

MODULAR LATTICE

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the
MASTER'S DEGREE IN MATHEMATICS

By

ARCHANA G S

Reg. No: 210011014836

Under the Guidance of

Dr. LAKSHMI C

Department of Mathematics

BHARATA MATHA COLLEGE, THRIKKAKARA

Affiliated to Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam

2021 - 2023

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the project entitled, “**MODULAR LATTICE**” submitted for the partial fulfilment requirement of Master’s Degree in Mathematics is the original work done by **ARCHANA G S** during the period of the study in the Department of Mathematics, Bharata Matha College, Thrikkakara under my guidance and has not been included in any other project submitted previously for the award of any degree.

Dr.LAKSHMI C

Supervisor

Place : Thrikkakara

Date :

DECLARATION

I, Archana G S, hereby declare that this project entitled “ MODULAR LATTICE” is a bonafide record of work done by me under the guidance of Dr. Lakshmi C, Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics, Bharata Matha College, Thrikkakara and this work has not previously formed by the basis for the award of any academic qualification, fellowship or other similar title of any other University or Board.

ARCHANA G S

M.Sc. Mathematics

Bharata Matha College, Thrikkakara

Place : Thrikkakara

Date :

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost I express my sincere gratitude towards the abiding presence and grace of God Almighty.

I sincerely express my gratitude to Dr. Lakshmi C , Assistant professor, Department of Mathematics, Bharata Matha College, Thrikkakara for guiding and helping me to complete this work.

I also express my profound gratitude to Dr. Lakshmi C , Head of the Department of Mathematics, Bharata Matha College, Thrikkakara for her wholehearted cooperation and valuable advices.

Finally I am obliged to all our teachers of the Mathematics Department, Bharata Matha College for the encouragement for completing this work.

ARCHANA G S

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
1 Lattice-Basic concepts	2
2 Modular lattices	14
3 Representation of modular lattice	24
4 Cubicles	31
CONCLUSION	40
BIBLIOGRAPHY	41

INTRODUCTION

The notion of lattice was introduced by Richard Dedekind to study the relations between ideals and rings of numbers. The lattice concept helps to unify a number of ideas. This paper aims to give a very basic concept about lattices, modular lattices and representation of modular lattice D . The key idea is the construction of sub lattices $B(l)$ and $B(l)$ called cubicles. We start with the fundamental concepts, properties and propositions about lattice and different lattices including distribute lattice with examples in the first chapter. We then discuss about modular lattice and its characterization in second chapter. Representation of modular lattices are discussed in the third chapter. Eventually we end up with discussing about the sub lattices of modular lattices called cubicles and their construction are discussed in the fourth chapter.

Chapter 1

Lattice-Basic concepts

section 1.1.

Definition: Partial order

A partial order is a binary relation $<$ over a set P which is reflexive, antisymmetric and transitive, that is which satisfies for all a, b and c in P ; [1]

- $a \leq a$ (reflexivity).
- if $a \leq b$, and $b \leq a$ then $b = a$ (antisymmetric)
- $a \leq b$ and $b \leq c$ then $a \leq c$ (transitivity) [1]

A set with a partial order is called a partially ordered set (also called a poset). A poset $(L, <)$ is called a lattice ordered if for every pair x, y of elements of L their supremum and infimum exist. [1]

Examples

- The set \mathbb{R} of real numbers ordered by the standard relation $<$ is a poset.
- The set \mathbb{N} of natural numbers equipped with the relation of divisibility. That is here $a \mid b$ means a/b (a divides b) forms a POSET.
- Let H be a collection of sets A, B, C, \dots then H under contained in forms a poset. i.e, here $A \mid B$ means $A \subseteq B$. [1]

Hasse Diagrams

A Hasse diagram is a graphical representation of the relation of elements of a partially ordered set. To define Hasse diagrams, we first define a relation covers as follows. For any two elements $x, y \in X$, y covers x if $x < y$ and $\forall z \in X: x \leq z < y$ implies $z = x$. In other words, there should not be any element z with $x < z < y$. We use $y \rightarrow x$ to denote that y covers x (or x is covered by y). We also say that y is an upper cover of x and x is a lower cover of y . A Hasse diagram of a poset is a graph with the property that there is an edge from x to y iff $y \rightarrow x$. [1] Furthermore, when drawing the graph on a Euclidean plane, x is drawn lower than y when y covers x . This allows us to suppress the directional arrows in the edges. [1]

Join and Meet Operations

Now define on subset of X -meet or infimum and join or supremum.

Let $Y \subseteq X$, where $(X; \leq)$ is a poset. For any $m \in X$, we say that $m = \inf Y$ iff

1. $\forall y \in Y: m \leq y$, and
2. $\forall m' \in X: (\forall y \in Y: m' \leq y) \implies m' \leq m$. [1]

The condition (1) implies m is a lower bound of Y and (2) implies if m' is another lower bound of Y , then m' is less than m .

Then m is called greatest lower bound of the set Y . Observe that m is not required to be an element of Y . The definition of sup is similar. For any $s \in X$, we say that $s = \sup Y$ iff [1]

1. $\forall y \in Y: y \leq s$
2. $\forall s' \in X: (\forall y \in Y: y \leq s') \implies s \leq s'$ [1]

Then s is called the least upper bound of Y . We denote the glb of a, b by $a \cup b$, and lub of a, b by $a \cap b$. In the set of natural numbers ordered by the divides relation, the glb corresponds to finding the greatest common divisor (gcd) and the lub corresponds to finding the least common multiple of two natural numbers. The greatest lower bound or the least upper bound may not always exist. [3]

Lemma 1.1.1 [Connecting Lemma]

1. $x \leq y \equiv (x \cup y) = y$, and

2. $x \leq y \equiv (x \cap y) = x$ [3]

Proof:

$x \leq y$ implies that y is an upper bound on x, y . y is also the least upper bound because any upper bound of x, y is greater than both x and y . Therefore, $(x \cup y) = y$. Conversely, $(x \cup y) = y$ means y is an upper bound on x, y . Therefore, $x \leq y$.

The proof for the second part is the dual of this proof.

section 1.2.

Definition:Lattices.

A poset $(X; \leq)$ is a lattice iff $\forall x, y \in X$: $x \cup y$ and $x \cap y$ exist. Or a lattice L is a set with two binary operations, intersection and sum.

if $a, b \in L$, we denote their intersection by $a \cdot b$ and their sum by $a + b$. Each of those operations is commutative and associative. Moreover for any $a, b \in L$ we have the identities:[2]

1. $a, b \in L, a \cdot a = a$ and $a + a = a$ (idempotent law)
2. $a, b \in L, a \cdot b = b \cdot a$ and $a + b = b + a$ (commutative law)
3. $a, b, c \in L, a \cdot (b \cdot c) = (a \cdot b) \cdot c$ and $a + (b + c) = (a + b) + c$ (associative law)
4. $a, b \in L, a \cdot (a + b) = a, a + (a \cdot b) = a$ (absorption law)[2]

In Mathematics a lattice is a partially ordered set in which every two elements have a unique supremum and a unique infimum. An example is given by when P is a set of positive integers set $x \leq y$ in P when x divides y without remainder. Lattices can also be characterized as algebraic structure satisfying certain axiomatic identities. Lattice theory draws on both order theory and universal algebra since the two definitions are equivalent.[2] **Lattices as partially ordered sets.**

If (L, \leq) is a partially ordered set (poset) and $S \subseteq L$ is an arbitrary subset, then an element $u \in L$ is said to be an upper bound of S if $s \leq u$ for each $s \in S$. A set may have many upper bounds or none at all. An upper bound u of S is said to be its least upper bound or join or supremum, if $u \leq x$ for each upper bound x of S . A set need not have a least upper bound, but it cannot have more than one. Dually $l \in L$ is said to be lowerbound of S , if $l \leq s$ for each $s \in S$. A lowerbound l of S is said to be its greatest lowerbound or meet or infimum if $x \leq l$ for each lowerbound x of S . A set may have many lowerbounds or none at all, but can have at most one greatest lowerbound. [2] **Lattices as algebraic structures**

