Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal

Ján Jakubík

Unoriented graphs of modular lattices

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 25 (1975), No. 2, 240–246

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/101314

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1975

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, 25 (100) 1975, Praha

UNORIENTED GRAPHS OF MODULAR LATTICES

JÁN JAKUBÍK, Košice

(Received December 4, 1973)

A lattice L is called discrete if each bounded chain of L is finite. All lattices dealt with in this note are assumed to be discrete. For $a, b \in L$, $a \leqq b$, the interval $[a, b]$ is the set $\{x \in L : a \leqq x \leqq b\}$. If $a < b$ and $[a, b] = \{a, b\}$, then $[a, b]$ is said to be a prime interval; this situation is also described by saying that b covers a or that a is covered by b.

To each lattice L there corresponds in a natural way an unoriented graph (an unoriented diagram) $G(L)$. The vertices of $G(L)$ are the elements of L; two vertices a, b are connected by an edge if and only if either a is covered by b or b is covered by a.

G. BIRKHOFF ([1], Problem 8) proposed the question to find necessary and sufficient conditions on a lattice L, in order that every lattice M whose unoriented graph is isomorphic with the graph of L be lattice-isomorphic with L. For the case when the lattices L and M are supposed to be distributive (or modular, respectively), this problem was solved in [3] (resp. [4]). Isomorphisms of unoriented diagrams of modular lattices were investigated also in [5].

The purpose of the present note is to show that if L and M are lattices whose unoriented graphs are isomorphic and if L is modular, then M is modular as well (Thm. 1.) (For finite lattices L this was proved in [4].) An analogous statement is valid for distributive lattices (Thm. 3). This enables one to generalize some results of [4], [5] (Thms. 2, 4).

For the basic notions concerning lattices cf. Birkhoff [1] and GRÄTZER [2]. The lattice operations will be denoted by $\wedge$ and $\vee$. A discrete lattice L is modular if and only if it fulfils the following "covering" condition (1) and the condition (1′) dual to (1):

(1) If a, b are elements of L such that a and b cover $a \wedge b$, then $a \vee b$ covers both elements a and b.

Let L be a modular lattice and let L' be a lattice such that there exists an isomorphism φ of $G(L)$ onto $G(L')$. Let a, b, u be distinct elements of L such that a, u are connected by an edge in $G(L)$ and b, u are connected by an edge in $G(L)$. Then $\varphi(a), \varphi(u)$ are connected by an edge in $G(L')$, and similarly for $\varphi(b), \varphi(u)$.

Let us remark that if x, y, z are elements of a discrete lattice X and if x is covered by y, z (or x covers y, z), then $x = y \wedge z$ (resp. $x = y \vee z$).

Lemma 1. *Let*

$$u < a\,, \quad u < b\,, \quad a \vee b = v\,,$$

$$\varphi(u) < \varphi(a)\,, \quad \varphi(u) < \varphi(b) < \varphi(v)\,.$$

Then $\varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b) = \varphi(v)$ *and* $\varphi(v)$ *covers both elements* $\varphi(a)$ *and* $\varphi(b)$.

Proof. According to (1), v covers a and b. Hence $\varphi(a)$, $\varphi(v)$ are connected by an edge in $G(L')$ and similarly for $\varphi(b)$, $\varphi(v)$. Hence $\varphi(b)$ is covered by $\varphi(v)$. Suppose that $\varphi(v)$ is covered by $\varphi(a)$. Then we would have

$$\varphi(u) < \varphi(b) < \varphi(v) < \varphi(a)$$

and this is a contradiction, because $\varphi(u)$ is covered by $\varphi(a)$. Thus $\varphi(a)$ is covered by $\varphi(v)$. Therefore $\varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b) = \varphi(v)$.

