

Preliminary On Results Lattices

DR.Kvr.Srinivas^{1*}, Mr.Vsn.Murthy²

^{1*} Professor-GIET Engineering College, Rajahmundry

Asst.Professor-GIET Engineering College, Rajahmundry

1.Abstract : In the Paper Mainly we have obtained certain Preliminary results on Lattices and also we obtain certain characterization.

2.Introduction: Lattices Plays important role in all Branches of sciences and Engineering, A Lattice is a non-empty set defined on 'L' which satisfy.

3.Key Words: P.O. Set, Lattice cumulative ,Associative Independent sup & Inf of Lattices and absorption Laws under meet \wedge and join \vee in the result.

1. we have the Lattice under binary relation ' \leq ' and also it is observed in theorem that when a Lattice is given under ordering ' \leq ' under join ' \vee ' and meet \wedge . If we Define a Lattice ' $<$ ' under partial ordering ' \leq ' then ($<, \leq$) is a unique Lattice which is obtained in theorems 3,4&5.

Def: Set ($<, \leq$) be a P.o.set with sup $\{a,b\}$ and inf $\{a,b\}$ exists for every $a,b \in L$. then the P.O. set in called a Lattice. Denoted ($<, \leq$) as $\text{Sup } \{a,b\} = a \vee b$, $\text{inf } \{a,b\} = a \wedge b$.

Theorem Lattice: A P.o. set ($<, \leq$) is a Lattice iff there exists a finite subset H of 'L' such that $\vee H$ and $\wedge H$ exists

Proof: set ($<, \leq$) be a P.O. set in which any two elements have sup & inf . then ($<, \leq$) is a Lattice. Conversely let ($<, \leq$) be a Lattice and H is a subset of L.

A subset of L

Case: If $H = \{a\}$ then $\vee H = \wedge H$.

If $H = \{a,b,c\}$ we show that $\vee H$ & $\wedge H$ exists

Let $d = \text{Sup } \{a,b\}$ and $e = \text{sup } \{d,c\}$

Then $d \geq a, d \geq b$ and $e \geq d, e \geq c$.

$e \geq a, b, c$ and Hence 'e' is the upper bound of $\{a,b,c\}$

Let 'f' be any upper bound of $\{a,b,c\}$ then

$f \geq a, f \geq b, f \geq c$

$\Rightarrow f \geq \text{sup } \{a,b\}$ and $f \geq d, f \geq c$.

$\Rightarrow f \geq \text{sup } \{d,c\}$ and hence $f \geq e$.

so that $\text{sup } \{a,b,c\} = (a \vee b) \vee c$.

Similarly Inf $\{a,b,c\}$ exists.

Denote $\text{sup } \{a,b\} = a \vee b$ and $\text{Inf } \{a,b\} = a \wedge b$.

Where \vee and \wedge are two binary Operations.

on L satisfy the following Laws.

1. **Commutative :** For $a,b \in L$.

$a \vee b = \text{sup } \{a,b\} = \text{sup } \{b,a\} = b \vee a$.

2. **Associative:** For $a,b,c \in L$, $(a \vee b) \vee c = a \vee (b \vee c)$

Now $(a \vee b) \vee c = \text{Sup } \{a \vee b, c\}$

$= \text{Sup } \{a, b \vee c\}$

$= \text{Sup } \{a, b, c\}$ (Claim)

$a \vee (b \vee c) = \text{Sup } \{a, b \vee c\}$

$= \text{Sup } \{a, b, c\}$ (claim)

Let $d = \text{Sup } \{a,b\}$, $e = \text{sup } \{d,c\}$

then $d \geq a, d \geq b, e \geq d, e \geq c$.

$e \geq a, b, c$ 'e' is an U.B. of $\{a,b,c\}$.

Let 'f' be any U.B of $\{a,b,c\}$

$f \geq a, b, c \Rightarrow f \geq e$.

Hence 'e' is $\text{Sup } \{a,b,c\}$

Similarly $a \vee (b \vee c) = \text{Sup } \{a,b,c\}$

Now we Claim that

$a_1 \vee a_2 \vee \dots \vee a_{n-1} \vee a_n = \text{Sup} \{a_1, \text{Sup} \{a_2, a_3 \dots a_{n-1} \text{ and } a_n\}$

If $n=1$ then $a_1 = \text{Sup} \{a_1\}$ Hence it is in Clear.

By using Mathematical induction. Let it be true for $n-1$.

$\text{Sup} \{a_1, a_2 \dots a_{n-1}, a_n\} = (a_1 \vee a_2 \vee \dots \vee a_{n-1}) \vee a_n$

$= \text{Sup} \{a_1, \text{Sup} \{a_2 \dots a_{n-1}\}\}$.

Hence is true for any finite elements

$\{a_1, a_2 \dots a_n\}$ of L and hence

$a_1 \vee a_2 \vee \dots \vee a_n$ is uniquely determined.

