Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal

Ivan Chajda; Radomír Halaš; František Machala

Congruences and ideals in ternary rings

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 47 (1997), No. 1, 163–172

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/127347

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1997

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.

This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* http://dml.cz

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, 47 (122) 1997, Praha

CONGRUENCES AND IDEALS IN TERNARY RINGS

IVAN CHAJDA, RADOMÍR HALAŠ, FRANTIŠEK MACHALA, Olomouc

(Received January 13, 1995)

Summary. A ternary ring is an algebraic structure $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 0, 1)$ of type $(3, 0, 0)$ satisfying the identities $t(0, x, y) = y = t(x, 0, y)$ and $t(1, x, 0) = x = (x, 1, 0)$ where, moreover, for any a, b, $c \in R$ there exists a unique $d \in R$ with $t(a, b, d) = c$. A congruence θ on $\mathcal{R}$ is called normal if $\mathcal{R}/\theta$ is a ternary ring again. We describe basic properties of the lattice of all normal congruences on $\mathcal{R}$ and establish connections between ideals (introduced earlier by the third author) and congruence kernels.

Keywords: ternary ring, ideal, congruence, normal congruence, congruence kernel

MSC 1991: 13A15, 08A30

The concept of a ternary field was introduced by M. Hall [5] under a different name and used for the so called coordinatization of projective planes, see [5], [10]. It was generalized to a ternary ring by the third author, see [7]. It forms an algebraic tool for a classification of the so called Klingenberg planes which generalize projective planes, see [7], [8] and [9] for more detail. In these costructions we search for a suitable factorization of the assigned ternary ring. This factorization can be done either by an ideal or a congruence. However, the mutual relationship between these two concepts has not yet been investigated. Moreover, only a little is known on the congruence lattice of a ternary ring. For a bit more complex structure, the so called bi-ternary ring, the ideal theory in the sense of H.-P.Gumm and A.Ursini [4], [11] was already settled by the first two authors in [3]; for the reduct called a semiloop it was done in [2].

Our object is to classify congruences in ternary rings, to describe the congruence lattice and to give a mutual relationship between ideals and congruences for ternary rings.

1. Congruences in ternary rings

Definition 1. By a ternary ring we mean an $\mathcal{R} = (R, t, 0, 1)$ of type $(3, 0, 0)$ satisfying the identities

$$t(0, x, y) = y = t(x, 0, y), \tag{1}$$

$$t(1, x, 0) = x = t(x, 1, 0), \tag{1'}$$

where for every a, b, c of R there exists a unique element $c \in R$ such that

$$t(a, b, d) = c. \tag{$*$}$$

Lemma 1. *A ternary ring $R = (R, t, 0, 1)$ is a one element algebra if and only if $0 = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose $0 = 1$ and $x \in R$. By (1), we have $t(0, x, 0) = 0$ and, by (1′), $t(0, x, 0) = x$, thus R is a singleton. The converse assertion is trivial. □

Definition 2. An equivalence θ on R is a congruence of a ternary ring $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 0, 1)$ if it has the substitution property with respect to t, i.e. if $a_i \theta b_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ implies $t(a_1, a_2, a_3)\theta t(b_1, b_2, b_3)$. A congruence θ on $\mathcal{R}$ is called normal if for each a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, x, y of R, if $a_1 \theta b_1$, $a_2 \theta b_2$ and $t(a_1, a_2, x)\theta t(b_1, b_2, y)$ then also $x \theta y$.

From now on let ω denote the identical relation and ι the full relation on R, i.e. $\iota = R \times R$ and $x \omega y$ if $x = y$. Clearly, ω and ι are normal congruences on a ternary ring $\mathcal{R}$. Denote by $\operatorname{Con} \mathcal{R}$ the congruence lattice of $\mathcal{R}$ and by $\operatorname{Con}_N \mathcal{R}$ the set of all normal congruences on $\mathcal{R}$. Trivially, ω is the least and ι the greatest element of $\operatorname{Con} \mathcal{R}$.

