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# POLARS ON CLOSURE SPACES 

BOHUMIL ŠMARDA, Brno<br>(Received October 18, 1976)

In this paper there is given a generalization of polar theory from lattice ordered groups (1-groups) on sets with closure systems. Basic properties of polars are generalized in § 1 , while § 2 contains a generalization of prime subgroups in an 1-group and their property that a factorgroup belonging to a prime subgroup is fully ordered. Examples and special cases of a polarity being in connexion with [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6] are given in § 3.

Let us introduce the following notation for the whole paper: A closure space $(S, \Omega)$ is a nonempty set $S$ with a closure system $\Omega$, the closure of a set $A \cong S$ in $\Omega$ is $\bar{A}$, $\bar{a}=\{\bar{a}\}$, for all $a \in S$. If $S$ is a partially ordered set, then $a \| b$ means that elements $a$, $b \in S$ are not comparable. We say that $a$ set $A \subseteq S$ is convex in $S$, when $a, b \in A$, $s \in S, a \geqq s \geqq b$ implies $s \in A$.

## §1. DEFINITIONS, NOTATIONS AND BASIC FACTS

1.1. Definition. Let $(S, \Omega)$ be a closure space, $C \subseteq S$. Then let us define a relation $\varrho_{c}(\Omega)$ on $S$, called $a C$-polarity, in this way: For every elements $a, b \in S$ there is $a \varrho_{c}(\Omega) b$, if $\bar{a} \cap \bar{b} \cong \bar{C}$.

Further, for each set $A \subseteq S$ let us define sets $p(A, C)=\left\{s \in S: s \varrho_{c}(\Omega) a\right.$, for each $a \in A\}, p^{n+1}(A, C)=p\left[p^{n}(A, C), C\right]$, for each positive integer $n$. A set $A \subseteq S$ with a property $A=p^{2}(A, C)$ is called a $C$-polar.

Remarks. 1. A $C$-polarity is a symmetric and antireflexive relation $\left(a \varrho_{c}(\Omega) a \Rightarrow\right.$ $\Rightarrow a \varrho_{c}(\Omega) s$ for each $s \in S$ ).
2. If $S$ is an l-group, $\Omega$ is a system of all convex l-subgroups in $S$, then $p(A,\{0\})=$ $=A^{\prime}$ is a usual polar of a set $A$ in an l-group $S$, introduced by F. Šik-see [5]. Other examples are in § 3 .
1.2. Proposition. For every $A, C \subseteq S$ it holds:
a) $p(A, C) \cap p^{2}(A, C)=\bar{C}$,
b) $p(A, C)=p(A, \bar{C})$,
c) $p(A, S)=S, p(A, A)=S, p(S, A)=\bar{A}, p(\Phi, A)=S$,
d) A correspondence $A \rightarrow p(A, C)$ forms a Galois connexion.

Proof. a) If $x \in C$ is an arbitrary element, then for each $A \subseteq S$ and each $a \in A$ it is $\bar{x} \cap \bar{a} \subseteq C$, i.e., $C \subseteq p(A, C) \cap p^{2}(A, C)$. Conversely, for each $x \in p(A, C) \cap$ $\cap p^{2}(A, C)$ we have $x \in \bar{x}=\bar{x} \cap \bar{x} \subseteq \bar{C}$ and thus $p(A, C) \cap p^{2}(A, C) \cong \bar{C}$.

The definition 1.1 implies $b$ ), $c$ ) and $d$ ).
1.3. Corollary. For every $I \neq \Phi, A_{i} \subseteq S(i \in I), C \cong S$ it holds:

$$
\left.p\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i}, C\right)=\bigcap_{i \in I} p\left(A_{i}, C\right), \quad p\left[\bigcap_{i \in I} p^{2}\left(A_{i}, C\right), C\right]=p^{2}\left[\bigcup_{i \in I} p(A], C\right), C\right]
$$

1.4. Proposition. If $A, B, C \subseteq S, C_{i} \subseteq S,(i \in I \neq \Phi)$, then:
a) $B \subseteq C \Rightarrow p(A, B) \subseteq p(A, C)$,
b) $\bigcap_{i \in I} p\left(A, C_{i}\right)=p\left(A, \bigcap_{i \in I} \bar{C}_{i}\right)$.

