

Modular lattices of finite length (Part A)

Marcel Wild

1. Introduction

These notes constitute the first revision of my unpublished 1992 notes [W2] with the same title, a project originally suggested by the late Gian-Carlo Rota. Laying dormant for decades my love for modular lattices got rekindled only recently [W8]. In the process I realized that nobody yet has heeded Rota's wish, and so I decided to resume this endeavour. Among others, my teacher (during [W1] and [HW]) Christian Herrmann would have been a more knowledgeable author. On the other hand, he would have been hard pressed to stay within the (challenging enough) realm of finite length modular lattices.

Convention: If not stated otherwise, all lattices are henceforth silently assumed to be of finite length.

For the time being these notes will stay on the ResearchGate and in the arXiv, being updated from time to time. Whether and where they will eventually be published, remains to be seen. Comments and contributions (potentially leading to co-authorship) are welcome. The Section titles are as follows.

1. Introduction
2. Basic facts
3. Lattice congruences via coverings
4. Geometric lattices and matroids
5. Partial linear spaces and matroids
6. Enumeration of modular lattices
7. Bases of lines: The essentials
8. Calculating the submodule lattice of a finite R -module
9. Bases of lines: Localization and two types of cycles
10. Existence of R -linear representations, partition representations, and 2-distributivity
11. Classification of the k -linear representations of acyclic modular lattices
12. Axiomatization
13. Constructions: Gluings and subdirect products
14. Relatively free structures: From semilattices to distributive to modular lattices

As indicated by the spacing, the planned topics are partitioned in Part A up to Part D, the most finalised of which being Part A. These parts will appear (and will be updated) individually on ResearchGate and arXiv. For the time being all that can be said is that Part B will follow Part A within weeks. Even within individual Parts the levels of coherency may vary considerably. In particular, several '??' remain to be filled. As to the references, currently the author dominates disproportionately; that will change with time (any hints are welcome).

In each Section the numbering of displayed formulas (or technical statements) restarts anew as (1),(2),.. and so forth. Likewise the numbering of Theorems and Lemmas (thus Lemma 3.1, Theorem 3.2, Theorem 3.3 in Section 3), the numbering of Figures, and the numbering of exercises. Speaking of the latter, apart from probing the reader's understanding, they also serve to unclutter the main text. Solutions to most exercises are planned. At present they are given just below the exercises. Missing solutions are due to their triviality or to the author's procrastination.

1.1 Here comes an (incomplete) Section break-up. Section 2 introduces basic lattice concepts, such as easy consequences of distributivity and semimodularity, closure systems and implications. Section 3 propagates to view lattice congruences mainly in terms of the behaviour of coverings (=2-element intervals). This works particularly well for modular lattices and, so it seems, features novel material. Section 4 glances at matroids and the coupled geometric (:= semimodular and atomistic) lattices L . A prominent special case are *modular* geometric lattices. As is well known, they are cryptomorphic to projective spaces. Taking another line of attack (Section 5), projective spaces generalize to partial linear spaces (PLSes). The standard text [BB] says nothing about so-called 'point-splittings' that are crucial to make a PLS acyclic, and hence more manageable. The (very preliminary) enumeration of modular lattices in Section 6 is based on Kohonen [K].

Section 7 keeps 'modular' but drops 'atomistic' while attempting to maintain the framework of projective geometry as far as possible. It is based on ground-breaking work of Herrmann, Faigle, Jonsson-Nation, Benson-Conway. The crucial concept generalizing a projective geometry is a certain PLS which was coined a 'base of lines' (BOL) in [HW]. Let L be a modular lattice. The point set of a BOL of L is the set $J(L)$ of join irreducibles, and the lines of the BOL are chosen among those sets $\ell \subseteq J(L)$ that are maximal with respect to any distinct $p, q \in \ell$ yielding the same join $p + q$. Applying bases of lines it is shown in Section 8 how the submodule lattice $\mathbb{L}(M)$ of a finite R -module M can be calculated in a compressed format. Modulo an open question that method extends to the calculation of the sublattice $\mathbb{L}' \subseteq \mathbb{L}(M)$ generated by arbitrary members of $\mathbb{L}(M)$. It remains to compare this with the wholly different approach in [LMR]. Section 9 investigates cycles in bases of lines of modular lattices L . It builds on point-splittings (Sec. 5) to retrieve relations among various invariants of L , e.g. a sharp lower bound for the number of join irreducibles of L . Given any BOL $\mathcal{B}$ of L and any covering (a, b) of L , it also pays to investigate the 'localization' $\mathcal{B}(a, b)$ of $\mathcal{B}$ to (a, b) .

Andras Huhn [Hu] introduced the 2-distributive law, which is a wide-ranging generalization of (ordinary) 1-distributivity. It is obvious that a modular and 2-distributive lattice doesn't contain (as interval the subspace lattice of) a projective plane, and Huhn managed to prove the converse. It turns out (Section 10) that the BOL's of 2-distributive modular lattices behave much better than in the general case. Namely, all BOLs $\mathcal{B}$ of L are 'locally acyclic' (i.e. each localization $\mathcal{B}(a, b)$ of $\mathcal{B}$ is acyclic) iff L is 2-distributive. Here comes the result that kindled¹ Rota's love of

¹Being a visiting Scholar at MIT (sponsored by the Swiss National Fonds) Rota asked me to 'teach' him

modular lattices: If R is a suitably restricted ring (e.g. a skew-field) and L is 2-distributive, then there is a lattice embedding of L into the submodule lattice of a free R -module [HW]. As to other kinds of embeddings, the embeddability of arbitrary lattices into partition lattices is a popular theme in lattice theory soon after its inception. The author contributed [W3,W8] to this line of research by focusing on *cover-preserving* (*cp*) embeddings of *modular* lattices L into partition lattices. It is easy to see that L must be 2-distributive and without covering sublattices M_4 , but this is not quite sufficient. Coming back to rings R , if a modular lattice L (of length n) is cp embeddable into a partition lattice then, for each field $R = k$, L is embeddable in $\mathbb{L}(k^n)$, the lattice of subspaces of k^n . Again, the converse fails. As opposed to existence, Section 11 focuses on the *classification* of k -linear representations. Here we need to restrict locally acyclic (=2-distributive) lattices to certain globally acyclic lattices. Section 11 mainly draws on [HW] and [W1]. The axiomatization of bases of lines (Section 12), spearheaded in [HPR], simplifies a lot when attention is restricted (at least initially) to the 2-distributive case. Likely Section 12 will develop only with the help of co-authors.

Part D so far comprises two 'loose ends' but more may follow. Section 13 hopefully will present, the first time in English (!), deep results of Herrmann [H] and Wille [Wi1, Wi2]. In particular [Wi1] completely classifies those finite posets P for which the freely generated modular lattice $FM(P)$ is finite. Section 14 tackles the 'practical side' of Wille's Theorem, i.e. the compact (based on wildcards as in Sec. 8) representation of $FM(P)$. This is new material, even for the free *distributive* lattice $FD(P)$.

2) Basic facts

2.1. Some basic concepts (such as dual lattice, direct products, congruences, etc) will not be defined in the sequel; their definitions can be found (most detailed) in [DP]; see also [G],[B],[D], which dig deeper. For elements x, y of a lattice L we usually (not always) scorn the traditional notation $x \vee y$ and $x \wedge y$ for joins and meets and rather write $x + y$ and xy respectively. In so doing, akin to ordinary arithmetic, we can save brackets by adopting the convention that meets (=products) bind stronger than joins (=sums). Thus $x + yz$ means $x + (yz)$ and not $(x + y)z$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we put $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

A chain C in a lattice is a totally ordered sublattice, i.e. for all $x, y \in C$ one either has $x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$. A lattice L has finite length (FL) if the cardinalities of all its chains are bounded by a universal constant. Notice that a FL lattice may well be infinite, such as M_n defined below.

Recall that by convention (Sec. 1) all lattices are assumed to be of **finite length (FL)**. We usually leave it to the reader to ponder in which scenarios this restriction could be weakened. It e.g. follows that for us each lattice L has a *unit* (=largest element) which we denote by 1_L or simply 1. Similarly L has *zero* (=smallest element) which we write as 0_L or 0. Call $x \in L$ a lower cover of $y \in L$ (and y an upper cover of x), written $x \prec y$, if $x < y$ and there is no z with $x < z < y$. For each $a < b$ there are maximal chains between a and b , all of which necessarily of type $a = x_0 \prec x_1 \prec \dots \prec x_t = b$. By definition the length of a $(t + 1)$ -element chain (maximal or not) is t . The lattice N_5 , the first in Figure 2.1, shows that not all maximal a, b -chains need to have the same length. In any lattice L we define $\delta(L)$ as the length of a *longest* maximal 0,1-chain. So $\delta(N_5) = 3$.

modular lattices on the blackboard in his office. Preferably in German, so that he could freshen up that too.

A *nonzero* element $p \in L$ is join-irreducible if $x + y = p$ implies $x = p$ or $y = p$. Each join irreducible p has a unique lower cover $p_* \prec p$. Graphically speaking, p is join irreducible iff in the diagram of L only one line reaches p from below. Denote by $J(L)$ the set of join irreducibles of L . Put

$$j(L) := |J(L)| \text{ and } J(x) := \{p \in J(L) \mid p \leq x\}$$


for all $x \in L$. Then $x = \sum J(x)$ for all $x \in L$ (see eg [DP,2.46]). Consequently for each $x < y$ the set $J(x, y) := J(y) \setminus J(x)$ is nonempty. According to Ex.2A it holds that

$$(1) \quad j(L) \geq \delta(L) \text{ in any finite length lattice } L.$$

The set $At(L)$ of all atoms $0 \prec p$ is a subset of $J(L)$. A lattice is atomistic if $J(L) = At(L)$. For any $n \geq 3$ (including infinite cardinals) the lattice M_n consists of 0,1, and n atoms. The case $n = 3$ yields the middle lattice in Figure 2.1. One defines meet-irreducibles and co-atoms in dual fashion. Actually, the dual L^d of a lattice L is obtained by turning the diagram of L on its head, see [DP,1.19]. It then holds that the meet-irreducibles of L match the join-irreducibles of L^d , and likewise for many other concepts.

An element $p \in L$ is join-prime if $x + y \geq p$ implies $x \geq p$ or $y \geq p$, for all $x, y \in L$. It is immediate that join-prime $\Rightarrow$ join-irreducible. Dually m is meet-prime if $xy \leq m$ implies $x \leq m$ or $y \leq m$, for all $x, y \in L$. It similarly follows that meet-prime $\Rightarrow$ meet-irreducible. Exercise 2B asks to determine the join-primes (and coupled meet-primes) in the three lattices of Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1: The three lattices N_5 , M_3 , SM_{10}




2.2 Several types of functions between lattices L, L' will be considered. A map $f : L \rightarrow L'$ is monotone if $a \leq b \Rightarrow f(a) \leq f(b)$ for all $a, b \in L$. It is an order embedding if $a \leq b \Leftrightarrow f(a) \leq f(b)$ for all $a, b \in L$. (Such f is necessarily injective.) For instance, let L be the left lattice in Figure 2.2 and L' be the powerset $\mathbb{P}([3])$ on the right. Defining f by

$$(2) \quad 0 \mapsto \emptyset, \quad a \mapsto \{1\}, \quad b \mapsto \{3\}, \quad c \mapsto \{1, 2\}, \quad d \mapsto \{2, 3\}, \quad e \mapsto \{1, 2, 3\}$$

yields an order embedding. For instance $a \not\leq d$ matches $\{1\} \not\subseteq \{2, 3\}$. A meet embedding is an order embedding that additionally satisfies $f(ab) = f(a)f(b)$ for all $a, b \in L$. A join embedding is an order embedding that additionally satisfies $f(a+b) = f(a) + f(b)$ for all $a, b \in L$. The order embedding f defined in (2) is neither a meet embedding ($f(cd) = f(0) = \emptyset \neq \{2\} = f(c)f(d)$), nor a join embedding ($f(a+b) = f(1) = \{1, 2, 3\} \neq \{1, 3\} = f(a) + f(b)$). However (Exercise 2C), each *bijective* order embedding must be both a meet and a join embedding.

Figure 2.2: Order embedding into a Boolean lattice



A homomorphism between lattices L and L' is any (e.g. constant) function $f : L \rightarrow L'$ satisfying $f(ab) = f(a)f(b)$ and $f(a + b) = f(a) + f(b)$ for all $a, b \in L$. Hence an injective homomorphism is the same thing² as a simultaneous meet and join embedding. A surjective homomorphism is called an epimorphism and a bijective homomorphism is an isomorphism. Epimorphisms are linked to congruences, which will be the topic of Section 3.

2.3 The interval determined by elements $c < d$ of a lattice L is the sublattice $[c, d] := \{x \in L : c \leq x \leq d\}$. An interval $[c, d]$ is upper transposed to the interval $[a, b]$, written $[a, b] \nearrow [c, d]$, if $a = bc$ and $d = b + c$. Dually $[c, d]$ is lower transposed to $[a, b]$, written $[a, b] \searrow [c, d]$, if $c = ad$ and $b = a + d$. For instance $[2, 1] \searrow [0, 4]$ in N_5 , and $[0, 2] \nearrow [4, 1] \searrow [0, 3]$ in M_3 . We may also use $\swarrow$ (equivalent to $\nearrow$) and $\nwarrow$ (equivalent to $\searrow$). Being (upper or lower) transposed is denoted by $\sim$. The proof of the following is left as Exercise 2G.

Theorem 2.1: *If L is a lattice and $p \in L$ is join-prime, then there is a largest (not just maximal) element $m \in L$ with the property that $m \not\geq p$. Hence $L = [p, 1] \uplus [0, m]$. Moreover, m is meet-prime and $[p_*, p] \nearrow [m, m^*]$.*

2.4. Before we come to particular types of lattices, a few words on three tightly interwoven concepts are in order (more details can e.g. be found in [W7]): closure operators, closure systems, implicational bases. A closure system on a set E is a family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets stable under arbitrary intersections. Formally $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{P}(E)$ and $\bigcap \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{F}$ for all $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. In particular $E = \bigcap \emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$.

A closure operator is a function $cl : \mathbb{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(E)$ which is extensive, monotone, and idempotent. We refer to the pair (E, cl) as a closure space. The family $\mathbb{L}(E, cl)$ of all closed sets X (i.e. $cl(X) = X$) is a closure system. Each closure system, ordered by set inclusion, is a lattice with meets and joins given by $X \wedge Y = X \cap Y$ and $X \vee Y = cl(X \cup Y)$ respectively. Conversely, each closure system $\mathcal{F}$ yields a closure operator by putting $cl(X) := \bigcap \{Y \in \mathcal{F} : X \subseteq Y\}$. The two transitions are mutually inverse.

The third concept amounts to pure Horn functions (a type of Boolean functions), but the following stripped-down formalism is more user-friendly. Call a pair of subsets $(A, B) \in \mathcal{P}(E) \times \mathcal{P}(E)$ an implication. It is henceforth more handy to write $A \rightarrow B$ instead of (A, B) . We call A the premise and B the conclusion of the implication. Given a family $\Sigma = \{A_1 \rightarrow B_1, \dots, A_n \rightarrow B_n\}$ of implications on E , the set $X \subseteq E$ is Σ -closed if for all $A_i \rightarrow B_i$ in Σ

²Non-injective maps that preserve $\wedge$ (or $\vee$) are necessarily monotone but the extra property is seldom relevant.

