is clear, so assume  $v = pb_0b_1 \cdots b_{n-1} * b_n$ , where  $a \sqsupset^p b_0$ . The cases are
  - (a)  $v = pb$ . Then  $|uv|^p = p|ab|^p$ ,  $|u \circ v|^p = p|a \circ b|^p$ , when  $|ab|^p, |a \circ b|^p$  exist by induction. And since by induction  $|ab|^p \sqsupset^p a$ , we have  $|uv|^p \sqsupset^p u$ .
  - (b)  $v = p \circ b$ . Then  $|uv|^p = |pa(p \circ b)|^p = p|a \circ b|^p p \circ p|ab|^p$  by the induction hypothesis and Theorem 1(i). Similarly  $|u \circ v|^p = |pa \circ (p \circ b)|^p = p \circ |a \circ b|^p$ . To see  $|uv|^p \sqsupset^p u$ , we have  $p|ab|^p \sqsupset_p pa$ , as  $|ab|^p \sqsupset^p a$  holds by the induction hypothesis, and  $p(ab) \circ pa = p(ab \circ a) = p(a \circ b)$ .

- (c)  $v = pb_0b_1 \cdots b_{n-1} * b_n$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Then  $|uv|^p = p|a \circ b_0|^p b_1 |pab_2|^p \cdots |pab_{n-1}|^p * |pab_n|^p$  by the induction hypothesis and Theorem 1(i) and Lemma 4(ii). And in the case  $* = \cdot$ ,  $|u \circ v|^p = |uv \circ u|^p = p|a \circ b_0|^p b_1 |pab_2|^p \cdots |pab_n|^p \circ pa$ . In the case  $* = \circ$ ,  $|u \circ v|^p = |uv \circ u|^p = p|a \circ b_0|^p b_1 |pab_2|^p \cdots |pab_{n-1}|^p \circ |pab_n \circ pa|^p$ , namely,  $|pab_n \circ pa|^p = |pa \circ b_n|^p$  exists by induction and is  $<_L p(a \circ b_0)b_1(pab_2) \cdots (pab_{n-2})$  by  $b_n <_L pb_0 \cdots b_{n-2}$  and Theorem 1(i). To see  $|uv|^p \sqsupset^p u$ , it is immediate if  $* = \cdot$ , and if  $* = \circ$ ,  $pab_n \sqsupset^p pa$  by induction, and  $pab_n \circ pa = pa \circ b_n <_L pa(pb_0 \cdots b_{n-2}) = p(a \circ b_0)b_1(pab_2) \cdots (pab_{n-2})$ , as desired.
- (iv)  $u = pa_0a_1 \cdots a_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . Then the case where the induction hypothesis is used is where  $v = pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1}b_n \cdots b_{m-1} * b_m$ , where  $a_n \sqsupset^p b_n$  and  $a_n \circ b_n \leq_L pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-2}$ . The cases and computations are similar to (iii).
- (v)  $u = pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . Then  $a_n \sqsupset^p v$ , so  $|a_nv|^p$ ,  $|a_n \circ v|^p$  exist, and  $a_nv <_L a_n \circ v \leq_L pa_0 \cdots a_{n-2}$ . Thus  $|uv|^p = pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1}|a_nv|^p$ ,  $|u \circ v|^p = |pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ |a_n \circ v|^p|^p$  which is  $pa_0 \cdots a_{i-1} \circ |a_i \circ v|^p$ , where  $i \leq n$  is greatest such that  $i = 1$  or  $a_i \circ v <_L pa_0 \cdots a_{i-1}$ . And for  $|uv|^p \sqsupset^p u$ , we have  $|a_nv|^p \sqsupset^p a_n$ , and  $a_nv \circ a_n = a_n \circ v \leq_L pa_0 \cdots a_{n-2}$ , as desired.