Lemma 2. *Let*

$$u < a\,, \quad u < b\,, \quad a \vee b = v\,,$$

$$\varphi(u) < \varphi(a)\,, \quad \varphi(u) < \varphi(b)\,.$$

Then $\varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b) = \varphi(v)$ *and* $\varphi(v)$ *covers both elements* $\varphi(a)$ *and* $\varphi(b)$.

Proof. Analogously as in the proof of Lemma 1 we conclude that $\varphi(a)$, $\varphi(v)$ are connected by an edge in $G(L')$ and similarly for $\varphi(b)$, $\varphi(v)$. Obviously $\varphi(a) \wedge \varphi(b) = \varphi(u)$. If

$$\varphi(a) > \varphi(v) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(b) > \varphi(v)\,,$$

then $\varphi(a) \wedge \varphi(b) = \varphi(v) \neq \varphi(u)$, which is a contradiction. Hence either $\varphi(a) < \varphi(v)$ or $\varphi(b) < \varphi(v)$. For completing the proof it suffices to apply Lemma 1.

The proof of the following lemma is analogous to that of Lemma 2.

Lemma 2'. *Let*

$$u > a\,, \quad u > b\,, \quad a \wedge b = v\,,$$

$$\varphi(u) < \varphi(a)\,, \quad \varphi(u) < \varphi(b)\,.$$

Then $\varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b) = \varphi(v)$ *and* $\varphi(v)$ *covers* $\varphi(a)$ *and* $\varphi(b)$.

Lemma 3. *Let*

$$u < a\,, \quad u < b\,, \quad a \vee b = v\,,$$

$$\varphi(a) < \varphi(u) < \varphi(b)\,.$$

Then $\varphi(a)$ *is covered by* $\varphi(v)$ *and* $\varphi(v)$ *is covered by* $\varphi(b)$.

Proof. The elements $\varphi(a)$, $\varphi(v)$ are connected by an edge in $G(L')$, hence $\varphi(a)$, $\varphi(v)$ are comparable, and similarly for $\varphi(b)$, $\varphi(v)$. If $\varphi(v) < \varphi(a)$, then

$$\varphi(v) < \varphi(a) < \varphi(u) < \varphi(b)\,,$$

hence neither $\varphi(v)$ is covered by $\varphi(b)$ nor $\varphi(b)$ is covered by $\varphi(v)$, which is a contradiction. Thus $\varphi(a) < \varphi(v)$. Analogously, if $\varphi(b) < \varphi(v)$, then

$$\varphi(a) < \varphi(u) < \varphi(b) < \varphi(v)\,,$$

which is impossible, because $\varphi(a)$ and $\varphi(v)$ are connected by edge in $G(L')$. Thus $\varphi(v) < \varphi(b)$. Therefore $\varphi(a)$ is covered by $\varphi(v)$ and $\varphi(v)$ is covered by $\varphi(b)$.

Dually, we can prove

Lemma 3'. *Let*

$$u > a\,, \quad u > b\,, \quad a \wedge b = v\,,$$
$$\varphi(b) < \varphi(u) < \varphi(a)\,.$$

Then $\varphi(b)$ is covered by $\varphi(v)$ and $\varphi(v)$ is covered by $\varphi(a)$.

Lemma 4. *Let $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n \in L$, $b \in L$,*

$$a_0 < b\,, \quad a_i < a_{i+1} \quad (i = 1, \ldots, n-1)\,,$$
$$\varphi(a_0) < \varphi(b)\,, \quad \varphi(a_i) > \varphi(a_{i+1}) \quad (i = 1, \ldots, n-1)\,.$$

