

Some properties of congruence lattices of path semigroups*

Yongle Luo^a, Zhengpan Wang^b and Jiaqun Wei^{a†}

^a*School of Mathematical Sciences, Nanjing Normal University, 210023 Nanjing, China*

^b*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Southwest University, 400715 Chongqing, China*

E-mail: yongleluo@nnu.edu.cn, zpwang@swu.edu.cn, weijiaqun@njnu.edu.cn

Abstract

Each quiver corresponds to a path semigroup, and such a path semigroup also corresponds to an associative K -algebra over an algebraically closed field K . Let Q be a quiver and S , KQ be its path semigroup, path algebra, respectively. In this paper, we studied some properties of the congruence lattice of S . First, we showed that there is a one-to-one correspondence between congruences on S and certain algebraic ideals of KQ . Based on such a description, we considered acyclic quivers and showed that the congruence lattices of such path semigroups are strong upper semimodular but not necessarily lower semimodular. Moreover, we provided some equivalent conditions for the congruence lattices to be modular and distributive.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 20M10, 16D25, 06C99, 06D99, 05C20

Keywords: path semigroups; path algebras; congruence lattices; algebraic ideals; modular lattices; distributive lattices.

1 Introduction and main results

Throughout this article, K will denote an arbitrary algebraically closed field. It is well known that each basic finite dimensional K -algebra corresponds to a graphical structure, which is called a quiver (directed graph). Conversely, each quiver corresponds to an associative K -algebra, which is finite dimensional under some

*Supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11771212) and Postgraduate Research & Practice Innovation Program of Jiangsu Province.

†Corresponding author

conditions. Gabriel [6] and Grothendieck [8] introduced the notions of quivers and linear representation theory. The modern representation theory of associative K -algebra has since developed rapidly.

A *quiver* $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t)$ is a quadruple consisting of two sets: Q_0 (whose elements are called *vertices*) and Q_1 (whose elements are called *arrows*), and two maps $s, t : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$ which associate to each arrow $\alpha \in Q_1$ its *source* $s(\alpha) \in Q_0$ and its *target* $t(\alpha) \in Q_0$, respectively. A quiver is usually denoted briefly by Q .

A *path* of length $n \geq 1$ in Q is a sequence $\alpha := \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_n$ of arrows such that $t(\alpha_i) = s(\alpha_{i+1})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. In particular, we also view a vertex a of Q_0 as a path of length 0 with $s(a) = t(a) = a$. We also call the vertex a a *trivial path* and denote it by e_a . A nontrivial path α is called a *cycle* if $s(\alpha) = t(\alpha)$. A quiver Q is called *acyclic* if it contains no cycles.

The *path semigroup* S of Q is the semigroup with zero generated by Q_0 and Q_1 . Nonzero elements in S are all paths in Q . For any paths $\alpha = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m, \beta = \beta_1 \cdots \beta_n$, the multiplication is defined naturally as follows:

$$\alpha \cdot \beta = \delta_{t(\alpha_m), s(\beta_1)} \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m \beta_1 \cdots \beta_n,$$

where $\delta_{t(\alpha_m), s(\beta_1)}$ denotes the Kronecker delta.

The *path algebra* KQ of Q is the K -algebra whose underlying K -vector space has as its basis the set of all paths in Q , that is, KQ is the semigroup algebra generated by $S \setminus \{0\}$. Recall from the representation theory [2, Theorem 3.7 of Chapter II], each basic and connected finite dimensional K -algebra is isomorphic to KQ/I , where I is an admissible ideal of KQ . From this perspective, each finite dimensional K -algebra is determined by some path semigroup. In order to understand more about algebras, it is necessary to study more properties of path semigroups.

There are many papers about path semigroups. Guo and Zheng [10] used a categorical characterization of path semigroups, which showed that path semigroups are precisely the free objects in the category of locality semigroups with a rigid condition. Forsberg studied the effective dimensions of path semigroups over an uncountable field [5]. Path semigroups are related to partial semigroups (algebras) [4, 9], which are introduced to solve word problem. In addition, path semigroups also play an important role in the study of graph inverse semigroups [14], Leavitt path algebras [1] and C^* algebras [18].

The theory of congruence lattices is one of the main contents in the study of semigroups. There are a large number of papers related to congruence lattices of completely simple semigroups [12, 19], regular semigroups [11, 13, 17], inverse semigroups [3, 15, 16], and so on. However, there are few known properties of congruences and congruence lattices of path semigroups.

In the present paper, we mainly studied some properties of congruence lattices

of path semigroups. First, we described some properties of congruences on path semigroups. Let Q be an arbitrary quiver and S , KQ be its path semigroup, path algebra, respectively. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$, $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ the set of all congruences on S , the set of all *special algebraic ideals* of KQ (Subsection 2.3), respectively. The two posets partially ordered by containments are both complete lattices. We proved that there is a closed relationship between the two lattices.

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 3.5). *Let Q be a quiver and S , KQ be its path semigroup, path algebra, respectively. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S , and denote by $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ the lattice of special algebraic ideals of KQ . Then the lattices $\mathcal{C}(S)$ and $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ are isomorphic.*

An algebra A is *hereditary*, that is, every submodule of a projective A -module is projective. This kind of algebra has aroused great interests in representation theory. It turns out that a finite dimensional K -algebra A is basic, connected and hereditary if and only if $A \cong KQ$, where Q is a finite, connected and acyclic quiver [2, Theorem 1.7 of Chapter VII]. In the present paper, we mainly considered acyclic quivers, and proved the following results.

Theorem 1.2 (Theorem 3.10). *Let Q be an acyclic quiver and S be its path semigroup. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . Then the lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is strong upper semimodular but not necessarily lower semimodular.*

Besides, we provided the necessary and sufficient conditions for this lattice to be lower semimodular and modular, as follows:

Theorem 1.3 (Theorem 3.11). *Let Q be an acyclic quiver and S be its path semigroup. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *There are at most two paths from one vertex to another.*
- (2) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is modular.*
- (3) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is strong lower semimodular.*
- (4) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is lower semimodular.*

In addition, we also described the necessary and sufficient conditions for the lattice to be distributive:

Theorem 1.4 (Theorem 3.12). *Let Q be an acyclic quiver and S be its path semigroup. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *There is at most one path from one vertex to another.*
- (2) *Each congruence $\rho \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ is a Rees congruence.*
- (3) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is distributive.*

Gabriel's theorem, a classical theorem in the representation theory, shows that a connected, finite dimensional hereditary algebra A is representation-finite (the number of the isomorphism classes of indecomposable finite dimensional A -modules is finite) if and only if $A \cong KQ$, where Q is a quiver whose underlying graph is one of the Dynkin graphs [2, Theorem 5.10 of Chapter VII]. The Dynkin graphs also appear in Lie theory. As an interesting application, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 1.5 (Corollary 3.14). *Let Q be a quiver and S be its path semigroup. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . If the underlying graph Q^* of Q is a tree, in particular, a Dynkin graph, then the lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is distributive.*

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Lattices

In this subsection, we recall some lattice theory from [7].

Let (L, \leq) be a poset and $a, b \in L$. We say that a *covers* b , and write $a \succ b$ or $b \prec a$, if $a > b$ and there is no element $c \in L$ such that $a > c > b$.

