

A SURVEY OF LATTICE PROPERTIES: MODULAR, ARGUESIAN, LINEAR, AND DISTRIBUTIVE

DALE R. WORLEY

ABSTRACT. This is a survey of characterizations and relationships between some properties of lattices, particularly the modular, Arguesian, linear, and distributive properties, but also some other related properties. The survey emphasizes finite and finitary lattices and deemphasizes complemented lattices.

A final section is a restatement of the open questions, which may prove to be a source of thesis problems.

When an author collects together the opinions of as many others as he can and fills half of every page with footnotes, this is known as “scholarship”. — Egyptologist Flinders Petrie quoted in [Bell1961]

Please send any suggestions for improvements, particularly to the “unknown” items in section 4, to the author for incorporation into a later version.

1. INTRODUCTION

This is a survey of characterizations and relationships between some properties of lattices, particularly the modular, Arguesian, linear, and distributive properties, but also some other related properties. We also enumerate how authors spell “Arguesian” in order to find the consensus.

Because the present author’s interest is in lattices that are finitary¹, and which are not complemented, or even relatively complemented, the survey emphasizes finite and finitary lattices and deemphasizes complemented lattices.

This survey is organized into four sections. The first section 2 is organized by the works surveyed, quoting the relevant results. The second section 3 is organized by the properties involved, synthesizing the results quoted in the first part. The third section 4 is a summary chart of the lattice properties, the relationships between them and their major characteristics. The fourth section 5 is a restatement of the open questions from the second section, which may prove to be a source of thesis problems.

2. SURVEY BY WORKS CITED

Words quoted with “...” are taken directly from the cited work. Words that are not explicitly quoted are the present author’s paraphrase. Quotations that continue into later paragraphs start each later paragraph with “. All translations are the present author’s. Quoted words are sometimes edited for consistency of terminology, brevity, or especially, to make citations match the present bibliography. Within quotations, words bracketed [...] are the present author’s paraphrase. Deleted passages are represented with For the exact wordings, please see the cited works themselves.

2.1. Birkhoff, “On the structure of abstract algebras”. [Birk1935]

[Birk1935, sec. 21 Th. 22] “Theorem 22: Every subgroup lattice [a sublattice of subgroups of a group] is isomorphic with an equivalence lattice [a sublattice of equivalence relations on a set], and conversely.”

[Birk1935, sec. 31] “The preceding material suggests several interesting questions whose answer is unknown.

“Some questions concern equivalence lattices. Is any lattice realizable as a lattice of equivalence relations? Is the dual of any equivalence lattice an equivalence lattice? ... More generally, are equivalence lattices a family in the species of algebras of double composition [a variety of algebras with two operations].”

Date: Apr 11, 2024.

¹all principal ideals are finite

2.2. Birkhoff, *Lattice theory*. [Birk1967]

Uses “Desarguesian” but only applies it to projective planes. [Birk1967, ch. I sec. 13]

[Birk1967, ch. I sec. 6 Th. 9] “Theorem 9. In any lattice, the following identities are equivalent:

$$(L6') \quad x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z) \text{ all } x, y, z$$

$$(L6'') \quad x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z) \text{ all } x, y, z$$

[Birk1967, ch. I sec. 6] “A ring of sets is a family Ψ of subsets of a set I which contains with any two sets S and T also their (set-theoretic) intersection $S \cap T$ and union $S \cup T$ Any ring of sets under the natural ordering $S \subset T$ is a distributive lattice.”

[Birk1967, ch. I sec. 7] “the self-dual “modular” identity: If $x \leq z$, then $x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge z$.”

[Birk1967, ch. I sec. 7] “Thus any distributive lattice satisfies [the modular identity].”

[Birk1967, ch. I sec. 7 Th. 11] “Theorem 11. The normal subgroups of any group G form a modular lattice.”

[Birk1967, ch. I sec. 7 Th. 12] “Theorem 12. Any nonmodular lattice L contains [the pentagon lattice N_5] as a sublattice.”

[Birk1967, ch. II sec. 7 Lem. 1] “Lemma 1. In a modular lattice, $x = y$ is implied by the conditions $a \wedge x = a \wedge y$ and $a \vee x = a \vee y$, provided that x and y are comparable (i.e., that $x \geq y$ or $y \geq x$).”

[Birk1967, ch. II sec. 7 Lem. 3] “Lemma 3. In any modular lattice, for all x, y, z , $[x \wedge (y \vee z)] \vee [y \wedge (z \vee x)] = (x \vee y) \wedge (y \vee z) \wedge (z \vee x)$.”

[Birk1967, ch. II sec. 7 Th. 13] “Theorem 13. Any modular, nondistributive lattice M contains a sublattice isomorphic with [the diamond lattice].”

[Birk1967, ch. II sec. 7 Th. 13 Cor.] “Corollary. For a lattice to be distributive, the following condition is necessary and sufficient: $a \wedge x = a \wedge y$ and $a \vee x = a \vee y$ imply $x = y$. That is, it is necessary and sufficient that relative complements be unique.”

[Birk1967, ch. II sec. 8 Th. 14 Cor.] “Corollary. Any modular or semimodular poset of finite length is graded by its height function $h[x]$.”

[Birk1967, ch. II sec. 7 Exer. 2] “Prove that, in any lattice, [the modular identity] is equivalent to each of the identities $x \wedge (y \vee z) = x \wedge \{[y \wedge (x \vee z)] \vee z\}$, $[(x \wedge z) \vee y] \wedge z = [(y \wedge z) \vee x] \wedge z$.”

[Birk1967, ch. II sec. 8] “We shall call P (upper) semimodular when it satisfies: If $a \neq b$ both cover c , then there exists $d \in P$ which covers both a and b . Lower semimodular posets of finite lengths are defined dually.”

[Birk1967, ch. II sec. 8 Th. 15] “Theorem 15. A graded lattice of finite length is semimodular if and only if $h[x] + h[y] \geq h[x \vee y] + h[x \wedge y]$. Dually, it is lower semimodular if and only if $h[x] + h[y] \leq h[x \vee y] + h[x \wedge y]$.” Thus a lattice of finite length is modular iff it is graded and $h[x] + h[y] = h[x \vee y] + h[x \wedge y]$.

[Birk1967, ch. II sec. 8 Th. 15 Cor.] “Corollary. In any modular lattice of finite length: $h[x] + h[y] = h[x \vee y] + h[x \wedge y]$.”

[Birk1967, ch. II sec. 8 Th. 16] “Theorem 16. Let L be a lattice of finite length. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) the modular identity L5,
- (ii) L is both upper and lower semimodular,
- (iii) the Jordan–Dedekind chain condition [all maximal chains between the same endpoints have the same finite length], and $[h[x] + h[y] = h[x \vee y] + h[x \wedge y]]$.

[Birk1967, ch. III sec. 3 Th. 3] “Theorem 3. Let L be any distributive lattice of length n . Then the poset X of join-irreducible elements $p_i > \hat{0}$ has order n and $L = \mathbf{2}^X$ [the set of weakly order-preserving functions from X to $\mathbf{2}$].”

2.3. Britz, Mainetti, and Pezzoli, “Some operations on the family of equivalence relations”. [BritzMainPezz2001]

[BritzMainPezz2001, Th. 1] “Two equivalence relations R and T are said to *commute* if and only if $RT = TR$.

Commuting equivalence relations can be characterized by various means, among others by

“Theorem 1. Let R and T be equivalence relations on a set S . The following statements are then equivalent:

- (1) R and T commute;
- (2) $R \vee T = RT$;
- (3) RT is an equivalence relation.”

[BritzMainPezz2001, Th. 2] “Two equivalence relations R and T are *independent* if and only if $\rho \cap \tau$ is nonempty for all classes $\rho \in S_R$ and $\tau \in S_T$. The following characterization in terms of the equivalence classes of R and T is due to P. Dubreil and M.-L. Dubreil-Jacotin[3].

“Theorem 2. The equivalence relations R and T commute if and only if, for any equivalence class $C \in S_{RVT}$ the restrictions $R|_C, T|_C$ are independent.”

2.4. Crawley and Dilworth, *Algebraic Theory of Lattices*. [CrawDil1973]

Uses “Arguesian” and “has a representation of type 1”.

[CrawDil1973, Chap. 12 12.4] “12.4: If a lattice L has a representation of type 1, then L is Arguesian.[Jóns1953b]”

2.5. Day, “In search of a Pappian lattice identity”. [Day1981]

[Day1981, sec. 1] “there is a lattice embedding of the non-pappian projective plane over the quaternions into the 5-dimensional projective space over the complex numbers.”

2.6. Day, “Geometrical applications in modular lattices”. [Day1982]

Uses “Arguesian” and “Desarguean”.

[Day1982, sec. 1] “Theorem (Dedekind [27]). Let $(M; \vee, \wedge)$ be a lattice; then the following are equivalent:

- (1) $(M; \vee, \wedge)$ is modular.
- (2) $(M; \vee, \wedge)$ satisfies $(\forall x, y, z \in M)(x \leq z \Rightarrow x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge z)$.
- (3) $(M; \vee, \wedge)$ satisfies $(\forall x, y, z \in M)((x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z) = ((x \wedge z) \vee y) \wedge z)$.”

Note there is a typo in the above reference; it should be “[30]”.

[Day1982, sec. 3 Def. 1] “Definition 1. A lattice $(L; \vee, \wedge)$ is called Desarguean if it satisfies the implication

$$[(a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) \leq a_2 \vee b_2] \Rightarrow [(a_0 \vee a_1) \wedge (b_0 \vee b_1) \leq [(a_0 \vee a_2) \wedge (b_0 \vee b_2)] \vee [(a_1 \vee a_2) \wedge (b_1 \vee b_2)]. ”$$

[Day1982, sec. 3 Lem. 2] “Lemma 2. Desarguean lattices are modular.”

[Day1982, sec. 3 Th. 7] “Theorem 7. A lattice is Desarguean if and only if it satisfies the identity $\lambda \leq \rho$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= (x_0 \vee x_1) \wedge (y'_0 \vee y_1) \\ \rho &= [(x_0 \vee x_2) \wedge (y_0 \vee y_2)] \vee [(x_1 \vee x_2) \wedge (y_1 \vee y_2)] \vee [y_1 \wedge (x_0 \vee x_1)] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$y'_0 = y_0 \wedge [x_0 \vee ((x_1 \vee y_1) \wedge (x_2 \vee y_2))]. ”$$

[Day1982, sec. 3 Th. 8] “Let $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2$ be six variables and define lattice terms

$$\begin{aligned} p &= (a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) \wedge (a_2 \vee b_2) \\ c_i &= (a_j \vee a_k) \wedge (b_j \vee b_k) \quad \{i, j, k\} = \{0, 1, 2\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\bar{c} = c_2 \wedge (c_0 \vee c_1).$$

“Theorem 8. For a lattice $(L; \vee, \wedge)$, the following are equivalent.

- (1) L is Desarguean
- (2) L satisfies $p \leq a_0 \vee [b_0 \wedge (b_1 \vee \bar{c})]$
- (3) L satisfies $p \leq [a_0 \wedge (a_1 \vee \bar{c})] \vee [b_0 \wedge (b_1 \vee \bar{c})]$
- (4) L satisfies $p \leq a_0 \vee b_1 \vee \bar{c}$ ”

2.7. Day and Pickering, “A note on the Arguesian lattice identity”. [DayPick1984]

Uses “Arguesian”.

[DayPick1984] “Let $(L; +, \cdot)$ be a lattice. A *triangle* in L is an element of L^3 . For two triangles in L , $\mathbf{a} = (a_0, a_1, a_2)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_0, b_1, b_2)$ we define auxiliary polynomials $p_i = p_i(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = (a_j + b_j) \cdot (a_k + b_k)$, $p = p_i p_j (= p_i p_k = p_j p_k)$, and $c_i = c_i(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = (a_j + a_k) \cdot (b_j + b_k)$. Two triangles, \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} in L , are called *centrally perspective* if $p_2(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq a_2 + b_2$ and are called *axially perspective* if $c_2(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq c_0(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) + c_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$. We abbreviate these concepts as $CP(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ and $AP(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ respectively. *Desargues’ implication* is the Horn sentence $CP(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \Rightarrow AP(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$.

“Theorem. In the theory of lattices the following are equivalent.

- (1) Desargues’ Implication
- (2) $p(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq a_0(a_1 + c_2(c_0 + c_1)) + b_0(b_1 + c_2(c_0 + c_1))$

- (3) $p(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq a_0 + b_0(b_1 + c_2(c_0 + c_1))$
 (4) $p(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq a_0 + b_1 + c_2(c_0 + c_1)$
 (5) $(a_0 + c_1)(b_0(a_0 + p_0) + b_1) \leq c_0 + c_1 + b_1(a_0 + a_1).$ ”

[DayPick1984] “one might ask if [a self-dual] equation exists for Arguesian lattices.”

2.8. Encyclopedia of Mathematics, “Arguesian lattice”. [EnMathArg]

Uses “Arguesian”.

[EnMathArg] “A lattice in which the Arguesian law is valid, i.e. for all $a_i, b_i,$

$$(a_0 + b_0)(a_1 + b_1)(a_2 + b_2) \leq a_0(a_1 + c) + b_0(b_1 + c),$$

$c = c_0(c_1 + c_2), c_i = (a_j + a_k)(b_j + b_k)$ for any permutation i, j, k [a21]. Arguesian lattices form a variety [are characterized by a set of identities], since within lattices $p \leq q$ is equivalent to $pq = p$. A lattice is Arguesian if and only if it is a modular lattice and $(a_0 + b_0)(a_1 + b_1) \leq a_2 + b_2$ (central perspectivity) implies $c_2 \leq c_0 + c_1$ (axial perspectivity). In an Arguesian lattice and for a_i, b_i such that $a_2 = (a_0 + a_2)(a_1 + a_2)$ and $b_2 = (b_0 + b_2)(b_1 + b_2)$, the converse implication is valid too [a24]. A lattice is Arguesian if and only if its partial order dual is Arguesian.”

2.9. Encyclopedia of Mathematics, “Desargues assumption”. [EnMathDes]

[EnMathDes] “In lattice-theoretical terms the Desargues assumption may be formulated as the identity ([1])

$$\begin{aligned} & [(x + z)(y + u) + (x + u)(y + z)](x + y) \\ & \leq [(y + x)(z + u) + (y + u)(z + x)](y + z) + [(z + y)(x + u) + (z + u)(x + y)](z + x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that in light of para. 2.15[Haim1985b, Note 2], since this equation contains only four variables, it is likely incorrect.