A Join-semilattice is a partially ordered set that has a join for any nonempty finite subset and a meet-semilattice is a partially ordered set which has a meet for any nonempty finite subset, denoted by $a \wedge b$ and $a \vee b$ respectively. (L, \leq) is called a lattice. If it is both a join and a meet semi lattice. This definition makes \wedge and \vee binary operations. [1] An algebraic structure (L, \wedge, \vee) consist of a set L and two binary operations \wedge and \vee on L is a lattice if the following axiomatic identities hold for all elements a, b, c of L . [3]

- Commutative laws: $a \vee b = b \vee a$, $a \wedge b = b \wedge a$
- Associative laws: $a \vee (b \vee c) = (a \vee b) \vee c$ $a \wedge (b \wedge c) = (a \wedge b) \wedge c$
- Absorption laws: $a \vee (a \wedge b) = a$, $a \wedge (a \vee b) = a$ [2]

The following two identities are also usually regarded as axioms, even though they follow from the two absorption laws taken together. [1]

- Idempotent laws: $a \vee a = a$, $a \wedge a = a$

These axioms implies the (L, \vee) and (L, \wedge) are semi lattices. The both join and meet appear in the absorption laws, assure the two semi lattices interact appropriately and distinguish a lattice from an arbitrary pair of semi lattices. In particular each semi lattice is the dual of the other.[2] **Examples**

- Let X be a non empty subset, then the poset $(P(X), \leq)$ of all subsets of X is a lattice with the binary operations \cap and \cup respectively.[2]
- Let V be a vector space, and L be the set of linear subspace ordered by inclusion. L is lattice with two binary operations intersection as $S.T$ and sum as $S+T$. [2]
- The set N of all natural numbers under divisibility forms a lattice. Here two operations is defined as $a.b=g.c.d(a,b)$ and $a+b=l.c.m(a,b)$ for all $a,b \in N$. [2]

section 1.3.

Definition:Sub Lattices.

S is a sub lattice of a given lattice $L=(X;\leq)$ iff it is non-empty, and: $\forall a,b \in S: \sup(a,b) \in S \wedge \inf(a,b) \in S$. [3] Note that the sup and inf of any two elements in the sub lattices S must be the same as the sup and inf of those elements in the original lattice L . It is not sufficient that S being a subset of a lattice when S to be a sublattice. In addition to S being a subset of a lattice, sup and inf operations must be inherited from the lattice. Also can be defined as; A sub lattice of a lattice L is a non empty subset of L that is a lattice with the same meet and join operations as L . That is if L is a lattice and $M \neq \emptyset$ is a subset of L such that for every pair of elements a,b in M both $a \vee b$ and $a \wedge b$ are in M , then M is a sublattice of L . [3]

Examples

1. If L is any lattice and $a \in L$ be any element then a is a sublattice of L .
2. For any two elements x, y in a lattice L with $x \leq y$, the interval $[x, y] = \{a \in L / x \leq a \leq y\}$ is a sublattice of L . [3]

Definition:Bounded lattice A bounded lattice is an algebraic structure of the form $(L, \vee, \wedge, 1, 0)$ such that L, \vee, \wedge is a lattice, 0 (the lattices bottom) is the identity element for the join operator \vee , and 1 (the lattices top) is the identity element for the meet operator \wedge . [3]

- Identity laws: $a \vee 0 = a, a \wedge 1 = a$

Definition: Complete lattice

A poset is called complete lattice if all its subsets have both a join and a meet.[3]

Definition: Continuous lattice

A continuous lattice is a complete lattice that is continuous as a poset.[3]

Definition: Algebraic lattice

An algebraic lattice is a complete lattice that is algebraic as a poset.[3]

Definition: Graded

A lattice (L, \leq) is called graded, sometimes ranked, if it can be equipped with a rank function r from L to \mathbb{N} sometimes to \mathbb{Z} , compatible with the ordering ($r(x) \leq r(y)$ whenever $x \leq y$) such that whenever y covers x , then $r(x)+1=r(y)$. The value of the rank function for a lattice element is called its rank.[3]

Definition: Distributive lattice

A lattice L is called distributive if the laws $x+(y.z)=(x+y).(x+z)$ and $x.(y+z)=(x.y)+(x.z)$ hold for all $x,y,z \in L$. These equalities are called distributive laws.[3]

Examples

1. $(P(M), \cap, \cup)$ is a distributive lattice as $A \cap (B \cup C) = (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$
2. Lattice \mathbb{N} of natural numbers under divisibility is distributive. Hence $a.b = \text{g.c.d}(a, b)$ and $a+b = \text{l.c.m}(a, b)$. Thus $(\mathbb{N}, \text{g.c.d}, \text{l.c.m})$ is a distributive lattice.[3]

Definition:Complementary

Two elements x, y in an interval $[a, b]$ are complementary and call each a relative complement of the other if $x.y=a, x+y=b$. [3]

Proposition 1.3.1 A lattice L is distributive if the equations $a.c=b.c$ and $a+b=b+c$ imply $a=b$ hold for any $a,b,c \in L$. [3]

proof: Let L be distributive and let $a.c=b.c$ and $a+b=b+c$. Then $a=a.(a+c)=a.(b+c)=(a.b)+(a.c)=(a.b)+(b.c)=b.(a+c)=b.(b+c)=b$ Hence the proposition. [3]

Proposition 1.3.2 In any distributive lattice, relative complements in each interval are unique. [3]

proof: Let $[a,b]$ be an interval. Let y and z be relative complements of x in $[a,b]$. Then, $x.y=a=x.z$ and $x+y=b=x+z$. Hence $y=z$ by above proposition. [3]

Theorem 1.3.3

1. Let (L, \leq) be a lattice ordered set. If we define $x.y = \inf(x,y)$ and $x+y = \sup(x,y)$, then $(L, ., +)$ is an algebraic lattice.
2. Let $(L, ., +)$ be an algebraic lattice. If we define $x \leq y$ iff $x.y = x$, then (L, \leq) is a lattice ordered set. [3]

proof:

1. Let (L, \leq) be a lattice ordered set for all $x,y,z \in L$ we have, $x.y = \inf(x,y) = \inf(y,x) = y.x$
 $x+y = \sup(x,y) = \sup(y,x) = y+x$ Also, $x.(y.z) = x.\inf(y,z) = \inf(x, \inf(y,z)) = \inf(x,y,z)$
 $= \inf(\inf(x,y), z) = \inf(x,y).z = (x.y).z$ And similarly $.(x+y)+z = x+(y+z)$
 $x.(x+y) = x.\sup(x,y) = \inf(x, \sup(x,y)) = x$ $x+(x.y) = x+\inf(x,y) = \sup(x, \inf(x,y)) = x$

2. Let $(L, \cdot, +)$ be an algebraic lattice. Clearly for all $x, y, z \in L$ $x \cdot x = x$ and $x + x = x$. So $x \leq x$. i.e, \leq is reflexive. If $x \leq y$ and $y \leq x$, then $x \cdot y = x$ and $y \cdot x = y$ and $x \cdot y = y \cdot x$. So $x = y$. i.e, \leq is antisymmetric. If $x \leq y$ and $y \leq z$, then $x \cdot y = x$ and $y \cdot z = y$. Therefore $x = x \cdot y = x \cdot (y \cdot z) = (x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot z$. So $x \leq z$. i.e, \leq is transitive. Let $x, y \in L$. Then $x \cdot (x + y) = x$ implies $x \leq x + y$ and similarly $y \leq x + y$. If $z \in L$ with $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$, then $(x + y) + z = x + (y + z) = x + z = z$. And so $x + y \leq z$. Thus $\sup(x, y) = x + y$ similarly $\inf(x, y) = x \cdot y$. Hence (L, \leq) is a lattice ordered set.[3]

section 1.4.

Some important properties of lattices.

- Completeness

A poset is called a complete lattice if every subset of poset has a least upper bound and a greatest lower bound. In particular, every complete lattice is a bounded lattice. [3]

Every poset that is a complete semilattice is also a complete lattice. Related to this result is the interesting phenomenon that there are various competing notions of homomorphism for this class of posets, depending on whether they are seen as complete lattices, complete join semilattices, complete meet semilattices or as join complete or meet complete lattices.[3]

- Conditional completeness.