A poset L is called a *lattice* if, for all $a, b \in L$, there exists a least upper bound $a \vee b \in L$, called the *join* of a and b , and a greatest lower bound $a \wedge b \in L$, called the *meet* of a and b . Recall, that a lattice $L = (L, \leq, \vee, \wedge)$ is called

- (i) *distributive*, if $(a \vee b) \wedge c = (a \wedge c) \vee (b \wedge c)$ for all $a, b, c \in L$.
- (ii) *modular*, if $a \leq c$ implies that $(a \vee b) \wedge c = a \vee (b \wedge c)$ for all $a, b, c \in L$.
- (iii) *strong upper semimodular*, if $a \succ a \wedge b$ implies that $a \vee b \succ b$ for all $a, b \in L$.
- (iv) *strong lower semimodular*, if $a \vee b \succ a$ implies that $b \succ a \wedge b$ for all $a, b \in L$.
- (v) *upper semimodular*, if $a, b \succ a \wedge b$ together imply that $a \vee b \succ a, b$ for all $a, b \in L$.
- (vi) *lower semimodular*, if $a \vee b \succ a, b$ together imply that $a, b \succ a \wedge b$ for all $a, b \in L$.

It is clear that each distributive lattice is modular, and each modular lattice is both strong upper semimodular and strong lower semimodular. Every strong upper (lower) semimodular lattice is upper (lower) semimodular. But conversely, modular lattices are not always distributive. A lattice which is both strong upper semimodular and strong lower semimodular is not necessarily modular. Moreover, the upper (lower) semimodularity does not imply the strong upper (lower) semimodularity in general.

A sublattice L_1 of a lattice L is called a *pentagon*, respectively a *diamond*, if L_1 is isomorphic to \mathfrak{N}_5 , respectively to \mathfrak{M}_3 , shown in Figure 1. The following two lemmas character a lattice to be distributive or modular.

Lemma 2.1. [7, Theorem 101]) *A lattice L is distributive if and only if it does not contain a pentagon or a diamond.*

Lemma 2.2. [7, Theorem 102]) *A lattice L is modular if and only if it does not contain a pentagon.*




Figure 1: The lattices \mathfrak{N}_5 and \mathfrak{M}_3 .

Let $L_1 = (L_1, \leq_1)$ and $L_2 = (L_2, \leq_2)$ be any two lattices. We say that L_1 and L_2 are *isomorphic* if, there is a bijection $\phi : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ such that $a \leq_1 b$ in L_1 if and only if $a\phi \leq_2 b\phi$ in L_2 .

2.2 Congruences on semigroups

Let S be a semigroup. Recall that an equivalence ρ on S is called a *congruence*, if $(x, y) \in \rho$ implies that $(ax, ay) \in \rho$ and $(xa, ya) \in \rho$ for all $x, y, a \in S$. Let ρ be a congruence on S and $x \in S$. We denote by $x\rho$ the ρ -class containing x , that is, $x\rho = \{y \in S \mid (x, y) \in \rho\}$.

Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the set of all congruences on S . It is well known that the poset $\mathcal{C}(S)$ partially ordered by inclusions forms a bounded lattice, where the minimum of $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is the identical relation 1_S , and the maximum of $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is the universal relation $S \times S$.

A congruence ρ is called a *Rees congruence*, if ρ is generated by a semigroup ideal I , that is, $\rho = (I \times I) \cup 1_S$.

2.3 Quivers and path algebras

In this subsection, we recall some concepts about quivers and path algebras in [2].

Let $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t)$ be a quiver. The quiver Q is said to be *finite*, if both Q_0 and Q_1 are finite. A *subquiver* of Q is a quiver $Q' = (Q'_0, Q'_1, s', t')$ such that $Q'_0 \subseteq Q_0, Q'_1 \subseteq Q_1$, and s', t' equal to the restrictions of s and t , respectively.

The *underlying graph* Q^* of Q is obtained from Q by forgetting the orientation of the arrows. Let e_1, e_n be different vertices in Q . An *undirected path* between e_1 and e_n in Q^* is a sequence $(e_1, e_2)(e_2, e_3) \cdots (e_{n-1}, e_n)$ of undirected arrows, where each e_i is a vertex for any $1 \leq i \leq n$. The underlying graph Q^* of Q is called a *tree*, if there exists a unique undirected path between any different vertices in Q^* . In particular, Dynkin graphs are trees.

Denote by Q_n the set of all paths in Q of length n , $n \geq 0$. For the path semigroup of Q , it is easy to see that $Q_n \cdot Q_m \subseteq Q_{n+m} \cup \{0\}$. The set of all idempotents in the semigroup is $\{0\} \cup Q_0$.

A K -vector subspace I of KQ is called an *algebraic ideal*, if $KQ \cdot I \cdot KQ \subseteq I$. Let I be an algebraic ideal of KQ and $A \subseteq I$, we say that I is *generated* by A and write $I = \langle A \rangle$, if for any $x \in I$, x is a finite sum of elements of the form uav , where $u, v \in KQ$ and $a \in A$. Because every element in KQ is a finite sum of elements of the form $k\alpha$, where $k \in K$ and α is a path. Then $x = k_1 u_1 a_1 v_1 + \dots + k_m u_m a_m v_m$, where $k_i \in K$, u_i, v_i are paths and $a_i \in A$ for any $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Let Q be a quiver and KQ be its path algebra. For any path $\alpha \in Q$, we call the element $\rho = \alpha$ in KQ a *monomial relation*. For any paths $\alpha \neq \beta \in Q$ with $s(\alpha) = s(\beta)$ and $t(\alpha) = t(\beta)$, we call the element $\rho = \alpha - \beta$ in KQ a *commutative relation*. In this case, we also define $s(\rho) = s(\alpha)$ and $t(\rho) = t(\alpha)$. Monomial relations and commutative relations are called *relations*. Let ρ be a relation in KQ . Certainly, $\alpha\rho\beta = 0$ or $\alpha\rho\beta$ is a relation again for any paths α, β .

An algebraic ideal is called *special*, if it is the zero ideal or it can be generated by relations. Denote by $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ the set of all special algebraic ideals of KQ . For any I_1, I_2 in $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$, it is easy to see that $I_1 + I_2$ is also a special algebraic ideal. Moreover, it is a join of I_1 and I_2 , that is,

$$I_1 \vee I_2 = I_1 + I_2.$$

However, $I_1 \cap I_2$ is not necessarily generated by relations, hence it is not a special algebraic ideal in general (see Example 2). In fact, the meet of I_1 and I_2 is

$$I_1 \wedge I_2 = \langle \rho \in I_1 \cap I_2 \mid \rho \text{ is a relation} \rangle.$$

Note that 0 and KQ are both special algebraic ideals. Thus $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ is a bounded lattice.

Let A be any subset of KQ . We denote by $\text{span } A$ the K -vector subspace generated by A .

3 Proof of the main results

First, we give some properties of congruences on path semigroups, which will be needed for the proof of our main results.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Q be a quiver and S be its path semigroup. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . For any congruence $\rho \in \mathcal{C}(S)$, we have the following properties.*

(1) *If $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho$ and $\alpha \notin 0\rho$, then $s(\alpha) = s(\beta)$ and $t(\alpha) = t(\beta)$.*

(2) *If $(e, f) \in \rho$, where e, f are different vertices in Q , then $e, f \in 0\rho$.*

Proof. (1) If $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho$, then it follows from $(s(\alpha)\alpha, s(\alpha)\beta) \in \rho$ that $(\alpha, s(\alpha)\beta) \in \rho$. Note that $\alpha \notin 0\rho$. So we have $s(\alpha)\beta \neq 0$, that is, $s(\alpha) = s(\beta)$. Dually, we also have $t(\alpha) = t(\beta)$.

