

THE REPRESENTATION OF LATTICES BY MODULES

BY GEORGE HUTCHINSON

Communicated by Saunders Mac Lane, August 8, 1972

1. A quasivariety characterization of lattices representable by Λ -modules.

If Λ is a nontrivial ring with 1, a lattice L is “representable by Λ -modules” if it can be embedded in the lattice of submodules of some unitary left Λ -module M . This lattice of submodules is denoted $\Gamma(M; \Lambda)$.

A (lattice) “Horn formula” is an open formula:

$$(e_1 = e_2 \ \& \ e_3 = e_4 \ \& \ \dots \ \& \ e_{n-3} = e_{n-2}) \Rightarrow e_{n-1} = e_n,$$

where e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n are lattice polynomials.

MAIN THEOREM. *For every commutative ring Λ , there exists a set $J(\Lambda)$ of Horn formulas such that a lattice L is representable by Λ -modules if and only if every formula of $J(\Lambda)$ is satisfied in L . Each member of $J(\Lambda)$ is constructible by a finite sequence of four basic operations.*

That is, the class $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$ of lattices representable by Λ -modules is the “quasivariety” of lattices satisfying $J(\Lambda)$, for commutative Λ .

OUTLINE OF PROOF. For Λ commutative, let $\iota: L \rightarrow \Gamma(M; \Lambda)$ be an embedding for some M . Without loss of generality, assume that L has a smallest element ω , and $\iota(\omega) = 0$. Motivated by the “abelian” lattice $\Gamma_f(G^N)$ of [2, 4.2] with $G = M$, we consider “constraint systems” in variables a_k (corresponding to coordinate positions in M^N) and “auxiliary” variables b_k (with existential quantifiers understood) for k in $N = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. Consider $r = (d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ below.

$$(d_1) \quad a_1 \in x_1, \quad a_2 \in x_2, \quad a_k \in \omega \quad \text{for } k \geq 3 \ (x_1, x_2 \in L).$$

$$(d_2) \quad b_1 \in x_3, \quad b_2 \in x_1, \quad b_k \in \omega \quad \text{for } k \geq 3 \ (x_3 \in L).$$

$$(d_3) \quad a_1 - a_2 - b_1 = 0.$$

$$(d_4) \quad a_1 - \lambda_0 b_2 = 0 \quad (\lambda_0 \in \Lambda).$$

A “solution” $f: N \rightarrow M$ of r satisfies

$$(e_1) \quad f(1) \in \iota(x_1), \quad f(2) \in \iota(x_2), \quad f(k) \in \iota(\omega) = 0 \quad \text{for } k \geq 3 \ (d_1).$$

$$(e_2) \quad f(1) - f(2) \in \iota(x_3) \quad (d_3, b_1 \in x_3).$$

$$(e_3) \quad \text{There exists } v \in \iota(x_1) \text{ such that } \lambda_0 v = f(1) \ (d_4, b_2 \in x_1).$$

Formally, let $N_1 = \{a_k : k \in N\}$, let $N_2 = N_1 \cup \{b_k : k \in N\}$, and let M_1^∞ and M_2^∞ be the Λ -modules of all functions $N_1 \rightarrow M$ and $N_2 \rightarrow M$, respectively. Let a “ Λ -equation” be a function $g : N_2 \rightarrow \Lambda$ such that $g(a_k) = g(b_k) = 0$ except for finitely many k in N ; g determines the “linear solution set” g^* in $\Gamma(M_2^\infty; \Lambda)$:

$$g^* = \left\{ m \in M_2^\infty : \sum_{k=1}^\infty (g(a_k)m(a_k) + g(b_k)m(b_k)) = 0 \right\}.$$

A “constraint function” is a function $\alpha : N_2 \rightarrow L$ such that $\alpha(a_k) = \alpha(b_k) = \omega$ except for finitely many k ; it determines a “box” $\iota_*(\alpha)$ in $\Gamma(M_2^\infty; \Lambda)$:

$$\iota_*(\alpha) = \{ m \in M_2^\infty : m(c_k) \in \iota\alpha(c_k) \text{ for } c_k \in N_2 \}.$$