If $a \in R$ and $\Phi \in Con\mathcal{R}$, denote by $[a]_\Phi$ the congruence class of Φ containing a. Introduce a ternary operation t_Φ in the factor set R/Φ as follows:

$$t_\Phi([a]_\Phi, [b]_\Phi, [c]_\Phi) = [d]_\Phi$$

if $t(a, b, c) = d'$ for some $d' \in [d]_\Phi$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 1, 0)$ be a ternary ring and $\Phi \in Con\mathcal{R}$. Then $\mathcal{R}/\Phi = (R/\Phi; t_\Phi, [0]_\Phi, [1]_\Phi)$ is a ternary ring if and only if Φ is normal.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{R}/\Phi = (R/\Phi; t_\Phi, [0]_\Phi, [1]_\Phi)$ be a ternary ring and $[a]_\Phi$, $[b]_\Phi$, $[c]_\Phi \in \mathcal{R}/\Phi$. Then there exists a unique $[d]_P hi \in \mathcal{R}/\Phi$ with

$$t_\Phi([a]_\Phi, [b]_\Phi, [c]_\Phi) = [d]_\Phi. \tag{$**$}$$

If $a_1, b_1 \in [a]_\Phi$, $a_2, b_2 \in [b]_\Phi$ and $t(a_1, a_2, x), t(b_1, b_2, y) \in [c]_\Phi$ for some $x, , y \in R$ then, by $(**)$, also $x, y \in [d]_\Phi$. Hence $a_1 \Phi b_1$, $a_2 \Phi b_2$ and $t(a_1, a_2, x) \Phi t(b_1, b_2, y)$ imply $x \Phi y$, thus Φ is normal.

Conversely, if $\Phi \in Con\mathcal{R}$ in normal then $(**)$ is clearly satisfied and hence $\mathcal{R}/\Phi = (R/\Phi; t_\Phi, [0]_\Phi, [0]_\Phi)$ is a ternary ring again. □

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 1, 0)$ be a ternary ring, $\theta \in Con\mathcal{R}$ and let the factor set $CalR/\theta$ be finite. Then θ is normal.*

Proof. Consider the natural mapping $h\colon R \to R/\theta$ given by $h(a) = [a]_\theta$. Trivially, h is a homomorphism of $\mathcal{R}$ onto an algebra $\mathcal{R}/\theta$ with one ternary and two nullary operations $t_\theta, [0]_\theta, [1]_\theta$ satisfying (1) and (1′). Let us consider the mappings $f_{ab}\colon R/\theta \to R/\theta$ defined as follows:

$$f_{ab}(h(x)) = t_\theta(h(a), h(b), h(x)) \quad \text{for each } a, b, x \text{ of } R.$$

These mappings are surjective. Namely, if $h(c) \in R/\theta$ then $t\big(h(a), h(b), h(x)\big) = h\big(t(a, b, x)\big) = h(c)$, where $c = t(a, b, x)$; by $(*)$ such a unique element x exists. However, R/θ is finite, thus every surjective mapping of R/θ onto itself is a bijection. Thus also $(*)$ is satisfied, i.e. $\mathcal{R}/\theta = (R/\theta, t_\theta, [0]_\theta, [1]_\theta)$ is a ternary ring. By Theorem 1, θ is normal. □

Corollary 1. *For every finite ternary ring $\mathcal{R}$,* $\operatorname{Con} R = \operatorname{Con}_N \mathcal{R}$.

We are going to show that for a non-finite ternary ring $\mathcal{R}$ the assertion of Theorem 2 need not hold in general:

Example. A congruence $\Theta \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{L}$ on a loop l is called normal if for every four elements x_1, x_2, y_1, $y_2 \in L$ such that $x_1 \Theta y_1$, $(x_1 + y_1)\Theta(x_2 = y_2)$ also $x_2 \Theta y_2$. As was pointed out e.g. in [1], there exists a loop $\mathcal{L}$ and a congruence Θ on $\mathcal{L}$ which is not normal. Let $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{L}; +, 0)$ be such a loop and let $\Theta \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{L}$ be not normal.

Choose freely but fix from now on an element $1 \in L$ such that $1 \notin [0]_\Theta$. Since θ is not normal then $\Theta \neq L \times L$, i.e. such an element exists. Introduce a new binary operation denoted by dot as follows:

(1) if $a \notin [1]_\Theta$ and $b \notin [1]_\Theta$ then $a \cdot b = 0$;
(2) if $a \in [1]_\Theta$ and $b \notin [1]_\Theta$ then $a \cdot b = b \cdot a = b$;
(3) if $a, b \in [1]_\Theta$ and $a \neq 1 \neq b$ then $a \cdot b = 1$;
(4) if $a, b \in [1]_\Theta$ and $a = 1$ then $a \cdot b = b \cdot a = b$.