(2) Suppose that $e \notin 0\rho$. Hence, it follows from (1) that $s(e) = s(f) = e = f = t(e) = t(f)$, which is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let Q be a quiver and S, KQ be its path semigroup, path algebra, respectively. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . For any path β and any congruence $\rho \in \mathcal{C}(S)$, if there exist some elements $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m+p}, \beta_{m+1}, \dots, \beta_{m+p}$ in S , where m, p are both positive integers, such that the following holds:*

(i) $\beta = k_1\alpha_1 + \dots + k_m\alpha_m + k_{m+1}(\alpha_{m+1} - \beta_{m+1}) + \dots + k_{m+p}(\alpha_{m+p} - \beta_{m+p})$, where $k_i \in K \setminus \{0\}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq m+p$.

(ii) $\beta, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ are K -linearly independent.

(iii) $\alpha_{m+1} - \beta_{m+1}, \dots, \alpha_{m+p} - \beta_{m+p}$ are K -linearly independent, and $(\alpha_{m+j}, \beta_{m+j}) \in \rho$ for any $1 \leq j \leq p$.

Then there exists $x \in \{0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}$ such that $(\beta, x) \in \rho$, and

$$\beta - x \in \text{span} \{ \alpha_{m+1} - \beta_{m+1}, \dots, \alpha_{m+p} - \beta_{m+p} \}.$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on p . If $p = 1$, that is,

$$\beta = k_1\alpha_1 + \dots + k_m\alpha_m + k_{m+1}(\alpha_{m+1} - \beta_{m+1}),$$

then we obtain from the condition (ii) that $\beta = \alpha_{m+1}$ or $\beta = \beta_{m+1}$. Note that $\alpha_{m+1} - \beta_{m+1}$ is K -linearly independent, i.e., $\alpha_{m+1} \neq \beta_{m+1}$. If $\beta = \alpha_{m+1}$, then we have $k_{m+1} = 1$ and $0 = k_1\alpha_1 + \dots + k_m\alpha_m - \beta_{m+1}$. Since $k_i \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. It follows from (i) that $\beta_{m+1} \neq 0$ and there exists $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that $\beta_{m+1} = \alpha_i$. In this case, $(\beta, \alpha_i) = (\alpha_{m+1}, \beta_{m+1}) \in \rho$, and $\beta - \alpha_i \in \text{span} \{\alpha_{m+1} - \beta_{m+1}\}$. Similarly, if $\beta = \beta_{m+1}$, then $\alpha_{m+1} = \alpha_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$, the conclusion also holds.

So we may assume that the conclusion holds for any $1 \leq p \leq n$. Let

$$\beta = k_1\alpha_1 + \dots + k_m\alpha_m + k_{m+1}(\alpha_{m+1} - \beta_{m+1}) + \dots + k_{m+n+1}(\alpha_{m+n+1} - \beta_{m+n+1}).$$

Note that $\alpha_{m+j} \neq \beta_{m+j}$ for any $1 \leq j \leq n+1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\beta = \alpha_{m+1} = \dots = \alpha_{m+s}$ and $k_{m+1} + \dots + k_{m+s} = 1$, $1 \leq s \leq n+1$. By the condition (iii), we get that $\beta_{m+1}, \dots, \beta_{m+s}$ are different from each other.

If the intersection of the sets $\{0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}$ and $\{\beta_{m+1}, \dots, \beta_{m+s}\}$ is not empty, i.e., there exists $x \in \{0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}$ and β_{m+j} for some $1 \leq j \leq s$ such that $x = \beta_{m+j}$. Then we have $(\beta, x) = (\alpha_{m+j}, \beta_{m+j}) \in \rho$, and

$$\beta - x \in \text{span} \{\alpha_{m+1} - \beta_{m+1}, \dots, \alpha_{m+n+1} - \beta_{m+n+1}\}.$$

If the intersection of the sets $\{0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}$ and $\{\beta_{m+1}, \dots, \beta_{m+s}\}$ is empty, then $\beta, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, \beta_{m+1}, \dots, \beta_{m+s}$ are different paths, that is, they are K -linearly independent. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= k_1\alpha_1 + \dots + k_m\alpha_m - k_{m+1}\beta_{m+1} - \dots - k_{m+s}\beta_{m+s} \\ &\quad + k_{m+s+1}(\alpha_{m+s+1} - \beta_{m+s+1}) + \dots + k_{m+n+1}(\alpha_{m+n+1} - \beta_{m+n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

We can easily see that $1 \leq s \leq n$. Indeed, if $s = n+1$, then

$$0 = k_1\alpha_1 + \dots + k_m\alpha_m - k_{m+1}\beta_{m+1} - \dots - k_{m+n+1}\beta_{m+n+1}.$$

Since $k_i \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m+n+1$, we get a contradiction that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, \beta_{m+1}, \dots, \beta_{m+s}$ are K -linearly dependent. Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{m+s} &= \frac{1}{k_{m+s}} [k_1\alpha_1 + \dots + k_m\alpha_m - k_{m+1}\beta_{m+1} - \dots - k_{m+s-1}\beta_{m+s-1} \\ &\quad + k_{m+s+1}(\alpha_{m+s+1} - \beta_{m+s+1}) + \dots + k_{m+n+1}(\alpha_{m+n+1} - \beta_{m+n+1})]. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, there exists $x \in \{0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, \beta_{m+1}, \dots, \beta_{m+s-1}\}$ such that $(\beta_{m+s}, x) \in \rho$, and

$$\beta_{m+s} - x \in \text{span} \{\alpha_{m+s+1} - \beta_{m+s+1}, \dots, \alpha_{m+n+1} - \beta_{m+n+1}\}.$$

Since $\beta = \alpha_{m+s}$, and $(\alpha_{m+s}, \beta_{m+s}) \in \rho$, we have $(\beta, x) \in \rho$. Moreover,

$$\beta - x = (\beta - \beta_{m+s}) + (\beta_{m+s} - x) = (\alpha_{m+s} - \beta_{m+s}) + (\beta_{m+s} - x),$$

we have $\beta - x \in \text{span} \{\alpha_{m+1} - \beta_{m+1}, \dots, \alpha_{m+n+1} - \beta_{m+n+1}\}$.

Finally, we need to prove that $x \in \{0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}$. Indeed, if $x = \beta_{m+j}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq s-1$, note that $\alpha_{m+s} = \alpha_{m+j}$, then we get from

$$-(\alpha_{m+s} - \beta_{m+s}) + (\alpha_{m+j} - \beta_{m+j}) = \beta_{m+s} - \beta_{m+j} = \beta_{m+s} - x$$

and

$$\beta_{m+s} - x \in \text{span} \{\alpha_{m+s+1} - \beta_{m+s+1}, \dots, \alpha_{m+n+1} - \beta_{m+n+1}\}$$

that $\alpha_{m+1} - \beta_{m+1}, \dots, \alpha_{m+n+1} - \beta_{m+n+1}$ are K -linearly dependent, which is a contradiction.

This finishes the proof of the Lemma. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let Q be a quiver and S, KQ be its path semigroup, path algebra, respectively. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . For any path β and any congruence $\rho \in \mathcal{C}(S)$, if there exist some elements $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m$ in S , where m is a positive integer and $(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \in \rho$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, such that*

$$\beta = k_1(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) + \dots + k_m(\alpha_m - \beta_m),$$

where $k_i \in K \setminus \{0\}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $\alpha_1 - \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_m - \beta_m$ are K -linearly independent. Then $(\beta, 0) \in \rho$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on m . If $m = 1$, that is, $\beta = k_1(\alpha_1 - \beta_1)$, then we easily obtain that $\beta = \alpha_1$ or $\beta = \beta_1$. For the former case, $k_1 = 1$ and $\beta_1 = 0$. For the latter case, $k_1 = -1$ and $\alpha_1 = 0$. The assertion holds.

