

# A note on non-generators in partially ordered sets

PAOLO LIPPARINI

**ABSTRACT.** A folklore argument shows that Frattini’s characterization of non-generators works in the framework of algebraic partially ordered sets. We provide characterizations of non-generators in arbitrary partially ordered sets. The validity of some characterizations is equivalent to Zorn’s Lemma, hence to the Axiom of choice. We notice that working on closure spaces or posets provides no essential improvement.

## 1. Introduction

Most results in the present note should be considered as folklore, but are possibly new at the level of generality we shall introduce. In any case, we hope that the note might help in clarifying some issues which sometimes appear obscure or neglected.

In a classical paper G. Frattini [Fr] showed that an element  $g$  of some group  $\mathbf{G}$  is a non-generator if and only if  $g$  belongs to all the maximal subgroups of  $\mathbf{G}$ . Motivated by [Fr], the intersection of all the maximal subgroups of a group is called the *Frattini* subgroup. Many years later N. Jacobson [Jac] introduced a similar notion in ring theory. Scattered generalizations to other kinds of structures appeared in the literature, though not as successful as Frattini’s and Jacobson’s notions, so far. See, e. g., [ADS, BS, KST, MSS, Sc, Sz, T] and further references in the quoted sources. In a recent illuminating paper G. Janelidze [Jan] exploited Frattini’s methods in a categorical context.

With a more modest aim, here we try to make the arguments work in the barest possible setting, that is, partially ordered sets, *posets*, for short, with no finiteness, completeness or algebraic assumption. This should be explained a bit, since Frattini’s work deals with the notion of “generation”, while the meaning of “generate” is somewhat ambiguous within the realm of posets. Indeed, at first sight, the simplest way to insert Frattini’s characterization into an abstract framework would be to consider the power set  $\mathcal{P}(G)$  of some set  $G$ , together with a notion of “generation”, “hull”, or “closure”. We shall see that Frattini’s characterization works in a much more general framework. Of course, in the specific case of groups, if  $\mathbf{G}$  is a group and  $X \subseteq G$ , the “closure”  $\langle X \rangle$  of  $X$  is interpreted as the subgroup of  $\mathbf{G}$  generated by  $X$ .

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 06A06.

*Key words and phrases*: non-generator; Frattini element.

Work performed under the auspices of G.N.S.A.G.A. Work partially supported by PRIN 2012 “Logica, Modelli e Insiemi”. The author acknowledges the MIUR Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Rome Tor Vergata, CUP E83C18000100006.

Abstracting from the above example, we obtain the notion of a *closure space*, roughly, a structure like a topological space, except that the union of two “closed” subsets is not necessarily assumed to be closed. Closure spaces have a long history and have found an unexpected number of applications in extremely disparate fields [E]. Just as an example, the above starting example can be generalized to every algebraic structure. If  $\mathbf{A}$  is an arbitrary algebraic structure, then  $\mathcal{P}(A)$  becomes a closure space when the (domains of) subalgebras of  $\mathbf{A}$  are considered as closed subsets, possibly including the empty set. However, as we mentioned, there are many more possible examples, we refer again to [E] for more information.

It has been noticed in [Jan] that, as far as Frattini’s characterization is concerned, we can deal just with the “closed” subsets, the lattice of subgroups, in the original example. Indeed, an element  $g$  of some group is a non-generator if and only if the subset  $\langle g \rangle$  is a non-generator in the lattice of subgroups of  $\mathbf{G}$ . Actually, we do not need the full lattice structure on the set of all subgroups of a group, it is enough to deal with the join-semilattice structure. The same remark applies to an arbitrary closure space; in fact, to any poset endowed with a closure operation. Namely, rather than dealing with the full closure poset, it is enough to deal with the lattice of closed elements.

Here we go just one step further. In order to exploit Frattini’s arguments, we do not need the actual notion of join or “generation”, we only need to know what “generating the whole structure” means. Hence we can work in an arbitrary poset  $\mathbf{P}$ , not necessarily a join-semilattice, provided that  $\mathbf{P}$  has a maximum element 1. A subset  $X \subseteq P$  is meant to “generate” 1 if there is no  $p \in P$  such that  $p < 1$  and  $x \leq p$ , for every  $x \in X$ . As we shall mention, the assumption of the existence of a maximum is just for convenience, since all the motivating examples have a maximum.

