

Josef Niederle

On completely meet-irreducible elements in compactly generated lattices

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 39 (1989), No. 3, 490–491

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/102321>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1989

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>

ON COMPLETELY MEET-IRREDUCIBLE ELEMENTS
IN COMPACTLY GENERATED LATTICES

JOSEF NIEDERLE, Brno

(Received November 23, 1987)

Definition. An element m in a lattice is said to be *relatively maximal with respect to an element x* when $x \not\leq m$, and $m < z$ implies $x \leq z$.

An element in a lattice is said to be *relatively maximal* when it is relatively maximal with respect to some element of the lattice.

Lemma. In any lattice, $\pi(a) = \bigwedge(\langle a \rangle \setminus \{a\})$ exists for every element a , and either $\pi(a) = a$ or $a < \pi(a)$.

Proof is obvious.

This lemma makes the following definition legitimate:

Definition. An element a of a lattice is said to be *completely* (alias *strictly*) *meet-irreducible* if $a < \pi(a)$.

Proposition. *Relatively maximal elements in a lattice coincide with completely meet-irreducible elements in the lattice.*

Proof. Suppose m is a relatively maximal element, say with respect to an element x . Then $x \leq \pi(m)$, and consequently $m \neq \pi(m)$. By the lemma, we obtain $m < \pi(m)$.

To prove the converse, suppose $a < \pi(a)$. It is easy to see that the element a is relatively maximal with respect to $\pi(a)$. Q.E.D.

Remark. In view of the preceding proposition, we may reformulate a well-known theorem:

In a compactly generated (alias algebraic) lattice, every element is representable as a meet of a set of relatively maximal elements.

(Cf. [1].)

The set of all completely meet-irreducible (i.e. relatively maximal) elements in a lattice L will be denoted by $Rm(L)$.

Theorem. Let L be a compactly generated lattice. Denote $r(a) = \{x \in Rm(L) \mid a \leq x\}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) L is distributive,

- (ii) r is an embedding of the lattice L into the dual of $\mathbf{2}^{Rm(L)}$,
 (iii) $(\forall a, b \in L) r(a \wedge b) = r(a) \cup r(b)$ and $r(a \vee b) = r(a) \cap r(b)$,
 (iv) $(\forall a, b \in L) r(a \wedge b) \subseteq r(a) \cup r(b)$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (iv): Take $m \in r(a \wedge b)$. In view of distributivity, $m = m \vee (a \wedge b) = (m \vee a) \wedge (m \vee b)$. Since m is meet-irreducible, $m = m \vee a$ or $m = m \vee b$. Hence $m \in r(a)$ or $m \in r(b)$, and consequently $m \in r(a) \cup r(b)$.

(iv) \Rightarrow (iii): Inclusions $r(a) \cup r(b) \subseteq r(a \wedge b)$ and $r(a \vee b) = r(a) \cap r(b)$ follow immediately from antitony of the operator r .

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii): It remains to prove that r is injective. Suppose $r(a) = r(b)$. Inasmuch as $a = \bigwedge r(a)$ and $b = \bigwedge r(b)$, we obtain $a = b$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): The lattice L is isomorphic to a sublattice of a Boolean lattice, and therefore distributive. Q.E.D.

Corollary. *A mapping sending each element a of a distributive lattice L to the complement of $r(a)$ is an embedding of L into $\mathbf{2}^{Rm(L)}$.*

Remark. In a distributive lattice, it is clear that all principal ideals with completely meet-irreducible top elements are prime. However, not every prime ideal in a compactly generated distributive lattice is principal. Hence we have obtained a generalization of the Birkhoff theorem for finite distributive lattices to distributive compactly generated lattices, distinct from the general case.

Reference

- [1] *G. Birkhoff: Lattice Theory. 3d ed. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence 1979.*

Author's address: Viniční 60, 615 00 Brno 15, Czechoslovakia.