

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

FREE LATTICE-ORDERED MODULES

A. BIGARD

FREE LATTICE-ORDERED MODULES

A. BIGARD

The aim of this paper is to show that the theory of free lattice-ordered groups developed by E. C. Weinberg in the abelian case can be generalized to modules over a totally ordered Ore domain A . The main result is that for every torsion-free ordered A -module M , there exists a free f -module over M . The generalization given will be seen to be, in a certain sense, the best possible.

All rings and modules considered will be assumed to be unital. Let A be a partially ordered ring and A_+ its order. If M is a left A -module, we say that $P \subseteq M$ is an order on M if:

$P + P \subseteq P$, $A_+P \subseteq P$, and $P \cap -P = \{0\}$. If such a P is given, we say that M is a partially ordered (or ordered) module. If P is a total order on M , that is, if $M = P \cup -P$, we say that M is a totally ordered module. Let M and N be partially ordered A -modules and let f be a mapping from M to N . Then f is an o -homomorphism if f is a monotonic homomorphism of A -modules. The o -homomorphism f is an o -isomorphism if f is one-to-one and if f^{-1} is an o -homomorphism.

1. Some properties of f -modules. In this section, A will denote a directed p.o. ring. An A -module M which is lattice-ordered by the order P is called a lattice-ordered module or l -module. Products of lattice-ordered modules are defined in a natural way. If M and N are l -modules, an homomorphism f from M to N is called a l -homomorphism if, for $x, y \in M$:

$$f(x \vee y) = f(x) \vee f(y) \quad \text{and} \quad f(x \wedge y) = f(x) \wedge f(y).$$

An f -module M is a lattice-ordered module which is a subdirect product of totally ordered modules. This definition was first introduced in [1] and [3].

Recall that a convex l -subgroup S in a commutative l.o. group G is called prime if G/S is totally ordered. The following theorem gives useful characterizations of f -modules.

THEOREM 1. *Let M be a lattice-ordered module over a unital directed ring A . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) M is an f -module.
- (2) For $x, y \in M$ and $0 \leq \lambda \in A$, $\lambda(x \vee y) = \lambda x \vee \lambda y$ and $\lambda(x \wedge y) = \lambda x \wedge \lambda y$.

- (3) $x \wedge y = 0$ implies $\lambda x \wedge y = 0$ for all $0 \leq \lambda \in A$.
 (4) Every minimal prime subgroup of M is a submodule.

Proof. (1) implies (2): This is clear since (2) is satisfied in a totally ordered module.

(2) implies (3): If $x \wedge y = 0$, then we have:

$$0 \leq \lambda x \wedge y \leq (\lambda \vee I)x \wedge (\lambda \vee I)y = (\lambda \vee I)(x \wedge y) = 0.$$

(3) implies (4): Let S be a minimal prime subgroup. Then, $x \in S$ if and only if there exists $y \notin S$ with $x \wedge y = 0$. [2]. Thus, if $x \in S$ and $0 \leq \lambda \in A$, we have $\lambda x \in S$. Since A is directed, S is a submodule.

(4) implies (1): Let $(S_i)_{i \in I}$ be the family of all minimal prime subgroups of M . Then each quotient M/S_i is a totally ordered module and M is a subdirect product of these modules.

If A is not unital, then (1), (3), and (4) are equivalent but condition (2) is weaker (see [3]).

In the sequel, we shall be concerned mainly with torsion-free modules, that is modules in which $\lambda x = 0$ implies $\lambda = 0$ or $x = 0$. The following property is useful:

PROPOSITION 1. *If A is totally ordered, every torsion-free f -module F is a subdirect product of torsion-free totally ordered modules.*

Let S be a minimal prime subgroup of F . Suppose that $\lambda \neq 0$ and $\lambda x \in S$. We may assume $\lambda > 0$, as A is totally ordered. As in the proof of Theorem 1, there exists $y \notin S$ with $\lambda x \wedge y = 0$. This implies $\lambda(x \wedge y) = \lambda x \wedge \lambda y = 0$, and hence $x \wedge y = 0$. As $y \notin S$, we obtain $x \in S$. This proves that M/S is torsion-free and the theorem follows.