Clearly, the identities

$$0 \cdot x = x \cdot 0 = 0 \text{ and} 1 \cdot x = x \cdot 1 = x$$

hold in $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{L}; \cdot, 0)$. Introduce a ternary operation t as follows:

$$t(x, y, z) = x \cdot y + z.$$

It is an easy exercise to check that $\mathcal{R} = (L; t, 0, 1)$ is a ternary ring and, moreover, the foregoing $\Theta \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{L}$ satisfies also $\Theta \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{R}$.

Hence, there exist elements x_1, x_2, y_1, $y_2 \in L$ such that $x_1 \Theta x_2$, $(x_1 + y_1)\Theta(x_2 + y_2)$ but y_1, y_2 are not congruent mod Θ. Applying the foregoing operation $\cdot$ on L, we obtain $t(x, y, z)$ as before. Hence, $x_1 + y_1 = (1, x_1, y_1)$, $x_2 + y_2 = t(1, X_2, y_2)$, i.e. also $t(1, x_1, y_1)\Theta t(1, x_2, y_2)$, thus Θ is not normal in $\mathcal{R} = (L; t, 0, 1)$.

Remark. Let $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 0, 1)$ be a ternary ring. Introduce a new ternary operation $q\colon R^3 \to R$ as follows:

$$q(a, b, c) = d \text{ if and only if } t(a, b, d) = c.$$

By $(*)$, q is correctly defined. The algebra $\mathcal{R}^* = (R; t, q, 0, 1)$ satisfying the identifies (1), (1′) and

$$t\big(x, y, q(x, y, z)\big) = z = q\big(x, y, t(x, y, z)\big) \tag{2}$$

is called a bi-ternary ring, see [3].

It is easy to see that (2) implies $(*)$. Hence, the reduct $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 0, 1)$ of a bi-ternary ring $\mathcal{R}^* = (R; t, q, 0, 1)$ is a ternary ring. Since bi-ternary rings are defined by identities, they form a variety. Hence, every congruence Θ on $\mathcal{R}^*$ is normal congruence on reduct $\mathcal{R}(R; t, 0, 1)$. Moreover, for ideals of bi-ternary rings the ideal theory can be used invent by H. P. Gumm and A. Ursini [4], [11], which is based on the universal algebraic approach. Applying it, we have shown in [3] that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between ideals and congruences of bi-ternary rings, i.e. the variety of all bi-ternary rings is ideal determined, see [3], [4].

2. Congruence lattice of ternary rings

Denote by $\theta \cdot \Phi$ the relational product of two binary relations θ, Φ on $\mathcal{R}$.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 0, 1)$ be a ternary ring and $\Phi \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{R}$ and $\theta \in \operatorname{Con}_N \mathcal{R}$. Then $\theta \cdot \Phi = \Phi \cdot \theta$.*

Proof. Suppose $\Phi \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{R}$ and $\theta \in \operatorname{Con}_N \mathcal{R}$ and $a\theta \cdot \Phi b$ for some a, b of R. Then there exists $c \in R$ with $a\theta c$ and $c\Phi b$. By $(*)$ there exist elements k,$s \in R$ such that

$$t(1, c,) = a = t(1, b, s). \tag{i}$$

Since $b\Phi c$ we also have

$$\text{(ii)} \qquad a = t(1,c,k)\Phi t(1,b,k).$$

However, by (i) and (1′)

$$t(1,c,k) = a = t(1,a,0)\theta t(1,c,0).$$

Since θ is normal, this implies $k\theta 0$.

Hence, $t(1,b,k)\theta t(1,b,0) = b$. Together with (ii) it implies $a\Phi\cdot\theta b$, i.e. $\theta\cdot\Phi \subseteq \Phi\cdot\theta$. It implies also

$$\Phi\cdot\theta = \Phi^{-1}\cdot\theta^{-1} = (\theta\cdot\Phi)^{-1} \subseteq (\Phi\cdot\theta)^{-1} = \theta^{-1}\cdot\Phi^{-1} = \theta\cdot\Phi,$$

thus $\theta\cdot\Phi = \Phi\cdot\theta$. □

Recall from [6] that a lattice $\mathcal{L}$ is Arguesian if it satisfies the identity

$$\bigwedge_{i<3}(x_i \vee y_i) \leqslant \big(x_0 \wedge (x_1 \vee m)\big) \vee \big(y_0 \wedge (y_1 \vee m)\big),$$

where

$$m = (x_0 \vee x_1) \wedge (y_0 \vee y_1) \wedge [\{(x_0 \vee x_2) \wedge (y_0 \vee y_2)\} \vee \{(x_2 \vee x_1) \wedge (y_2 \vee y_1)\}].$$

Hence, every Arguensian lattice is modular.

