

Orthogonality spaces associated with posets

Gejza Jenča

Department of Mathematics and Descriptive Geometry, Faculty
of Civil Engineering, Slovak University of Technology,
Radlinského 11, Bratislava, 810 05, Slovakia.

Contributing authors: gejza.jenca@stuba.sk;

Abstract

An orthogonality space is a set equipped with a symmetric, irreflexive relation called orthogonality. Every orthogonality space has an associated complete ortholattice, called the logic of the orthogonality space. To every poset, we associate an orthogonality space consisting of proper quotients (that means, nonsingleton closed intervals), equipped with a certain orthogonality relation. We prove that a finite bounded poset is a lattice if and only if the logic of its orthogonality space is an orthomodular lattice. We prove that that a poset is a chain if and only if the logic of the associated orthogonality space is a Boolean algebra.

MSC 2020: 06A06 , 06C15

1 Introduction

In his PhD. thesis [4], Dacey explored the notion of “abstract orthogonality”, by means of sets equipped with a symmetric, irreflexive relation \perp . He named these structures *orthogonality spaces*. Every orthogonality space has an orthocomplementation operator $X \mapsto X^\perp$ defined on the set of all its subsets. Dacey proved that $X \mapsto X^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator and that the set of all closed subsets of an orthogonality space forms a complete ortholattice, which we call *the logic of an orthogonality space*. Moreover, Dacey gave a characterization of orthogonality spaces such that their logic is an orthomodular lattice. The orthogonality spaces of this type are nowadays called *Dacey spaces*.

Let us remark that (as a special case of a *polarity between two sets*) the idea of an orthogonality space and its associated lattice of closed sets appears

already in the classical monograph [1, Section V.7]. Nevertheless, Dacey was probably the first person that explored the orthomodular law in this context.

Since orthogonality spaces are nothing but (undirected, simple, loopless) graphs, it is perhaps not surprising that the $X \mapsto X^\perp$ mapping appears under the name *neighbourhood operator* in graph theory. Implicitly, the logic associated with the neighbourhood operator was used in the seminal paper [6], in which Lovász proved the Kneser’s conjecture. Explicitly, they were used by Walker in [10]. In that paper, the ideas from the [6] paper were generalized and reformulated in the language of category theory.

For an overview of the results on orthogonality spaces and more general *test spaces*, see [11]. See also [8, 9] for some more recent results on orthogonality spaces.

In this paper, we construct an orthogonality space $(Q^+(P), \perp)$ from every poset P . The elements of $Q^+(P)$ are pairs (a, b) of elements of P with $a < b$ and the orthogonality relation can be described as “to be above/below each other in some chain” (see Figure 3). Then we examine how are the properties of P reflected in the structure of the orthogonality space $(Q^+(P), \perp)$ and its logic. In the last section, we describe some straightforward connections between the logic of $Q^+(P)$ and two constructions: the Kalmbach construction and the MacNeille completion.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Posets, lattices

A poset P is *lower bounded* if it has the smallest element, which we denote by 0. Similarly, the greatest element of an *upper bounded* poset is denoted by 1. A poset that is both upper and lower bounded is called *bounded*.

If X is a subset of a poset P , then a is a *lower bound* of X if and only if for all $x \in X$, $a \leq x$. For every set $X \subseteq P$, we write X^\downarrow for the set of all lower bounds of X . The notions of an *upper bound* and X^\uparrow are defined dually. For a singleton subset $\{x\}$, we abbreviate $\{x\}^\downarrow = x^\downarrow$ and $\{x\}^\uparrow = x^\uparrow$. Note that $\emptyset^\uparrow = \emptyset^\downarrow = P$.

A poset P is a *complete lattice* if and only if for all subsets X of P , X^\uparrow has the smallest element, denoted by $\bigvee X$ and called *the smallest upper bound* of X . In every complete lattice P , every subset X of P has a *greatest lower bound*, denoted by $\bigwedge X$. We say that a poset P is a *lattice* if and only if for all $x, y \in P$, $\bigwedge\{x, y\}$ and $\bigvee\{x, y\}$ exist. In a lattice, we write $x \wedge y = \bigwedge\{x, y\}$ and $x \vee y = \bigvee\{x, y\}$. A bounded lattice P is *complemented* if for every $x \in P$ there is a $x' \in P$ such that $x \wedge x' = 0$ and $x \vee x' = 1$. The element x' is then called a *complement* of x .

A subset I of a poset P is an *order ideal* of P if for every $x \in I$, $x^\downarrow \subseteq I$. The dual notion is *order filter*. An order ideal I of a poset P is *closed* if and only if $I = I^{\uparrow\downarrow}$. It is well known [7] that every poset P embeds into a complete lattice, called the *Dedekind-MacNeille completion* of P , denoted by \widehat{P} . The poset \widehat{P} consists of all closed order ideals of P , ordered by inclusion. There




Fig. 1 The hexagon

is a canonical embedding $\eta_P: P \rightarrow \widehat{P}$, given by the rule $\eta_P(x) = x^\perp$. It is well-known that P is a complete lattice if and only if η_P is surjective. Since every finite lattice is a complete lattice, this gives us a characterization of finite non-lattices, as follows.

