

NON-GENERATORS IN COMPLETE LATTICES AND SEMILATTICES

PAOLO LIPPARINI

ABSTRACT. As well-known, in a finitary algebraic structure the set Γ of all the non-generators is the intersection of all the maximal proper substructures. In particular, Γ is a substructure.

We show that the corresponding statements hold for complete semilattices but fail for complete lattices, when as the notion of substructure we take complete subsemilattices and complete sublattices, respectively.

We shall consider complete lattices and complete semilattices, whose substructures are taken to be complete sublattices and complete subsemilattices, respectively. In a *complete sublattice* both meets and joins, possibly infinitary, should agree with meets and joins of the original structure. In a *complete subsemilattice* only meets are required to agree with the original meets. We refer to [G2] for basics about lattices and semilattices.

To simplify notation, we shall not distinguish between a structure and its underlying set. This little abuse of notation will never produce ambiguity. If, say, L is a complete lattice and $X \subseteq L$, then $\langle X \rangle$ denotes the complete sublattice *generated by* X , that is, the intersection of all the complete sublattices of L containing X . Of course, when dealing with complete semilattices, $\langle X \rangle$ generally turns out to be a different set; it will always be clear from the context whether we are working in the setting of lattices or of semilattices. The following definitions apply to both settings.

An element $a \in L$ is a *non-generator* if, for every $X \subseteq L$, it happens that $\langle X, a \rangle = L$ implies $\langle X \rangle = L$. Otherwise, a is called a *relative generator*. Thus a is a relative generator if there is some $X \subseteq L$ such that $\langle X, a \rangle = L$ but not $\langle X \rangle = L$. Here, as usual, $\langle X, a \rangle$ is an abbreviation for $\langle X \cup \{a\} \rangle$. An element a is *indispensable* if a belongs to every generating set, that is, $\langle X \rangle = L$ implies $a \in X$. In particular, every indispensable element is a relative generator (take $X = L \setminus \{a\}$). Notice that some element a is indispensable if and only if $L \setminus \{a\}$ is a substructure.

Date: January 4, 2022.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 06B23; Secondary 06A12; 08A65.

Key words and phrases. non-generator; complete lattice; complete sublattice; complete semilattice.

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.

Of course the above notions can be considered—and originally have been considered—in various distinct algebraic settings. See [BS, J, KV] for further details and references. It is immediate to see that a non-generator belongs to the intersection of all the proper maximal substructures, if any. The converse holds for algebraic structures whose operations are finitary, but not necessarily in the infinitary case [H]. We show that a counterexample can be realized already in the classical and well-studied setting of complete lattices. On the other hand, complete semilattices share the good behavior of finitary algebraic structures, as far as non-generators are considered. Let us mention that we deal with completeness just for notational simplicity; in both cases asking just for the existence of countable meets or joins is enough. A few further variations shall be presented in Remark 6 below.

The arguments presented in this note are substantially different from the proof in [H], which is indirect and relies on [G1]. In order to make a comparison, we briefly sketch the arguments from [H]; this shall not be needed in the sequel.

If A is an algebraic structure, let $S(A)$ be the closure system associated to the set of substructures of A , $\Gamma(A)$ be the set of the non-generators of A and $\Phi(A)$ be the intersection of all the proper maximal substructures of A , setting $\Phi(A) = A$ if A has no proper maximal substructure. Thus $\Gamma(A) = \Phi(A)$ in any finitary structure, $\Phi(A)$ is a substructure of A and $\Gamma(A) \subseteq \Phi(A)$ always.

In [H] a closure system S is constructed such that if A is a structure and $S = S(A)$, then $\Gamma(A)$ is not a substructure of A , and moreover $\langle \Gamma(A) \rangle$ is strictly contained in $\Phi(A)$. By [G1, Theorem 1], for every closure system S , there is indeed some infinitary algebraic structure A such that $S = S(A)$. It follows that $\Gamma(A) \subsetneq \Phi(A)$ might actually happen for infinitary algebraic structures. To the best of our knowledge, no other example of $\Gamma(A) \subsetneq \Phi(A)$ has appeared before in the literature. Further examples will appear in [L].

The structures considered in [G1] have infinitely many operations and each operation is everywhere a projection, except when applied to a single specific sequence. On the other hand, here we can equivalently work with countably complete lattices, hence our counterexamples can be taken to be structures with just two operations. Actually, as we shall show in Corollary 7, our examples can be easily modified in order to work with just one operation depending on countably many arguments.