A conditionally complete lattice is a lattice in which every non empty subset

that has an upperbound has a join-generalization of the completeness axiom of the real numbers given by such lattices. A conditionally complete lattice is either a complete lattice or a complete lattice without its maximum element 1, its minimum element 0, or both.[3]

- Distributivity[3]

Since lattices come with two binary operations, it is natural to ask whether one of them distributes over the other. i.e, whether one or the other of the following dual laws for every three elements a, b, c of L ; Distributivity of \vee over \wedge : $a \vee (bc) = (a \vee b)(a \vee c)$ Distributivity of \wedge over \vee : $a \wedge (bc) = (a \wedge b)(a \wedge c)$ A lattice that satisfies the first or equivalently, the second axiom, is called a distributive lattice. The only non-distributive lattices with fewer than 6 elements are called M_3 (diamond lattice) and N_5 (pentagon lattice).[3] They are shown in figure: 1 and figure: 2 respectively.

- Modularity[3]

For some applications the distributivity condition is too strong and the following weaker property is often useful. A lattice (L, \wedge, \vee) is modular if, for all elements a, b, c of the following identity holds;

Modular identity: $(a \wedge c) \vee (b \wedge c) = [(a \wedge c) \vee b] \wedge c$ This condition is equivalent to the following axiom, Modular law: $a \leq c$ implies $a \vee (b \wedge c) = (a \vee b) \wedge c$. [3]

Chapter 2

Modular lattices

section 2.1.

Modular lattice

We describe a special class of lattices called modular lattices. Modular lattices are numerous in mathematics. In the branch of mathematics called order theory a modular lattice is a lattice that satisfies the following self dual condition; Modular law: $x \leq b \implies x \vee a \wedge b = (x \vee a) \wedge b$; where \leq is the partial order, and \vee and \wedge are the operations of the lattice.[4] Modular lattices arise naturally in algebra and in many other areas of mathematics. For example, the subspaces of a vector space (and more generally the submodules of a module over a ring) form a modular lattice. Every distributive lattice is modular. Modular elements are the elements in which a is not necessarily modular lattice there is an element b for which the modular law holds in connection with arbitrarily elements a and b . A pair (a,b) may hold the modular

law is called the modular pair, and there are various generalisations of modularity related to this notion and to semimodularity. The modular law can be seen as a restricted associative law that connects the two lattice operations similarly to the way in which the associative law, $\mu x = \alpha \mu x$ for vector spaces connects multiplication in the field and scalar multiplication. The restriction $x \leq b$ is clearly necessary since it follows for $x \vee a \wedge b = x \vee a \wedge b$. In other words, no lattice with more than one element satisfies unrestricted consequent of the modular law. (To see this, just pick non maximal b and let x be any element strictly less than b .) [4]

It is easy to see that $x \leq b$ implies $x \vee a \wedge b x \vee a \wedge b$ in every lattice. Therefore the modular can be also being stated as modular law (variant):- $x \leq b$ implies $x \vee a \wedge b x \vee a \wedge b$. By substituting x with $x b$, the modular law can be expressed as an equation that is required to hold unconditionally, as follows: Modular identity:- $x \wedge b a \wedge b = a \wedge b \vee a \wedge b$. The smallest non modular lattice is the “pentagon” lattice N_5 consisting of five elements $0, 1, x, a, b$ such that, $0 < x < b < 1$, $0 < a < 1$, and a is not comparable to x or to b . For this lattice $x \vee a \wedge b = x \vee 0 = x < b = 1 \wedge b = x \vee a \wedge b$ holds, contradicting the modular law. Every nonmodular lattice contains a copy of N_5 as a sublattice. Modular lattice are sometimes called Dedekind lattices after Richard Dedekind who discovered the modular identity in several motivating examples.[4]

Definition: Modular

A lattice L is called modular (or Dedekind) if for every $x, y, z \in L$ such that $x \leq z$, we have $x + (y \cdot z) = (x + y) \cdot z$. This relation is called Dedekind’s axiom.[5]

Lemma 2.1.1

For all lattices, $a \cap (b \cup c) \geq (a \cap b) \cup (a \cap c)$ [5]

proof:

$$a \cap (b \cup c) \geq (a \cap b)$$

$$a \cap (b \cup c) \geq (a \cap c) \text{ Combining, we get}$$

$a \cap (b \cup c) \geq (a \cap b) \cup (a \cap c)$ A similar observation follows from the definition of modular lattices. [5]

Lemma 2.1.2

For all lattices, $a \geq c \implies a \cap (b \cup c) \geq (a \cap b) \cup c$ [5]

proof:

$$a \geq c \implies a \cap c = c \text{ Using Lemma 2.1.1 it follows that } a \cap (b \cup c) \geq (a \cap b) \cup c$$
 [5]

Lemma 2.1.2

L is distributive implies that L is modular. [5]

proof:

Assume that L is distributive. Then by definition of a distributive lattice, $\forall a, b, c: a \cap (b \cup c) = (a \cap b) \cup (a \cap c) \implies \forall a, b, c: a \geq c$ implies $a \cap (b \cup c) = (a \cap b) \cup c$ (since $a \geq c$ is equivalent to $a \cap c = c$.)

Therefore L is modular. [5]

Duality principle [2]

Any formula involving the operations \cdot and $+$ which is valid in any lattice $(L, \cdot, +)$ remains valid if we replace \cdot by $+$ and $+$ by \cdot everywhere in the formula. This process of replacing is called dualizing. [2]

Examples [2]

1. The normal subgroups of a group ordered by set inclusion form a modular lattice.

Let G be any group and L be the set of all normal subgroups of G . Then $L \neq \emptyset$ as $G \in L$. (L, \subseteq) is then a poset.

For any $A, B \in L$, let $A \cdot B = A \cap B$ and $A + B = AB$. Also $A \subseteq AB$ and $B \subseteq AB$ as $a \in A \implies ae \in AB$, etc.

Thus AB is the smallest normal subgroup containing A and B . Indeed if C is any normal subgroup containing A and B , then $AB \subseteq C$ ($x \in AB \implies x = ab \in C$ as $a \in A \subseteq C$, $b \in B \subseteq C$).

Now to check the modularity conditions. Here we proceed by applying the Duality principle.

Let $A, B, C \in L$ with $A \supseteq B$ be any members.

We show $A \cdot B + C = B + (A \cdot C)$

i.e., $A \cap BC = B(A \cap C)$

Let $x \in A \cap BC$ be any element.

Then $x \in A$ and $x \in bc \implies \exists b \in B, c \in C$ s.t. $x = bc$ $x \in A \implies bc \in A$. Also $b \in B \subseteq A \implies b^{-1} \in A$. Thus $b^{-1}bc \in A \implies c \in A \implies c \in A \cap C$.

So $b \in B, c \in A \cap C \implies bc \in B(A \cap C) \implies A \cap BC \subseteq B(A \cap C)$

Again if $y \in B(A \cap C)$ Then $y = bk$; where $b \in B, k \in A \cap C$

Now $b \in B \subseteq A, k \in A \implies bk \in A$

Also $b \in B, k \in C \implies bk \in BC$ Thus $bk \in A \cap BC \implies B(A \cap C) \subseteq A \cap BC$

Hence, $B(A \cap C) = A \cap BC$.

2. Let $\langle R, +, \cdot \rangle$ be a ring and L be the set of all ideals of R , then (L, \subseteq) forms a modular lattice.

(L, \subseteq) forms a lattice where for any $A, B \in L, A \cdot B = A \cap B$ and $A + B = A \cup B$. We show that L is modular.

Let $A, B, C \in L$ be any three members with $A \subseteq B$.

We claim $A \cap (B + C) = B + (A \cap C)$

Let $x \in A \cap (B + C)$ be any element. Then $x \in A$ and $x \in B + C \implies x \in A$ and $x = b + c, b \in B, c \in C$ Now $b \in B \subseteq A, x = b + c \in A$ Thus $b + c - b \in A \implies c + b - b \in A \implies c \in A \implies c \in A \cap C$

i.e, $x = b + c, b \in B, c \in A \cap C \implies x \in B + A \cap C$

i.e, $A \cap (B + C) \subseteq B + (A \cap C)$

Again by modular inequality which holds in every lattice,

$A \cap (B + C) \supseteq B + (A \cap C)$

Hence, $A \cap (B + C) = B + (A \cap C)$

$\implies L$ is a modular lattice.[2]

proposition 2.1.4

A lattice L is modular if and only if, for each interval I of L , any two elements of I which are comparable and have a common complement in L are equal.[3]

proof:

In a lattice L , given $a, b, c \in L$, if $a \leq c$ then $a + (b.c) = a + b$ and $a + (b.c) \leq c$

From the identities of lattice we have $a.b = b$ and $a + b = b$ for $a, b \in L$.