Theorem 4. *For every ternary ring $\mathcal{R}$, $\operatorname{Con}_N \mathcal{R}$ is a complete Arguesian lattice which is a sublattice of $\operatorname{Con}\mathcal{R}$.*

Proof. It is a routine to show that an arbitrary intersection of normal congruences is a normal congruence. Since also ω, $\iota \in \operatorname{Con}_N \mathcal{R}$, this means that $\operatorname{Con}_N \mathcal{R}$ is a complete lattice.

By Theorem 3, every two normal congruences permute and thus, by [6], $\operatorname{Con}_N \mathcal{R}$ is Arguesian.

In both the lattice $\operatorname{Con}\mathcal{R}$ and $\operatorname{Con}_N \mathcal{R}$ the meet coincides with set intersection.

It remains to prove that also the operation join coincides in these lattices. Since θ_1, $\theta_2 \in \operatorname{Con}_N \mathcal{R}$ are permutable, then $\theta_1\cdot\theta_2$ is the least congruence containing θ_1 and θ_2. We need only to show that also $\theta_1\cdot\theta_2$ is normal.

Let a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, x, $y \in R$ and suppose

$$a_1\theta_1\cdot\theta_2 b_1,\ a_2\theta_1\cdot\theta_2 b_2 \quad \text{and} \quad t(a_1,a_2,x)\theta_1\cdot\theta_2 t(b_1,b_2,y).$$

Then there exist c_1, c_2, $c_3 \in R$ with

$$a_1\theta_1 c_1, c_1\theta_2 b_1,$$
$$a_2\theta_1 c_2, c_2\theta_2 b_2,$$
$$t(a_1, a_2, x)\theta_1 c_3, c_3\theta_2 t(b_1, b_2, y).$$

By $(*)$, there exist a unique $z \in R$ with

$$t(c_1, c_2, z) = c_3,$$

whence

$$t(a_1, a_2, x)\theta_1 t(c_1, c_2, z) \text{ and } t(c_1, c_2, y)\theta_2 t(b_1, b_2, y).$$

Since θ_1, θ_2 are normal, we conclude

$$x\theta_1 z \text{ and } z\theta_2 y,$$

i.e. $x\theta_1 \cdot \theta_2 y$, which proves normality of $\theta_1 \cdot \theta_2$. □

Theorem 5. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 0, 1)$ be a ternary ring and a, $b \in R$, $\theta \in \operatorname{Con}\mathcal{R}$. Then*

$$card[0]_\theta \leqslant \operatorname{card}[a]_\theta.$$

If, moreover, θ is normal, then

$$\operatorname{card}[a]_\theta = \operatorname{card}[b]_\theta.$$

Proof. For each $a \in R$ define a unary polynomial function $\varphi_a(z) = t(1, a, z)$. By $(1')$, we have

$$\varphi_a(0) = t(1, a, 0) = a.$$

Hence, φ_a induces a mapping of $[0]_\theta$ into $[a]_\theta$. By $(*)$, φ_a is an injection. This proves the first assertion.

Now, suppose $\theta \in \operatorname{Con}_N \mathcal{R}$. If $d \in [a]_\theta$ then, by $(*)$, there exist a unique $c \in R$ with $\varphi_a(c) = t(1, ac,) = d$. By $(1')$ we have $d = t(1, d, 0)$. Using $d \in [a]_\theta$ and normality of θ we conclude from $t(1, a, c) = t(1, d, 0)$ also $c \in [0]_\theta$. Hence, φ_a is also surjective, i.e. it is a bijection. Then $\operatorname{card}[a]_\theta = \operatorname{card}[0]_\theta = \operatorname{card}[b]_t$. □

Corollary 2. *Let θ Φ be normal congruences on a ternary ring $\mathcal{R} = (R; t; 0, 1)$. If $[a]_\theta = [a]_\Phi$ for some $a \in R$ then $\theta = \Phi$.*

It is an easy consequence of Theorem 5 since the mapping $\varphi_a(z) = t(1, a, z)$ is bijection which does not depend on the choice of θ.

