

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

THE CENTER OF A POSET

STANLEY P. GUDDER AND L. HASKINS

THE CENTER OF A POSET

S. GUDDER AND L. HASKINS

The definition of neutral element is extended in a natural way from lattices to posets. The centers of posets of varying degrees of generality are then characterized.

The center of a poset. In [1], G. Birkhoff states that the factorization of a poset with universal bounds is best analyzed by considering its center. He characterizes the center of a lattice as its set of complemented, neutral elements and asks (Problem 7, page 78) if the concept of neutral element can be extended to posets. We will generalize the definition of neutral element in such a way as to be able to extend his theorem on the center of a lattice to posets. For example we shall show that an element is in the center of a poset if and only if it is complemented and satisfies a generalized associative and distributive law and that an element is in the center of a multilattice if and only if it is complemented and satisfies a generalized distributive law. Other approaches to the factorization of a poset are possible (cf. [2]). However, our approach gives a direct generalization of Birkhoff's result.

Let P be a poset with universal bounds 0 and 1. If $A \subseteq P$ define

$$\begin{aligned} U(A) &= \{x \in P: x \geq y \text{ for some } y \in A\}, \\ L(A) &= \{x \in P: x \leq y \text{ for some } y \in A\}, \\ M(A) &= \{x \in A: y > x \text{ for no } y \in A\}, \\ m(A) &= \{x \in A: y < x \text{ for no } y \in A\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice it follows from these definitions that $U(\phi) = L(\phi) = M(\phi) = m(\phi) = \phi$. Let $S(P)$ be the power set on P . Then $u, l: S(P) \times S(P) \rightarrow S(P)$ are defined by $A l B = M[L(A) \cap L(B)]$ and $A u B = m[U(A) \cap U(B)]$. For convenience we write x for the singleton set $\{x\}$. Thus if P is a lattice $x l y = x \wedge y$ and $x u y = x \vee y$. An element $e \in P$ is *central* or (*in the center*) if $P = X \cdot Y$ where X, Y are posets with 0 and 1 and $e = (0, 1)$ or $(1, 0)$. We denote the center of P by $Z(P)$. An element $e \in P$ is *complemented* if there is an $e' \in P$ such that $e u e' = 1$ and $e l e' = 0$.

To extend the concept of neutrality to posets, in a natural way, we must define the distributive laws for posets. Consider the following equations:

$$(D1) \quad e u (x l y) = (e u x) l (e u y),$$

$$(D2) \quad x u (e l y) = (x u e) l (x u y),$$

and dually

$$(D3) \quad el(xuy) = (elx)u(ely),$$

$$(D4) \quad xl(euy) = (xle)u(xly).$$

We say that an element $e \in P$ is *weakly distributive* if (D1), (D4) hold whenever, $xly \neq \phi$ and (D2), (D3) hold whenever $xuy \neq \phi$. We say that e is *distributive* if e is weakly distributive and (D2) holds whenever $xle = yle$ and $xue = yue$. An element e is *strongly distributive* if (D1)–(D4) hold for all $x, y \in P$. In lattices these three types of distributive elements coalesce to the concept of neutral element.

An element $e \in P$ is *associative* if $x \leq e, yle = 0$ imply $sux(xuy) = (sux)uy$ for all $s \in P$ and dually $x \geq e, yue = 1$ imply $sl(xly) = (slx)ly$ for all $s \in P$. Of course, if P is a lattice all elements are associative. This need not be the case for posets.

Notice if e is complemented and distributive then the complement is unique. Indeed, if e', e'' are complements of e then since $e'le = e''le$ and $e'ue = e''ue$ we can apply (D2) to obtain

$$e' = e'u(ele'') = (e'u e)l(e'u e'') = e'u e''.$$

Thus $e' \geq e''$ and by symmetry $e' \leq e''$.

THEOREM. *An element e is in $Z(P)$ if and only if e is associative, complemented and distributive.*