Assume that all intervals $[a_0, b]$, $[a_i, a_{i+1}]$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n-1)$ are prime. Put $t_i = a_i \vee b$ $(i = 0, \ldots, n)$. Then $\varphi(a_i)$ is covered by $\varphi(t_i)$ for $i = 0, \ldots, n$ and $\varphi(t_i)$ covers $\varphi(t_{i+1})$ for $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on n. For $n = 1$ the assertion is valid according to Lemma 3. Let $n > 1$ and assume that the assertion is valid for $n - 1$. By Lemma 3, the element $\varphi(a_1)$ is covered by $\varphi(t_1)$ and $\varphi(t_1)$ is covered by $\varphi(b) = \varphi(t_0)$. Now consider the elements $a_1, \ldots, a_n, t_1$. The element a_1 is covered by t_1 and $\varphi(a_1) < \varphi(t_1)$. Moreover, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ we have

$$t_i = a_i \vee b = (a_1 \vee a_i) \vee b = (a_1 \vee b) \vee (a_i \vee b) =$$
$$= t_1 \vee a_i \vee b = a_i \vee t_1\,.$$

Therefore, according to the assumption, $\varphi(a_i)$ is covered by $\varphi(t_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $\varphi(t_i)$ covers $\varphi(t_{i+1})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$. The proof is complete.

Lemma 5. *Let $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_m \in L$, $a_0 = b_0$, $a_n = b_m$. Suppose that*

(i) *a_i is covered by a_{i+1} and $\varphi(a_i)$ is covered by $\varphi(a_{i+1})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$;*

(ii) *$\varphi(b_j)$ is covered by $\varphi(b_{j+1})$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m - 1$. Then $m = n$ and $b_j < b_{j+1}$ holds for $j = 1, \ldots, m - 1$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on n. If $n = 1$. then the assertion is obviously valid. Assume that $n > 1$ and that the assertion holds for $n - 1$. Clearly $m > 1$. Let us distinguish two cases.

(a) Let $b_0 < b_1$. Denote $a_1 \vee b_1 = c_2$. Then c_2 covers both elements a_1, b_1 and according to Lemma 1, $\varphi(c_2)$ covers both elements $\varphi(a_1), \varphi(b_1)$; moreover, $\varphi(c_2) \leqq \leqq \varphi(a_n)$. By the assumption there are elements $c_3, \ldots, c_n \in L$ such that $c_n = a_n$, c_i is covered by c_{i+1} and $\varphi(c_i)$ is covered by $\varphi(c_{i+1})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$. Because $\{b_1, c_2, c_3, \ldots, c_n\}$ is a maximal chain in L, by the assumption we have $n - 1 = = m - 1$ and $b_j < b_{j+1}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m - 1$.

There are elements $c_3, c_4, \ldots, c_k \in L$ such that $c_k = a_n$ and $\varphi(c_i)$ is covered by $\varphi(c_{i+1})$ for $i = 3, \ldots, k - 1$. By using the induction assumption for the elements $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n$; $c_2, c_3, \ldots, c_k$, we obtain that $k = n$ and that c_i is covered by c_{i+1} for $i = 3, 4, \ldots, k - 1$. Now we use the induction assumption for the elements $b_1, c_2, c_3, \ldots, c_n$; $b_2, \ldots, b_m$ and we infer that $m = n$ and that b_i is covered by b_{i+1} for $i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$.

(b) Suppose that $b_0 > b_1$. If $b_j > b_{j+1}$ for $j = 0, \ldots, m - 1$, then $a_0 = b_0 > > b_m = a_n$, which contradicts (i). Thus there exists a minimal j, $1 < j < m$, with $b_j < b_{j+1}$; we denote this j by j_0. Denote $x = b_0 \vee b_{j_0+1}$, $t_1 = b_{j_0+1} \vee b_1$. According to lemma 4,

$$x \text{ covers } a_0 \text{ and } \varphi(x) \text{ covers } \varphi(a_0)\,,$$

$$x \text{ covers } t_1 \text{ and } \varphi(x) \text{ is covered by } \varphi(t_1)\,,$$

$$\varphi(t_1) \leqq \varphi(b_{j_0+1})\,.$$

If $x = a_1$, then we consider the chain $C_1 = \{\varphi(a_1), \ldots, \varphi(a_n)\}$ in L'. There exists a maximal chain C_2 in $[\varphi(a_1), \varphi(a_n)]$ such that $\varphi(t_1), \varphi(b_{j_0+1}), \ldots, \varphi(b_m) \in C_2$. Since card $C_1 < n + 1$, by the induction assumption (by considering the chains C_1 and C_2) we obtain that the element $a_1 = x$ is covered by the element t_1, which is a contradiction.