Proof. a) For each $x \in p(A, B)$ and each $a \in A$ we have $\bar{x} \cap \bar{a} \subseteq \bar{B} \subseteq \bar{C}$, i.e., $x \in p(A, C)$.
b) $\bigcap_{i \in I} p\left(A, C_{i}\right) \supseteq p\left(A, \bigcap_{i \in I} C_{i}\right)$-see a) and 1.2, b). If $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I} p\left(A, C_{i}\right)$, then $\bar{x} \cap \bar{a} \cong C_{i}$, for each $a \in A$ and each $i \in I$, i.e., $\bar{x} \cap \bar{a} \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in I} \bar{C}_{i}, x \in p\left(A, \bigcap_{i \in I} \bar{C}_{i}\right)$.
1.5. Proposition. If $A, C \subseteq S$, then:
a) $p(A, C)=p(A, A \cap \bar{C})=p(A \cup C, C)$,
b) $A \subseteq \bar{C} \Leftrightarrow A \cong p(A, C) \Leftrightarrow p(A, C)=S$.

Proof. a) $p(A, \bar{A} \cap \bar{C}) \cong p(A, C)-$ see $1.4, \mathrm{a}), p(A \cup C, C) \cong p(A, C)-$ see $1.2, \mathrm{~d})$. If $x \in p(A, C)$, then $\bar{x} \cap \bar{a} \cong \bar{C} \cap \bar{A}$ for each $a \in A$ and $x \in p(A, \bar{A} \cap \bar{C})$. Further, $\bar{x} \cap \bar{y} \subseteq C$, for each $y \in A \cup C$, i.e., $x \in p(A \cup C, C)$.
b) $A \subseteq \bar{C}$ implies $A \subseteq p(A, C)-$ see 1.2 , a). Now, if $A \subseteq p(A, C)$, then $\bar{a} \cap \bar{s} \subseteq \bar{C}$ for each $a \in A, s \in S$, i.e., $S=p(A, C)$. Finally, $p(A, C)=S$ implies $a \in \bar{a}=\bar{a} \cap \bar{a} \subseteq$ $\cong C$, for each $a \in A$.
1.6. Proposition. If $A, B \subseteq S$, then:
a) $A=\cap\{p(S \backslash A, C): \bar{C} \supseteq A\}=p(S \backslash A, A)$,
b) $p(A, B) \cap p(S \backslash A, B)=\bar{B}$.

Proof. a) If $x \in \cap\{p(S \backslash A, C): \bar{C} \supseteq A\} \backslash \bar{A}$, then $\bar{x} \cap \bar{s} \cong \bar{C}$ for each $s \notin A$ and each $\bar{C} \supseteqq A$ and $x \in \bar{x}=\bar{x} \cap \bar{x} \cong \bar{C}$, i.e., $x \in \cap\{\bar{C}: \bar{C} \supseteqq A\}=\bar{A}$, a contradiction. The second inclusion is clear with regard to 1.2, a). The rest of a) follows from 1.2, d). b) If $x \in p(A, B) \cap p(S \backslash A, B)$, then either $x \in A$ and $x \in \bar{x}=\bar{x} \cap \bar{x} \subseteq \bar{B}$ or $x \in S \backslash A$ and again $x \in \bar{x}=\bar{x} \cap \bar{x} \subseteq \bar{B}$. The second inclusion follows from 1.2, a).
1.7. Proposition. If $A, C \subseteq S, B \in \Omega, B \cap \bar{A} \subseteq C$, then $B \subseteq p(A, C)$.

Proof. If $B \in \Omega, B \cap \bar{A} \subseteq \bar{C}$, then $\bar{a} \cap \bar{b} \cong \bar{A} \cap B \subseteq \bar{C}$ for each $a \in A, b \in B$, i.e., $B \subseteq p(A, C)$.

## §2. PRIME C-SETS

2.1. Definition. Let $(S, \Omega)$ be a closure system, $P \in \Omega, C \cong S$. A set $P$ is called a prime $C$-set, if $p(s, C) \cong P$, for each $s \in S \backslash P$. A prime $\omega$-set, where $\omega=$ $=\cap\{Q: Q \in \Omega\}$, is called a prime set .