Proof. For necessity, suppose $e \in Z(P)$ and $e = (1, 0)$ with respect to some factorization $P = X \cdot Y$. For $x, y \in P$ let $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2)$ where $x_1, y_1 \in X, x_2, y_2 \in Y$. If $z \in xly$, then $z_1 \leq x_1, y_1$ and $z_2 \leq x_2, y_2$. If there exists a w_1 such that $z_1 < w_1 \leq x_1, y_1$ then $(z_1, z_2) < (w_1, z_2) \leq (x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)$ a contradiction. Thus $z_1 \in x_1ly_1$ and $z_2 \in x_2ly_2$. The argument reverses so $z \in xly$ if and only if $z_1 \in x_1ly_1$ and $z_2 \in x_2ly_2$. We now show that e is weakly distributive. If $xly \neq \phi$ then

$$\begin{aligned} eu(xly) &= m[U(1, 0) \cap U\{(z_1, z_2): z_i \in x_i ly_i\}] \\ &= m\{(1, v): v \geq z_2 \in x_2 ly_2\} \\ &= \{(1, z_2): z_2 \in x_2 ly_2\} = M\{(1, v): v \leq x_2, y_2\} \\ &= M[L(1, x_2) \cap L(1, y_2)] = M[L(eux) \cap L(euy)] \\ &= (eux)l(euy). \end{aligned}$$

If $xuy \neq \phi$ then

$$\begin{aligned} xu(ely) &= m[U(x) \cap U\{(z_1, z_2): z_i \in e_i ly_i\}] \\ &= m[U(x_1, x_2) \cap U(y_1, 0)] = \{(v_1, x_2): v_1 \in x_1 uy_1\} \\ &= M\{(w_1, w_2): w_1 \leq v_1 \in x_1 uy_1, w_2 \leq x_2\} \\ &= M[L(1, x_2) \cap L\{(v_1, v_2): v_i \in x_i uy_i\}] \\ &= M[L(xue) \cap L(xuy)] = (xue)l(xuy). \end{aligned}$$

The dual statements follow in a similar manner so e is weakly distributive. To show e is distributive suppose $xle = yle$ and $xue = yue$. It follows that $x = y$ so clearly $xuy \neq \phi$ and (D2) holds. If $x \leq e$ and $yle = 0$ then $x = (x_1, 0)$ and $y = (0, y_2)$ so

$$\begin{aligned} (sux)uy &= \{(r, s_2): r \in s_1 u x_1\} u(0, y_2) \\ &= \{(r, t): r \in s_1 u x_1, t \in s_2 u y_2\} \\ &= (s_1, s_2) u(x_1, y_2) = su(xuy). \end{aligned}$$

The dual is similar so e is associative. It is clear that $(0, 1)$ is a complement for e .

We divide the proof of sufficiency into seven steps. Suppose e is associative, complemented and distributive.

(1) We first show that $e \vee x$ and $e \wedge x$ exist for all $x \in P$. Now $eux \neq \phi$ since otherwise $e = eu(xl0) = (eux)l(eu0) = \phi le = \phi$, contradiction. If $e \vee x$ does not exist there are distinct elements $z, w \in P$ with $z, w \in eux$ since otherwise eux is a singleton set and if $s \geq e, x$ we have $(eux)ls = (els)u(xls) = eux$ so $eux \leq s$ which would imply $eux = e \vee x$. Now

$$z = zl(eux) = (zle)u(zlx) = eux \supseteq \{z, w\}$$

which is impossible. Thus $e \vee x$ exists and the existence of $e \wedge x$ follows dually.

(2) We now show that $elA = M\{e \wedge a: a \in A\}$. By definition $elA = M[L(e) \cap L(A)]$. If $x \in elA$ then $x \leq e$ and $x \leq a$ for some $a \in A$. If there exists $y \leq e, a$ and $x < y$ this would contradict the maximality of x in $L(e) \cap L(A)$, so $x \in ela$ and $x = e \wedge a$. If $z = e \wedge a_1$ for some $a_1 \in A$ then $z \in L(e) \cap L(A)$ so $z \triangleright x$. Hence $x \in M\{e \wedge a: a \in A\}$. Conversely, if $x \in M\{e \wedge a: a \in A\}$ then $x \in L(e) \cap L(A)$. Suppose $y \in L(e) \cap L(A)$ and $y > x$. Then $y \leq e, a$ for some $a \in A$ so $y \leq e \wedge a$ which implies $x < e \wedge a$, a contradiction. Hence $x \in M[L(e) \cap L(A)] = elA$. That $euA = m\{e \vee a: a \in A\}$ follows dually.

Let $\phi_e: P \rightarrow L(e) \cdot U(e)$ be defined by $\phi_e(x) = (x \wedge e, x \vee e)$.

(3) To show ϕ_e is injective, suppose $\phi_e(x) = \phi_e(y)$. Then $x \wedge e = y \wedge e, x \vee e = y \vee e$. It follows from (D2) that

$$\begin{aligned} y &= (y \wedge e)uy = (x \wedge e)uy = (xuy)l(e \vee y) \\ &= (xuy)l(e \vee x) = (y \wedge e)ux = (x \wedge e)ux = x. \end{aligned}$$

(4) If $x \leq y$ then $x \wedge e \leq y \wedge e$ and $x \vee e \leq y \vee e$ so ϕ_e is order preserving.

