Pacific Journal of Mathematics

ON SUBGROUPS OF A PSEUDO LATTICE ORDERED GROUP

J. Jakubík

Vol. 34, No. 1 May 1970

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 34, No. 1, 1970

ON SUBGROUPS OF A PSEUDO LATTICE ORDERED GROUP

J. JAKUBÍK

The purpose of this note is to investigate some problems raised in a recent paper of Conrad and Teller concerning o-ideals and p-subgroups in an abelian pseudo lattice ordered group.

The concept of a pseudo lattice ordered group ("p-group") has been introduced by Conrad [1]. In recent papers by Teller [5] and Conrad and Teller [2] there is developped a systematic theory of p-groups. Let G be an abelian p-group. In § 3 it is proved that if M is a subgroup of G such that $\{a, b\} \cap M \neq \emptyset$ for any pair of p-disjoint elements $a, b \in G$, then M contains a prime o-ideal; this generalizes a result from [2]. In § 4 we prove that the intersection of two p-subgroups of a p-group G need not be a p-subgroup of G. Moreover, if Δ is a partially ordered set and for each $\delta \in \Delta$ $H_\delta \neq \{0\}$ is a linearly ordered group, then for the mixed product $G = V(\Delta, H_\delta)$ the following conditions are equivalent: (i) for any two p-subgroups A, B of G their intersection $A \cap B$ is a p-subgroup of G as well; (ii) G is an l-group. If A is an o-ideal of a p-group G and B is a p-subgroup of G, then $A + B$ is a p-subgroup of G.

2. **Preliminaries.** Let G be a partially ordered group. G is a Riesz group (cf. Fuchs [3], [4]) if it is directed and if from a_i, $b_j \in G$, $a_i \leqq b_j$ $(i, j = 1, 2)$ it follows that there exists $c \in G$ satisfying $a_i \leqq c \leqq b_j$ $(i, j = 1, 2)$. G is a p-group (cf. [1] and [5]) if it is Riesz and if each $g \in G$ has a representation $g = a - b$ such that $a, b \in G$, $a \geqq 0$, $b \geqq 0$ and

$$(*) \qquad x \in G,\ x \leqq a,\ x \leqq b \Longrightarrow nx \leqq a,\ nx \leqq b$$

for any positive integer n.

Throughout the paper G denotes an abelian p-group. Elements $a, b \in G$, $a \geqq 0$, $b \geqq 0$ satisfying $(*)$ are called p-disjoint. A subgroup M of G is a p-subgroup, if for each $m \in M$ there are elements $a, b \in M$ such that a, b are p-disjoint in G and $m = a - b$. A subgroup C of G is an o-ideal, if it is directed and if $0 \leqq g \leqq c \in C$, $g \in G$ implies $g \in C$. Let $O(G)$ be the system of all o-ideals of G (partially ordered by the set inclusion). An o-ideal C of G is called prime, if G/C is a linearly ordered group. For any pair a, b of p-disjoint elements $H(a, b)$ denotes the subgroup of G generated by the set

$$\{0 \leqq m \in G \mid m \leqq a,\ m \leqq b\}.$$

Then $H(a, b) \in O(G)$ (cf. [2]).

Let Δ be a partially ordered set and let $H_\delta \neq \{0\}$ be a linearly ordered group for each $\delta \in \Delta$. Let $V = V(\Delta, H_\delta)$ be the set of all Δ-vectors $v = (\cdots, v_\delta, \cdots)$ where $v_\delta \in H_\delta$, for which the support $S(v) = \{\delta \in \Delta \mid v_\delta \neq 0\}$ contains no infinite ascending chain. An element $v \in V$, $v \neq 0$ is defined to be positive if $v_\delta > 0$ for each maximal element $\delta \in S(v)$. Then ([2], Th. 5.1) V is a p-group; V is an 1-group if and only if Δ is a root system (i.e., $\{\delta \in \Delta \mid \delta \geqq \gamma\}$ is a chain for each $\gamma \in \Delta$).

3. Subgroups containing a prime *o*-ideal. The following assertion has been proved in [2] (Proposition 4.3):

(A) For $M \in O(G)$, the following are equivalent: (1) M is prime; (2) the *o*-ideals of G that contain M form a chain; (3) if a and b are p-disjoint in G, then $a \in M$ or $b \in M$.