Remark. For each prime $C$-set $P$ we have $C \subseteq P$.
2.2. Proposition. If $P \in \Omega$, then following assertions are equivalent:
(I) $P$ is a prime $P$-set,
(II) $P=A \cap B \Rightarrow P=A$ or $P=B$, for each $A, B \in \Omega$,
(III) $P \supseteqq A \cap B \Rightarrow P \supseteqq A$ or $P \cong B$, for each $A, B \in \Omega$,
(IV) $p(A, P)=P$ or $p(A, P)=S$, for each $A \subseteq S$.

Proof. (I) $\Rightarrow$ (II): If $P=A \cap B, P \neq A$, then $a \in A \backslash P$ exists and $P \cong p(A, P) \cong$ $\cong p(\{a\}, P) \subseteq P$. From this $B \supseteqq p(A, P)=P=A \cap B \subseteq B$, i.e., $B=P$.
(II) $\Rightarrow$ (III): If $P \cong A \cap B, P$ non $\cong A$, then $a \in A \backslash P$ exists and $P=p(\{a\}, P) \cap$ $\cap p^{2}(\{a\}, P), q \in p^{2}(\{a\}, P) \neq P$. Hence $B \cong p(A, P) \subseteq p(\{a\}, P)=P$.
(III) $\Rightarrow$ (IV): If $P \neq p(A, P)$, then $P=p(A, P) \cap p^{2}(A, P)$ implies $p^{2}(A, P) \subseteq P$, i.e., $p^{2}(A, P)=P$ and it means that $p(A, P)=S$.
$(\mathrm{IV}) \Rightarrow(\mathrm{I}):$ If $s \in S \backslash P$, then $p(s, P)=S$ implies $P=p(S, P) \cap p^{2}(S, P)=p^{2}(S, P)$ and $s \in P$, a contradiction. Thus $p(s, P)=P$.
2.3. Proposition. If $P$ is a prime $C$-set in a set $(S, \Omega)$, then $p(C, P)=S$ and $p^{2}(P, C)=S$ or $P$ is a maximal $C$-polar.

Proof. $p(C, P)=S$-see $1.5, \mathrm{~b})$ and Remark before 2.2. If $P \neq p^{2}(P, C)$, then $x \in p^{2}(P, C) \backslash P$ exists and from this $p(P, C) \subseteq p(\{x\}, C) \subseteq P$, i.e., $p(P, C)=p(P, C) \cap$ $\cap p^{2}(P, C)=\bar{C}$ and $p^{2}(P, C)=S$. If $P$ is a $C$-polar and $p^{2}(A, C) \supseteqq P$ such that an element $s \in p^{2}(A, C) \backslash P$ exists, then $p(A, C) \cong p(\{s\}, C) \subseteq P \subseteq p^{2}(A, C)$ and $C=$ $=p(A, C) \cap p^{2}(A, C)=p(A, C)$, i.e., $p^{2}(A, C)=S$.
2.4. Definition. Let $P, Q \in \Omega, P \subseteq Q$. Then we say that $Q$ has a property $P(\Omega)$ (notation: $Q \in P(\Omega)$ ) if it holds:

If $A \cap B=Q$, for $A, B \in \Omega$, then $A^{\prime}, B^{\prime} \in \Omega$ exist such that $A^{\prime} \cap B^{\prime}=P$ and $A \subseteq$ $\subseteq \overline{A^{\prime} \cup Q}, B \cong \overline{B^{\prime} \cup Q}$.

Remark. A prime $Q$-set is clearly a prime $C$-set, for each $C \cong Q, C \in \Omega$.
2.5. Proposition.. Let $P, Q \in \Omega, P \subseteq Q$. Then $Q$ is a prime $Q$-set if and only if $Q \in P(\Omega)$ and $Q$ is a prime $P$-set.