2.10. Encyclopedia of Mathematics, “Modular lattice”. [EnMathMod]

[EnMathMod] “[A modular lattice is one] in which the modular law is valid, i.e. if $a \leq c$, then $(a + b)c = a + bc$ for any b .”

[EnMathMod] “[Modularity] amounts to saying that the identity $(ac + b)c = ac + bc$ is valid.”

[EnMathMod] “Examples of modular lattices include the lattices of subspaces of a linear space, of normal subgroups (but not all subgroups) of a group, of ideals in a ring, etc.”

[EnMathMod] “A lattice with a composition sequence is a modular lattice if and only if there exists on it a dimension [rank] function d , i.e. an integer-valued function such that $d(x + y) + d(xy) = d(x) + d(y)$ and such that if the interval $[a, b]$ is prime [a covering], it follows that $d(b) = d(a) + 1$.”

2.11. Grätzer, *General lattice theory*. [Grätz1996]

Uses “Arguesian” and “representation of type 1”.

[Grätz1996, Ch. I sec. 4 Lem. 10] “Lemma 10. Consider the following two identities and inequality:

- (i) $x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z),$
 (ii) $x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z),$
 (iii) $(x \vee y) \wedge z \leq x \vee (y \wedge z).$

Then (i), (ii), and (iii) are equivalent in any lattice L .

“Remark. A lattice satisfying identities (i) or (ii) is called *distributive*.”

[Grätz1996, Ch. I sec. 4 Lem. 12] “Lemma 12. The identity

$$(x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z) = x \wedge (y \vee (x \wedge z))$$

is equivalent to the condition:

$$x \geq z \text{ implies that } (x \wedge y) \vee z = x \wedge (y \vee z).$$

“Remark. A lattice satisfying either condition is called *modular*.”

[Grätz1996, Ch. IV sec. 1 Th. 1] “Theorem 1. For a lattice L , the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) L is modular, that is,

$$x \geq z \text{ implies that } x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee z.$$

- (ii) L satisfies the *shearing identity*:

$$x \wedge (y \vee z) = x \wedge ((y \wedge (x \vee z)) \vee z).$$

(iii) L does not contain a pentagon.

“... Observe also the dual of the shearing identity:

$$x \vee (y \wedge z) = x \vee ((y \vee (x \wedge z)) \wedge z). ”.$$

[Grätz1996, Ch. IV sec. 1 Exer. 1] “a lattice L is modular iff it satisfies the identity

$$(x \vee (y \wedge z)) \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge (y \vee z)) \vee (y \wedge z).$$

[Grätz1996, Ch. IV sec. 4 Def. 9] “Definition 9. Let $x_0, x_1, x_2, y_0, y_1, y_2$ be variables. We define some polynomials:

$$\begin{aligned} z_{ij} &= (x_i \vee x_j) \wedge (y_i \vee y_j), & 0 \leq i < j < 3, \\ z &= z_{01} \wedge (z_{02} \vee z_{12}). \end{aligned}$$

The *Arguesian identity* is

$$(x_0 \vee y_0) \wedge (x_1 \vee y_1) \wedge (x_2 \vee y_2) \leq ((z \vee x_1) \wedge x_0) \vee ((z \vee y_1) \wedge y_0).$$

“A lattice satisfying this identity is called *Arguesian*.”

2.12. Haiman, “The theory of linear lattices”. [Haim1984a]

Note most results of [Haim1984a] are in para. 2.14[Haim1985a] and for many, we have not made duplicate entries here.

Uses “Arguesian” and “linear”.

[Haim1984a, Intro.] “the lattices of normal subgroups of a group, ideals of a ring, or subspaces of a vector space are more than modular; as Birkhoff and Dubreil-Jacotin were first to observe, they are lattices of equivalence relations which commute relative to the operation of composition of relations. The combinatorial properties of lattices of commuting equivalence relations are not mere consequences of their modularity, but rather the opposite; the consequences of the modular law derived since Dedekind, who originally formulated it, have mainly been guessed on the basis of examples which were lattices of commuting equivalence relations.”

[Haim1984a, Intro.] “This thesis is a study of lattices of commuting equivalence relations, which we have named *linear* lattices, a term suggested by Rota for its evocation of the archetypal example of projective geometry.”

[Haim1984a, Ch. II] “By general theorems of universal algebra ([Grätz1979] Appendix 4, Theorems 3, 4, for instance), the axiomatizability of the class of linear lattices by universal equational Horn sentences, such as (1), is equivalent to the closure of the class of linear lattices under isomorphism, sublattices, and products. These closure properties can also be seen directly. Namely, closure under isomorphism and sublattices are built into the definition, and closure under products is given by the sum of representations construction.”

[Haim1984a, Ch. II] “From Theorem 1 it is clear that every implication (1) depends on only finitely many of its hypotheses $P_i \leq Q_i$. This fact implies the further closure of the class of linear lattices under direct limits. It does not seem possible, however, straightforwardly to construct a representation of a direct limit of linear lattices from representations of the individual lattices.”

[Haim1984a, Ch. II] “It also does not seem possible, straightforwardly or otherwise, to construct a linear representation of an arbitrary homomorphic image of a linear lattice. To do so, of course, would show that the class of linear lattices is a variety, answering the most important open question concerning linear lattices.”

2.13. Haiman, “Linear lattice proof theory: an overview”. [Haim1984b]

Uses “Arguesian” and “linear”.

[Haim1984b, sec. 1] “Theorem 2, while not solving the free linear lattice word problem, comes close and clearly isolates the difficulties. It also suggests a natural conjecture [Conj. 2] which if true would simultaneously solve the free linear lattice word problem and prove that the class of linear lattices is not self-dual and (hence) not equal to the variety of Arguesian lattices.”

[Haim1984b, sec. 3] “Conjecture 2. The number of deductions (A) required in a Normal Form proof is zero.

“... ”

“As the next example shows, the truth of Conjecture 2 would imply that the variety generated by linear lattices is not self-dual, hence [Jóns1972] not equal to the variety of Arguesian lattices.

“Example 2. The lower series-parallel graph in Figure 4 is derived from the upper one by using paired deductions (CD) to partition vertices u and v as indicated by the subscripted labels in the lower graph. The corresponding lattice polynomials (which can be read from the graphs, so there is no need to write them out in symbols) therefore are

the left- and right-hand sides of a valid linear lattice inequality. This derivation is not planar, so it is not surprising to find (and routine, though tedious, to verify) that the dual inequality, displayed in Figure 5, has no proof using vertex partitioning and deduction (E) alone. Both inequalities are short [in the sense defined here], so if Conjecture 2 holds, the dual inequality cannot be valid in all linear lattices.

“A linear lattice violating the inequality of Figure 5 would of course be of interest, independent of Conjecture 2.”

2.14. Haiman “Proof theory for linear lattices”. [Haim1985a]

Most of these results are from para. 2.12[Haim1984a].

Uses “Arguesian” and “linear”.

[Haim1985a, sec. 0.0] “the lattices of normal subgroups of a group, ideals of a ring, or subspaces of a vector space are more than modular; as Birkhoff and Dubreil-Jacotin were first to observe, they are lattices of equivalence relations which commute relative to the operation of composition of relations.”

[Haim1985a, sec. 0.0] “Let $p(S)$ denote the lattice of equivalence relations (or partitions) on the set S If $\rho : L \rightarrow p(S)$ and $\rho' : L' \rightarrow p(S')$ are linear representations with $S \cap S' = \emptyset$, their *sum* $\rho \oplus \rho' : L \times L' \rightarrow p(S \cup S')$ defined by $\rho \oplus \rho'((x, x')) = \rho(x) \cup \rho'(x')$ is also a linear representation. If $L = L'$ we also refer to $(\rho \oplus \rho') \circ \Delta : L \rightarrow p(S \cup S')$, where $\Delta(x) = (x, x)$ [the minimum, discrete, or identity equivalence relation], as the *sum* of the representations ρ, ρ' of L . Sums of arbitrary finite or infinite collections of representations are defined analogously.”

[Haim1985a, sec. 1.0] “Recall that the *dual* of a lattice L is the lattice L^d on the same underlying set as L , but in which meet and join have been interchanged, or what is the same, the partial order reversed. As is well known, the varieties of distributive lattices, modular lattices, and all lattices are closed under dualization. [Jóns1972] showed that the variety of Arguesian lattices is also self-dual in this sense (see (2.2))

“While it remains an open question whether the class of all linear lattices is self-dual, there is an intrinsic duality to the list of deductions (A)-(F).”

[Haim1985a, Exam. 1.1] “Example 1.1. The Arguesian implication [Jóns1954a][Jóns1953b] is

$$(a \vee a') \wedge (b \vee b') \leq c \vee c'$$

implies

$$(a \vee b) \wedge (a' \vee b') \leq [(a \vee c) \wedge (a' \vee c')] \vee [(c \vee b) \wedge (c' \vee b')] \dots$$

“Reading the primed graphs backward gives a proof of the dual implication

$$c \wedge c' \leq (a \wedge a') \vee (b \wedge b')$$

implies

$$[(a \wedge c) \vee (a' \wedge c')] \wedge [(c \wedge b) \vee (c' \wedge b')] \leq (a \wedge b) \vee (a' \wedge b'). ”$$

This proof of the Arguesian implication shows that it is true for all linear lattices.

[Haim1985a, sec. 1.0] “By general theorems of universal algebra ([15], Appendix 4, Theorems 3, 4, for instance), the axiomatizability of the class of linear lattices by universal equational Horn sentences, such as (1.1), is equivalent to the closure of the class of linear lattices under isomorphism, sublattices, and products. These closure properties can also be seen directly. Namely, closure under isomorphism and sublattices are built into the definition, and closure under products is given by the sum of representations construction.

“From Theorem 1.1 it is clear that every implication (1.1) depends on only finitely many of its hypotheses $P_i \leq Q_i$. This fact implies the further closure of the class of linear lattices under direct limits. It does not seem possible, however, straightforwardly to construct a representation of a direct limit of linear lattices from representations of the individual lattices.

“It also does not seem possible, straightforwardly or otherwise, to construct a linear representation of an arbitrary homomorphic image of a linear lattice. To do so, of course, would show that the class of linear lattices is a variety, answering the most important open question concerning linear lattices.”

[Haim1985a, Exam. 2.2] “Example 2.2. The Arguesian identity ([Jóns1953b] [7]—our version is a simplified equivalent form [Haim1985b]) is

$$c \wedge (((a \vee a') \wedge (b \vee b')) \vee c') \leq a \vee (((a \vee b) \wedge (a' \vee b')) \vee ((b \vee c) \wedge (b' \vee c'))) \wedge (a' \vee c').$$

We now apply Proposition 2.1. Since every variable already occurs exactly once on the left-hand side, the second subscript on the replacement variables does not vary, and we suppress it. The equivalent form then reads

$$(2.2) \quad c \wedge (((a_1 \wedge a_2) \vee (a'_1 \wedge a'_2)) \vee ((b_1 \wedge b_2) \vee (b'_1 \wedge b'_2))) \vee (c'_1 \wedge c'_2) \\ \leq a_1 \vee (((a_2 \vee b_1) \wedge (a'_2 \vee b'_1)) \vee ((b_2 \vee c) \wedge (b'_2 \vee c'_1))) \wedge (a_1 \vee c'_2).$$

“It is a remarkable fact that (2.2) becomes its own dual after exchanging the symbols $a_1 \leftrightarrow c$, $a'_1 \leftrightarrow c'_1$, $a_2 \leftrightarrow b_2$, and $a'_2 \leftrightarrow b'_2$. (2.2) is the first explicitly self-dual form of the Arguesian identity to have been found.”

[Haim1985a, Exam. 2.3] “Example 2.3. One form of the modular law is the identity

$$(b \vee c) \wedge a \leq b \vee (c \wedge (a \vee b)).$$

Proposition 2.1 converts this identity to

$$((b_1 \wedge b_2) \vee c) \wedge a \leq b_1 \vee (c \wedge (a \vee b_2)). ”$$

[Haim1985a, Exam. 2.5, Figs. 6 and 7] “Example 2.5. Generalizing Example 2.4 yields higher Arguesian identities, the first of which is shown in Fig. 7. It has probably occurred to the reader by now that a complicated lattice polynomial is more easily recognized from a drawing of its series-parallel graph than from an expression for the polynomial itself. Therefore we do not actually write down a higher Arguesian identity, but let the graphs in Fig. 7 stand for its left and right sides. The generalization beyond Figs. 6 and 7 should be apparent. The proofs of the higher Arguesian identities are all analogous to that of the usual Arguesian identity (2.2); all are planar and self-dual.

“Each higher Arguesian identity is equivalent by Proposition 2.1 to its special case in which $x_1 = x_2$ for each primed or unprimed letter x among the variables. Using this form and setting $a = b$, $a' = b'$, one easily derives each identity from the next higher one. It is not known whether each higher Arguesian identity is strictly stronger than the ones below it. We suspect that this is indeed the case.”

[Haim1985a, sec. 3.0] “The four most fundamental open questions about the class of linear lattices are (1) is it a variety, (2) is it self-dual, (3) does it generate the variety of Arguesian lattices, and (4) does it have a solvable free lattice word problem? The diagrammatic proof theory presented here has clear relevance for attacks on the last three questions, as we have sought to make clear.”

2.15. Haiman, “Two notes on the Arguesian identity”. [Haim1985b]

Uses “Arguesian”.

[Haim1985b, eq. 1] This equation is equivalent to the Arguesian identity

$$“ c \wedge (((a \vee a') \wedge (b \vee b')) \vee c') \leq a \vee (((a \vee b) \wedge (a' \vee b')) \vee ((b \vee c) \wedge (b' \vee c'))) \wedge (a' \vee c') ”$$

[Haim1985b, eq. 2] This equation is equivalent to the Arguesian identity and is self-dual

$$“ c \wedge (((a_1 \wedge a_2) \vee (a'_1 \wedge a'_2)) \wedge ((b_1 \wedge b_2) \vee (b'_1 \wedge b'_2))) \vee (c'_1 \wedge c'_2) \\ \leq a_1 \vee (((c \vee b_2) \wedge (c'_1 \vee b'_2)) \vee ((b_1 \vee a_2) \wedge (b'_1 \vee a_2))) \wedge (a'_1 \vee c'_2) ”$$

[Haim1985b, Note 2] “We construct a non-Arguesian lattice L all of whose [sublattices generated by five elements] are Arguesian; in fact, are sublattices of a quaternionic projective geometry.” Thus, “any lattice identity equivalent to the Arguesian law must necessarily involve at least six variables.”

