

33. Remarks on the Jordan-Hölder-Schreier Theorem^{*)}

By Tsuyoshi FUJIWARA

Department of Mathematics, Yamaguchi University

(Comm. by K. SHODA, M.J.A., March 12, 1955)

The Jordan-Hölder-Schreier theorem, or shortly the J-H-S theorem, in lattices has been considered as the formulation of the J-H-S theorem for algebraic systems. But, A. W. Goldie has proved in his paper [3] the usual theorem on lengths of chains in modular lattices, using the Jordan-Hölder theorem for algebraic systems. In this note, the relations between these theorems will be more cleared. First, we shall show the J-H-S theorem for algebraic systems (§ 1). Next, considering a lattice L as the algebraic system with the composition \cup only, we shall introduce a theorem for normal chains of L as the special case of the above theorem. And this theorem will be shown to be the usual J-H-S theorem in the lattice L (§ 2).

§ 1. Algebraic Systems. In this note we put the following conditions on the algebraic system A to keep out the complication:

0. All compositions are binary and single-valued, moreover any two elements may be composable by any composition.

I. A has a null-element e .

We denote by $\theta(B), \varphi(B), \dots$ the congruences on a subsystem B of A . Moreover we denote by Θ the set of all congruences on all subsystems of A , i.e. $\Theta = \{\theta(B) : B \subset A\}$.

Two congruences $\theta(B)$ and $\varphi(C)$ are called *weakly permutable* if and only if

$$(S(\theta(B \wedge C)) | \varphi(B \wedge C)) = (S(\varphi(B \wedge C)) | \theta(B \wedge C)).$$

Moreover a congruence $\omega(B \wedge C)$ is called a *quasi-join* of $\theta(B)$ and $\varphi(C)$, if and only if

- i) $\omega(B \wedge C) \supseteq \theta(B \wedge C) \cup \varphi(B \wedge C)$ and
- ii) $S(\omega(B \wedge C)) = S(\theta(B \wedge C) \cup \varphi(B \wedge C))$.

A subset Φ of Θ is called a *normal family*, when Φ has the following conditions:

- i) Any two congruences in Φ are weakly permutable.
- ii) For any congruences $\theta(B), \varphi(C)$ in Φ , there exists a quasi-join $\omega(B \wedge C) \in \Theta$ such that $[\omega(B \wedge C) | \theta(B)], [\omega(B \wedge C) | \varphi(C)] \in \Phi$. Such a quasi-join $\omega(B \wedge C)$ is called a *normal quasi-join*.

A normal chain

$$M = A_0 \supset S(\theta_0(A_0)) = A_1 \supset \dots \supset S(\theta_{r-1}(A_{r-1})) = A_r = N$$

^{*)} In this note, we shall use the theorems, the terms and the notations in [1] and [2], without the explanations.

is called an (M, N) - Φ -normal chain, when any $\theta_i(A_i)$ is a congruence in a given normal family Φ .

Theorem 1 (Schreier theorem for algebraic systems). *Let*

$$M = A_0 \supset S(\theta_0(A_0)) = A_1 \supset \cdots \supset S(\theta_{r-1}(A_{r-1})) = A_r = N \text{ and}$$

$$M = B_0 \supset S(\varphi_0(B_0)) = B_1 \supset \cdots \supset S(\varphi_{s-1}(B_{s-1})) = B_s = N$$

be any two (M, N) - Φ -normal chains. Then these chains can be refined by interpolation of terms $A_{i,j} = (A_i \wedge B_j \mid \theta_i(A_i)) = S([\omega_{i,j-1}(A_i \wedge B_{j-1}) \mid \theta_i(A_i)](A_{i,j-1}))$ and $B_{i,j} = (A_i \wedge B_j \mid \varphi_j(B_j)) = S([\omega_{i-1,j}(A_{i-1} \wedge B_j) \mid \varphi_j(B_j)](B_{i-1,j}))$ such that

$$A_{i,j} / [\omega_{i,j}(A_i \wedge B_j) \mid \theta_i(A_i)] \cong B_{i,j} / [\omega_{i,j}(A_i \wedge B_j) \mid \varphi_j(B_j)],$$

where $\omega_{i,j}(A_i \wedge B_j)$ are normal quasi-joins of $\theta_i(A_i)$ and $\varphi_j(B_j)$ respectively.