³Of course $[0, 2] \nearrow [4, 1] \searrow [0, 3]$ abbreviates $[0, 2] \nearrow [4, 1]$ and $[4, 1] \searrow [0, 3]$.

it follows from $A_i \subseteq X$ that $B_i \subseteq X$. It is easy to see (Exercise 2H) that the family $\mathbb{L}(E, \Sigma)$ of all Σ -closed sets is a closure system. The coupled closure operator $cl_\Sigma(Y)$ is calculated by iteratively adding conclusions B_i whenever the corresponding premise A_i is contained in the superset of Y obtained so far; see [W7] for concrete examples. Conversely, given any closure operator $cl : \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$, there always are families of implications Σ such that $cl = cl_\Sigma$. We then call Σ an implicational base of cl , or of the coupled closure system $\mathbb{L}(E, cl)$.

2.5. A lattice D is distributive if $x(y + z) = xy + xz$ for all $x, y, z \in D$. Then automatically the dual identity holds: $x + yz = (x + y)(x + z)$ for all $x, y, z \in L$. For instance (Ex. 2I), each chain is a distributive lattice. The 2-element chain D_2 will come up frequently. If $(J, \leq)$ is a poset, then the collection $\mathbb{L}(J, \leq)$ of all its order ideals is easily seen to be closed under intersections and unions. Hence $\mathbb{L}(J, \leq)$ is a sublattice of the distributive powerset lattice $\mathbb{P}(J)$, and so itself is distributive.

The converse also holds (Birkhoff's Theorem, [DP,p.116]): Each (FL) distributive L is actually finite and the map $x \mapsto J(x)$ is an isomorphism from L to $\mathbb{L}(J(L), \leq)$. As a consequence, each element x of a distributive lattice has a *unique* irredundant representation by join-irreducibles (i.e. by the set of maximal elements of $J(x)$). By duality also the irredundant representations by meet-irreducibles are unique. Replacing each set $J(x) \subseteq J(L)$ by its characteristic 0,1-vector, and using that all join irreducibles are join-prime, one can view (Ex.2O) the map $x \mapsto J(x)$ as a subdirect product representation $L \rightarrow (D_2)^n$.

A lattice L is complemented if each $x \in L$ has a complement c , i.e. $x + c = 1$ and $xc = 0$. If L is Boolean, i.e. distributive and complemented, then $(J(L), \leq)$ is unordered (i.e. an antichain), and so $\mathbb{L}(J(L), \leq)$ becomes $\mathbb{P}(J(L))$.

2.6 If an interval $[c, d]$ has cardinality two, i.e. $c \prec d$, then we call⁴ it a covering. A lattice L is upper semimodular if upper transposes of coverings are again coverings. For instance, the rightmost lattice in Figure 2.1, call it SM_{10} , is upper semimodular, e.g. the covering $[0, 2]$ transposes up to the covering $[8, 1]$. Notice that coverings can have *lower* transposes which are not coverings, e.g. $[7, 1] \searrow [0, 6]$ in SM_{10} . An upper semimodular lattice in particular has the property that from $a \prec b$, $a \prec c$ it follows that $b \prec b + c$, $c \prec b + c$. In fact this property is equivalent to our definition. Evidently each *interval* sublattice of an upper semimodular lattice is again upper semimodular, but inheritance of upper semimodularity is not⁵ guaranteed for arbitrary sublattices.

Each upper semimodular lattice has a rank function $\delta : L \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, i.e. satisfying $\delta(0) = 0$ and $x \prec y \Rightarrow \delta(y) = \delta(x) + 1$. The existence of δ is due to the fact that all maximal chains C between elements $a < b$ have the same length (which e.g. fails in N_5). In particular, the length of L , defined as $\delta(L) := \delta(1)$, is the length of any maximal 0-1-chain. Furthermore, it holds that

$$(3) \quad \delta(x) - \delta(xy) \geq \delta(x + y) - \delta(y),$$

i.e. switching from an interval to an upper transposed interval cannot increase the length⁶.

⁴Other authors speak of prime intervals or of prime quotients.

⁵In fact, a famous Theorem of Dilworth states that *each* finite lattice occurs as sublattice in a suitable semi-modular lattice. A short proof can be found in [W3].

⁶Many textbooks state this inequality in equivalent (yet pedagogically inferior) fashion as $\delta(xy) + \delta(x + y) \leq$

2.6.1 A lattice L is lower semimodular if lower transposes of coverings are coverings. Not surprisingly, in this case $\geq$ in (3) becomes $\leq$. Put another way, L is lower semimodular iff L^d is upper semimodular. Henceforth upper semimodular will be more important than lower semimodular, and so we convene that semimodular always abbreviates 'upper semimodular'. The lattice SM_{10} in Figure 2.1 is semimodular but not lower semimodular. The lattice N_5 is neither semimodular nor lower semimodular. We leave it as an exercise to prove the following fact [Lemma 1 in W3].

- (4) Let $f : L \rightarrow L'$ be a cover preserving order between lattices. If L semimodular, then f preserves joins. Dually, if L lower semimodular, then f preserves meets.

The example in Section 2.2 shows that the (upper resp. lower) semimodularity of L in (4) is essential.

2.7 By definition a lattice L is modular if it is both upper and lower semimodular. Consequently (3) improves to the rank formula

$$(5) \quad \delta(x) - \delta(xy) = \delta(x + y) - \delta(y).$$

A handy consequence (Exercise 2Q) is the following:

- (6) Suppose in a modular lattice $b_i \leq a_i$ and $d_i := \delta(a_i) - \delta(b_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$).
Then $\delta(a_1 + a_2) - \delta(b_1 + b_2) \leq d_1 + d_2$.

Transposed intervals not only have the same length, they are in fact isomorphic:

- (7) *Dedekind's transposition principle: Whenever $[a, b] \nearrow [c, d]$ takes place in a modular lattice, the map $x \mapsto x + c$ is a lattice isomorphism between $[a, b]$ and $[c, d]$ with inverse $y \mapsto yb$.*

Sometimes useful is this consequence [FRS, p.361] of (7) which generalizes the well-known (and easy) case that $p, q \in At(L)$:

- (8) *If L is modular and $x \in L$, $p, q \in J(L)$ are such that $p \leq x + q$ but $p \not\leq x + q_*$, then $x + p = x + q$.*

To prove it, $y \mapsto x + y$ is an isomorphism $[xq, q] \rightarrow [x, x + q]$ between *non-singleton* intervals (why?). Because therefore q_* is the unique lower cover of q in $[xq, q]$, we have $x + q_*$ as the unique lower cover of $x + q$ in $[x, x + q]$. By assumption $x + p \in [x, x + q]$, but $x + p \notin [x, x + q_*]$. This forces $x + p = x + q$ and proves (8).

The proof of the Transposition Principle (7) hinges on the fact that

$$\delta(x) + \delta(y).$$

(9) $(x + y)z = x + yz$ for all $x, y, z \in L$ with $x \leq z$.

Condition (9) is actually the usual definition of *modularity*, but we hasten to add that in our FL framework (9) is equivalent to 'semimodular plus lower semimodular'. It is easy to see that the conditioned (by $x \leq z$) identity appearing in (9) is equivalent to the unconditioned identity $(xz + y)z = xz + xy$. This observation e.g. implies that the family of all modular lattices is a variety, i.e. closed under taking sublattices, direct products, and epimorphic images. Yet varieties will concern us only in Part D of this text. As shown in Exercise 2M:

(10) If (a, b) is a covering in a modular lattice then $J(a, b)$ is an antichain.

(This property e.g. fails in N_5 .) Subspace lattices of vector spaces, and their sublattices, are among the most important examples of modular lattices. Also each distributive lattice is modular because $(xz + y)z = xzz + yz = xz + xy$. As is well known [DP,4.10], a modular lattice is distributive iff it does not contain a sublattice M_3 . We will see soon that due to our FL convention M_3 can be found as a *covering* (= length two) sublattice.

A lattice is sectionally complemented if all its intervals are complemented.

Theorem 2.2: *For each modular lattice L these properties are equivalent:*

- (a) *It is complemented.*
- (b) *It is sectionally complemented.*
- (c) *It is atomistic.*
- (d) *Its unit is a sum of atoms.*
- (e) *It is co-atomistic.*
- (f) *Its zero is a meet of co-atoms.*

Proof. As to $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$, in order to find a complement of $x \in [a, b]$ within this interval, let x' be a complement within L and put $y := a + x'b \in [a, b]$. Using (8) we conclude that $x + y = x + x'b = (x + x')b = 1b = b$ and $yx = (a + x'b)x = a + x'bx = a + 0 = a$. As to $(b) \Rightarrow (c)$, if any lattice has a join irreducible p which is not an atom, then $p_* \neq 0$ has no complement in the interval $[0, p]$. Implication $(c) \Rightarrow (d)$ is trivial, and $(d) \Rightarrow (a)$ is covered by Exercise 2L. Since the dual of a modular lattice is modular, we have $(c) \Leftrightarrow (e)$ and $(d) \Leftrightarrow (f)$. $\square$

For instance, since the modular lattice in Figure 4.2 is such that 1 is the join of atoms, it must be complemented. Furthermore, we will e.g. exploit the following: In each modular lattice L (complemented or not), when x_0 is the meet of all lower covers of $x \in L$, then $[x_0, x]$ is complemented (e.g. Boolean when L was distributive). The fine structure of complemented modular lattices will occupy us in Section 4. It is interesting to pinpoint (Ex.2L) what survives from Theorem 2.2 when L is merely semimodular.

2.8 Exercises.

Ex. 2A. Show that always $j(L) \geq \delta(L)$.

Solution of Exercise 2A. Let $0 \prec x_1 \prec x_2 \prec \cdots \prec x_n = 1$ be a longest chain in L (so $n = \delta(L)$). For all $1 \leq i \leq n$ pick any p_i in $J(x_{i-1}, x_i)$ (which is nonempty by 2.1). The p_i 's are distinct because for all $i < j$ it holds that $x_{j-1} + p_j = x_j$ but $x_{j-1} + p_i = x_{j-1}$. Hence $j(L) \geq n$.

Ex. 2B. Determine all join-prime elements p and their coupled meet-primes m for the lattices in Figure 2.1.

Solution of Exercise 2B. In N_5 the asked pairs (p, m) are $(2, 4)$ and $(3, 2)$, in SM_{10} it is $(3, 7)$, and M_3 has no join-prime elements.

Ex. 2C. Show that every bijective⁷ order embedding $f : L \rightarrow L'$ is a lattice isomorphism.

Solution to Exercise 2C. Let $f : L \rightarrow L'$ be such that $a \leq b \Leftrightarrow f(a) \leq f(b)$ for all $a, b \in L$. Since f is bijective, it has an inverse f^{-1} which clearly satisfies $\alpha \leq \beta \Leftrightarrow f^{-1}(\alpha) \leq f^{-1}(\beta)$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in L'$. From $x, y \leq x + y$ follows $f(x), f(y) \leq f(x + y)$, hence $f(x) + f(y) \leq f(x + y)$. We now show that

$$x + y \stackrel{(\&)}{\leq} f^{-1}(f(x) + f(y)) \stackrel{(\#)}{\leq} x + y.$$

This immediately gives $f(x + y) = f(x) + f(y)$ (and similarly $f(xy) = f(x)f(y)$). As to $(\&)$, from $f(x), f(y) \leq f(x) + f(y)$ follows $x, y \leq f^{-1}(f(x) + f(y))$, hence $x + y \leq f^{-1}(f(x) + f(y))$. As to $(\#)$, this follows from $f(x) + f(y) \leq f(x + y)$.

Ex. 2D. Show that $f(x) := J(x)$ is a meet embedding $L \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(J(L))$ for each lattice L .

Solution to Exercise 2D. If $J(x) \not\subseteq J(y)$, there is $p \in J(x) \setminus J(y)$, and so $x \not\leq y$. Hence f is an order embedding. As to meet-preservation, clearly $J(x \wedge y) \subseteq J(x) \cap J(y)$. Conversely, pick $p \in J(x) \cap J(y)$. Then p is a common lower bound of x and y . But the largest common lower bound is $x \wedge y$, and so $p \leq x \wedge y$.

Ex. 2E Let $\varphi : L \rightarrow L'$ be a homomorphism. Show that $\varphi(x) < \varphi(y)$ does not imply $x < y$. (Hint: Take $L := N_5$). However, show that $\varphi(x) < \varphi(y)$ *does* imply $\varphi(x) = \varphi(z)$ for some $z < x$.

Solution of Exercise 2E. Define $\varphi : N_5 \rightarrow D_2$ by $\varphi(0) = \varphi(2) = 0$ and $\varphi(a) = 1$ otherwise. Then $\varphi(2) < \varphi(3)$ but $2 \not< 3$. Consider now any homomorphism $\varphi : L \rightarrow L'$ with $\varphi(x) < \varphi(y)$. Then $\varphi(xy) = \varphi(x)\varphi(y) = \varphi(x) \neq \varphi(y)$, hence $xy \neq y$, hence $z := xy < y$ satisfies $\varphi(z) = \varphi(x)$.

Ex. 2F. Show that from $[a, b] \nearrow [c, d] \nearrow [e, f]$ follows $[a, b] \nearrow [e, f]$.

Solution of Exercise 2F. We need to show $be = a$ and $b + e = f$. As to the first identity, $be \geq bc = a$, and $be \leq de = c$ implies $be \leq bc = a$. Hence $be = a$. Similarly one shows $b + e = f$.

Ex. 2G. Prove Theorem 2.1.

Solution to Exercise 2G. Let p be join-prime. Using FL there are elements $m, m', \dots$ maximal with the property that $m \not\geq p$, $m' \not\geq p$, and so forth. Hence $m + m' \not\geq p$ by

⁷Strictly speaking, talking of an 'embedding' is inappropriate here since $f(L)$ is no smaller than L' . More precise is it to talk of a bijective map f that satisfies $a \leq b \Leftrightarrow f(a) \leq f(b)$ for all $a, b \in L$. But then again, adopting this pedantry (or pedanticism, pedantism?!) would also force us to trim the definition of 'order embedding' in 2.2 by adding 'non-bijective'.

definition of join-prime. By maximality $m = m'$ is the largest element $\not\leq p$ in L . In other words, $L = [p, 1] \uplus [0, m]$. In order to show that m is meet-prime (whence a fortiori meet irreducible), take any $x, y \not\leq m$. Then $x, y \in [p, 1]$, hence $xy \in [p, 1]$, hence $xy \not\leq m$.

From $p \leq m^*$, $p \not\leq m$, $m \prec m^*$ follows $p + m = m^*$. Similarly $pm = p_*$, and so $[p_*, p] \nearrow [m, m^*]$.

Ex. 2H. Given a family Σ of implications on E , show that the system $\mathbb{L}(E, \Sigma)$ of all Σ -closed sets is closed under intersections. If additionally all implications in Σ have singleton premises, show that $\mathbb{L}(E, \Sigma)$ is closed under unions as well.

Solution to Exercise 2H. Let $X, Y \subseteq E$ be Σ -closed and take any $A \rightarrow B$ in Σ . If $A \not\subseteq X \cap Y$, there is nothing to show. If $A \subseteq X \cap Y$, then $A \subseteq X$ and $A \subseteq Y$, hence $B \subseteq X$ and $B \subseteq Y$, hence $B \subseteq X \cap Y$. Additionally we now assume that all implications in Σ have singleton premises. Again, let $X, Y \subseteq E$ be Σ -closed and take any $A \rightarrow B$ in Σ with $A \subseteq X \cup Y$. Generally this neither implies $A \subseteq X$ nor $A \subseteq Y$, but here it does since $A = \{a\}$. If say $A \subseteq X$, then $B \subseteq X \subseteq X \cup Y$.