2.16. Haiman, “Arguesian lattices which are not linear”. [Haim1987]

Uses “Arguesian” and “linear”.

[Haim1987, sec. 1] “Nevertheless, the question raised by Jónsson, whether every Arguesian lattice is linear, has remained open until now. Here we describe an infinite family A_n ($n > 3$) of nonlinear lattices, Arguesian for $n > 7$ (and possibly for $n > 4$), settling Jónsson’s question in the negative. Actually, we obtain more: a specific infinite sequence of identities strictly between Arguesian and linear, and a proof that the universal Horn theory of linear lattices is not finitely based.”

[Haim1987, sec. 3] “Theorem. A_n is not a linear lattice.

“Proof. In [Haim1985a], the author introduced “higher Arguesian identities”

$$D_n: a_0 \wedge \left(a'_0 \vee \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} [a_i \vee a'_i] \right) \leq a_1 \vee \left((a'_0 \vee a'_1) \wedge \bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} [(a_i \vee a_{i+1}) \wedge (a'_i \vee a'_{i+1})] \right)$$

which hold in all linear lattices. D_3 is the Arguesian law [Haim1985b]. ... D_n fails in A_n . In particular, A_3 is not Arguesian. This minimally non-Arguesian lattice was discovered by Pickering [8].

“Theorem. Every proper sublattice of A_n is linear.

“... ”

“Theorem. If $X \subset A_n$ generates A_n , then $|X| \geq n$.”

Note that in the above identity, indexes of a and a' are to be taken modulo n , that is, $a_0 = a_n$ and $a'_0 = a'_n$. Compare with equation 2.18[Hawr1996, eq. 15].

[Haim1987, sec. 4] “The results of §3 imply that no finite set of identities, or even universal Horn sentences, can completely characterize linearity; in particular, the Arguesian law is insufficient, since it holds in A_n for $n > 7$. It is known, however, how to characterize linear lattices by an infinite set of universal Horn sentences [Haim1985a][Jóns1959a].”

[Haim1987]sec. 4 “If, as appears likely, the identity D_{n-1} holds in A_n ($n > 4$), we would have that D_{n-1} does not imply D_n , showing that $\{D_n\}$ forms a hierarchy of progressively strictly stronger linear lattice identities.”

2.17. Haiman, “Arguesian lattices which are not type-1”. [Haim1991]

Uses “Arguesian”. Uses “type-1 representability” for lattices. Uses “linear representation” for an isomorphism of a lattice with a sublattice of the lattice of subspaces of a vector space.

[Haim1991, sec. 1] “It is known that there is an infinite system of universal Horn sentences characterizing type-1 representability [Haim1985a] [Jóns1959a].”

[Haim1991, sec. 1] “Nation and Picketing [NatPick1987] conjectured that having a distributive skeleton might be a sufficient condition for a finite-dimensional Arguesian lattice to be type-1 representable. [In section 4] we show how to modify the examples A_n , to give counterexamples to this conjecture.”

[Haim1991, sec. 3] Uses the fact that if a lattice is a sublattice of the lattice of subspaces of a vector space, then the lattice is Arguesian and linear.

[Haim1991, sec. 3] Constructs a series of lattices that are Arguesian but violate the higher Arguesian identities which are satisfied by every linear lattice.

[Haim1991, sec. 3 Th. 1] “Theorem 1. Let D_n be the lattice identity

$$x_0 \left(x'_0 + \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} [x_i + x'_i] \right) \leq x_1 + (x'_0 + x'_1) \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (x_i + x_{i+1})(x'_i + x'_{i+1}).$$

Then D_n is valid in every type-1 representable lattice but not in A_n .

“... ”

“Note that for $n = 3$, D_n is equivalent to the Arguesian law [Haim1985b], so $A_3(K)$ is a non-Arguesian lattice. These are in fact minimal non-Arguesian lattices which were first discovered by Pickering [9].”

[Haim1991, sec. 3 Th. 2] “Theorem 2. Every proper sublattice of A_n has a type-1 representation, and even a linear representation over K .”

[Haim1991, sec. 3 Cor. 5] “Corollary 5. No finite set of lattice identities, or even universal Horn sentences, i.e. sentences of the form $\forall x_1 \cdots \forall x_k [P_1(x) = Q_1(x)] \wedge \cdots \wedge [P_k(x) = Q_k(x)] \Rightarrow P_0(x) = Q_0(x)$, can characterize lattices with type-1 representation.”

2.18. Hawrylycz, “Arguesian identities in invariant theory”. [Hawr1996]

Uses “Arguesian” and “linear lattice”.

[Hawr1996, sec. 4 eq. 14] “It can be shown [Haim1985a] that the Arguesian law may be written

$$c \wedge ((a \vee a') \wedge (b \vee b')) \vee c' \leq a \vee (((a \vee b) \wedge (a' \vee b')) \vee ((b \vee c) \wedge (b' \vee c'))) \wedge (a' \vee c')$$

[Hawr1996, sec. 4 eqs. 15 and 16] “The N th higher Arguesian law as given by Haiman [Haim1985a] may be written, given alphabets of letters a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n , and b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n as

$$a_n \wedge \left(\left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} (a_i \vee b_i) \right] \vee b_n \right) \leq a_1 \vee \left(\left[\bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} ((a_i \vee a_{i+1}) \wedge (b_i \vee b_{i+1})) \right] \wedge (b_1 \vee b_n) \right)$$

“... ”

“By applying Proposition 4.12 the N th higher Arguesian law may be written in the following self-dual form.

“ N th Higher Order Arguesian Law. Let $a_1, \dots, a_n, a'_1, \dots, a'_n$ and $b_1, \dots, b_n, b'_1, \dots, b'_n$ be alphabets. Then the following identity holds as a linear lattice identity:

$$a'_n \wedge \left(\left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} ((a_i \wedge a'_1) \vee (b_i \wedge b'_i)) \right] \vee (b_n \wedge b'_n) \right) \leq a_1 \vee \left(\left[\bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} ((a'_1 \vee a_{i+1}) \wedge (b'_i \vee b_{i+1})) \right] \wedge (b_1 \vee b'_n) \right) "$$

2.19. Herrmann, “A review of some of Bjarni Jónsson’s results on representation of arguesian lattices”. [Herr2013] Uses “arguesian”.

[Herr2013, sec. 3] “Jónsson considered this construction of a lattice L for $L_i = L(V_{iD_i})$ and $\dim V_{iD_i} = 3$. In [Jóns1954a, Th. 3.6], he chose $\dim v = 1$ and D_1, D_2 of distinct prime characteristic to obtain an example of a simple lattice of height 5 isomorphic to a lattice of permuting equivalences but not embeddable into the normal subgroup lattice of any group.”

2.20. Jónsson, “On the representation of lattices”. [Jóns1953b]

Uses “Desarguesian” but only applies it to projective planes. Uses “representation of type 1 (or 2 or 3)”.

[Jóns1953b, Intro.] “It is therefore natural to ask whether every modular lattice is isomorphic to a lattice of normal subgroups of some group. As will be shown in Section 2 below, the answer to this question is negative.”

[Jóns1953b, sec. 1] “Definition 1.1. By a representation of a lattice A we mean an ordered pair $\langle F, U \rangle$ such that U is a set and F is a function which maps A isomorphically onto a sublattice of the lattice of all equivalence relations over U . We say that $\langle F, U \rangle$ is

- (i) of type 1 if $F(x) + F(y) = F(x); F(y)$ for $x, y \in A$,
- (ii) of type 2 if $F(x) + F(y) = F(x); F(y); F(x)$ for $x, y \in A$,
- (iii) of type 3 if $F(x) + F(y) = F(x); F(y); F(x); F(y)$ for $x, y \in A$.

[where “;” is simple composition of relations] The equation in (i) is equivalent to the condition that $F(x); F(y) = F(y); F(x)$.”

[Jóns1953b, sec. 1] “It is well known that the lattice of all normal subgroups of a group G has a representation of type 1; we let $U = G$, and for each normal subgroup H of G let $F(H)$ be the set of all ordered pairs $\langle u, v \rangle$ with $uv^{-1} \in H$. It is not known whether the converse of this result holds.”

[Jóns1953b, sec. 1 Th. 1.2] “Theorem 1.2. If a lattice A has a representation of type 2, then A is modular.” This implies that every lattice with a representation of type 1 is modular.

[Jóns1953b, sec. 2 Lem. 2.1] “Lemma 2.1. Every modular lattice A which has a representation of type 1 satisfies the following condition: If $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2 \in A$, and if

$$\begin{aligned} x &= (a_0 + b_0) \cdot (a_1 + b_1) \cdot (a_2 + b_2), \\ y &= (a_0 + a_1) \cdot (b_0 + b_1) \cdot [(a_0 + a_2) \cdot (b_0 + b_2) + (a_1 + a_2) \cdot (b_1 + b_2)], \end{aligned}$$

then

$$x \leq a_0 \cdot (a_1 + y) + b_0 \cdot (b_1 + y). "$$

Note that the above gives Jónsson’s definition of the Arguesian condition, but he does not label it as such.

[Jóns1953b, sec. 2 Th. 2.2] “Theorem 2.2. If A is the lattice of all subspaces of a projective plane P , then the following conditions are equivalent: (1) A has a representation of type 1, (ii) A satisfies the condition [of Lemma 2.1], (iii) P is Desarguesian, (iv) A is isomorphic to a lattice of subgroups of some Abelian group G .”

[Jóns1953b, sec. 2 Th. 2.3] “Theorem 2.3. A free modular lattice with four or more generators does not have a representation of type 1.”

[Jóns1953b, sec. 3 Th. 3.7] “Theorem 3.7. Every modular lattice has a representation of type 2.”

[Jóns1953b, sec. 4 Th. 4.3] “Theorem 4.3. Every lattice has a representation of type 3.”

[Jóns1953b, sec. 5] “In connection with the above results it is natural to ask whether the class of all lattices which are isomorphic to lattices of commuting equivalence relations can be characterized by means of identities. ... Similar questions can be raised concerning lattices which are isomorphic to lattices of normal subgroups of arbitrary groups or to lattices of subgroups of Abelian groups. In particular, it would be interesting to know whether these three classes of lattices are actually distinct”

2.21. Jónsson, “Modular lattices and Desargues’ theorem”. [Jóns1954a]

Uses “Arguesian” and “lattice of commuting equivalence relations”.

[Jóns1954a, sec. 1 Def. 1.1] “Definition 1.1. A lattice A is said to be projective if it is complete, atomistic, complemented and modular, and satisfies the following condition: If p is an atom of A , if I is any set, and if the elements $a_i \in A$ with $i \in I$ are such that $p \leq \sum_{i \in I} a_i$, then there exists a finite subset J of I such that $p \leq \sum_{i \in J} a_i$.”

[Jóns1954a, sec. 1 Th. 1.7] “Theorem 1.7. If A is a projective lattice, then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) A is isomorphic to a lattice of commuting equivalence relations.
- (ii) A is isomorphic to a lattice of normal subgroups of a group.
- (iii) A is isomorphic to a lattice of subgroups of an Abelian group.
- (iv) A is isomorphic to the lattice of all subspaces of an Arguesian projective space.
- (v) For any $a, b \in A^3$, if

$$y = (a_0 + a_1) \cdot (b_0 + b_1) \cdot [(a_0 + a_2) \cdot (b_0 + b_2) + (a_1 + a_2) \cdot (b_1 + b_2)],$$

then

$$(a_0 + b_0) \cdot (a_1 + b_1) \cdot (a_2 + b_2) \leq a_0 \cdot (y + a_1) + b_0 \cdot (y + b_1). ”$$

[Jóns1954a, sec. 1 Def. 1.8] “Definition 1.8. A lattice B is said to be Arguesian if it satisfies the following condition: For every $a, b \in B^3$, if

$$y = (a_0 + a_1) \cdot (b_0 + b_1) \cdot [(a_0 + a_2) \cdot (b_0 + b_2) + (a_1 + a_2) \cdot (b_1 + b_2)],$$

then

$$(a_0 + b_0) \cdot (a_1 + b_1) \cdot (a_2 + b_2) \leq a_0 \cdot (y + a_1) + b_0 \cdot (y + b_1). ”$$

[Jóns1954a, sec. 1 Th. 1.9] “Theorem 1.9. Every arguesian lattice is modular.”

[Jóns1954a, sec. 1 Th. 2.14] “Theorem 2.14. If B is a complemented modular lattice, then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) B is Arguesian.
- (ii) B is isomorphic to a lattice of commuting equivalence relations.
- (iii) B is isomorphic to a lattice of normal subgroups of a group.
- (iv) B is isomorphic to a lattice of subgroups of an Abelian group.
- (v) B is isomorphic to a lattice of subspaces of an Arguesian projective space.”

[Jóns1954a, sec. 3] Without assuming complementation, each condition in Th. 2.14 implies all of the preceding conditions.

[Jóns1954a, sec. 3 Th. 3.6] “Theorem 3.6. There exists a five dimensional modular lattice B which is isomorphic to a lattice of commuting equivalence relations, but not to a lattice of normal subgroups of a group.”

[Jóns1954a, sec. 3] “Thus we see that even for finite modular lattices the conditions (ii) and (iii) of theorem 2.14 are not equivalent.”

2.22. Jónsson, “Representations of lattices. II. Preliminary report.” [Jóns1954c]

[Jóns1954c] Within complemented modular lattices, representability by (i) commuting equivalence relations, (ii) normal subgroups of a group, (iii) subgroups of an Abelian group, (iv) subspaces of a (possibly degenerate) Desarguesian projective space are equivalent. Similarly for modular lattices of dimension 4 or less. But some 5-dimensional modular lattices that can be represented by normal subgroups of a group cannot be represented by commuting equivalence relations.

2.23. Jónsson, “Representation of modular lattices and of relation algebras”. [Jóns1959a]

[Jóns1959a, sec. 3] “While there do exist modular lattices which are not isomorphic to lattices of commuting equivalence relations, the only known examples are of a more or less pathological nature, such as the lattice of all subspaces of a non-Arguesian projective plane ([Jóns1953b]).”