If $x \neq a_1$, then we put $x \vee a_1 = y$. By Lemma 1, $\varphi(y)$ covers $\varphi(a_1)$ and $\varphi(x)$. Clearly $\varphi(y) \leqq \varphi(a_n)$. By considering the chain C_1 we infer (by the induction assumption) that there are elements $y_2, \ldots, y_n = a_n$ in L, $y_2 = y$ such that $C_3 = = \{\varphi(a_1), \varphi(y_2), \ldots, \varphi(y_n)\}$ is a maximal chain in $[\varphi(a_1), \varphi(a_n)]$ and y_i is covered by y_{i+1} for $i = 2, \ldots, n - 1$. Thus $C_4 = \{\varphi(x), \varphi(y_2), \ldots, \varphi(y_n)\}$ is a maximal chain in $[\varphi(x), \varphi(a_n)]$. Because card $C_4 < n + 1$, and $\varphi(x) < \varphi(t_1) \leqq \varphi(b_{j_0+1}) \leqq \varphi(a_n)$, by the induction assumption we must have $x < t_1$, which is a contradiction.

Analogously we can prove

Lemma 5′. *Let $a_0, \ldots, a_n$, $b_0, \ldots, b_m$ be as in Lemma 5 with the distinction that a_i covers a_{i+1} for $i = 0, \ldots, n - 1$. Then $m = n$ and $b_j > b_{j+1}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m - 1$.*

Lemma 6. *Let $a, u, b, v \in L$ and assume that a is covered by u and u is covered by b, $\varphi(u)$ is covered by $\varphi(a)$ and $\varphi(b)$; $\varphi(v)$ covers $\varphi(a)$ and $\varphi(b)$. Then a is covered by v and v is covered by b.*

Proof. The elements v and a are comparable. If $v < a$, then $v < a < u < b$, hence v is not covered by b and b is not covered by a, a contradiction. Thus $a < v$ and hence a is covered by v. The remaining part of the proof is analogous.

Lemma 7. *Let $a_0, b_0, u_0, a_1, b_1, u_1, v_1 \in L$ such that x_1 covers x_0 for each $x \in \{a, b, u\}$, $\varphi(x_1)$ covers $\varphi(x_0)$ for each $x \in \{a, b, u\}$;*

a_i is covered by u_i and u_i is covered by b_i for $i = 0, 1$;

$\varphi(u_i)$ is covered by $\varphi(a_i)$ and $\varphi(b_i)$ for $i = 0, 1$;

$\varphi(v_1)$ covers $\varphi(a_1)$ and $\varphi(b_1)$.

Then there is $v_0 \in L$ such that $\varphi(v_0)$ covers $\varphi(a_0)$ and $\varphi(b_0)$.

Proof. By Lemma 6, a_1 is covered by v_1 and v_1 is covered by b_1. Put $v_0 = b_0 \wedge v_1$. According to Lemma 3′, $\varphi(b_0)$ is covered by $\varphi(v_0)$ and $\varphi(v_0)$ is covered by $\varphi(v_1)$. We have $a_0 < v_1$, $a_0 < b_0$, thus $a_0 \leqq v_0$. Because L is modular and $\{a_0, a_1, v_1\}$ is a maximal chain in $[a_0, v_1]$, we obtain that $\{a_0, v_0, v_1\}$ must be a maximal chain in $[a_0, v_1]$, hence a_0 is covered by v_0. If $\varphi(v_0) < \varphi(a_0)$, then $\varphi(v_0)$ is not covered by $\varphi(v_1)$, which is a contradiction. Thus $\varphi(v_0) > \varphi(a_0)$ and hence $\varphi(v_0)$ covers $\varphi(a_0)$. The proof is complete.