If α is a constraint function and $G = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n\}$ is a finite (possibly empty) set of Λ -equations, the pair (G, α) is a “constraint system”. An “extended solution” $m : N_2 \rightarrow M$ of (G, α) is a member of

$$\mu_0(G, \alpha) = \iota_*(\alpha) \cap g_1^* \cap g_2^* \cap \dots \cap g_n^* \text{ in } \Gamma(M_2^\infty; \Lambda).$$

A “solution” $m' : N_1 \rightarrow M$ of (G, α) is a restriction $m' = m|_{N_1}$ of an extended solution m . Let $D(L; \Lambda)$ denote the set of all constraint systems. Given M and ι , define $\mu : D(L; \Lambda) \rightarrow \Gamma(M_1^\infty; \Lambda)$ by the “solution set” $\mu(G, \alpha) = \{m|_{N_1} : m \in \mu_0(G, \alpha)\}$. Since $\iota(\omega) = 0$, $\mu(G, \alpha)$ has “finite support” as in [2, p. 181].

Now, $D(L; \Lambda)$ can be defined for any lattice L , not just those in $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$. Meet and join operations, corresponding to solution set intersection and sum, can be defined abstractly in $D(L; \Lambda)$. We can also define “equivalence” of constraint systems, obtaining a congruence $E(L; \Lambda)$ on $D(L; \Lambda)$. If an embedding $\iota : L \rightarrow \Gamma(M; \Lambda)$ with $\iota(\omega) = 0$ exists, the corresponding $\mu : D(L; \Lambda) \rightarrow \Gamma(M_1^\infty; \Lambda)$ preserves meet and join and takes equivalent constraint systems modulo $E(L; \Lambda)$ into the same solution set. Seven “rules of equivalence” generate $E(L; \Lambda)$; we reconsider $r = (d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ to suggest them:

Constraint decrease: The lattice constraint of a_1 can be changed to $x_1 \wedge (x_2 \vee x_3)$, since d_3 can be solved for $a_1, a_1 = a_2 + b_1$, and $a_2 + b_1$ is in $x_2 \vee x_3$. *Linear combination augmentation:* Any Λ -equation of the form $\lambda d_3 + \lambda' d_4$ can be added to r . *Defined variable augmentation:* We can “define” an unused auxiliary variable, say b_4 , by adding a Λ -equation, say $\lambda a_2 + \lambda' b_2 + b_4 = 0$, if we change the lattice constraint of b_4 to $x_2 \vee x_1$ ($-\lambda a_2 - \lambda' b_2$ is in $x_2 \vee x_1$). *Union augmentation:* Add the Λ -equation $a_2 - b_7 - b_9 = 0$, for example, expressing a variable a_2 as a sum of two unused auxiliary variables. Then change the lattice constraints of b_7 and b_9 to some x_4 and x_5 in L , respectively, such that $x_2 \subset x_4 \vee x_5$ ($a_2 \in x_2$). *Null variable augmentation:* Terms λa_5 and $\lambda' a_5$

can be added to the Λ -equations d_3 and d_4 , respectively, since $a_5 \in \omega$ and $\iota(\omega) = 0$. *Inessential variables augmentation*: We can add finitely many Λ -equations in the variables b_k , $k \geq 3$, and make finitely many arbitrary changes in the lattice constraints of those variables. *Renumbering*: b_1 and b_2 can be replaced throughout r by any two other auxiliary variables.

The solution set of r is unchanged by any of the above modifications. The primary fact about $M(L; \Lambda) = D(L; \Lambda)/E(L; \Lambda)$ is that it is an abelian lattice under the induced meet and join. Intuitively, $M(L; \Lambda)$ acts like the lattice of submodules with finite support of M^N , for some hypothetical Λ -module M .