However—already in the setting of complete lattices—the generalization of Frattini’s characterization does not necessarily hold, unless some algebraicity assumption is made [Jan, Remark 2.3]. We show that algebraicity is enough to guarantee that Frattini’s characterization holds in the realm of posets; moreover, we weaken it to a form of algebraicity relative only to “unbounded limits”. Actually, we notice that we only need algebraicity with respect to chains all whose members are not extendable to a maximal element. Furthermore, we give a characterization of non-generators in a poset even when no algebraicity assumption is made.

In a final section we notice that, as far as Frattini’s characterization is concerned, dealing with closure spaces or closure posets provides no essential gain. All the significant results seem to follow already from the results provable for posets with no further structure.

## 2. Non-generators in partially ordered sets

Henceforth,  $\mathbf{P} = (P, \leq)$  is a fixed *partially ordered set*, *poset*, for short. For convenience, we suppose that  $\mathbf{P}$  has a maximum 1. An element  $a \in P$  is a *non-generator* if  $a \vee e = 1$  implies  $e = 1$ , for every  $e \in P$ . Notice that we do not assume that  $P$  is a semilattice; the meaning of  $a \vee e = 1$  is that there is no  $p \in P$  such that  $p < 1$  and both  $a \leq p$  and  $e \leq p$ . In other words,  $a \vee e = 1$  means that  $a$  and  $e$  have no common bound  $< 1$ . The notation is consistent with the standard notion of join when considered as a partial operation.

An element  $p \in P$  is *maximal*<sub><1</sub> if  $p < 1$  and there is no  $q \in P$  such that  $p < q < 1$ . Thus  $p$  is maximal<sub><1</sub> in  $\mathbf{P}$  if and only if  $p$  is maximal in the standard sense in the poset induced by  $\mathbf{P}$  on  $P \setminus \{1\}$ . Alternative expressions for maximal<sub><1</sub> are *proper maximal* or *almost maximal*. However, the use of maximal for what we call maximal<sub><1</sub> is quite standard, though ambiguous. We have preferred to use a terminology as closed as possible to the standard one, just adding a subscript in order to avoid ambiguity.

Similarly to the finite case, if  $X \subseteq P$ , then  $\bigvee X = 1$  means that there is no  $p \in P$  such that  $p < 1$  and  $x < p$ , for every  $x \in X$ . Intuitively,  $\bigvee X = 1$  should always be intended as “ $X$  generates the whole structure”, hence  $\langle X \rangle = 1$  could be an alternative notation. We have favored the notation compatible with the standard notation used in (partial) lattice theory.

We could rephrase all the results here in the case when  $\mathbf{P}$  has no maximum; in this case,  $a \vee b = 1$  should be replaced by “ $a$  and  $b$  have no common bound”, and similarly for  $\langle X \rangle = 1$ . The assumption of the existence of 1 is just because all the concrete examples have indeed a maximum.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be a poset with maximum 1 and let  $a, b \in P$ .*

- (i) *If  $a$  is a non-generator and  $b \leq a$ , then  $b$  is a non-generator.*
- (ii) *If  $a, b$  are non-generators and the join  $a \vee b$  exists in  $\mathbf{P}$ , then  $a \vee b$  is a non-generator.*
- (iii) *If  $a$  is a non-generator,  $X \subseteq P$  and  $\bigvee(X \cup \{a\}) = 1$ , then  $\bigvee X = 1$ .*

*Proof.* (i) If  $b \vee e = 1$ , for some  $e \in P$ , then  $a \vee e = 1$ , hence  $e = 1$ , since  $a$  is a non-generator.

(ii) Suppose that  $(a \vee b) \vee e = 1$ ; this means that there is no  $p \in P$  such that  $p < 1$ ,  $a \leq p$ ,  $b \leq p$  and  $e \leq p$ .

Suppose that  $b \leq d$  and  $e \leq d$ , for some  $d$ . Then  $a \vee d = 1$ , since otherwise there is some  $p < 1$  such that  $a \leq p$  and  $d \leq p$ , thus also  $b \leq p$  and  $e \leq p$ , a contradiction. Since  $a$  is a non-generator, then  $d = 1$ .