Conventionally, the intersection of an empty family of substructures of some structure L is taken to be L itself. In the standard definition of a complete semilattice (lattice) the empty subset is required to have a meet (and a join); in other words, complete semilattices (lattices) are required to have a maximum (and a minimum). We adopt the above convention; in particular, a complete subsemilattice of some complete semilattice shares the maximum with the parent structure, and similarly for lattices. In any case, in all the examples below, maxima and minima are non-generators even under the alternative convention under which the meet or join of the

empty subset need not exist or need not be preserved. It follows that our results hold irrespective of the convention about the meet and join of the empty set. See Remark 3(b).

Proposition 1. *In every complete semilattice the set Γ of non-generators is a complete subsemilattice and Γ is the intersection of all the maximal proper complete subsemilattices.*

Proof. We first prove that an element a of some complete semilattice S is a non-generator if and only if a is *meet reducible* (here meets are always allowed to be infinitary), that is, there is a subset $Y \subseteq S$ such that $a \notin Y$ and $a = \bigwedge Y$.

Indeed, suppose that a is meet reducible, as witnessed by Y . If $X \subseteq S$ and $\langle X, a \rangle = S$, then $y \in \langle X, a \rangle$, for every $y \in Y$. But then $y \in \langle X \rangle$, since $y > a$, hence a cannot contribute to the generation of y . Then also $a \in \langle X \rangle$, since $a = \bigwedge Y$ and $\langle X \rangle$ is a complete subsemilattice. Hence $\langle X \rangle = \langle X, a \rangle = S$. Thus a is a non-generator.

On the other hand, if a is meet irreducible, then $S \setminus \{a\}$ is a complete subsemilattice of S , hence a fails to be a non-generator, actually, a is indispensable.

We have proved a bit more: an element of some complete semilattice is either indispensable, or a non-generator (the finitary case appears in [K]). Thus the set Γ of the non-generators is the intersection of the complete subsemilattices of the form $S \setminus \{b\}$, with b indispensable. No maximal proper complete subsemilattice of a different kind exists, since all the non-generators belong to every maximal proper complete subsemilattice and if some element b fails to be a non-generator, then $S \setminus \{b\}$ is a complete subsemilattice of S . Hence Γ is the intersection of the maximal proper complete subsemilattices of L . In particular, Γ is a complete subsemilattice. \square

See Remark 6 below for some variations on Proposition 1.


Besides semilattices, there are many situations in which $\Gamma(A) = \Phi(A)$ even for infinitary algebras. Indeed, the proof of Proposition 1 shows that this is the case for every structure in which every element is either indispensable or a non-generator. As another example, $\Gamma(A) = \Phi(A)$ holds for finite (= having finite domain) structures, since in this case any substructure can be extended to a maximal one, and then the classical argument applies. We are not aware of any systematic study of infinitary structures for which $\Gamma(A) = \Phi(A)$ holds. In [L] we show that every structure with at least one infinitary operation can be embedded into some structure B such that $\Gamma(B)$ is not a substructure of B , but can also be embedded into some structure C such that $\Gamma(C) = \Phi(C)$. Moreover, in [L] we present non-trivial examples of structures D such that $\Gamma(D^+)$ is a substructure of D^+ , for every expansion D^+ of D .

We now show that lattices behave in a way different from semilattices. The next proposition is rather simple and shows that in a distributive complete lattice the intersection of all the maximal proper complete sublattices might be strictly larger than the set of the non-generators.

A complete linearly ordered set is considered as a complete lattice endowed with the operations of sup and inf. In particular, this applies to the set $\{0, 1\}$ with the standard order. The reader familiar with ordinals will recognize that the linearly ordered sets K in, respectively, Proposition 2 and Theorem 4 below are isomorphic to the ordinals $\omega + 1$ and $\omega^2 + 1$. However, we shall need no aspect of the theory of ordinals, hence we give explicit definitions from scratch.

Proposition 2. *Let K be the complete lattice obtained from the linearly ordered set \mathbb{N} by adding a top element ω . Let L be the lattice product $K \times \{0, 1\}$.*

In the complete lattice L the element $(\omega, 0)$ is a relative generator, but $(\omega, 0)$ belongs to all the maximal proper complete sublattices of L . The set Γ of all the non-generators is a complete sublattice of L .



The lattice L in Proposition 2.

Proof. Observe that $M = (\mathbb{N} \times \{1\}) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$ is a complete proper sublattice of L . Here we include the bottom element $(0, 0)$ according to the convention that complete sublattices share the minimum with their parent lattice. Since $\langle M, (\omega, 0) \rangle = L$, then $(\omega, 0)$ is a relative generator.