Hence $b.c = b$. Therefore $a + (b.c) = a + b$

Now, $a + (b.c) = a + b = b + a = a \leq c$. Hence $a + (b.c) \leq c$

Hence $a + (b.c) \leq (a + b).c \rightarrow (1)$

Therefore L is non modular if and only if the inequality (1) is strict for at least one triple (a, b, c) such that $a \leq c$. When $a = c$, the two sides of (1) are equal by the absorption law.

$$\text{L.H.S} = a + (b.c) = a + b = b + a = a$$

$$\text{R.H.S} = (a + b).c = (a.c) + (b.c) = a + b = a$$

When $a < c$, suppose first that strict inequality holds in (1).

Put $a' = a + (b.c)$ and $c' = (a + b).c$ then by (1) $a \leq a' < c' \leq c \rightarrow (2)$ And $b.c' = b.(a + b).c = b.c$

$$a' + b = a + (b.c) + b = a + b$$

Moreover $c' \leq a + b$, hence $b + c' \leq a + b \leq b + c'$ by (1)

Therefore $b + c' = a + b$ and dually $a'.b = b.c$

This shows that a' and c' have the common complement b in $[b.c, a + b]$ and by (2) they are comparable but distinct.

Conversely if a', c' are distinct elements which are comparable and have a common complement in $[u, v]$, say $a'.b=c'.b=u$, $a'+b=c'+b=v$ and $u \leq a' < c' \leq v$ then $a'+(b.c')=a' < c'=(a'+b).c'$.

Hence L is non modular.[3]

section 2.2.

Characterization of Modular lattices

There are two special lattices pentagon lattice and diamond lattice. M_3 is modular.

It is, however, not distributive.[3]

To see this, we have,

$$a \cap (b \cup c) = a \cap 1 = a \text{ and } (a \cap b) \cap (a \cap c) = 0 \cup 0 = 0.$$

Since $a \neq 0$, M_3 is not distributive. All lattices of four elements or less are modular. The smallest lattice which is not modular is the pentagon (N_5).

We now discuss about the modular lattices and characterization theorems of modular lattices. In the definition of modular lattices, if c satisfies $(a \cap b) \leq c \leq a$, then we get that $a \cap b \cup c = a \cap b \cup c = c$.

The following theorem shows that to check modularity it is sufficient to consider c 's that are in the interval $[a \cap b, a]$. [3]

Theorem 2.2.1

A lattice L is modular iff $\forall a, b \in L$

$$d \in a \cap b, a \implies a \cap b \cup d = d \rightarrow (1) \quad [3]$$

proof:

First, we show that (1) implies that L is modular.

Suppose $c \leq a$ but $a \cap b \cap c$ is false.

We define $d = c \cup (a \cap b) \rightarrow (2)$. Clearly $d \in [a \cap b, a]$.

Consider $a \cap (b \cup d)$. Replacing the value of d from (2) we get, $a \cap (b \cup (c \cup (a \cap b))) = c \cup (a \cap b)$

$\rightarrow (3)$

Now consider $a \cap (b \cup c)$.

Using the fact that $c \leq c \cup (a \cap b)$ we get $a \cap (b \cup c) \leq a \cap (b \cup (c \cup (a \cap b))) \rightarrow (4)$

Combining (3) and (4), we get $a \cap (b \cup c) \leq c \cup (a \cap b)$.

Rewriting the equation gives us $a \cap (b \cup c) \leq (a \cap b) \cup c$.

Since $a \cap (b \cup c) \leq (a \cap b) \cup c$ holds for all lattices (Lemma 2.1.2), we get, $a \cap (b \cup c) = (a \cap b) \cup c$.

Hence L is modular, which is what we wanted to show. Showing the other side, that modularity implies condition (1) is trivial.

The following lemma is useful in proving the next theorem. [3]

Lemma 2.2.2

For all lattices $L, \forall a, b, c$: let $\nu = a \cap (b \cup c)$ and $u = (a \cap b) \cup c$. Then, $\nu > u \implies$

$$[\nu \cap b = u \cap b] \wedge [\nu \cup b = u \cup b]. [1]$$

proof:

We show the first conjunct. The proof for the second is similar.

$$\begin{aligned}
a \cap b &= (a \cap b) \cap b \leq [(a \cap b) \cup c] \cap b = u \cap b \text{ (by definition of } u) \\
&\leq \nu \cap b \text{ (since } \nu > u) \\
&= (a \cap (b \cup c)) \cap b \text{ (by definition of } \nu) \\
&= a \cap b \text{ (since } b \leq (b \cup c)).
\end{aligned}$$

We are now ready for another characterization of modular lattices.[1]

Theorem 2.2.3

A lattice L is modular if and only if it does not contain a sublattice isomorphic to N_5 . [1]

proof:

L violates the modularity if it contains N_5 .

Now assume the contrary that L is not modular. Then, there exist a, b, c such that $a > c$ and $a \cap (b \cup c) > (a \cap b) \cup c$.

It can easily be verified that $b \parallel a$ and $b \parallel c$. For example $b \leq a \implies (a \cap b) \cup c = b \cup c \leq a \cap (b \cup c)$.

The other cases are similar. We let $\nu = a \cap (b \cup c)$ and $u = (a \cap b) \cup c$. We know that $\nu > u$.

It is easy to verify that $b \parallel u$ and $b \parallel \nu$.

For example, $b < \nu \equiv b < a \cap (b \cup c) \implies b < a$.

From Lemma 2.2.2, $u \cup b = \nu \cup b$ and $u \cap b = \nu \cap b$. Thus $u, \nu, b, u \cup b$ and $u \cap b$ form N_5 . [1]

Theorem 2.2.4 [Shearing identity] [3]

A lattice L is modular if and only if $\forall x, y, z: x \cap (y \cup z) = x \cap ((y \cap (x \cup z)) \cup z)$.

Proof:

Assume that L is modular. We have to prove that the shearing identity. We use

the fact that $x \cup z \leq z$. $(y \cap (x \cup z)) \cup z = z \cup (y \cap (x \cup z)) = (z \cup y) \cap (x \cup z)$ (by modularity)
 $= (y \cup z) \cap (x \cup z)$

Considering the right hand side of shearing identity.

$$x \cap (y \cap (x \cup z)) \cup z = x \cap ((y \cup z) \cap (x \cup z)) = x \cap (y \cup z) \quad (\text{since } x \leq x \cup z). [3]$$

Chapter 3

Representation of modular lattice

section 3.1.

Definition:Representation

Let L be a modular lattices and V be a finite dimensional vector space over a field K . A representation of L in V is a morphism from L into the lattice $L(V)$. Thus a representation: $L \rightarrow L(V)$ associates with each element $x \in L$ a subspace $\rho(x) \subseteq V$ such that for every $x, y \in L$, $\rho(xy) = \rho(x)\rho(y)$ [4]

$$\rho(x+y) = \rho(x) + \rho(y)$$

Definition: Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be representations of a lattice L in vector spaces V_1 and V_2 respectively. We set $\rho(x) = \rho_1(x) \oplus \rho_2(x), \forall x \in X$, where $\rho_1(x) \rho_2(x)$ is the subspace of $V_1 \oplus V_2$ consisting of all pairs (ε, η) such that $\varepsilon \in \rho_1(x)$ and $\eta \in \rho_2(x)$.

