

*Mailbox***A note on directly indecomposable algebras**

STANLEY BURRIS

Given an algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  and a congruence  $\theta$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  let  $\theta$  be the subalgebra of  $\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{A}$  with universe  $\theta$ . The results in this note depend on the following simple observation: if  $\mathbf{A}$  belongs to a congruence distributive variety then the congruences of  $\theta$  are just the restrictions to  $\theta$  of the congruences  $\theta_1 \times \theta_2$  of  $\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{A}$ .

**THEOREM 1.** *If  $V$  is a congruence distributive variety such that every directly indecomposable member is subdirectly irreducible then  $V$  is semi-simple.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mathbf{A}$  is a subdirectly irreducible non-simple member of  $V$ . Let  $\theta$  be the unique atom of  $\text{Con } \mathbf{A}$ . Then  $\theta$  is directly indecomposable but it is not subdirectly irreducible.  $\square$

**COROLLARY 2.** *A congruence distributive variety is Boolean representable (see Clark and Krauss [1]) iff it is a discriminator variety.*

*Proof.* If a congruence distributive variety is Boolean representable then it must be semi-simple by Theorem 1. The rest is in [1].  $\square$

**THEOREM 3.** *A finitely generated congruence distributive variety is directly representable by finitely many finite algebras (see McKenzie [2]) iff it is semi-simple arithmetical.*

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ) This is well-known. ( $\Rightarrow$ ) If it is directly representable then it has only finitely many finite directly indecomposable members. Suppose  $\mathbf{A}$  is a finite non-simple directly indecomposable member of the variety. Let  $\theta$  be a maximal congruence of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Then  $\theta$  is directly indecomposable and  $|\theta| > |\mathbf{A}|$ ; repeating this

leads to infinitely many finite directly indecomposable members, which is impossible. Thus each directly indecomposable member is simple, hence the free algebra on three generators is isomorphic to a product of finitely many finite simples. From this we conclude that the variety is congruence permutable.  $\square$

## References

- [1] PETER H. KRAUSS and DAVID M. CLARK, *Global subdirect products*. Memoirs of the AMS 17 No. 210 (1979).
- [2] R. MCKENZIE, *Para primal varieties: A study of finite axiomatizability and definable principle congruences in locally finite varieties*. Alg. Universalis 8 (1978), 336–348.

University of Waterloo  
Waterloo, Ontario  
Canada