Ex. 2I Show that each chain is a distributive lattice.

Solution to Exercise 2I. For all x, y in a chain one has $x \vee y = \max(x, y)$, $x \wedge y = \min(x, y)$. If say $z < x < y$, then $x \wedge (y \vee z) = x \wedge y = x = x \vee z = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z)$. For the other five orderings of x, y, z one proceeds likewise.

Ex. 2J (From [DP,p.125,Ex.5.5]) Using Ex. 2I, and the fact that distributivity carries over to direct products, show that the poset of all divisors of a natural number n (partially ordered by $x \leq y :\Leftrightarrow y = xz$) is a distributive lattice.

Ex. 2K Show that in a finite distributive lattice all join irreducibles are join-prime.

Solution to Exercise 2K. Let $p \in J(L)$ and let $x, y \in L$ be such that $p \leq x + y$. Then, using distributivity, $p = p(x + y) = px + py$. Since p is join irreducible, $px = p$ or $py = p$, hence $x \geq p$ or $y \geq p$.

Ex. 2L This exercise appeals to Theorem 2.2. Let L be a semimodular lattice whose unit 1 is a sum of atoms. Show that:

- (i) L needs not be atomistic. (Hint: Consider SM_{10} in Figure 2.1.)
- (ii) L is co-atomistic.
- (iii) L is complemented.

Solution to Exercise 2L.

As to (ii), we need to derive a contradiction from assuming there is a meet irreducible m with $m^* \neq 1$. Since 1 is a sum of atoms, there is an atom p with $p \not\leq m^*$. A fortiori $p \not\leq m$, and so semimodularity implies $m \prec m + p$. But then $m + p \neq m^*$ is a second upper cover of m , contradicting meet irreducibility.

As to (iii), to fix ideas suppose $d(L) = 8$ and $d(x) = 5$. We calculate a complement x' of x as follows. Since 1 is a sum of atoms, there is $0 \prec p_1$ with $p_1 \not\leq x$, and so $d(x + p_1) = 6$ by semimodularity. Similarly there are atoms $p_2 \not\leq x + p_1$ and $p_3 \not\leq x + p_1 + p_2$. It follows that $d(x + p_1 + p_2 + p_3) = 8$. Putting $x' := p_1 + p_2 + p_3$ we have $d(x') \leq 3$ and $x + x' = 1$, as well as $d(xx') \leq d(x) + d(x') - d(x + x') \leq 5 + 3 - 8 = 0$. Hence $xx' = 0$ (and $d(x') = 3$).

Ex.2M. Show that in a modular lattice L each join irreducible p is 'weakly' join-prime in the sense that from $p \leq p_* + x$ follows $x \geq p$. Furthermore prove claim (10).

Solution to Exercise 2M. Suppose that $x + p_* \geq p$. Then $p = (x + p_*)p = p_* + xp$. From $p \in J(L)$ follows $xp = p$, i.e. $x \geq p$. As to (10), suppose there were $p, q \in J(a, b)$ with $p < q$. Then $p \leq q_*$ implies $q \leq b = a + p \leq a + q_*$, contradicting the weak primality of q .

Ex.2N. For each vector space V (over any field and possibly of infinite dimension) let $\mathbb{L}(V)$ be the closure system of all subspaces. Convince yourself that $X \vee Y$ is the usual sum $X + Y$ of subspaces. Show that $\mathbb{L}(V)$ is modular by applying (9) rather than upper plus lower semimodularity.

Solution to Exercise 2N. Each subspace containing X and Y must contain $X + Y$. Since $X + Y$ is itself a subspace, it coincides with the join ($:=$ least common upper bound) $X \vee Y$.

In *any* lattice it follows from $X \leq Z$ that $(X \vee Y) \wedge Z \geq X \vee (Y \wedge Z)$ (check). It hence suffices to verify that in the situation of vector subspaces the converse inequality $(X + Y) \cap Z \subseteq X + (Y \cap Z)$ holds. Indeed, every element on the left is of the form $x + y$, where $x \in X$, $y \in Y$, $x + y \in Z$. From $x \in X \subseteq Z$ follows $y = (x + y) - x \in Z$, and so $x + y \in X + (Y \cap Z)$.

Ex.2O. Let L be a lattice all of whose join-irreducibles $p_1, \dots, p_s$ are join-prime. For each $x \in L$ define $f(x)$ as the bitstring of length s whose i -th component is 1 iff $p_i \leq x$. Show that f provides a subdirect representation $L \rightarrow (D_2)^s$. Conclude that L must be distributive. Hint: Use exercises 2D.

Ex.2P. Show that distributivity implies $(a + b)(a + c)(b + c) = ab + ac + bc$, and modularity implies $(a + b)(a + c)(b + c) = b(a + c) + a(b + c)$.

Ex. 2Q Prove claim (6).

Solution to Exercise 2Q. We have

$$\delta(a_1 + a_2) - \delta(b_1 + b_2) = \delta(a_1) + \delta(a_2) - \delta(a_1 a_2) - (\delta(b_1) + \delta(b_2) - \delta(b_1 b_2)) = d_1 + d_2 - \delta(a_1 a_2) + \delta(b_1 b_2) \leq d_1 + d_2, \text{ viewing that } b_1 b_2 \leq a_1 a_2 \text{ implies } \delta(b_1 b_2) - \delta(a_1 a_2) \leq 0.$$

3. Lattice congruences via coverings

Recall from universal algebra [KNT] that a congruence (relation) $\theta \subseteq A \times A$ of a (universal) algebra A yields a factor algebra A/θ and that the set of all congruences forms a lattice $Con(A)$. Here $\theta \wedge \theta' = \theta \cap \theta'$ and $\theta \vee \theta'$ is the smallest congruence containing $\theta \cup \theta'$. The 0 of $Con(A)$ is the identity relation $\{(x, x) : x \in A\}$ and $1 \in Con(A)$ is the universal relation $A \times A$. If $Con(A) = \{0, 1\}$, then A is congruence-simple (in brief: c-simple). By the second isomorphism theorem, A/θ is c-simple iff θ is a co-atom in $Con(A)$. We will be mostly concerned with lattices $A = L$.

3.1. Here comes an important example. Suppose that $p \in L$ is join-prime with coupled meet-prime m . Recall from Theorem 2.1 that $L = [p, 1] \uplus [0, m]$. Define the map $f : L \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by $f(x) := 1$ for $x \in [p, 1]$ and $f(x) := 0$ for $x \in [0, m]$. Exercise 3B shows that f is an epimorphism whose kernel $\theta \in Con(L)$ has the congruence classes $[p, 1]$ and $[0, m]$. Conversely, let $f : L \rightarrow D_2$ be any epimorphism with kernel θ . Then the smallest element of $f^{-1}(1)$ is a join-prime element of L .

3.2 Let $\theta \in \text{Con}(L)$. Then the blocks (=equivalence classes) S of θ are easily seen to have these properties:

- (1) Each block is an interval⁸ of L .
- (2) The blocks S are closed under transposition in this sense. If $[a, b] \subseteq S$ and $c, d \in L$ are such that $[a, b] \sim [c, d]$, then $[c, d]$ is also contained in a block.

Conversely [DP p.136], if an equivalence relation θ on L satisfies (1) and (2), then θ is a congruence. Here comes another characterization of congruences. Let θ be a reflexive binary relation on a lattice L . According to [KNT p.90] θ is a congruence on L iff for all $a, b, c \in L$:

- (3) $a\theta b$ iff $(ab)\theta(a + b)$.
- (4) If $a \leq b \leq c$ and $a\theta b$ and $b\theta c$, then $a\theta c$.
- (5) If $a \leq b$ and $a\theta b$, then $(ac)\theta(bc)$ and $(a + c)\theta(b + c)$.

3.3 Recall from Section 2.6 that intervals of cardinality two are called coverings. From now on we denote intervals $[a, b]$ that are coverings by (a, b) ; then (a, b) can conveniently be viewed as member⁹ of $L \times L$. Let $\text{Cov}(L)$ be the set of all coverings of L . Furthermore, for $\theta \in \text{Con}(L)$ let $\text{Cov}(\theta)$ be the set of all $(a, b) \in \text{Cov}(L)$ with $(a, b) \in \theta$. In the sequel we strive to reduce congruences of L to the behaviour of $\text{Cov}(L)$. For starters, if $a < b$, there always are chains of coverings from a to b in the sense that $a = x_0 \prec x_1 \prec \dots \prec x_n = b$. Further it is clear from (3), (4), (5) that for all $a, b \in L$ it holds that $a\theta b$ iff there is a chain of coverings, all of which belonging to $\text{Cov}(\theta)$, from ab to $a + b$. It follows that each $\theta \in \text{Con}(L)$ is uniquely determined by $\text{Cov}(\theta)$. In particular, $\theta \neq 0 \Rightarrow \text{Cov}(\theta) \neq \emptyset$. Here comes an inherent characterizations of the sets of type $\text{Cov}(\theta)$.

Lemma 3.1: *For each lattice L and each (possibly empty) set $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \text{Cov}(L)$ the following are equivalent:*

- (a) $\mathcal{Q}$ is closed under subtransposition, i.e. for all $(a, b) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and all intervals $[c, d]$ with $(a, b) \sim [c, d]$ it follows that $(c', d') \in \mathcal{Q}$ for all $c \leq c' \prec d' \leq d$.
- (b) There is $\theta \in \text{Con}(L)$ with $\mathcal{Q} = \text{Cov}(\theta)$.

Proof. The implication (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) holds because of (1) and (2). Assume now that $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \text{Cov}(L)$ satisfies (a). Our candidate $\theta \in \text{Con}(L)$ with $\mathcal{Q} = \text{Cov}(\theta)$ is the binary relation θ defined by $(a, b) \in \theta$ iff there is a chain of coverings from $\mathcal{Q}$ stretching from ab to $a + b$ (for $a = b$ that chain is empty). It suffices to show that θ satisfies properties (3), (4), (5). Properties (3), (4) are immediate and (5) is left as exercise 3E. $\square$

Theorem 3.2: *The congruence lattice $\text{Con}(L)$ is distributive for each lattice L .*

⁸If L is not assumed to be FL (as it isn't in [DP]) then 'interval' needs to be replaced by 'convex sublattice'.

⁹For arbitrary ordered pairs we use other letters, say (x, y) .

Proof. This is a well-known result of Funayama and Nakayama [DP,6.19]. The proof can be trimmed for our FL lattices L . Namely, as previously noticed, then $\theta \in \text{Con}(L)$ is uniquely determined by $\text{Cov}(\theta)$, and so for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(L)$ it holds that $\theta \leq \theta'$ iff $\text{Cov}(\theta) \subseteq \text{Cov}(\theta')$. Hence the distributivity of $\text{Con}(L)$ will ensue if we show that the family (=set system) $\{\text{Cov}(\theta) : \theta \in \text{Con}(L)\}$ is stable under taking unions and intersections and whence, akin to $\mathbb{L}(J, \leq)$ in 2.5, is a necessarily distributive sublattice of the powerset lattice of $\text{Cov}(L)$. By Lemma 3.1 it suffices to show that the family of all sets $\mathcal{Q}$ closed under subtransposition is stable under unions and intersections. Since the property that $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \text{Cov}(L)$ is closed w.r.to subtransposition readily translates to being Σ -closed w.r.to a certain family Σ of implications with singleton premises, the claim follows from Exercise 2H. $\square$.

3.3.1. Recall¹⁰ that a universal algebra B is subdirectly irreducible if $\text{Con}(B)$ has a unique atom. Consequently $B = A/\theta$ is subdirectly irreducible iff $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ is meet-irreducible. A universal algebras A may have several subdirect representations into subdirectly irreducible factors. Let now $A = L$ be a lattice. Since in distributive lattices D (such as $D = \text{Con}(L)$) the zero has a unique irredundant representation as meet of meet-irreducibles, L has a unique representation $L \simeq L' \subseteq L/\theta_1 \times \cdots \times L/\theta_t$ with subdirectly irreducible factors L/θ_i . What if $\text{Con}(L)$ is not just distributive but Boolean? Then $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_t$ above must be the co-atoms of $\text{Con}(L)$, and all L/θ_i must even be c-simple. This foreshadows Theorem 3.3.

3.4. Let $\approx$ be the transitive closure of $\sim$ (transposition). Thus $\approx$ is an equivalence relation on the set $\text{Int}(L)$ of all nontrivial intervals of a lattice. Intervals $[a, b] \approx [c, d]$ are called projective. Unfortunately $[a, b]$ and $[c, d]$ need not be isomorphic, not even of the same length. In particular, if (a, b) and (c, d) are coverings such that $(a, b) \approx (c, d)$, then the *intermediate* intervals in a witnessing sequence of transpositions need not be coverings. This leads to the next definition.

We call $(a, b), (c, d) \in \text{Cov}(L)$ *homogeneous-projective* if all intermediate intervals in some¹¹ witnessing sequence $(a, b) \sim [u, v] \sim \cdots \sim (c, d)$ are also coverings. By definition the hom-proj classes (of coverings) are the connected components of the graph with vertex set $\text{Cov}(L)$, where vertices are adjacent iff they are transposed. For each lattice we put

$$(6) \quad s(L) := \text{the number of hom-proj classes constituting } \text{Cov}(L).$$

Recall that $j(L) := |J(L)|$ (which may be infinite, say for $L = M_{\aleph_3}$). It is easy to see (Ex.3A) that

$$(7) \quad j(L) \geq s(L) \text{ in each finite length lattice } L.$$

For instance, N_5 has the hom-proj classes of coverings $\{[4, 1], [0, 2]\}$, $\{[2, 1], [0, 3]\}$, $\{[3, 4]\}$, and so $j(N_5) = s(N_5) = 3$. We empasize that a hom-proj class of coverings need not be closed under sub-transposition (thus $[3, 4] \notin \{[4, 1], [0, 2]\}$ in N_5).

However, let $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \text{Cov}(L)$ be closed under subtransposition. Then it follows from $(a, b), (c, d) \in \text{Cov}(L)$ and $(a, b) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$ that $(c, d) \in \mathcal{Q}$. Therefore $\mathcal{Q}$ is a certain disjoint union

¹⁰For readers not familiar with the upcoming concepts we recommend [KNT].

¹¹It is allowed that other witnessing sequences have intermediate intervals which are not coverings, see Exercise 3F

of hom-proj classes. Hence the number of subtransposition-closed subsets of $Cov(L)$ is $\leq 2^{s(L)}$. In view of Lemma 3.1 we conclude:

(8) *For any lattice L it holds that $|Con(L)| \leq 2^{s(L)}$.*

Theorem 3.3: *If L is a modular lattice of finite length, then $Con(L)$ is a Boolean lattice of length $s(L)$. Furthermore, if the lattices L/θ_i are the subdirectly irreducible factors of L (i.e. the θ_i 's are the co-atoms of $Con(L)$), then $\delta(L) = \sum_{i=1}^{s(L)} \delta(L/\theta_i)$. Finally, for each projectivity class $\mathcal{P}$ of coverings, each maximal 0-1-chain has the same number of coverings belonging to $\mathcal{P}$.*

Proof. In a modular lattice coverings can only transpose to coverings. In other words, "closed under subtransposition" amounts to "closed under transposition". Because therefore each hom-proj class¹² is subtransposition-closed, *every* union of hom-proj classes is subtransposition-closed as well. It follows that $Con(L)$ is a Boolean lattice of cardinality $2^{s(L)}$. (As to the relevance of Boolean congruence lattices, see 3.3.1.)