We have showed that there is no  $d < 1$  such that  $b \leq d$  and  $e \leq d$ , that is  $b \vee e = 1$ . Since  $b$  is a non-generator, then  $e = 1$ , what we had to show.

(iii) Suppose by contradiction that  $\bigvee X = 1$  fails. Then there is  $r \in P$  such that  $r < 1$  and  $x \leq r$ , for every  $x \in X$ . Then  $r \vee a = 1$ , since  $\bigvee(X \cup \{a\}) = 1$ . Since  $a$  is a non-generator, then  $r = 1$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

For short, (i) and (ii) entail that in a join semilattice the set of non-generators is an ideal. However, Lemma 2.1 holds even for posets which are not semilattices. Clause (iii) means that being a non-generator with respect to elements is the same as being a non-generator with respect to subsets.

As we mentioned, G. Frattini showed that in a group the set of non-generators is the intersection of all the maximal ( $\text{maximal}_{<1}$ , in the present terminology) subgroups. For arbitrary posets, it is not always the case that some element  $a$  is a non-generator if and only if  $a \leq p$ , for every maximal  $<1$   $p$ .

A *chain* in a poset is a subset which is linearly ordered by the induced order. We shall always assume that chains are nonempty. By a slight abuse of notation, we shall denote chains as sequences. In what follows, we could always assume that chains are well-ordered, however we do not give details, since this remark shall never be used.

If  $\mathbf{Q}$  is a poset, we say that a chain  $(e_i)_{i \in I}$  in  $\mathbf{Q}$  is *unbounded* if there is no  $q \in \mathbf{Q}$  such that  $e_i \leq q$ , for every  $i \in I$ .

We rephrase Zorn's Lemma as follows.

**2.2. (ZORN'S LEMMA)** *For every nonempty poset  $\mathbf{Q}$ , either  $\mathbf{Q}$  has a maximal element, or there is an unbounded chain in  $\mathbf{Q}$ .*

Suppose that  $\mathbf{P}$  is a poset with maximum 1. We say that a chain  $(e_i)_{i \in I}$  in  $\mathbf{P}$  is *unbounded* $_{<1}$  if  $e_i < 1$ , for every  $i \in I$ , and moreover there is no  $p \in P$  such that  $p < 1$  and  $e_i \leq p$ , for every  $i \in I$ . Thus, for every poset  $\mathbf{P}$  with maximum, a chain is unbounded in  $P \setminus \{1\}$  if and only if it is unbounded $_{<1}$  in  $\mathbf{P}$  and 1 does not belong to the chain.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Suppose that  $\mathbf{P}$  is a poset with maximum 1. If  $a \in P$ , the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) *The element  $a$  is a non-generator.*
- (2) *Both (i)  $a \leq p$ , for every maximal $_{<1}$   $p$ , and (ii) for every  $e \in P$  such that  $e < 1$  and  $e$  cannot be extended to a maximal $_{<1}$  element, there is  $r \in P$  such that  $r < 1$ ,  $a < r$  and  $e < r$ .*
- (3) *Both (i)  $a \leq p$ , for every maximal $_{<1}$   $p$ , and (iii) for every unbounded $_{<1}$  chain  $(e_i)_{i \in I}$  and for every  $i \in I$  (equivalently, for some  $i \in I$ ), there is  $r \in P$  such that  $a \leq r$  and  $e_i \leq r$ .*
- (4) *Both (i)  $a \leq p$ , for every maximal $_{<1}$   $p$ , and (iv) whenever  $(e_i)_{i \in I}$  is an unbounded $_{<1}$  chain such that no element of the chain can be extended to a maximal $_{<1}$  element, then, for every  $i \in I$  (equivalently, for some  $i \in I$ ), there is  $r \in P$  such that  $a \leq r$  and  $e_i \leq r$ .*

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)(i) If  $p$  is maximal and not  $a \leq p$ , then  $a \vee p = 1$ . Since  $a$  is a non-generator, then  $p = 1$ , contradicting  $p < 1$  from the definition of maximality.

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)(ii) is trivial; actually, if  $a$  is a non-generator, then for every  $e \in P$ , if  $e < 1$ , then there is  $r \in P$  such that  $r < 1$ ,  $a < r$  and  $e < r$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) Assume (2) and suppose that  $e \in P$  and  $a \vee e = 1$ . We have to show that  $e = 1$ . Suppose not. If  $e$  cannot be extended to a maximal $_{<1}$  element, then (ii) contradicts  $a \vee e = 1$ . Otherwise, there is some maximal $_{<1}$   $p$  such that  $e \leq p$ . But then  $a \vee e = 1$  implies  $a \vee p = 1$ , which is impossible, since  $a \leq p$ , by (i). We have reached a contradiction in each case, hence  $e = 1$ .