Further it is remarked in [2] that each subgroup M of G fulfilling (3) is a p-subgroup and any subgroup containing a prime *o*-ideal satisfies (3); then it is asked whether a subgroup M of a p-group G satisfies (3) if and only if it contains a prime *o*-ideal (a similar assertion is known to be valid for lattice ordered groups). We shall prove that the answer is positive.

We need the following propositions (cf. [2] and [5]):

(B) Let $g = a - b \in G$ where a and b be p-disjoint. Then $g = x - y$, where x and y are p-disjoint, if and only if $x = a + m$ and $y = b + m$ for some $m \in H(a, b)$.

(C) If a and b are p-disjoint, then na and nb are p-disjoint for any positive integer n and $H(a, b) = H(na, nb)$ ([2], Proposition 3.1).

LEMMA 1. *Let M be a subgroup of G fulfilling* (3) *and let a, b be p-disjoint elements in G. Then $H(a, b) \subset M$.*

Proof. Let $h \in H(a, b)$. According to (3) we may assume without loss of generality that $a \in M$. Suppose (by way of contradiction) that $h \notin M$. Then $a + h \notin M$, hence by (B) $b + h \in M$, and analogously $b - h \in M$, thus $2b \in M$. Further $2a + h \notin M$ and therefore according to (C) and (B) $2b + h \in M$, which implies $h \in M$.

LEMMA 2. *Let M be a subgroup of G satisfying* (3) *and let $X = \{X_i\}$ be the system of all o-ideals of G such that $X_i \subset M$. Then the system X has a largest element.*

Proof. Let Y be the subgroup of G generated by the set $\bigcup X_i$.

Then $Y \subset M$ and Y is the supremum of the system $\{X_i\}$ in the lattice $\mathscr{G}$ of all subgroups of G. Since $O(G)$ is a complete sublattice of $\mathscr{G}$ ([2], Th. 2.1), $Y \in O(G)$ and thus $Y \in X$.

Let H be the subgroup of G generated by the set $\bigcup H(a, b)$ where a, b runs over the system of all p-disjoint pairs of elements in G. Since each set $H(a, b)$ is an o-ideal ([2]), $H = \bigvee H(a, b)$ (a and b p-disjoint in G) where $\bigvee$ denotes the supremum in the lattice $O(G)$. According to Lemma 1 $H \subset M$ whenever the subgroup M of G satisfies (3).

For any $u, v \in G$, $u \leqq v$, the interval $[u, v]$ is the set

$$\{x \in G \;\; u \leqq x \leqq v\} .$$

LEMMA 3. *Let M be a subgroup of G satisfying* (3) *and let N be the largest o-ideal of G that is contained in M. Let $g \in G$, $g > 0$. Then*

$$[0, g] \subset M \Longrightarrow g \in N .$$

Proof. According to Lemma 2 the largest o-ideal N in M exists. Assume that $g \in G$, $g > 0$, $[0, g] \subset M$. The set

$$Z = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [-ng, ng]$$

is clearly an o-ideal in G. Let $z \in Z$, hence $z \in [-ng, ng]$ for a positive integer n. This implies $0 \leqq y \leqq 2ng$ where $y = z + ng$. Since G is a Riesz group, according to [3, p. 158, Th. 27] there are elements $g_1, \cdots, g_{2n} \in G$, $0 \leqq g_i \leqq g$ such that $y = g_1 + \cdots + g_{2n}$. Thus $g_i \in M$, therefore $y \in M$ and $Z \subset M$. Now we have $Z \subset N$ and so $g \in N$.

LEMMA 4. *Let M be a subgroup of G fulfilling* (3) *and let N be the largest o-ideal of G contained in M. Then G/N is a linearly ordered group.*