(5) We now show that $d \wedge e'$ exists if $d \geq e$. By associativity, $ol(dle') = (old)le' = 0$ so $dle' \neq \phi$. Suppose $s, t \in dle'$. By (2) $m\{e \vee w: w \in dle'\} = eu(dle') = eud = d$. Since $d \geq e, x, t$ we have

$d \geq e \vee s, e \vee t$. Hence $d = e \vee s = e \vee t$. Since $s, t \leq e'$ we have $e \wedge s, e \wedge t \leq e \wedge e' = 0$ so $e \wedge s = e \wedge t = 0$. Hence $\phi_e(s) = \phi_e(t)$ so by (3) $s = t$. Thus dle' is a singleton set. If $z \leq d, e'$ then by associativity $zl(dle') = (zld)le' = z$ so $z \leq dle'$ and $dle' = d \wedge e'$.

(6) We now show that ϕ_e is bijective. Let $(c, d) \in L(e) \cdot U(e)$. We shall prove that $x \equiv cu(d \wedge e') = c \vee (d \wedge e')$ and that $e \wedge x = c, e \vee x = d$. Since $c \leq e$ and $(d \wedge e')le = 0$, applying associativity $1u[cu(dle')] = (1uc)u(dle') = 1$ so $cu(dle') \neq \phi$. If $s, t \in cu(d \wedge e')$ then $s, t \geq c$ and since $e \geq c$ we have $e \wedge s, e \wedge t \geq c$. Applying (2) we conclude that $e \wedge s = e \wedge t = c$. Now $s, t \geq d \wedge e'$ and hence $s \vee e, t \vee e \geq (d \wedge e') \vee e = (d \vee e) \wedge (e' \vee e) = d \vee e = d$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} cu(d \wedge e') &= (c \wedge e)u(d \wedge e') = [cu(d \wedge e')]l[eu(d \wedge e')] \\ &= [cu(d \wedge e')]ld, \end{aligned}$$

and hence $s, t \leq d$. Since $e \leq d$ it follows that $s \vee e, t \vee e \leq d$ and hence $s \vee e = t \vee e = d$. Applying (3), $s = t = x$ and $x \wedge e = c, x \vee e = d$ so ϕ_e is bijective. If $z \geq c, d \wedge e'$, then by associativity $zu[cu(d \wedge e')] = (zuc)u(d \wedge e') = z$ so $z \geq cu(d \wedge e')$ and $cu(d \wedge e') = c \vee (d \wedge e')$.

(7) To show ϕ_e^{-1} is order preserving suppose $(a, b), (c, d) \in L(e) \cdot U(e)$ and $(a, b) \leq (c, d)$. Then by (6) $\phi_e^{-1}(a, b) = a \vee (b \wedge e')$ and $\phi_e^{-1}(c, d) = c \vee (d \wedge e')$. But clearly $a \vee (b \wedge e') \leq c \vee (d \wedge e')$.

It follows that P is isomorphic to $L(e) \cdot U(e)$ and the proof is complete.

COROLLARY. *If e is associative, complemented and strongly distributive, then $e \in Z(P)$.*

The converse of the corollary does not hold. Specifically, if $e \in Z(P)$ then although e must be associative, complemented and distributive, e need not be strongly distributive. For example, let $X = \{0, 1\}$ and let Y be a poset with 0, 1 and two elements x, y satisfying $xy = \phi$. If $P = Y \cdot X$ then $e = (1, 0) \in Z(P)$. However,

$$eu[(x, 0)l(y, 0)] = eu\phi = \phi \neq e = elee = [eu(x, 0)]l[eu(y, 0)]$$

so e is not strongly distributive. This difficulty can not be eliminated by making the convention $U(\phi) = L(\phi) = P$. Indeed, in this case if we let $P = X \cdot Y$ then $e = (1, 0) \in Z(P)$, but

$$eu[(0, x)l(0, y)] = eu\phi = e \neq \phi = (1, x)l(1, y) = [eu(0, x)]l[eu(0, y)]$$

so again e is not strongly distributive.

For the posets in the next corollary the three types of distributivity are the same.

