Discussiones Mathematicae General Algebra and Applications 20(2000) 207–217

RELATIVELY COMPLEMENTED ORDERED SETS

Ivan Chajda and Zuzana Morávková

Department of Algebra and Geometry, Palacký University of Olomouc Tomkova 40, 779 00 Olomouc, Czech Republic **e-mail:** chajda@risc.upol.cz

Abstract

We investigate conditions for the existence of relative complements in ordered sets. For relatively complemented ordered sets with 0 we show that each element $b \neq 0$ is the least one of the set of all upper bounds of all atoms contained in b.

Key words and phrases: modular ordered set, complemented, relatively complemented ordered set, atom.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification: 06A99.

Let (A, \leq) be an ordered set and $B \subseteq A$. Denote by

$$L(B) = \{ x \in A; x \le b \text{ for all } b \in B \},\$$
$$U(B) = \{ x \in A; b \le x \text{ for all } b \in B \}.$$

If $B = \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$, we shall write briefly $L(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ or $U(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ instead of L(B) or U(B), respectively. Moreover, for $B, C \subseteq A$ we write L(B, C) for $L(B \cup C)$ and U(B, C) for $U(B \cup C)$. Following [5], an ordered set (A, \leq) is *modular* if for every $a, b, c \in A$ it holds:

$$a \le c \Rightarrow L(c, U(a, b)) = L(U(a, L(b, c))).$$

Modular ordered sets were treated in [2], a special sort of them, the so called distributive ordered sets were investigated in [2] and [4].

Let (A, \leq) be an ordered set and $a \in A$. An element $b \in A$ is called a *complement of a* if

$$L(U(a,b)) = A$$
 and $U(L(a,b)) = A$.

Complemented ordered sets were studied in [1]. A generalization of the complement called a pseudocomplement in an ordered set was introduced in [5].

It is well known that if L is a complemented modular lattice, then L is also relatively complemented. The aim of our paper is to find a generalization of this result for ordered sets. However, there are several possibilities how to introduce the concept of a relative complement in an ordered set. We can pick up the following two:

Definition. Let (A, \leq) be an ordered set, $a, b \in A$ and $a \leq b$. Let $x \in [a, b] = \{z \in A : a \leq z \leq b\}$. An element $y \in [a, b]$ is called a *weak relative complement of x in* [a, b] if

$$U(x, y) \cap [a, b] = \{b\}$$
 and
 $L(x, y) \cap [a, b] = \{a\}.$

An element $y \in [a, b]$ is called a strong relative complement of x in [a, b] if

U(x,y) = U(b) and L(x,y) = L(a).

An ordered set (S, \leq) is strongly relatively complemented if for every interval [a, b] of S, each $x \in [a, b]$ has a strong relative complement in [a, b].

Of course, every strong relative complement of $x \in [a, b]$ is also a weak relative complement of x in [a, b] but not vice versa.

For the sake of brevity, we will write $U_{[a,b]}(x,y)$ or $L_{[a,b]}(x,y)$ instead of $U(x,y) \cap [a,b]$ or $L(x,y) \cap [a,b]$, respectively.

Theorem 1. Let (S, \leq) be a modular ordered set. Let $a, b \in S$, $a \leq b$, and $x \in [a, b]$. Suppose $y \in S$ is a complement of x. The set U(a, L(y, b)) has the least element p if and only if the set L(U(a, y), b) has the greatest element p; in such a case, p is a strong relative complement of x in [a, b].

Proof. Denote by A = U(a, L(y, b)) and B = L(U(a, y), b). Since (S, \leq) is modular, we have

$$A = U(a, L(y, b)) = U(L(U(a, y), b)) = U(B),$$

$$B = L(U(a, y), b) = L(U(a, L(y, b))) = L(A).$$

(Let us note that the second line follows by an application of the dual of modular law since modularity is selfdual, see [2], [3].) Hence, if p is the least

208

element of A, then A = U(p) and B = L(A) = L(U(p)) = L(p), thus p is the greatest element of B. Dually we can show the converse implication. Moreover, the modularity of (S, \leq) yields

$$\begin{split} U(x,p) &= U(x,L(p)) = U(x,B) = U(x) \cap U(B) = U(x) \cap A = \\ &= U(x) \cap U(a,L(y,b)) = U(x,a,L(y,b)) = U(x,L(y,b)) = \\ &= U(L(U(x,y),b)) = U(L(b)) = U(b), \\ L(x,p) &= L(x,U(p)) = L(x,A) = L(x) \cap L(A) = L(x) \cap B = \\ &= L(x) \cap L(U(a,y),b) = L(x,U(a,y),b) = L(x,U(a,y)) = \\ &= L(U(a,L(x,y))) = L(U(a)) = L(a). \end{split}$$

Example 1. Applying methods of [2], we can check that the set (S, \leq) in Figure 1 is modular.