Now we check that $(\omega, 0)$ belongs to all the maximal proper complete sublattices of L . Suppose by contradiction that P is a maximal complete sublattice and $(\omega, 0) \notin P$. Then there is some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(m, 0) \notin P$, for every $m \geq n$, since P is assumed to be complete. Now notice that $Q = L \setminus \{(m, 0) \mid m \in \mathbb{N}, m > n\}$ is a proper complete sublattice of L . Moreover, $P \subsetneq Q$, since $(n, 0) \in Q \setminus P$. Hence P is not maximal and we have obtained the desired contradiction. Notice that if we consider L as a finitary lattice, instead, then the subset $L \setminus \{(\omega, 0)\}$ is a sublattice. However this subset is not a complete sublattice, since it is not closed with respect to the operation of taking infinitary joins.

Next, observe that $L \setminus \{(0, 1)\}$, as well as the subsets of the form $L \setminus \{(n, 0), (n, 1)\}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$, are maximal proper complete sublattices. Since any non-generator is contained in all the maximal proper complete sublattices, then $\Gamma \subseteq \{(0, 0), (\omega, 1)\}$, since we have already proved that $(\omega, 0) \notin \Gamma$. But $(0, 0)$ and $(\omega, 1)$ are obviously non-generators, thus $\Gamma = \{(0, 0), (\omega, 1)\}$, which is a complete sublattice. \square

Remark 3. Some remarks about the proof of Proposition 2 are in order.

(a) First, the proof shows that the intersection Φ of all the maximal proper complete sublattices is $\{(0, 0), (\omega, 0), (\omega, 1)\}$, since every non-generator belongs to Φ , we have showed directly that $(\omega, 0) \in \Phi$ and, for every remaining element ℓ of L , we have exhibited a maximal proper complete sublattice P such that $\ell \notin P$. In particular, $\Phi \neq \Gamma$.

(b) In the present lattice L the bottom element $(0, 0)$ and the top element $(\omega, 1)$ are non-generators even under the alternative convention that sublattices need not respect minima and maxima. Indeed, since, say, $(\omega, 1)$ is the top element of L , then $\langle X, (\omega, 1) \rangle = \langle X \rangle \cup \{(\omega, 1)\}$, for every $X \subseteq L$. Thus if $\langle X, (\omega, 1) \rangle = L$, then $(0, 1), (\omega, 0) \in \langle X \rangle$, hence $\langle X \rangle = \langle X, (\omega, 1) \rangle$, since $(0, 1) \vee (\omega, 0) = (\omega, 1)$. This shows that $(\omega, 1)$ is a non generator in L and a similar argument applies to $(0, 0)$. (On the other hand, for example, in a complete linearly ordered lattice the bottom and the top elements are non-generators if and only if we assume the convention that sublattices respect minima and maxima.)

(c) Finally, we show that all the maximal proper complete sublattices of L are the ones described in the third paragraph of the proof. We show that if P is a maximal proper complete sublattice of L , $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \geq 1$, then $(n, 0) \in P$ if and only if $(n, 1) \in P$.


Suppose by contradiction that, say, $(n, 0) \in P$ and $(n, 1) \notin P$. Then $(0, 1), \dots, (n-1, 1) \notin P$, since $(n, 0) \in P$ and $(i, 1) \vee (n, 0) = (n, 1)$, for $i < n$. Hence if $Q = L \setminus \{(0, 1), \dots, (n, 1)\}$, then $P \subseteq Q$, but this contradicts the maximality of P , since Q is a complete sublattice which is not maximal. Indeed, since $n \geq 1$, then $L \setminus \{(0, 1), \dots, (n-1, 1)\}$ is a proper complete sublattice of L extending Q . Symmetrically, if $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(n, 1) \in P$ and $(n, 0) \notin P$, then P is contained in the sublattice $L \setminus \{(i, 0) \mid n \leq i \leq \omega\}$, which is not maximal.

Since we have showed that $(0, 0)$, $(\omega, 0)$ and $(\omega, 1)$ belong to every maximal complete sublattice, then the maximal complete sublattices of L are exactly $L \setminus \{(0, 1)\}$ and $L \setminus \{(n, 0), (n, 1)\}$, for $n \geq 1$.

The next result needs a bit more work and shows that in a distributive complete lattice the set of the non-generators might even fail to be a complete sublattice. We shall denote by $L \times M$ the lexicographic product of two linearly ordered sets. Elements of $L \times M$ shall be denoted by $a \times b$, for $a \in L$ and $b \in M$. In the next theorem we shall consider an extension of $(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}) \times \{0, 1\}$, where \times is the standard product of lattices. Elements of $(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}) \times \{0, 1\}$ shall be denoted by $(m \times n, 0)$ and $(m \times n, 1)$.