Proof. Assume (by way of contradiction) than G/N is not linearly ordered. According to Lemma 1 $H \subset N$, hence by [2], Theorem 4.1 G/N is a lattice ordered group. Thus there exist elements $X, Y \in G/N$ such that $X \wedge Y = \bar{0}$, $X > \bar{0}$, $Y > \bar{0}$ ($\bar{0}$ being the neutral element of G/N). From [2] (Proposition 2.2, (ii)) it follows that there are elements $x \in X$, $y \in Y$ such that x and y are p-disjoint in G and hence $x \in M$ or $y \in M$. Clearly $x \notin N$, $y \notin N$ and thus according to Lemma 3 there exist elements $x_1, y_1 \in G$ such that

$$0 < x_1 \leqq x, \; 0 < y_1 \leqq y, \; x_1 \notin M, \; y_1 \notin M .$$

Then in G/N we have $\overline{0} < x_1 + N \leqq x + N = X$, $\overline{0} < y_1 + N \leqq y + N = Y$, whence

$$(x_1 + N) \wedge (y_1 + N) = \overline{0}\,.$$

Thus by using repeateadly [2], Proposition 2.2, we can choose elements $x_2 \in x_1 + N$, $y_2 \in y_1 + N$ such that x_2 and y_2 are p-disjoint in G. Therefore (without loss of generality) we may assume $x_2 \in M$ and this implies $x_1 \in x_1 + N = x_2 + N \subset M$, a contradiction. The proof is complete.

THEOREM 1. *Let M be a subgroup of a p-group G. Then* $(3) \Rightarrow (2)$ *and the condition* (3) *is equivalent to* (1′) *M contains a prime o-ideal.*

Proof. According to Lemma 4 $(3) \Rightarrow (1')$. By [2] $(1') \Rightarrow (3)$. Assume that M is a subgroup of G fulfilling (3). Let K_1, K_2 be o-ideals of G such that $M \subset K_1 \cap K_2$. Let N have the same meaning as in Lemma 4. Since $N \subset M$,

$$K_1 \subset K_2 \Longleftrightarrow K_1/N \subset K_2/N\,.$$

K_1/N and K_2/N are o-ideals of G/N and G/N is linearly ordered, hence $K_1/N \subset K_2/N$ or $K_2/N \subset K_1/N$; therefore (2) holds.

If M is an o-ideal of G satisfying (3), then by Theorem 1 M contains a prime o-ideal N; according to [2] (Corollary 1 to the Induced Homomorphism Theorem) G/M is isomorphic to $(G/N)/(M/N)$ and hence (G/N being linearly ordered) G/M is a linearly ordered group and M is prime. Thus it follows from Theorem 1 that $(3) \Rightarrow (1)$ for $M \in O(G)$ (cf. (A)).

Let us remark that if M is a subgroup of G fulfilling (3) then M need not contain any nonzero o-ideal that is a lattice; further (3) is not implied by (2).

EXAMPLE 1. Let B be an infinite Boolean algebra that has no atoms and put $\Delta = \{b \in B \mid b \neq 0\}$. For each $\delta \in \Delta$ let $H_\delta = E$ where E is the additive group of all integers with the natural order, $G = V(\Delta, H_\delta)$. Let $M = \{v \in G \mid v_1 = 0\}$ (by 1 we denote the greatest element of B). Then M is a prime o-ideal of G, hence M satisfies (3) and M contains no lattice ordered o-ideal different from $\{0\}$.

EXAMPLE 2. Let $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\}$, where $\delta_1 < \delta_3$, $\delta_2 < \delta_3$ and δ_1, δ_2 are incomparable. Put $H_{\delta_i} = E (i = 1, 2, 3)$, $G = V(\Delta, H_\delta)$, $M = (v \in G \mid v_{\delta_1} = v_{\delta_2} = 0\}$. Then the only o-ideal that contains M is G, thus (2) holds. Let $a, b \in G$ such that $a_{\delta_1} = 1$, $a_{\delta_2} = a_{\delta_3} = 0$, $b_{\delta_2} = 1$, $b_{\delta_1} = b_{\delta_3} = 0$. The elements a and b are p-disjoint in G and $a \notin M$, $b \notin M$, hence M does not fulfil (3).

4. Intersections and sums of two p-subgroups. Another problem formulated in [2] is whether the intersection of two p-subgroups of a p-group G must be a p-subgroup of G; there is remarked in [2] that this conjecture seems rather dubious. The answer to this problem is negative.