Fact 2.1. *A finite poset P is a non-lattice if and only if there is a closed order ideal I with at least two maximal elements.*

2.2 Ortholattices, orthomodular lattices

An *ortholattice* is a bounded lattice $(L, \vee, \wedge, 0, 1, \perp)$ equipped with an antitone mapping called *orthocomplementation* $\perp: L \rightarrow L$ such that

- $0^\perp = 1, 1^\perp = 0$
- $x^{\perp\perp} = x$
- $(x \vee y)^\perp = x^\perp \wedge y^\perp$
- $(x \wedge y)^\perp = x^\perp \vee y^\perp$
- $x \wedge x^\perp = 0$
- $x \vee x^\perp = 1$

An ortholattice is L an *orthomodular lattice* if it satisfies the orthomodular law

$$x \leq y \implies y = x \vee (y \wedge x^\perp),$$

for all $x, y \in L$.

Similarly as for modular or distributive lattices, orthomodular lattices can be characterized among ortholattices by absence of a “forbidden sublattice”.

Proposition 2.2. *(see for example [5, Theorem 1.3.2]) An ortholattice L is orthomodular if and only if it does not contain a sub-ortholattice isomorphic to the hexagon (see Figure 1).*

A *Boolean algebra* is a distributive ortholattice. We shall use the following well-known characterization.

Proposition 2.3. [3] *An ortholattice L is a Boolean algebra if and only if, for all $a, b \in L$,*

$$a \wedge b = 0 \implies a \leq b^\perp. \quad (1)$$

Proof Clearly, every Boolean algebra satisfies (1).

By [5, Proposition 1.3.7] an ortholattice is a Boolean algebra iff it is uniquely complemented. We shall prove that (1) implies that L is uniquely complemented. Let y be a complement of x . Since $x \wedge y = 0$, $y \leq x^\perp$ by (1). Since $x \vee y = 1$,

$$0 = 1^\perp = (x \vee y)^\perp = x^\perp \wedge y^\perp.$$

By (1) $x^\perp \wedge y^\perp = 0$ implies that $x^\perp \leq y^{\perp\perp} = y$. Hence $y = x^\perp$ and y is unique. \square

3 Orthogonality spaces

Definition 3.1. Let V be a set, write $\mathcal{P}(V)$ for the powerset of V . A mapping $\text{cl}: \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(V)$ is a *closure operator* if it satisfies the conditions, for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}(V)$

1. $X \subseteq \text{cl}(X)$,
2. $X \subseteq Y \implies \text{cl}(X) \subseteq \text{cl}(Y)$,
3. $\text{cl}(\text{cl}(X)) = \text{cl}(X)$.

The pair (V, cl) is then called a *closure space*.

In a closure space (V, cl) , a set $X \subseteq V$ is called *closed* if $\text{cl}(X) = X$. It is easy to see that the set of all closed subsets of a closure space forms a complete lattice under inclusion.

Definition 3.2. An *orthogonality space* (O, \perp) is a set O equipped with an irreflexive symmetric binary relation $\perp \subseteq O \times O$.

Let (O, \perp) be an orthogonality space. We say that two elements $x, y \in O$ with $x \perp y$ are *orthogonal*. A subset B of O is *pairwise orthogonal* if every distinct pair of elements of B is orthogonal. Two subsets X, Y of O are *orthogonal* (in symbols $X \perp Y$) if $x \perp y$, for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. We write $y \perp X$ for $\{y\} \perp X$. For every subset X of O , we write

$$X^\perp = \{y \in O \mid y \perp X\}$$

so that X^\perp is the greatest subset of O orthogonal to X . Note that the mapping $X \mapsto X^\perp$ on the $(\mathcal{P}(O), \subseteq)$ is antitone. Clearly, for every family $(X_i)_{i \in H}$ of subsets of O ,

$$\left(\bigcup_{i \in H} X_i\right)^\perp = \bigcap_{i \in H} X_i^\perp.$$

Since the orthocomplementation is antitone, the mapping $X \mapsto X^{\perp\perp}$ is isotone. Moreover, for every $X \subseteq O$ we have $X \subseteq X^{\perp\perp}$ and $X^\perp = X^{\perp\perp\perp}$.