As to the other claims, fix any maximal 0-1-chain C in L . Let d_i be the number of coverings in C that belong to the i th projectivity class $\mathcal{P}_i$ of coverings. Trivially $\sum_{i=1}^s d_i = \delta(L)$. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the union of all projectivity classes of coverings *distinct* from a fixed $\mathcal{P}_i$. Then $\mathcal{Q} = Cov(\theta_i)$ for a unique co-atom $\theta_i = \theta(\mathcal{P}_i)$ of $Con(L)$ which satisfies $\delta(L/\theta_i) = d_i$. (Thus θ_i *separates* exactly the coverings in $\mathcal{P}_i$.) Therefore d_i is independent from the particular choice of C . $\square$

3.4.2 Akin to $\delta(L)$ in Theorem 3.3, also $j(L)$ can be reduced to the subdirectly irreducible factors. Here come the details. Trivially each covering of type (p_*, p) (so $p \in J(L)$) belongs to some projectivity class of coverings. Slightly more subtle (Ex.3A), each projectivity class of coverings contains at least one $[p_*, p]$.

By abuse of language we say that join irreducibles p, q are projective if $[p_*, p] \approx [q_*, q]$. And we say that p belongs to a projectivity class $\mathcal{P}$ of coverings if $[p_*, p] \in \mathcal{P}$. To summarize:

(9) *Let L be modular and let $\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_s$ be its $s = s(L)$ many projectivity classes of coverings. Each set $J(\mathcal{P}_i)$ of join irreducibles belonging to $\mathcal{P}_i$ is nonempty and $J(L) = J(\mathcal{P}_1) \uplus \dots \uplus J(\mathcal{P}_s)$.*

Here comes the connection to the c-simple factors of L .

(10) *Let $\theta_i \in Con(L)$ be the co-atom that separates exactly the coverings in $\mathcal{P}_i$, and let $\varphi_i : L \rightarrow L/\theta_i$ be the canonical epimorphism. Then φ_i maps $J(\mathcal{P}_i)$ bijectively upon $J(L/\theta_i)$, which implies $j(L) = \sum_{i=1}^{s(L)} j(L/\theta_i)$.*

Proof of (10). Introducing new notation it holds by the above that $J(\mathcal{P}_i) = \{p \in L : \varphi_i(p_*) < \varphi_i(p)\} =: J[\varphi_i]$. According to Exercise 3G (which applies to

¹²One can succinctly put it this way. In a modular lattice the hom-proj classes of coverings are exactly the projectivity classes of intervals containing at least one covering.

arbitrary lattices) we have $J[\varphi_i] = \sigma(J(L/\theta_i))$, where $\sigma : L/\theta_i \rightarrow L$ is the (injective) map that yields the smallest φ_i -preimages. Hence φ_i maps $J(\mathcal{P}_i)$ bijectively upon $J(L/\theta_i)$.

3.4.3 If $J(\mathcal{P}_i)$ is a singleton $\{p\}$ (we also say p is projectively isolated), then $j(L/\theta_i) = |J(\mathcal{P}_i)| = 1$ by (10). But then $L/\theta_i = D_2$, and so p is join-prime by Ex.3B. Conversely, if $p \in J(L)$ is join-prime then no join irreducible $q \neq p$ satisfies $[q_*, q] \approx [p_*, p]$ (Ex.3C), and so $\{p\}$ equals some $J(\mathcal{P}_i)$. In brief:

- (11) *In a modular lattice the projectively isolated join irreducibles are exactly the join-primes.*


This further implies:

- (12) *In each distributive lattice L it holds that $s(L) = \delta(L) = j(L)$. In particular L is finite.*

Proof of (12). In a distributive lattice *all* join irreducibles are join-prime (Ex. 2K). Hence (11) implies that $L/\theta_i \simeq D_2$ for all $s(L)$ many co-atoms $\theta_i \in \text{Con}(L)$. From $j(D_2) = 1$ and (10) follows $j(L) = \sum_{i=1}^{s(L)} j(L/\theta_i) = 1 + \dots + 1 = s(L)$. Likewise from $\delta(D_2) = 1$ and Thm.3.3 follows $\delta(L) = \sum_{i=1}^{s(L)} \delta(L/\theta_i) = 1 + \dots + 1 = s(L)$. Any (FL) lattice L with $j(L) < \infty$ is finite (of cardinality $\leq 2^{j(L)}$) because $x \neq y \Rightarrow J(x) \neq J(y)$. $\square$

A direct proof of $\delta(L) = j(L)$ in (12) is given in Exercise 3A. For non-modular lattices the identity $s(L) = \delta(L) = j(L)$ does not imply that L is distributive (take $L = N_5$). However, recall from Exercise 2.O that 'all join irreducibles are join-prime' is indeed equivalent to distributivity.

Figure 3.1: Three projectivity classes of coverings



3.5 Assume the diagram of the modular lattice L is planar (this is not strictly necessary but certainly helps) and that the projectivity classes of coverings are known. Then all factor lattices

L/θ can be drawn by "inspection". For instance consider the modular lattice L_1 in Figure 3.1. It has three projectivity classes of coverings, which are rendered by *normal*, *dashed*, and *boldface* lines. Let us denote the sets of join irreducibles belonging to these projectivity classes by $J(n)$, $J(d)$, and $J(b)$ respectively. One checks that

$$(13) \quad J(L_1) = J(n) \uplus J(d) \uplus J(b) = \{2, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16\} \uplus \{3\} \uplus \{4, 10, 12\}$$

Hence 3 must be prime by (11). Let $\theta_n, \theta_d, \theta_b$ be the congruences that separate exactly the normal, dashed and boldface coverings respectively. They are hence the co-atoms of $Con(L_1)$. To fix ideas let $L = L_1$ and $\theta = \theta_n$. Then the diagram of $L' := L_1/\theta_n$ in Fig. 3.1(B) is obtained by collapsing all dashed and boldface coverings in Fig. 3.1(A). All normal (=normally drawn) coverings thus survive but some may be forced to coincide. For instance (5,9) and (8,11) in Fig. 3.1(A) coincide and become (p_1, b) in Fig.3.1(B). By (10), if $f : L_1 \rightarrow L'$ is the natural epimorphism then f maps $J(n)$ bijectively upon $J(L')$, i.e.

$$f(2) = p_1, \quad f(6) = p_2, \quad f(7) = p_3, \quad f(14) = p_4, \quad f(15) = p_5, \quad f(16) = p_6.$$

While most pre-images are singletons, note that $f^{-1}(p_1) = \{2, 4, 5, 8\} = [2, 8]$. Apart from $[2, 8]$, the other nontrivial blocks of θ_n are $[0, 3]$, $[9, 17]$, and $[18, 1]$.




Figure 3.1(B)

As another example, let us look ahead to the modular lattice L_2 in Figure 4.1. It also has three projectivity classes of coverings. One checks that the three c-simple factors of L_2 are M_3, D_2, D_2 . Let us illustrate the statement about maximal 0,1-chains made in Theorem 3.3. The maximal 0-1-chain $0 \prec 2 \prec 15 \prec 1$ is of type *dbbn*, whereas $0 \prec 4 \prec 13 \prec 19 \prec 1$ is of type *bnbd*.

Do we really need to determine the projectivity classes of coverings in order to find (or just count) the c-simple factors of a modular lattice? Fortunately there is a faster way. We handle the atomistic case in Section 4.5 and the general case in Theorem 7.3.

3.6 Exercises

Exercise 3A.

- (i) Let (a, b) be a covering in any lattice. Show there is $p \in J(a, b)$ with $[p_*, p] \nearrow [a, b]$.
(Hint: Consider an element $p \in L$ minimal with the property that $p \leq a$ but $p \not\leq b$.)
- (ii) Trimming (1) in Section 2 show that in each distributive lattice L one has $\delta(L) = j(L)$.
(Hint: Use Ex.2A and the join-primeness of all $p \in J(L)$)

- (iii) Show that $j(L) \geq s(L)$ in every lattice L .
- (iv) Suppose that the lattice L is such that $(p_*, p) \approx (q_*, q)$ for all $p, q \in J(L)$. Show that L is congruence-simple.

Solution to Exercise 3A. (i). The set $S \subseteq L$ of all x with $x \leq b$, $x \not\leq a$ is not empty since $a \in S$. If $x \in S$, then $a < a+x \leq b$, and so $a+x = b$. Since L has finite length, S has minimal members p . Suppose $p = u + v$ for some $u, v < p$. By the minimality of p one has $u, v \leq a$, yielding the contradiction $p \leq a$. It follows that $p \in J(L)$ and $p_* \leq a$ and $[p_*, p] \nearrow [a, b]$.

(iii). By (i) each homogeneous projectivity class of coverings contains at least one member of type $[q_*, q]$. Hence $j(L) \geq s(L)$.

(iv). By (i) each $(a, b) \in \text{Cov}(L)$ transposes down to some (p_*, p) . By assumption any two $(a, b), (c, d) \in \text{Cov}(L)$ are therefore projective. Every nonzero congruence θ contains at least one covering (a, b) . According to (2) it follows from $(a, b) \in \theta$ and $(a, b) \approx (c, d)$ that $(c, d) \in \theta$. Hence $\text{Cov}(L) \subseteq \theta$. It follows from (4) that $(0_L, 1_L) \in \theta$, and so L is congruence-simple. (A harder question is, whether the converse holds. It e.g. holds for modular lattices.)

Exercise 3B. Prove the claims about join-primes made in Section 3.1.

Exercise 3C. Let $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \text{Cov}(L)$ be closed under sub-transpositions. Show the hard part of Lemma 3.1, i.e. that $\mathcal{Q} = \text{Cov}(\theta)$ for some $\theta \in \text{Con}(L)$.


Solution to Exercise 3C. Given $\mathcal{Q}$ define the binary relation θ by setting $a\theta b$ iff there is a chain from ab to $a+b$ whose coverings are from $\mathcal{Q}$. In order to show that θ is a congruence it suffices to establish (3),(4),(5), the first two of which being straightforward. As to (5), let $a < b$ be such that $a\theta b$, and pick $c \in L$ such that $ca < cb$ (for $ca = cb$ the claim is trivial). In order to show¹³ that $(ca)\theta(cb)$, consider any maximal chain $x_0 \prec x_1 \prec \cdots \prec x_{n-1} \prec x_n$ such that $x_0 = a$, $x_n = b$ and $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{Q}$ for all $0 \leq i < n$. Putting $y_0 := cx_0$ we will construct a chain $y_0 < y_1 < \cdots < y_s$ such that $y_s = cx_n$ and for each interval $[y_j, y_{j+1}]$ there is a covering $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ that transposes down to it. Because by assumption $\mathcal{Q}$ is closed under sub-transposition, this implies that the coverings of any maximal chain from y_j to y_{j+1} belong to $\mathcal{Q}$. Connecting these s maximal chains yields a maximal chain from ca to cb all of whose coverings belong to $\mathcal{Q}$, and so $(ca)\theta(cb)$.

For the sake of notation (and because the argument can be repeated) we only explain how y_1 and y_2 are found. Because of $cx_0 < cx_n$ there is an index i such that $cx_0 = cx_1 = \cdots = cx_i < cx_{i+1}$. Putting $y_1 := cx_{i+1}$ we have $x_i y_1 = x_i c = y_0$. Furthermore $y_1 \not\leq x_i$, hence $x_i < x_i + y_1 \leq x_{i+1}$, hence $x_i + y_1 = x_{i+1}$ (in view of $x_i \prec x_{i+1}$), hence $[x_i, x_{i+1}] \searrow [y_0, y_1]$. If $y_1 = cx_n$, we are done (put $s := 1$). Otherwise $y_1 < cx_n$, and so there is an index k with $cx_{i+1} = cx_{i+2} = \cdots = cx_k < cx_{k+1}$. Putting $y_2 := cx_{k+1}$ one similarly concludes that $[x_k, x_{k+1}] \searrow [y_1, y_2]$.

Exercise 3D. Use Lemma 3.1 to calculate the congruence lattice $\text{Con}(N_5)$.

Exercise 3E. In each of these modular lattices, determine the projectivity classes $\mathcal{P}$ of coverings, and the corresponding c-simple factor lattices obtained by separating exactly the coverings in $\mathcal{P}$.

¹³Showing $(c+a)\theta(c+b)$ proceeds along the same lines and will be omitted.



Exercise 3F. Construct a lattice with two coverings $(a, b), (c, d)$ which are homogeneously projective. Yet there there also is a witnessing sequence for $(a, b) \approx (c, d)$ which features an interval of length two.

Exercise 3G. Let $f : L \rightarrow L'$ be an epimorphism between any two lattices. Define $\sigma : L' \rightarrow L$ by $\sigma(y) := \min f^{-1}(y)$ (=smallest pre-image of y). Clearly σ is injective. Further show:

- (i) $\sigma(J(L')) \subseteq J[f] := \{p \in J(L) : f(p_*) < f(p)\}$
- (ii) σ is monotone
- (iii) σ is a $\vee$ -embedding (see Sec. 2.2)
- (iv) Improving (i) show that $\sigma(J(L')) = J[f]$.

Solution to Exercise 3G. (i) Take $p' \in J(L')$ and suppose there were $a, b < \sigma(p')$ with $a + b = \sigma(p')$. Then $f(a) < p', f(b) < p'$, and so $p' = f(\sigma(p')) = f(a + b) = f(a) + f(b)$. This contradicts $p' \in J(L')$. Hence $\sigma(J(L')) \subseteq J(L)$. From $\sigma(p') =: p \in J(L)$ follows $f(p_*) < f(p)$, and so $\sigma(J(L')) \subseteq J[f]$.

(ii) Let $y' < z'$ be in L' and suppose we had $\sigma(y') \not\leq \sigma(z')$. Then $\sigma(y') \wedge \sigma(z') < \sigma(y')$, and so $f(\sigma(y') \wedge \sigma(z')) < y'$. This contradicts $f(\sigma(y') \wedge \sigma(z')) = f(\sigma(y')) \wedge f(\sigma(z')) = y' \wedge z' = y'$.

(iii) Take $x', y' \in L'$. Since σ is monotone, we have $\sigma(x') \leq \sigma(x' \vee y')$ and $\sigma(y') \leq \sigma(x' \vee y')$, which yields $\sigma(x') \vee \sigma(y') \leq \sigma(x' \vee y')$. On the other hand $f(\sigma(x') \vee \sigma(y')) = f(\sigma(x')) \vee f(\sigma(y')) = x' \vee y'$ yields $\sigma(x' \vee y') \leq \sigma(x') \vee \sigma(y')$. Hence $\sigma(x' \vee y') = \sigma(x') \vee \sigma(y')$.

(iv) Take any $p \in J[f]$. Putting $x' := f(p)$ we show (a) that p is the smallest f -preimage of x' , and (b) that $x' \in J(L')$. This establishes the claim $J[f] \subseteq \sigma(J(L'))$. As to (a), by (1) the full preimage S of x' is an interval of L with $p \in S$. Let s be the smallest element of S . From $s < p$ would follow $s \leq p_* < p$, hence $f(s) \leq f(p_*) < f(p)$, contradicting $f(s) = f(p)$. Hence $p = s$. As to (b), suppose we had $x' = a' \vee b'$ for some $a', b' < x'$. From (iii) we get $p = \sigma(x') = \sigma(a' \vee b') = \sigma(a') \vee \sigma(b')$, which contradicts $p \in J(L)$. The contradiction shows that $x' \in J(L')$.

4. Geometric lattices and matroids

In a nutshell, we start out with a subclass of semimodular lattices, i.e. geometric lattices. This leads us to matroids, their connected components, matroid-circuits, and coordinatizing matroids by fields. Much in this Section is inspired by Faigle's chapter in [Wh1].