Suppose that the assertion holds for any $1 \leq m \leq n$. Now we consider the case when $\beta = k_1(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) + \dots + k_{n+1}(\alpha_{n+1} - \beta_{n+1})$. Since $\alpha_i \neq \beta_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n+1$. We may assume that $\beta = \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_s$ and $k_1 + \dots + k_s = 1$, $1 \leq s \leq n+1$. Thus, β_1, \dots, β_s are different elements from each other. If $0 \in \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s\}$, there is nothing to prove. So we assume that β_1, \dots, β_s are different paths. Note that

$$0 = -k_1\beta_1 - \dots - k_s\beta_s + k_{s+1}(\alpha_{s+1} - \beta_{s+1}) + \dots + k_{n+1}(\alpha_{n+1} - \beta_{n+1}),$$

that is,

$$\beta_s = \frac{1}{k_s}[-k_1\beta_1 - \dots - k_{s-1}\beta_{s-1} + k_{s+1}(\alpha_{s+1} - \beta_{s+1}) + \dots + k_{n+1}(\alpha_{n+1} - \beta_{n+1})].$$

Clearly, we have $s \leq n$. Indeed, if $s = n+1$, then we get from

$$0 = -k_1\beta_1 - \dots - k_{n+1}\beta_{n+1}$$

and $k_i \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n+1$ that β_1, \dots, β_s are K -linearly dependent, which is a contradiction.

If $s = 1$, by assumption, then we have $(\beta_1, 0) \in \rho$. Note that $\beta = \alpha_1$ and $(\alpha_1, \beta_1) \in \rho$. Hence $(\beta, 0) \in \rho$.

Next, we consider that case when $2 \leq s \leq n$. By Lemma 3.2, there exists $x \in \{0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{s-1}\}$ such that $(\beta_s, x) \in \rho$ and

$$\beta_s - x \in \text{span} \{\alpha_{s+1} - \beta_{s+1}, \dots, \alpha_{n+1} - \beta_{n+1}\}.$$

If $x = 0$, then we get from $\beta = \alpha_s$, and $(\alpha_s, \beta_s) \in \rho$ that $(\beta, 0) \in \rho$. If $x = \beta_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq s - 1$, note that $\alpha_s = \alpha_j$, then we get from

$$-(\alpha_s - \beta_s) + (\alpha_j - \beta_j) = \beta_s - \beta_j = \beta_s - x$$

and $\beta_s - x \in \text{span} \{\alpha_{s+1} - \beta_{s+1}, \dots, \alpha_{n+1} - \beta_{n+1}\}$ that $\alpha_1 - \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_{n+1} - \beta_{n+1}$ are K -linearly dependent, which is a contradiction. Thus, we finished the proof. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let Q be a quiver and S, KQ be its path semigroup, path algebra, respectively. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . For any elements α, β in S and any congruence $\rho \in \mathcal{C}(S)$, if there exist some elements $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m$ in S , where m is a positive integer and $(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \in \rho$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, such that*

$$\alpha - \beta = k_1(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) + \dots + k_m(\alpha_m - \beta_m),$$

where $k_i \in K$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho$.

Proof. If $\alpha = \beta$, there is nothing to show. If $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$, Without loss of generality, we may assume that $k_i \neq 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $\alpha_1 - \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_m - \beta_m$ are K -linearly independent. It follows from Lemma 3.3 that $(\beta, 0) \in \rho$. Thus, $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho$. If $\beta = 0$ and $\alpha \neq 0$, the proof is similar.

Now, we consider the case when α and β are different paths. We can also assume that $k_i \neq 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq m$, $\alpha_1 - \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_m - \beta_m$ are K -linearly independent. Note that

$$\alpha = \beta + k_1(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) + \dots + k_m(\alpha_m - \beta_m).$$

By Lemma 3.2, then we have $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho$ or $(\alpha, 0) \in \rho$. If $(\alpha, 0) \in \rho$, then $\alpha \in \text{span} \{\alpha_1 - \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_m - \beta_m\}$. In this case, $\beta = \alpha - (\alpha - \beta) \in \text{span} \{\alpha_1 - \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_m - \beta_m\}$. By Lemma 3.3 again, we also have $(\beta, 0) \in \rho$. Hence $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho$. \square

Next, we study the relationship between the lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ and the lattice $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$.

Theorem 3.5. *Let Q be a quiver and S, KQ be its path semigroup, path algebra, respectively. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S , and denote by $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ the lattice of special algebraic ideals of KQ . Then the lattices $\mathcal{C}(S)$ and $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ are isomorphic.*

Proof. For any congruence $\rho \in \mathcal{C}(S)$, ρ determines an algebraic ideal

$$I_\rho = \langle \alpha - \beta \mid (\alpha, \beta) \in \rho \rangle$$

of KQ . It is easy to check that I_ρ is a special algebraic ideal. To see this, it is enough to show that each generator defined in I_ρ can be generated by relations. Indeed, for any $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho$, if $(\alpha, 0) \in \rho$, then $(\beta, 0) \in \rho$. Thus the monomials $\alpha = \alpha - 0$ and $\beta = \beta - 0$ are generators of I_ρ , which together imply that $\alpha - \beta$ is generated by relations. If $(\alpha, 0) \notin \rho$, then it follows from Lemma 3.1 (1) that $s(\alpha) = s(\beta)$, $t(\alpha) = t(\beta)$. Thus $\alpha - \beta$ is a commutative relation in I_ρ .

Conversely, for any special algebraic ideal $I \in \mathcal{SI}(KQ)$, I also determines a congruence $\rho_I \in \mathcal{C}(S)$, where

$$\rho_I = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in S \times S \mid \alpha - \beta \in I\}.$$

Indeed, for any $\alpha \in S$, since $\alpha - \alpha = 0 \in I$, so we have $(\alpha, \alpha) \in \rho_I$. For any $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho_I$, by the construction of ρ_I we have $\alpha - \beta \in I$. Then it follows $\beta - \alpha \in I$ and $(\beta, \alpha) \in \rho_I$. For any $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho_I$ and $(\beta, \gamma) \in \rho_I$, we get from $\alpha - \beta \in I$ and $\beta - \gamma \in I$ that $\alpha - \gamma = (\alpha - \beta) + (\beta - \gamma) \in I$. Hence we have $(\alpha, \gamma) \in \rho_I$. Next, we need to prove that ρ_I satisfies the left and right compatible conditions. For any $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho_I$ and any $\gamma \in S$, it is easy to get from $\alpha - \beta \in I$ that $\gamma\alpha - \gamma\beta = \gamma(\alpha - \beta) \in I$, $\alpha\gamma - \beta\gamma = (\alpha - \beta)\gamma \in I$. Hence we have $(\gamma\alpha, \gamma\beta) \in \rho_I$, and $(\alpha\gamma, \beta\gamma) \in \rho_I$.

Next, we prove that there is a one-to-one correspondence between $\mathcal{C}(S)$ and $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$. By the construction above, it is enough to show that for any $\rho \in \mathcal{C}(S)$, $\rho = \rho_{I_\rho}$, and for any special algebraic ideal $I \in \mathcal{SI}(KQ)$, $I = I_{\rho_I}$.

Let ρ be any congruence and $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho$. Then we clearly have $\alpha - \beta \in I_\rho$. By the definition of ρ_{I_ρ} , we obtain that $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho_{I_\rho}$. Thus, we proved $\rho \subseteq \rho_{I_\rho}$. Conversely, for any $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho_{I_\rho}$, by the definition, we have $\alpha - \beta \in I_\rho$. Then

$$\alpha - \beta = k_1 u_1 (\alpha_1 - \beta_1) v_1 + \dots + k_n u_n (\alpha_n - \beta_n) v_n,$$

where n is a positive integer, $k_i \in K$, u_i, v_i are paths in Q , and $(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \in \rho$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n$. By the transitivity of ρ , we have $(u_i \alpha_i v_i, u_i \beta_i v_i) \in \rho$. It follows from Lemma 3.4 that $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho$. Thus, we proved $\rho_{I_\rho} \subseteq \rho$.