[Jóns1959a, sec. 3 Th. 2] “Theorem 2. In order for a lattice $\mathfrak{A} = \langle A, +, \cdot \rangle$ to be isomorphic to a lattice of commuting equivalence relations it is necessary and sufficient that the following condition be satisfied:

“(Γ’) Suppose n is a positive integer, $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2n}, z \in A$ and, for each positive integer $k \leq n$, $\phi(k)$ and $\psi(k)$ are natural numbers with $\phi(k) \leq k$ and $\psi(k) \leq k$. Let

$$b_{1,0,1} = b_{1,1,0} = a_0, \quad b_{1,0,0} = b_{1,1,1} = z,$$

and for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, k$ let

$$\begin{aligned} b_{k+1,i,j} &= \prod_{p \leq k} (b_{k,i,p} + b_{k,p,j}), \\ b_{k+1,i,k+1} &= b_{k+1,k+1,i} = (b_{k+1,i,\phi(k)} + a_{2k-1}) \cdot (b_{k+1,i,\psi(k)} + a_{2k}), \\ b_{k+1,k+1,k+1} &= z. \end{aligned}$$

With these notations, if $b_{k,\phi(k),\psi(k)} \leq a_{2k-1} + a_{2k}$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then $a_0 \leq b_{n+1,0,1}$."

[Jóns1959a, sec. 4 Prob. 1] "Problem 1. Can the infinite sets of axioms [Horn sentences] contained in the conditions (Γ) and (Γ') [above] be replaced by finite sets of axioms? By sets of equations [identities]?"

[Jóns1959a, sec. 4] "It is an open question whether, conversely, every Arguesian lattice is isomorphic to a lattice of commuting equivalence relations, but we know that this is the case for complemented lattices ([Jóns1954a, Th. 2.14])"

2.24. Jónsson, "The class of Arguesian lattices is self-dual". [Jóns1972]

Uses "Arguesian".

[Jóns1972] "The class of Arguesian lattices is self-dual."

[Jóns1972] Shows that the Arguesian condition: for all $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2 \in L$,

$$(a_0 + b_0)(a_1 + b_1) \leq a_2 + b_2 \Rightarrow (a_0 + a_1)(b_0 + b_1) \leq (a_0 + a_2)(b_0 + b_2) + (a_1 + a_2)(b_1 + b_2)$$

implies the dual of the condition: for all $x_0, x_1, x_2, y_0, y_1, y_2 \in L$

$$x_0 y_0 + x_1 y_1 \geq x_2 y_2 \Rightarrow x_0 x_1 + y_0 y_1 \geq (x_0 x_2 + y_0 y_2)(x_1 x_2 + y_1 y_2).$$

2.25. Lampe, "A perspective on algebraic representations of lattices". [Lamp1994]

Uses "Arguesian" and "type-1".

[Lamp1994] "Modular laws

$$(a) \ z \leq x \Rightarrow x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee z$$

$$(b) \ x \leq y \vee z \Rightarrow x \leq y \vee [z \wedge (x \vee y)] "$$

[Lamp1994] "A lattice L is Arguesian iff it satisfies the following identity

$$\bigwedge_{i < 3} (x_i \vee y_i) \leq (x_0 \wedge (x_1 \vee m)) \vee (y_0 \wedge (y_1 \vee m))$$

where

$$m = (x_0 \vee x_1) \wedge (y_0 \vee y_1) \wedge [\{(x_0 \vee x_2) \wedge (y_0 \vee y_2)\} \vee \{(x_2 \vee x_1) \wedge (y_2 \vee y_1)\}]. "$$

2.26. Kiss and Pálfi, "A lattice of normal subgroups that is not embeddable into the subgroup lattice of an Abelian group". [KissPál1998]

[KissPál1998, sec. 1] "Theorem. The lattice of normal subgroups of the three generator free group G in the group variety defined by the laws $x^4 - 1$ and $x^2 y - y x^2$ cannot be embedded into the subgroup lattice of any abelian group."

2.27. Nation, "Jónsson's contributions to lattice theory". [Nat1994]

Uses "Arguesian".

[Nat1994] "Bjarni defined a representation of a lattice by equivalence relations to be of *type n* if only n relational compositions are required to achieve the join. Thus, for example, a representation by permuting [commuting] equivalence relations would be of type 1. His first result improved Whitman's theorem to show that every lattice has a type 3 representation. The next result is even better. Theorem (Jónsson). L has a type 2 representation if and only if it is modular."

[Nat1994] "Bjarni showed in that there is a simpler equation with the same property, which is now known as the *Arguesian equation*:

$$(a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) \wedge (a_2 \vee b_2) \leq a_0 \vee (b_0 \wedge (c \vee b_1))$$

where

$$c = c_2 \wedge (c_0 \vee c_1)$$

and

$$c_i = (a_j \vee a_k) \wedge (b_j \vee b_k)$$

for $\{i, j, k\} = \{0, 1, 2\}$. [...] Now the Arguesian equation is still pretty horrible as equations go, but Bjarni showed that it really is equivalent to the condition

$$(a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) \leq a_2 \vee b_2 \text{ implies } c_2 \leq c_0 \vee c_1$$

where c_i is as above, which is the lattice form of Desargues' Law."

[Nat1994] "every lattice having a type 1 representation is Arguesian."

[Nat1994] "Haiman found examples of Arguesian lattices which don't have a type 1 representation. In fact, Haiman constructed a sequence of examples which give a stronger result. The class of all lattices with a type 1 representation forms a quasivariety \mathcal{Q} , and Bjarni gave an infinite set of Horn sentences determining \mathcal{Q} .

"Theorem (Haiman). The quasivariety \mathcal{Q} of all lattices with a type 1 representation is not finitely based.

"So in particular, a single equation like the Arguesian law does not characterize \mathcal{Q} . It is unknown whether \mathcal{Q} is a variety, i.e., if it is closed under homomorphic images."

2.28. Nation, *Notes on Lattice Theory*. [Nat2017]

Uses "Arguesian". Uses "lattice of permuting equivalence relations" and "representation of type 1 (or 2 or 3)".

[Nat2017, ch. 4] "A lattice is said to be Arguesian if it satisfies

$$(A) (a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) \leq a_2 \vee b_2 \text{ implies } c_2 \leq c_0 \vee c_1$$

where

$$c_i = (a_j \vee a_k) \wedge (b_j \vee b_k)$$

for $\{i, j, k\} = \{0, 1, 2\}$. The Arguesian law is (less obviously) equivalent to a lattice inclusion,

$$(A') (a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) \wedge (a_2 \vee b_2) \leq a_0 \vee (b_0 \wedge (c \vee b_1))$$

where

$$c = c_2 \wedge (c_0 \vee c_1). "$$

[Nat2017, ch. 4 Th. 4.6 Cor.] "Theorem 4.6. If \mathcal{L} is a sublattice of $\mathbf{Eq} X$ with the property that $R \vee S = R \circ S$ for all $R, S \in \mathcal{L}$, then \mathcal{L} satisfies the Arguesian law.

"Corollary. Every lattice that has a type 1 representation is Arguesian."

[Nat2017, ch. 4] "Note that the normal subgroup lattice of a group G has a natural representation (X, F) : take $X = G$ and $F(N) = \{(x, y) \in G^2 : xy^{-1} \in N\}$. This representation is in fact type 1 (Exercise 3)."

[Nat2017, ch. 4] "It follows that the lattice of normal subgroups of a group is not only modular, but Arguesian; see exercise 3. All these types of lattices are Arguesian [and have a type 1 representation]: the lattice of subgroups of an abelian group, the lattice of ideals of a ring, the lattice of subspaces of a vector space, the lattice of submodules of a module. More generally, Ralph Freese and Bjarni Jónsson proved that if \mathcal{V} is a variety of algebras, all of whose congruence lattices are modular (such as groups or rings), then the congruence lattices of algebras in \mathcal{V} are Arguesian [4]."

[Nat2017, ch. 4] "Interestingly, P. P. Pálffy and Laszlo Szabó have shown that subgroup lattices of abelian groups satisfy an equation that does not hold in all normal subgroup lattices [PálSzab1995]."

[Nat2017, ch. 4] "The question remains: *Does there exist a set of equations Σ such that a lattice has a type 1 representation if and only if it satisfies all the equations of Σ ?* Haiman proved that if such a Σ exists, it must contain infinitely many equations. In Chapter 7 we will see that a class of lattices is characterized by a set of equations if and only if it is closed with respect to direct products, sublattices, and homomorphic images. The class of lattices having a type 1 representation is easily seen to be closed under sublattices and direct products, so the question is equivalent to: *Is the class of all lattices having a type 1 representation closed under homomorphic images?*"

2.29. Nation, "Tribute to Bjarni Jónsson". [Nat2018]

Uses "Arguesian".

2.30. Nation and Pickering, "Arguesian lattices whose skeleton is a chain". [NatPick1987]

Uses "arguesian" and "type-1-representable".

[NatPick1987] [Jóns1953b] points out that if L is linear it satisfies "the *arguesian* lattice identity,

$$(a_0 + b_0)(a_1 + b_1)(a_2 + b_2) \leq a_0 + b_0(b_1 + c_2(c_0 + c_1))$$

where

$$c_i = (a_j + a_k)(b_j + b_k)$$

for $i \neq j \neq k \neq i$.”

[NatPick1987] “[Haim1987] has shown that the converse is false: there exist arguesian lattices which do not have a type 1 representation. In fact, no finite set of universal Horn sentences suffices to characterize the class of lattices having a type 1 representation.”

[NatPick1987] “[Jóns1959a] has given an infinite set of universal Horn sentences which does characterize [linear lattices].”

[NatPick1987] “the classical theorem of projective geometry (see [1], [4]): If L is a finite dimensional complemented arguesian lattice, then L is a direct product of lattices L_i , each of which is isomorphic to the lattice of all subspaces of a vector space over a division ring K_i . This naturally induces a type 1 representation of L .”

[NatPick1987] “Theorem. If L is a finite dimensional arguesian lattice and [the skeleton of L] is a chain, then L has a type 1 representation.”

[NatPick1987] “It is easy to see that a subdirect product of type-1-representable lattices is type-1-representable [Jóns1959a].”

[NatPick1987, Proof of Lem. 2] “for a finite dimensional modular lattice, [L is simple] is equivalent to every pair of prime quotients in L being projective.”

[NatPick1987, Proof of Lem. 4] “For a fixed lattice L , the type 1 representations of L form an elementary class of relational structures. Using this, it is not hard to show that a lattice L has a type 1 representation if and only if every finitely generated sublattice of L has a type 1 representation [Jóns1959a]. Therefore [if every countable sublattice of L is type-1-representable, L is.]”

[NatPick1987, Proof of Lem. 4] “Moreover, using the construction from [Jóns1959a] (or a simple direct argument), if a countable lattice L has a type 1 representation, it has a type 1 representation with a countable base set.”

2.31. Ore, “Theory of equivalence relations”. [Ore1942]

[Ore1942, Ch. 1 sec. 5 eq. 5] “One of the most important relations in the theory of structures is the so-called *Dedekind law*

$$(4) \quad A \cap (B \cup C) = B \cup (A \cap C) \quad (A \supset B).$$

Sometimes it is also formulated

$$(5) \quad A = B \cup (A \cap C) \quad (B \cup C \supset A \supset B). ”$$

2.32. Pálffy, “Groups and lattices”. [Pál2001]

Uses “arguesian”.

[Pál2001, sec. 2 Th. 2.1] “Theorem 2.1 (Whitman, 1946) Every lattice is isomorphic to a sublattice of the subgroup lattice of some group.”

[Pál2001, sec. 2 Th. 2.2] “Theorem 2.2 ([PudTûm1980]) Every finite lattice is isomorphic to a sublattice of the subgroup lattice of some finite group.”

[Pál2001, sec. 2] “Recall that a lattice L is called distributive if the following equivalent conditions hold for every $x, y, z \in L$:

- (1) $x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z)$;
- (2) $x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z)$;
- (3) $(x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z) \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z)$.”

[Pál2001, sec. 3 Th. 3.3] “Theorem 3.3 (Grätzer and Schmidt, 1963) For every algebraic lattice L there exists an algebra \mathbf{A} such that $\text{Con } \mathbf{A} \cong L$ [the lattice of congruences of \mathbf{A} is isomorphic to L].”

[Pál2001, sec. 3 Prob. 3.4] It is unknown whether for every finite lattice L there exists a finite algebra \mathbf{A} such that $\text{Con } \mathbf{A} \cong L$.

[Pál2001, sec. 4] Modular lattices can be defined via a number of equivalent conditions:

- (1) $x \geq z$ implies $(x \wedge y) \vee z = x \wedge (y \vee z)$,
- (2) $x \geq z$ implies $(x \wedge y) \vee z \geq x \wedge (y \vee z)$,
- (3) $(x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z) = x \wedge [y \vee (x \wedge z)]$,
- (4) the lattice does not contain the pentagon sublattice.

[Pál2001, sec. 4] “There exist laws of normal subgroup lattices that are even stronger than modularity. The most important one is the *arguesian law* introduced by Bjarni Jónsson in 1954. (The idea appeared earlier in [Schüt1945].)

This is a translation of Desargues' Theorem from projective geometry into the language of lattices. Among the several equivalent formulations we prefer the following form:

$$X_1 \wedge \{Y_1 \vee [(X_2 \vee Y_2) \wedge (X_3 \vee Y_3)]\} \leq [(Q_{12} \vee Q_{23}) \wedge (Y_1 \vee Y_3)] \vee X_3,$$

where $Q_{ij} = (X_i \vee X_j) \wedge (Y_i \vee Y_j)$."

[Pál2001, sec. 4] "So the arguesian law holds in the subspace lattice of a projective plane if and only if Desargues' Theorem is true in the geometry. Since there are nonarguesian planes, the arguesian law is stronger than the modular law, as the subspace lattice is always modular."

[Pál2001, sec. 4 Th. 4.1] "Theorem 4.1 (Jónsson, 1954) The arguesian law holds in the normal subgroup lattice of every group."

[Pál2001, sec. 4] "In fact the arguesian law holds in every lattice consisting of [commuting] equivalence relations."

[Pál2001, sec. 4] "Mark Haiman in 1987 discovered a sequence of laws, the higher arguesian identities

$$X_1 \wedge \left[Y_1 \vee \bigwedge_{i=2}^n (X_i \vee Y_i) \right] \leq \left[\bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} Q_{i,i+1} \wedge (Y_1 \vee Y_n) \right] \vee X_n,$$

where $Q_{ij} = (X_i \vee X_j) \wedge (Y_i \vee Y_j)$, each one being strictly stronger than the previous one, that all hold in every lattice consisting of permuting equivalence relations. ... Like the modular and the arguesian laws, the higher arguesian identities hold not only in subgroup lattices of abelian groups (as suggested by the underlying geometry), but also in normal subgroup lattices of arbitrary groups."

[Pál2001, sec. 4] "Later it was proved by Ralph Freese [Frees1994] that there is no finite basis for the laws of the class of all normal subgroup lattices."