Of course, $L(U(x, y)) = L(\emptyset) = S$ and $U(L(x, y)) = U(\emptyset) = S$; thus y is a complement of x in (S, \leq) . Further, U(a, L(y, b)) = U(a, c) = U(p). Thus (S, \leq) , a, b, x, y satisfy the assumption of Theorem 1, and hence p is a strong relative complement of x in [a, b].

Example 2. Let (S, \leq) be the ordered set depicted in Figure 2. S is modular and the element y is a complement of x. The set $A = U(a, L(y, b)) = U(a, c) = \{b, d\}$ has not a least element. The set $B = L(U(a, y), b) = L(d, b) = \{a, c\}$ has not a greatest element. It is easy to see that the element x has not a weak relative complement in [a, b].





Although Theorem 1 is a generalization of the well known lattice statement, we can remove the assumption of modularity of (S, \leq) and the complementarity of x to obtain a bit more general result:

Theorem 2. Let (S, \leq) be an ordered set, let $a, b \in S$, $a \leq b$, and $x \in [a, b]$. If there exists an element $y \in S$ such that:

- (i) the set L(U(a, y), b) has the greatest element e and the set U(a, L(y, b)) has the least element f,
- (ii) the set L(U(a, y), x) has the greatest element a and the set U(x, L(y, b))has the least element b,

then e and f are strong relative complements of x in [a, b].

Proof. Set A = U(a, L(y, b)) and B = L(U(a, y), b). By (i), there exist $e, f \in S$ with A = U(f), B = L(e). Prove $f \leq e$:

Since $c \leq b$ for each $c \in L(y, b)$, we have $U(b) \subseteq U(L(y, b))$. However, $a \leq b$ yields $U(b) \subseteq U(a)$, thus $U(b) \subseteq L(a, L(y, b))$, whence

(*)
$$L(b) \supseteq L(U(a, L(y, b))).$$

Analogously, $c \leq y$ for each $c \in L(y, b)$ yields $U(y) \subseteq U(L(y, b))$, clearly $U(a, y) \subseteq U(a, L(y, b))$, whence

$$(**) L(U(a, y)) \supseteq L(U(a, L(y, b))).$$

Applying (*) and (**), we conclude

$$L(e) = B = L(U(a, y), b) \supseteq L(U(a, L(y, b))) = L(A) = L(U(f)) = L(f),$$

i.e. $L(e) \supseteq L(f)$ proving $f \le e$.

Moreover, (i) and (ii) imply

$$\begin{split} L(e,x) &= L(e) \cap L(x) = B \cap L(x) = L(U(a,y),b) \cap L(x) = \\ &= L(U(a,y),b,x) = L(U(a,y),x) = L(a) \,, \\ U(f,x) &= U(f) \cap U(x) = A \cap U(x) = U(a,L(y,b)) \cap U(x) = \\ &= U(a,L(y,b),x) = U(L(y,b),x) = U(b) \,. \end{split}$$

Further, we obtain

$$\begin{array}{l} U(b) = U(b, L(U(a, y), b)) = U(b, B) = U(b, e) \subseteq U(x, e) \subseteq U(x, f) = U(b), \\ L(a) = L(a, U(a, L(y, b))) = L(a, A) = L(a, f) \subseteq L(x, f) \subseteq L(x, e) = L(a), \end{array}$$

proving U(x, e) = U(b) and L(x, f) = L(a). Thus e and f are strong relative complements of x in [a, b].

Example 3. It is easy to see that the ordered set (S, \leq) in Figure 3 is not modular and for x, y, a, b we have $x \in [a, b]$ and

$$L(U(a, y), b) = L(e),$$

$$U(a, L(y, b)) = U(f)$$

$$L(U(a, y), x) = L(a),$$

$$U(x, L(y, b)) = U(b)$$



Figure 3

Hence, by Theorem 2, e and f are strong relative complements of x in [a, b].

An anologous result is valid also for weak relative complements:

Theorem 3. Let (S, \leq) be an ordered set, let $a, b \in S$, $a \leq b$, and $x \in [a, b]$. If there exists an element $y \in S$ such that:

- (i) the set L(U(a, y), b) has the greatest element e and the set U(a, L(y, b))has the least element f,
- (ii)* the set L(U(a, y), x) has a maximal element a and the set U(x, L(y, b))has a minimal element b,

then e and f are weak relative complements of x in [a, b].