Associated with any abelian lattice X is a small abelian category A_X [2, Main Theorem]. We next construct for each object A of $A_{M(L; \Lambda)}$ a ring homomorphism ζ_A preserving 1 from Λ into the ring of endomorphisms of A ($\zeta_A(\lambda)$ is a formal analogue of $\lambda 1_A$). Let \mathbf{Ab} and $\Lambda\text{-Mod}$ be the usual categories of abelian groups and of Λ -modules, respectively. By [1, Theorem 7.14], there exists an exact embedding functor $F: A_{M(L; \Lambda)} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$. Defining $\lambda x = (F(\zeta_A(\lambda)))(x)$ makes $F(A)$ into a Λ -module, denoted $G(A)$ ($F\zeta_A(\lambda) = \lambda 1_{G(A)}$). We can prove that $\zeta_B(\lambda)f = f\zeta_A(\lambda)$ for $f: A \rightarrow B$ in $A_{M(L; \Lambda)}$, so $Ff: G(A) \rightarrow G(B)$ is Λ -linear. But then $G(A)$ and $Gf = Ff$ define an exact embedding functor $G: A_{M(L; \Lambda)} \rightarrow \Lambda\text{-Mod}$. Because of G , the lattice of subobjects of each object of $A_{M(L; \Lambda)}$ is in $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$. But then every interval sublattice of $M(L; \Lambda)$ is in $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$ by [2, 3.24], and $M(L; \Lambda) \in \mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$ follows, using a direct limit of Λ -modules.

We now define a lattice homomorphism $\psi: L \rightarrow M(L; \Lambda)$, similar to ψ in [2, 4.3]. For x in L , $\psi(x)$ is the equivalence class in $M(L; \Lambda)$ of (\emptyset, θ_x) in $D(L; \Lambda)$ given by $\theta_x(a_1) = x$, $\theta_x(c_k) = \omega$ for $c_k \in N_2 - \{a_1\}$. If ψ is one-to-one, it embeds L into $M(L; \Lambda)$, and so L is in $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$. Suppose L is in $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$ with embedding $\iota: L \rightarrow \Gamma(M; \Lambda)$, $\iota(\omega) = 0$. Since equivalent constraint systems have equal solution sets, $\mu: D(L; \Lambda) \rightarrow \Gamma(M_1^\infty; \Lambda)$ induces a function $\bar{\mu}: M(L; \Lambda) \rightarrow \Gamma(M_1^\infty; \Lambda)$. Clearly $\bar{\mu}\psi(x) = \mu(\emptyset, \theta_x) = \bar{\psi}\iota(x)$, where $\bar{\psi}: \Gamma(M; \Lambda) \rightarrow \Gamma(M_1^\infty; \Lambda)$ is given by

$$\bar{\psi}(M') = \{m \in M_1^\infty : m(a_1) \in M', m(a_k) = 0 \text{ for } k > 1\}.$$

So, $\bar{\psi}\iota = \bar{\mu}\psi$. Since $\bar{\psi}\iota$ is one-to-one, so is ψ . Therefore, L is in $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$ if and only if ψ is one-to-one.

Four of the rules generating $E(L; \Lambda)$ are called “direct reductions”, namely constraint decrease, linear combination augmentation, defined variable augmentation and union augmentation. A key argument shows that ψ is one-to-one iff, for each x in L and sequence r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n in $D(L; \Lambda)$ such that $r_1 = (\emptyset, \theta_x)$, $r_n = (G, \alpha)$ and r_{i+1} is obtained by a direct reduction of r_i ($1 \leq i < n$), we have $\alpha(a_1) = x$. Each of the infinitely

many Horn formulas of $J(\Lambda)$ is generated by a finite sequence of four operations. These operations imitate the four rules of direct reduction, with lattice polynomials replacing elements of L . Using the above, we show that ψ is one-to-one iff every formula of $J(\Lambda)$ is satisfied in L , and the main theorem follows.