[Pál2001, sec. 4] "the higher arguesian identities hold not only in subgroup lattices of abelian groups (as suggested by the underlying geometry), but also in normal subgroup lattices of arbitrary groups."

[Pál2001, sec. 4] "Problem 4.2 ([Jóns1954a]; [Birk1967, p. 179]) Can one embed the normal subgroup lattice of an arbitrary group into the subgroup lattice of an abelian group? Do all the laws of subgroup lattices of abelian groups hold in normal subgroup lattices?"

2.33. Pálffy and Szabó, "An identity for subgroup lattices of Abelian groups". [PálSzab1995]

Uses "Arguesian".

[PálSzab1995] "subgroup lattices of Abelian groups satisfy the modular identity"

[PálSzab1995] "[Jóns1953b] introduced a lattice identity equivalent to Desargues' theorem in projective geometry:

$$(x_0 \vee y_0) \wedge (x_1 \vee y_1) \wedge (x_2 \vee y_2) \leq [(z \vee x_1) \wedge x_0] \vee [(z \vee y_1) \wedge y_0],$$

where $z = z_{01} \wedge (z_{02} \vee z_{12})$ with $z_{ij} = (x_i \vee x_j) \wedge (y_i \vee y_j)$. [Haim1985a] discovered some stronger "higher Arguesian identities". All these identities hold in subgroup lattices of Abelian groups. Moreover, they even hold in every lattice consisting of pairwise permuting [commuting] equivalence relations, in particular, in the lattice of normal subgroups of an arbitrary group."

[PálSzab1995] "Theorem. The identity

$$x_1 \wedge \{y_1 \vee [(x_2 \vee y_2) \wedge (x_3 \vee y_3) \wedge (x_4 \vee y_4)]\} \leq [(p_{12} \vee p_{34}) \wedge (p_{13} \vee p_{24}) \wedge (p_{14} \vee p_{23})] \vee x_2 \vee y_3 \vee y_4$$

where $p_{ij} = (x_i \vee y_j) \wedge (x_j \vee y_i)$, holds in the subgroup lattice of every Abelian group but fails in the lattice of normal subgroups of some finite group."

2.34. Pudlák and Tůma, "Every finite lattice can be embedded in a finite partition lattice". [PudTům1980]

[PudTům1980, final Th.] "Theorem. For every [finite] lattice L , there exists a positive integer n_0 , such that for every $n \geq n_0$, there is a normal embedding [preserving $\hat{0}$ and $\hat{1}$] $\phi : L \rightarrow \text{Eq}(A)$, where $|A| = n$."

2.35. Whitman, "Lattices, equivalence relations, and subgroups". [Whit1946]

[Whit1946, sec. 5 Th. 1] "Theorem 1. Any lattice is isomorphic to a sublattice of the lattice of all equivalence relations on some set."

2.36. Yan, “Distributive laws for commuting equivalence relations”. [Yan1998]

[Yan1998] “[Ore1942] found necessary and sufficient conditions under which the modular and distributive laws hold in the lattice of equivalence relations on a set S . In the present paper, we consider commuting equivalence relations. It has been proved by [Jóns1953b] that the modular law holds in the lattice of commuting equivalence relations. We give some necessary and sufficient conditions for the distributive law and its dual to hold for commuting equivalence relations.”

3. SURVEY BY PROPERTIES

3.1. Generalities. We use “Arguesian” rather than “arguesian”, as that is the consensus of authors, and by analogy with, “Boolean”, “Euclidean”, and “Darwinian”. By contrast, “abelian” is often used by authors instead of “Abelian”. We use “linear” for lattices that can be represented by commuting equivalence relations, following [Haim1984a, Intro.], which follows Gian-Carlo Rota.

Definition 3.1. *An equation or identity within a type of abstract algebra is a statement*

$$P(\mathbf{x}) = Q(\mathbf{x})$$

where \mathbf{x} is a (possibly empty) finite set of variables that take values from the set of elements of the abstract algebra, and P and Q are formulas composed of the variables \mathbf{x} , the constants of the type, and the operations of the type.

Definition 3.2. [Grätz1979, App. 4 sec. 63] *A variety or equationally defined class of algebras is the class of algebras of which all elements satisfy a particular (not necessarily finite) set of equations.*

Theorem 3.3. (Birkhoff’s Variety Theorem [Birk1935, sec. 10 Th. 10][Grätz1979, sec. 23 and sec. 26 Th. 3][WikiVar]) *A class of algebras is a variety iff the class is closed under taking subalgebras, direct products, and homomorphic images.*

Definition 3.4. *An implication, equational implication, universal Horn sentence, or sentence within a type of abstract algebra is a statement*

$$P_1(\mathbf{x}) = Q_1(\mathbf{x}) \text{ and } P_2(\mathbf{x}) = Q_2(\mathbf{x}) \text{ and } \dots P_n(\mathbf{x}) = Q_n(\mathbf{x}) \text{ implies } P(\mathbf{x}) = Q(\mathbf{x})$$

where \mathbf{x} is a (possibly empty) finite set of variables that take values from set of elements of the abstract algebra, $n \geq 0$, P_i , Q_i , P , and Q are formulas composed of the variables \mathbf{x} , the constants of the type of abstract algebra, and the operations of the type of abstract algebra.

Definition 3.5. [Grätz1979, App. 4 sec. 63] *An implicationally defined class of algebras is the class of algebras of which all elements satisfy a particular (not necessarily finite) set of implications.*

Theorem 3.6. [Grätz1979, App. 4 sec. 63 Th. 3] *A class of algebras is implicationally defined iff the class is closed under taking subalgebras, direct products, isomorphic images, and direct limits.*

Theorem 3.7. *In a lattice, $P \leq Q$ iff $P \vee Q = Q$ iff $P \wedge Q = P$. Thus, a statement $P \leq Q$ can be considered an abbreviation for either of these equations.*

Theorem 3.8. *An equation is a special case of an implication (with $n = 0$). Thus, any equationally defined class of algebras is an implicationally defined class of algebras.*

Definition 3.9. *A class of lattices is self-dual if, for every lattice in the class, its dual is also a member of the class, or equivalently, if the dual class composed of the duals of all members of the class is the same class.*

3.2. General lattices.

Theorem 3.10. *The class of lattices is defined by finite set of identities and is self-dual.*

Proof.

The axioms of lattices are a finite set of identities, and the set of them is self-dual. □

Theorem 3.11. [Birk1935, sec. 21 Th. 22] *Every sublattice of subgroups of a group is isomorphic with a sublattice of equivalence relations on a set, and conversely. Every sublattice of subgroups of a finite group is isomorphic with a sublattice of equivalence relations on a finite set, and conversely.*

Theorem 3.12. [Whit1946, sec. 5 Th. 1][Pál2001, sec. 2 Th. 2.1] *Any lattice is isomorphic to a sublattice of the lattice of all equivalence relations on some set and thus to a sublattice of subgroups of a group.*

Theorem 3.13. [PudTüm1980, final Th.][Pál2001, sec. 2 Th. 2.2] *Every finite lattice is isomorphic to a sublattice of the equivalence relations of a finite set and also to a subgroup lattice of some finite group.*

Definition 3.14. *For any abstract algebra \mathbf{A} , $\text{Con } \mathbf{A}$ is the lattice of congruences of \mathbf{A} .*

Theorem 3.15. [Pál2001, sec. 3 Th. 3.3] *For every algebraic lattice L there exists an algebra \mathbf{A} such that $\text{Con } \mathbf{A}$ is isomorphic to L .*

Question 3.16. [Pál2001, sec. 3 Prob. 3.4] *It is unknown whether for every finite lattice L there exists a finite algebra \mathbf{A} such that $\text{Con } \mathbf{A} \cong L$. Is this true?*

Definition 3.17. *For two equivalence relations x, y on a set U , we say $x \leq y$ if $x \subset y$ considering x, y as sets of pairs of elements of U , or equivalently if $a \equiv_x b$ implies $a \equiv_y b$ for all $a, b \in U$. Parallely, for two partitions x, y of a set U , we say $x \leq y$ if x is finer than y , that is, if every block of x is contained in a block of y .*

Thus the minimum element in the lattice of equivalence relations of a set is the discrete or identity equivalence relation, and the maximum element is the indiscreet or universal equivalence relation. The meet of x and y is composed of the intersection of the equivalence classes of x and y , and the join of x and y is composed of the transitive closures of the collective elements of x and y .

Definition 3.18. [Jóns1953b, sec. 1] *By a representation of a lattice A we mean an ordered pair $\langle F, U \rangle$ such that U is a set and F is a function which maps A isomorphically onto a sublattice of the lattice of all equivalence relations over U or equivalently a sublattice of the lattice of partitions of U . We say that $\langle F, U \rangle$ is*

- (1) *of type 1 if $F(x) + F(y) = F(x) \circ F(y)$ for $x, y \in A$,*
- (2) *of type 2 if $F(x) + F(y) = F(x) \circ F(y) \circ F(x)$ for $x, y \in A$,*
- (3) *of type 3 if $F(x) + F(y) = F(x) \circ F(y) \circ F(x) \circ F(y)$ for $x, y \in A$.*

where \circ is simple composition of relations.

Theorem 3.19. [Jóns1953b, sec. 4 Th. 4.3] *Every lattice has a representation of type 3.*

Question 3.20. *Given theorems 3.13 and 3.19, is it true that every finite lattice has a type-3 representation over a finite base set?*

3.3. Modular.

Theorem 3.21. *For a lattice L , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) [Day1982, sec. 1][Grätz1996, Ch. I sec. 4 Lem. 12][Pál2001, sec. 4][EnMathMod] *L satisfies*

$$(x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z) = x \wedge (y \vee (x \wedge z))$$
- (2) [dual to item 1] *L satisfies*

$$(x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z) = x \vee (y \wedge (x \vee z))$$
- (3) [Ded1900, sec. 2 par. VIII eq. 8][Birk1967, ch. I sec. 7][Ore1942, Ch. 1 sec. 5 eq. 4][Day1982, sec. 1][Lamp1994][Grätz1996, Ch. IV sec. 1 Th. 1][Pál2001, sec. 4][EnMathMod] *L satisfies*

$$x \geq z \text{ implies } (x \wedge y) \vee z = x \wedge (y \vee z)$$
- (4) [Pál2001, sec. 4] *L satisfies*

$$x \geq z \text{ implies } (x \wedge y) \vee z \geq x \wedge (y \vee z)$$
- (5) [Birk1967, ch. II sec. 7 Exer. 2][Grätz1996, Ch. IV sec. 1 Th. 1] *L satisfies*

$$x \wedge (y \vee z) = x \wedge ((y \wedge (x \vee z)) \vee z)$$
- (6) [Grätz1996, Ch. IV sec. 1 Th. 1] *L satisfies*

$$x \vee (y \wedge z) = x \vee ((y \vee (x \wedge z)) \wedge z)$$
- (7) [Lamp1994] *L satisfies*

$$x \leq y \vee z \text{ implies } x \leq y \vee [z \wedge (x \vee y)]$$

(8) [dual to item 7] L satisfies

$$x \geq y \wedge z \text{ implies } x \geq y \wedge [z \vee (x \wedge y)]$$

(9) [Grätz1996, Ch. IV Exer. 1] L satisfies

$$(x \vee (y \wedge z)) \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge (y \vee z)) \vee (y \wedge z)$$

(10) [Haim1985a, Exam. 2.3] L satisfies

$$(b \vee c) \wedge a \leq b \vee (c \wedge (a \vee b))$$

(11) [Haim1985a, Exam. 2.3] L satisfies

$$((b_1 \wedge b_2) \vee c) \wedge a \leq b_1 \vee (c \wedge (a \vee b_2))$$

(12) [dual to item 11] L satisfies

$$((b_1 \vee b_2) \wedge c) \vee a \geq b_1 \wedge (c \vee (a \wedge b_2))$$

(13) [Birk1967, ch. II sec. 7 Exer. 2] L satisfies

$$[(x \wedge z) \vee y] \wedge z = [(y \wedge z) \vee x] \wedge z$$

(14) [dual to item 13] L satisfies

$$[(x \vee z) \wedge y] \vee z = [(y \vee z) \wedge x] \vee z$$

(15) [Birk1967, ch. II sec. 7 Lem. 1] L satisfies

$$x \geq y \text{ and } a \wedge x = a \wedge y \text{ and } a \vee x = a \vee y \text{ implies } x = y$$


(16) [Ore1942, Ch. 1 sec. 5 eq. 5] L satisfies

$$b \vee c \geq a \geq b \text{ implies } a = b \vee (a \wedge c)$$

(17) [dual to item 16] L satisfies

$$b \wedge c \leq a \leq b \text{ implies } a = b \wedge (a \vee c)$$

(18) [Birk1967, ch. I sec. 7 Th. 12][Grätz1996, Ch. IV sec. 1 Th. 1][Pál2001, sec. 4] L does not contain the lattice N_5 (the “pentagon lattice”) as a sublattice.



Definition 3.22. A lattice satisfying any of the conditions of theorem 3.21 is called modular.²

Theorem 3.23. The class of modular lattices is defined by a finite set of identities and is self-dual. There are finite lattices that are not modular.

Proof.

The set of axioms of lattices, together with any one of the items of theorem 3.21 that is an identity, is a finite set of identities characterizing modular lattices. Choosing item 9 as the modular identity makes the set self-dual. The lattice described in item 18, N_5 , is a finite lattice that is not modular. \square

Theorem 3.24. If L is a finitary lattice, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) L is modular
- (2) [Birk1967, ch. II sec. 8 Th. 16] If $a \neq b$ both cover c , then there exists $d \in L$ which covers both a and b , and dually, if $a \neq b$ both are covered by c , then there exists $d \in L$ which is covered by both a and b .

²[Ore1942] uses *Dedekind condition, law, and relation* for “modular” and *structure* for “lattice”.