Proof. The proof of $f \le e$ is the same as in that of Theorem 2. Applying (i) and (ii)* we obtain

$$\begin{split} L_{[a,b]}(e,x) \ &= L(e) \cap L(x) \cap [a,b] = B \cap L(x) \cap [a,b] = \\ &= L(U(a,y),b) \cap L(x) \cap [a,b] = L(U(a,y),b,x) \cap [a,b] = \\ &= L(U(a,y),x) \cap [a,b] = L_{[a,b]}(U(a,y),x) = L_{[a,b]}(a) = \{a\} \end{split}$$

and dually

$$\begin{split} U_{[a,b]}(f,x) &= U(f) \cap U(x) \cap [a,b] = A \cap U(x) \cap [a,b] = \\ &= U(a,L(y,b)) \cap U(x) \cap [a,b] = U(a,L(y,b),x) \cap [a,b] = \\ &= U(L(y,b),x) \cap [a,b] = U_{[a,b]}(L(y,b),x) = U_{[a,b]}(b) = \{b\} \,. \end{split}$$

Since $f \leq e$, we conclude

$$\begin{array}{l} U_{[a,b]}(b) = U(b) \cap [a,b] = U(b,L(U(a,y),b)) \cap [a,b] = U(b,B) \cap [a,b] = \\ = U(b,e) \cap [a,b] \subseteq U(x,e) \cap [a,b] \subseteq U(x,f) \cap [a,b] = U(b) \cap [a,b] = U_{[a,b]}(b), \end{array}$$

whence $U_{[a,b]}(x,e) = U_{[a,b]}(b)$. Dually, it can be shown that $L_{[a,b]}(x,f) = L_{[a,b]}(a)$. We have proved that e and f are weak relative complements of x in [a,b].

Example 4. Consider the ordered set (S, \leq) depicted in Figure 4. Although (S, \leq) is not modular, the elements a, b, x, y satisfy (i) and (ii)* of Theorem 3, thus e and f are weak relative complements of x in [a, b]. Moreover, the element x has no strong relative complement in [a, b], since $[a, b] = \{a, b, x, e, f\}$ and for the only possible candidates e and f we have

$$\begin{split} L(e, x) &= \{a, y\} \neq \{a\} = L(a), \\ U(e, x) &= \{b, h\} \neq \{b\} = U(b) \,, \end{split}$$

analogously also for f.





Now, we turn our attention to some aspects of atomicity in relatively complemented ordered sets. In the case of lattices, it is well known that if L is a relatively complemented lattice of finite length and $b \in L$, $b \neq 0$, then $b = \forall A(b)$, where A(b) is the set of all atoms of L less or equal to b (see e.g. [6]). In the case of ordered sets with 0 we investigate whether U(A(b)) = U(b).

An element a of an ordered set (S, \leq) is called an *atom* if either a covers 0 whenever 0 is the least element of (S, \leq) or a is a minimal element of (S, \leq) in the opposite case. For $b \in S$, denote by A(b) the set of all atoms of S below b. (S, \leq) is called *atomic* if for any $b \in S$, $b \neq 0$ (whenever 0 in S exists) there exists an atom $a \in S$ with $a \leq b$. It is almost evident that if (S, \leq) is of a finite length, then (S, \leq) is atomic.

Theorem 4. Let (S, \leq) be a strongly relatively complemented ordered set of a finite length with 0. If $b \in S$ and $b \neq 0$, then U(A(b)) = U(b).

Proof. If b is an atom in S, then $A(b) = \{b\}$, and hence U(A(b)) = U(b). Suppose b is not an atom in S and $b \neq 0$. Since (S, \leq) is of a finite length and hence atomic, there exists $p_1 \in A(b)$. Since (S, \leq) is strongly relatively complemented, there exists $c_1 \in [0, b]$ with $U(p_1, c_1) = U(b)$.

(a) If c_1 is an atom of (S, \leq) then $c_1 \leq b$ implies $c_1 \in A(b)$. Denote by $D = A(b) \setminus \{p_1, c_1\}$. Clearly $U(D) \supseteq U(b)$ (since U(D) = S if $D = \emptyset$ and, for $D \neq \emptyset$, $d \leq b$ for each $d \in D$. Then

$$U(A(b)) = U(p_1, c_1) \cap U(D) = U(b) \cap U(D) = U(b).$$

(b) Suppose c_1 is not an atom of (S, \leq) . We can repeat the same consideration for the element c_1 (instead of the element b), i.e. there exists

 $p_2 \in A(c_1)$ and $c_2 \in [0, c_1]$ such that $U(p_2, c_2) = U(c_1)$. Since (S, \leq) is of a finite length, we will finish after n steps of this procedure to obtain an element $c_n \in S$ such that $U(p_n, c_n) = U(c_{n-1})$ and $c_n \in A(c_{n-1})$. Denote by $D_n = A(c_{n-1}) \setminus \{p_n, c_n\}$. Evidently, $U(D_n) \supseteq U(c_{n-1})$ and