This defines a representation in the space $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$.[4]

Definition: A representation ρ is decomposable if it is isomorphic to the

direct sum set $\rho = \rho_1 \oplus \rho_2$ of two nonzero representations ρ_1 and ρ_2 . The representation ρ in a vector space V is decomposable if and only if subspaces U_1 and U_2 such that $U_1 \cdot U_2 = 0$ and $U_1 + U_2 = V$ and that $\rho(a) = U_1 \rho(a) + U_2 \rho(a)$, $\forall a \in L$. [5]

Definition: Perfect lattice

An element a of a modular lattice L is called perfect if for every field K and every representation $\rho: L \rightarrow L(V) = L(K^n)$ the subspace $\rho(a) \subseteq V$ has the property that, there is a subspace U complementary to $\rho(a)$ (i.e, $U \rho(a) = 0$ and , $U + \rho(a) = V$) such that the subspace U and $\rho(a)$ define a decomposition of ρ into the direct sum of sub representations. i.e, $\rho(x) = U \rho(x) + \rho(a) \cdot \rho(x)$ for every element $x \in L$. [3]

Definition: Linear lattice

A modular lattice L is called linear if for any $x, y \in L$ and every representation $\rho: L \rightarrow L(K^n)$ we have, $x = y \iff \rho(x) = \rho(y)$. [3]

Definition: Linear equivalence

Two elements a and b of a modular lattice L are called linearly equivalent if $\rho(a) = \rho(b)$ in every representation $\rho: L \rightarrow L(K^n)$ for any K and n . In this case we write $a \cong b$. [3]

Definition: Projective space

Let V be an $(n+1)$ -dimensional vector space over F . The projective space $P(F, n)$ is the geometry whose points, lines, planes, ... Are the vector subspaces of V of dimensions 1, 2, 3... A projective space of dimension n over a field F can be constructed by "projection" of an $(n+1)$ -dimensional vector space over F . Note also that a d -dimensional projective space is a $d+1$ -dimensional vector subspace. [3]

Definition: Completely irreducible

A representation of a modular lattice L in a space V over a field K of characteristic zero is called completely irreducible if $\rho(L) \cong P(Q, m)$. (i.e, projective space over the field Q of rational numbers). Here we denote by $\rho(L)$ the sublattice of $L(K^n)$ consisting of all elements $a, a \in L$. [3]

Case 1: First we construct the representation $\rho_{t,l}$ in the vector spaces $V_{t,l}$, $t \in 1, 2, 3, \dots, l \in 1, 2, 3, \dots$

Clearly a representation ρ of D_r in a space V is completely determined by the subspaces $(e_j)_{j=1,2,\dots}$ of V . We set $\rho_{t,l}(e_j) = E_{j,l} \subseteq V_{t,l}$.

Let $l=1$ then $\rho_{t,1}; t \in 1, 2, 3, \dots, r$ is the representation in the one dimensional space $V \cong K^1$ such that $\rho_{t,1}(e_j) = 0$ if $j \neq t$ and $\rho_{t,1}(e_j) = V$. Now let $t \geq 1$. We denote by $W_{t,l}$ the linear vector space over K with the basis η_α where $\alpha = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{l-1}, t)$ ranges over the whole set $At(r,l) (\alpha \in At(r,l) \iff \alpha = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{l-1}, t) \text{ and } t \text{ fixed})$. We denote by $Z_{t,l}$ the subspace of $W_{t,l}$ spanned by all possible vectors. $g_{\alpha,k} = \sigma_{ik} \eta_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k, \dots, i_{l-1}, t}$, where $1 \leq k \leq l-1$ and the summation is over those $\alpha = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{l-1}, t)$ in which $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{l-1}$ are fixed. Next we set $V_{t,l} = W_{t,l}/Z_{t,l}$. The images of the vectors η_α in the factor space $V_{t,l}$ are denoted by ϵ_α . Thus $V_{t,l}$ is a vector space over K spanned by the vectors ϵ_α for which $\sigma_{ik} \in i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k, \dots, i_{l-1}, t = 0 \forall k$.

By $E_{j,t}$ we denote the subspace of $V_{t,l}$ spanned by all vectors ϵ_α such that $\alpha = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{l-1}, t) = (j, i_2, \dots, i_{l-1}, t)$ where $i_1 = j$ is fixed. We define a representation $\rho_{t,l}$ in $V_{t,l}$ by setting $\rho_{t,l}(e_j) = E_{j,t}$.

Case 2: For $l=1$, $\rho_{0,1}$ is the representation in the one dimensional space $V \cong K^1$ such that $\rho_{0,1}(e_j)=0 \forall i=1,2,\dots,r$.

For $l \geq 1$, we define a set $A_0(r,l)$ in the following way, $A_0(r,l)=\alpha=(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{l-1}, 0): i_\lambda \in I=1,2,\dots,r, i_1 \neq i_2, i_2 \neq i_3, \dots, i_{l-2} \neq i_{l-1}$. Clearly $A_0(r,l) \neq A_0(r,l-1)$.

The representation $\rho_{0,l}$ is constructed on $A_0(r,l)$. The vector space over K with the basis η_α , where $\alpha \in A_0(r,l)$ is denoted by $W_{0,l}$. Further let $Z_{0,l}$ be the subspace of $W_{0,l}$ spanned by all possible vectors $g_{\alpha,k} = \sigma_{ik} \eta_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k, \dots, i_{l-1}, 0}$. We denote by $V_{0,l}$ the factor space $W_{0,l}/Z_{0,l}$ and by ϵ_α the image of η_α under the canonical map $W_{0,l} \rightarrow V_{0,l}$. The subspace of $V_{0,l}$ spanned by ϵ_α with $\alpha=(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{l-1}, 0)=(j, i_2, \dots, i_{l-1}, 0)$ is denoted by $E_{j,0}$. We define a representation $\rho_{0,l}$ in $V_{0,l}$ by setting $\rho_{0,l}(e_j)=E_{j,0}$. [3]

Definition: Admissible [5]

Let ρ be a representation of modular lattice L in a linear space V . A subspace U of V admissible relative to ρ if for any $x,y \in L$ one of the following conditions is satisfied.

1. $U(\rho(x)+\rho(y))=U\rho(x)+U\rho(y)$
2. $U+\rho(x)\rho(y)=(U+\rho(x))(U+\rho(y))$

[5]

Proposition 3.1.1

Let ρ be a representation of a lattice L in space V . Let U be a subspace of V and let $U''=V/U$ the factor space. Let $\theta:V \rightarrow U''$ be the canonical mapping. Then

the following conditions are equivalent.

1. The subspace U is admissible relative to ρ
2. The correspondence defines $x \rightarrow U\rho(x)$, a representation in U .
3. The correspondence defines $x \rightarrow \theta\rho(x)$ a representation in U'' . [5]

Proof: First we show that (i) \implies (ii).

Let U be an admissible subspace. Then $U\rho(x+y) = U(\rho(x)+\rho(y)) = U\rho(x) + U\rho(y)$

Moreover $U\rho(xy) = U\rho(x)\rho(y) = (U\rho(x) \cdot U\rho(y))$ Consequently the rule $x \rightarrow U\rho(x)$ defines a representation in U .

This representation is called admissible, it is also called the restriction of ρ to U and is denoted by ρ/U . In the similar way (ii) and (iii) can be proved. [5]

Proposition 3.1.2

A representation $\rho \in R(L, K)$, the set of finite dimensional representations of L over K in V is decomposable if and only if there exist nonzero subspaces U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n such that

$$V = U_1 \oplus U_2 \dots \oplus U_n \text{ and if } \forall x \in L,$$

$$\rho(x) = \sigma_{i=1}^n U_i \rho(x) \rightarrow (1) [6]$$

Proof The necessity of (1) is clear. To prove the sufficiency we show that every subspace U_i is admissible.

i.e, $U_j(\rho(x)+\rho(y)) = U_j\rho(x) + U_j\rho(y)$ for any $x, y \in L$ By (1), $\rho(x)+\rho(y) = \sigma_{i=1}^n U_i\rho(x) + \sigma_{i=1}^n U_i\rho(y)$

Using Dedekind's axiom we find;

$$U_j(\rho(x)+\rho(y))=[U_j(\sum_{i=1}^n U_i\rho(x))+U_j(\sum_{i=1}^n U_i\rho(y))] =U_j(U_j\rho(x)+U_j\rho(y))+\sum_{i \neq j} U_i(\rho(x)+\rho(y))$$

$$=U_j\rho(x)+U_j\rho(y)+\sum_{i \neq j} U_i(\rho(x)+\rho(y))$$
 Note that $\sum_{i \neq j} U_i(\rho(x)+\rho(y)) = \sum_{i \neq j} U_i\rho(x)+\sum_{i \neq j} U_i\rho(y)$

Consequently $U_j\rho(x)+\rho(y)=U_j\rho(x)+U_j\rho(y)$

This proves that every subspace U_j is admissible and means that the correspondence $x \mapsto U_j x$ defines a representation ρ_j in U_j . It is easy to check that $\rho_j = \rho|_{U_j}$; where ρ is over $i=1,2,\dots,n$ and also so that ρ is decomposable.

