Ivan Chajda A note on congruence kernels in ortholattices

Mathematica Bohemica, Vol. 125 (2000), No. 2, 169-172

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/125950

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 2000

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

125 (2000)

MATHEMATICA BOHEMICA

No. 2, 169-172

A NOTE ON CONGRUENCE KERNELS IN ORTHOLATTICES

IVAN CHAJDA, Olomouc

(Received January 28, 1998)

Abstract. We characterize ideals of ortholattices which are congruence kernels. We show that every congruence class determines a kernel.

Keywords: ortholattice, congruence, kernel, ideal *MSC 1991*: 06C15, 06B10

The problem whether an ideal of a lattice \mathcal{L} is a kernel of a congruence θ on \mathcal{L} was solved by J. Hashimoto in the 50-ties, [2]. By his result, every ideal of \mathcal{L} is a kernel of some $\theta \in \text{Con }\mathcal{L}$ if and only if \mathcal{L} is distributive. However, ortholattices and orthomodular lattices are distributive if and only if they are Boolean algebras. Hence, for determining whether an ideal I of an ortholattice \mathcal{L} is a congruence kernel we cannot adopt Hashimoto's result. We are going to characterize such ideals by means of closedness with respect to suitable terms.

In accordance with [1], [3], by an ortholattice we mean an algebra

$$\mathcal{L} = (L, \lor, \land, ^{\bot}, 0, 1)$$

such that $(L, \lor, \land, 0, 1)$ is a bounded lattice and $^{\perp}$ is the unary operation of *or*-thocomplementation, i.e. $^{\perp}$ is order-reversing with respect to the lattice order and satisfying the following identities:

$$\begin{split} (x^{\perp})^{\perp} &= x, \\ x \wedge x^{\perp} &= 0 \quad \text{and} \quad x \vee x^{\perp} = 1, \\ (x \wedge y)^{\perp} &= x^{\perp} \vee y^{\perp} \quad \text{and} \quad (x \vee y)^{\perp} = x^{\perp} \wedge y^{\perp}, \\ 0^{\perp} &= 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1^{\perp} = 0. \end{split}$$

This research is supported by the grant agency Aktion Östereich-Tschechische Republik, grant No. 19p14 "Ordered algebraic structures and applications".

169

Roughly speaking, ortholattices satisfy all axioms of Boolean algebras except distributivity.

By an $ideal\ I$ of an ortholattice $\mathcal L$ we mean the lattice ideal of $(L,\vee,\wedge),$ i.e. $\emptyset\neq I\subseteq L$ with

$$a, b \in I \implies a \lor b \in I$$
$$a \in I, \ x \in L \implies a \land x \in I.$$

An example of an ortholattice which is neither distributive nor modular is shown in Fig. 1:



Let θ be a congruence on an ortholattice \mathcal{L} . By a *kernel* of θ we mean the set

$$\operatorname{Ker} \theta = \{ a \in L; \langle a, 0 \rangle \in \theta \}.$$

R e m a r k s. (1) An ideal of an ortholattice \mathcal{L} need not be a kernel of any congruence on \mathcal{L} . For example, $I(x) = \{x, 0\}$ is an ideal of the ortholattice in Fig. 1 but it is not a kernel of any $\theta \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{L}$; if $\langle x, 0 \rangle \in \theta$ for $\theta \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{L}$ then also $\langle y, 0 \rangle \in \theta$ but $y \notin I(x)$.

(2) If an ideal I of an ortholattice \mathcal{L} is a kernel of some $\theta \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{L}$ then θ need not be unique. For example, $\{0\}$ is an ideal of \mathcal{L} in Fig.1 but it is the kernel of the identity congruence on \mathcal{L} as well as of the congruence given by the partition $\{0\}, \{x, y\}, \{x^{\perp}, y^{\perp}\}, \{1\}.$

For characterizing the ideals which are congruence kernels in ortholattices we recall the well-known result of A. I. Mal'cev [4]:

Proposition. Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, F)$ be an algebra, $\emptyset \neq B \subseteq A$. B is a class of some congruence on \mathcal{A} if and only if for every $c, d \in B$ and each unary polynomial $\tau(x)$ over $\mathcal{A}, \tau(c) \in B \Rightarrow \tau(d) \in B$.



Recall that by a unary polynomial $\tau(x)$ over $\mathcal{A} = (A, F)$ we mean a unary function $\tau: A \to A$ such that there exists an (n+1)-ary term function $t(y, x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ of type F and elements $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A$ such that $\tau(x) = t(x, a_1, \ldots, a_n)$.

We are ready to formulate our first result:

Theorem 1. An ideal I of an ortholattice \mathcal{L} is a kernel of some $\theta \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{L}$ if and only if for each (n + 1)-ary term t, for every $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in L$ and every $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in I$ we have $(i_1^{\perp} \wedge t(i_2, a_1, \ldots, a_n))^{\perp} \wedge t(i_3, a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in I$.