As in the theory of ordered groups, P is an isolated order on M if $\lambda > 0$ and $\lambda x \in P$ implies $x \in P$.

PROPOSITION 2. *Every torsion-free f -module is isolated.*

Proof. If $\lambda > 0$ and $\lambda x \geq 0$, we have $\lambda(-x \vee 0) = -\lambda x \vee 0 = 0$, hence $-x \vee 0 = 0$ and $x \geq 0$.

Conversely, it is clear that when A is totally ordered, every isolated module is torsion-free.

2. Embedding an order in a total order. In this section, we consider only torsion-free modules over a totally ordered unital ring A . This is not as restrictive as it seems, since the existence of a

nontrivial torsion-free module implies that A has no zero divisors, and an f -ring with no zero divisors is totally ordered.

LEMMA 1. *Let M be a torsion-free A -module. For every $x \in M$, A_+x is an order.*

Proof. Suppose that $y \in A_+x \cap -A_+x$, so that $y = \lambda x = -\mu x$. The relation $(\lambda + \mu)x = 0$ implies $\lambda + \mu = 0$ or $x = 0$. In the first case, $\lambda = -\mu \in A_+ \cap -A_+$ so in each case $y = 0$.

LEMMA 2. *Let P and Q be two orders on M . Then $P - Q$ is an order if and only if $P \cap Q = 0$.*

Proof. The condition is necessary, since $P \cap Q \subseteq (P - Q) \cap (Q - P)$. For the converse, suppose $P \cap Q = 0$ and let $y \in (P - Q) \cap (Q - P)$. Then $y = p - q = q' - p'$, and $p + p' = q + q' \in P \cap Q = 0$. Hence, $p = -p' \in P \cap -P = 0$, $q = -q' \in Q \cap -Q = 0$, and it follows that $y = 0$.

The ring A is said to be a left Ore domain if A admits a left quotient field. Equivalently, A has no zero divisors and satisfies the following condition:

(I) If $\rho \neq 0$ and $\sigma \neq 0$, $A\rho \cap A\sigma \neq 0$.

Clearly, when A is totally ordered, this condition can be replaced by the following:

(II) If $0 < \rho$ and $0 < \sigma$, $A_+\rho \cap A_+\sigma \neq 0$.

THEOREM 2. *Let A be a totally ordered ring with no divisors of zero. The following are equivalent:*

(1) A is a left Ore domain.

(2) *In a torsion-free A -module, every order is contained in a total order.*

(3) *In a torsion-free A -module, every order is contained in an isolated order.*

Proof. (1) implies (2): By Zorn's lemma, every order is contained in a maximal order. It remains to show that each maximal order P is total. If not, suppose $b \in P \cup -P$. As $P \subset P + A_+b$ (strictly), $P + A_+b$ fails to be an order. By Lemma 2, $P \cap -A_+b \neq 0$ and there exists $\rho > 0$ with $\rho b \in -P$. Similarly, $P - A_+b$ is not an order, $P \cap A_+b \neq 0$, and there exists $\sigma > 0$ with $\sigma b \in P$. By condition (II), there exists $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu > 0$ with $\lambda\rho = \mu\sigma > 0$. Hence $\lambda\rho b = \mu\sigma b \in P \cap -P = 0$. This implies $b = 0$, which is a contradiction. Hence P is a total order.

(2) implies (3): This is clear from Proposition 2.

(3) implies (1): Consider A as a left-module on itself. Take $0 < \rho$ and $0 < \sigma$. If $A_+\rho \cap A_+\sigma = 0$, $A_+\rho - A_+\sigma$ is an order by Lemma 2. Hence it is contained in an isolated order P , and thus $\rho 1 \in P$ and $\sigma(-1) \in P$. Then $1 \in P$ and $-1 \in P$, which is a contradiction.