EXAMPLE 3. Let $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\}$, where $\delta_1 > \delta_3$, $\delta_2 > \delta_3$ and δ_1, δ_2 are incomparable. Let $H_{\delta_i} = E (i = 1, 2, 3)$, $G = V(\Delta, H_\delta)$. We write $v(\delta_i)$ instead of v_{δ_i}. Let $c_i \neq 0$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be positive integers, $c_1 \neq c_2$. Denote

$$A_i = \{v \in G \mid v(\delta_3) = c_i[v(\delta_1) + v(\delta_2)]\}$$

$(i = 1, 2)$. Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$ be fixed. For proving that A_i is a p-subgroup of G we have to verify that to each $v \in A_i$ we can choose $a, b \in A_i$, $a \geqq 0$, $b \geqq 0$ such that $(*)$ holds and $v = a - b$. It is easy to verify that it suffices to consider the case when 0 and v are uncomparable, hence we may assume $v(\delta_1) > 0$, $v(\delta_2) < 0$ (the case $v(\delta_1) < 0$, $v(\delta_2) > 0$ being analogous). Let $a, b \in G$,

$$a(\delta_1) = v(\delta_1),\ a(\delta_2) = 0,\ a(\delta_3) = c_i a(\delta_1)\ ,$$
$$b(\delta_1) = 0,\ b(\delta_2) = -v(\delta_2),\ b(\delta_3) = -c_i v(\delta_2)\ .$$

Then a and b have the desired properties, hence A_i is a p-subgroup of G. Denote $C = A_1 \cap A_2$. If $v \in C$, we have

$$c_1[v(\delta_1) + v(\delta_2)] = v(\delta_3) = c_2[v(\delta_1) + v(\delta_2)]$$

and thus (since $c_1 \neq c_2$)$v(\delta_3) = 0$, $v(\delta_2) = -v(\delta_1)$. Therefore any element $v \in C$, $v \neq 0$ is incomparable with 0 and C is not a p-subgroup of G.

The method used in this example can be employed for proving the following theorem:

THEOREM 2. *Let Δ be a partially ordered set and for each $\delta \in \Delta$ let $H_\delta \neq \{0\}$ be a linearly ordered group, $V = V(\Delta, H_\delta)$. If V is not lattice ordered, then V contains infinitely many pairs of p-subgroups A_1, A_2 such that $A_1 \cap A_2$ is not a p-subgroup of V.*

Proof. Assume that V is not lattice ordered. Then Δ is no root system, hence there exist elements $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3$ such that $\delta_1 > \delta_3$, $\delta_2 > \delta_3$ and δ_1, δ_2 are incomparable. Choose $e_i \in H_{\delta_i}$, $e_i > 0$ and let c_1, c_2 be positive integers, $c_1 \neq c_2$. Let $V_1 = \{v \in V \mid v_\delta = 0$ for each $\delta \notin \{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\}\}$,

$$A_i = \{v \in V_1 \mid v(\delta_1) = n_1 e_1,\ v(\delta_2) = n_2 e_2,\ v(\delta_3) = c_i(n_1 + n_2)e_3\}$$

where n_1 and n_2 run over the set of all integers $(i = 1, 2)$. Analogously as in Example 3 we can verify that A_1 and A_2 are p-subgroups of V. Let $v \in C = A_1 \cap A_2$. Then $c_1(n_1 + n_2) = c_2(n_1 + n_2)$, thus $n_2 = -n_1$ and $v(\delta_3) = 0$. Therefore no element of C is strictly positive and C is no p-subgroup of G. Since the positive integers $c_1 \neq c_2$ are arbitrary there exist enfinitely many such pairs A_1, A_2.

As a corollary, we obtain:

PROPOSITION 1. *Let* $V = V(\Delta, H_\delta)$, *where each* H_δ *is linearly ordered. Then the following conditions are equivalent:* (i) V *is lattice ordered;* (ii) *if* A *and* B *are* p*-subgroups of* V, *then* $A \cap B$ *is a* p*-subgroup of* V *as well.*

Proof. By Theorem 2 (ii) implies (i). Let V be lattice ordered. Then a subgroup A of V is a p-subgroup of V if and only if it is an 1-subgroup of V; since the intersection of two 1-subgroups is an 1-subgroup, (ii) is valid.

PROPOSITION 2. *Let* Δ *be a partially ordered set and for any* $\delta \in \Delta$ *let* $H_\delta \neq \{0\}$ *be a linearly ordered group. Assume that there exist* $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 \in \Delta$ *such that* $\delta_1 < \delta_3$, $\delta_2 < \delta_3$ *and* δ_1, δ_2 *are incomparable,* $V = V(\Delta, H_\delta)$. *Then there are infinitely many* p*-subgroups* A, B *of* V *such that* $A + B$ *is not a* p*-subgroup of* V.