Proof. $\Rightarrow$ : If $Q=A \cap B$, then $A=Q$ or $B=Q$-see 2.2. Let us suppose that $A=Q$. Then $A^{\prime} \cap B^{\prime}=P$, for $A^{\prime}=P, B^{\prime}=B$ and $\overline{A^{\prime} \cup Q}=\overline{Q \cup P}=Q=A$, $\overline{B^{\prime} \cup Q}=\overline{B \cup Q}=B . \leftrightarrow:$ If $s \in S \backslash Q$, then $Q=p(\{s\}, Q) \cap p^{2}(\{s\}, Q)$ implies the
existence of sets $A^{\prime}, B^{\prime} \in \Omega$ such that $A^{\prime} \cap B^{\prime}=P, p(\{s\}, Q) \subseteq \overline{A^{\prime} \cup Q}, p^{2}(\{s\}, Q) \subseteq$ $\cong \overline{B^{\prime} \cup Q}$. If $A^{\prime} \cong Q$, then $p(\{s\}, Q) \cong Q$. If $A^{\prime}$ non $\subseteq Q$, then $a \in A^{\prime} \backslash Q$ exists and thus $p(\{a\}, P) \cong Q, B^{\prime} \cong p\left(A^{\prime}, P\right) \subseteq p(\{a\}, P) \subseteq Q$, because $Q$ is a prime $P$-set. Finally, $s \in p^{2}(\{s\}, Q) \subseteq B^{\prime} \cup Q=Q$, a contradiction. Finally, $Q$ is a prime $Q$-set.
2.6. Theorem. If $(S, \Omega)$ is a closure space, then for each $P \in \Omega$ the following assertions are equivalent:
(I) The set inclusion is a fully relation on $\Omega_{\mathrm{P}}=\{X \in \Omega: X \supseteqq P\}$ and for each $Q \in \Omega_{\mathrm{P}}$ and each $s \in S \backslash Q$ it is $p(s, Q) \in \Omega$.
(II) Each $Q \in \Omega_{\mathrm{P}}$ is a prime $Q$-set.
(III) A set $C \in \Omega, C \cong P$ exists such that $P$ is a prime $C$-set and $\Omega_{\mathrm{P}} \subseteq C(\Omega)$.

Proof. (I) $\Rightarrow$ (II): If $s \in S \backslash Q, s \notin p(s, Q)$, then $p(s, Q) \in \Omega_{\mathrm{P}}, s \cup Q \in \Omega_{\mathrm{P}}$ and thus $p(s, Q) \subseteq s \cup Q$, what is a contradiction.
(II) $\Rightarrow$ (I): If $A, B \in \Omega_{\mathrm{P}}, A \neq A \cap B$, then $a \in A \backslash A \cap B$ exists and $B \subseteq p(\{a\}, B \subseteq B$, $p(\{a\}, A) \supseteq p(A, A)=S$ (see $1.2, \mathrm{c}))$. Further, $B=p(\{a\}, B) \cap p(\{a\}, A)=p(\{a\}$, $A \cap B) \subseteq A \cap B$, from $A \cap B \in \Omega_{\mathrm{p}}$ and 1.4, b). It implies $B \subseteq A$. (II) $\Leftrightarrow$ (III) immediately from 2.5.
2.7. Proposition. If ( $G, \geqq$ ) is an l-group with a lattice order $\geqq$ and if $\Omega$ is a system of all convex l-subgroups in $G$, then it holds:

1. ( $G, \geqq$ ) is a fully ordered set if and only if a system $\Omega$ is fully ordered by set inclusion.
2. If $P$ is a prime set in $G$, then each $Q \in \Omega_{\mathbf{P}}$ is a prime $Q$-set.
3. $\Omega_{\mathrm{P}} \subseteq C(\Omega)$, for each prime $C$-set $P, C \in \Omega$.