**Lemma 7.** *Suppose  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $w \in q - DF$ . Then*

- (i)  $|pw|^{pq}$  exists, and  $|pw|^{pq} \sqsupset^{pq} p$ .
- (ii) If  $|pw|^{p \circ q}$  exists, then  $|pw|^{p \circ q} \sqsupset^{p \circ q} p$ .

*Proof.* We check part (ii), part (i) being similar. Assume the lemma is true for all proper components  $w'$  of  $w$ . If  $w \leq q$ , then  $pw < p \circ w \leq p \circ q$  and, by  $pw \circ p = p \circ w$ , we have  $pw \sqsupset^{p \circ q} p$ . So assume the most general case on  $w$ ,  $w = qa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n$ . Then  $pw = (p \circ q)a_0(pa_1) \cdots (pa_{n-1}) \circ (pa_n)$  is prenormal, so if  $|pw|^{p \circ q}$  exists, then by Lemma 4(i) and (ii)  $|pw|^{p \circ q} = (p \circ q)|a_0|^{p \circ q}|pa_1|^{p \circ q} \cdots |pa_{n-1}|^{p \circ q} \circ |pa_n|^{p \circ q}$ . Then  $|pa_n|^{p \circ q} \sqsupset^{p \circ q} p$  by the induction assumption, and  $pa_n \circ p = p \circ a_n <_L p(qa_0 \cdots a_{n-2}) = (p \circ q)a_0(pa_1) \cdots (pa_{n-2})$ . So  $|pw|^{p \circ q} \sqsupset^{p \circ q} p$ . The case  $n = 0$  yields  $p(q \circ a) = p(qa \circ q) = (p \circ q)a \circ (pq)$  and is similarly checked, using that

Note, for  $F$  a finite subset of  $\mathcal{P}$ , the following induction principle: if  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ ,  $S \neq \emptyset$ , then there is a  $w \in S$  such that for all  $u$ , if  $pu \leq w$  for some  $p \in F$ , then  $u \in S$ . Otherwise some  $w \in S$  would be  $\geq$  arbitrarily long compositions of the form  $p_0 \circ p_1 \circ \cdots \circ p_n$ , each  $p_i \in F$ . By Theorem 1(ii), some  $p \in F$  would occur at least  $m$  times in one of these compositions, where  $p^m > p^{(m)} > w$ , and applications of the  $a \circ b = ab \circ a$  law would give  $p^m \leq p_0 \circ \cdots \circ p_n \leq w$ , a contradiction to Theorem 1(v) and (viii).

**Theorem.** For all  $w, r \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $|w|^r$  exists.

*Proof.* We show that  $T = \{r \in \mathcal{P} : \text{for all } w \in \mathcal{P}, |w|^r \text{ exists}\}$  contains  $x$  and is closed under  $\cdot$  and  $\circ$ .

(i)  $x \in T$ . Suppose, letting  $F = \{x\}$  in the induction principle, that  $|w|^x$  does not exist but  $|u|^x$  exists for all  $u$  such that  $xu \leq w$ . Pick  $v \leq w$  such that  $|v|^x$  doesn't exist, and, subject to that, the  $(x, x)$ -normal form of  $v$  ([5], Lemmas 25, 27, Theorem 28) has minimal length. The  $(x, x)$ -normal form of  $v$  is a term  $xa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} * a_n$ , which is prenormal, where  $a_0$  is in the normal form of [5] (see the corollary below), and for  $i > 0$ , each  $a_i$  is in  $(x, x)$ -normal form. Then for  $i > 0$ , each  $|a_i|^x$  exists, and since  $xa_0 \leq w$ ,  $|a_0|^x$  exists. Thus  $|v|^x$  exists,  $|v|^x = x|a_0|^x \cdots |a_{n-1}|^x * |a_n|^x$ .