We now assume that $V=U_1 \oplus U_2 \dots \oplus U_n$ and that each of the subspaces U_i is admissible relative to ρ . The following example shows that we cannot in general assert that $\rho|_V$ is equal to the sum of its restriction $\rho|_{U_j}$. [6]

Proposition 3.1.3 [5]

Let $\nu^+(l) \in B^+(l)$ and $\nu^+(m) \in B^+(l)$. If $l < m$ then $\nu^+(l) \supseteq \nu^+(m)$. Similarly if $l < m$ then $\nu^-(l) \subseteq \nu^-(m)$ where $\nu^-(i) \in B^-(i)$. To prove this we need two lemma

Lemma 1 [5]

Let $\alpha = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l) \in A(r, l)$ for $l \leq 2$. We write

$\pi(\alpha) = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l - 1)$. Then the element e_α and $e_{\pi\alpha}$ of D_r can be ordered as

follows $e_{\pi\alpha} \supseteq e_\alpha$.

Proof: The proof is by induction on l [5].

Let $l=2$ i.e; $\alpha=(i_1, i_2)$. Then the elements $e_\alpha = e_{i_1 i_2} = e_{i_1} e_{i_2}$ and $e_{\pi\alpha} = e_{i_1}$.

Clearly $e_\alpha \supseteq e_{\pi\alpha}$.

Suppose that the lemma has been proved for every $\lambda \in A(r, \lambda)$ with $\lambda < l$. We prove it for $\alpha = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$.

By definition $e\alpha = e_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l} = \sum_{\beta \in \tau(\alpha)} e\beta$; where $\tau(\alpha) = \beta = (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{l-1}) \in A(r, l-1) / k_1 \notin i_1, i_2, k_2 \notin i_2, i_3, \dots, k_{l-1} \notin i_{l-1}, i_l$

Similarly $e\pi(\alpha) = e_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l} = \sum_{\beta \in \tau(\pi(\alpha))} e\beta$; where $\tau(\pi(\alpha)) = \beta' = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{l-2}) \in A(r, l-2) / m_1 \notin i_1, i_2, m_2 \notin i_2, i_3, \dots, m_{l-2} \notin i_{l-2}, i_{l-1}$

Clearly for any $\beta = (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{l-1}) \in \tau(\pi(\alpha))$ we can find an element $\beta' \in \tau(\pi(\alpha))$ such that $\beta' = \pi(\beta) = (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{l-2})$.

By induction on such and $\beta' = \pi(\beta)$ we have $e\beta \subseteq e\pi(\beta)$.

Consequently $\sum_{\beta \in \tau(\alpha)} e\beta \subseteq \sum_{\beta' \in \tau(\pi(\alpha))} e\beta'$ Hence $e\alpha \subseteq e\pi(\alpha)$. [5]

Lemma 2_[5]

Let $ht(l-1) \in B_+(l-1)$ for $l > 1$ and $t \in 1$. Then $e\alpha \subseteq ht(l-1)$ for every $\alpha \in A(r, l)$.

Proof of proposition:_[5]

The maximal element of $B_+(l)$ is $\bigvee_{i \in 1} e_i(l) = \sum_{\alpha \in A(r, l)} e\alpha$ and the minimal element of $B_+(l-1)$ is $\bigvee_{\theta, l-1} = \bigcap_{t \in 1} ht$. It is clear from lemma 2 that for any $\alpha \in A(r, l), \bigcap_{t \in 1} ht(l-1) \supseteq e\alpha$

Therefore $\bigvee_{i, l-1} = \bigcap_{t \in 1} ht(l-1) \supseteq \sum_{\alpha \in A(r, l)} e\alpha = \bigvee_{i, l}$.

Now if $\nu_+(l-1)$ and $\nu_-(l-1)$ are arbitrary elements of $B_+(l-1)$ and $B_-(l)$ respectively then, $\nu_+(l-1) \supseteq \bigvee_{\theta, l-1} \supseteq \nu_+(l)$.

The corresponding statements for the cubicles $B_-(l)$ and $B_-(m)$ is obtained by duality.

We denote by B_+ the subset of D_r that is the union of the $B_+(l)$, $l = 1, 2, \dots$. Similarly $B_- = \bigcup_{l=1} B_-(l)$.

Hence the proposition.

Chapter 4

Cubicles

In this section we deal with the representation of the modular lattice D_r with r generators e_1, e_2, \dots, e_r . It is dealt with the construction of the sublattice B of D_r whose elements all are perfect. Here the lattice D_r is the r -dimensional lattice with countably many elements.

section 4.1.

Constructions

We construct sublattices $B_+(l)$ and $B_-(l)$ each consisting of 2^r perfect elements. We call $B_+(l)$, the l th upper cubicle and $B_-(l)$, the l th lower cubicle. [4]

To define the upper cubicle $B_+(1)$ we set $h_t(1) = \sum_{j \neq t} e_j$. Then the upper cubicle $B_+(1)$ is the sublattice of D_r generated by the elements $h_1(1), h_2(1), \dots, h_r(1)$. Thus $B_+(1)$ is isomorphic to the lattice of vertices of an r -dimensional cube with the

natural ordering. The element $h_i(1)$ corresponds to the point $(1, 1, \dots, 1, 0, 1, \dots, 1, 1)$ with 0 in i th place. Now we construct the lattice $B_+(1)$ with $l \geq 1$ from certain important polynomials e_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l} . Now we proceed to define these polynomials. Let $l \leq r$ and $I = \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. We denote by $A(r, l)$ the set whose elements are sequence of integers $\alpha = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$ with $i \in I$ such that $i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < \dots < i_{l-1} < i_l$. In particular $A(r, 1) = I$.

For fixed $\alpha \in A(r, l)$ we construct a set $\psi(\alpha)$ consisting of elements $\beta \in A(r, l-1)$ in the following way ; $\psi(\alpha) = \{\beta = (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{l-1}) \in A(r, l-1) \mid k_1 \notin \{i_1, i_2\}, k_2 \notin \{i_2, i_3\}, \dots, k_{l-1} \notin \{i_{l-1}, i_l\}\}$. Note that $k_1 \notin \{i_1, i_2\}, k_2 \notin \{i_2, i_3\}, \dots, k_{l-1} \notin \{i_{l-1}, i_l\}$ because $\beta \in A(r, l-1)$. With each $\alpha \in A(r, l)$ we now associate an element $e_\alpha \in D_r$ by the following rule; Let $l=1$ and $\alpha = (i_1)$ we set $e_\alpha = e_{i_1}$

For $l=2$ and $\alpha = (i_1, i_2)$ with $i_1 < i_2$ we set $e_\alpha = e_{i_1} e_{i_2} = e_{i_1} \sum_{\beta \in \psi(\alpha)} e_\beta = \sum_{j \neq i_1, i_2} e_j$.

In general for arbitrary l and $\alpha \in A(r, l)$ we set by induction $e_\alpha = e_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l} = e_{i_1} \sum_{\beta \in \psi(\alpha)} e_\beta$ Now we introduce the elements $h_t(l)$. We denote by $At(r, l)$ the subset of $A(r, l)$ consisting of all $\alpha = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{l-1}, t)$ whose last index is fixed and equal to 't'.

We set $e_t(l) = \sum_{\alpha \in At(r, l)} e_\alpha$ and $h_t(l) = \sum_{j \neq t} e_j(l)$.

Thus we define the sublattice of D_r generated by the elements $h_1(l), h_2(l), \dots, h_r(l)$ as follows.