Fig. 2 Two orthogonality spaces and their logics

Consequently, $X \mapsto X^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator. Note that $s \in X^{\perp\perp}$ if and only if, for all $a \in O$,

$$a \perp X \implies s \perp a.$$

We say that a subset X of O is *orthoclosed* if $X = X^{\perp\perp}$. The set of all orthoclosed subsets of an orthogonality space forms a complete ortholattice $L(O, \perp)$, with meets given by intersection and joins given by $X \vee Y = (X^\perp \cap Y^\perp)^\perp$. The smallest element of $L(O, \perp)$ is \emptyset and the greatest element of $L(O, \perp)$ is O . We say that $L(O, \perp)$ is the *logic* of O .

Let (O, \perp) be an orthogonality space, let X be an orthoclosed subset of O . A maximal pairwise orthogonal subset of X is called a *basis* of X .

In his PhD. thesis, J.C. Dacey proved the following theorem.

Theorem 3.3. [4] *Let (O, \perp) be an orthogonality space. Then $L(O, \perp)$ is an orthomodular lattice if and only if for every orthoclosed subset X of O and every basis B of X , $X = B^{\perp\perp}$.*

An orthogonality space satisfying the condition of Theorem 3.3 is called a *Dacey space*. A orthoclosed subset X in an orthogonality space such that $X = B^{\perp\perp}$, for every basis B of X is called a *Dacey set*.

Example 3.4. Consider orthogonality spaces G_1, G_2 (Figure 2). The logic of G_1 is a 4-element Boolean algebra, hence an orthomodular lattice, so G_1 is Dacey. The logic of G_2 is a hexagon, which is not an orthomodular lattice. Therefore, by Theorem 3.3, G_2 is not Dacey. To see this directly, consider the orthoclosed subset $\{b, d\}$. Then $\{b\}$ is a basis of $\{b, d\}$. However,

$$\{b\}^{\perp\perp} = \{a, c\}^\perp = \{b\} \neq \{b, c\},$$

so $\{b, d\}$ is a non-Dacey orthoclosed set.

Lemma 3.5. *Let X be an orthoclosed subset an orthogonality space. The following are equivalent.*

- (a) X is Dacey.
- (b) For every basis B of X , $B^\perp = X^\perp$.

(c) For every basis B of X , $B^\perp \subseteq X^\perp$.

Proof

(a) \implies (b): $B^\perp = B^{\perp\perp\perp} = X^\perp$.

(b) \implies (c): Trivial.

(c) \implies (a): Since $B^\perp \subseteq X^\perp$, $X = X^{\perp\perp} \subseteq B^{\perp\perp}$. Since $B \subset X$, $B^{\perp\perp} \subseteq X^{\perp\perp} = X$. Since $X \subseteq B^{\perp\perp}$ and $B^{\perp\perp} \subseteq X$, $B^{\perp\perp} = X$ and X is Dacey. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let X_1, X_2 be two Dacey subsets of an orthogonality space (O, \perp) with $X_1 \perp X_2$. If $X_1 \cup X_2$ is orthoclosed, then $X_1 \cup X_2$ is Dacey.*

Proof Let B be a basis of $X_1 \cup X_2$. We claim that $B \cap X_1$ is a basis of X_1 . Since B is pairwise orthogonal, $B \cap X_1$ is pairwise orthogonal. Suppose that $B \cap X_1$ is not a basis of X_1 , and let $x \in (X_1 \setminus B)$ be such that $x \perp (B \cap X_1)$. Then $X_1 \perp X_2$ implies that $x \perp X_2 \supseteq B \cap X_2$ and thus

$$x \perp (B \cap X_1) \cup (B \cap X_2) = B \cap (X_1 \cup X_2) = B.$$

This contradicts the maximality of B in $X_1 \cup X_2$, hence $B \cap X_1$ is a basis of X_1 . Similarly, $B \cap X_2$ is a basis of X_2 .

Since X_1 and X_2 are Dacey, we may use Lemma 3.5 (b) to compute

$$\begin{aligned} B^\perp &= (B \cap (X_1 \cup X_2))^\perp = ((B \cap X_1) \cup (B \cap X_2))^\perp = \\ &= (B \cap X_1)^\perp \cap (B \cap X_2)^\perp = X_1^\perp \cap X_2^\perp = (X_1 \cup X_2)^\perp \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 3.5 (b), we see that $X_1 \cup X_2$ is Dacey. \square

4 Orthogonality spaces associated with posets

In this section, we will associate to every poset P an orthospace. For a finite bounded poset, we will prove that this orthospace is Dacey if and only if the poset is a lattice.

For a poset P , we write $Q^+(P)$ for the set of all pairs $(a, b) \in P \times P$ with $a < b$. In lattice theory, the elements of $Q^+(A)$ are called *proper quotients*.

An element $(a, b) \in Q^+(P)$ is denoted by $[a < b]$. A quotient (a, b) is usually denoted by b/a but $[a < b]$ will be more handy for our purposes. For $[a < b], [c < d] \in Q^+(P)$, we write $[a < b] \leq [c < d]$ if $c \leq a < b \leq d$. Note that $(Q^+(P), \leq)$ is a subposet of the poset $P^* \times P$, where P^* is the dual poset of P and that $(Q^+(P), \leq)$ is isomorphic to the poset of non-singleton closed intervals in P , ordered by inclusion.

