

## 80. A Note on Modularity in Atomistic Lattices

By Shûichirô MAEDA

Department of Mathematics, Ehime University

(Communicated by Kôsaku YOSIDA, M. J. A., Sept. 13, 1982)

Let  $L$  be an atomistic lattice ([1], (7.1)), and let  $A, B$  be subsets of  $L$ . If  $(a, b)$  is a modular pair (resp. dual-modular pair) for every  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ , we write  $(A, B)M$  (resp.  $(A, B)M^*$ ). We denote by  $\Omega$  the set of atoms of  $L$ , and we put

$$\Omega^n = \{p_1 \vee \cdots \vee p_n; p_i \in \Omega\} \quad (n=1, 2, \dots).$$

Evidently,  $\Omega^1 = \Omega$  and  $\Omega^n \subset \Omega^{n+1}$ . Moreover, we put

$$F = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \Omega^n \cup \{0\}.$$

$(L, F)M$  means that  $L$  is finite-modular ([1], (9.1)), and each of  $(\Omega, L)M$  and  $(\Omega, L)M^*$  is equivalent to that  $L$  has the covering property ([1], (7.6)). If  $A_1 \subset A_2$  and  $B_1 \subset B_2$ , then evidently  $(A_2, B_2)M$  implies  $(A_1, B_1)M$ , and  $(A_2, B_2)M^*$  implies  $(A_1, B_1)M^*$ .

In the previous paper [3], the following equivalences and non-trivial implications were proved:

(1) For any  $A \subset L$ ,  $(A, L)M \iff (A, L)M^*$ ,  $(A, F)M \iff (A, F)M^*$ ,  $(A, \Omega^n)M \iff (A, \Omega^{n-1})M^*$  ( $n \geq 2$ ). ( $(L, \Omega)M$  always holds.)

(2)  $(L, F)M^* \implies (F, L)M^*$ .

(3)  $(L, \Omega^n)M^* \iff (L, F)M^*$  for  $n \geq 1$ .

(4)  $(F, \Omega^n)M^* \iff (F, F)M^*$  for  $n \geq 1$ .

(5)  $(\Omega^n, F)M^* \iff (F, F)M^*$  for  $n \geq 2$ .

(6)  $(\Omega^n, \Omega)M^* \iff (\Omega^{n-1}, \Omega^2)M^* \iff \cdots \iff (\Omega^2, \Omega^{n-1})M^*$  for  $n \geq 3$ .

(7)  $(\Omega^2, \Omega^{n-1})M^* \implies (\Omega, \Omega^n)M^*$  for  $n \geq 2$ .

Moreover, it was shown by examples that the implications (2) and (7) and the following implications are not reversible:

$$(\Omega^2, L)M^* \implies (\Omega^2, F)M^* \implies \cdots \implies (\Omega^2, \Omega^n)M^* \implies \cdots \implies (\Omega^2, \Omega)M^*,$$

$$(\Omega, L)M^* \implies (\Omega, F)M^* \implies \cdots \implies (\Omega, \Omega^n)M^* \implies \cdots \implies (\Omega, \Omega)M^*,$$

$$(\Omega^2, L)M^* \implies (\Omega, L)M^*, \quad (\Omega^2, F)M^* \implies (\Omega, F)M^*.$$

But, it remained open whether the following implications are reversible or not:

$$(F, L)M^* \implies \cdots \implies (\Omega^n, L)M^* \implies \cdots \implies (\Omega^2, L)M^*.$$

In this paper, we shall prove that these implications are reversible, that is,

**Theorem.** For an atomistic lattice  $L$ ,

(8)  $(\Omega^n, L)M^* \iff (F, L)M^*$  for  $n \geq 2$ .

To prove this theorem, we prepare the following lemma which

follows from [1], (1.5) by the duality.

**Lemma.** *Let  $a, b$  and  $c$  be elements of a lattice  $L$ .*

(i) *If  $(a, b)M^*$  and  $(a \vee b, c)M^*$  then  $(a, b \vee c)M^*$  for any  $a_1 \in L[a, a \vee c]$ .*

(ii) *If  $(a, b)M^*$  then  $(a, b_1)M^*$  for any  $a_1 \in L[a, a \vee b]$  and  $b_1 \in L[b, a \vee b]$ .*

*Proof of the theorem.* It suffices to prove that  $(\Omega^n, L)M^*$  implies  $(\Omega^{n+1}, L)M^*$  for  $n \geq 2$ . Assume  $(\Omega^n, L)M^*$ , and let  $u \in \Omega^{n+1}$ ,  $a \in L$ . We put  $u = p_0 \vee p_1 \vee \dots \vee p_n$  where  $p_i \in \Omega$ . If  $p_i \leq a \vee p_0 \vee p_1 \vee \dots \vee p_{i-1}$  for some  $i$  ( $0 \leq i \leq n$ ), then putting  $v = p_0 \vee p_1 \vee \dots \vee p_{i-1} \vee p_{i+1} \vee \dots \vee p_n$ , we have  $v \in \Omega^n$  and  $a \vee v = a \vee u$ . Since  $(v, a)M^*$  by the assumption and since  $u \in L[v, v \vee a]$ , we have  $(u, a)M^*$  by (ii) of the above lemma. Hence, we may assume that

$$(*) \quad p_i \not\leq a \vee p_0 \vee p_1 \vee \dots \vee p_{i-1} \quad \text{for every } i = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