An element $p \in L$ will be said to have the property (α) with respect to elements $q, r \in L$ if

(i) $r \neq q$;

(ii) $\varphi(p)$ is covered by both elements $\varphi(r)$ and $\varphi(q)$;

(iii) either $\varphi(r)$ or $\varphi(q)$ is not covered by $\varphi(r) \vee \varphi(q)$.

Lemma 8. *Suppose that $u \in L$ has the property (α) with respect to elements $a, b \in L$. Then there are elements $u_1, a_1, b_1 \in L$ such that u_1 has the property (α) with respect to a_1, b_1, the element $\varphi(u)$ is covered by $\varphi(u_1)$ and*

$$\varphi(u_1) < \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b) = \varphi(a_1) \vee \varphi(b_1) .$$

Proof. If a and b cover u then according to Lemma 2, u cannot have the property (α) with respect to a and b. If both a and b are covered by u then the same holds by Lemma 2′. Hence we may suppose that a is covered by u, and u is covered by b.

Let $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n \in L$ with $x_0 = u$, $x_1 = a$ such that $\{\varphi(x_0), \varphi(x_1), \varphi(x_2), \ldots, \varphi(x_n)\}$ is a maximal chain in $[\varphi(u), \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)]$. If x_i covers x_{i+1} for $i = 0, \ldots, n - 1$, then by Lemma 5′ we would have $u > b$, which is a contradiction. Hence there is

$i_0 > 0$ such that x_i is covered by x_{i_0+1}. Let i_0 be the first index with this property. Put $t_i = x_i \vee x_{i_0+1}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, i_0$. According to Lemma 4,

t_i covers x_i and $\varphi(t_i)$ covers $\varphi(x_i)$ for $i = 0, \ldots, i_0$;

t_i covers t_{i+1} and $\varphi(t_i)$ is covered by $\varphi(t_{i+1})$ for $i = 0, \ldots, i_0 - 1$.

If $t_0 = b$, then $\varphi(t_1) = \varphi(x_1) \vee \varphi(t_0) = \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)$ and because $\varphi(t_1)$ covers $\varphi(x_1) = \varphi(a)$ and $\varphi(t_0)$, we have a contradiction. Thus $t_0 \neq b$. Denote $t_0 = u_1$, $t_1 = a_1$, $t_0 \vee b = b_1$. Then b_1 covers both b and u_1. By Lemma 2 we have $\varphi(b_1) = \varphi(t_0) \vee \varphi(b)$. Hence $\varphi(b_1)$ covers both $\varphi(b)$ and $\varphi(u_1)$. Moreover,

$$\varphi(a) \leqq \varphi(a_1) = \varphi(t_1) \leqq \ldots \leqq \varphi(t_{i_0+1}) = \varphi(x_{i_0+1}) \leqq \varphi(x_n) = \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)\,,$$

$$\varphi(t_0) \leqq \varphi(t_1) = \varphi(a_1)\,,$$

hence $\varphi(t_0) \leqq \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)$ and therefore

$$\varphi(b) < \varphi(b_1) = \varphi(t_0) \vee \varphi(b) \leqq \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)\,,$$

$$\varphi(a_1) \vee \varphi(b_1) = \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)\,.$$

The elements $\varphi(a_1)$, $\varphi(b_1)$ are uncomparable, thus $\varphi(a_1) < \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)$ and $\varphi(b_1) < \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)$. Suppose that the element $\varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)$ covers both elements $\varphi(a_1)$ and $\varphi(b_1)$. Then according to Lemma 7 (applied to the elements a, x_0, b; $t_1 = a_1, t_0, b_1$, and $v_1 = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b))$ there is $v_0 \in L$ such that $\varphi(v_0)$ covers $\varphi(a)$ and $\varphi(b)$. Obviously $\varphi(v_0) = \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)$, hence $\varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)$ covers both $\varphi(a)$ and $\varphi(b)$, which is a contradiction. Therefore either $\varphi(a_1)$ or $\varphi(b_1)$ is not covered by $\varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b) = \varphi(a_1) \vee \varphi(b_1)$. Thus u_1 has the property (α) with respect to a_1, b_1 and $\varphi(u_1) < \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)$.