For $[a < b], [c < d] \in Q^+(P)$ we write $[a < b] \perp [c < d]$ if $b \leq c$ or $d \leq a$, see Figure 3. Clearly, \perp is symmetric and irreflexive, so $(Q^+(P), \perp)$ is an orthogonality space. Note that \emptyset is orthoclosed in $(Q^+(P), \perp)$.

We equipped $Q^+(P)$ with two relations: the orthogonality \perp and the partial order \leq . Various classes of posets equipped with an orthogonality relation were considered in [2]. In the terminology of that paper, every $(Q^+(P), \perp, \leq)$ is a *poset with a strong degenerate orthogonality*.




Fig. 3 The orthogonality relation in $Q^+(P)$

Lemma 4.1. *Let P be a poset, let*

$$B = \{[a_1 < a_2], \dots, [a_{2n-1} < a_{2n}]\}$$

be a finite pairwise orthogonal subset of $Q^+(P)$. Then $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2n}\}$ are pairwise comparable.

Proof Note that whenever $[a < b] \perp [c < d]$, the elements in the set $\{a, b, c, d\}$ are pairwise comparable. The rest follows by an easy induction. \square

Observe that $[u < v] \leq [a < b] \perp [c < d]$ implies that $[u < v] \perp [c < d]$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let P be a poset. Every orthoclosed subset of $(Q^+(P), \perp)$ is a lower set in $(Q^+(P), \leq)$.*

Proof Let X be an orthoclosed subset of $(Q^+(P), \perp)$. Let $[a < b] \in X$ and $[u < v] \leq [a < b]$. We need to prove that $[u < v] \in X = X^{\perp\perp}$, that means, for all $[c < d] \in Q^+(P)$, $[c < d] \perp X$ implies $[c < d] \perp [u < v]$. However, this is easy: if $[c < d] \perp X$, then $[c < d] \perp [a < b]$ and since $[u < v] \leq [a < b]$, $[c < d] \perp [u < v]$. \square

Let U be a subset of a poset P . We denote

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(U) &= \{[a < b] \in Q^+(P) \mid b \in U\} \\ \beta(U) &= \{[a < b] \in Q^+(P) \mid a \in U\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for all $[x < y] \in Q^+(P)$,

$$\begin{aligned} [x < y]^\perp &= \tau(x^\downarrow) \cup \beta(y^\uparrow) \\ [x < y]^\downarrow &= \beta(x^\uparrow) \cap \tau(y^\downarrow). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.3.

- (a) For every lower set I of a lower-bounded poset P , $\tau(I)^\perp = \beta(I^\uparrow)$.
 (b) For every upper set F of an upper-bounded poset P , $\beta(F)^\perp = \tau(F^\downarrow)$.

Proof (a) Let us prove that $\tau(I)^\perp \subseteq \beta(I^\uparrow)$. Let $[x < y] \in \tau(I)^\perp$. We need to prove that $[x < y] \in \beta(I^\uparrow)$, that means that, for all $b \in I$, $b \leq x$. If $b = 0$, there is nothing to prove, so let us assume that $0 < b$. Then $[0 < b] \in \tau(I)$, so $[0 < b] \perp [x < y]$ and this clearly implies $b \leq x$.

For the opposite inclusion, let $[x < y] \in \beta(I^\uparrow)$, meaning that $x \in I^\uparrow$. For all $[a < b] \in \tau(I)$, $b \in I$ and thus $b \leq x$. Therefore, $[a < b] \perp [x < y]$ and hence $[x < y] \in \tau(I)^\perp$.

(b) Dually. □

Corollary 4.4. For every lower set I of a bounded poset P , $\tau(I)^{\perp\perp} = \tau(I^{\uparrow\downarrow})$

Proof Using (a) and (b) of Lemma 4.3,

$$\tau(I)^{\perp\perp} = \beta(I^\uparrow)^\perp = \tau(I^{\uparrow\downarrow})$$
□

Corollary 4.5. Let P be a poset. For every $[x < y] \in Q^+(P)$,

$$[x < y]^{\perp\perp} = [x < y]^\downarrow$$

Proof By Corollary 4.4,

$$\begin{aligned} [x < y]^{\perp\perp} &= (\tau(x^\downarrow) \cup \beta(y^\uparrow))^\perp = (\tau(x^\downarrow)^\perp) \cap (\beta(y^\uparrow)^\perp) = \\ &= (\beta(x^{\downarrow\uparrow}) \cap \tau(y^{\uparrow\downarrow})) = \beta(x^\uparrow) \cap \tau(y^\downarrow) = [x < y]^\downarrow \end{aligned}$$
□

Lemma 4.6. Let P be a poset. For every $[x < y] \in Q^+(P)$, $[x < y]^\downarrow$ is Dacey.