4.1 What are two natural necessary conditions for any lattice to be sectionally complemented? The first, trivially, is to be *complemented*. The second is to be atomistic. Theorem 2.2 shows that for modular lattices either one of them is sufficient. For *semimodular* lattices 'complemented' is not sufficient, as evidenced by SM_{10} in Fig. 2.1, but 'atomistic' does the job:

Lemma 4.1 *Let L be semimodular. Then L is sectionally complemented iff it is atomistic.*

Proof. It remains to show that a semimodular, atomistic lattice L is sectionally complemented. So why is each interval $[a, b] \subseteq L$ complemented? Since $[a, b]$ is itself semimodular, it suffices by Ex.2L to show that b is a sum of atoms of $[a, b]$. By assumption there are atoms $p_1, \dots, p_t$ of L with $p_1 + \dots + p_t = b$. Evidently $(a + p_1) + \dots + (a + p_t) = b$. Now $a + p_i = a$ if $p_i \leq a$. Otherwise it follows from $[0, p_i] \nearrow [a, a + p_i]$ and semimodularity that $a \prec a + p_i$. Hence b is a sum of atoms of $[a, b]$. $\square$

By definition a lattice is geometric if it is semimodular and satisfies the two equivalent conditions in Lemma 4.1. Each lattice L is isomorphic to a direct product $L_1 \times \dots \times L_t$ of directly irreducible lattices L_i . It is routine to show (Ex.4A) that L is geometric iff all factors L_i are geometric. According to Ex.2L each geometric lattice is co-atomistic.

4.2 The closure space $\mathbb{M} = (E, cl)$ is called a matroid if $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M}) := \mathbb{L}(E, cl)$ has finite length and cl satisfies the Exchange Axiom, i.e. for all $p, q \in E$ and $X \subseteq E$ it holds that

$$(1) \quad p \notin cl(X) \text{ and } p \in cl(X \cup \{q\}) \text{ jointly imply } q \in cl(X \cup \{p\}).$$

Condition (1) has a crisper equivalent: Whenever an atom q is not in a closed set $cl(X)$, then $cl(X \cup \{q\})$ is an upper cover of $cl(X)$ in the lattice $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M})$. In particular, looking at the zero $cl(\emptyset)$ of $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M})$, we see that the sets $[p] := cl(\{p\})$, where p ranges over $E \setminus cl(\emptyset)$, are exactly¹⁴ the atoms of $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M})$. It readily follows (Ex. 4B) that $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M})$ is a geometric lattice. The members of $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M})$ are called the flats of $\mathbb{M}$.

4.2.1. An important type of matroid is obtained as follows. For a field k and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ fix a (possibly infinite) subset $E' \subseteq \mathbb{L}(k^n)$ of vectors. Since for $X \subseteq E'$ the generated subspace $\langle X \rangle$ need not be contained in E' , define $cl'(X) := \langle X \rangle \cap E'$. In this scenario (1) boils down to the Steinitz Exchange Lemma familiar from linear algebra, and so (E', cl') is a matroid, called a k -linear matroid. It is usually hard to decide, whether some given matroid (E, cl) is k -coordinatizable, i.e. isomorphic¹⁵ to a suitable k -linear matroid (E', cl') .

4.2.2. A subset $I \subseteq E$ is independent in a matroid $\mathbb{M} = (E, cl)$ if $x \notin cl(I \setminus \{x\})$ for all $x \in I$. Each subset of an independent set is independent. Furthermore (Ex. 4C):

$$(2) \text{ If } I \subseteq E \text{ is independent, and } p \notin cl(I), \text{ then } I \cup \{p\} \text{ stays independent.}$$

¹⁴The elements in $cl(\emptyset)$ are called loops, and the non-loops in $[p]$ are parallel to p . (The terminology comes from graph theory, see 4.2.3.) One calls $\mathbb{M}$ simple if $cl(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ and $[p] = \{p\}$ for all $p \in E$. This kind of 'simple' has nothing to do with c-simple lattices.

¹⁵Generally an isomorphism $f : E \rightarrow E'$ between matroids (E, cl) and (E', cl') by definition satisfies $f(cl(X)) = cl'(f(X))$ for all $X \subseteq E$.

Let X be a flat of $\mathbb{M}$ and let $I \subseteq X$ be a maximal independent subset. Such I cannot be infinite (Ex.4D), and by (2) there is no $p \in X \setminus cl(I)$. Hence $cl(I) = X$. We see that all maximal independent subsets of a flat generate the flat. Further they have the *same* finite cardinality (which coincides with the height $\delta(X)$ of X in $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M})$). More generally, the rank of any subset $Y \subseteq E$ is defined as $rk(Y) := \delta(cl(Y))$. A maximal independent set $B \subseteq E$ is called a base of $\mathbb{M}$. Restating the above for $X = E$ we record:

(3) *All bases of a matroid (E, cl) have cardinality $rk(E)$.*

4.2.3 Each minimal dependent (=not independent) set C is called a circuit of $\mathbb{M}$. A priori this merely implies there is at least *one* $x \in C$ with $x \in cl(X \setminus \{x\})$. However, it follows from (2) that $x \in cl(X \setminus \{x\})$ for *all* $x \in C$. One can retrieve cl from the set $\mathbb{C}$ of all circuits via the implicational base¹⁶

(4) $\Sigma := \{ (C \setminus \{x\}) \rightarrow \{x\} : C \in \mathbb{C}, x \in C \}.$

Not only can one retrieve cl from the circuits, one can also start out with the circuits in the first place. Specifically, let $\mathbb{C}$ be any family of subsets (called 'circuits') of a set E , such that two axioms are satisfied.

- *Axiom 1:* $\mathbb{C}$ is an antichain.
- *Axiom 2:* For all intersecting $C, C' \in \mathbb{C}$ and all $x \in C \cap C'$ there is a $C'' \in \mathbb{C}$ with $C'' \subseteq (C \cup C') \setminus \{x\}$.

Then it holds that the closure space (E, cl) defined by the implications in (4) is a matroid. We will also write $\mathbb{M}(E, \mathbb{C})$. For instance if $G = (V, E)$ is a graph with vertex set V and edge set E , then the circuits of G (in the usual sense) constitute a set family $\mathbb{C}$ that satisfies Axiom 1 and Axiom 2. One calls $\mathbb{M}(E, \mathbb{C})$ the graphic matroid induced by G .

4.2.4. Let $\mathbb{M} = (E, cl)$ be a matroid. Two elements of E are $\mathbb{M}$ -connected if there is a circuit containing both of them. From Axiom 2 follows that 'being connected' is an equivalence relation. Its blocks, i.e. the connected components $A_1, \dots, A_s$, are closed (so $B \subseteq A_i \Rightarrow cl(B) \subseteq A_i$) and have the property that each $X \subseteq E$ can be handled componentwise:

(5) $cl(X) = cl(X \cap A_1) \uplus \dots \uplus cl(X \cap A_s).$

Attention, if G is a graph, then the $\mathbb{M}(G)$ -connected sets are the edge sets of the 2-*connected* components of G . Yet another concept of 'connected' will be introduced in Section 4.4.

4.2.5 The direction can be reversed. Namely, putting $s = 2$ for convenience, let $\mathbb{M}_1, \mathbb{M}_2$ be matroids on *disjoint* sets A_1, A_2 , having closure operators cl_1, cl_2 . Putting $A := A_1 \cup A_2$ one gets a new matroid $\mathbb{M} = (A, cl)$ with cl defined by

¹⁶A set of type $C \setminus \{x\}$ is called a broken circuit. Thus $X \subseteq E$ is a flat iff with any broken circuit it contains the whole circuit.

$$cl(X) := c_1(A_1 \cap X) \cup c_2(A_2 \cap X).$$

One calls $\mathbb{M}$ the direct sum of $\mathbb{M}_1$ and $\mathbb{M}_2$.

4.3 Recall that $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M})$ is geometric for each matroid $\mathbb{M}$. Here comes a kind of converse. For any geometric lattice L define the closure operator cl_L on the set $At(L) = J(L)$ of atoms by

$$(6) \quad cl_L(X) := J(\sum X) \text{ for all } X \subseteq J(L).$$

It follows (Ex. 4E) that $\mathbb{M}(L) := (At(L), cl_L)$ a simple matroid and that $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M}(L)) \simeq L$. We prefer to work with simple matroids of type $\mathbb{M}(L)$ because then points and atoms are the same thing.

4.3.1 Join irreducibles p and q in a lattice are called perspective if the coverings (p_*, p) and (q_*, q) have a common upper transpose. For instance, the join irreducibles 5 and 9 in SM_{10} are perspective: $(2, 5) \nearrow (7, 1) \nwarrow (4, 9)$. In semimodular lattices the common upper transpose must be a covering. Therefore perspectivity is most useful in semimodular lattices, particularly geometric or modular ones.

Lemma 4.2 *Let L be a geometric lattice.*

- (a) *Any $p \neq q$ in $At(L)$ are perspective iff they belong to the same connected component of $\mathbb{M}(L)$.*
- (b) *If additionally L is modular, then $p \neq q$ are perspective iff there a third atom r such that $\{0, p, q, r, p + q\}$ is a covering M_3 -sublattice.*

Proof. (a) By 4.2.4 we need to show that being in a common circuit of $\mathbb{M}(L)$ is equivalent to being perspective. First let p, q be distinct elements of any circuit $C \subseteq At(L)$. Let e be the sum of all atoms in $C \setminus \{p, q\}$. We conclude:

$$(7) \quad p \leq e + q \stackrel{(1)}{\Rightarrow} q \leq e + p \Rightarrow e + p = e + q =: f \Rightarrow [0, p] \nearrow [e, f] \searrow [0, q].$$

Conversely, if the atoms $p \neq q$ are perspective, we choose the common upper transpose $[e, f]$ of $[0, p]$ and $[0, q]$ such that $\delta(e)$ is minimal. By 4.2.2 there are independent atoms $r_1, \dots, r_t$ with $r_1 + \dots + r_t = e$. Put $C := \{r_1, \dots, r_t, p, q\}$. From $q < f = e + p = r_1 + \dots + r_t + p$ follows the dependency of C . It remains to show that dropping any element from C yields an independent set. From $p \not\leq r_1 + \dots + r_t (= e)$ and (2) follows that $\{r_1, \dots, r_t, p\}$ is independent. Likewise $\{r_1, \dots, r_t, q\}$ is independent. It remains to check, say, $\{r_2, \dots, r_t, p, q\}$. Put $e' := r_2 + \dots + r_t$. If we had $p \leq e' + q$, then also $q \leq e' + p$ by (1). Putting $f' := e' + p = e' + q$, this yields the contradiction $[0, p] \nearrow [e', f'] \searrow [0, q]$ with $\delta(e') < \delta(e)$.

(b) By (a) and Ex.4F, in any geometric lattice atoms p, q are perspective iff they have a common complement, i.e. there is $c \in L$ with $p + c = q + c = 1$ and $pc = qc = 0$. Putting $r := c(p + q)$ we conclude (using the modularity assumption) that $p + r = p + c(p + q) = (p + c)(p + q) = p + q$ and $pr = pc(p + q) = 0$. By symmetry also $q + r = p + q$, $qr = 0$. It is clear that r is an atom distinct from p, q and that $\{0, p, q, r, p + q\}$ is a covering M_3 -sublattice. Thus in the modular case the common upper transpose (e, f) in (7) can be found as close to $(p_*, p), (q_*, q)$ as possible, i.e. $(e, f) = (r, p + q)$. $\square$

4.4 In any lattice perspective join irreducibles p, q are a fortiori projective (written $p \approx q$) in the sense (Sec.3.4.2) that $(p_*, p) \approx (q_*, q)$. The converse fails (Ex.4G), but holds in geometric lattices.


- (8) *In any geometric lattice L any two atoms are projective iff they are perspective. Further, let $A_1, \dots, A_s \subseteq \text{At}(L)$ be the projectivity classes of atoms, and $a_i := \sum A_i$. Then $L \simeq [0, a_1] \times \dots \times [0, a_s]$. All lattices $[0, a_i]$ are c-simple.*

The direction from right to left in the claimed isomorphism is given by $(x_1, \dots, x_s) \mapsto x_1 + \dots + x_s$, whereas the converse direction is $x \mapsto (x_1, \dots, x_s)$ where $x_i := \sum \{p \in J(x) : p \leq a_i\}$. While in every lattice "c-simple $\Rightarrow$ directly irreducible", by (8) the two are equivalent for geometric lattices.

Proof of (8). The first claim is referred to Exercice 4H. If $A_1, \dots, A_s \subseteq E$ are the connected components of any matroid $\mathbb{M} = (E, cl)$, then $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M}) \simeq \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M}(A_1)) \times \dots \times \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M}(A_s))$ by Ex.4I. If E happens to be the set of atoms of L , this isomorphism becomes $L \simeq [0, a_1] \times \dots \times [0, a_s]$. It follows from Ex.3A(iv) that each $[0, a_i]$ is c-simple. $\square$

4.5 At the end of Section 3.5 we raised the question whether finding, or at least counting, the c-simple factors of a modular lattice can be achieved without determining all projectivity classes $\mathcal{P}_i$ of coverings, and thus the projectivity classes $J(\mathcal{P}_i)$ of join irreducibles. Specializing to *geometric* modular lattices we can now provide a smooth solution. (In view of (8) we can also say that we specialize to *modular* geometric lattices.) Thus by (8) 'projective' boils down to 'perspective', which by Lemma 4.2(b) amounts to easily detect or exclude a M_3 sublattice. For instance take L from Figure 4.1. The atoms 3 and 4 are perspective since $[0, 3 + 4] \simeq M_3$, whereas 2 and 3 are not perspective since $[0, 2 + 3] \not\simeq M_3$. It is clear that the perspectivity (=projectivity) classes of atoms are $\{2\}$, $\{6\}$, $\{3, 4, 5\}$, and so by (8) L has three c-simple factors $[0, a_1] \simeq D_2$, $[0, a_2] \simeq D_2$, $[0, a_3] \simeq M_3$, where $a_1 = 2$, $a_2 = 6$, $a_3 = 3 + 4 + 5 = 10$.

Figure 4.1: Atomistic modular lattice



In fact, if L in (8) is modular, then the lattices $[0, a_i]$ are isomorphic to subspace lattices of so-called projective spaces; more on that in 5.6.

4.6 Exercises

Exercise 4A. Consider the direct product of lattices $L = L_1 \times L_2$. Show that L is geometric iff L_1 and L_2 are geometric.

Exercise 4B. Show that each matroid $\mathbb{M} = (E, cl)$ has a geometric flat lattice $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M})$.

Solution of Ex. 4B. For all $X \in L(M)$ one has $X = cl(\bigcup\{[p] : p \in X\}) = \bigvee\{[p] : p \in X\}$, and so $L(M)$ is atomistic. To establish semimodularity, take any $A, B, C, D \in L(M)$ with $A \prec B$ and $[A, B] \nearrow [C, D]$. We need to show $C \prec D$. For any $p \in B \setminus A$ we have $cl(A \cup \{p\}) = B$ because of $A \prec B$. Hence $D = B \vee C = cl(B \cup C) = cl(A \cup \{p\} \cup C) = cl(C \cup \{p\})$. As noted after (1), this implies $C \prec D$.

Exercise 4C. Prove property (2). Then use (2) to show that for each circuit C it holds that $x \notin C \setminus \{x\}$ for all $x \in C$.