Proof. $1 . \Rightarrow$ : If $A, B \in \Omega, A \| B$, then $a \in A \backslash B, b \in B \backslash A$ exist such that $a \geqq 0$, $b \geqq 0$. If $a \geqq b(b \geqq a)$, then $b \in A,(a \in B)$, a contradiction.
$\Leftarrow$ : If $a, b \in G, a \| b$, then $c \wedge d=0$, for $c=a-(a \wedge b), d=b-(a \wedge b), c$, $d \in G \backslash\{0\}$. It means that $p^{2}(\{c\},\{0\}) \neq\{0\} \neq p^{2}(\{d\},\{0\}), p^{2}(\{c\},\{0\}), p^{2}(\{d\},\{0\}) \in$ $\in \Omega, p^{2}(\{c\},\{0\}) \cap p^{2}(\{d\},\{0\})=\{0\}$, a contradiction.
2. If $P$ is a prime set in $G$, then a right decomposition $G / P$ is a fully ordered set. Then for every $A, B \in \Omega_{\mathrm{p}}, A \| B$ there exist elements $a \in A \backslash B, b \in B \backslash A, a \geqq 0$, $b \geqq 0$. The right classes $a+P, b+P$ are comparable. If $a+P \geqq b+P$, then $a+P \subseteq A, b \in A$, a contradiction. From this $\Omega_{\mathrm{P}}$ is fully ordered by set inclusion. The rest follows from Theorem 2.6.
3. $P$ is a prime convex l-subgroup in $G(s \in S \backslash P \Rightarrow p(\{s\},\{0\})=p(\{s\}, \omega) \subseteq$ $\subseteq p(\{s\}, C) \subseteq P)$ and the right decomposition $G / P$ is a fully ordered set. Then for every $A, B \in \Omega_{\mathrm{P}}, A \| B$ there exist elements $a \in A \backslash B, b \in B \backslash A, a \geqq 0, b \geqq 0$. Right classes $a+P, b+P$ are comparable. If $a+P \geqq b+P(a+P \leqq b+P)$, then $a+P \subseteq A(b+P \subseteq B)$ and $b \in A(a \in B)$, a contradiction. Finally, $\Omega_{\mathrm{P}}$ is fully ordered by set inclusion.

Now, for each $Q \in \Omega_{\mathrm{P}}, Q=A \cap B, A, B \in \Omega_{\mathrm{P}}$ iniplies $Q=A$ (or $Q=B$ ). If we choose $A^{\prime}=C, B^{\prime}=B\left(A^{\prime}=A, B^{\prime}=C\right)$, then $A^{\prime} \cap B^{\prime}=C$ and $\overline{A^{\prime} \cup Q}=Q=A$, $\overline{B^{\prime} \cup Q}=B\left(\overline{A^{\prime} \cup Q}=A, B^{\prime} \cup Q=Q=B\right)$ and thus $Q \in C(\Omega)$.

## §3. EXAMPLES

I. R. D. Byrd in [1] defines a $C$-polarity on an 1-group ( $G$, $\geqq$ ) with a closure system $\Omega$ of all convex 1 -subgroups in $G$ for each $C \subseteq G$ in the following way:

$$
a \beta b \Leftrightarrow|a| \wedge|b| \in \bar{C}, \text { for } a, b \in G \text { (where }|a|=a \vee-a) .
$$

3.1. Lemma. If $a, b, c \in G, a \geqq 0, b \geqq 0, c \geqq 0, C \in \Omega, a \wedge b \in C$, then $[a \wedge$ $\wedge(b+c)]-(a \wedge c) \in C$ and $(m a \wedge n b)-(a \wedge b) \in C$, for every positive integer $m, n$.

Proof. $a \wedge c \leqq a \wedge(b+c)=a \wedge(b+c) \wedge(a+c)=a \wedge[(b \wedge a)+c] \leqq$ $\leqq[(b \wedge a)+a] \wedge[(b \wedge a)+c]=(b \wedge a)+(a \wedge c) \quad$ implies $0 \leqq a \wedge(b+c)-$ $-(a \wedge c) \leqq b \wedge a=a \wedge b$. The rest follows from convexity of $G$.
3.2. Proposition. If ( $G, \geqq$ ) is an 1 -group and $\Omega$ is a closure system of all convex 1 -subgroups in $G, C \cong G$, then $C$-polarity $\beta$ is $C$-polarity $\varrho_{c}(\Omega)$.

Proof. If $a \varrho_{c}(\Omega) b, a, b \in G$, then $\bar{a} \cap \bar{b} \subseteq \bar{C}$ and $|a| \wedge|b| \in \bar{a} \cap \bar{b} \cong \bar{C}$, i.e., $a \beta b$.