 $U(A(c_{n-1})) = U(p_n, c_n) \cap U(D_n) = U(c_{n-1}) \cap U(D_n) = U(c_{n-1}).$ Further, let $D_{n-1} = A(c_{n-2}) \setminus \{p_{n-1}, A(c_{n-1})\}$. Clearly $U(D_{n-1}) \supseteq U(c_{n-2})$ and again

$$U(A(c_{n-2})) = U(p_{n-1}) \cap U(A(c_{n-1})) \cap U(D_{n-1}) =$$

= $U(p_{n-1}, c_{n-1}) \cap U(D_{n-1}) = U(c_{n-2}) \cap U(D_{n-1}) = U(c_{n-2}).$

Analogously we proceed to prove $U(A(c_k)) = U(c_k)$ for k = 1, ..., n. For $D_1 = A(b) \setminus \{p_1, A(c_1)\}$ we have $U(D_1) \supseteq U(b)$, thus also

$$U(A(b)) = U(p_1) \cap U(A(c_1)) \cap U(D_1) =$$

= $U(p_1) \cap U(c_1) \cap U(D_1) = U(b) \cap U(D_1) = U(b).$

Example 5. Let (S, \leq) be the ordered set depicted in Figure 5. Then (S, \leq) is strongly relatively complemented and of a finite length. For the element $b \in S$ we really have $A(b) = \{a, c, d\}$ and U(A(b)) = U(a, c, d) = U(b).



Figure 5

Remark. If (S, \leq) is a strongly relatively complemented ordered set of a finite length without 0, the assertion of Theorem 4 does not hold in general, see, e.g., Figure 6, where $A(b) = \{a, c\}$ but $U(A(b)) = U(a, c) = U(d) = \{d, b\} \neq \{b\} = U(b)$.





Moreover, b is not even a minimal element of U(A(b)). On the other hand, we can state the following

Theorem 5. Let (S, \leq) be an ordered set, let $b \in S$ and $b \neq 0$ whenever 0 in S exists. If b covers an atom a and card $(A(b)) \geq 2$, then b is a minimal element of U(A(b)).

Proof. Let $b \neq 0$ covers an atom a and let $card(A(b)) \geq 2$. Suppose b is not minimal in U(A(b)). Then there exists $m \in U(A(b))$ with m < b. Since $a \in A(b)$, we conclude $a \leq m < b$. But b covers a, i.e. a = m, hence $a \in U(A(b))$ Since $card(A(b)) \geq 2$, there exists $c \in A(b)$ with $c \neq a$. It is easy to check that c and a are bot comparable. However $a \in U(A(b))$ implies $c \leq a$, a contradiction.

Example 6. Let (S, \leq) be an ordered set with the diagram depicted in Figure 7.

Then (S, \leq) has not 0 and it is not of a finite length. $A(b) = \{a, c\}$, i.e. card(A(b)) = 2. In accordance with Theorem 5, b is a minimal element in the set $U(A(b)) = U(a.c) = \{b, d_1, d_2, \ldots, e_1, e_2, \ldots\}$. On the other hand $U(A(b)) \neq \{b\} = U(b)$.



Remark. The condition "b covers an atom a" in Theorem 5 is not necessary. For the set (S, \leq) in Figure 8 we have that b is the unique and hence minimal element of U(A(b)) but b covers no atom of S.



On the other hand, if $b \neq 0$ (whenever 0 in S exists) and b is not an atom of S, then, if b is minimal in U(A(b)), $card(A(b)) \geq 2$. Namely, if card(A(b)) = 0, then $A(b) = \emptyset$ and $U(A(b)) = U(\emptyset) = S$; thus b is a minimal element of S. Since $b \neq 0$, S has not 0. However, b is not an atom, a contradiction. If card(A(b)) = 1, then $A(b) = \{a\}$ and $a \neq b$, i.e. U(A(b)) = U(a) and b cannot be the minimal element of U(A(b)), a contradiction again.

References

- [1] I. Chajda, Complemented ordered sets, Arch. Math. (Brno) 28 (1992), 25–34.
- [2] I. Chajda and J. Rachůnek, Forbidden configurations for distributive and modular ordered sets, Order 5 (1989), 407–423.
- [3] R. Halaš, Pseudocomplemented ordered sets, Arch. Math. (Brno) 29 (1993), 153-160.
- [4] J. Niederle, Boolean and distributive ordered sets, Order 12 (1995), 189-210.
- [5] J. Rachůnek and J. Larmerová, Translations of modular and distributive ordered sets, Acta Univ. Palacký Olomouc, Fac. Rerum Nat., Math., **31** (1988), 13–23.
- [6] V.N. Salij, Lettices with Unique Complementations (Russian), Nauka, Moskva 1984.

Received 21 September 1998 Revised 7 June 1999