Solution of Ex. 4C By way of contradiction, suppose $X \subseteq E$ was independent, $p \notin cl(X)$, but $X \cup \{p\}$ was dependent. Hence some element in this set (by assumption not p) is in the closure of the others: $q \in cl((X \setminus \{q\}) \cup \{p\})$. But $q \notin cl(X \setminus \{q\})$ since X is independent. From (1) follows the desired contradiction $p \in cl((X \setminus \{q\}) \cup \{q\}) = cl(X)$.

Exercise 4D. Show that a matroid cannot contain infinite independent sets.

Solution of Ex. 4D Suppose $\mathbb{M} = (E, cl)$ had a (w.l.o.g. denumerably) infinite independent set $\{p_1, p_2, \dots\} \subseteq E$. By definition of 'independent' $p_{i+1} \notin cl(\{p_1, \dots, p_i\})$, and so we had an infinite chain of flats $cl(\{p_1\}) \subset cl(\{p_1, p_2\}) \subset \dots$, contradicting the fact that $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M})$ has finite length by definition of 'matroid'.

Exercise 4E. Show that the closure space $\mathbb{M}(L) = (At(L), cl_L)$ associated to the geometric lattice L is a simple matroid.

Solution of Ex. 4E In order to establish the exchange property (1), let $X \subseteq At(L)$ and let $p \neq q$ be atoms not in $cl(X) =: x$, but satisfying $p \in cl(X \cup \{q\})$. Hence $p \leq x + q$, and so $x < x + p \leq x + q$. But $x \prec x + q$ by semimodularity. Hence $x + p = x + q$, which implies $q \in cl(X \cup \{p\})$.

Exercise 4F. Show that in any lattice L two atoms p, q which possess a common complement are perspective. If L is co-atomistic (e.g. geometric), the converse holds as well.

Solution of Ex. 4F. If c is a common complement, then $[0, p] \nearrow [c, 1] \nwarrow [0, q]$. Conversely, let $[0, p] \nearrow [e, f] \nwarrow [0, q]$. If L is co-atomistic, there is a co-atom c with $e \leq c$ but $f \not\leq c$. In view of $p + e = f$ this implies $p \not\leq c$. Hence c is a complement of p . Likewise c is a complement of q .

Exercise 4G. Find two join irreducibles in L_1 of Fig. 3.1 which are projective but not perspective.

Solution of Ex. 4G. For instance $7, 16 \in J(L_1)$ are projective, witnessed by $(3, 7) \nearrow (6, 9) \searrow (0, 2) \nearrow (14, 18) \searrow (10, 16)$. The atoms $7, 16$ are not perspective since generally coverings $(a, b), (c, d)$ with $b \leq c$ cannot have a common upper transpose (check).

Exercise 4H. Show that in a geometric lattice two atoms are perspective iff they are projective.

Solution of Ex.4H. The reverse implication being trivial we only show 'projective $\Rightarrow$ perspective'. So fix $p, q \in \text{At}(L)$ with $p \approx q$. Since neither $(0, p)$ nor $(0, q)$ can be upper transposes, each witnessing sequence of $p \approx q$ is of type

$$(0, p) \nearrow (a, b) \searrow (c, d) \nearrow \cdots \searrow (e, f) \nearrow (g, h) \searrow (0, q).$$

By Ex.3A(i) each lower transpose $(c, d), \dots, (e, f)$ can be assumed to stem from an atom (so $(c, d) = (0, r)$, etc). Therefore $p \sim r \sim \cdots \sim q$. Since $\sim$ is transitive by Lemma 4.2(a), we conclude that $p \sim q$.

Exercise 4I. Let $A_1, \dots, A_s$ be the connected components of $\mathbb{M} = (E, cl)$. Using (5) show that $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M}) \simeq \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M}(A_1)) \times \cdots \times \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{M}(A_s))$.

5. Partial linear spaces and matroids

In 5.1 and 5.2 we put in place standard material about partial linear spaces (PLS), a general reference being [BB]. Some technicalities about cycles (5.3) seem to be new. Also novel, but perhaps more exhilarating, is the concept of a 'point-splitting' (5.4). In 5.6 (projective geometries) and 5.7 (parallel connections of lines) PLSes are related to matroids.

5.1 Let E be a set, whose elements we call points, and let $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{P}(E)$ be a set of subsets called lines. The pair (E, Λ) is a *partial linear space (PLS)* if the following is satisfied [BB].


(PLS 1) *Every line is incident with at least two points.*

(PLS 2) *Any two distinct points are incident with at most one line.*

Notice that axiom (PLS 2) is equivalent to

(PLS 2') For all distinct $\ell, \ell' \in \Lambda$ it holds that $|\ell \cap \ell'| \leq 1$.

When distinct points $p, q \in E$ are incident with a line, then it is unique by (PLS 2) and we denote it by $\langle p, q \rangle$. A line $\ell \in \Lambda$ in a PLS (E, Λ) is short if $|\ell| = 2$, otherwise it is long. If all lines in a PLS are short, then the PLS is just a graph. In the PLS below (Fig.5.1(A), nicer picture welcome!), the so-called Fano plane, all seven lines qualify as long, albeit "just quite". (It is impossible to display all 7 lines as 'straight lines'.)



5.2 A path of a PLS (E, Λ) is a sequence $(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$ of points such that all lines $\langle p_i, p_{i+1} \rangle$ exist ($1 \leq i < n$). Two points $p, q \in E$ are connected if $p = q$ or if they lie on a common path. Let $E_1, \dots, E_c$ be the classes of this equivalence relation. Put $\Lambda_i := \{\ell \in \Lambda : \ell \subseteq E_i\}$. Then $\Lambda = \biguplus \{\Lambda_i : 1 \leq i \leq c\}$, and $\Lambda_i = \emptyset$ iff $E_i = \{p\}$ consists of an isolated point. The $c = c(E, \Lambda)$ many PLSes (E_i, Λ_i) are the connected components of (E, Λ) . The PLS (E, Λ) is connected if $c(E, \Lambda) = 1$.

Apart from connected matroids and connected PLSes let us introduce yet another meaning of 'connected'. We call a line-set $S \subseteq \Lambda$ connected if either $S = \emptyset$ or the PLS $(\bigcup S, S)$ is connected. Note the following:

- (1) Let (E, Λ) be a PLS and $S \subseteq \Lambda$. If (E, S) is a connected PLS, then S is a connected line-set. Conversely, if S is a connected line-set, then (E, S) need not be a connected PLS because it has isolated points whenever $\bigcup S \neq E$.

The next observation is slightly more subtle (Ex.5A):

- (2) Each nonempty connected line-set S contains at least one $\ell \in S$ such that $S \setminus \{\ell\}$ remains a connected line-set.

5.3 A cycle of a PLS (E, Λ) is a sequence $C = (\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_n)$ of $n \geq 3$ distinct lines such that all¹⁷ n intersections $\ell_i \cap \ell_{i+1}$ are nonempty and distinct. For instance, if the PLS is the Fano plane and¹⁸ $\ell_1 = \{1, 3, 2\}$, $\ell_2 = \{2, 7, 5\}$, $\ell_3 = \{5, 3, 4\}$, $\ell_4 = \{4, 7, 1\}$, then $(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, \ell_4)$ is a cycle.

We define the C-interior of a line ℓ_i in a cycle C as $\ell_i^\circ := \ell_i \setminus (\ell_{i-1} \cup \ell_{i+1})$. Clearly consecutive interiors $\ell_i^\circ, \ell_{i+1}^\circ$ are disjoint. The cycle C is strong if *all* sets ℓ_i° are disjoint. For the cycle C above we have $\ell_1^\circ = \ell_3^\circ = \{3\}$, $\ell_2^\circ = \ell_4^\circ = \{7\}$, and so C is not strong.

¹⁷Without further mention, this means 'modulo n ', i.e. $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, as well as $\ell_n \cap \ell_1 \neq \emptyset$. The distinctness of the junctions $p_i \in \ell_i \cap \ell_{i+1}$ is crucial. Otherwise unpleasant sequences of lines, such as $(\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 4\}, \{1, 5, 6, 7\})$, would qualify as cycles.

¹⁸The order in which the elements of a line are listed is irrelevant, but some orderings are more illuminating than others.

- (3) Each cycle $(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n)$ contains a strong cycle in the sense that some subset of $\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n\}$, suitably ordered, constitutes a strong cycle.

We establish (3) by inducting on n . Letting $n = 3$ consider a cycle (ℓ_1, ℓ_2, ℓ_3) . Let $\ell_1 \cap \ell_2 = \{p\}$, $\ell_2 \cap \ell_3 = \{q\}$, $\ell_3 \cap \ell_1 = \{r\}$. Hence $\ell_1^\circ = \ell_1 \setminus \{p, r\}$, $\ell_2^\circ = \ell_2 \setminus \{p, q\}$. Assuming $\ell_1^\circ \cap \ell_2^\circ \neq \emptyset$, say $t \in \ell_1^\circ \cap \ell_2^\circ$, yields the contradiction $|\ell_1 \cap \ell_2| \geq |\{p, t\}| = 2$. Similarly one shows $\ell_1^\circ \cap \ell_3^\circ = \ell_2^\circ \cap \ell_3^\circ = \emptyset$, and so (ℓ_1, ℓ_2, ℓ_3) is strong. Let $n > 3$ and assume that $(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n)$ is not strong. Then, wlog, there is $i \in \{3, \dots, n-1\}$ with $\ell_1^\circ \cap \ell_i^\circ \neq \emptyset$. Then $(\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_i)$ is a cycle of length $< n$, which by induction contains a strong cycle. $\square$

For instance, if the non-strong cycle $(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, \ell_4)$ above is replaced by (ℓ_1, ℓ_2, ℓ_3) , the latter is strong with $\ell_1^\circ = \{1\}$, $\ell_2^\circ = \{7\}$, $\ell_3^\circ = \{4\}$.

5.3.1 If (E, Λ) is a PLS then a line-set $T \subseteq \Lambda$ is acyclic if no subset can be ordered to become a cycle.

- (4) If $C = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n)$ is a strong cycle in some PLS, then $|\ell_1 \cup \dots \cup \ell_n| = |\ell_1| + \dots + |\ell_n| - n$. If $S = \{\ell'_1, \dots, \ell'_m\}$ is acyclic and $(\bigcup S, S)$ has c connected components, then $|\ell'_1 \cup \dots \cup \ell'_m| = |\ell'_1| + \dots + |\ell'_m| - m + c$. In particular $|\bigcup S| \geq 2m - m + c = m + c$.

As to the first claim, if Jc is the n -set of all junctions of C , then $|\ell_1 \cup \dots \cup \ell_n| = |\ell_1^\circ \uplus \dots \uplus \ell_n^\circ \uplus Jc| = (|\ell_1| - 2) + \dots + (|\ell_n| - 2) + n = |\ell_1| + \dots + |\ell_n| - 2n + n$.

As to the second claim, first assume that $c = 1$. Then by (2) there is a line in S whose removal does not destroy connectivity. Hence wlog $S_0 := S \setminus \{\ell'_m\}$ is a connected line-set. With S a fortiori S_0 is acyclic. Since S is a connected line-set, we have $|(\bigcup S_0) \cap \ell'_m| \geq 1$. But if ≥ 1 was ≥ 2 then, since S_0 is a connected line-set, S would contain a cycle (which it doesn't). Therefore ≥ 1 is $= 1$. Put another way, $|\ell'_m \setminus (\bigcup S_0)| = |\ell'_m| - 1$. By induction $|\ell'_1 \cup \dots \cup \ell'_{m-1}| = |\ell'_1| + \dots + |\ell'_{m-1}| - (m-1) + c$, and so $|\ell'_1 \cup \dots \cup \ell'_m| = |\ell'_1 \cup \dots \cup \ell'_{m-1}| + (|\ell'_m| - 1) = |\ell'_1| + \dots + |\ell'_m| - m + c$.

Suppose now $c > 1$, w.l.o.g. $c = 2$. If $(\bigcup S, S)$ has connected components $(S_1, \{\ell'_1, \dots, \ell'_m\})$ and $(S_2, \{\ell'_{m+1}, \dots, \ell'_{m+t}\})$, then $|S| = |S_1| + |S_2| = (|\ell'_1| + \dots + |\ell'_m| - m + 1) + (|\ell'_{m+1}| + \dots + |\ell'_{m+t}| - t + 1) = |\ell'_1| + \dots + |\ell'_{m+t}| - (m + t) + c$.

5.4 If a PLS (E, Λ) is not acyclic, we can make it acyclic by 'splitting points'. Formally a point-splitting is an ordered pair $(\ell, p) \in \Lambda \times E$ such that $p \in \ell$. Let $PtSp \subseteq \Lambda \times E$ be the set of all point-splittings. Applying a set $X \subseteq PtSp$ to (E, Λ) yields a new PLS $(E, \Lambda)^X$, which arises from (E, Λ) by separating for each $(\ell, p) \in X$ the line ℓ "at p from the rest". Let us gradually make this more precise. Let $X' := \{p^\ell : (\ell, p) \in X\}$ be a disjoint $|X|$ -element set of 'new points' to be added to E . As opposed to the points, the number of lines ℓ' in the new PLS will be the same as the number of old lines ℓ , due to some natural bijection $\ell \mapsto \ell'$. Namely, put $\ell' := (\ell \setminus \{p \in \ell : (\ell, p) \in X\}) \uplus \{p^\ell : (\ell, p) \in X\}$. The formal definition of the new PLS is

- (5) $(E, \Lambda)^X := (E', \Lambda')$, where $E' := E \uplus X'$ and $\Lambda' := \{\ell' : \ell \in \Lambda\}$.

Let us illustrate this on the Fano plane but use p^*, p^+ (rather than p^{ℓ_i}, p^{ℓ_j}) for the new points resulting from splitting p . We begin by detaching the line $\ell_4 = \{1, 4, 7\}$ in Figure 5.1(A) from

the rest. This creates a new point 1^+ and replaces ℓ_4 by $\ell_4^+ := \{1^+, 4, 7\}$. The old point 1 still belongs to two other lines. That is until we detach $\ell_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ at point 1, which creates 1^* and replaces ℓ_1 by $\ell_1^* := \{1^*, 2, 3\}$. Actually, when we look at Figure (B), we see a line $\{1^*, 2, 3^+\}$. That is because we also splitted twice the point 3 in Figure (A), and likewise we splitted 5. The PLS resulting from these six point-splittings is rendered in Figure (B). This PLS still has cycles, such as $(\{2, 4, 6\}, \{6, 3^*, 7\}, \{7, 5, 2\})$. In Figure (C) seven point-splittings were applied (check). Here the detection of cycles is harder; in fact $(\{2, 1^+, 3\}, \{3, 6^+, 7\}, \{7, 1, 4\}, \{4, 6^*, 2\})$ is the only cycle.

5.4.1 We are mainly concerned with particular sets of point-splittings. Namely, call $A \subseteq PtSp$ an acyclifier of (E, Λ) if $(E, \Lambda)^A$ is acyclic but retains the same number of connected components. Returning to the Fano plane, the six point-splittings in (B) can be augmented to an 8-element acyclifier by splitting points 2 and 4 (more precisely, detach the curved line at these points). Similarly the seven point-splittings applied in (C) yield an 8-element acyclifier by splitting any junction of the sole surviving cycle. Although this is little evidence for speculating that acyclifiers always have the same cardinality, it is in fact correct:

Theorem 5.1: *Let $\mathcal{B} = (E, \Lambda)$ be a partial linear space.*

- (a) *Then all acyclifiers have the same cardinality, which we can hence denote by $r^*(\mathcal{B})$.*
- (b) *Actually, if $\Lambda = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t\}$, then $r^*(\mathcal{B}) = c(\mathcal{B}) + \sum_{i=1}^t |\ell_i| - |E| - t$.*

For instance, if $\mathcal{B}$ is the Fano plane, then $r^*(\mathcal{B}) = 1 + 7 \cdot 3 - 7 - 7 = 8$

Proof of Thm. 5.1. (a) According to [W3, Lemma 11] the acyclifiers of $\mathcal{B}$ bijectively match the bases of some¹⁹ matroid, hence by (3) in Sec. 4 all acyclifiers have the same cardinality.