If $a \beta b$ and $x \in \bar{a} \cap \bar{b}$, then positive integers $m, n$ exist such that $|x| \leqq n|a|$, $|x| \leqq m|b|$, i.e., $|x| \leqq n|a| \wedge m|b|$. Lemma 3.1 implies $n|a| \wedge m|b| \in$ $\in(|a| \wedge|b|)+\bar{C}=\bar{C}$ and $x \in \bar{C}$ from convexity $\bar{C}$, i.e., $\bar{a} \cap \bar{b} \cong \bar{C}, a \varrho_{c}(\Omega) b$.
II. Let $L$ be a lattice and $I$ be an ideal in a lattice $L(x, y \in I, z \in L, z \leqq x \Rightarrow$ $\Rightarrow x \vee y \in I, z \in I)$. Then a set $\Omega$ of all ideals of a lattice $L$ is a closure system and we define a relation $\gamma_{C}$, for each $C \in \Omega$, in the following way:

$$
y \gamma_{c} y \Leftrightarrow x \wedge y \in C, \quad \text { for } x, y \in L .
$$

3.3. Proposition. If $L$ is a lattice with a closure system $\Omega$ of all ideals in $L$, then $\gamma_{c}$ is a $C$-polarity $\varrho_{c}(\Omega)$, for each $C \in \Omega$.

Proof. $\Leftarrow: x \varrho_{c}(\Omega) y \Rightarrow \bar{x} \cap \bar{y} \subseteq C \Rightarrow x \wedge y \in \bar{x} \cap \bar{y} \subseteq C \Rightarrow x \gamma_{c} y$.
$\Rightarrow$ : If $m \in \bar{x} \cap \bar{y}=\{l \in L: l \leqq x\} \cap\{l \in L: l \leqq y\}=\{l \in L: l \leqq x \wedge y\}$, then $m \leqq x \wedge y$. If $x \gamma_{c} y$, then $x \wedge y \in C$ and $m \in C, \bar{x} \cap \bar{y} \subseteq C$, i.e., $x \varrho_{c}(\Omega) y$.
III. Let $M$ be a partially ordered set, $\bar{N}=\{m \in M: m \leqq n$, for each $n \in N\}$, $N \cong M, \Omega=\{\bar{N}: N \subseteq M\}$. Then $\Omega$ is a closure system in $M$ and we define a relation $\mu_{c}$, for each $C \in \Omega$, in the following way:

$$
x \mu_{c} y \Leftrightarrow\{z \in M, z \leqq x, z \leqq y \Rightarrow z \in C\}, \quad \text { for } x, y \in M .
$$

3.4. Proposition. A relation $\mu_{C}$ is a $C$-polarity $\mu_{c}(\Omega)$, for each $C \in \Omega$.

Proof. $\Leftarrow$ : If $z \leqq x, z \leqq y$, then $z \in \bar{x} \cap \bar{y}$ and if $x \sigma_{c}(\Omega) y$, then $z \in \bar{x} \cap \bar{y} \cong C$ and $x \mu_{c} y$.
$\Rightarrow$ : If $x \mu_{c} y, z \in \bar{x} \cap \bar{y}$, then $z \leqq x, z \leqq y$ and thus $z \in C$, i.e., $\bar{x} \cap \bar{y} \in C, x \varrho_{c}(\Omega) y$.
IV. A. W. Glass defines in [2] $C$-polars on an interpolation partially ordered group $G(s, t, u, v \in G, s, t \leqq u, v \Rightarrow x \in G$ exists such that $s, t \leqq x \leqq u, v)$ with a closure system $\Omega$ generated by the set $C(G)$ of all dc-subgroups (directed convex subgroups) in $G$.

A notation $p_{G}(A, C)$ will be used for $C$-polars of Glass. If $C(G)$ is the set of all dc-subgroups in $G$ and $C(G)=\Omega$, then $G$ is called a strong interpolation group (see [2]).
3.5. Proposition. If $G$ is a strong interpolation group (interpolation group) with a closure system $\Omega$, then $p(\bar{A}, C)=p_{G}(A, C)=p_{G}\left(\langle A\rangle, C\left(p_{G}(\langle A\rangle, C) \cong p(\bar{A}, C)\right)\right.$, where $\langle A\rangle$ is the smallest dc-subgroup in $G$ containing $A$.