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (3)(iii) is immediate since, by construction,  $e_i < 1$ , for every  $i \in I$ .

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) is trivial.

(4)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) Assume (4) and let  $e < 1$ . We want to show that there is  $r < 1$  such that  $a \leq r$  and  $e \leq r$ . Apply Zorn's Lemma 2.2 to the poset  $Q = \{b \in P \mid e \leq b < 1\}$ , with the order induced by  $\mathbf{P}$ . Notice that  $Q$  is nonempty, since  $e < 1$ . If  $Q$  has a maximal element  $p$ , then  $p$  is maximal $_{<1}$  in  $\mathbf{P}$ , hence  $a \leq p$  by (i) and  $e \leq p$  by construction, so we can take  $r = p$ . Otherwise,  $\mathbf{Q}$  has an unbounded chain, which henceforth is an unbounded $_{<1}$  chain in  $\mathbf{P}$ . Then  $r$  is given by (iv).  $\square$

While the equivalence of (1) and (2) in 2.3 is trivial, though useful, the other equivalences are less trivial; actually they imply back Zorn's Lemma. The following corollary is stated in some set theory in which the Axiom of choice is not assumed, say, Zermelo Fraenkel set theory (ZF).

**Corollary 2.4.** (ZF) *The assertion that Clause (3) in Theorem 2.3 implies Clause (1) is equivalent to Zorn's Lemma, hence also to the Axiom of choice.*

*Proof.* Suppose that Clause (3) implies Clause (1), we shall prove Zorn's Lemma.

Let  $\mathbf{Q}$  be a nonempty poset. If  $\mathbf{Q}$  has some maximal element, we are done. Otherwise, let  $P = Q \cup \{1, a\}$  and order  $P$  by adding the conditions  $a < 1$ ,  $q < 1$ , for every  $q \in Q$  and let  $a$  be incomparable with every element of  $Q$ . Since  $Q$  is nonempty, then  $a$  fails to be a non-generator, hence Clause (3) must fail for  $a$ . Since  $\mathbf{Q}$  has no maximal element, the only maximal element of  $\mathbf{P}$  is  $a$ , hence (3)(i) is satisfied. Thus (3)(ii) fails,  $\mathbf{P}$  has some unbounded $_{<1}$  chain, hence  $\mathbf{Q}$  has some unbounded chain.

All the rest is trivial or well-known.  $\square$

An element  $a$  of some poset  $\mathbf{P}$  with a maximum 1 is *1-compact* if, whenever  $(e_i)_{i \in I}$  is a chain of elements of  $P$  and  $\bigvee_{i \in I} e_i = 1$ , then  $a \leq e_i$ , for some  $i \in I$ . As a standard argument, Theorem 2.3 implies that a 1-compact element  $a$  is a non-generator if and only if  $a$  is contained in every maximal $_{<1}$  element.

In fact, the argument works for an even larger class of elements. Say that  $a$  is *weakly-1-compact* if, whenever  $(e_i)_{i \in I}$  is a chain of elements of  $P$  and  $\bigvee_{i \in I} e_i = 1$ , then there are some  $i \in I$  and some  $r \in P$  such that  $r < 1$ ,  $e_i \leq r$  and  $a \leq r$ . As an even weaker notion, say that  $a$  is *very-weakly-1-compact* if the above condition applies, limited to those chains  $(e_i)_{i \in I}$  such that no  $e_i$  can be extended to a maximal $_{<1}$  element.

**Corollary 2.5.** *Suppose that  $a$  is a 1-compact element of  $\mathbf{P}$ , or just that  $a$  is very-weakly-1-compact.*

Then  $a$  is a non-generator if and only if  $a \leq p$ , for every  $p$  maximal $_{<1}$  in  $\mathbf{P}$ .