Proof By Corollary 4.5, $[x < y]^\downarrow$ is orthoclosed.

Let B be a basis of $[x < y]^\downarrow$. Since B is pairwise orthogonal, we may write

$$B = \{[c_1 < d_1], \dots, [c_k < d_k]\}$$

and by Lemma 4.1 we may assume without loss of generality that $d_i \leq c_{i+1}$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. If $x < c_1$, then $[x < c_1] \perp B$ and B is not maximal pairwise orthogonal, so $x = c_1$. Similarly, $d_k = y$ and, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, $d_i = c_{i+1}$. It is now obvious that $[p < q] \in B^\perp$ implies either $q \leq c_1 = x$ or $y = d_k \leq p$, so $[p < q] \in [x < y]^\perp = ([x < y]^\downarrow)^\perp$. Therefore, $B^\perp \subseteq ([x < y]^\downarrow)^\perp$ and by Lemma 3.5 (c), this implies that $[x < y]^\downarrow$ is Dacey. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let P be a lattice and let X be an orthoclosed subset of $Q^+(P)$.*

Let $[a < b], [c < d] \in X$ be such that $[a < b] \not\perp [c < d]$. Then

(a) $\{[a < b], [c < d]\}^\perp = \beta((b \vee d)^\uparrow) \cup \tau((a \wedge c)^\downarrow)$

(b) $[a \wedge c < b \vee d] \in X$

Proof

- (a) The inclusion $\{[a < b], [c < d]\}^\perp \supseteq \beta((b \vee d)^\uparrow) \cup \tau((a \wedge c)^\downarrow)$ is clear, let us prove the other one. Let $[x < y] \in \{[a < b], [c < d]\}^\perp$. Since $[x < y] \perp [a < b]$, either $b \leq x$ or $y \leq a$.

Suppose that $b \leq x$. Since $[x < y] \perp [c < d]$, either $y \leq c$ or $d \leq x$. If $y \leq c$ then $a < b \leq x < y \leq c < d$, which contradicts $[a < b] \not\perp [c < d]$. Therefore, $d \leq x$, so $b \vee d \leq x$ meaning that $[x < y] \in \beta((b \vee d)^\uparrow)$.

Similarly $y \leq a$ implies that $y \leq a \wedge c$, hence $[x < y] \in \tau((a \wedge c)^\downarrow)$.

- (b) Clearly,

$$\beta((b \vee d)^\uparrow) \cup \tau((a \wedge c)^\downarrow) = [a \wedge c < b \vee d]^\perp.$$

Therefore by (a), $[x < y] \in \{[a < b], [c < d]\}^\perp$ implies that $[x < y] \perp [a \wedge c < b \vee d]$, so

$$[a \wedge c < b \vee d] \in \{[a < b], [c < d]\}^{\perp\perp} \subseteq X^{\perp\perp} = X.$$

□

Lemma 4.8. *Let P be a poset, let X be an orthoclosed subset of $Q^+(P)$. If $[p < q_2], [q_1 < r] \in X$ and $q_1 \leq q_2$ and $p < r$, then $[p < r] \in X$.*

Proof Let $[x < y] \in Q^+(P)$ be such that $[x < y] \in \{[p < q_2], [q_1 < r]\}^\perp$. We shall prove that this implies $y \leq p$ or $r \leq x$. Indeed, assume that $y \not\leq p$ and $r \not\leq x$. Then $[x < y] \perp [p < q_2]$ implies $q_2 \leq x$ and $[x < y] \perp [q_1 < r]$ implies $y \leq q_1$. Hence $q_2 \leq x < y \leq q_1$ and this contradicts $q_1 \leq q_2$.

We have proved that $y \leq p$ or $r \leq x$ and each of these implies $[x < y] \perp [p < r]$. Therefore,

$$[p < r] \in \{[p < q_2], [q_1 < r]\}^{\perp\perp} \subseteq X^{\perp\perp} = X$$

□

Let P be a finite poset. We say that an lower subset X of $(Q^+(P), \leq)$ is of *chain type* if for all pairs $[a < b] \neq [c < d]$ of maximal elements of X of $Q^+(P)$, we have $[a < b] \perp [c < d]$ and either $b < c$ or $d < a$.

Lemma 4.9. *Let P be a finite poset. Every $X \subset Q^+(P)$ of a chain type is Dacey.*

Proof Let us prove that X is orthoclosed. Write

$$\max(X) = \{[a_1 < a_2], \dots, [a_{2n-1} < a_{2n}]\}.$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $a_1 < a_2 < a_3 < \dots < a_{2n-1} < a_{2n}$. Obviously,

$$X = [a_1 < a_2]^\downarrow \cup \dots \cup [a_{2n-1} < a_{2n}]^\downarrow$$

Note that

$$\max(X)^\perp = \tau(a_1^\downarrow) \cup [a_2 < a_3]^\downarrow \cup [a_4 < a_5]^\downarrow \cup \cdots \cup [a_{2n-2} < a_{2n-1}]^\downarrow \cup \beta(a_{2n}^\uparrow).$$

It is easy to see that $X = \max(X)^{\perp\perp}$. In particular, X is orthoclosed.