Proof. Let I be a kernel of some $\theta \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{L}$, let t be an (n + 1)-ary term of \mathcal{L} and $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in L$, $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in I$. Since $0 \in I$ we have $\langle i_1, 0 \rangle \in \theta$, $\langle i_2, 0 \rangle \in \theta$, $\langle i_3, 0 \rangle \in \theta$. Moreover,

 $(0^{\perp} \wedge t(0, a_1, \dots, a_n))^{\perp} \wedge t(0, a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0,$

whence, by the substitution property of θ , also

$$\begin{split} \langle (i_1^{\perp} \wedge t(i_2, a_1, \ldots, a_n))^{\perp} \wedge t(i_3, a_1, \ldots, a_n), 0 \rangle = \\ \langle (i_1^{\perp} \wedge t(i_2, a_1, \ldots, a_n))^{\perp} \wedge t(i_3, a_1, \ldots, a_n), \\ (0^{\perp} \wedge t(0, a_1, \ldots, a_n))^{\perp} \wedge t(0, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \rangle \in \theta \end{split}$$

i.e. $(i_1^{\perp} \wedge t(i_2, a_1, \dots, a_n))^{\perp} \wedge t(i_3, a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \text{Ker}\,\theta = I.$

Conversely, let I be an ideal of an ortholattice \mathcal{L} which satisfies the condition of Theorem 1. Suppose $i, j \in I$ and $\tau(i) \in I$ for a unary polynomial $\tau(x)$ over \mathcal{L} . Hence, $\tau(x) = t(x, a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ for some (n+1)-ary term t and some elements $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in L$. Applying our condition for $i_1 = \tau(i), i_2 = i, i_3 = j$, we obtain

$$\tau(j) = (\tau(i)^{\perp} \wedge \tau(i))^{\perp} \wedge \tau(j) \in I.$$

By the Proposition, we are done since I is a 0-class of some $\theta\in {\rm Con}\,\mathcal{L}$, i.e. $I={\rm Ker}\,\theta.$

Theorem 2. Let \mathcal{L} be an ortholattice. Then for each $\theta \in \text{Con } \mathcal{L}$, the kernel Ker θ is determined by every class of θ .

Proof. Let $\theta \in \text{Con } \mathcal{L}$ and let C be an arbitrary class of θ . Define a subset I of \mathcal{L} as follows:

(*) $a \in I$ iff there exists $c \in C$ such that $a \wedge c = 0$ and $a \vee c \in C$. We prove that $I = \operatorname{Ker} \theta$.

(i) $0 \in I$ since $c \wedge 0 = 0$ and $c \vee 0 = c \in C$ for each $c \in C$.

171

(ii) Let $a \in I$. Denote $d = a \lor c$. Then $c, d \in C$ imply $\langle c, d \rangle \in \theta$ and $d \land a =$ $(a \lor c) \land a = a$ whence $\langle a, 0 \rangle = \langle d \land a, c \land a \rangle \in \theta$, i.e. $a \in \operatorname{Ker} \theta$.

(iii) Suppose $a \in \text{Ker}\,\theta$. Then $\langle a, 0 \rangle \in \theta$, thus also $\langle a^{\perp}, 1 \rangle = \langle a^{\perp}, 0^{\perp} \rangle \in \theta$. Hence, for each $c_0 \in C$ we have $\langle c_0, a^{\perp} \wedge c_0 \rangle = \langle 1 \wedge c_0, a^{\perp} \wedge c_0 \rangle \in \theta$, i.e. also $a^{\perp} \wedge c_0 \in C$. Further,

$$\langle a^{\perp} \wedge c_0, (a^{\perp} \wedge c_0) \vee a \rangle = \langle (a^{\perp} \wedge c_0) \vee 0, (a^{\perp} \wedge c_0) \vee a \rangle \in \theta,$$

i.e. also $(a^{\perp} \wedge c_0) \lor a \in C$. We can set $c = a^{\perp} \wedge c_0$. Then $c \in C$, $c \wedge a = a^{\perp} \wedge c_0 \wedge a = 0$ and $c \lor a = (a^{\perp} \land c_0) \lor a \in C$. By (*) we have $a \in I$. Together, $I = \text{Ker } \theta$, which proves the assertion.

References

- Beran L.: Orthomodular lattices. Algebraic Approach. Academia, Praha, 1984.
 Hashimoto J.: Ideal theory for lattices. Math. Japon. 2 (1952), 149–186.
- [3] Kalmbach B.: Orthomodular Lattices. London Math. Soc. Monographs 18, Academic Press, London, 1983.
- [4] Mal'cev A. I.: On the general theory of algebraic systems. Mat. Sb. 35(77) (1954), 3-20. (In Russian.)

Author's address: Ivan Chajda, Department of Algebra and Geometry, Palacký University Olomouc, Tomkova 40, 77900 Olomouc, Czech Republic, e-mail: chajda@risc.upol.cz.

172