Proof. If $k \in p_{G}(\langle A\rangle, C)$, then $\bar{A} \cap \bar{k} \subseteq \bar{k} \subseteq\langle k\rangle$ and because $p_{G}(\langle A\rangle, C)$ is a dc-subgroup in $G$ (see [2], after 3.2), there is $\bar{k} \cap \bar{A} \subseteq p_{G}(\langle A\rangle, C)$. Further, [2], Remark before L. 9 and L.8, (i) implies $\bar{k} \cap \bar{A} \subseteq \bar{A} \subseteq\langle A\rangle \subseteq p_{G}^{2}(\langle A\rangle, C)$ and $\bar{k} \cap \bar{A} \subseteq$ $\subseteq p_{G}(\langle A\rangle, C) \cap p_{G}^{2}(\langle A\rangle, C)=C=C$ - see L.9, (i). Finally, $k \in p(\bar{A}, C)$ and $p_{\mathrm{G}}(\langle A\rangle, C) \cong p(\bar{A}, C)$.

In case that $G$ is a strong interpolation group and $k \in p_{G}(A, C)$, then $\bar{k} \cap \bar{A} \subseteq$ $\subseteq\langle k\rangle \subseteq p_{G}(A, C)$, because $p_{G}(A, C)$ is a dc-subgroup in $G$. Further, $\bar{k} \cap \bar{A} \cong$ $\subseteq p_{G}^{2}(A, C)$, see [2], L.8, (ii) and thus $\bar{k} \cap \bar{A} \cong p_{G}(A, C) \cap p_{G}^{2}(A, C)=C$. Finally, $p_{G}(A, C) \cong p(\bar{A}, C)$.

For the converse, if $k \in p(\bar{A}, C)$, then $\bar{k} \cap \bar{A} \subseteq C \cap \bar{A}=C \cap\langle A\rangle$. Further, [2], L.7, (iv) implies $p_{G}(\langle A\rangle, C)=p_{G}(\langle A\rangle, C \cap\langle A\rangle)$ and [2], L.9, (ii) and Remark before implies $\langle A\rangle \cap p_{G}(\langle A\rangle, C)=\langle A\rangle \cap p_{G}(\langle A\rangle, C \cap\langle A\rangle)=C \cap\langle A\rangle$. Hence and from [2], L.9, (iv) we have $k \in\langle k\rangle \subseteq p_{G}(\langle A\rangle, C \cap\langle A\rangle)=p_{\mathrm{G}}(\langle A\rangle, C)$, i.e., $p(A, C) \cong p_{G}(\langle A\rangle, C) \subseteq p_{G}(A, C) \subseteq p(A, C)-$ see [2], L.5, (ii).
V. J. Rachůnek in [3] defines on a po-group $G$ a polarity $\delta: x, y \in G, x \delta y \Leftrightarrow$ $\Leftrightarrow a, b \in G$ exist, such that $a \geqq 0, b \geqq 0, a \in|x|, b \in|y|, a \wedge b=0$, where $|x|=$ $=\{g \in G: g \geqq x, g \geqq-x\}$ for each $x \in G$.

Po-group $G$ is called 2-isolated, when:

$$
a \in G, \quad a \geqq-a \Rightarrow a \geqq 0
$$

3.6. Proposition. Let $G$ be a 2 -isolated po-group, $\Omega$ be the smallest closure system containing a set $C(G)$ of all dc-subgroups in $G$ and
(I) $|x| \neq \Phi$, for each $x \in G$,
(II) $x \vee-x$ exists for each $x \in G$.

Then a polarity $\delta$ is $\varrho_{\{0\}}(\Omega)$.

Proof. If $x \delta y$, then $a, b \in G$ exist such that $a, b \geqq 0, a \in|x|, b \in|y|, a \vee b=0$. [3], Prop. 2.5 implies that $g^{\delta}=\left\{x \in G_{v} x \delta g\right\}$ is a dc-subgroup in $G$, for each $g \in G$. Hence $\overline{g^{\delta}}=g^{\delta}$ and therefore $y \in x^{\delta}, y \in \bar{y} \subseteq \overline{x^{\delta}}=x^{\delta}, x \in \bar{x} \subseteq x^{\delta \delta}-$ see [3]. Definition mentioned after 2.3. Finally, $\bar{x} \cap \bar{y} \subseteq x^{\delta} \cap x^{\delta \delta}=\{0\}$ (see [3], Th. 2.6). It means that $x \varrho_{\{0\}}(\Omega) y$.