Theorem 4. *Let K be the linearly ordered set obtained from the lexicographic product $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ by adding a top element ω^2 . Let L be the lattice product $K \times \{0, 1\}$.*

In the complete lattice L the element $(\omega^2, 0)$ is a relative generator, but $(\omega^2, 0)$ belongs to the complete sublattice generated by the set Γ of the non-generators of L . In particular, Γ is not a complete sublattice of L .



The lattice L in Theorem 4.

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 2, $M = (K \times \{1\}) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$ is a proper complete sublattice of L and $\langle M, (\omega^2, 0) \rangle = L$, hence $(\omega^2, 0)$ is a relative generator.

We now show that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$, the element $(n \times 0, 0)$ is a non-generator. Suppose that $n \geq 1$ and $\langle X, (n \times 0, 0) \rangle = L$. We first claim that $(n \times 1, 0) \in \langle X \rangle$. Indeed, since $L \setminus \{(n \times 1, 0), (n \times 1, 1)\}$ is a complete sublattice of L , then either $(n \times 1, 0) \in X$, or $(n \times 1, 1) \in X$. If the first eventuality occurs, we are done. Otherwise, let $P = \{(k, 0) \mid k \in K \text{ and } k \geq n \times 1 \text{ in } K\}$. Since $L \setminus P$ is a complete sublattice of L and $\langle X, (n \times 0, 0) \rangle = L$, then $(k, 0) \in X$, for some $k \geq n \times 1$. From $(n \times 1, 1) \in X$ and $(k, 0) \in X$ we get $(n \times 1, 1) \wedge (k, 0) = (n \times 1, 0) \in \langle X \rangle$. The claim that $(n \times 1, 0) \in \langle X \rangle$ has been proved.

Now let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \geq 1$. As above, since $L \setminus \{(n-1 \times m, 0), (n-1 \times m, 1)\}$ is a complete sublattice of L , then either $(n-1 \times m, 0) \in X$, or $(n-1 \times m, 1) \in X$. Since $(n \times 1, 0) \in \langle X \rangle$ and $(n-1 \times m, 1) \wedge (n \times 1, 0) = (n-1 \times m, 0)$, we get $(n-1 \times m, 0) \in \langle X \rangle$ in each case. Since $m \geq 1$ was arbitrary in the above argument and $\langle X \rangle$ is a complete sublattice of L , then $\bigvee_{m \geq 1} (n-1 \times m, 0) = (n \times 0, 0) \in \langle X \rangle$, thus $\langle X \rangle = L$ follows from $\langle X, (n \times 0, 0) \rangle = L$.

We have proved that the elements of the form $(n \times 0, 0)$, $n \geq 1$, are non-generators. Since $(\omega^2, 0)$ is a relative generator and $(\omega^2, 0) = \bigvee_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (n \times 0, 0)$, then the set of all the non-generators is not a complete sublattice of L .

The proof is complete. We just point out that, arguing as above, we get

$$\Gamma = \{(n \times 0, 0) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{(n \times 0, 1) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1\} \cup \{(\omega^2, 1)\}$$

and $\Phi = \langle \Gamma \rangle = \Gamma \cup \{(\omega^2, 0)\}$. Using the arguments in Remark 3(c), the maximal proper complete sublattices of L are $L \setminus \{(0 \times 0, 1)\}$ and $L \setminus \{(n \times m, 0), (n \times m, 1)\}$, for $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \geq 1$. \square

The complete lattice L in Theorem 4 is countable. The example can be somewhat simplified if we allow lattices of larger cardinalities. In the following proposition $[0, 1]$ is the closed interval of real numbers between 0 and 1, with the lattice operations of sup and inf.

Proposition 5. *In the complete lattice $L = [0, 1] \times \{0, 1\}$ all the elements are non-generators, except for $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$. Hence the set Γ of the non-generators is not a complete sublattice. The set Γ generates the whole of $[0, 1] \times \{0, 1\}$.*

Proof. (Sketch) Let $0 < r < 1$ and suppose that $\langle X, (r, 0) \rangle = L$. Since $L \setminus \{(s, 0) \mid r < s\}$ is a complete sublattice, there is $s > r$ such that $(s, 0) \in X$. For every t with $0 \leq t < r$, the set $L \setminus ([t, r] \times \{0, 1\})$ is a complete sublattice, hence $(v, a) \in X$, for some $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and v with $t < v < r$. Taking the meet with $(s, 0)$, we get $(v, 0) \in \langle X \rangle$. Letting t approximate r from below, we get a sequence of elements $(v_n, 0) \in \langle X \rangle$ whose join is $(r, 0)$, hence $(r, 0) \in \langle X \rangle$, thus $\langle X \rangle = L$.