COROLLARY. *Every abelian lattice is representable by abelian groups.*

2. Comparison of classes of representable lattices. Let Λ and Λ' be rings with 1, not necessarily commutative. Then $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) \subset \mathcal{L}(\Lambda')$ if there exists a ring homomorphism $\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda'$ preserving 1, or if there exists a (Λ', Λ) -bimodule M which is faithfully flat as a right Λ -module. A simple change of rings argument proves the first result. For the other: the exact embedding functor $M \otimes_{\Lambda}$ from $\Lambda\text{-Mod}$ into $\Lambda'\text{-Mod}$ induces an embedding from the lattice of subobjects of any M_0 in $\Lambda\text{-Mod}$ into the lattice of subobjects of $M \otimes_{\Lambda} M_0$ in $\Lambda'\text{-Mod}$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{L}(\Lambda')$ if Λ is a regular ring and unitary subring of Λ' , by known ring theory. Let \mathcal{Q} denote the field of rationals and \mathbf{Z}_n the ring of integers modulo n , $n \geq 2$. So, $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Q})$ if Λ has a unitary subring isomorphic to \mathcal{Q} . Also, $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Z}_n)$ if Λ has characteristic n for n a square-free number (prime, or a product of distinct primes). Let P_{Λ} be the set of primes p such that $1 + 1 + \cdots + 1$ (p times) is invertible in Λ . If P is a set of primes, let $\mathcal{Q}(P)$ be the unitary subring of \mathcal{Q} generated by $\{p^{-1} : p \in P\}$. If Λ has characteristic zero, \mathfrak{a} is the two-sided ideal of torsion elements of Λ and $P_{\Lambda/\mathfrak{a}} = P_{\Lambda}$, then $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Q}(P_{\Lambda}))$. So, $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Q}(P_{\Lambda}))$ if Λ is torsion-free.

Some of the above results are the best possible. Under various hypotheses, $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) - \mathcal{L}(\Lambda') \neq \emptyset$ is proved by constructing a Horn formula satisfied in all lattices in $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda')$ but not in all lattices in $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$. These formulas reflect properties of the (additive) multiples $k \cdot 1_M = 1_M + 1_M + \cdots + 1_M$ for M an arbitrary Λ -module. For example, $k \cdot 1_M = 0$ if the characteristic of Λ divides k , and $k \cdot 1_M$ is an automorphism if $k \cdot 1$ is invertible in Λ . So, we can show that $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) - \mathcal{L}(\Lambda') \neq \emptyset$ if the characteristic of Λ does not divide the (nonzero) characteristic of Λ' , and therefore $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) \neq \mathcal{L}(\Lambda')$ if Λ and Λ' have different characteristics. If p is a prime invertible in Λ' but not in Λ , then $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) - \mathcal{L}(\Lambda') \neq \emptyset$, and so $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) \neq \mathcal{L}(\Lambda')$ if $P_{\Lambda} \neq P_{\Lambda'}$. If n is not square-free, then there exists Λ with characteristic n such that $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) \neq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Z}_n)$. Also, if Λ has characteristic zero and torsion ideal \mathfrak{a} , then $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) \neq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Q}(P_{\Lambda}))$ if $P_{\Lambda/\mathfrak{a}} \neq P_{\Lambda}$. If P is a proper subset of the primes or is empty, then Λ with characteristic zero exists such that $P_{\Lambda} = P$ but $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) \neq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{Q}(P))$.

The detailed proofs of these results have been submitted for publication.

C. Herrmann and W. Poguntke have recently communicated to the author a theorem which implies that $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$ admits ultraproducts, for

any ring Λ with 1. It then follows nonconstructively that $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$ is always a quasivariety, using the known result that a class of algebras admitting isomorphic images, subalgebras, products and ultraproducts is a quasivariety. Another of their results implies that $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$ is not finitely first-order axiomatizable if Λ is a unitary subring of \mathcal{Q} .

REFERENCES

1. P. J. Freyd, *Abelian categories: An introduction to the theory of functors*, Harper's Series in Modern Math., Harper & Row, New York, 1964. MR 29 #3517.
2. G. Hutchinson, *Modular lattices and abelian categories*. *J. Algebra* 19 (1971), 156–184. MR 43 #4880.

DIVISION OF COMPUTER RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY, NIH, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE, BETHESDA, MARYLAND 20014