COROLLARY 1. *Let A be a totally ordered left Ore domain. Let f be an o -homomorphism of the torsion-free module M ordered by P into a torsion-free totally ordered module T . There exists a total order P_0 which contains P such that $f(x) > 0$ implies $x \in P_0$.*

To see that $S = \{x \mid f(x) > 0\} \cup \{0\}$ is an order on M , note that $S + S \subseteq S$ and $S \cap -S = \{0\}$. Also for $\lambda > 0$ and $0 \neq x \in S$, $f(x) > 0$ and hence $f(\lambda x) = \lambda f(x) > 0$ since T is torsion-free. As $P \cap -S = 0$, $P + S$ is an order by Lemma 2. The corollary then follows from Theorem 1.

COROLLARY 2. *Let A be a totally ordered left Ore domain and let M be a torsion-free A -module ordered by P . The intersection of all total orders containing P is the set \bar{P} of elements $x \in M$ for which there exists $\lambda > 0$ with $\lambda x \in P$.*

Each total order containing P is isolated and hence contains \bar{P} . Suppose $x \notin \bar{P}$, so that $P \cap A_+x = 0$. By Lemma 2, $P - A_+x$ is an order. By Theorem 2, $P - A_+x$ is contained in a total order Q . Since $-x \in Q$ and $x \neq 0$, $x \notin Q$.

THEOREM 3. *Let A be a totally ordered left Ore domain. If M is an A -module ordered by P , these are equivalent:*

- (1) P is isolated.
- (2) M is torsion-free and P is an intersection of total orders.
- (3) M can be embedded in a direct product of totally ordered torsion-free modules.
- (4) M can be embedded in a torsion-free f -module.

Proof. (1) implies (2): This follows directly from Corollary 2, as $P = \bar{P}$.

(2) implies (3): Let $(P_i)_{i \in I}$ be the set of all total orders containing P . If we denote by M_i the module M ordered by P_i , there is a canonical embedding of M into the direct product of the modules M_i .

(3) implies (4): Clear.

(4) implies (1): This follows from Proposition 1.

3. **Free f -modules.** Let A be a totally ordered left Ore domain, and let M be a torsion-free A -module ordered by P . A torsion-free f -module L will be called *free over M* if:

(1) There exists an injective o -homomorphism φ from M to L .

(2) For every torsion-free f -module F and every o -homomorphism f from M to F , there exists a unique l -homomorphism \bar{f} from L to F such that $\bar{f} \circ \varphi = f$.

It is not difficult to show that L is determined up to an l -isomorphism. To show that such an L exists, we use the two following lemmas:

LEMMA 3. *If $x_{\alpha\beta} (\alpha \in R, \beta \in S)$ and $x_{\gamma\delta} (\gamma \in U, \delta \in V)$ are two finite families of elements in a lattice-ordered module,*

$$\bigvee_{\alpha \in R} \bigwedge_{\beta \in S} x_{\alpha\beta} - \bigvee_{\gamma \in U} \bigwedge_{\delta \in V} x_{\gamma\delta} = \bigvee_{(\alpha, \sigma) \in R \times (VS \times U)} \bigwedge_{(\beta, \tau) \in S \times U} (x_{\alpha\beta} - x_{(\tau)(\sigma(\beta, \tau))}).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee_R \bigwedge_S x_{\alpha\beta} - \bigvee_U \bigwedge_V x_{\gamma\delta} &= \bigvee_R \bigwedge_S \bigwedge_U \bigvee_V (x_{\alpha\beta} - x_{\gamma\delta}) = \bigvee_R \bigwedge_{S \times U} \bigvee_V (x_{\alpha\beta} - x_{\gamma\delta}) \\ &= \bigvee_R \bigvee_{\sigma \in (VS \times U)} \bigwedge_{S \times U} (x_{\alpha\beta} - x_{(\tau)(\sigma(\beta, \tau))}) \\ &= \bigvee_{(\alpha, \sigma) \in R \times (VS \times U)} \bigwedge_{(\beta, \tau) \in S \times U} (x_{\alpha\beta} - x_{(\tau)(\sigma(\beta, \tau))}). \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 4. *Let N be a f -module and K a submodule of N . The f -submodule generated by K is the set K' of all elements $\bigvee_{\alpha \in R} \bigwedge_{\beta \in S} x_{\alpha\beta}$ with $x_{\alpha\beta} \in K$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3, K' is an l -subgroup of N . If $\lambda \geq 0$, it follows from Theorem 1 that: $\lambda \bigvee_R \bigwedge_S x_{\alpha\beta} = \bigvee_R \bigwedge_S \lambda x_{\alpha\beta}$. Since the ring is assumed to be directed, K' is a submodule.