All the rest is symmetrical or similar to the proof of Theorem 4. \square

As we have just showed, the set Γ of the non-generators of a complete lattice is not necessarily a complete sublattice. However, Γ is always a sublattice, that is, Γ is closed under finite meets and joins. Indeed, if a and b are non-generators and, say, $\langle X, a \wedge b \rangle = L$, then $\langle X, a, b \rangle = L$, since $\langle X, a \wedge b \rangle \subseteq \langle X, a, b \rangle$. Hence $\langle X, a \rangle = L$, since b is a non-generator, thus $\langle X \rangle = L$, since a is a non-generator. This shows that $a \wedge b$ is a non-generator.

Remark 6. (a) As we mentioned, we have dealt with complete lattices and semilattices just for the sake of simplicity. Since the counterexample in Theorem 4 is countable, completeness is the same as countable completeness. Hence even in a countably complete lattice it might happen that the set of all the non-generators fails to be a substructure. Recall that *countably complete* means that every countable subset has a meet and a join.

(b) Similarly, the version of Proposition 1 holds with the same proof when “complete” is everywhere replaced by “countably complete” or, more generally, by “ $< \kappa$ -complete”, for κ an infinite cardinal, where the latter notion means that every subset of cardinality $< \kappa$ has a meet. Of course, the notion of meet-reducibility in the proof should be replaced by an appropriate notion of $< \kappa$ -meet reducibility.

The versions of Proposition 1 hold also under the convention under which “completeness” does not include the possibility of taking the meet of the empty set, that is, for semilattices not assumed to have a maximum.

(c) Notice that the notion of a non-generator in a $<\kappa$ -complete semilattice depends on κ . For example, consider a descending countably infinite sequence with a further element d added at the bottom. The element d is indispensable if the above semilattice is considered as finitary; however, d is a non-generator if we consider the semilattice as countably complete.

Similarly, if d is added at the bottom of a descending chain of cofinality λ , then d is a non-generator if and only if we consider the semilattice as $<\kappa$ -complete, for $\kappa > \lambda$.

(d) In the proof of Theorem 4 we have only used binary meets and (countable) infinitary joins, hence the theorem holds in the context of countably-join-complete lattices.

Corollary 7. *There is an algebraic structure with a single operation depending on countably many arguments and such that the set of all the non-generators fails to be a substructure.*

Proof. Consider the example from Theorem 4 with the single infinitary operation $f(x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots) = \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (x_{2i} \wedge x_{2i+1})$, noticing that finite meets and countable joins can be expressed in function of f . Then use remark (d) above. \square

Acknowledgement. We thank an anonymous referee for many useful comments which helped improve the paper.

REFERENCES

- [BS] Bergman, C., Slutzki, G., *Computational complexity of generators and nongenerators in algebra*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **12** (2002), 719–735.
- [G1] Grätzer, G., *On the family of certain subalgebras of a universal algebra*, Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A 68 = Indag. Math., **27**, (1965), 790–802.
- [G2] Grätzer, G., *Lattice theory: foundation*, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel (2011).
- [H] Hansoul, G. E., *The Frattini subalgebra of an infinitary algebra*, Bull. Soc. Roy. Sci. Liège, **49** (1980), 423–424.
- [J] Janelidze, G., *Frattini subobjects and extensions in semi-Abelian categories*, Bull. Iranian Math. Soc. **44** (2018), 291–304.
- [KV] Kiss, E. W., Vovsi, S. M., *Critical algebras and the Frattini congruence*, Algebra Universalis, **34** (1995), 336–344.
- [K] Koh, K., *On the Frattini sub-semilattice of a semilattice*, Nanta Math., **5**, (1971), 22–33.
- [L] Lipparini, P., *Non-generators in extensions of infinitary algebras*, submitted, available at <https://art.torvergata.it/handle/2108/277569>
Email address: lipparin@xp.mat.uniroma2.it
URL: <http://www.mat.uniroma2.it/~lipparin>

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, VIALE DELLA RICERCA GENERETICOLATA, UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA “TOR VERGATA”, I-00133 ROME ITALY, ORCID: 0000-0003-3747-6611