Proof. This theorem may be obtained by the same way as the proof of Theorem 7 in [2].

§ 2. Lattices and J-systems. Hereafter we assume that a lattice L has the least element 0 to keep out the complication. A lattice L is called a J -system, when L is considered as an algebraic system with the composition \cup only. And the element 0 is considered as the null-element of the J -system L . A J -congruence means a congruence on a J -system, and an *ideal* means an ideal of lattices in the usual sense.

By Definition 1 and Theorem 1 in [2], any ideal of the J -system L is a normal sub- J -system, and conversely. Moreover the lower- J -congruence θ with respect to a normal sub- J -system N is defined by $x \overset{\theta}{\sim} y \Leftrightarrow \exists n \in N: n \cup x = n \cup y$. In particular when N is a principal ideal $n/0$, θ is defined by $x \overset{\theta}{\sim} y \Leftrightarrow n \cup x = n \cup y$.

A lower- J -congruence θ which is defined on a sub- J -system $m/0$ and whose normal sub- J -system is $n/0$, is called an $(m/0, n/0)$ -congruence. In particular when n is $m/0$ -modular, θ is called a *modular* $(m/0, n/0)$ -congruence, or simply a *modular congruence*.

Lemma 1. *Let θ be an $(m/0, n/0)$ -congruence. Then the quotient m/n is a representative system of the residue classes of $m/0$ with respect to θ , and $(m/0)/\theta$ is join-isomorphic to the quotient m/n .*

Proof. Let $x \in m/0$. Then $n \cup x = n \cup (n \cup x)$, i.e. $x \overset{\theta}{\sim} n \cup x$. Hence any class contains an element of m/n . On the other hand, let $x, y \in m/n$ and $x \neq y$. Then $n \cup x = x \neq y = n \cup y$. Hence x and y are not contained in a same class. Therefore m/n is a representative system of the residue classes, and $(m/0)/\theta$ is join-isomorphic to the quotient m/n .

Lemma 2. *Let $\theta(m/0)$ be a modular $(m/0, n/0)$ -congruence, and a contained in L . Then $\theta(m \wedge a/0)$ is a modular $(m \wedge a/0, n \wedge a/0)$ -congruence.*

Proof. $n \wedge a/0$ is evidently the normal sub-J-system with respect to $\theta(m \wedge a/0)$, and by Theorem 2 in [1], $n \wedge a$ is $m \wedge a/0$ -modular. Hence $\theta(m \wedge a/0) \geq$ the modular $(m \wedge a/0, n \wedge a/0)$ -congruence φ . On the other hand, let $x, y \in m \wedge a/0$ and $x \overset{\circ}{\sim} y$. Then $n \vee x = n \vee y$. Hence $(m \wedge a) \wedge (n \vee x) = (m \wedge a) \wedge (n \vee y)$. By the $m/0$ -modularity of n , we get $(m \wedge a \wedge n) \vee x = (m \wedge a \wedge n) \vee y$. Hence $(n \wedge a) \vee x = (n \wedge a) \vee y$, i.e. $x \overset{\circ}{\sim} y$. Hence $\theta(m \wedge a/0) \leq \varphi$. Therefore $\theta(m \wedge a/0)$ is the modular $(m \wedge a/0, n \wedge a/0)$ -congruence φ .