- (3) [Birk1967, ch. II sec. 8 Ths. 15 and 16][EnMathMod] L is graded with rank function ρ^3 and $\rho(x) + \rho(y) = \rho(x \vee y) + \rho(x \wedge y)$
(4) x and y both cover $x \wedge y$ iff x and y are both covered by $x \vee y$

Theorem 3.25. [Jóns1953b, sec. 3 Th. 3.7][Jóns1953b, sec. 1 Th. 1.2] *A lattice is modular iff it has a representation of type 2.*

Question 3.26. *Given theorems 3.13 and 3.25, is it true that every finite modular lattice has a type-2 representation over a finite base set?*

Theorem 3.27. [NatPick1987, Proof of Lem. 2] *If L is a finite dimensional modular lattice, L is simple iff all pairs of prime quotients⁴ in L are projective to each other.*

Theorem 3.28. [Pál2001, sec. 4] *The subspace lattice of a projective space (of any dimension, whether or not it satisfies Desargues theorem) is modular.*

3.4. Arguesian.

Theorem 3.29. *For a lattice L , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) [Jóns1953b, sec. 2 Lem. 2.1][Jóns1954a, sec. 1 Def. 1.8][DayPick1984][Lamp1994][Grätz1996, Ch. IV sec. 4 Def. 9] *For $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2 \in L$*

$$(a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) \wedge (a_2 \vee b_2) \leq (a_0 \wedge (y \vee a_1)) \vee (b_0 \wedge (y \vee b_1))$$

where

$$y = (a_0 \vee a_1) \wedge (b_0 \vee b_1) \wedge (((a_0 \vee a_2) \wedge (b_0 \vee b_2)) \vee ((a_1 \vee a_2) \wedge (b_1 \vee b_2)))$$

- (2) [Haim1985a, Exam. 2.2][Haim1985b, eq. 1][Hawr1996, sec. 4 eq. 14][Pál2001, sec. 4] *For $X_1, X_2, X_3, Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 \in L$*

$$X_1 \wedge \{Y_1 \vee [(X_2 \vee Y_2) \wedge (X_3 \vee Y_3)]\} \leq [(Q_{12} \vee Q_{23}) \wedge (Y_1 \vee Y_3)] \vee X_3$$

where $Q_{ij} = (X_i \vee X_j) \wedge (Y_i \vee Y_j)$

- (3) [Jóns1953b][Jóns1954a][Day1982, sec. 3 Def. 1][DayPick1984][Haim1985a, Exam. 1.1][Jóns1972][Nat2017, ch. 4][EnMathArg] *For $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2 \in L$*

$$(a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) \leq a_2 \vee b_2 \text{ implies } c_2 \leq c_0 \vee c_1$$

where

$$c_i = (a_j \vee a_k) \wedge (b_j \vee b_k) \text{ for } \{i, j, k\} = \{0, 1, 2\}$$

- (4) [Day1982, sec. 3 Th. 8][DayPick1984][Nat2017, ch. 4] *For $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2 \in L$*

$$(a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) \wedge (a_2 \vee b_2) \leq a_0 \vee (b_0 \wedge (c \vee b_1))$$

where

$$c_i = (a_j \vee a_k) \wedge (b_j \vee b_k) \text{ for } \{i, j, k\} = \{0, 1, 2\}$$

$$c = c_2 \wedge (c_0 \vee c_1)$$

- (5) [Haim1985a, Exam. 2.2] *For $a_1, a'_1, a_2, a'_2, b_1, b'_1, b_2, b'_2, c, c'_1, c'_2 \in L$*

$$\begin{aligned} c \wedge (((a_1 \wedge a_2) \vee (a'_1 \wedge a'_2)) \vee ((b_1 \wedge b_2) \vee (b'_1 \wedge b'_2))) \vee (c'_1 \wedge c'_2)) \\ \leq a_1 \vee (((a_2 \vee b_1) \wedge (a'_2 \vee b'_1)) \vee ((b_2 \vee c) \wedge (b'_2 \vee c'_1))) \wedge (a_1 \vee c'_2)) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the above is its own dual after exchanging the variables $a_1 \leftrightarrow c$, $a'_1 \leftrightarrow c'_1$, $a_2 \leftrightarrow b_2$, and $a'_2 \leftrightarrow b'_2$.

- (6) [Day1982, sec. 3 Th. 7][DayPick1984] *For $x_0, x_1, x_2, y_0, y_1, y_2 \in L$*

$$(x_0 \vee x_1) \wedge (z \vee y_1) \leq [(x_0 \vee x_2) \wedge (y_0 \vee y_2)] \vee [(x_1 \vee x_2) \wedge (y_1 \vee y_2)] \vee [y_1 \wedge (x_0 \vee x_1)]$$

where

$$z = y_0 \wedge [x_0 \vee ((x_1 \vee y_1) \wedge (x_2 \vee y_2))]$$

³Thus satisfying the the Jordan–Dedekind chain condition: all maximal chains between the same endpoints have the same finite length.

⁴That is, all covering pairs $x < y$.

(7) [Day1982, sec. 3 Th. 8] For $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2 \in L$

$$(a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) \wedge (a_2 \vee b_2) \leq a_0 \vee b_1 \vee \bar{c}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_i &= (a_j \vee a_k) \wedge (b_j \vee b_k) & \{i, j, k\} &= \{0, 1, 2\} \\ \bar{c} &= c_2 \wedge (c_0 \vee c_1) \end{aligned}$$

(8) [Day1982, sec. 3 Th. 8][EnMathArg] For $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2 \in L$

$$(a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) \wedge (a_2 \vee b_2) \leq [a_0 \wedge (a_1 \vee \bar{c})] \vee [b_0 \wedge (b_1 \vee \bar{c})]$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_i &= (a_j \vee a_k) \wedge (b_j \vee b_k) & \{i, j, k\} &= \{0, 1, 2\} \\ \bar{c} &= c_2 \wedge (c_0 \vee c_1) \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.30. A lattice satisfying any of the conditions of theorem 3.29 is called Arguesian.⁵

Theorem 3.31. [Jóns1954a, sec. 1 Th. 1.9][Day1982, sec. 3 Lem. 2] Any Arguesian lattice is modular.

Theorem 3.32. [Jóns1972] The class of Arguesian lattices is defined by a finite set of identities and is self-dual.

Proof.

[Jóns1972] proves this by showing theorem 3.29 item 3 implies its own dual. [Haim1985a] proves this by the fact that theorem 3.29 item 5 is self-dual. \square

Theorem 3.33. [Pál2001, sec. 4] The subspace lattice of a projective plane is Arguesian if and only if Desargues' Theorem is true in the projective plane.

Theorem 3.34. There are finite modular lattices that are not Arguesian.

Proof.

Consider a finite projective plane in which Desargues' Theorem is not true. By theorem 3.28, the subspace lattice of that projective plane is modular, but by theorem 3.33 it is not Arguesian. \square

Theorem 3.35. [Haim1985b, Note 2] Any lattice identity equivalent to the Arguesian law must necessarily involve at least six variables.

Proof.

[Haim1985b, Note 2] constructs a non-Arguesian lattice all of whose sublattices generated by five elements are Arguesian (and in fact, are sublattices of a quaternionic projective geometry). Thus, any identity with five or fewer variables that is true in all Arguesian lattices is true in this lattice, and so the identity does not exclude all non-Arguesian lattices. \square

Remark 3.36. Reformulating the implication in theorem 3.29 item 3 into two equalities produces a form which strongly resembles the geometric statement of Desargues Theorem in projective geometry: For $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2 \in L$

$$(1) \quad (a_0 \vee b_0) \wedge (a_1 \vee b_1) = a_2 \vee b_2 \text{ implies } c_2 = c_0 \vee c_1$$

where

$$c_i = (a_j \vee a_k) \wedge (b_j \vee b_k) \text{ for } \{i, j, k\} = \{0, 1, 2\}$$

However, equation 1 is not straightforwardly equivalent to item 3, as in the Young-Fibonacci lattice of degree 1, the instance $a_0 = 2, a_1 = 2, a_2 = 11, b_0 = 121, b_1 = 1211, b_2 = 21$ satisfies the antecedent of 1 but not the consequent. (However, it is unknown whether the Young-Fibonacci lattice is Arguesian.)

⁵This concept appeared in [Schüt1945].

3.5. Higher-order Arguesian.

Theorem 3.37. *Given $n \geq 1$, for all lattices L , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) [Haim1985a, sec. 2.0 Exam. 2.5, Figs. 6 and 7][Haim1987, sec. 3][Haim1991, sec. 3 Th. 1][Hawr1996, sec. 4 eq. 15][Pál2001, sec. 4] For a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n and $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n \in L$

$$a_n \wedge \left(\left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} (a_i \vee b_i) \right] \vee b_n \right) \leq a_1 \vee \left(\left[\bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} ((a_i \vee a_{i+1}) \wedge (b_i \vee b_{i+1})) \right] \wedge (b_1 \vee b_n) \right)$$

- (2) [Hawr1996, sec. 4 eq. 16] For $a_1, \dots, a_n, a'_1, \dots, a'_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$, and $b'_1, \dots, b'_n \in L$

$$a'_n \wedge \left(\left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} ((a_i \wedge a'_1) \vee (b_i \wedge b'_i)) \right] \vee (b_n \wedge b'_n) \right) \leq a_1 \vee \left(\left[\bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} ((a'_1 \vee a_{i+1}) \wedge (b'_i \vee b_{i+1})) \right] \wedge (b_1 \vee b'_n) \right)$$

Note that the above is self-dual under a suitable change of variables.

Definition 3.38. [Haim1991, sec. 3 Th. 1][Haim1991, sec. 3 Th. 1] *For any $n \geq 1$, the equivalent conditions in theorem 3.37 are called D_n and the n -th order Arguesian law. Collectively, the D_n for $n \geq 4$ are called higher-order Arguesian laws.*

Definition 3.39. *A lattice which satisfies D_n is called n -th order Arguesian.*

Theorem 3.40. *D_1 is trivially true for any lattice. D_2 is equivalent to the modular law. D_3 is equivalent to the Arguesian law.*

Theorem 3.41. *For any $n \geq 1$, the class of n -th order Arguesian lattices is defined by a finite set of identities and is self-dual.*

Proof.

The defining identities are the axioms of lattices and D_n [2]. These identities are self-dual. □

Theorem 3.42. *For any $n \geq 1$, D_{n+1} implies D_n .*

Proof.

The theorem is true for $n = 1$ because D_1 is trivially true.

Alternatively, $n \geq 2$. We start with this formulation of D_{n+1} , set $a_1 = a_2$ and $b_1 = b_2$ and will show that the result is D_n .

$$(2) \quad a_{n+1} \wedge \left(\left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^n (a_i \vee b_i) \right] \vee b_{n+1} \right) \leq a_1 \vee \left(\left[\bigvee_{i=1}^n ((a_i \vee a_{i+1}) \wedge (b_i \vee b_{i+1})) \right] \wedge (b_1 \vee b_{n+1}) \right)$$

Consider the iterated meet on the left of equation 2. The substitution makes the first two terms equal, so

$$(3) \quad \bigwedge_{i=1}^n (a_i \vee b_i) = \bigwedge_{i=2}^n (a_i \vee b_i)$$

Consider the iterated join on the right of equation 2. The first two terms are $(a_1 \vee a_2) \wedge (b_1 \vee b_2)$ and $(a_2 \vee a_3) \wedge (b_2 \vee b_3)$. Substituting turns the first term into $a_2 \wedge b_2$, which is \leq the second term and thus drops out of the join.

$$(4) \quad \bigvee_{i=1}^n ((a_i \vee a_{i+1}) \wedge (b_i \vee b_{i+1})) = \bigvee_{i=2}^n ((a_i \vee a_{i+1}) \wedge (b_i \vee b_{i+1}))$$

Now looking at equation 2 as D_{n+1} , substituting $a_1 = a_2, b_1 = b_2$, and using equations 3 and 4

$$a_{n+1} \wedge \left(\left[\bigwedge_{i=2}^n (a_i \vee b_i) \right] \vee b_{n+1} \right) \leq a_2 \vee \left(\left[\bigvee_{i=2}^n ((a_i \vee a_{i+1}) \wedge (b_i \vee b_{i+1})) \right] \wedge (b_2 \vee b_{n+1}) \right)$$

which, with a change of variables, is D_n . □

Definition 3.43. [Haim1987, sec. 2] *defines a series of finite lattices named A_n for $n \geq 3$.*

Theorem 3.44.

- (1) [Haim1985a, sec. 2.0 Exam. 2.5] *Every D_n is satisfied by every linear[3.52] lattice.*
- (2) *D_n can be written with $2n$ variables (in the form of defining equation 1).*
- (3) [Haim1987, sec. 3] *D_n fails in A_n , and hence A_n is not linear.*
- (4) [Haim1987, sec. 3] *Every proper sublattice of A_n is linear, and hence satisfies all D_n 's.*
- (5) [Haim1987, sec. 3] *At least n elements are required to generate A_n .*

Theorem 3.45. *Any statement containing $< n$ variables that is true in all linear[3.52] lattices is true in A_n .*

Proof.

Given such a statement and values of its variables, the truth of that instance of the statement depends only on the sublattice generated by the values of the variables. Since the number of variables is less than the number needed to generate A_n , that sublattice is a proper sublattice, and hence linear. Thus, the statement is true for those values of the variables. Since this follows for any values of the variables, the statement is satisfied by A_n . \square

Theorem 3.46. *The sequence of properties D_{2^n-1} for $n \geq 2$ (specifically D_3, D_7, D_{15}, \dots) are an infinite sequence of identities of strictly increasing strength on the class of finite lattices. The sequence begins with D_3 , which is the Arguesian condition.*

Proof.

Consider D_i and A_j with $j > 2i$. D_i has $2i$ variables and by theorems 3.44 and 3.45, so D_i is valid in A_j .

By theorem 3.42, $D_{2^{n+1}-1}$ is at least as strong as D_{2^n-1} . But D_{2^n-1} is valid in $A_{2^{n+1}-1}$ and $D_{2^{n+1}-1}$ fails in it, showing that $D_{2^{n+1}-1}$ is strictly stronger than D_{2^n-1} . \square

Question 3.47. [Haim1987, sec. 4] *It is expected that D_{n+1} is strictly stronger than D_n for all $n \geq 1$. Is this true? Is this true in the class of finite lattices?*

3.6. Unbounded-order Arguesian.

Definition 3.48. *The property D_∞ or the unbounded-order Arguesian law is the conjunction of all properties D_n for $n \geq 3$ [3.38].⁶ A lattice which satisfies D_∞ is called unbounded-order Arguesian.*

Theorem 3.49. *The unbounded-order Arguesian law is strictly stronger than all of the D_n on the class of finite lattices.*

Proof.

This is because the D_n contain an endless sequence of strictly increasingly strong statements on the class of finite lattices.[theorem 3.46] \square

Theorem 3.50. *The class of unbounded-order Arguesian lattices is defined by identities and is self-dual.*

Theorem 3.51. [Haim1987, sec. 4][Haim1991, sec. 3 Cor. 5] *The class of unbounded-order Arguesian lattices cannot be defined by a finite set of statements.*

Proof.