Definition: The subsets of D_r generated by $h_1(l), h_2(l), \dots, h_r(l)$ is called the l th upper cubicle $B_+(l)$. The collection of elements of all of the cubicles $B_+(l)$ is also a lattice which is denoted by B_+ . We denote by $B_-(l)$ the sublattice

of Dr dual to $B_+(l)$. The sublattice $B_+(l)$ is called the l th lower cubicle. [4]

Atomic representation and their connection with representation of $B_+(l)$ [5]

We define the most trivial among the indecomposable representation of Dr the atomic representations of Dr the atomic representation for $\rho_{j,1}$ for $j \in 1, 2, \dots, r$.

a. The representation $\rho_{0,1}$ in the one dimensional space $V \cong K1$ is defined by $\rho_{0,1}(e_i) = 0 \forall i \in 1, 2, \dots, r$. It follows that $\rho_{0,1}(x) = 0 \forall x \in Dr$.

b. The representation $\rho_{t,1}$ for $t \in 1, 2, \dots, r$ in $V \cong K1$ is defined by $\rho_{t,1}(e_i) = 0$ for $t \neq j$ and $\rho_{t,1}(e_t) = V$.

We have $B_+(l)$ is a Boolean Algebra with minimal element $V_{\theta,1} = \bigcap_{t \in l} ht(1)$. Now we prove that $V_{\theta,1}$ is perfect that is the restriction of ρ to $\rho(V_{\theta,1})$ is a direct summand of ρ . We denote $\rho(V_{\theta,1})$ by $V_{\theta,1}$.

Proposition 4.1.1 [6]

Let ρ be a representation of Dr in a space V over K and let $V_{\theta,1}$ be the $\rho = (\bigoplus_{j \in U_0} \rho_{j,1}) \oplus \tau_{\theta,1}$ where $\tau_{\theta,1}$ is the restriction of ρ to the subspace $V_{\theta,1} = \rho(V_{\theta,1})$ and each $\rho_{j,1}$ is a multiple of the atomic representation $\rho_{j,1}$. i.e; $\rho_{j,1} = \rho_{j,1} \oplus \rho_{j,1} \oplus \dots \oplus_{j,1} (m_j \text{ times})$ where $m_j \geq 0$.

Proof: [6]

We choose U_j such that $V = (\bigoplus_{j \in U_0} U_j) \oplus V_{\theta,1}$ where $U_0 = \bigcup_{j=0,1,\dots,r}$ and ρ decomposes into a direct sum relative to these subspaces.

We claim that U_j can be chosen as subspaces satisfying the following relations

$$U_0 \sum_{i=1}^r \rho(e_i) = 0, U_0 + \sum_{i=1}^r \rho(e_i) = v \rightarrow (1)$$

And for any $j \neq 0$, $j \in$

$$U_j \rho(h_j) = 0, U_{j+} \rho(e_j h_j) = \rho(e_j); \text{ where } h_j = h_j() = \sum_{t \neq j} e_t \rightarrow (2)$$

Step 1

Any element of $B_+(1)$ can be written in the form;

$$V_{a,l} = \sum_{i \in a} e_i + \sum_{j \in a'} e_j h_j \rightarrow (3) \text{ where; } a \text{ is a subset of } = 1, 2, \dots, r \text{ and } a' = -a.$$

We write $V_{a,l} = \rho(V_{a,l})$ and claim that if in V subspaces U_j , $j=0, 1, \dots, r$ are chosen to satisfy (1) (2) then for any $a \subseteq$, $V_{a,l} = \sum_{j \in a} U_j + V_{\theta,l} \rightarrow (4)$

We prove (4) first for the case of one element subsets $a = t$, $t \in 1, 2, \dots, r$. i.e; prove that $V_{t,l} = U_t + V_{\theta,l} \rightarrow (5)$ Let $\rho(e_i) = E_i$ and $\rho(h_i) = H_i$

$$\text{Then from (3) } V_{t,l} = \sum_{i \neq t} E_i H_i + V_{\theta,l} = \sum_{i=1}^r E_i H_i.$$

This proves (4). Then we find that $U_t + V_{\theta,l} = U_t + \sum_{i=1}^r E_i H_i = U_t + E_t H_t + \sum_{i \neq t} E_i H_i$

$$\text{From (2) } U_t + E_t H_t = E_t, \text{ consequently } U_t + V_{\theta,l} = U_t + \sum_{i \neq t} E_i H_i = V_{t,l}$$

This proves (5)

We have $B_+(1)$ is a Boolean Algebra and that $V_{a \cup b,l} = V_{a,l} + V_{b,l}$ for any subset $a, b \subseteq$. In particular $V_{a,l} = \sum_{t \in a} V_{t,l}$.

Thus every subspace $\rho(V_{a,l}) = V_{a,l}$ can be represented as a sum $V_{a,l} = \sum_{t \in a} V_{t,l}$.

Putting $V_{t,l} = U_t + V_{\theta,l}$ in this we obtain

$$V_{a,l} = \sum_{t \in a} (U_t + V_{\theta,l}) = \sum_{t \in a} U_t + V_{\theta,l}.$$

This proves (4).

Step 2

We show that our chosen subspaces U_j are such that

$$V \cong V_{\theta, l} \oplus U_0 \oplus U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U_r.$$

We write $U_t = U_{t+1, r}$ and $W_t = V_{at, l} = \rho(V_{at})$

$$W_t = \sum_{i=1}^t E_i H_i + \sum_{j=t+1}^r E_j$$

It follows easily from the relations $E_i H_i \subseteq E_i$ that the subspaces $W_t, t \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ form a chain, $W_r \subseteq W_{r-1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq W_2 \subseteq W_1 \subseteq W_0 \subseteq V$, where $W_r = \sum_{i=1}^r E_i H_i = V_{\theta, l}$, $W_0 = \sum_{i=1}^r E_i = V_{l, l}$.

We claim that $U_j, j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, r\}$ subject to (1) and (2) are connected with the W_j by the following equations,

$$W_0 + U_0 = V \text{ and } W_0 U_0 = 0 \rightarrow (6)$$

$$\text{And for every } t \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}, W_t + U_t = W_{t-1} \rightarrow (7)$$

$$U_t W_t = 0 \rightarrow (8)$$

Note that (6) is the same as (1) because $W_0 = \sum_{i=1}^r E_i + \sum_{i=1}^r \rho(E_i)$

We have proved earlier that $V_{a, l} = \sum_{i \in a} U_i + V_{\theta, l}, \forall a \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$.

Consequently $W_t = V_{at, l} = \sum_{j=t+1}^r U_j + V_{\theta, l} = \sum_{j=t+1}^r U_j + W_r$

Now (7) evidently follows from this equation. Note that

$$W_t = \sum_{i=1}^t E_i H_i + \sum_{j=t+1}^r E_j \subseteq E_t H_t + \sum_{j \neq t} E_j = E_t H_t + H_t = H_t.$$

From this, using (2) ($U_t H_t = 0$) we obtain $U_t W_t \subseteq H_t U_t = 0$. i.e; $U_t W_t = 0$.

This proves (8).

It follows easily from (6) - (8) that $V = \sum_{t=0}^r U_t + W_t = \sum_{t=0}^r U_t + V_{\theta, l}$ and that this sum is direct.

Step 3

We claim that for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$, $E_i = \sum_{j=0}^i U_j + E_i V_{\theta, l} \rightarrow (9)$

To prove this we first show that $E_j U_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$ and $E_i U_i = U_i$.

For by construction $U_0 \sum_{i=1}^r E_i = 0$ and $U_j H_j = U_j \sum_{i \neq j} E_i = 0$, $U_i + E_i H_i = E_i$.

Consequently, $\forall i \neq 0$ we have

1. $U_0 E_i = 0$
2. $U_j E_i = 0$, for $i \neq 0, j \neq 1$
3. $E_i U_i = U_i$

Thus we can rewrite the right hand side of (9) in the following form;

$$\sum_{i=1}^r E_i U_j + E_i V_{\theta, l}$$

Let us find $E_i V_{\theta, l}$

By definition $V_{\theta, l} = \rho(V_{\theta, l}) = \rho(\cap_{j=1}^r h_j) = \cap_{j=1}^r H_j$ Where $H_j = \sum_{t \neq j} E_t$. Hence $E_i H_j = E_i$, where $i \neq j$ and therefore

$$E_i V_{\theta, l} = E_i \cap_{j=1}^r H_j = \cap_{j=1}^r E_i H_j = E_i H_i$$
 which is true by construction (2).

This proves (9).