(ii)  $p, q \in T$  implies  $pq \in T$ . For  $u \in p - DF$ , define the  $\langle p, q \rangle - DF$  of  $u$  as follows. If  $u \leq p$ , the  $\langle p, q \rangle - DF$  of  $u$  is  $u$ . If  $u = pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} * a_n$ , the  $\langle p, q \rangle - DF$  of  $u$  is  $p\bar{a}_0\bar{a}_1 \cdots \bar{a}_{n-1} * \bar{a}_n$ , where  $\bar{a}_0 = |a_0|^q$  and for  $i > 0$ ,  $\bar{a}_i$  is the  $\langle p, q \rangle - DF$  of  $a_i$ . Then by assumption every  $r \in \mathcal{P}$  has a  $\langle p, q \rangle - DF$  representation. Pick  $v$  such that  $|v|^{pq}$  doesn't exist, and subject to that, the  $\langle p, q \rangle - DF$  representation of  $v$  has minimal length. If  $v \leq pq$ , we are done. So assume  $v$ 's  $\langle p, q \rangle - DF$  representation is  $p(qa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} * a_n)b_0b_1 \cdots b_{m-1} * b_m$ , where the proof for  $n \geq 0$  and the first  $*$  being  $\circ$  will cover all cases. Then  $v = pq(pa_0)(pa_1) \cdots (pa_{n-1})(pa_nb_0)b_1 \cdots b_{m-1} * b_m$ . Then  $|pa_0|^{pq} \cdots |pa_{n-1}|^{pq}, |pa_n|^{pq}, |b_0|^{pq} \cdots |b_m|^{pq}$  all exist by the minimality of  $v$ 's

$\langle p, q \rangle - DF$  representation. And since  $b_0 \leq v$ ,  $|b_0|^{pq} \leq |v|^{pq}$ , by Lemma 7(i)



and  $|pa_n b_0|^{pq}$  exists by Lemma 6. The sequence  $(pq), (pa_0) \cdots (pa_{n-1}), (pa_n b_0), b_1 \cdots b_{n-1}, b_n$  need not be prenormal. But we claim  $|p(qa_0 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n)|^{pq} = pq|pa_0|^{pq} \cdots |pa_{n-1}|^{pq} \circ |pa_n|^{pq} \sqsupseteq^{pq} |b_0|^{pq}$ . The equality is clear. For the  $\sqsupseteq^{pq}$  relation, we have  $|pa_n|^{pq} \sqsupseteq^{pq} |b_0|^{pq}$  and  $pa_n \circ b_0 \leq pa_n \circ p = p \circ a_n \leq pq(pa_0) \cdots (pa_{n-2})$  since  $a_n < pa_0 \cdots a_{n-2}$ , giving the claim. So by Lemma 6,  $|p(qa_0 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n) b_0|^{pq} \sqsupseteq^{pq} |p(qa_0 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n)|^{pq} \geq b_1$ . By Lemma 5,  $|p(qa_0 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n) b_0|^{pq} \sqsupseteq^{pq} |b_1|^{pq}$ . With this as the first step, iterate Lemma 6 and Lemma 5,  $m$  times, to get that  $|p(qa_0 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n) b_0 b_1 \cdots b_{m-1} * b_m|^{pq}$  exists.

- (iii)  $p, q \in T$  implies  $p \circ q \in T$ . Letting  $F = \{q\}$  in the induction principle, suppose  $|w|^{p \circ q}$  does not exist but  $|a|^{p \circ q}$  exists for all  $a$  such that  $qa \leq w$ . Pick  $v \leq w$  such that  $|v|^{p \circ q}$  does not exist and, subject to that, the  $\langle p, q \rangle - DF$  representation of  $v$  has minimal length. If  $v \leq p \circ q$ , then again the cases on the  $\langle p, q \rangle - DF$  representation of  $v$  are covered by the proof where that representation is  $p(qa_0 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n) b_0 b_1 \cdots b_{m-1} * b_m$ .