Let I be any special algebraic ideal. Since I is generated by relations, to prove $I \subseteq I_{\rho_I}$, we need only to prove that every relation in I is contained in I_{ρ_I} . For any monomial relation $x \in I$, since $x = x - 0 \in I$, we have $(x, 0) \in \rho_I$, thus we get $x \in I_{\rho_I}$. For any commutative relation $x - y \in I$, we have $(x, y) \in \rho_I$, thus we have $x - y \in I_{\rho_I}$. Hence, we proved $I \subseteq I_{\rho_I}$. Conversely, for any generator $\alpha - \beta \in I_{\rho_I}$, by the definition, we have $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho_I$. Thus, $\alpha - \beta \in I$. So we proved $I_{\rho_I} \subseteq I$.

To finish the proof, we need to show that the two constructions above both preserve partial orders. If $\rho_1 \subseteq \rho_2$, then we clearly have

$$I_{\rho_1} = \langle \alpha - \beta \mid (\alpha, \beta) \in \rho_1 \rangle \subseteq \langle \alpha - \beta \mid (\alpha, \beta) \in \rho_2 \rangle = I_{\rho_2}.$$

If $I_1 \subseteq I_2$, then we also have

$$\rho_{I_1} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in S \times S \mid \alpha - \beta \in I_1\} \subseteq \{(\alpha, \beta) \in S \times S \mid \alpha - \beta \in I_2\} = \rho_{I_2}.$$

□

Example 1. Let Q be the quiver in the Figure 2.




Figure 2: An example.

The path semigroup $S = \{0, e_1, e_2, \alpha\}$. There are 5 congruences on S : $\rho_1 = 1_S$, ρ_2 is the Rees congruence generated by $\{0, \alpha\}$, ρ_3 is the Rees congruence generated by $\{0, e_1, \alpha\}$, ρ_4 is the Rees congruence generated by $\{0, e_2, \alpha\}$, and ρ_5 is the universal congruence $S \times S$.

The corresponding special algebraic ideals in $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ are $I_1 = \{0\}$, $I_2 = \langle \alpha \rangle$, $I_3 = \langle e_1 \rangle = \text{span} \{e_1, \alpha\}$, $I_4 = \langle e_2 \rangle = \text{span} \{e_2, \alpha\}$, and $I_5 = \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle = KQ$.

The Hasse diagram of the lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ ($\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$) is shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: The Hasse diagram of the lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ in Example 1.

In the representation theory of associative K -algebra, hereditary algebras play an important role. It is well known that a basic, connected, finite dimensional K -algebra A is hereditary if and only if $A \cong KQ$, where Q is a finite, connected, and acyclic quiver [2, Theorem 1.7 of Chapter VII]. Next, we study the congruence lattices of acyclic quivers (not necessarily finite).

Lemma 3.6. *Let Q be an acyclic quiver and KQ be its path algebra. Let I_1 and I_2 be any special algebraic ideals of KQ with $I_1 \subsetneq I_2$. For any relation $x \in I_2 \setminus I_1$, if there exist $\alpha_0, \beta_0 \in S$ such that $\alpha_0 x \beta_0 \neq x$ and $\alpha_0 x \beta_0 \notin I_1$, then $I_1 \subsetneq I_1 + \langle \alpha_0 x \beta_0 \rangle \subsetneq I_2$.*

Proof. Since $\alpha_0 x \beta_0 \notin I_1$, we have $I_1 \subsetneq I_1 + \langle \alpha_0 x \beta_0 \rangle$. To prove $I_1 + \langle \alpha_0 x \beta_0 \rangle \subsetneq I_2$, it is sufficient to prove $x \notin I_1 + \langle \alpha_0 x \beta_0 \rangle$. Suppose $x \in I_1 + \langle \alpha_0 x \beta_0 \rangle$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$x = k_1 \alpha_1 + \dots + k_m \alpha_m + k_{m+1} \beta_1 + \dots + k_{m+p} \beta_p,$$

where m, p are non-negative integers such that $m + p \geq 1$, $k_i \in K \setminus \{0\}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m + p$, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ are relations in I_1 , and β_1, \dots, β_p are relations in $\langle \alpha_0 x \beta_0 \rangle$. We know from $x \notin I_1$ that $p \geq 1$. Moreover, we have

$$x = s(x)xt(x) = s(x)(k_1 \alpha_1 + \dots + k_m \alpha_m)t(x) + s(x)(k_{m+1} \beta_1 + \dots + k_{m+p} \beta_p)t(x).$$

Since $s(x)(k_1 \alpha_1 + \dots + k_m \alpha_m)t(x) \in I_1$, we have $s(x)(k_{m+1} \beta_1 + \dots + k_{m+p} \beta_p)t(x) \neq 0$, that is, there exists β_i for some $1 \leq i \leq p$ such that $s(x)\beta_{m+i}t(x) \neq 0$. Note that β_{m+i} is a relation generated by $\alpha_0 x \beta_0$. We may assume that $\beta_{m+i} = u \alpha_0 x \beta_0 v$, where u, v are paths. Now we get $s(x) = s(\beta_{m+i}) = s(u \alpha_0) = r(u \alpha_0)$. Since Q is acyclic, we obtain that $u = \alpha_0 = s(x)$, similarly, $v = \beta_0 = r(x)$. Hence, $x = \alpha_0 x \beta_0$, which is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let Q be an acyclic quiver and KQ be its path algebra. For any special algebraic ideals I_1, I_2 of KQ , if $I_1 \prec I_2$, then $I_2 = I_1 + \text{span} \{x\}$ for any relation $x \in I_2 \setminus I_1$.*

Proof. Let x be any relation in $I_2 \setminus I_1$. It is clear that $I_1 \subsetneq I_1 + \text{span} \{x\} \subseteq I_2$ as K -vector spaces. Next, we show that $I_1 + \text{span} \{x\}$ is a special algebraic ideal of KQ . Indeed, if there exist $\alpha_0, \beta_0 \in S$ such that $\alpha_0 x \beta_0 \neq x$ and $\alpha_0 x \beta_0 \notin I_1$. By Lemma 3.6, then we know that $I_1 \subsetneq I_1 + \langle \alpha_0 x \beta_0 \rangle \subsetneq I_2$, which contradicts the fact that $I_1 \prec I_2$. Hence, we proved that $I_1 + \text{span} \{x\}$ is an ideal for any relation $x \in I_2 \setminus I_1$. Note that $I_1 \prec I_2$ and $I_1 + \text{span} \{x\}$ is also generated by relations. We clearly obtain $I_2 = I_1 + \text{span} \{x\}$. \square

Next, we study the semimodularity of the congruence lattices of path semigroups of acyclic quivers.

Lemma 3.8. *Let Q be an acyclic quiver and KQ be its path algebra. Denote by $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ the set of all special algebraic ideals of KQ . Then the lattice $(\mathcal{SI}(KQ), \subseteq, \vee, \wedge)$ is strong upper semimodular.*

Proof. Let I_1, I_2 be any two special ideals of KQ with $I_1 \succ I_1 \wedge I_2$. If $I_1 \subseteq I_2$, then $I_1 \wedge I_2 = I_1$, which contradicts the fact that $I_1 \succ I_1 \wedge I_2$. If $I_2 \subsetneq I_1$, that is, $I_1 \wedge I_2 = I_2$, then we clearly have $I_1 \vee I_2 = I_1 \succ I_2$. Next, we consider the case when I_1 and I_2 are not comparable.