*Proof.* Immediate from Proposition 2.5(1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (4).  $\square$

If the meet of all the maximal $_{<1}$  elements of  $\mathbf{P}$  exists, it shall be denoted by  $\Phi$  and shall be called the *Frattini element* of  $\mathbf{P}$ . If  $\mathbf{P}$  has no maximal $_{<1}$  element, we set  $\Phi = 1$ .

An element  $b$  of  $\mathbf{P}$  is *locally 1-compact* (*very-weakly-locally-1-compact*) if  $b$  can be expressed as the join of 1-compact (very-weakly-1-compact) elements. A poset  $\mathbf{P}$  is (very-weakly)-1-algebraic if every element of  $P$  is (very-weakly)-locally 1-compact.

**Corollary 2.6.** *Suppose that  $\mathbf{P}$  is a poset with maximum 1.*

- (1) *If  $\Phi$  exists and is locally 1-compact, or just very-weakly-1-compact, then  $\Phi$  is the join of all the non-generators of  $\mathbf{P}$ .*
- (2) *In particular, if  $\mathbf{P}$  is a complete 1-algebraic lattice, or just a complete very-weakly-1-algebraic lattice, then  $\Phi$  is the join of all the non-generators of  $\mathbf{P}$ .*
- (3) *If  $\mathbf{P}$  is a very-weakly-1-algebraic poset, then  $\Phi$  exists if and only if the join of all the non-generators exists and, if this is the case, they coincide.*
- (4) *If  $\mathbf{P}$  is a finite join-semilattice and there exists at least one non-generator, then  $\Phi$  exists and is the join of all the non-generators.*

*Proof.* (1)  $\Phi$  is greater than all the non-generators, by Theorem 2.3(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (i). By assumption,  $\Phi$  can be expressed as the join of a family of very-weakly-1-compact elements, which are thus non-generators, because of Corollary 2.5. Hence every  $r \in P$  which contains all the non-generators must contain  $\Phi$ .

(2) is a special case of (1).

(3) If  $\Phi$  exists, then the join of all the non-generators exists by (1), and they coincide, again by (1).

Suppose that the join of all the non-generators exists, call it  $\Gamma$ . Every maximal $_{<1}$  element  $p$  is greater than all the non-generators, by Theorem 2.3(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (i), hence  $p \geq \Gamma$ , since  $\Gamma$  is the join of all the non-generators.

Suppose that  $r \leq p$ , for every maximal $_{<1}$  element  $p$ . Since  $\mathbf{P}$  is very-weakly-1-algebraic, then  $r = \bigvee A$ , where  $A$  is a family of very-weakly-1-compact elements. Since  $a \leq r \leq p$ , for every  $a \in A$  and every maximal $_{<1}$  element  $p$ , then every  $a$  in  $A$  is a non-generator, by Corollary 2.5. Hence  $a \leq \Gamma$ , for every  $a \in A$ . In particular,  $r \leq \Gamma$ , since  $r = \bigvee A$ ,

We have showed that  $\Gamma \leq p$  for every maximal $_{<1}$  element  $p$ . Moreover, if  $r \leq p$ , for every maximal $_{<1}$  element  $p$ , then  $r \leq \Gamma$ . This shows that  $\Gamma$  is the meet of all the maximal $_{<1}$  elements, thus  $\Phi$  exists and  $\Phi = \Gamma$ .

(4) is immediate from (3). Notice that  $\Phi$  might not exist in a finite join-semilattice  $\mathbf{S}$ : just let  $\mathbf{S}$  consist of just a maximum 1 and at least two maximal $_{<1}$  elements and no more element.  $\square$

### 3. Further remarks

As we mentioned in the introduction, we now see that dealing with closure posets or even closure spaces does not improve the results in the preceding section. Actually, we only assume that some poset  $\mathbf{R}$  has a specified subset  $P$  of “closed” elements and we show that it is no loss of generality to work already in  $\mathbf{P}$ .

Suppose that  $\mathbf{R}$  is a poset with maximum 1,  $P \subseteq R$  and  $1 \in P$ . Elements of  $P$  shall be called *closed*. However, we make no specific assumption on the induced poset  $\mathbf{P}$ , for example, we do not assume that  $\mathbf{P}$  is a semilattice. We say that some subset  $Y \subseteq R$  *P-generates* 1 if there is no  $b \in P$  such that  $b < 1$  and  $y \leq b$ , for every  $y \in Y$ .