(b) Once we manage the connected case (claim (6)), the general case will be immediate.

(6) *Each connected PLS $\mathcal{B}_1 = (E_1, \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m\})$ has $r^*(\mathcal{B}_1) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^m |\ell_i| - |E_1| - m$.*

We verify (6) by inducting on m . If $m = 0$ (so $\mathcal{B}_1$ is an isolated point), then $r^*(\mathcal{B}_1) = 0 = 1 + 0 - 1 - 0$. If $m = 1$ (so $\mathcal{B}_1$ is a single line), then $r^*(\mathcal{B}_1) = 0 = 1 + |\ell_1| - |E_1| - 1$. Let $m > 1$. Since $\mathcal{B}_1$ is connected and because of (2) there is a line, say ℓ_m , whose removal results in the connected line-set $\Lambda_0 := \Lambda_1 \setminus \{\ell_m\}$. Suppose there are $e \geq 0$ points on ℓ_m which are not on any line $\ell_i \neq \ell_m$. Since $\mathcal{B}_1$ is connected, we have $e < |\ell_m|$, and so there are exactly $|\ell_m| - e > 0$ points on ℓ_m which additionally lie on lines $\neq \ell_m$. By (a) we are free to choose whatever acyclifier suits us best to derive a formula for $r^*(\mathcal{B}_1)$. We opt to launch our point-splitting endeavour by choosing any $|\ell_m| - e - 1$ points among the $|\ell_m| - e$ above-mentioned points. By separating ℓ_m at these points from the 'rest' we retain connectivity of the PLS and never again need to split points on ℓ_m . More formally, let E_0 be the subset of E_1 obtained by dropping the above-mentioned e points of ℓ_m . Then $\mathcal{B}_0 := (E_0, \Lambda_0)$ is a connected²⁰ PLS with fewer lines than $\mathcal{B}_1$. Therefore induction yields $r^*(\mathcal{B}_0) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} |\ell_i| - |E_0| - (m - 1)$. Straightforward arithmetic finishes the proof of (6):

¹⁹Each matroid has a dual matroid which is most conveniently defined by its bases; they are the complements of the original bases. Thus above 'some matroid' means 'the dual of some graphic matroid coupled to the PLS'.

²⁰This is akin to (1): Although Λ_0 is a connected line-set, the PLS (E_1, Λ_0) has e isolated points. They disappear when E_1 gets replaced by E_0 .

$$\begin{aligned}
r^*(\mathcal{B}_1) &= (|\ell_m| - e - 1) + r^*(\mathcal{B}_0) = (|\ell_m| - e - 1) + 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} |\ell_i| - |E_0| - (m - 1) \\
&= 1 + \sum_{i=1}^m |\ell_i| - |E_1| - m.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to handle a disconnected $\mathcal{B}$ with $c = c(\mathcal{B}) \geq 2$ connected components $\mathcal{B}_k = (E_k, \Lambda_k)$. In this case evidently $r^*(\mathcal{B}) = \sum_{k=1}^c r^*(\mathcal{B}_k)$. From $|E_k| < |E|$ and induction follows that each $\mathcal{B}_k$ is evaluated as $\mathcal{B}_1$ in (6). Summing up these c equations proves claim (b) in general. $\square$

5.5. A subset $X \subseteq E$ of a partial linear space (E, Λ) is Λ -closed if

$$(7) \quad |X \cap l| \geq 2 \text{ implies } l \subseteq X, \text{ for all } l \in \Lambda.$$

The set $\mathbb{L}(E, \Lambda)$ of all Λ -closed subsets is a closure system; viewed as a lattice it is atomistic with atoms $\{p\}$ ($p \in E$). Let $c_\Lambda : \mathbb{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(E)$ be the coupled closure operator. A natural implicational base of $\mathbb{L}(E, \Lambda)$ (or of c_Λ) is given by

$$(8) \quad \Sigma_\Lambda := \{ \{p, q\} \rightarrow \langle p, q \rangle : p \neq q \text{ in } E \}.$$


Although $\mathbb{L}(E, \Lambda)$ is atomistic, it is generally not semimodular, i.e. not the flat lattice of a matroid. However, in 5.6 (projective spaces) and 5.7 (parallel connection of lines) we construct types of PLSes where it works.

5.6 A partial linear space (E, Λ) is a linear space (LS) if 'at most' in (PS2) is replaced by 'exactly'. We mention in passing that [EMSS] it then holds that $|\Lambda| \geq |E|$. The equality is e.g. sharp for the Fano plane ($7 \geq 7$). A linear space (E, Λ) is called²¹ a projective geometry of dimension $n - 1$ if the following takes place.

(PG1) *Every line is long.*

(PG2) *The Triangle-Axiom (Fig.5.2): If a line intersects two sides of a triangle (not at their intersection), then it also intersects the third line.*

(PG3) *The lattice $\mathbb{L}(E, \Lambda)$ can be spanned by n points but not fewer.*



²¹This kind of 'projective' has nothing to do with projective coverings $(a, b) \approx (c, d)$! Instead of 'projective geometry' one also speaks of 'projective space'.

A configuration of four lines as in Fig.5.2 will be called a triangle configuration. In case of PLSes that are projective geometries one speaks of subspaces rather than Λ -closed sets. Note that (PG3) makes sense for all $n \geq 1$. For $n = 1, 2$ the projective geometry boils down to a single point (so $\Lambda = \emptyset$), respectively to a single line (so $|\Lambda| = 1$). For $n = 3$ one speaks of a projective plane. For instance the Fano plane is a projective plane.

5.6.1 The easiest examples of projective geometries derive from vector spaces V (over arbitrary skew fields). Namely, let E_V be the set of all 1-dimensional subspaces $\langle p \rangle$ ($p \in V$), and let Λ_V be the set of all lines $\ell_S := \{\langle p \rangle : p \in S\}$ where S ranges over all 2-dimensional subspaces. In Ex.5C you are asked to show that (E_V, Λ_V) satisfies (PG1) to (PG3). It is easy to see that $\mathbb{L}(E_V, \Lambda_V)$ is isomorphic to the lattice $\mathbb{L}(V)$ of linear subspaces of V . In particular $\mathbb{L}(E_V, \Lambda_V)$ is modular. As is well known, *all* projective spaces have modular subspace lattices, but the general proof is more subtle.


In Section 4.5 we considered geometric modular lattices L . Let us assume they are c-simple as well. Then if Λ_L is the set of all 'lines' $\ell_x := At(x)$, where x ranges over the rank two elements, then $(At(L), \Lambda_L)$ turns out to be a projective space as well. It is a classic result that $\mathbb{L}(At(L), \Lambda_L) \simeq L$ (see Ex.5H). More generally, let (E, Λ) be *any* projective space. Then $L := \mathbb{L}(E, \Lambda)$ turns out to be a c-simple geometric modular lattice such that $E \simeq At(L)$ and $\Lambda \simeq \Lambda_L$.

5.6.2 In Theorem 7.5 we will drop *both* "c-simple" and "geometric" and start investigating arbitrary modular lattices L under a geometric perspective. Specifically, suitable subsets $\ell \subseteq J(L)$ will be called 'lines'. Letting Λ_L be the subset of all lines, it was shown by Benson and Conway that L is isomorphic (via $x \mapsto J(x)$) to the closure system of all Λ_L -closed *order ideals* of $(J(L), \leq)$. The main perk of Theorem 7.5 is the insight that instead of Λ_L it suffices to take suitable (not uniquely determined) *subfamilies* $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_L$, called 'bases of lines'. Only in 'rare' cases the only choice for Λ is $\Lambda = \Lambda_L$, the two most important ones are these. Either L is atomistic (not necessarily c-simple), or L is distributive in which case $\Lambda = \Lambda_L = \emptyset$. Indeed, by Birkhoff's Theorem $L \simeq \mathbb{L}(J(L), \leq)$ (see Sec.2.5).


5.7 Let $\mathbb{M}(E, cl)$ be a matroid and (J, Λ) a partial linear space. Following [W8, Def.4.1] we say that a bijection $\psi : J \rightarrow E$ *line-preserving (line-pres)* models (J, Λ) if $cl(\psi(p), \psi(q)) = \psi(\ell)$ for all 2-sets $\{p, q\} \subseteq \ell$ and all $\ell \in \Lambda$. In particular $\psi(\ell)$ is a dependent subset of E whenever $|\ell| \geq 3$. If we briefly say that ' $\mathbb{M}$ line-pres models (J, Λ) ', then we insinuate that mentioned ψ exists. Upon identifying each $p \in J$ with its 'label' $\psi(p)$ we can view J as a set that simultaneously carries a matroid and a PLS-structure. It then holds that:

(9) *Each $\mathbb{M}$ -closed subset $X \subseteq J$ is Λ -closed.*

Indeed, let $\ell \in \Lambda$ be such that $|\ell \cap X| \geq 2$. Then $\ell = cl(\ell \cap X) \subseteq cl(X) = X$, and so X is Λ -closed. The converse fails; in Fig. 5.3 the set $X = \{a, c, a + c, b + d\}$ is Λ -closed but not $\mathbb{M}$ -closed since $a + b + d \in cl(X)$.



The converse however holds in acyclic PLSes. Specifically (Fig. 5.4(A)) consider a PLS with $J = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and just a single line, i.e. $\Lambda = \{\{1, 2, 3\}\}$. Let k be any field with $|k| \geq 3$ and a, b independent k -vectors. Defining $\psi(1) = a$, $\psi(2) = a + b$, $\psi(3) = b$ yields a k -linear matroid $\mathbb{M}$ on J . It is clear that the Λ -closed subsets of J are exactly the $\mathbb{M}$ -closed subsets of J . For any further line ℓ that we attach to the acyclic PLS so far (such as $\ell = \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$) we invest a new vector not in the span of the previous ones (such as c). This vector along with the vector labelling the point of attachment (here b) takes care to label the points of ℓ (here $\psi(3) = b$, $\psi(4) = b + c$, $\psi(5) = b + 2c$, $\psi(6) = c$). For any acyclic (possibly disconnected) PLS (J, Λ) and any large enough²² field the arising kind of labelling ψ thus line-pres models (J, Λ) .



Theorem 5.2: *Let (J, Λ) be an acyclic PLS and let $\mathbb{M}$ be a k -linear matroid that naturally line-pres models (J, Λ) . Then the $\mathbb{M}$ -closed subsets of J coincide with the Λ -closed subsets of J .*

Proof: Exercise 5F.

For instance in Fig 5.4(B) the set $X = \{a + b, b + 2c, c + d, c + e\}$ is Λ -closed, and so must be $\mathbb{M}$ -closed by Theorem 5.2. To spell it out, none of $a, b, b + c, c, d, e$ are in the span of X . (This isn't clear for everybody by inspection.) Following [W3,p.216] we define the PLS-rank of a partial linear space (J, Λ) as

$$(10) \quad r(J, \Lambda) := |\Lambda| - r^*(J, \Lambda)$$

²²Akin to $|k| \geq 3$ above we need that $|k| + 1$ is $\geq$ the largest cardinality of a line.

That concept will be crucial in Part C. Among other things we will deal with line-pres $\mathbb{M}$ -modelings of (J, Λ) that furthermore are rank-preserving in the sense that the matroid rank $rk(\mathbb{M})$ equals $r(J, \lambda) + c(J, \Lambda)$. All natural line-pres modelings of acyclic PLSes are rank-preserving (Ex.5G), and certain others as well. For instance the one in Fig.5.3 since $r(J, \Lambda) + c(J, \Lambda) = (5 - 2) + 1 = 4 = rk(\mathbb{M})$.

5.7.1 Let us put the PLSes from Thm. 5.2 in a broader context. Let $\mathbb{M}(E_i, \mathbb{C}_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$) be two matroids given by their circuits which have exactly one point in common, so $E_1 \cap E_2 = \{p\}$. Define $\mathbb{C} : \mathbb{C}_1 \cup \mathbb{C}_2 \cup \mathbb{C}^{new}$, where $\mathbb{C}^{new}$ consists of all 'novel' circuits $C = C_1 \cup C_2 \setminus \{p\}$ where $C_i \in \mathbb{C}_i$ and $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{p\}$. Putting $E := E_1 \cup E_2$ it turns out [Ox,p.240 and Ex.5D] that $\mathbb{M}(E, \mathbb{C})$ is a matroid, the so-called parallel connection $\mathbb{M}_1 * \mathbb{M}_2$ of $\mathbb{M}_1$ and $\mathbb{M}_2$. This construction can be extended to more than two matroids by putting $\mathbb{M}_1 * \dots * \mathbb{M}_n := (\mathbb{M}_1 * \dots * \mathbb{M}_{n-1}) * \mathbb{M}_n$. In fact $*$ turns out (nontrivial) to be associative, and so (say) $\mathbb{M}_1 * \dots * \mathbb{M}_4 = \mathbb{M}_1 * ((\mathbb{M}_2 * \mathbb{M}_3) * \mathbb{M}_4)$. Parallel connections tie in nicely [Wh1, Prop.7.6.10] with k -linear representations: If $\mathbb{M}_i$ is represented by the set S_i of k -vectors, then $\mathbb{M}_1 * \dots * \mathbb{M}_n$ is represented by the set $S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_n$.

5.7.2 We are only concerned with the case where all $\mathbb{M}_i$'s derive from the lines ℓ_i of an acyclic PLS. Specifically, we simply declare any three or more points in ℓ_i as dependent. Consequently the family $\mathbb{C}_i$ of circuits of ℓ_i consists of all 3-element subsets of ℓ_i . For instance, $\ell_2 = \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$ in Fig. 5.4(A) triggers $\mathbb{M}_2(\ell_2, \mathbb{C}_2)$ with $\mathbb{C}_2 = \{456, 356, 346, 345\}$. Exercise 5E asks to calculate $\mathbb{C}$ for the parallel connection $\mathbb{M}(E, \mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{M}_1 * \mathbb{M}_2 * \mathbb{M}_3 * \mathbb{M}_4$. For instance $C := \{1, 2, 5, 7, 8\} \in \mathbb{C}$. As they must, the five matching vectors in Fig.5.4(B) turn out to be dependent (e.g. $b + 2c = ((a + b) - a) + 2((c + d) - d)$); but any four of them are independent.

5.7.3 In [W8] the lines ℓ_i of all occurring PLSes have $|\ell_i| \leq 3$, this condition being necessary (though not sufficient) for certain associated modular lattices to occur as covering sublattice of a partition lattice. If $|\ell_i| = 3$ then we can couple ℓ_i to a triangle, more precisely the graphic matroid $\mathbb{M}_i$ induced by the triangle. For instance, if ℓ_3, ℓ_4 are as in Figure 5.4 then $\mathbb{M}_3 * \mathbb{M}_4$ is the graphic matroid induced by the graph in Fig.5.4(C). The term 'parallel connection' (for arbitrary matroids) stems from this scenario. Specifically, instead of gluing two graphs by sharing a vertex (serial connection of graphs), here two graphs are glued by sharing an edge (parallel connection of graphs).

5.8 Exercises

Exercise 5A. Prove claim (2).