Recall that an algebra $\mathcal{A} = (A, F)$ is congruence-uniform if $\operatorname{card}[a]_\theta = \operatorname{card}[d]_t$ for each $\theta \in \operatorname{Con}\mathcal{A}$ and every a, b of A. $\mathcal{A}$ is congruence-regular if $[a]_\theta = [a]\Phi$ implies $\theta = \Phi$ for each $a \in A$ and every two θ, $\Phi \in \operatorname{Con}\mathcal{A}$.

By using Theorem 2, Theorem 5 and Corollary 1, we obtain

Corollary 3. *Every finite ternary ring is congruence-regular and congruence-uniform.*

3. Ideals of ternary rings

The concept of an ideal of a ternary ring occured for the first time in [7]:

Definition 3. Let $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 0, 1)$ be a ternary ring. For a, $b \in R$ we put $a + b = t(1, a, b)$. A subset $J \subseteq R$ is called an ideal of $\mathcal{R}$ if the following hold:

(I_1) $0 \in J$;
(I_2) if $b = a + r$ for some $r \in J$ then there exists $r' \in J$ with $a = b + r$;
(I_3) for every a, b, c of R and every r_1, r_2, r_3 of J there exists $r \in J$ with

$$t(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r_3) = t(a, b, c) + r;$$

(I_4) if $t(a, b, y) = t(a, b, x) + r$ for some $r \in J$ then there exists $r' \in J$ with $y = x + r'$.

Remark. If J is an ideal of a ternary ring $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 0, 1)$ and $a \in R$, r_1, $r_2 \in J$, then $t(a, r_1, r_2) \in J$ and $t(r_1, a, r_2) \in J$. Moreover, if $r \in R$ and $(a + r_1) + r_2 = a + r$ then $r \in J$, see e.g. [7].

Theorem 6. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 0, 1)$ be a ternary ring and $J \subseteq R$. The following are equivalent:*
(1) *J is an ideal of $\mathcal{R}$;*
(2) *$0 \in J$ and if $t(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r) = t(a, b, c) + s$ for some r_1, $r_2 \in J$, then $r \in J$ iff $s \in J$.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): For any elements a, b, r_1, r_2, r of R there exists $s \in R$ such that

$$t(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r) = t(a, b, c) + s = t\big(1, (a, b, c), s\big).$$

By $(*)$, this "s" is uniquely determined. Suppose $r_1, r_2 \in J$. If $r \in J$, then, by (I_3), we have $s \in J$. If $r' \in J$ then there exists $k_1 \in R$ such that $(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r') = t(a, b, c) + k_1$ and, by the foregoing part, $k_1 \in J$. By (I_2), there exists $k_3 \in J$ with

$$t(a, b, c) = t(a = r_1, b + r_2, c + r') + k_2),$$

thus also

$$t(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r) = \big(t(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r') + k_2\big) + s.$$

Since k_2, $s \in J$, there exists $k_3 \in J$ with

$$\big(t(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r') + k_3\big) + s = t(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r') + k_3,$$

see e.g. the foregoing Remark. Hence

$$t(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r) = t(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r') + k_3.$$

By (I_4) there exists $k_4 \in J$ with $c + r = (c + r') = c + k$ where $k \in J$, see the foregoing Remark again.

Applying $(*)$ we conclude $r = k$, thus $r \in J$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): We prove directly (I_2) and (I_4) of the definition. The condition (I_3) follows immediately by $(*)$ and (2).

First we prove that if $(a + r) + r_2 = a + r$ and r_1, $r \in J$ then also $r_2 \in J$. Indeed, we have

$$(a + r_1) + r_2 = t(1, a + r_1, r_2) = t(1 + 0, a + r_1, 0 + r_2) = a + r = t(1, a, 0).$$

By (2) we obtain $r_2 \in J$.

Now, we suppose $b = a + r$ for $r \in J$. By $(*)$ there exists $r' \in R$ with $a = b + r'$. Then $a = (a + r) + r' = a + 0$. Since r, $0 \in J$, we conclude $r' \in J$, thus the condition (I_2) is evident.