COROLLARY. *Let P satisfy $xuy, xly \neq \phi$ for all $x, y \in P$. Then $e \in Z(P)$ if and only if e is associative, complemented and strongly distributive.*

A *multilattice* is a poset for which $s \leq x, y$ implies there exist $z \in xly$ such that $s \leq z$ and $t \geq x, y$ implies there is a $w \in xuy$ such that $t \geq w$. Multilattices are still vast generalizations of lattices; in particular, any poset with no infinite chains is a multilattice. In a multilattice the associative laws always hold so every element is associative. Indeed, if $z \in su(xuy)$ then $z \geq s, z \geq z_1 \in xuy$ and z is minimal. Then $z \geq s, x, y$ so $z \geq z_2 \in sux$. Suppose there is $z_3 \geq y, z_3 \geq z_4 \in sux$, with $z > z_3$. Then $z_3 \geq s, z_3 \geq z_5 \in xuy$ which contradicts the minimality of z . Thus $z \in (sux)uy$. By symmetry $su(xuy) = (sux)uy$ and the other associative law holds similarly. Our next result gives the most direct generalization of Birkhoff's theorem [1, page 69].

COROLLARY. *If P is a multilattice with $0, 1$ then $e \in Z(P)$ if and only if e is complemented and strongly distributive.*

Of course, in this case the three types of distributivity are the same.

REFERENCES

1. G. Birkhoff, *Lattice Theory*, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloq. Publ. XXV, Providence, R. I., 1967.
2. V. Novak and J. Schmidt, *Direct decompositions of partially ordered sets with zero*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **239/240** (1969), 97-108.

Received January 3, 1973.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER
AND
CARLTON UNIVERSITY

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

David R. Adams, <i>On the exceptional sets for spaces of potentials</i>	1
Philip Bacon, <i>Axioms for the Čech cohomology of paracompacta</i>	7
Selwyn Ross Caradus, <i>Perturbation theory for generalized Fredholm operators</i>	11
Kuang-Ho Chen, <i>Phragmén-Lindelöf type theorems for a system of nonhomogeneous equations</i>	17
Frederick Knowles Dashiell, Jr., <i>Isomorphism problems for the Baire classes</i>	29
M. G. Deshpande and V. K. Deshpande, <i>Rings whose proper homomorphic images are right subdirectly irreducible</i>	45
Mary Rodriguez Embry, <i>Self adjoint strictly cyclic operator algebras</i>	53
Paul Erdős, <i>On the distribution of numbers of the form $\sigma(n)/n$ and on some related questions</i>	59
Richard Joseph Fleming and James E. Jamison, <i>Hermitian and adjoint abelian operators on certain Banach spaces</i>	67
Stanley P. Gudder and L. Haskins, <i>The center of a poset</i>	85
Richard Howard Herman, <i>Automorphism groups of operator algebras</i>	91
Worthen N. Hunsacker and Somashekhar Amrith Nainpally, <i>Local compactness of families of continuous point-compact relations</i>	101
Donald Gordon James, <i>On the normal subgroups of integral orthogonal groups</i>	107
Eugene Carlyle Johnsen and Thomas Frederick Storer, <i>Combinatorial structures in loops. II. Commutative inverse property cyclic neofields of prime-power order</i>	115
Ka-Sing Lau, <i>Extreme operators on Choquet simplexes</i>	129
Philip A. Leonard and Kenneth S. Williams, <i>The septic character of 2, 3, 5 and 7</i>	143
Dennis McGavran and Jingyal Pak, <i>On the Nielsen number of a fiber map</i>	149
Stuart Edward Mills, <i>Normed Köthe spaces as intermediate spaces of L_1 and L_∞</i>	157
Philip Olin, <i>Free products and elementary equivalence</i>	175
Louis Jackson Ratliff, Jr., <i>Locally quasi-unmixed Noetherian rings and ideals of the principal class</i>	185
Seiya Sasao, <i>Homotopy types of spherical fibre spaces over spheres</i>	207
Helga Schirmer, <i>Fixed point sets of polyhedra</i>	221
Kevin James Sharpe, <i>Compatible topologies and continuous irreducible representations</i>	227
Frank Siwiec, <i>On defining a space by a weak base</i>	233
James McLean Sloss, <i>Global reflection for a class of simple closed curves</i>	247
M. V. Subba Rao, <i>On two congruences for primality</i>	261
Raymond D. Terry, <i>Oscillatory properties of a delay differential equation of even order</i>	269
Joseph Dinneen Ward, <i>Chebyshev centers in spaces of continuous functions</i>	283
Robert Breckenridge Warfield, Jr., <i>The uniqueness of elongations of Abelian groups</i>	289
V. M. Warfield, <i>Existence and adjoint theorems for linear stochastic differential equations</i>	305