Given any finite set of statements, there is an N that is greater than the number of variables in any of the statements. By theorem 3.45, all of the statements are true in A_N . But theorem 3.44 shows that A_N does not satisfy D_N , and so the set of statements cannot characterize unbounded-order Arguesian lattices. \square

3.7. Linear.

While there do exist modular lattices which are not isomorphic to lattices of commuting equivalence relations, the only known examples are of a more or less pathological nature, such as the lattice of all subspaces of a non-Arguesian projective plane ([Jóns1953b]). — Bjarni Jónsson [Jóns1959a, sec. 3]

Definition 3.52. *A lattice is linear if it has a type 1 representation [3.18] by a sublattice of equivalence relations on a set (equivalently partitions of a set).*

⁶From [Haim1985a, sec. 2.0 Exam. 2.5, Figs. 6 and 7] it is clear that there is no transfinite version of the sentences D , and thus no grounds for considering the index of D to be either a cardinal or an ordinal. So instead of using the well-defined \aleph_0 or ω , we use the indicative ∞ .

Theorem 3.53. [Jóns1953b, sec. 1] *A representation of a lattice is type 1 iff for every two elements x, y , their representative equivalence relations $\phi(x), \phi(y)$ commute when composed as general binary relations: $\phi(x) \circ \phi(y) = \phi(y) \circ \phi(x)$.*

Theorem 3.54. [BritzMainPezz2001, Th. 1] *Let R and T be equivalence relations on a set S . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *R and T commute as binary relations;*
- (2) *The join of R and T within the lattice of equivalence relations on S is equal to their composition $R \circ T$;*
- (3) *$R \circ T$ is an equivalence relation.*

Question 3.55. [Wor2024a] *Given theorem 3.13, is it true that every finite linear lattice has a type-1 representation over a finite base set?*

Obviously, an infinite lattice does not have a (faithful) linear representation with a finite base set. However, we can investigate:

Definition 3.56. [Wor2024a] *A linear representation ϕ of a lattice L is finite-block if for every $x \in L$, $\phi(x)$ (looked at as a partition) consists of only finite blocks.*

Theorem 3.57. *If a finitary lattice L has a finite-block linear representation ϕ on a set B , then for every $x \in L$, ϕ restricted to the interval $[\hat{0}, x]$ can be restricted to a smaller base set to construct a (faithful) representation ϕ_x over a finite base set.*

Proof.

Consider the value $\phi(x)$. Since ϕ is finite-block, it is composed of disjoint finite blocks, which we call B_i for i in some index set I . Every block of every $\phi(y)$ for $y \in [\hat{0}, x]$ is contained in some block B_i . This means that ϕ can be decomposed into the sum of a set of (not necessarily faithful) linear representations ϕ_i which are ϕ restricted to B_i :

$$\begin{aligned}\phi &= \bigoplus_{i \in I} \phi_i \\ B &= \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i\end{aligned}$$

Because ϕ is faithful, for every one of the finite set of pairs $y, z \in [\hat{0}, x]$ there is at least one $i \in I$ for which $\phi(y) \neq \phi(z)$. We call this $i = i_{y,z}$ and we call the set of all $i_{y,z}$ (which may not be distinct) I_x , which is finite. Set

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_x &= \bigoplus_{i \in I_x} \phi_i \\ B_x &= \bigcup_{i \in I_x} B_i\end{aligned}$$

By construction, ϕ_x is a linear representation of $[\hat{0}, x]$. Because I_x is finite and each B_i is finite, B_x is finite. Because for every $y, z \in [\hat{0}, x]$, I_x contains the index of a ϕ_i that distinguishes y and z , ϕ_x is faithful. \square

Question 3.58. *Does every finitary linear lattice have a finite-block representation?*

Theorem 3.59. [3.44][Haim1985a, sec. 2.0 Exam. 2.5] *A linear lattice satisfies all of the properties D_n and so is Arguesian and modular.*

Definition 3.60. [Haim1985a, sec. 0.0] *Let $\text{Eq } S$ denote the lattice of equivalence relations of the set S (which are subsets of $S \times S$). Let $\rho : L \rightarrow \text{Eq } S$ and $\rho' : L' \rightarrow \text{Eq } S'$ be linear representations of lattices L and L' .*

If $S \cap S' = \emptyset$, the sum $\rho \oplus \rho' : L \times L' \rightarrow \text{Eq } (S \cup S')$ is defined as $\rho \oplus \rho'((x, x')) = \rho(x) \cup \rho'(x')$. If $L = L'$ we also refer to $(\rho \oplus \rho') \circ \Delta : L \rightarrow \text{Eq } (S \cup S')$, where $\Delta(x) = (x, x)$ [the minimum, discrete, or identity equivalence relation], as the sum of the representations ρ, ρ' of L .

The product $\rho \otimes \rho' : L \times L' \rightarrow \text{Eq } (S \times S')$ is defined as $\rho \otimes \rho'((x, x')) = \{(a, a'), (b, b')\} : (a, b) \in \rho(x) \text{ and } (a', b') \in \rho'(x')\}$. If $L = L'$ we also refer to $(\rho \otimes \rho') \circ \Delta : L \rightarrow \text{Eq } (S \times S')$, as the product of the representations ρ, ρ' of L .

Sums and products of arbitrary finite or infinite collections of representations are defined analogously.

Theorem 3.61. *The sum and product of linear representations are linear representations.*

Theorem 3.62. [Jóns1959a][Haim1984a, Ch. II][Haim1985a, sec. 1.0][NatPick1987][Nat2017, ch. 4] *The class of linear lattices is closed under direct products and taking sublattices.*

Proof.

Closure under sublattices is trivial. Closure under direct products is demonstrated by the sum of linear representations (and also by the product of linear representations). \square

Question 3.63. [Jóns1953b, sec. 5][Jóns1959a, sec. 4 Prob. 1][Haim1984a, Ch. II][Haim1985a, sec. 1.0][Nat1994][Nat2017, ch. 4] *Is the class of linear lattices closed under homomorphic images (which by theorems 3.62 and 3.3 is equivalent to being a variety and to being definable by identities)?*

Question 3.64. [Haim1985a, sec. 1.0] *Is the class of linear lattices self-dual?*

Question 3.65. *Is the linear condition strictly stronger than the unbounded-order Arguesian condition? That is, are there unbounded-order Arguesian lattices that are not linear? If so, does there exist such a finite lattice? (If not, then questions 3.63 and 3.64 are true.)*

Theorem 3.66. [parallel to theorem 3.51][Haim1987, sec. 4][Haim1991, sec. 3 Cor. 5][Nat1994] *The class of linear lattices is not definable by a finite set of sentences.*

Theorem 3.67. [Jóns1959a, sec. 3 Th. 2][Haim1985a][NatPick1987][Haim1991, sec. 1] *There is an infinite system of universal Horn sentences characterizing linear lattices. Specifically, in order for a lattice A to be linear, it is necessary and sufficient that the following condition be satisfied:*

Suppose n is a positive integer, $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2n}, z \in A$ and, for each positive integer $k \leq n$, $\phi(k)$ and $\psi(k)$ are natural numbers with $\phi(k) \leq k$ and $\psi(k) \leq k$. Let

$$b_{1,0,1} = b_{1,1,0} = a_0, \quad b_{1,0,0} = b_{1,1,1} = z,$$

and for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, k$ let

$$b_{k+1,i,j} = \bigwedge_{p \leq k} (b_{k,i,p} \vee b_{k,p,j}),$$

$$b_{k+1,i,k+1} = b_{k+1,k+1,i} = (b_{k+1,i,\phi(k)} \vee a_{2k-1}) \wedge (b_{k+1,i,\psi(k)} \vee a_{2k}),$$

$$b_{k+1,k+1,k+1} = z.$$

With these definitions, if $b_{k,\phi(k),\psi(k)} \leq a_{2k-1} \vee a_{2k}$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then $a_0 \leq b_{n+1,0,1}$.

Question 3.68. *Which of the sentences defined by theorem 3.67 are implied by one or more of the laws D_n ? Conversely, which of the laws D_n are implied by one or more of the sentences of theorem 3.67?*

Theorem 3.69. [NatPick1987, Proof of Lem. 4]

- (1) *For a fixed lattice L , the type 1 representations of L form an elementary class [WikiEl] of relational structures.*
- (2) [Jóns1959a] *A lattice L is linear if and only if every finitely generated sublattice of L is linear.*
- (3) *If every countable sublattice of L is linear, L is.*
- (4) [Jóns1959a] *If a countable lattice L is linear, it has a type 1 representation with a countable base set.*

Theorem 3.70. [Haim1984a, Ch. II][Haim1985a, sec. 1.0] *The class of linear lattices is closed under direct limits.*

Proof.

Because the class is defined by implications, and every implication depends on only finitely many hypotheses $P_i \leq Q_i$, every implication that is satisfied by every lattice in a direct system is satisfied by the direct limit of the direct system. \square

Question 3.71. [Haim1984a, Ch. II][Haim1985a, sec. 1.0] *It does not seem possible, however, straightforwardly to construct a representation of a direct limit of linear lattices from representations of the individual lattices. Is there such a construction?*

3.8. Normal subgroups of a group.

Theorem 3.72. [Jóns1953b, sec. 1][Nat2017, ch. 4] *The normal subgroup lattice of a group G has a natural linear representation (X, F) : take $X = G$ and $F(N) = \{(x, y) \in G^2 : xy^{-1} \in N\}$. Thus the normal subgroup lattice of a group is linear, and so is any sublattice of normal subgroups of a group.*

Theorem 3.73. [Jóns1954a, Th. 3.6][Herr2013, sec. 3] *There is a finite linear lattice (called B' in [Jóns1954a]) which is not embeddable into the normal subgroup lattice of any group.*

Question 3.74. *Is the class of sublattices of normal subgroups of a group self-dual?*

Question 3.75. [Jóns1953b, sec. 5] *Can the class of sublattices of normal subgroups of a group be specified by a set of sentences? By a set of identities? By a finite set of sentences? By a finite set of identities?*

3.9. Subgroups of an Abelian group.

Theorem 3.76. *Because all subgroups of Abelian groups are normal, every lattice of subgroups of an Abelian group is also a lattice of normal subgroups of the same group.*

Theorem 3.77. [PálSzab1995] *The identity*

$$x_1 \wedge \{y_1 \vee [(x_2 \vee y_2) \wedge (x_3 \vee y_3) \wedge (x_4 \vee y_4)]\} \leq [(p_{12} \vee p_{34}) \wedge (p_{13} \vee p_{24}) \wedge (p_{14} \vee p_{23})] \vee x_2 \vee y_3 \vee y_4$$

where $p_{ij} = (x_i \vee y_j) \wedge (x_j \vee y_i)$, holds in the subgroup lattice of every Abelian group but fails in the lattice of normal subgroups of some finite group.

Theorem 3.78. [KissPál1998, sec. 1] *The lattice of normal subgroups of the three generator free group G in the group variety defined by the laws $x^4 - 1$ and $x^2y - yx^2$ cannot be embedded into the subgroup lattice of any Abelian group.*

Theorem 3.79. *Theorems 3.77 and 3.78 each imply that the property of being a sublattice of the subgroups of an Abelian group is strictly stronger than the property of being a sublattice of the normal subgroups of a general group. Theorem 3.77 implies this for finite groups.*

Question 3.80. *Are the set of lattices that are embeddable into the subgroups of an Abelian group self-dual?*

Question 3.81. [Jóns1953b, sec. 5] *Can the class of sublattices of subgroups of an Abelian group be specified by a set of sentences? By a set of identities? By a finite set of sentences? By a finite set of identities?*

3.10. Subspaces of a skew vector space.

Definition 3.82. *A skew vector space is a module over a division ring.*

Theorem 3.83. (the Veblen–Young theorem) *For any projective space in which Desargues' theorem holds, the incidence lattice of the projective space is isomorphic to the subspace lattice of a skew vector space.*

Theorem 3.84. *Because a skew vector space is Abelian with respect to the operator $+$, its subspace lattice is the lattice of subgroups of the vector space taken as an Abelian group.*

Theorem 3.85. *The class of sublattices of subspaces of a skew vector space is self-dual.*

Proof.

The map of a subspace W of a skew vector space V into the annihilator W^0 of W , which is a subspace of the dual V^* of V , is order-reversing and embeds the lattice of subspaces of V into the lattice of subspaces of V^* . (If V is finite-dimensional, the mapping is a dual-isomorphism.) \square

Question 3.86. *Are there lattices of subgroups of Abelian groups that cannot be embedded into the lattice of subspaces of a skew vector space? Of those lattices, are there any that are finite?*

Question 3.87. *Can the class of sublattices of subspaces of skew vector spaces be specified by a set of sentences? By a set of identities? By a finite set of sentences? By a finite set of identities?*

3.11. Subspaces of a vector space.

Theorem 3.88. *(the Veblen–Young theorem) For any projective space in which Desargues’ theorem and Pappus’ hexagon theorem hold, the incidence lattice of the projective space is isomorphic to the subspace lattice of a vector space.*

Question 3.89. *Is there a lattice embeddable into the subspaces of a skew vector space which cannot be embedded into the subspaces of a vector space? If so, is there such a lattice that is finite?*

Remark 3.90. [Day1981] *The incidence lattice of subspaces of the 3-dimensional skew vector space over the quaternions (the (non-Pappian) projective plane over the quaternions) can be embedded into the incidence lattice of subspaces of the 6-dimensional vector space over the complex numbers (the (Pappian) 5-dimensional projective space over the complex numbers).*

Theorem 3.91. *The class of sublattices of subspaces of a vector space is self-dual.*

Proof.

The map of a subspace W of a vector space V into the annihilator W^0 of W , which is a subspace of the dual V^* of V , is order-reversing and embeds the lattice of subspaces of V into the lattice of subspaces of V^* . (If V is finite-dimensional, the mapping is a dual-isomorphism.) □

Question 3.92. *Can the class of sublattices of subspaces of vector spaces be specified by a set of sentences? By a set of identities? By a finite set of sentences? By a finite set of identities?*

3.12. Distributive.

Theorem 3.93. *For a lattice L , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) [Birk1967, ch. I sec. 6 Th. 9][Grätz1996, Ch. I sec. 4 Lem. 10] L satisfies

$$x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z)$$

- (2) [Birk1967, ch. I sec. 6 Th. 9][Grätz1996, Ch. I sec. 4 Lem. 10] L satisfies

$$x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z)$$

- (3) [Grätz1996, Ch. I sec. 4 Lem. 10] L satisfies

$$(x \vee y) \wedge z \leq x \vee (y \wedge z)$$

- (4) [Pál2001, sec. 2] L satisfies


$$(x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z) \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z)$$

- (5) [Birk1967, ch. II sec. 7 Th. 13 Cor.] L satisfies

$$a \wedge x = a \wedge y \text{ and } a \vee x = a \vee y \text{ implies } x = y$$

(That is, relative complements be unique.)