Lemma 9. *There does not exist elements $u, a, b \in L$ such that u has the property (α) with respect to a, b (i.e., the covering condition (1) is valid for L').*

Proof. Suppose that there are elements $u, a, b \in L$ such that u has the property (α) with respect to a, b. From Lemma 8 it follows by induction, that there are elements $u_n, a_n, b_n \in L$ ($n = 1, 2, \ldots$) such that

(i) u_n has the property (α) with respect to a_n, b_n,

(ii) $\varphi(u) < \varphi(u_1) < \varphi(u_2) < \ldots < \varphi(a) \vee \varphi(b)$.

The relation (ii) cannot hold because L' is discrete. Hence we have a contradiction.

By a dual argument we can verify

Lemma 10. *Let $a, b, u \in L$ such that $\varphi(u)$ covers $\varphi(a)$ and $\varphi(b)$. Then $\varphi(a) \wedge \varphi(b)$ is covered by $\varphi(a)$ and $\varphi(b)$.*

From Lemma 9 and Lemma 10 we obtain:

Theorem 1. *Let L and L' be discrete lattices such that the unoriented graphs $G(L)$ and $G(L')$ are isomorphic. If L is modular, then L' is modular as well.*

For any lattice A, we denote by $A^{\sim}$ the lattice dual to A.

The following theorem generalizes Thm. 7.8, [3] and Thm. 1, [4].

Theorem 2. *Let L be a discrete modular lattice. Let L' be a discrete lattice such that $G(L)$ is isomorphic to $G(L')$. Then there are lattices A, B such that L is isomorphic with the direct product $A \times B$ and L' is isomorphic with $A^{\sim} \times B$.*

The proof follows from Thm. 1, and Thm. 1, [4].

Theorem 3. *Let L be a discrete distributive lattice and let L' be a discrete lattice such that $G(L)$ is isomorphic with $G(L')$. Then L' is distributive.*

Proof. Let A, B be as in Thm. 2. Since L is distributive, the lattices A, B must be distributive and hence $A^{\sim}$ is distributive. By Thm. 2, L' is distributive.

Let us remark that if L and L' are discrete lattices such that $G(L)$ is isomorphic with $G(L')$ and L is semimodular, then L' need not be semimodular.

Theorem 4. *Let L be a discrete modular lattice. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *If L' is a discrete lattice such that $G(L')$ is isomorphic to $G(L)$, then L' is isomorphic to L.*

(b) *Each direct factor of L is self-dual.*

(c) *Each undecomposable direct factor of L is self-dual.*

The proof follows from Thm. 1 and [5], Thm. 3.7.

References

[1] *G. Birkhoff:* Lattice theory, second ed., Providence, 1948.

[2] *G. Grätzer:* Lectures on lattice theory, Vol. 1, San Francisco, 1971.

[3] *J. Jakubík, M. Kolibiar:* О некоторых свойствах пар структур, Czechoslov. Math. J. *4* (1954), 1—27.

[4] *J. Jakubík:* О графическом изоморфизме структур, Czechoslov. Math. J. *4* (1954), 131—141.

[5] *J. Jakubík:* Weakproduct decompositions of discrete lattices, Czechoslov. Math. J. *21* (1971), 399—412.

Author's address: 040 01 Košice, Švermova 5, ČSSR (VUT v Košiciach).