THEOREM 4. *Let $(P_i)_{i \in I}$ be the set of all total orders on M containing P , and denote by M_i the module M ordered by P_i . Let φ be the canonical map of M into $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$. Then the f -submodule L of $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$ generated by $\varphi(M)$ is free over M .*

Proof. Suppose f is an o -homomorphism from M into a torsion-free f -module F . If $x \in L$, then by Lemma 4, $x = \bigvee_R \bigwedge_S \varphi(x_{\alpha\beta})$ where $x_{\alpha\beta} \in M$.

Let $\bar{f}(x) = \bigvee_R \bigwedge_S f(x_{\alpha\beta})$. To show that \bar{f} is a mapping, it is sufficient to show, by Lemma 3, that $\bigvee_R \bigwedge_S \varphi(x_{\alpha\beta}) = 0$ implies $\bigvee_R \bigwedge_S f(x_{\alpha\beta}) = 0$.

By Proposition 1, we may assume that F is totally ordered. By

Corollary 1 of Theorem 2, there exists a total order P_0 containing P such that $f(x) > 0$ implies $x \in P_0$.

If $\bigvee_R \bigwedge_S f(x_{\alpha\beta}) > 0$, there exists $\alpha \in R$ such that for each $\beta \in S$, $f(x_{\alpha\beta}) > 0$, which implies $x_{\alpha\beta} \in P_0$. It follows that $\bigvee_R \bigwedge_S x_{\alpha\beta} > 0$ (modulo P_0) and $\bigvee_R \bigwedge_S \varphi(x_{\alpha\beta}) \neq 0$. Alternatively, if $\bigvee_R \bigwedge_S f(x_{\alpha\beta}) < 0$, there exists for each $\alpha \in R$, a $\beta \in S$ such that $f(x_{\alpha\beta}) < 0$. Thus $x_{\alpha\beta} \in -P_0$ and it follows that $\bigvee_R \bigwedge_S x_{\alpha\beta} < 0$ (with respect to P_0). Hence $\bigvee_R \bigwedge_S \varphi(x_{\alpha\beta}) \neq 0$. Now, it is clear that \bar{f} is a mapping. By Lemma 3, \bar{f} is a group homomorphism. The theorem follows easily.

COROLLARY. *Let A be a totally ordered ring with no divisors of zero. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *A is a left Ore domain.*
- (2) *For every torsion-free ordered module M , there exists a free f -module over M .*

Proof. By Theorem 4, (1) implies (2). Conversely, if φ is the o -homomorphism of M into the free f -module L over M , the positive cone of M is a subset of $Q = \{x \mid \varphi(x) \geq 0\}$, which is an isolated order. Thus, (2) implies (1) by Theorem 2.

Note that φ is an o -isomorphism of M into L if and only if M is isolated.

It is now easy to construct the free f -module over an arbitrary set E . Let M be the free module generated by E , and trivially order M by $P = \{0\}$. The free f -module L generated by M is a free f -module over E , with obvious definitions.