Prove (I_4): let $t(a, b, y) = t(a, b, x) + r$ for $r \in J$. By $(*)$ there exists $r' \in R$ with $y = x + r'$. We obtain

$$t(a, b, y) = t(a + 0, b + 0, x + r') = t(a, b, x) + r.$$

Since 0, $r \in J$, (2) implies also $r' \in J$. $\square$

Theorem 7. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (R; t, 0, 1)$ be a ternary ring and θ a binary relation on R. The following are equivalent:*

(1) *θ is a normal congruence on $\mathcal{R}$;*

(2) *$[0]_\theta$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{R}$ and $a\theta b$ if only $b = a + r$ for some $r \in [0]_\theta$;*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Suppose $a\theta b$. By $(*)$, there exists $r \in R$ with $b = t(1, a, r) = a + r$. Since $a = t(1, a, 0)$, we conclude $t(1, a, r)\theta t(1, a, 0)$. By (1), θ is normal, thus also $r\theta 0$, i.e. $r \in [0]_\theta$.

Conversely, if $b = a + r$ and $r \in [0]\theta$ then $t(1, a, 0)\theta t(1, a, r)$ whence $a\theta b$. Now, put $J = [0]_t$ and suppose

$$(***) \qquad t(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r_3) = t(a, b, c) + r.$$

Suppose r_1, r_2, $r_3 \in [0]\theta$. Then $(a + r_1)\theta a$, $(b + r_2)\theta b$, $(c + r_3)\theta c$, i.e. also

$$(****) \qquad t(a + r_1, b + r_2, c + r_3)\theta t(a, b, c).$$

By using $(*)$ and $(***)$ we obtain $r \in [0]_\theta = J$. Suppose r_1, r_2, $r \in J = [0]_\theta$. Then $(a + r_1)\theta a$, $(b + r_2)\theta b$ and $(****)$ give $(c + r_3)\theta c$ since θ is normal. By the first part of this proof, $r_3 \in [0]_\theta$. Applying (2) of Theorem 6, J be an ideal of $\mathcal{R}$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Let J be an ideal of $\mathcal{R}$. It is an easy exercise to show that the relation θ defined by

$$a\theta b \text{ if and only if } b = a + r \text{ for some } r \in J$$

is a congruence on $\mathcal{R}$ and $J = [0]_\theta$. It remains to prove that θ is normal. Let $a_i\theta b_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, let x, $y \in R$ and suppose $t(a_1, a_2, x) = a_3$, $t(b_1, b_2, y) = b_3$. Then $b_i = a_i + r_i$ for some $r_i \in [0]_\theta$. By $(*)$, there exists $r \in R$ with $y = t(1, x, r) = x + r$. Hence

$$t(b_1, b_2, y) = t(a_1 + r_1, a_2 + r_2, x + r) = a_3 + r_3.$$

By (2) of Theorem 6, we have $r \in [0]_\theta$ whence

$$t(1, x, 0)\theta t(1, x, r),$$

i.e. $x\theta(x + r)$. Since $x + r = y$, we conclude $x\theta y$. □

References

[1] *G.E. Bates, F. Kiokemeister*: A note on homomorphic mappings of quasigroups into multiplicative systems. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. *54* (1948), 1180–1185.

[2] *R. Bělohlávek, I. Chajda*: Congruences and ideals in semiloops. Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) *59* (1994), 43–47.

[3] *I. Chajda, R. Halaš*: Ideals in bi-ternary rings. Discussione Math. Algebra and Stochastic Methods *15* (1995), 11–21.

[4] *H.P. Gumm, A. Ursini*: Ideals in universal algebra. Algebra Univ. *19* (1984), 45–54.

[5] *M. Hall*: Projective planes. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. *54* (1943), 229–277.

[6] *B. Jónsson*: On the representation of lattices. Math. Scand. *1* (1953), 193–206.

[7] *F. Machala*: Erweiterte lokale Ternärringe. Czech. Math. J. *27* (1977), 560–572.

[8] *F. Machala*: Koordinatisation projectiver Ebenen mit Homomorphismus. Czech. Math. J. *27* (1977), 573–590.

[9] *F. Machala*: Koordinatisation affiner Ebenen mit Homomorphismus. Math. Slovaca *27* (1977), 181–193.

[10] *G. Pickert*: Projective Ebenen Springer-Verlag Berlin. Heidelberg, New York, 1975.

[11] *A. Ursini*: Sulle varietá di algebra con una buona teoria degli ideali. Bull. U.M.I. *6* (1972), no. 4, 90–95.

Authors' address: Dept. of Algebra and Geometry, Palacký University Olomouc, Tomkova 40, 779 00 Olomouc, Czech Republic.