Step 4

We combine the results of steps 2 and 3 we have proved that $V = \sum_{i=1}^r U_i + V_{\theta, l}$ and that this sum is direct. Further we have proved that every subspace $E_i (c = \rho(E_i))$ is represented as sum, $E_i = \sum_{j=0}^r E_i U_j + E_i V_{\theta, l}$. ρ splits into the direct sum

$$\rho = (\oplus_{j \in 0} \rho_{j, l}) \oplus \tau_{\theta, l} \quad \text{where } \rho_{j, l} = \rho_{U_j} \text{ and } \tau_{\theta, l} = \rho_{V_{\theta, l}}$$

Step 5

We claim that $\rho_{j, l}$ is a multiple of the atomic representation $\rho_{j, l}$.

$$\text{i.e.; } \rho_{j, l} = \rho_{j, l} \oplus \rho_{j, l} \oplus \dots \oplus \rho_{j, l}$$

First we study the representation $\rho_{0,l}$. The subspace U_0 is admissible, therefore $\rho_{0,l}(e_i)$. We have proved that $U_0 e_i = 0 \forall i$. Thus the sub representation $\rho_{0,l}$ in U_0 is such that $\rho_{0,l}(e_i) = 0 \forall i$.

If $\dim U_0 = m_0 > 0$, then $\rho_{0,l}$ is different from zero and clearly splits into the direct sum $\rho_{0,l} = \rho_{0,l} \oplus \rho_{0,l} \oplus \dots \oplus \rho_{0,l}$ of atomic representation $\rho_{0,l}$.

Similarly for the $\rho_{j,l}$, with $j \neq 0$, we obtain

$$\rho_{j,l}(e_i) = U_j \rho(e_i) = E_i U_j = 0, \text{ if } i \neq j = U_j, \text{ if } i = j$$

If $\dim U_j = m_j > 0$ then it is easy to see that $\rho_{j,l}$ splits into a direct sum of atomic representations $\rho_{j,l} = \rho_{j,l} \oplus \rho_{j,l} \oplus \dots \oplus \rho_{j,l}$. [5]

Lemma 4.1.1 [3]

Let L be an arbitrary modular lattice and e_1, \dots, e_r a finite set of elements of L . Then the sublattice B generated by the elements $h_j = \bigwedge_{i \neq j} e_i$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ is a Boolean Algebra.

Proof: Let C be a non empty subset of $I = \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. We claim that the following identity holds in L ; $\bigcap_{i \in C} h_i = \sum_{i \in C} e_i h_i + \sum_{k \in (I-C)} e_k \rightarrow (1)$

If C consists of a single element $C = \{j\}$ then (1) takes the form $h_j = e_j h_j + \sum_{k \neq j} e_k \rightarrow (2)$

By definition $\sum_{k \neq j} e_k = h_j$. Thus in the case $C = \{j\}$ we must prove that $h_j = e_j h_j + C_1$ which is obviously true.

Suppose that (1) is proved for every subset C of m elements ($m < r$). Now we show that (1) holds for every subset C_1 containing C and consisting of $m+1$ elements.

Suppose for example that $C_1 = C \cup s$ where $s \notin C$.

Then; $\cap_{j \in C1} h_j = h_s(\cap_{j \in C} h_j)$

$$= \sum_{t \neq s} e_t (\sum_{i \in C} e_i h_i + \sum_{k \in (I-C)} e_k) = \sum_{t \in s} e_t (\sum_{i \in C} e_i h_i + \sum_{k \in (I-C1)} e_k + e_s)$$

It follows from $s \notin C$ that; $\sum_{t \neq s} e_t \supseteq \sum_{i \in C} e_i \supseteq \sum_{i \in C} e_i h_i$ and

$$\sum_{t \neq s} e_t \supseteq \sum_{k \in (I-C)} e_k$$

Then by Dedekind's axiom

$$\cap_{j \in C1} h_j = \sum_{i \in C} e_i h_i + \sum_{k \in (I-C)} e_k + (\sum_{t \neq s} e_t) e_s$$

$$= \sum_{i \in C} e_i h_i + \sum_{k \in (I-C)} e_k + e_s h_s = \sum_{i \in C} e_i h_i + \sum_{k \in (I-C)} e_k$$

We have denoted by B the sublattice of L generated by the elements $h_j = \sum_{t \neq j} e_t$ et. We claim that every element $v \in B$ can be written in the form $v = \sum_{i \in a} e_i + \sum_{j \in a'} e_j h_j$ where $a \subseteq I$ and $a' = I - a$.

Note that in the case $v = h_j$ we have proved in (2) that $h_j = \sum_{i \in I-a} e_i + e_j h_j$ Now let v_1, v_2 be two elements of L such that; $v_q = \sum_{i \in a_q} e_i + \sum_{j \in a'_q} e_j h_j$ ($q=1,2$)

It easily follows from the identity $e_i h_i = e_i$ that $v_1 + v_2 = \sum_{i \in (a_1 \cup a_2)} e_i + \sum_{j \in (a'_1 \cup a'_2)} e_j h_j$

Applying (1) we can write in the case $a \neq I$;

$$\sum_{i \in a} e_i + \sum_{j \in a'} e_j h_j = \cap_{j \in a} h_j$$

In accordance with this identity, in case $a \neq I$ we have;

$$v_1 v_2 = (\cap_{i \in a_1} h_i) (\cap_{i \in a_2} h_i) = \cap_{i \in (a_1' \cup a_2')} h_i$$

Since we have $a_1' \cup a_2' = (a_1 \cap a_2)'$ we have;

$$v_1 v_2 = \cap_{i \in (a_1 \cap a_2)'} h_i = \sum_{i \in (a_1 \cap a_2)} e_i + \sum_{j \in (a_1 \cap a_2)'} e_j h_j$$

It remains true when $a_1 = I$ or $a_2 = I$. We proved that every element $v \in B$ can be written in the form $v = \sum_{i \in a} e_i + \sum_{j \in a'} e_j h_j$.

We denote such an element by v_a . The set of all subsets of $I = \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ is

denoted by $B(I)$. We know that $B(I)$ is a Boolean algebra with 2^r elements. We have proved that $\nu a + \nu b = \nu a \cup \nu b$ and $\nu a \cdot \nu b = \nu a \cap \nu b$ for an $a, b \in B(I)$. This shows that the correspondence $a \rightarrow \nu a$ is a morphism of $B(I)$ onto B .

Hence B is a Boolean algebra with 2^m elements where $m \leq r$. [3]

Corollary 4.1.2_[3]

Each sublattice $B^{+(1)}, B^{+(1)} ; l = 1, 2, \dots$ of D_r is a Boolean algebra.

CONCLUSION

This paper presented the very basic concept about lattices and modular lattices especially the representation of modular lattice D_n . The fundamental concepts, properties and propositions about lattices were discussed thoroughly. The different kinds of lattices with examples and its properties were taken in particular in first chapter. Modular lattice and its characterisation is considered in the second chapter. Representation of modular lattices are considered and defined in the third chapter. Finally the sublattices of modular lattice named cubicles were introduced and hence the upper cubicle and the lower cubicle were defined. The construction of sublattices $B_+(1)$ and $B_-(1)$ were discussed more clearly through the fourth chapter.

Apart from this, the theory of posets and lattices has many practical application in distributed computing. We believe that the future will bring even more applications of the theory of order to distributed computing. For example, the concepts of Mobious function, Zeta polynomial and Generating functions in a posets or modular lattices,geometric lattices etc.

Bibliography

- [1] G.Birkhoff.Lattice theory.Providence,R.I.,1967,third edition.
- [2] R.P.Dilworth.A decomposition theorem for partially ordered sets.Ann.Math.51,pages 161-166,1950
- [3] B.A.Davey and H.A.Priestley.Introduction to lattices and order.Cambridge university press,Cambridge,UK,1990
- [4] E.Egervary.On combinatorial properties of matrices.Mat.Lapok,38:16-28,1931
- [5] C.J.Fidge.Partial orders for parallel debugging.Proc.of the ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS.Workshop on parallel and Distributed Debugging,(ACM SIGPLAN Notices),24(1):183-194,January 1989.
- [6] V.K.Garg.Principles of Distributed systems.Kluwer Academic Publishers,Boston,MA,1996