Theorem 2: Let (L, \leq) be a Lattice, where ' \leq ' is a binary operation on L satisfying Laws and transitive Laws and $\text{Sup} \{a, b\}, \text{Inf} \{a, b\}$ exists for all a, b , in L :

Define two "binary operations \vee and \wedge in L in (L, \vee, \wedge)

by $a \vee b = \text{Sup} \{a, b\}$ and $a \wedge b = \text{Inf} \{a, b\}$ then (L, \vee, \wedge) is a Lattice.

Theorem 3: Let (L, \vee, \wedge) be a Lattice, where \vee and \wedge are binary Operations on L , with the $a \vee b = \text{sup} \{a, b\}$ and $a \wedge b = \text{Inf} \{a, b\}$.

Define a relation ' \leq ' on L by $a \leq b$ if $a \wedge b = a$ then (L, \leq) is a Lattice.

Proof : 1. Reflexive : $a \leq a$ since $a \wedge a = \text{Inf} \{a, a\}$

2. Antisymmetric: Let $a \leq b$ and $b \leq a$ for any $a, b \in L$ then

and for $b \leq a$ and $a \wedge b = \text{Inf} \{a, b\} = a$

$\text{Inf} \{b, a\} = b \wedge a = b$

Hence $a = b$ ' \wedge ' is commutative and $\text{Inf} \{a, b\} = \text{Inf} \{b, a\}$.

3. Transitive: Let $a \leq b$ and $b \leq c$.

Then we have to show that $a \leq c$.

$a \leq b, \text{Inf} \{a, b\} = a$

$b \leq c$ and $\text{Inf} \{b, c\} = b \wedge c$.

$a = a \wedge b = a \wedge (b \wedge c) = (a \wedge b) \wedge c = a \wedge c$.

Hence $a \leq c$. Hence \leq is Transitive.

Now we Claim that ' \leq ' is a partial orders on L .

Now we show that $\text{Sup} \{a, b\} = a \vee b, \text{Inf} \{a, b\} = a \wedge b$.

Since $a \wedge (a \vee b) = a \Rightarrow a \leq a \vee b$

$b \wedge (a \vee b) = b \Rightarrow b \leq a \vee b$.

hence $a \vee b$ is an O.B. of $\{a, b\}$

Let ' d ' be an O.B. of $\{a, b\}$

$d \geq a, d \geq b \Rightarrow d \geq a \vee b$

hence $a \vee b = \text{sup} \{a, b\}$.

similarly $a \vee (a \wedge b) = a \Rightarrow a \wedge b \leq a$ and $b \wedge (a \wedge b) = a \wedge b \leq b$.

hence $a \wedge b$ is Lower bound of $\{a, b\}$.

Let ' e ' be any Lower bound of $\{a, b\}$ then $e \leq a, e \leq b \Rightarrow e \leq a \wedge b$.

Hence $a \wedge b = \text{Inf} \{a \wedge b = \text{Inf} \{a, b\}\}$ Imply that (L, \leq) is Lattice.

Theorem 4: Let (L, \vee, \wedge) be a Lattice, where \vee and \wedge are two binary operations on L with $a \vee b = \text{sup} \{a, b\}$ and $\text{Inf} \{a, b\} = a \wedge b$.

Define ' \leq ' on L by $a \leq b$ if $a \wedge b = a$. Then (L, \leq) is a Lattice and the Ordering ' \leq ' is unique.

Proof: If ' \leq ' be any binary operation defined on L , defined by $a \leq b$ if $a \vee b = b$

Claim: $a \leq b \iff a \wedge b = a$

let $(a, b) \in \leq$ iff $a \leq b$ if $a \vee b = b$

if $a \leq b$ if $(a, b) \in \leq$.

Imply that $\leq, \leq, \leq \rightarrow \otimes$

Let $(a, b) \in \leq$, iff $a \leq b$ iff $\text{Inf} \{a, b\} = a$

Iff $a \leq b$ iff $(a, b) \in \leq$ imply that

$\leq = \leq_1 \leq_1, \leq = \leq \rightarrow \otimes \otimes$

For an \oplus and $\otimes \otimes \leq \leq$. it is also observed that $a \vee b = a \vee b$ and $a \wedge b = a \wedge b$.

Now we claim that \leq is a partial on L on L

Now we s.t. $\text{sup} \{a, b\} = a \vee b$

$\text{Inf } \{a,b\} = a \wedge b$.

Since $a \wedge (a \vee b) = a \Rightarrow a \leq a \vee b$,

$b \wedge (a \vee b) = b \Rightarrow b \leq a \vee b$

hence $a \vee b$ is an O.B. of $\{a,b\}$

Let 'd' be an U.B. of $\{a,b\}$

$d \geq a, d \geq b \Rightarrow d \geq a \vee b$

hence $a \vee b = \sup \{a,b\}$, $a \wedge b \leq a$.

similarly $a \vee (a \wedge b) = a \Rightarrow$

and $b \vee (a \wedge b) = b \Rightarrow a \wedge b \leq b$.

hence $a \wedge b$ is Lower bound of $\{a,b\}$

let 'e' be any lower bound of $\{a,b\}$

then $e \leq a, e \leq b \Rightarrow e \leq a \wedge b$.

hence $a \wedge b = \text{Inf } \{a,b\}$ imply that (\leq, \leq) is a Lattice.