Since  $(\Omega^n, L)M^*$  implies the covering property,  $L$  is an AC-lattice ([1], (8.7)) and hence  $L[a, a \vee u]$  is also an AC-lattice by [1], (8.18). Hence, for every  $x \in L[a, a \vee u]$  we can define the height  $h(x)$  of  $x$  in  $L[a, a \vee u]$  ([1], (8.5)). It follows from (\*) that  $h(a \vee u) = n + 1$ . Now, we shall show that

$$(**) \quad (c \wedge u) \vee a = c$$

for every  $c \in L[a, a \vee u]$ . First, we assume  $h(c) \leq n - 1$ . We put  $v = p_1 \vee \dots \vee p_n$  and  $v' = (p_0 \vee c) \wedge v$ . If  $p_0 \vee c \geq v$ , then we would have  $p_0 \vee c \geq p_0 \vee v \vee a = a \vee u$  and then  $n + 1 = h(a \vee u) \leq h(p_0 \vee c) \leq h(c) + 1 \leq n$ , a contradiction. Hence,  $p_0 \vee c \not\geq v$  and hence  $v' < v$ . We have  $v' \in \Omega^{n-1}$  since  $v \in \Omega^n$ , and hence  $p_0 \vee v' \in \Omega^n$ . Using  $(p_0 \vee v', a)M^*$  and  $(v, p_0 \vee a)M^*$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (c \wedge u) \vee a &= (c \wedge (p_0 \vee v)) \vee a \geq (c \wedge (p_0 \vee v')) \vee a = c \wedge (p_0 \vee v' \vee a) \\ &= c \wedge ((p_0 \vee c) \wedge v) \vee p_0 \vee a = c \wedge (p_0 \vee c) \wedge (v \vee p_0 \vee a) \\ &= c \wedge (u \vee a) = c \geq (c \wedge u) \vee a, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (\*\*). Next, if  $h(c) = n$ , then there exist  $c_1, c_2 \in L[a, a \vee u]$  such that  $h(c_1) = n - 1$ ,  $h(c_2) = 1$  and  $c = c_1 \vee c_2$ . Since  $n - 1 \geq 1$ ,  $(c_i \wedge u) \vee a = c_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) as above. Hence,

$$(c \wedge u) \vee a \geq (c_1 \wedge u) \vee (c_2 \wedge u) \vee a = c_1 \vee c_2 = c \geq (c \wedge u) \vee a.$$

If  $h(c) = n + 1$ , then (\*\*) holds since  $c = a \vee u$ .

If  $d \geq a$ , then putting  $c = d \wedge (a \vee u)$ , we have  $c \in L[a, a \vee u]$  and  $c \wedge u = d \wedge u$ . Hence, by (\*\*) we have

$$(d \wedge u) \vee a = (c \wedge u) \vee a = c = d \wedge (u \vee a).$$

Therefore  $(u, a)M^*$  holds.

**Remark.** In [3], the six statements (2)–(7) were proved by the aid of the concept of  $P$ -relation, introduced in [2]. We remark that three of them directly follow from (i) of the above lemma. We can show the following statement:

(9) For any  $A \subset L$ ,  $(A \vee \Omega_0, \Omega^{n-1})M^* \implies (A, \Omega^n)M^*$  ( $n \geq 2$ ), where  $A \vee \Omega_0 = \{a \vee p; a \in A, p \in \Omega \cup \{0\}\}$ .

In fact, if  $a \in A$  and  $u \in \Omega^n$ , then putting  $u = p \vee v$  with  $p \in \Omega$  and  $v \in \Omega^{n-1}$ , we have  $(a, p)M^*$  and  $(a \vee p, v)M^*$  by  $(A \vee \Omega_0, \Omega^{n-1})M^*$ , and hence  $(a, p \vee v)M^*$  by the lemma.

Now, it is easy to verify that (3) and (4) follows from (9), since if  $A = L$  or  $F$  then  $A \vee \Omega_0 = A$ . Moreover, it follows from (9) that

$(\Omega^n, \Omega)M^* \implies (\Omega^{n-1}, \Omega^2)M^* \implies \dots \implies (\Omega^2, \Omega^{n-1})M^* \implies (\Omega, \Omega^n)M^*$ ,  
which includes (7) and a half of (6).

### References

- [1] F. Maeda and S. Maeda: Theory of Symmetric Lattices. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1970).
- [2] S. Maeda: On finite-modular atomistic lattices. Algebra Universalis, **12**, 76–80 (1981).
- [3] —: On modularity in atomistic lattices (to appear in Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, **33** (Contributions to lattice theory)).