REFERENCES

1. A. Bigard, *Contribution à la théorie des groupes réticulés*, Thèse Sc. Math., Paris, 1969.
2. P. Conrad, *Introduction à la théorie des groupes réticulés*, Secrétariat mathématique, Paris, 1967.
3. S. A. Steinberg, *Lattice-ordered rings and modules*, Ph. D. Thesis, Urbana, Illinois, 1970.
4. E. C. Weinberg, *Free lattice-ordered abelian groups*, Math. Annalen t, **151** (1963), 187-199 and t. **159** (1965), 217-222.

Received July 19, 1972 and in revised form May 4, 1973.

CENTRE UNIVERSITAIRE DU MANS

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

RICHARD ARENS (Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

J. DUGUNDJI*
Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

R. A. BEAUMONT
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

D. GILBARG AND J. MILGRAM
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
OSAKA UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
* * *
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER

* C. R. DePrima California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91109, will replace J. Dugundji until August 1974.

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

A. Bigard, <i>Free lattice-ordered modules</i>	1
Richard Bolstein and Warren R. Wogen, <i>Subnormal operators in strictly cyclic operator algebras</i>	7
Herbert Busemann and Donald E. Glassco, II, <i>Irreducible sums of simple multivectors</i>	13
W. Wistar (William) Comfort and Victor Harold Saks, <i>Countably compact groups and finest totally bounded topologies</i>	33
Mary Rodriguez Embry, <i>Maximal invariant subspaces of strictly cyclic operator algebras</i>	45
Ralph S. Freese and James Bryant Nation, <i>Congruence lattices of semilattices</i>	51
Ervin Fried and George Grätzer, <i>A nonassociative extension of the class of distributive lattices</i>	59
John R. Giles and Donald Otto Koehler, <i>On numerical ranges of elements of locally m-convex algebras</i>	79
David A. Hill, <i>On dominant and codominant dimension of $\mathbf{QF} - 3$ rings</i>	93
John Sollion Hsia and Robert Paul Johnson, <i>Round and Pfister forms over $R(t)$</i>	101
I. Martin (Irving) Isaacs, <i>Equally partitioned groups</i>	109
Athanasios G. Kartsatos and Edward Barry Saff, <i>Hyperpolynomial approximation of solutions of nonlinear integro-differential equations</i>	117
Shin'ichi Kinoshita, <i>On elementary ideals of θ-curves in the 3-sphere and 2-links in the 4-sphere</i>	127
Ronald Brian Kirk, <i>Convergence of Baire measures</i>	135
R. J. Knill, <i>The Seifert and Van Kampen theorem via regular covering spaces</i>	149
Amos A. Kovacs, <i>Homomorphisms of matrix rings into matrix rings</i>	161
Young K. Kwon, <i>HD-minimal but no HD-minimal</i>	171
Makoto Maejima, <i>On the renewal function when some of the mean renewal lifetimes are infinite</i>	177
Juan José Martínez, <i>Cohomological dimension of discrete modules over profinite groups</i>	185
W. K. Nicholson, <i>Semiperfect rings with abelian group of units</i>	191
Louis Jackson Ratliff, Jr., <i>Three theorems on imbedded prime divisors of principal ideals</i>	199
Billy E. Rhoades and Albert Wilansky, <i>Some commutants in $B(c)$ which are almost matrices</i>	211
John Philip Riley Jr., <i>Cross-sections of decompositions</i>	219
Keith Duncan Stroyan, <i>A characterization of the Mackey uniformity $m(L^\infty, L^1)$ for finite measures</i>	223
Edward G. Thurber, <i>The Scholz-Brauer problem on addition chains</i>	229
Joze Vrabec, <i>Submanifolds of acyclic 3-manifolds</i>	243
Philip William Walker, <i>Adjoint boundary value problems for compactified singular differential operators</i>	265
Roger P. Ware, <i>When are Witt rings group rings</i>	279
James D. Wine, <i>Paracompactifications using filter bases</i>	285