Let x be any relation in $I_1 \setminus I_2$. It follows from Lemma 3.7 that $I_1 = I_1 \wedge I_2 + \text{span} \{x\}$. Let Y be the set of all relations in $I_2 \setminus I_1$. Then we can see that $I_2 = I_1 \wedge I_2 + \text{span} Y$. Indeed, since $Y \subseteq I_2$, we have $\text{span} Y \subseteq I_2$, hence $I_1 \wedge I_2 + \text{span} Y \subseteq I_2$. On the other hand, for any relation $\alpha \in I_2$, if $\alpha \in I_1 \cap I_2$, note that α is a relation, then $\alpha \in I_1 \wedge I_2$. If $\alpha \notin I_1$, then $\alpha \in Y$. So we proved that any relation $\alpha \in I_2$, $\alpha \in I_1 \wedge I_2 + \text{span} Y$. Hence, $I_2 \subseteq I_1 \wedge I_2 + \text{span} Y$.

By the definition of the join of I_1 and I_2 , we get

$$I_1 \vee I_2 = I_1 + I_2 = I_1 \wedge I_2 + \text{span} \{x\} + \text{span} Y.$$

It is clear that $I_1 \vee I_2 \succ I_2$. Hence we proved that the lattice $(\mathcal{SI}(KQ), \subseteq, \vee, \wedge)$ is strong upper semimodular. \square

Remark 3.9. (1) Denote by $\mathcal{I}(KQ)$ the set of all algebraic ideals of KQ . We need to remind the readers that although the set $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ is contained in $\mathcal{I}(KQ)$, the lattice $(\mathcal{SI}(KQ), \subseteq, \vee, \wedge)$ is not a sublattice of $(\mathcal{I}(KQ), \subseteq, +, \cap)$ in general. Because the meet of two special algebraic ideals in $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ is different in $\mathcal{I}(KQ)$. For any special ideals I_1 and I_2 , the meet in $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ is the ideal generated by all relations in $I_1 \cap I_2$. But the meet in $\mathcal{I}(KQ)$ is the set of all elements in $I_1 \cap I_2$, which is not necessarily generated by relations in general.

(2) It is well known that the lattice of all ideals in any ring (algebra) is modular, so is the lattice $(\mathcal{I}(KQ), \subseteq, +, \cap)$. However, the lattice of all special algebraic ideals $(\mathcal{SI}(KQ), \subseteq, \vee, \wedge)$ is not necessarily lower semimodular. To see this, one can consider the following example.

Example 2. Let Q be the quiver in the Figure 4.




Figure 4: An example where $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ is not lower semimodular.

The path semigroup $S = \{0, e_1, e_2, \alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$. There are 18 special algebraic ideals of KQ : $I_1 = \{0\}$, $I_2 = \langle \alpha \rangle$, $I_3 = \langle \beta \rangle$, $I_4 = \langle \gamma \rangle$, $I_5 = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle$, $I_6 = \langle \beta, \gamma \rangle$, $I_7 = \langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle$, $I_8 = \langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle$, $I_9 = \langle \alpha - \beta \rangle$, $I_{10} = \langle \beta - \gamma \rangle$, $I_{11} = \langle \alpha - \gamma \rangle$, $I_{12} = \langle \alpha, \beta - \gamma \rangle$, $I_{13} = \langle \beta, \alpha - \gamma \rangle$, $I_{14} = \langle \gamma, \alpha - \beta \rangle$, $I_{15} = \langle \alpha - \beta, \alpha -$

$\gamma \succ \langle \alpha - \beta, \beta - \gamma \rangle = \langle \alpha - \gamma, \beta - \gamma \rangle$, $I_{16} = \langle e_1 \rangle = \text{span} \{e_1, \alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$, $I_{17} = \langle e_2 \rangle = \text{span} \{e_2, \alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$, $I_{18} = \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle = KQ$.

The Hasse diagram of the lattice $(\mathcal{SI}(KQ), \subseteq, \vee, \wedge)$ is shown in the Figure 5. It is strong upper semimodular but not lower semimodular. Indeed, $I_{12} = \text{span} \{\alpha, \beta - \gamma\}$, $I_{14} = \text{span} \{\gamma, \alpha - \beta\}$, we have $I_{12} \vee I_{14} = \text{span} \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\} = I_8$. Note that $I_{12} \cap I_{14} = \text{span} \{\alpha - \beta + \gamma\}$ has no relation, so we have $I_{12} \wedge I_{14} = \{0\}$. It is clearly that $I_8 \succ I_{12}, I_{14}$, but there exists a special algebraic ideal $I_2 = \text{span} \{\alpha\}$ such that $\{0\} \subsetneq I_2 \subsetneq I_{12}$. Thus, the lattice is not lower semimodular.




Figure 5: The Hasse diagram of the lattice $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ in Example 2.

By Lemma 3.5, Lemma 3.8 and Example 3.9, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 3.10. *Let Q be an acyclic quiver and S be its path semigroup. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . Then the lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is strong upper semimodular but not necessarily lower semimodular.*

The following theorem gives some equivalent characterizations of the congruence lattice to be lower semimodular.

Theorem 3.11. *Let Q be an acyclic quiver and S be its path semigroup. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *There are at most two paths from one vertex to another.*
- (2) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is modular.*
- (3) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is strong lower semimodular.*
- (4) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is lower semimodular.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Suppose that there are at most two paths from one vertex to another in the quiver Q . Let I_1, I_2 be any special algebraic ideals of KQ . Next, we show that $I_1 \wedge I_2 = I_1 \cap I_2$. To show this, it is enough to show $I_1 \cap I_2 \subseteq I_1 \wedge I_2$. That is, for every element x in $I_1 \cap I_2$, x can be generated by relations in $I_1 \cap I_2$.

Note that there are at most two paths between two vertices. For any commutative relations $\alpha - \beta$ and $\alpha - \gamma$, we have $\beta = \gamma$. Moreover, we also should note that $\langle \alpha, \alpha - \beta \rangle = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that x can be expressed as such K -linear combinations as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x &= k_1\alpha_1 + \dots + k_m\alpha_m + k_{m+1}(\beta_{m+1} - \gamma_{m+1}) + \dots + k_{m+p}(\beta_{m+p} - \gamma_{m+p}) \\ &= l_1\delta_1 + \dots + l_n\delta_n + l_{n+1}(\zeta_{n+1} - \eta_{n+1}) + \dots + l_{n+q}(\zeta_{n+q} - \eta_{n+q}), \end{aligned}$$

where $k_1, \dots, k_{m+p}, l_1, \dots, l_{n+q} \in K \setminus \{0\}$, m, n, p, q are non-negative integers. Moreover, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, \beta_{m+1} - \gamma_{m+1}, \dots, \beta_{m+p} - \gamma_{m+p}$ are K -linearly independent relations in I_1 , and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, \beta_{m+1}, \dots, \beta_{m+p}, \gamma_{m+1}, \dots, \gamma_{m+p}$ are distinct paths. Similarly, $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n, \zeta_{n+1} - \eta_{n+1}, \dots, \zeta_{n+q} - \eta_{n+q}$ are K -linearly independent relations in I_2 , and $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n, \zeta_{n+1}, \dots, \zeta_{n+q}, \eta_{n+1}, \dots, \eta_{n+q}$ are distinct paths.