To prove that X is Dacey, we shall use induction with respect to n .

If $n = 0$, then $X = \emptyset$ and X is Dacey.

Let $n > 0$.

Put $X_1 = [a_{2n-1} < a_{2n}]^\downarrow$, $X_2 = X \setminus ([a_{2n-1} < a_{2n}]^\downarrow)$ and note that $X_1 \perp X_2$. By Lemma 4.6, $[a_{2n-1} < a_{2n}]^\downarrow$ is Dacey. The set X_2 is of a chain type, hence X_2 is Dacey by induction hypothesis. The conditions of Lemma 3.6 are satisfied, hence $X = X_1 \cup X_2$ is Dacey. □

Theorem 4.10. *Let P be a finite bounded poset. The following are equivalent.*

- (a) P is a lattice.
- (b) Every orthoclosed subset of $Q^+(P)$ is of chain type.
- (c) $Q^+(P)$ is Dacey.
- (d) $L(Q^+(P))$ is an orthomodular lattice.

Proof

(a) \implies (b): Let X be an orthoclosed subset of $Q^+(P)$, let $[a < b], [c < d] \in \max(X)$ with $[a < b] \neq [c < d]$. Let us prove that $[a < b] \perp [c < d]$. Assume the contrary; by Lemma 4.7 (b), $[a \wedge c < b \vee d] \in X$. As $[a < b] \leq [a \wedge c < b \vee d]$ and $[a < b]$ is maximal in X , $[a < b] = [a \wedge c < b \vee d]$. This implies $a = a \wedge c$ and $b = b \vee d$, in other words, $a \leq c$ and $d \leq b$ so $[c < d] \leq [a < b]$, hence $[c < d] = [a < b]$ because $[c < d]$ is maximal in $Q^+(P)$ and we have reached the desired contradiction.

From $[a < b] \perp [c < d]$ it follows that either $b \leq c$ or $d \leq a$. Assume that $b = c$. Then, by Lemma 4.8, $[a < d] \in X$ and this contradicts the maximality of $[a < b]$ and $[b < c]$ in X .

(b) \implies (c): By Lemma 4.9.

(c) \implies (a): Suppose that P is a non-lattice. We need to prove that $Q^+(P)$ is not Dacey. By Fact 2.1, since P is a non-lattice, there exists a lower set I of P with $I = I^{\uparrow\downarrow}$ such that I has at least two maximal elements. Let a, b be two distinct maximal elements of I . By Corollary 4.4,

$$\tau(I)^{\perp\perp} = \tau(I^{\uparrow\downarrow}) = \tau(I),$$

hence $\tau(I)$ is orthoclosed. Clearly, $\{[0 < a]\}$ is a basis of $\tau(I)$ and we may apply Lemma 4.3 to compute

$$\{[0 < a]\}^{\perp\perp} = (\beta(a^\uparrow))^\perp = \tau(a^{\uparrow\downarrow}) = \tau(a^\downarrow).$$

However, as $[0 < b] \notin \tau(a^\downarrow)$, $\tau(a^\downarrow) \neq I$. Therefore, $(Q^+(P), \perp)$ is not Dacey.

(c) \Leftrightarrow (d): By Theorem 3.3. □

Example 4.11. Consider the bounded poset P on the left side of Figure 4. Since it is a non-lattice, Theorem 4.10 tells us that $(Q^+(P), \perp)$ is not a Dacey space or, equivalently, that $L(Q^+(P), \perp)$ is not orthomodular. Hence $L(Q^+(P), \perp)$ must contain a hexagon as its sub-ortholattice. One of such




Fig. 4 A non-lattice poset and a sub-ortholattice of its logic

hexagons is depicted on the right side of Figure 4. To see more directly that $(Q^+(P), \perp)$ is not a Dacey space, just consider the orthoclosed set $\{[0 < a], [0 < b]\}$ and its basis $\{[0 < a]\}$.

Theorem 4.12. *Let P be a bounded poset. Then P is a chain if and only if $L(Q^+(P))$ is a Boolean algebra.*

Proof Suppose that P is a chain. $L(Q^+(P))$ is a Boolean algebra if and only if, for all orthoclosed subsets X, Y ,

$$X \cap Y = \emptyset \implies X \perp Y$$

Assume the contrary, that means, $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ and X, Y are not orthogonal. There are $[x_1 < x_2] \in X$ and $[y_1 < y_2] \in Y$ such that $[x_1 < x_2] \not\perp [y_1 < y_2]$. As $[x_1 < x_2] \not\perp [y_1 < y_2]$, we see that $x_2 \not\leq y_1$ and $y_2 \not\leq x_1$. Since P is a chain, this is equivalent to $y_1 < x_2$ and $x_1 < y_2$.