Theorem 5: Let (\leq, \vee, \wedge) be a Lattice, where \vee and \wedge are two binary operations on L with $a \vee b = \sup \{a,b\}$ and $a \wedge b = \text{Inf } \{a,b\}$.

Define: $<$ on \leq by $a \leq b$ if $a \wedge b = a$ then (\leq, \leq) is a Lattice

And the ordering \leq is Unique.

Proof: If ' \leq_1 ' be any binary operation on $<$ defined by $a \leq_1 b$ iff $a \vee b = b$

Claim: $\leq_1 = \leq$

Let $(a,b) \in \leq$ if $a \leq b$ if $a \vee b = b$

If $a \leq b$ if (a,b) if $(a,b) \in \leq_1$

Imply that $\leq \leq \leq_1 \rightarrow$

Let $(a,b) \in \leq_1$, if $a \leq b$ if

$\text{Inf } \{a,b\} = a$

$\text{Inf } a \leq b$ if $(a,b) \in \leq$

Imply that $\leq_1 \leq \leq \rightarrow \otimes \otimes$

F or an \oplus and $\otimes \otimes \leq = \leq_1$

It in also Observed that

$a \vee \vee = a \vee b$ and $a \wedge b = a \wedge b$

The following is an Example of a p.o. set in which supreme of the set consisting of any two elements exists and infimum doesn't exists.

Example 1: Let $x =$ Infinite set. $P =$ Set of all non-empty subsets of x Define \leq as ' \subset ' (i.e) for $A, B \in P$, $A \leq B$ IF $A \subset B$ iff $A \leq B$

For $A, B \in P \Rightarrow A \neq B, B \neq A \Rightarrow A \cup B \neq \emptyset$

So that $A \cup B \in P$

Now we claim that $A \vee B = A \cup B$

Since $A \subset A \cup B$ and $B \subset A \cup B \Rightarrow A \cup B$ is an U.B OF $\{A,B\}$

Let 'd' be any U.B. of $\{A,B\}$ Then $D \supseteq A, D \supseteq B$ so that $A \cup B = A \vee B$

Let A, B be any two non-empty subsets of x such that $A \cap B = \emptyset$

Let ' \leq_1 ' be any lower bound of $\{A,B\}$

Then $P \subset A, P \subset B \Rightarrow P \subset A \cap B \Rightarrow P = \emptyset$

Hence $A \cap B$ doesn't exist.

The following is an example of a p.o. set in which Infimum of the set consisting of any two elements exists and supreme doesn't exists.

Example 2: Set $x =$ infinite set and $P =$ the set of all subsets of X .

Let \leq be a partial ordering on ' P ' now we S.T. $A \wedge B$ and $A \cup B$ doesn't exist for any $A, B \in P$.

Since $A \cap B \leq A, A \cap B \leq B \Rightarrow A \cap B$ is a lower bound of $\{A,B\}$

Let A, B be any two subsets of ' X ' such that

$A \cup B = x$

Let $c \in P$ be any U.B. OF $\{A,B\}$

$\Rightarrow A \cup B \leq c$.

Let $A \leq c, B \leq c \Rightarrow A \cup B \leq c$ so that $X \leq c$

Hence $X = c$. which is a contradiction as $c \in P$.

So that $A \cup B$ doesn't exist in P .



Def 2: covering of two elements in a P.O. se let (p, \leq) be a p.o. set and let $a, b \in p$ than we say that 'a' covers 'b' b is covered by a if 1. $b \leq a$ 2. There exists $x \in p$. such that $b \leq x \leq a$ we write this as $b \leq a$.

Theorem 6 : Let (P, \leq) be a finite P.O. set and set $a, b \in p$ then $a \leq b$ if $a = b$ There exists a finite sequence $\{x_0 = a, x_{n-1} = b \text{ and } x_i \leq x_{i+1} \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq n-1$

Proof: Let (p, \leq) be a finite p.o. set and let $a, b \in p$. If the exists a finite sequence $a = x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_{n-1} = b$, then $a \leq b$.

Let (p, \leq) be a P.O. set with $a \leq b \forall a, b \in p$.

If $a = b$ then it is clear.

If $a < b$: then we have to construct a since sequence $\{a = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} = b\}$

Let 'H' be any subset of 'P' which in contains non-elements say $\{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}\}$

With $x_0 = a$, as least element and $x_{n-1} = b$ as greatest element $a = x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_{n-1}$

Of $x_i \neq x_{i+1}, x \in p, x_i \leq x \leq x_{i+1}$

Then $H \cup \{x\}$ contains +1 elements which is a contradiction as H contains m elements and hence $x_i \leq x_{i+1}$.

References:

1. General Lattice Theory- Gratzler
2. Garrett Birlchoff- Lattice Theory-AMS Colloquium Publications Vol: 25, ISBN-978-0821810255
3. A Course in Universal Algebra, Springer – Verlog, ISBN 3-540-90578-2