Solution of Ex.5A. Let (E, Λ) be a PLS and $S \subseteq \Lambda$ a connected line-set. Suppose a connected line-subset $T_1 = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k\} \subseteq S$ has been found (the case $k = 1$ is trivial). Let $T_2 := S \setminus T_1$. If $T_2 = \emptyset$, we are finished. Otherwise, if the nonvoid pointsets $\bigcup T_1$ and $\bigcup T_2$ were not intersecting, then $(\bigcup S, S)$ would be a disconnected PLS, contradicting the assumption that the line-set S is connected. Hence there is a line $\ell_{k+1} \in T_2$ intersecting $\bigcup T_1$, and so $\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{k+1}\}$ is a larger connected line-set contained in S . If the final enumeration is $S = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n\}$, then $S \setminus \{\ell_n\}$, $S \setminus \{\ell_n, \ell_{n-1}\}$, and so forth all remain connected line-sets.

Exercise 5B. Let $\mathbb{M}$ be the matroid induced by the projective geometry (E_V, Λ_V) of 5.6.1. Show that here *all* $\Lambda(\mathbb{M})$ -closed subsets are $\mathbb{M}$ -closed.

Solution of Ex.5B. Recall from (9) that $\mathbb{M}$ -closed are always $\Lambda(\mathbb{M})$ -closed. As to the converse,

if some point $\langle q \rangle$ is in the $\mathbb{M}$ -closure of say $\{\langle p_1 \rangle, \langle p_2 \rangle, \langle p_3 \rangle\}$ then there must be scalars λ_i such that $q = \lambda_1 p_1 + \lambda_2 p_2 + \lambda_3 p_3$. In order to show that $\langle q \rangle$ is in the $\Lambda(\mathbb{M})$ -closure of $\{\langle p_1 \rangle, \langle p_2 \rangle, \langle p_3 \rangle\}$ note that $\langle \lambda_1 p_1 + \lambda_2 p_2 \rangle$ is in the line determined by $\langle p_1 \rangle, \langle p_2 \rangle$. Likewise $\langle (\lambda_1 p_1 + \lambda_2 p_2) + \lambda_3 p_3 \rangle$ is in the line determined by $\langle \lambda_1 p_1 + \lambda_2 p_2 \rangle$ and $\langle p_3 \rangle$.

Exercise 5C. Let V be a vector space. Show that the coupled linear space (E_V, Λ_V) in 5.6.1 is a projective space.

Exercise 5D. Show that $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}_1 \cup \mathbb{C}_2 \cup \mathbb{C}^{new}$ from 5.7.1 satisfies the circuit axioms from 4.2.3.

Exercise 5E. Calculate the set family $\mathbb{C}$ appearing in the parallel connection $\mathbb{M}(E, \mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{M}_1 * \mathbb{M}_2 * \mathbb{M}_3 * \mathbb{M}_4$ in 5.7.2.

Solution of Ex.5E. The matroid $\mathbb{M}_1(\ell_1, \mathbb{C}_1)$ coupled to line ℓ_1 has $\mathbb{C}_1 = \{\ell_1\} = \{\{1, 2, 3\}\}' = \{123\}$ (for brevity). We likewise have $\mathbb{M}_i(\ell_i, \mathbb{C}_i)$ with $\mathbb{C}_2 = \{456, 356, 346, 345\}$, $\mathbb{C}_3 = \{678\}$, $\mathbb{C}_4 = \{6910\}$ ($= \{6, 9, 10\}$). If $\mathbb{M}'(E', \mathbb{C}')$ is the parallel connection of $\mathbb{M}_1$ and $\mathbb{M}_2$, $\mathbb{M}''(E'', \mathbb{C}'')$ is the parallel connection of $\mathbb{M}'$ and $\mathbb{M}_3$, and $\mathbb{M}(E, \mathbb{C})$ is the parallel connection of $\mathbb{M}''$ and $\mathbb{M}_4$, then one checks that

- $\mathbb{C}' = \mathbb{C}_1 \cup \mathbb{C}_2 \cup \{1256, 1246, 1245\}$
- $\mathbb{C}'' = \mathbb{C}' \cup \mathbb{C}_3 \cup \{4578, 3578, 3478, 12578, 12478\}$
- $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}'' \cup \mathbb{C}_4 \cup \{45910, 3510, 3410, 78910\} = \mathbb{C}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathbb{C}_4 \cup \{1256, \dots, 78910\}$

Exercise 5F. Prove Theorem 5.2.

Exercise 5G. Show that the natural line-pres modelling of every acyclic PLS (by a k -linear or graphic matroid) is rank-preserving.


Exercise 5H. Let L be an atomistic modular lattice (not necessarily c-simple). As for any lattice, L is isomorphic to the lattice (closure system) $\{J(x) : x \in L\}$; see Sec.2.4 and Ex.2C. In order to prove $(At(L), \Lambda_L) \simeq L$ (see 5.6.1), it thus suffices to show that the Λ_L -closed subsets of $At(L)$ are exactly the sets of type $J(x)$. Therefore show:

- (a) The set $J(x) \subseteq At(L)$ is Λ_L -closed for all $x \in L$ (easy).
- (b) If $X \subseteq At(L)$ is Λ_L -closed, then $X = J(x)$ for $x := \sum X$ (more subtle).

6. Enumeration of modular lattices

Let $g(n)$ be the number of distributive lattices of cardinality n . According to [EHK] it holds that $g(30) = 8'186'962$, the largest known value being $g(49) = 908'414'736'485$. For counting modular lattices completely different methods are in order. Kohonen [K] has determined the number $f(n)$ of modular, non-distributive n -element lattices for all $n \leq 30$, thereby shattering the old record of $n = 23$. For instance $f(30) = 3'485'707'007 \gg g(30)$. We expand on that below, but a lot remains to be done (e.g. lost figures need to be restored).

A lattice is vertically decomposable if there is $x \in L \setminus \{0, 1\}$ such that for all $y \in L$ one has $y \leq x$ or $y \geq x$. Then L is the 'vertical sum' of $L_1 := [0, x]$ and $L_2 := [x, 1]$. Conversely, given any lattices L'_1, L'_2 it is easy (Ex.6A) to construct a lattice L which is the vertical sum of sublattices $L_1 \simeq L'_1$ and $L_2 \simeq L'_2$. In both cases we write $L = L_1 \oplus L_2$. For instance, Figure 6.1 (A) shows $M_3 \oplus M_4$. Vertically decomposable lattices reduce in a trivial manner to their constituents and whence are often neglected in the enumeration of lattices. More relevant than $M_3 \oplus M_4$ is $M_{3,4}$ (Fig. 6.1(B)). Generally $M_{s,t}$ is obtained by gluing²³ an upper covering of M_s and a lower covering of M_t . In Section 6 it is convenient to allow $n = 2$ in M_n , so M_2 is the distributive length 2 lattice with 2 atoms; see $M_{3,2}$ in Figure (C) and $M_{2,2}$ in (D).



6.1 We hence list in Table 6.1 all 168 vertically indecomposable (VI), modular, *non-distributive* lattices L of cardinality $n \leq 12$. For $n = 5, 6, 7, 8$ only lattices of length 2 or 3 occur, and they are readily found ad hoc. (For instance $M_{2,2}$ is distributive and does not qualify for $n = 6$.) For $n = 9$ there are six lattices of length 4, labelled *Koh.9.1* to *Koh.9.6*. For $n = 10, 11, 12$ the number of n -lattices of length ≥ 4 increases to 15, 45, 102. For the time being only the diagrams of *Koh.11.1* to *Koh.11.45* are provided²⁴ in Exercise 6C.

n	length 2	length 3	length ≥ 4
5	M_3		
6	M_4		
7	M_5	$M_{3,2}, M_{2,3}$	
8	M_6	$M_{4,2}, M_{3,3}, M_{2,4}$	
9	M_7	$M_{5,2}, M_{4,3}, \dots, M_{2,5}$	<i>Koh.9.1, \dots, Koh.9.6</i>
10	M_8	$M_{6,2}, M_{5,3}, \dots, M_{2,6}$	<i>Koh.10.1, \dots, Koh.10.15</i>
11	M_9	$M_{7,2}, M_{6,3}, \dots, M_{2,7}$	<i>Koh.11.1, \dots, Koh.11.45</i>
12	M_{10}	$M_{8,2}, M_{7,3}, \dots, M_{2,8}$	<i>Koh.12.1, \dots, Koh.12.102</i>

Table 6.1. The 168 modular, non-distributive, VI lattices of cardinality at most 12.

6.2 How many lattices in Table 6.1 are c-simple? Apart from all occurring lattices $M_s, M_{s,t}$ there are 11 lattices of type *Koh.i.j* which are c-simple; see Ex.6B.

As to a systematic procedure, here comes a fairly easy-to-implement algorithm to check the congruence-simplicity of any modular lattice L whose cover relations $a \prec b$ are known. (The

²³Such gluings will be discussed in Section 13. They are not related to (matroidal) parallel connections.


²⁴The diagrams of all 168 lattices were kindly provided by Jukka Kohonen. I redrew (by hand) those that admit a planar drawing but unfortunately these got lost due to a stolen laptop. Perhaps they will be redrawn (who helps?) some time.

reasons for WHY this works will be provided in Part B.) First, identify $J(L)$, i.e. all elements with exactly one lower cover. Second, partition L into classes of elements of equal rank. Third, find all M_t -elements x as follows. For all $x \in L \setminus J(L)$ find all its t lower covers $x_1, x_2, \dots$. If $t = 2$, go to the next x . Otherwise check whether in the class of all elements of rank $\delta(x) - 2$ there is some (necessarily unique) x_0 which is below all x_i 's. If no, go to the next x . If yes, add the M_t -element x to the set of M_t -elements and check the next x . Fourth, for each M_t -element x find any 'line' $\ell_x = \{p_1, \dots, p_t\}$ by picking (at random) p_i from $J(x_0, x_i)$. Fifth, check whether the PLS $(J(L), \{\ell_x : x \text{ is } M_t\text{-element}\})$ is connected. If yes, L is c-simple, otherwise not. One can speed up the algorithm by doing the following between Step 1 and Step 2. Check whether any $p \in J(L)$ is join-prime (using Theorem 2.1). If yes, L is not c-simple. If no, continue with Steps 2 to 5.


6.3 Exercises


Exercise 6A. Given any lattices L'_1, L'_2 carefully define a lattice L which is the vertical sum of sublattices $L_1 \simeq L'_1$ and $L_2 \simeq L'_2$.

Exercise 6B. By inspection, there are exactly 11 congruence-simple lattices among *Koh.9.1* to *Koh.12.102*. They can be obtained by adding doubly irreducible elements to the three lattices below. Please do so.



Exercise 6C. Below the lattices *Koh.11.1* to *Koh.11.45* are depicted. Can you replace the nonplanar drawings (i.e. having intersecting lines) by planar ones?





References (to be updated)

- [A] M. Aigner, Combinatorial Theory, Springer Verlag Berlin, Heidelberg, New York 1979.
- [B] G. Birkhoff, Lattice Theory, AMS Coll. Publ., vol.25, third edition 1967.
- [BB] L.M. Batten, A. Beutelsbacher, The theory of finite linear spaces, Cambridge University Press 2009.
- [BC] D. Benson, J. Conway, Diagrams for modular lattices, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 37 (1985) 111-116.
- [CD] J. Crawley and R.P. Dilworth, Algebraic Theory of Lattices, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs 1973.
- [D] A. Day, Characterizations of lattices that are bounded homomorphic images or sublattices of free lattices, Can. J. Math. 31 (1979) 69-78.
- [DF] A. Day and R. Freese, The role of glueing constructions in modular lattice theory, p.251-260 in: The Dilworth Theorems, Birkhauser 1990.
- [DP] BA Davey, HA Priestley, Introduction to lattices and order, Cambridge University Press 2002.
- [EHK] Marcel Ern e, Jobst Heitzig, and J urgen Reinhold, On the number of distributive lattices, Electron. J. Combin. 9 (2002).
- [EMSS] Erd s, P; Mullin, R. C.; S s, V. T.; Stinson, D. R.; Finite linear spaces and projective planes. Discrete Math. 47 (1983), no. 1, 49–62.
- [FH] U. Faigle and C. Herrmann, Projective geometry on partially ordered sets, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 266 (1981) 319-332.

- [FRS] U. Faigle, G. Richter and M. Stern, Geometric exchange properties in lattices of finite length, *Algebra Universalis* 19 (1984) 355-365.
- [G] G. Grätzer, *General Lattice Theory: Foundation*, Birkhauser 2011.
- [H] C. Herrmann, S-verklebte Summen von Verbaenden, *Math. Zeitschrift* 130 (1973) 225-274.
- [HPR] C. Herrmann, D. Pickering and M. Roddy, Geometric description of modular lattices, to appear in *Algebra Universalis*.
- [HW] C. Herrmann and M. Wild, Acyclic modular lattices and their representations, *J. Algebra* 136 (1991) 17-36.
- [Hu] A. Huhn, Schwach distributive Verbaende I, *Acta Sci. Math. Szeged* 33 (1972) 297-305.
- [JN] B. Jonsson and J.B. Nation, Representations of 2-distributive modular lattices of finite length, *Acta Sci. Math.* 51 (1987) 123-128.
- [K] J. Kohonen, Generating modular lattices of up to 30 elements. *Order* 36 (2019) 423–435.
- [KNT] McKenzie, Ralph ; McNulty, George ; Taylor, Walter F; *Algebras, lattices, varieties. Vol. I.* Wadsworth and Brooks/Cole Advanced Books and Software, Monterey, CA, 1987. xvi+361 pp.
- [LMR] Lux, Klaus; Müller, Jürgen; Ringe, Michael; Peakword condensation and submodule lattices: an application of the MEAT-AXE. *J. Symbolic Comput.* 17 (1994), no. 6, 529–544.
- [P] W. Poguntke, Zerlegung von S-Verbänden, *Math. Z.* 142 (1975), 47–65.
- [S] M. Stern, *Semimodular lattices*, Teubner Texte zur Mathematik 125 (1991), Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft Stuttgart, Leipzig, Berlin.
- [Wh1] N. White (ed.), *Theory of Matroids*, *Encyclopedia Math. and Appl.* 26, Cambridge University press 1986.
- [Wh2] N. White (ed.), *Combinatorial geometries*, *Encyclopedia Math. and Appl.* 29, Cambridge University press 1987.
- [W1] M. Wild, *Dreieckverbaende: Lineare und quadratische Darstellungstheorie*, Thesis University of Zurich 1987.
- [W2] M. Wild, Modular lattices of finite length, first version (1992) of the present paper, ResearchGate.
- [W3] M. Wild, Cover preserving embedding of modular lattices into partition lattices, *Discrete Mathematics* 112 (1993) 207-244.
- [W4] M. Wild, The minimal number of join irreducibles of a finite modular lattice. *Algebra Universalis* 35 (1996), 113–123.
- [W5] M. Wild, Optimal implicational bases for finite modular lattices. *Quaest. Math.* 23 (2000), no. 2, 153–161.

- [W6] M. Wild, Output-polynomial enumeration of all fixed-cardinality ideals of a poset, respectively all fixed-cardinality subtrees of a tree, *Order* 31 (2014) 121–135.
- [W7] M. Wild, The joy of implications, aka pure Horn formulas: mainly a survey. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 658 (2017), part B, 264–292.
- [W8] M. Wild, Tight embedding of modular lattices into partition lattices: progress and program, *Algebra Universalis* 79 (2018) 1–49.
- [Wi1] R. Wille, Über modulare Verbände, die von einer endlichen halbgeordneten Menge frei erzeugt werden. *Math. Z.* 131 (1973), 241–249.
- [Wi2] Subdirekte Produkte vollständiger Verbände. (German) *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 283(284) (1976), 53–70.