(Case 1) $x_1 \leq y_1$: we see that $x_1 \leq y_1 < x_2$, hence $[y_1 < x_2] \leq [x_1 \leq x_2]$ and $[y_1 < x_2] \in X$.

(Case 1a) $y_2 \leq x_2$: this implies $x_1 \leq y_1 < y_2 \leq x_2$, hence $[y_1 < y_2] \in X$ and X, Y are not disjoint.

(Case 1b) $x_2 < y_2$: we see that $x_1 \leq y_1 < x_2 \leq y_2$, hence $[y_1 < x_2] \leq [y_1 < y_2] \in Y$ and $[y_1 < x_2] \in X$ and X, Y are not disjoint.

(Case 2) $y_1 < x_1$: we see that $y_1 < x_1 < x_2$.

(Case 2a) $x_2 \leq y_2$: this implies $y_1 < x_1 < x_2 \leq y_2$, hence $[x_1 < x_2] \leq [y_1 < y_2]$ and $[x_1 < x_2] \in Y$ and X, Y are not disjoint.

(Case 2b) $y_2 < x_2$: this implies $y_1 < x_1 < y_2 < x_2$, hence $[x_1 < y_2] \leq [x_1 < x_2] \in X$ and $[x_1 < y_2] \leq [y_1 < y_2] \in Y$ and X, Y are not disjoint.

Suppose that P is not a chain. Let a, b be incomparable elements of P . Then $[a < 1]^\downarrow$ and $[0 < b]^\downarrow$ are disjoint elements of $L(Q^+(P))$ that are not orthogonal. Hence $L(Q^+(P))$ is not a Boolean algebra. \square

Let us remark that Theorem 4.12 is not true if we do not assume that P is bounded. To see this, let P be a two-element antichain. Then $Q^+(P)$ is empty and $L(Q^+(P), \perp)$ is a two-element Boolean algebra.

5 Connections to other constructions

Let us extend our $[x < y]$ notation to an arbitrary finite number of elements: if $C = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a finite chain in a poset P , we write $C = [x_1 < \dots < x_n]$ to indicate the partial order.

The following construction was discovered by Kalmbach in [5]. Let P be a bounded lattice, write

$$K(P) = \{C : C \text{ is a finite chain in } P \text{ with even number of elements}\}$$

Define a partial order on $K(P)$ by the following rule:

$$[x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{2n-1} < x_{2n}] \leq [y_1 < y_2 < \dots < y_{2k-1} < y_{2k}]$$

if for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ there is $1 \leq j \leq k$ such that

$$y_{2j-1} \leq x_{2i-1} < x_{2i} \leq y_{2j}.$$

Define a unary operation $C \mapsto C^\perp$ on $K(P)$ to be the symmetric difference with the set $\{0, 1\}$.

Theorem 5.1. [5] *For every bounded lattice P , $K(P)$ is an orthomodular lattice.*

The lattice $K(P)$ is called *the Kalmbach construction*.

Theorem 5.2. *For every finite lattice P , $K(P) \simeq L(Q^+(P), \perp)$.*

Proof For $C = [x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{2n-1} < x_{2n}] \in K(P)$, write $f(C) = [x_1 < x_2]^\perp \cup \dots \cup [x_{2n-1} < x_{2n}]^\perp$. Then $f(C)$ is a lower subset of $Q^+(P)$ the chain type. By Lemma 4.9, $f(C)$ is Dacey and hence orthoclosed. Obviously, f is isotone, $f(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ and $f(P) = f([0 < 1]) = [0 < 1]^\perp = Q^+(P)$, hence $f: K(P) \rightarrow L(Q^+(P), \perp)$ is an isotone mapping preserving the bounds. Moreover, f preserves the complementation. There are four cases to check, each of the cases consisting of a conjunction of one of $(0 \in C, 0 \notin C)$ and one of $(1 \in C, 1 \notin C)$. We will check one of the cases, the remaining three are very similar.

Suppose that $0 \in C$, $1 \notin C$, that means, $0 = x_1$ and $x_{2n} < 1$:

$$f(C) = f([0 < x_2 < \dots < x_{2n-1} < x_{2n}]) = [0 < x_2]^\perp \cup \dots \cup [x_{2n-1} < x_{2n}]^\perp$$

Then

$$f(C^\perp) = f([x_2 < x_3 < \dots < x_{2n} < 1]) = [x_2 < x_3]^\perp \cup \dots \cup [x_{2n} < 1]^\perp$$

It is easy to see that $f(C)^\perp = f(C^\perp)$.