Lemma 3. *Let θ be a modular $(m/0, a/0)$ -congruence, and φ a modular $(m/0, b/0)$ -congruence. Then $(S(\theta) | \varphi) = (S(\varphi) | \theta) = a \vee b/0$.*

Proof. Let $x \in (S(\theta) | \varphi)$. Then there exists $a' \in S(\theta) = a/0$ such that $b \vee x = b \vee a'$. Hence by $b \vee a' \leq b \vee a$, we get $x \in a \vee b/0$. Conversely, let $y \in a \vee b/0$. Then by the $m/0$ -modularity of a , we get $((b \vee y) \wedge a) \vee b = (b \vee y) \wedge (a \vee b) = b \vee y$. Hence $y \overset{\circ}{\sim} (b \vee y) \wedge a \in a/0 = S(\theta)$, i.e. $y \in (S(\theta) | \varphi)$. Therefore we get $(S(\theta) | \varphi) = a \vee b/0$. Similarly we get $(S(\varphi) | \theta) = a \vee b/0$.

Lemma 4. *The set Ψ of all modular congruences forms a normal family. In other words, let $\theta(m/0)$ be a modular $(m/0, a/0)$ -congruence, and $\varphi(m'/0)$ a modular $(m'/0, a'/0)$ -congruence. If $\omega(m \wedge m'/0) = \theta(m \wedge m'/0) \vee \varphi(m \wedge m'/0)$, then $[\omega(m \wedge m'/0) | \theta(m/0)]$ is a modular $((m \wedge m') \vee a/0, (m \wedge a') \vee a/0)$ -congruence, and $[\omega(m \wedge m'/0) | \varphi(m'/0)]$ is a modular $((m \wedge m') \vee a'/0, (m' \wedge a) \vee a'/0)$ -congruence.*

Proof. By Lemma 2, $\theta(m \wedge m'/0)$ is a modular $(m \wedge m'/0, m' \wedge a/0)$ -congruence. Similarly $\varphi(m \wedge m'/0)$ is a modular $(m \wedge m'/0, m \wedge a'/0)$ -congruence. By Lemma 3, $\omega(m \wedge m'/0)$ is a quasi-join of $\theta(m/0)$ and $\varphi(m'/0)$. By Theorem 4 in [2] and Theorem 5 in [1], $\omega(m \wedge m'/0)$ is a modular $(m \wedge m'/0, (m' \wedge a) \vee (m \wedge a')/0)$ -congruence.

Now we shall prove that $[\omega(m \wedge m'/0) | \theta(m/0)]$ is a modular $((m \wedge m') \vee a/0, (m \wedge a') \vee a/0)$ -congruence ψ . First, by the $m/0$ -modularity of a , $[\omega(m \wedge m'/0) | \theta(m/0)]$ is defined on $(m \wedge m') \vee a/0$ and its normal sub-J-system is $(m \wedge a') \vee a/0$. Moreover by the $m \wedge m'/0$ -modularity of $(m' \wedge a) \vee (m \wedge a')$, it is clear that $(m \wedge a') \vee a$ is $(m \wedge m') \vee a/0$ -modular. Hence $[\omega(m \wedge m'/0) | \theta(m/0)] \geq$ the modular congruence ψ . On the other hand, let x and y be congruent by $[\omega(m \wedge m'/0) | \theta(m/0)]$. Then by the $m/0$ -modularity of a and Theorem 1 in [1], we get

$$(*) \quad [(x \vee a) \wedge (m \wedge m')] \vee a = x \vee a.$$

Hence $x \overset{\circ}{\sim} (x \vee a) \wedge (m \wedge m')$. Similarly $y \overset{\circ}{\sim} (y \vee a) \wedge (m \wedge m')$. Hence $(x \vee a) \wedge (m \wedge m')$ and $(y \vee a) \wedge (m \wedge m')$ are congruent by $[\omega(m \wedge m'/0) | \theta(m/0)]$ and contained in the domain of $\omega(m \wedge m'/0)$. Therefore $(x \vee a) \wedge (m \wedge m')$ and $(y \vee a) \wedge (m \wedge m')$ are congruent by $\omega(m \wedge m'/0)$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & [(m' \wedge a) \cup (m \wedge a')] \cup [(x \cup a) \wedge (m \wedge m')] \\ & \quad = [(m' \wedge a) \cup (m \wedge a')] \cup [(y \cup a) \wedge (m \wedge m')]. \end{aligned}$$