If $m \geq 1$, for any $1 \leq i \leq m$, then it is clear that

$$\alpha_i \in \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n, \zeta_{n+1}, \dots, \zeta_{n+q}, \eta_{n+1}, \dots, \eta_{n+q}\}.$$

If $\alpha_i = \delta_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$, then $k_i\alpha_i = l_j\delta_j \in I_1 \cap I_2$. If $\alpha_i = \zeta_{n+j}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq q$, then $\eta_{n+j} \neq \beta_{m+r}$ for any $1 \leq r \leq p$. Otherwise, the three different paths $\alpha_i = \zeta_{n+j}$, $\eta_{n+j} = \beta_{m+r}$, and γ_{m+r} have the same source and the same target, which contradicts the condition that there are at most two paths from one vertex to another. Similarly, we also have $\eta_{n+j} \neq \gamma_{m+r}$ for any $1 \leq j \leq q$. Hence, $\eta_{n+j} = \alpha_s$ for some $s \neq i$ and $1 \leq s \leq m$. In this case, $k_i = l_{n+j}$ and $k_s = -l_{n+j}$. So we have $k_i\alpha_i + k_s\alpha_s = l_j(\zeta_j - \eta_j) \in I_1 \cap I_2$.

Now we consider the relation $\beta_{m+i} - \gamma_{m+i}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq p$. It is clear that

$$\beta_{m+i} \in \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n, \zeta_{n+1}, \dots, \zeta_{n+q}, \eta_{n+1}, \dots, \eta_{n+q}\}.$$

If $\beta_{m+i} = \delta_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$, then $\gamma_{m+i} \neq \zeta_{n+r}$ for any $1 \leq r \leq q$. Otherwise, the three different paths $\beta_{m+i} = \delta_j$, $\gamma_{m+i} = \zeta_{n+r}$, and η_{n+r} have the same source and the same target, which is a contradiction. Similarly, we also have $\gamma_{m+i} \neq \eta_{n+r}$ for any $1 \leq r \leq q$. Thus, $\gamma_{m+i} = \delta_s$ for some $s \neq i$ and $1 \leq s \leq n$. In this case $k_{m+i} = l_j = -l_s$, and we have $k_{m+i}(\beta_{m+i} - \gamma_{m+i}) = l_j\delta_j + l_s\delta_s \in I_1 \cap I_2$. If $\beta_{m+i} = \zeta_{n+j}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq q$, since there are at most two paths from one vertex to another, then clearly we have $\gamma_{m+i} = \eta_{n+j}$. Hence, $k_{m+i} = l_{n+j}$ and $k_{m+i}(\beta_{m+i} - \gamma_{m+i}) = l_j(\zeta_{n+j} - \eta_{n+j}) \in I_1 \cap I_2$.

Thus, we proved that x can be generated by relations in $I_1 \cap I_2$. Thus $I_1 \wedge I_2 = I_1 \cap I_2$, which means that $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ is a sublattice of $\mathcal{I}(KQ)$. Note that $\mathcal{I}(KQ)$ is modular, so is $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (4). It is clear that every modular lattice is strong lower semimodular and every strong lower semimodular lattice is lower semimodular.

(4) \Rightarrow (1). Suppose that there exist three different paths α , β and γ between two vertices in the quiver Q . Then all the arrows and vertices that make up the three paths form a subquiver Q' . We claim that there is no arrow $a \in Q'$ such that $t(a) = s(\alpha)$. Suppose that there is an arrow $a \in Q'$ such that $t(a) = s(\alpha)$. Then a is a part of α , or β , or γ . If $\alpha = uav$ for some paths u, v in Q' , then it follows $s(ua) = s(\alpha) = t(a) = t(ua)$. Since Q is acyclic, we obtain that $u = a = s(\alpha)$, that is, a is a vertex, which is a contradiction. If a is a part of β or γ , the proof is similar. So we proved that there is no arrow $a \in Q'$ such that $t(a) = s(\alpha)$. Dually, we also obtain that there is no arrow $a \in Q'$ such that $s(a) = t(\alpha)$.

We denote by T the K -vector space whose basis is the set of all paths in Q but not in the subquiver Q' . It is easy to see that T is a special algebraic ideal. Indeed, for any path ξ in T and x, y in S , if $x\xi y \neq 0$, then $x\xi y$ is a path not in the subquiver Q' , that is, $x\xi y \in T$.

Note that $\text{span} \{\alpha, \beta - \gamma\} \cap T = \{0\}$. Let I_1 be the direct sum of the two K -vector spaces $\text{span} \{\alpha, \beta - \gamma\}$ and T , and denote it by $I_1 = \text{span} \{\alpha, \beta - \gamma\} \oplus T$. We claim that I_1 is a special algebraic ideal. Indeed, for any paths x, y in Q , if $x\alpha y = 0$ or $x\alpha y = \alpha$, then we have $x\alpha y \in I_1$. If $x\alpha y \neq 0$ and $x\alpha y \neq \alpha$, then $x\alpha y$ is a path longer than α , we have shown that there is no arrow $a \in Q'$ such that $t(a) = s(\alpha)$, or $s(a) = r(\alpha)$. Thus, we have $x\alpha y \notin Q'$. That is, $x\alpha y \in T$. So we obtain $x\alpha y \in T \subseteq I_1$ for any x, y . For any path x, y in Q , since β and γ have the same source and the same target, we know that $x\beta y = 0$ if and only if $x\gamma y = 0$, $x\beta y = \beta$ if and only if $x\gamma y = \gamma$. If $x\beta y \neq 0$ and $x\beta y \neq \beta$, then $x\beta y$ is a path longer than β , so we have $x\beta y \in T$. Similarly, $x\gamma y \in T$. Thus we proved $x(\beta - \gamma)y \in I_1$ for any x, y . This finished the proof that I_1 is a special algebraic ideal.

Similar to I_1 , $I_2 = \text{span} \{\beta, \alpha - \gamma\} \oplus T$ is also a special algebraic ideal. One can see that $I_1 \vee I_2 = \text{span} \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\} \oplus T$, and $I_1 \cap I_2 = \text{span}\{\alpha + \beta - \gamma\} \oplus T$, which is not a special algebraic ideal. So it follows from the definition of the meet that $I_1 \wedge I_2 = T$. Thus, $I_1 \vee I_2 \succ I_1$ and $I_1 \vee I_2 \succ I_2$, but there exists a special algebraic ideal $I = \text{span} \{\alpha\} \oplus T$ such that $I_1 \wedge I_2 \subsetneq I \subsetneq I_1$, which is a contradiction. \square

Example 3. Let Q be the Kronecker quiver in the Figure 6.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \alpha & \\ \circ & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \circ \\ 1 & \beta & 2 \end{array}$$

Figure 6: An example where $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is modular.

The path semigroup $S = \{0, e_1, e_2, \alpha, \beta\}$. There are 8 congruences: $\rho_1 = 1_S$, ρ_2 is the congruence such that $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho_2$ and other ρ_2 -classes are trivial, ρ_3 is the Rees congruence generated by $\{0, \alpha\}$, ρ_4 is the Rees congruence generated by $\{0, \beta\}$, ρ_5 is the Rees congruence generated by $\{0, \alpha, \beta\}$, ρ_6 is the Rees congruence generated by $\{0, e_1, \alpha, \beta\}$, ρ_7 is the Rees congruence generated by $\{0, e_2, \alpha, \beta\}$, $\rho_8 = S \times S$.

See the Hasse diagram shown in the Figure 7. The lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is modular but not distributive.




Figure 7: The Hasse diagram of the lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ in Example 3.