Then  $v = (p \circ q) a_0 (pa_1) \cdots (pa_{n-1}) (pa_n b_0) b_1 \cdots b_{m-1} * b_m$ . As in case (ii),  $|pa_1|^{p \circ q}, \dots, |pa_{n-1}|^{p \circ q}, |pa_n|^{p \circ q}, |b_0|^{p \circ q}, \dots, |b_m|^{p \circ q}$  exist, and using Lemma 7(ii) and

Lemma 6,  $|pa_n b_0|^{p \circ q}$  exists. And since  $qa_0 \leq v$ ,  $|a_0|^{p \circ q}$  exists by the induction principle. Thus  $|p(qa_0 \cdots a_{n-1} \circ a_n)|^{p \circ q}$  exists, and, as in case (ii), is  $\sqsupseteq^{p \circ q} |b_0|^{p \circ q}$ . Then iterate Lemmas 6 and 5 as in case (ii) to obtain the existence of  $|v|^{p \circ q}$ . This completes the proof of the theorem.

For  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ , say that a term  $w$  in the alphabet  $\{q : q <_L p\} \cup \{p^{(i)} : i < \omega\}$  is in  $p$ -normal form ( $p - NF$ ) if either  $w <_L p$  is a term of length one, or  $w = p^{(i)} a_0 a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} * a_n$ , where each  $a_k \in p - NF$ ,  $p^{(i)} a_0 a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} * a_n$  is prenormal, and  $a_0 <_L p^{(i)}$ . Let  $|w|_p$  be the  $p - NF$  representation of  $w$  if it exists. As in [5], Lemmas 9 and 12, such a representation is unique. It is proved in [5] that for all  $p \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $w \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $|w|_p$  exists. The  $DF$  theorem allows this to be extended to  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ .

**Corollary** *If  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ , then  $|p|_p$  exists.*

*Proof.* By induction on  $w \in p - DF$ . If  $w <_L p$ , we are done; so assume  $w$  is the  $p - DF$  term  $pa_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} * a_n$ . Then each  $|a_i|_p$  exists, and if  $a_0 <_L p$ , we are done. Also, if  $a_0 = p$ , then the  $p - NF$  expression for  $w$  is  $p^{(1)}|a_1|_p \cdots |a_{n-1}|_p * |a_n|_p$ . Without loss of generality assume  $a_0$ 's  $p - NF$  representation is  $p^{(m)}b_0b_1 \cdots b_{k-1} \circ b_k$ . Then it is easily checked that  $|pa_0|_p = p^{(m+1)}|pb_0|_p \cdots |pb_{k-1}|_p \circ |pb_k|_p$ . Thus  $w = p^{(m+1)}(pb_0) \cdots (pb_{k-1})(pb_k a_1)a_2 \cdots a_{n-1} * a_n$ . In [4, Theorem 16], a  $\sqsupset_p$  theorem is proved for  $p - NF$  (for  $p \in \mathcal{A}$ , but a similar result holds for all  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ). We may use a version of it, and an analog of Lemma 7 above, as Lemmas 6 and 7 were used in Theorem 8, to obtain  $|pa_0|_p \sqsupset_p a_1$ , and then iterate to get the existence of  $|w|_p$ . The details are left to the reader.

## References

- [1] P. Dehornoy, Free distributive groupoids, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **61** (1989), 123–146.
- [2] P. Dehornoy, Sur la structure des gerbes libres, C.R.A.S. Paris, t.308, Série I (1989), 143–148.
- [3] P. Dehornoy, Braid groups and left distributive operations, preprint.
- [4] R. Dougherty, On critical points of elementary embeddings, Handwritten notes, 1988.
- [5] R. Laver, On the left distributive law and the freeness of an algebra of elementary embeddings, *Advances in Mathematics* **91** (1992), 209-231.
- [6] R. Laver, On an algebra of elementary embeddings, preprint.
- [7] J. Steel, On the well foundedness of the Mitchell order, preprint.