Let us construct an isotone map inverse to f . Let X be an orthoclosed subset of $Q^+(P)$. By Theorem 4.10, X is of the chain type. Write $\max(X) = \{[x_1 < x_2], \dots, [x_{2n-1} < x_{2n}]\}$ and assume, without loss of generality, that $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{2n-1} < x_{2n}$. This chain is an element of $K(P)$, put $g(X) = [x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{2n-1} < x_{2n}]$. It is easy to check g is isotone, preserves the bounds and preserves the orthocomplementation. \square

For general infinite lattices, Theorem 5.2 is not true. For example, for the real unit interval $[0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$, the Kalmbach construction $K([0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}})$ is not a complete lattice, whereas every $L(Q^+(P), \perp)$ is a complete lattice.

For every poset P , its Dedekind-MacNeille completion \widehat{P} can be represented as the complete lattice of all lower sets I with $I = I^{\uparrow\downarrow}$. For a family $(I_j)_{j \in H}$ of elements of \widehat{P} , their meet is their intersection and their join is the closure of their union:

$$\bigvee_{j \in H} I_j = (\bigcup_{j \in H} I_j)^{\uparrow\downarrow}$$

By Corollary 4.4, for every lower set I we have $\tau(I)^{\perp\perp} = \tau(I^{\uparrow\downarrow})$. In particular, $\tau(I^{\uparrow\downarrow})$ is orthoclosed. Therefore, for every $I \in \widehat{P}$, $\tau(I)$ is orthoclosed.

Theorem 5.3. *For every bounded poset P , $\tau: \widehat{P} \rightarrow L(Q^+(P), \perp)$ is an injective morphism of complete lattices.*

Proof Clearly, τ is injective and preserves the bounds of \widehat{P} . Let $(I_j)_{j \in H}$ be a family of elements of \widehat{P} . Clearly,

$$\tau(\bigcap_{j \in H} I_j) = \bigcap_{j \in H} \tau(I_j)$$

so τ preserves all meets. For joins, we may compute

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee_{j \in H} \tau(I_j) &= (\bigcup_{j \in H} \tau(I_j))^{\perp\perp} = (\bigcap_{j \in H} \tau(I_j)^{\perp})^{\perp} = (\bigcap_{j \in H} \beta(I_j^{\uparrow}))^{\perp} = \\ &= \beta((\bigcup_{j \in H} I_j)^{\uparrow})^{\perp} = \tau((\bigcup_{j \in H} I_j)^{\uparrow\downarrow}) = \tau(\bigvee_{j \in H} I_j) \end{aligned}$$

□

Let us close with a conjecture.

Conjecture 1. There exists an infinite bounded non-lattice P such that $(Q^+(P), \perp)$ is Dacey.

Declarations

Funding: This research is supported by grants VEGA 2/0142/20 and 1/0006/19, Slovakia and by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under the contracts APVV-18-0052 and APVV-20-0069.

Other support: The author expresses his gratitude for the possibility to present this material on the conference SSAOS 2022 in Tatranská Lomnica.

Conflict of interest/Competing interest: None.

Availability of data and material: Not applicable.

Code availability: Not applicable.

Authors' contributions: There is a single author.

References

- [1] Garrett Birkhoff. *Lattice theory*, volume 25. American Mathematical Soc., 1948.
- [2] Gianpiero Cattaneo and Alessandro Manià. Abstract orthogonality and orthocomplementation. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 76(1):115–132, 1974.
- [3] R Cignoli. Deductive systems and congruence relations in ortholattices, in,” math. logic. In *Proc. 1st Brazil Conf.* Dekker, New York, 1978.
- [4] James Charles Dacey Jr. *Orthomodular spaces*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst, 1968.
- [5] Gudrun Kalmbach. Orthomodular lattices do not satisfy any special lattice equation. *Archiv der Mathematik*, 28(1):7–8, 1977.
- [6] László Lovász. Kneser’s conjecture, chromatic number, and homotopy. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 25(3):319–324, 1978.
- [7] Holbrook Mann MacNeille. Partially ordered sets. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 42(3):416–460, 1937.
- [8] Jan Paseka and Thomas Vetterlein. Categories of orthogonality spaces. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 226(3), 2022. Cited by: 1; All Open Access, Green Open Access, Hybrid Gold Open Access.
- [9] Jan Paseka and Thomas Vetterlein. Normal orthogonality spaces. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 507(1), 2022. Cited by: 0; All Open Access, Green Open Access, Hybrid Gold Open Access.
- [10] James W Walker. From graphs to ortholattices and equivariant maps. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 35(2):171–192, 1983.
- [11] Alexander Wilce. Test spaces. In Kurt Engesser, Dov M Gabbay, and Daniel Lehmann, editors, *Handbook of quantum logic and quantum structures: Quantum structures*. Elsevier, 2011.