Given a semigroup S and a semigroup ideal I of S , we know that there is a Rees congruence generated by I , that is, $\rho_I = (I \times I) \cup 1_S$. But conversely, not all congruences can be generated by semigroup ideals in general. Thus, there is a natural question: what kind of semigroups satisfies the property that all the congruences are Rees congruences? The following theorem gives a partial answer, and it also gives an equivalent condition making the congruence lattice to be distributive.

Theorem 3.12. *Let Q be an acyclic quiver and S be its path semigroup. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *There is at most one path from one vertex to another.*
- (2) *Each congruence $\rho \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ is a Rees congruence.*
- (3) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is distributive.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Let ρ be any congruence. It is clear that 0ρ is a semigroup ideal of S . For any $(\alpha, \beta) \in \rho$, if $\alpha \in 0\rho$, then $\beta \in 0\rho$, that is, $(\alpha, \beta) \in 0\rho \times 0\rho$. If $(\alpha, 0) \notin \rho$, then it follows from Lemma 3.1 that $s(\alpha) = s(\beta)$ and $t(\alpha) = t(\beta)$. Since Q is acyclic and there is at most one path between any two vertices, we have $\alpha = \beta$. Therefore, we proved that $\rho = (0\rho \times 0\rho) \cup 1_S$, which is a Rees congruence.

(2) \Rightarrow (3). Since each congruence is a Rees congruence, the lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is isomorphic to the lattice of semigroup ideals. For any semigroup ideals I_1, I_2 in

S , it is easy to obtain that $I_1 \wedge I_2 = I_1 \cap I_2$ and $I_1 \vee I_2 = I_1 \cup I_2$. Thus $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is distributive.

(3) \Rightarrow (1). Suppose that there exist two different paths α and β between two vertices in the quiver Q . Then all arrows and vertices that make up the two paths form a subquiver Q' . We denote by T the K -vector space whose basis is the set of all paths in Q but not in the subquiver Q' . Then T is a special algebraic ideal.

Note that the K -vector space $\text{span} \{\alpha\} \cap T = \{0\}$. Let I_1 be the direct sum of the two K -vector spaces $\text{span} \{\alpha\}$ and T , that is, $I_1 = \text{span} \{\alpha\} \oplus T$. Similar to the proof of (4) \Rightarrow (1) in Theorem 3.11, I_1 is a special algebraic ideal of KQ .

Similarly, let $I_2 = \text{span} \{\alpha\} \oplus T$, and it is also a special algebraic ideal. Moreover, since α and β have the same source and the same target, we know that $I_3 = \text{span} \{\alpha - \beta\} \oplus T$ is a special algebraic ideal as well. We can easily get that

$$I_1 \wedge I_2 = I_1 \wedge I_3 = I_2 \wedge I_3 = T,$$

and

$$I_1 \vee I_2 = I_1 \vee I_3 = I_2 \vee I_3 = \text{span} \{\alpha, \beta\} \oplus T.$$

By Lemma 2.1, we get that $\mathcal{SI}(KQ)$ is not distributive, which is a contradiction. \square

For the path semigroups of acyclic quivers, it is proved that the modularity and distributivity of the congruence lattices are related to the number of paths between two vertices. Thus we have the following.

Corollary 3.13. *Let Q be an acyclic quiver and $\{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$ be the collection of all connected components of Q , where I is an index set. Let S be the path semigroup of Q and S_i be the path semigroup of Q_i for any $i \in I$. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S , and denote by $\mathcal{C}(S_i)$ the congruence lattice of S_i for any $i \in I$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is modular if and only if each lattice $\mathcal{C}(S_i)$ is modular for any $i \in I$.*
- (2) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is distributive if and only if each lattice $\mathcal{C}(S_i)$ is distributive for any $i \in I$.*

Gabriel [6] showed that a connected, finite dimensional hereditary algebra is representation-finite if and only if the underlying graph of its quiver is one of the Dynkin graphs: \mathbb{A}_m with $m \geq 1$; \mathbb{D}_n with $n \geq 4$; and $\mathbb{E}_6, \mathbb{E}_7, \mathbb{E}_8$ (also in [2, Theorem 5.10 of Chapter VII]).

In the end, we give the following corollary as an interesting application.

Corollary 3.14. *Let Q be a quiver and S be its path semigroup. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ the congruence lattice of S . If the underlying graph Q^* of Q is a tree, in particular, a Dynkin graph, then the lattice $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is distributive.*

Declaration: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] G. Abrams and G. A. Pino, The Leavitt path algebra of a graph, *J. Algebra* **293** (2) (2005), 319–334. DOI: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2005.07.028
- [2] I. Assem, D. Simson and A. Skowroński, Elements of the Representation Theory of Associative Algebras, Vol. 1, Techniques of Representation Theory, *London Mathematical Society Student Texts* 65, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2006. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511614309
- [3] K. Auinger, The congruence lattice of a combinatorial strict inverse semigroup, *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.* **37** (1) (1993), 25–37. DOI: 10.1017/S0013091500018654
- [4] V. Bergelson, A. Blass and N. Hindman, Partition theorems for spaces of variable words, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **68** (3) (1994), 449–476. DOI: 10.1112/plms/s3-68.3.449.
- [5] L. Forsberg, Effective representations of path semigroup, *Semigroup Forum* **92** (2) (2016), 449–459. DOI: 10.1007/s00233-015-9697-1.
- [6] P. Gabriel, Unzerlegbare Darstellungen I, *Manuscripta Math.* **6** (1972), 71–103. DOI: 10.1007/BF01298413.
- [7] G. Grätzer, Lattice Theory: Foundation. Springer, Birkhäuser, Basel (2011). DOI: 10.1007/978-3-0348-0018-1.
- [8] A. Grothendieck, Sur quelques points d’algèbre homologique, *Tohoku Math. J.* **9** (2) (1957), 119–221.
- [9] S. P. Gudder, Partial algebraic structures associated with orthomodular posets, *Pacific J. Math* **41** (3) (1972), 717–730. DOI: 10.2140/pjm.1972.41.717.
- [10] L. Guo and S. Zheng, Quivers and path semigroups characterized by locality conditions. arXiv: 10.48550/arXiv.2207.11058.
- [11] T. E. Hall, Congruences and Green’s relations on regular semigroups, *Glasgow Math. J.* **13** (2) (1972), 167–175. DOI: 10.1017/S0017089500001610.

- [12] P. Jones, Congruences contained in an equivalence on a semigroup, *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **29** (2) (1980), 162–176. DOI: 10.1017/S1446788700021170.
- [13] P. Jones, Joins and meets of congruences on a regular semigroup, *Semigroup Forum* **30** (1984), 1–16. DOI: 10.1007/BF02573433.
- [14] Z. Mesyan and J. D. Mitchell, The structure of a graph inverse semigroup. *Semigroup Forum* **93** (1) (2016), 111-130. DOI: 10.1007/s00233-016-9793-x.
- [15] H. Mitsch, Semigroups and their lattice of congruences, *Semigroup Forum* **26** (1983), 1–63. DOI: 10.1007/BF02572819.
- [16] H. Mitsch, Semigroups and their lattice of congruences II, *Semigroup Forum* **54** (1997), 1–42. DOI: 10.1007/BF02676585.
- [17] F. Pastijn and M. Petrich, Congruences on regular semigroups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **295** (2) (1986), 607–633. DOI: 10.2307/2000054.
- [18] A. L. T. Paterson, Groupoids, Inverse Semigroups, and their Operator Algebras, Springer, Birkhäuser (1999). DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4612-1774-9.
- [19] M. Petrich, Congruences networks for completely simple semigroups, *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **56** (2) (1994), 243–266. DOI: 10.1017/S1446788700034868.