We say that  $a \in R$  is a *P-non-generator* in case that, for every  $e \in R$ , if  $\{a, e\}$  *P-generates* 1, then  $\{e\}$  *P-generates* 1.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose that  $\mathbf{R}$  is a poset with maximum 1 and  $P \subseteq R$ . Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be the induced poset on  $P$ .*

*If  $a \in R$  and there exists a smallest element  $c \in P$  such that  $a \leq c$ , then  $a$  is a *P-non-generator* in  $\mathbf{R}$  if and only if  $c$  is a non-generator in  $\mathbf{P}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $a$  is a *P-non-generator* and  $c \vee d = 1$  in  $\mathbf{P}$ . Since  $c$  is the smallest closed containing  $a$ , then there is no closed  $< 1$  containing both  $a$  and  $d$ . Thus  $\{a, d\}$  *P-generates* 1, hence  $\{d\}$  *P-generates* 1, since  $a$  is a *P-non-generator*. But  $d$  is closed, hence  $d = 1$ .

Conversely, assume that  $c$  is a non-generator in  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $\{a, b\}$  *P-generates* 1. Suppose by contradiction that  $\{b\}$  does not *P-generate* 1, hence  $b \leq d < 1$ , for some  $d \in P$ . Since  $\{a, b\}$  *P-generates* 1 and  $a \leq c$ ,  $b \leq d$ , then  $\{c, d\}$  *P-generates* 1, but this amounts to say that  $c \vee d = 1$  in  $\mathbf{P}$ , since  $c$  and  $d$  are closed. Since  $c$  is a non-generator in  $\mathbf{P}$ , then  $d = 1$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

*Remark 3.2.* The present abstract study is not intended to capture all the significant aspects of Frattini’s and Jacobson’s theory. At the heart of their radical theory there seems to be a deep and unexpected connection between subalgebra- or module-like notions on the “maximality side” and congruence-like notions at the radical level. Whether the group and ring theory of Frattini and Jacobson can be fully extended to a general universal-algebraic setting, or even to a categorical one, seems to be still an open problem. In this connection, see however [KV, K].

#### REFERENCES

- [ADS] Adams, M. E., Dwinger, P., Schmid, J., *Maximal sublattices of finite distributive lattices*, Algebra Universalis **36** (1996), 488–504.
- [BS] Bergman, C., Slutzki, G., *Computational complexity of generators and nongenerators in algebra*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **12** (2002), 719–735.
- [E] Ern e, M., *Closure*, in *Beyond topology*, Contemp. Math. **486**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2009), 163–238.

- [Fr] Frattini, G., *Intorno alla generazione dei gruppi di operazioni*, Rend. Atti Accad. Lincei (4) I (1885), 281–285.
- [Jac] Jacobson, N., *The radical and semi-simplicity for arbitrary rings*, Amer. J. Math. **67**, (1945), 300–320.
- [Jan] Janelidze, G., *Frattini subobjects and extensions in semi-Abelian categories*, Bull. Iranian Math. Soc. **44** (2018), 291–304.
- [K] Kearnes, K. A., *Critical algebras and the Frattini congruence. II*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc., **53** (1996), 91–100.
- [KV] Kiss, E. W., Vovsi, S. M., *Critical algebras and the Frattini congruence*, Algebra Universalis, **34** (1995), 336–344.
- [KST] Kissin, E., Shulman V. S., Turovskii Y. V., *Topological radicals, IV. Frattini theory for Banach Lie algebras*, arXiv:1201.1086 (2012), 1–49.
- [MSS] McAlister, A., Stagg Rovira, K., Stitzinger, E., *Frattini properties and nilpotency in Leibniz algebras*, Int. Electron. J. Algebra **25** (2019), 64–76.
- [Sc] Schmid, J., *Nongenerators, genuine generators and irreducibles*, Houston J. Math., **25** (1999), 405–416.
- [Sz] Szász, F. A., *On Frattini one-sided ideals and subgroups*, Math. Nachr. **46** (1970), 235–242.
- [T] Towers, D. A., *On minimal non-elementary Lie algebras*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **143** (2015), 117–120

PAOLO LIPPARINI

Dipartimento di Matematica, Viale della Ricerca Non Generata, Università di Roma  
“Tor Vergata”, I-00133 ROME ITALY  
URL: <http://www.mat.uniroma2.it/~lipparin>