Proof. Denote $V_1 = \{v \in V \mid v(\delta) = 0 \text{ for each } \delta \notin \{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\}\}$ and let c be a fixed positive integer, $e_i \in H_{\delta_i}$, $e_i > 0$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$. Put

$$A = \{v \in V_1 \mid v(\delta_1) = ne_1, v(\delta_2) = -cne_2, v(\delta_3) = ne_3\},$$
$$B = \{v \in V_1 \mid v(\delta_1) = v(\delta_2) = 0, v(\delta_3) = ne_3\}$$

where n runs over the set of all integers. A and B are linearly ordered subgroups of V, hence they are p-subgroups of V. The set $C = A + B$ is the system of all elements $v \in V_1$ such that

$$v(\delta_1) = n_1e_1\,, \quad v(\delta_2) = -cn_1e_2\,, \quad v(\delta_3) = n_2e_3$$

where n_1, n_2 are arbitrary integers. Hence there is $g \in C$ satisfying

$$g(\delta_1) = e_1\,, \quad g(\delta_2) = -ce_2\,, \quad g(\delta_3) = 0\,.$$

If $g = a - b$, $a \in C$, $b \in C$, $a \geqq 0$, $b \geqq 0$, then $a \neq 0 \neq b$ (since $g \not> 0$, $g \not< 0$), thus $a(\delta_3) = b(\delta_3) \geqq e_3$. There exists $v \in V_1$ such that $v(\delta_3) = a(\delta_3)$, $v(\delta_1) < a(\delta_1)$ and $b(\delta_1)$, $v(\delta_2) < a(\delta_2)$ and $b(\delta_2)$. Thus $v < a$, $v < b$, but $2v \not< a$, $2v \not< b$. Therefore a and b are not p-disjoint in G and C is no p-subgroup of G.

One of the problems raised in [2] is affirmatively solved by

THEOREM 3. *Let A be an o-ideal of G and let B be a p-subgroup of G. Then $A + B$ is a p-subgroup of G.*

Proof. Let us denote $G/A = \bar{G}$ and for any $t \in G$ write $t + A = \bar{t}$. Let $A + B = X$, $x \in X$. There are elements $a \in A$, $b \in B$ such that $x = a + b$ and since B is a p-subgroup there exist $b_1, b_2 \in B$ such that $b = b_1 - b_2$ and b_1, b_2 are p-disjoint in G. Further $x = u - v$, $u, v \in G$, where u and v are p-disjoint in G. According to [2] $\bar{G}$ is a p-group and by [2], Proposition 2.2, $\bar{b}_1$ and $\bar{b}_2$ ($\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$) are p-disjoint in G. Further we have

$$\bar{x} = \bar{b}_1 - \bar{b}_2 = \bar{u} - \bar{v} ,$$

hence if we apply (B) (§ 3) to the p-group $\bar{G}$ it follows that there exists $\bar{m} \in H(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$ fulfilling

$$\bar{b}_1 = \bar{u} + \bar{m} , \quad \bar{b}_2 = \bar{v} + \bar{m} .$$

Again, by Proposition 2.2 of [2], there is $m_1 \in \bar{m}$ such that $m_1 \in H(u, v)$. Thus according to (B) the elements $u_1 = u + m_1$ and $v_1 = v + m_1$ are p-disjoint in G and $x = u_1 - v_1$. Since

$$u_1 \in \bar{u}_1 = \bar{u} + \bar{m}_1 = \bar{u} + \bar{m} = \bar{b}_1 = b_1 + A \subset A + B = X$$

and analogously $v_1 \in X$, the set X is a p-subgroup of G.

REFERENCES

1. P. Conrad, *Representations of partially ordered Abelian groups as groups of real valued functions*, Acta Math. **116** (1966), 199-221.
2. P. Conrad and J. R. Teller, *Abelian pseudo lattice ordered groups*, Publications Math. (to appear)
3. L. Fuchs, *Partially ordered algebraic systems*, Moskva, 1965.
4. ———, *Riesz groups*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **19** (1965), 1-34.
5. J. R. Teller, *On abelian pseudo lattice ordered groups*, Pacific J. Math. **27** (1968), 411-419.

Received July 1, 1969.

TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
KOŠICE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Printed in Japan by International Academic Printing Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 34, No. 1 May, 1970