- (6) [Birk1967, ch. II sec. 7 Th. 13] L is modular and does not contain the “diamond lattice” (which is called both M_3 and M_5)⁷ as a sublattice:




Definition 3.94. *A lattice satisfying any of the conditions of theorem 3.93 is called distributive.*

Theorem 3.95. *There are finite lattices that are the subspace lattice of a vector space that are not distributive.*

⁷The older usage seems to be to call it M_5 after the number of elements. The newer usage seems to be to call it M_3 after the number of rank-1 elements, extending to M_n being the diamond lattice with n rank-1 elements.

Proof.

Specifically, consider the subspace lattice of $PG(\mathbb{F}_2, 2)$, where $\langle v_1, v_2, \dots \rangle$ denotes the subspace spanned by v_1, v_2, \dots :



□

Theorem 3.96. *The class of distributive lattices is defined by a finite number of identities, specifically the axioms of lattices and any one of the identities 1, 2, 3, or 4 of theorem 3.93. Because such set of identities is self-dual (in the case of 3 or 4), or dual to an equivalent set of identities (in the case of 1 or 2), the class of distributive lattices is self-dual.*

Theorem 3.97. *(Birkhoff's Representation Theorem) [Birk1967, ch. III sec. 3 Th. 3][Stan2012, Prop. 3.4.3] Let L be a finite or finitary distributive lattice. Let X be the poset of join-irreducible elements of L (from which we exclude $\hat{0}$). Then L is isomorphic to $\mathbf{2}^X$ (the set of weakly order-preserving functions from X to $\mathbf{2}$) or equivalently, $J_f(X)$ (the set of finite order ideals of X).*

3.13. Complemented. We are not primarily interested in complemented lattices, but we include this interesting result:

Theorem 3.98. [Jóns1954a, sec. 1 Th. 2.14][Jóns1954c] *Within complemented modular lattices, being Arguesian is equivalent to being isomorphic to a lattice of subspaces of a skew vector space. Consequently, for complemented modular lattices, all properties in the hierarchy we have been studying from Arguesian to being isomorphic to a lattice of subspaces of a skew vector space are equivalent.*

4. SUMMARY OF PROPERTIES

<i>Property</i>	<i>Strictly stronger than the preceding property?</i>	<i>Strictly stronger on finite lattices?</i>	<i>Self-dual?</i>	<i>Defined by sentences?</i>	<i>Defined by identities?</i>	<i>Defined by a finite number of sentences/identities?</i>
General lattice	—	—	yes	yes	yes	yes
Modular	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Arguesian	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Higher-order Arguesian	some are, unknown whether all	some are, unknown whether all	yes	yes	yes	yes
Unbounded-order Arguesian	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
Linear	unknown	unknown	unknown	yes	unknown	no
Sublattices of normal subgroups of a group	yes	yes	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
Sublattices of subgroups of an Abelian group	yes	yes	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
Subspaces of a skew vector space	unknown	unknown	yes	unknown	unknown	unknown
Subspaces of a vector space	unknown	unknown	yes	unknown	unknown	unknown
Distributive	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

5. SUMMARY OF OPEN QUESTIONS

We collect the open questions here.

Question 3.16. [Pál2001, sec. 3 Prob. 3.4] *It is unknown whether for every finite lattice L there exists a finite algebra \mathbf{A} such that $\text{Con } \mathbf{A} \cong L$. Is this true?*

Question 3.20. *Given theorems 3.13 and 3.19, is it true that every finite lattice has a type-3 representation over a finite base set?*

Question 3.26. *Given theorems 3.13 and 3.25, is it true that every finite modular lattice has a type-2 representation over a finite base set?*

Question 3.47. [Haim1987, sec. 4] *It is expected that D_{n+1} is strictly stronger than D_n for all $n \geq 1$. Is this true? Is this true in the class of finite lattices?*

Question 3.55. [Wor2024a] *Given theorem 3.13, is it true that every finite linear lattice has a type-1 representation over a finite base set?*

Question 3.58. *Does every finitary linear lattice have a finite-block representation?*

Question 3.63. [Jóns1953b, sec. 5][Jóns1959a, sec. 4 Prob. 1][Haim1984a, Ch. II][Haim1985a, sec. 1.0][Nat1994][Nat2017, ch. 4] *Is the class of linear lattices closed under homomorphic images (which by theorems 3.62 and 3.3 is equivalent to being a variety and to being definable by identities)?*

Question 3.64. [Haim1985a, sec. 1.0] *Is the class of linear lattices self-dual?*

Question 3.65. *Is the linear condition strictly stronger than the unbounded-order Arguesian condition? That is, are there unbounded-order Arguesian lattices that are not linear? If so, does there exist such a finite lattice? (If not, then questions 3.63 and 3.64 are true.)*

Question 3.68. *Which of the sentences defined by theorem 3.67 are implied by one or more of the laws D_n ? Conversely, which of the laws D_n are implied by one or more of the sentences of theorem 3.67?*

Question 3.71. [Haim1984a, Ch. II][Haim1985a, sec. 1.0] *It does not seem possible, however, straightforwardly to construct a representation of a direct limit of linear lattices from representations of the individual lattices. Is there such a construction?*

Question 3.74. *Is the class of sublattices of normal subgroups of a group self-dual?*

Question 3.75. [Jóns1953b, sec. 5] *Can the class of sublattices of normal subgroups of a group be specified by a set of sentences? By a set of identities? By a finite set of sentences? By a finite set of identities?*

Question 3.80. *Are the set of lattices that are embeddable into the subgroups of an Abelian group self-dual?*

Question 3.81. [Jóns1953b, sec. 5] *Can the class of sublattices of subgroups of an Abelian group be specified by a set of sentences? By a set of identities? By a finite set of sentences? By a finite set of identities?*

Question 3.86. *Are there lattices of subgroups of Abelian groups that cannot be embedded into the lattice of subspaces of a skew vector space? Of those lattices, are there any that are finite?*

Question 3.87. *Can the class of sublattices of subspaces of skew vector spaces be specified by a set of sentences? By a set of identities? By a finite set of sentences? By a finite set of identities?*

Question 3.89. *Is there a lattice embeddable into the subspaces of a skew vector space which cannot be embedded into the subspaces of a vector space? If so, is there such a lattice that is finite?*

Question 3.92. *Can the class of sublattices of subspaces of vector spaces be specified by a set of sentences? By a set of identities? By a finite set of sentences? By a finite set of identities?*

6. REFERENCES

- [Bell1961] Eric Temple Bell, *The last problem*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1961.
- [Birk1935] Garrett Birkhoff, *On the structure of abstract algebras*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **31** (1935), 433–454, DOI 10.1017/S0305004100013463, available at <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/mathematical-proceedings-of-the-cambridge-philosophical-society/article/On-the-structure-of-abstract-algebras/95848484848484848484848484848484> available at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180330012312/https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/a2888484848484848484848484848484> <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=4998884063153058981>.

- [Birk1967] ———, *Lattice theory*, 3rd ed., American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, vol. 25, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1967. Original edition 1940. available at <https://archive.org/details/latticetheory0000birk> <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=10180976689018188837>.
- [BritzMainPezz2001] T. Britz, M. Mainetti, and L. Pezzoli, *Some operations on the family of equivalence relations*, Algebraic Combinatorics and Computer Science: A Tribute to Gian-Carlo Rota (H. Crapo, D. Senato, Ralph S. Freese, and O. C. Garcia, eds.), Springer-Verlag, Milan, 2001, 2001, pp. 445–459, DOI 10.1007/978-88-470-2107-5_18, available at <http://www2.mat.dtu.dk/people/oldusers/T.Britz/papers/equrel.pdf> https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-88-470-2107-5_18 <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=6682016611742498100>.
- [CrawDil1973] J. P. Crawley and R. P. Dilworth, *Algebraic Theory of Lattices*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1973. available at <https://archive.org/details/algebraictheoryo0000craw>.
- [Day1981] Alan Day, *In search of a Pappian lattice identity*, Canad. Math. Bull. **24** (1981), 187–198, DOI 10.4153/CMB-1981-030-0, available at <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/4FDC4136B6E81E49> <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/canadian-mathematical-bulletin/article/in-search> <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=13192605395332536270>.
- [Day1982] ———, *Geometrical applications in modular lattices*, Universal algebra and lattice theory (Puebla, Mexico, 1982) (Ralph S. Freese and O. C. Garcia, eds.), Lecture Notes in Math. (LNM), vol. 1004, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 2006, 1982, DOI 10.1007/BFb0063433, available at <https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/BFb0063433> <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=14570042586739298811>.
- [DayPick1984] Alan Day and Douglas Pickering, *A note on the Arguesian lattice identity*, Conference on Universal Algebra (Visegrád, Hungary, May 1982), 1984, pp. 303–305, available at <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/35157988.pdf#page=309> <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=15359437393910443487>.
- [Ded1900] Richard Dedekind, *Ueber die drei Moduln erzeugte Dualgruppe [The lattice generated by three subgroups]*, Math. Annalen **53** (1900), 371–403, DOI 10.1007/BF01448979, available at <https://sci-hub.ru/https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01448979> <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF01448979> <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?c>.
- [EnMathArg] *Encyclopedia of Mathematics: Arguesian lattice*, https://encyclopediaofmath.org/wiki/Arguesian_lattice Accessed December 3, 2023.
- [EnMathDes] *Encyclopedia of Mathematics: Desargues assumption*, [https://encyclopediaofmath.org/wiki/Desargues](https://encyclopediaofmath.org/wiki/Desargues_assumption) Accessed December 3, 2023.
- [EnMathMod] *Encyclopedia of Mathematics: Modular lattice*, https://encyclopediaofmath.org/wiki/Modular_lattice Accessed December 13, 2023.
- [Frees1994] Ralph S. Freese, *Finitely based modular congruence varieties are distributive*, Algebra Universalis **32** (1994), 104–114, DOI 10.1007/BF01190818, available at <https://math.hawaii.edu/~ralph/Preprints/modcv2.pdf> <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF01190818> <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?c>.
- [Grätz1979] George Grätzer, *Universal Algebra*, Springer, New York, 1979. <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=9635876586085855118>.
- [Grätz1996] ———, *General lattice theory*, 2nd ed., Birkhäuser, Basel, 1996. <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=14018131805847906905>.
- [Haim1984a] Mark D. Haiman, *The Theory of Linear Lattices*, Ph.D. Thesis, Massachusetts Inst. of Tech., 1984. <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=12728508576024553972>.
- [Haim1984b] ———, *Linear lattice proof theory: an overview*, Universal algebra and lattice theory (Charleston, South Carolina, 1984) (Stephen D. Comer, ed.), Lecture Notes in Math. (LNM), vol. 1149, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1985, 1984, DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0098460>, available at <https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/BFb0098460> <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=2326541148673430734>.

- [Nat1994] J. B. Nation, *Jónsson's contributions to lattice theory*, Algebra Universalis **31** (1994), 430–445, DOI 10.1007/BF01221797, available at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF01221797>.
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=8251348821874564111>.
- [Nat2017] ———, *Notes on Lattice Theory*, 2017. <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=2514237753731>
Links to individual chapters are in <https://math.hawaii.edu/~jb/books.html>.
- [Nat2018] ———, *Tribute to Bjarni Jónsson*, Algebra Universalis **79** (2018), art. 57, DOI 10.1007/s00012-018-0542-8, available at https://math.hawaii.edu/~jb/bjarni_jonsson_3.pdf.
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=4641080885284972445>
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00012-018-0542-8>.
- [NatPick1987] J. B. Nation and Douglas A. Pickering, *Arguesian lattices whose skeleton is a chain*, Algebra Universalis **24** (1987), 91–100, DOI 10.1007/BF01188386, available at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF01188386>.
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=8996748697701020082>.
- [Ore1942] Øystein Ore, *Theory of equivalence relations*, Duke Math. J. **9** (1942), 573–627, DOI 10.1215/S0012-7094-42-00942-6, available at <https://projecteuclid.org/journals/duke-mathematical-journal/volume-9/issue-3/Theory-of->
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=8845904821420179904>.
- [Pál2001] Péter P. Pálffy, *Groups and lattices*, Groups St Andrews 2001 in Oxford: Volume 2 (Oxford, 2001), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series, vol. 305, Cambridge Univ., Cambridge, 2003, 2001, available at <https://web.archive.org/web/20121022011544/https://math.hawaii.edu/~williamdemeo/latticet>
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=3870854386669262006>.
- [PálSzab1995] Péter P. Pálffy and Cs. Szabó, *An identity for subgroup lattices of Abelian groups*, Algebra Universalis **33** (1995), 191–195, DOI 10.1007/BF01190930, available at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF01190930>.
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=3373915366505029858>.
- [PudTům1980] Pavel Pudlák and Jiří Tůma, *Every finite lattice can be embedded in a finite partition lattice*, Algebra Universalis **10** (1980), 74–95, DOI 10.1007/BF02482893, available at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF02482893>.
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=3014669489435746571>.
- [Schüt1945] M.-P. Schützenberger, *Sur certains axiomes de la théorie des structures*, C. R. Acad. Sci. **221** (1945), 218–222, available at <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k3173p.item>.
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=10841751010223657184>.
- [Stan2012] Richard P. Stanley, *Enumerative Combinatorics, Volume 1*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 49, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, 2012. original edition 1997.
- [Whit1946] Philip M. Whitman, *Lattices, equivalence relations, and subgroups*, Bull. of the AMS **52** (1946), 507–522, available at <https://community.ams.org/journals/bull/1946-52-06/S0002-9904-1946-08602-4/S0002-9904-1946-08602-4/>
<https://www.ams.org/journals/bull/1946-52-06/S0002-9904-1946-08602-4/>
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=4422758468344119213>.
- [WikiE] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elementary_class. Accessed February 12, 2024.
- [WikiVar] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Variety_\(universal_algebra\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Variety_(universal_algebra)). Accessed January 21, 2024.
- [Wor2024a] Dale Worley, *Can we extend "every finite lattice is a sublattice of partitions of a finite set" to linear and/or finitary lattices?*, <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/461875/can-we-extend-every-finite-lattice-is-a-sublat>
Accessed February 13, 2024.
- [Yan1998] Catherine Huafei Yan, *Distributive laws for commuting equivalence relations*, Discrete Math. **181** (1998), 295–298, DOI 10.1016/S0012-365X(97)00061-7, available at <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/82571977.pdf>.
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=17278291977600796519>.

Email address: `worley@alum.mit.edu`