Join a to both sides of this identity, and using (*), we obtain

$$(m' \wedge a) \cup (m \wedge a') \cup (x \cup a) = (m' \wedge a) \cup (m \wedge a') \cup (y \cup a).$$

Hence $[(m \wedge a') \cup a] \cup x = [(m \wedge a') \cup a] \cup y$, i.e. $x \stackrel{\psi}{\sim} y$. Hence $[\omega(m \wedge m'/0) | \theta(m/0)] \leq \psi$. Therefore $[\omega(m \wedge m'/0) | \theta(m/0)]$ is the modular $((m \wedge m') \cup a/0, (m \wedge a') \cup a/0)$ -congruence ψ . Similarly $[\omega(m \wedge m'/0) | \psi(m'/0)]$ is the modular $((m \wedge m') \cup a'/0, (m' \wedge a) \cup a'/0)$ -congruence.

Combining Theorem 1 and Lemma 4, we can immediately obtain the following

Theorem 2 (Schreier theorem for J-systems). *Let*

$$m/0 = a_0/0 \supset S(\theta_0(a_0/0)) = a_1/0 \supset \cdots \supset S(\theta_{r-1}(a_{r-1}/0)) = a_r/0 = n/0,$$

$$m/0 = b_0/0 \supset S(\varphi_0(b_0/0)) = b_1/0 \supset \cdots \supset S(\varphi_{s-1}(b_{s-1}/0)) = b_s/0 = n/0$$

be any two $(m/0, n/0)$ - \mathcal{P} -normal chains. Then these chains can be refined by interpolation of terms $a_{i,j}/0 = a_{i+1} \cup (a_i \wedge b_j)/0$ and $b_{i,j}/0 = b_{j+1} \cup (a_i \wedge b_j)/0$ such that $(a_{i,j}/0) | \theta_{i,j}$ and $(b_{i,j}/0) | \varphi_{i,j}$ are join-isomorphic, where $\theta_{i,j}$ is the modular $(a_{i,j}/0, a_{i,j+1}/0)$ -congruence, and $\varphi_{i,j}$ is the modular $(b_{i,j}/0, b_{i+1,j}/0)$ -congruence.

By Lemma 1, the join-isomorphism between the quotients $a_{i,j}/a_{i,j+1}$ and $b_{i,j}/b_{i+1,j}$ is obtained from $(a_{i,j}/0) | \theta_{i,j} \cong (b_{i,j}/0) | \varphi_{i,j}$. Hence the quotients $a_{i,j}/a_{i,j+1}$ and $b_{i,j}/b_{i+1,j}$ are also isomorphic as lattices. Therefore translating Theorem 2 into the language of lattices, we can immediately obtain the following usual theorem in lattices:

Theorem 3 (Schreier theorem in lattices). *Let*

$$m = a_0 > a_1 > \cdots > a_r = n \text{ and } m = b_0 > b_1 > \cdots > b_s = n$$

be any two m/n -modular chains on 0. Then these chains can be refined by interpolation of terms $a_{i,j} = a_{i+1} \cup (a_i \wedge b_j)$ and $b_{i,j} = b_{j+1} \cup (a_i \wedge b_j)$ such that corresponding quotients $a_{i,j}/a_{i,j+1}$ and $b_{i,j}/b_{i+1,j}$ are isomorphic.

References

- [1] T. Fujiwara and K. Murata: On the Jordan-Hölder-Schreier theorem, Proc. Japan Acad., **29** (1953).
- [2] T. Fujiwara: On the structure of algebraic systems, Proc. Japan Acad., **30** (1954).
- [3] A. W. Goldie: The scope of the Jordan-Hölder theorem in abstract algebra, Proc. London Math. Soc., (3) **2** (1952).