If $x \varrho_{\{0\}}(\Omega) y$, then $\bar{x} \cap \bar{y}=\{0\}$ and $\bar{x}=\cap\{Q \in C(G): x \in Q\}$. Further, if $x \in Q$, $Q \in C(G)$, then $-x \in Q$ and $d \in Q$ exists such that $d \geqq x,-x$. Hence $d \geqq x \vee-x \geqq$ $\geqq x,-x$, i.e., $x=-x \in Q$ and $x \vee-x \in \bar{x}$. Similarly $y \vee-y \in \bar{y}$ and from this $x \vee-x \geqq 0, \quad y \vee-y \geqq 0, x \vee-x \in|x|, \quad y \vee-y \in|y|,(x \vee-x) \wedge(y \vee-y) \in$ $\in \bar{x} \cap \bar{y}=\{0\}$, i.e., $x \delta y$.
3.7. Proposition. Let ( $G, \geqq$ ) be a 2 -isolated po-group, $\Omega$ be the smallest closure system containing the set $C(G)$ of all dc-subgroups in $G$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:
(I) $(|G|, \cong)$ is fully ordered, where $|G|=\{|g|: g \in G\}$,
(II) $(C(G), \cong)$ is fully ordered,
(III) $\left(G^{+}, \geqq\right)$is fully ordered, where $G^{+}=\{g \in G: g \geqq 0\}$.

Moreover, in case that $(G, \geqq)$ is directed, then $(C(G), \cong)$ is fully ordered if and only if $(G, \geqq)$ is fully ordered.

Remark. If $G$ is directed interpolation group, then $\Omega$ is not fully ordered (see [2], Remark before Th. 23).

Proof. (I) $\Rightarrow$ (II): If $A, B \in C(G), A \| B$, then elements $a \in A \backslash B, b \in B \backslash A$ exist and $|x||||a|$ for each $x \in B \backslash A$. Namely, if $| x| \supseteqq|a|$, then $x \in A$, see [3], Lemma after 1.1 , a contradiction. For $|x| \subseteq|a|$ we have $a \in B$, similarly and again a contradiction.
(II) $\Rightarrow$ (III): If $a, b \in G^{+}$exist such that $a \| b$, then $|a|$ non $\supseteq|b|$ and $|b|$ non $\supseteq|a|$. Suppose $\langle | a\rangle \supseteqq\langle | b|\rangle$. Then for each $x \in|b| \cong\langle | b\rangle \cong\langle | a|\rangle$ there exist elements $g_{i} \in|a|, i=1,2, \ldots, n$ such that for $p=g_{1}+g_{2}+\ldots+g_{n}$ there is $|x| \supseteqq|p|$. But $p \geqq g_{i} \geqq a$, for $i=1,2, \ldots, n$ and thus $p \in|a|$, which is in a contradiction with [3], Lemma mentioned after 1.1.
(III) $\Rightarrow$ (I): $a \leqq b$ if and only if $|a| \supseteqq|b|$, for every $a, b \in G^{+}$. The rest is evident from the fact that $G=G^{+}-G^{+}$for a directed po-group.

## REFERENCES

[1] R. D. Byrd: M-polars in lattice ordered groups, Czech. Math. J. 18 (93), 1968, 230-239.
[2] A. W. M. Glass: Polars and their applications in directed interpolation groups, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 166 (1972), 1-25.
[3] J. Rachůnek: Prime subgroups of ordered groups, Czech. Math. J. 24 (99), 1974, 541-551.

〔4] F. Šik: On the theory of lattice-ordered groups, Czech. Math. J., 6 (1956), 1-25.
[5] F. Sik: Die Anwendung der Polarität auf die direkten Produktzerlegungen einer Gruppen, Cz Math. J., 5 (80), 1955, 61-75.
[6] B. Smarda: Polars and x-ideals in semigroups, Math. Slov., 1 (26), 1976, 31-37.

B. Šmarda<br>66295 Brno, Janáčkovo nám. $2 a$<br>Czechoslovakia

