1-20-2021

Lattice-ordered Pregroups are Semi-distributive

Nikolaos Galatos
University of Denver

Peter Jipsen
Chapman University, jipsen@chapman.edu

Michael Kinyon
University of Denver

Adam Přenosil
Vanderbilt University

Recommended Citation

Galatos, N., Jipsen, P., Kinyon, M., Přenosil, A.: Lattice-ordered pregroups are semi-distributive. Algebra Univers. 82, 16 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00012-020-00703-4

Lattice-ordered pregroups are semidistributive

Nick Galatos, Peter Jipsen, Michael Kinyon and Adam Přenosil*

Abstract. We prove that the lattice reduct of every lattice-ordered pregroup is semidistributive. This is a consequence of a certain weak form of the distributive law which holds in lattice-ordered pregroups.

Mathematics Subject Classification. 06F05, 06B99.

Keywords. Pregroups, ℓ-pregroups, residuated lattices.

1. Introduction

Lattice-ordered pregroups, or ℓ-pregroups for short, were introduced by Lambek [8], who called them lattice-ordered monoids with adjoints. Their partially ordered counterparts were studied in more detail by Lambek [9, 10] and Buszkowski [1, 2, 3] with linguistic motivations (type grammar) in mind. An ℓ-pregroup is an algebra $\langle G, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, 1, {}^{\ell}, {}^{r} \rangle$ where $\langle G, \wedge, \vee \rangle$ is a lattice, $\langle G, \cdot, 1 \rangle$ is a monoid such that multiplication is order-preserving in both arguments, and the unary maps $x \mapsto x^{\ell}$ and $x \mapsto x^{r}$ satisfy the inequalities

$$x^{\ell}x \leq 1 \leq xx^{\ell} \qquad \text{and} \qquad xx^{r} \leq 1 \leq x^{r}x.$$

Alternatively, they are involutive residuated lattices satisfying $x \cdot y \approx x + y$, where addition is the De Morgan dual of multiplication (see [6]). Imposing the equation $x^{\ell} \approx x^{r}$ on ℓ-pregroups yields the variety of ℓ-groups.

The major open question concerning these algebras is whether their lattice reducts are distributive, like the lattice reducts of ℓ-groups. We leave this question open, however, we describe some positive properties of lattice reducts of ℓ-pregroups. These follow from the fact that the distributive law for ℓ-pregroups holds at least up to certain idempotents.

The variety of ℓ-pregroups exhibits an order duality as well as a left–right duality: if $\langle G, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, 1, {}^{\ell}, {}^{r} \rangle$ is an ℓ-pregroup, then so are $\langle G, \vee, \wedge, \cdot, 1, {}^{r}, {}^{\ell} \rangle$ and $\langle G, \wedge, \vee, \odot, 1, {}^{r}, {}^{\ell} \rangle$, where $x \odot y := y \cdot x$. These symmetries imply that if a

The authors are grateful to the anonymous referee for their careful reading of the manuscript and helpful comments.

(quasi)equation holds in all ℓ-pregroups, then so does its order dual, obtained by switching $\vee$ and $\wedge$ as well as ${}^\ell$ and ^{r}, as well as its left–right dual, obtained by switching ${}^\ell$ and ^{r} and reversing the order of multiplication.

We recall that ℓ-pregroups satisfy the following equations:

$$\begin{array}{llll} x(y \wedge z) \approx xy \wedge xz, & xx^\ell x \approx x, & (x \wedge y)^\ell \approx x^\ell \vee y^\ell, & (x \vee y)^\ell \approx x^\ell \wedge y^\ell, \\ (x \wedge y)z \approx xz \wedge yz, & xx^r x \approx x, & (x \wedge y)^r \approx x^r \vee y^r, & (x \vee y)^r \approx x^r \wedge y^r. \end{array}$$

Moreover, they also satisfy the equations $x^{\ell r} \approx x \approx x^{r\ell}$.

Let us now recall the definition of semidistributivity. A lattice is called *meet semidistributive* if it satisfies the quasiequation

$$x \wedge y \approx x \wedge z \implies x \wedge (y \vee z) \approx x \wedge y.$$

It is called *join semidistributive* if it satisfies the dual quasiequation, namely

$$x \vee y \approx x \vee z \implies x \vee (y \wedge z) \approx x \vee z.$$

It is called *semidistributive* if it is both meet and join semidistributive. We call an ℓ-pregroup modular or (semi)distributive if its lattice reduct is modular or (semi)distributive.

2. Main results

We now prove an analogue of the distributive law for ℓ-pregroups. The proof given below is the ℓ-pregroup analogue of the proof of distributivity for GBL-algebras due to Galatos & Tsinakis [7, Lemma 2.9].

Proposition 2.1. *The following inequalities hold in all ℓ-pregroups:*

$$x \wedge (y \vee z) \leq yy^\ell (x \wedge y) \vee zz^\ell (x \wedge z),$$
$$x \wedge (y \vee z) \leq (x \wedge y) y^r y \vee (x \wedge z) z^r z.$$

Proof. We only prove the first inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} x \wedge (y \vee z) &\leq (y \vee z)(y \vee z)^\ell x \wedge (y \vee z) \\ &= (y \vee z)((y^\ell \wedge z^\ell)x \wedge 1) \\ &= y((y^\ell \wedge z^\ell)x \wedge 1) \vee z((y^\ell \wedge z^\ell)x \wedge 1) \\ &\leq y(y^\ell x \wedge 1) \vee z(z^\ell x \wedge 1) \\ &= (yy^\ell x \wedge y) \vee (zz^\ell x \wedge z) \\ &= (yy^\ell x \wedge yy^\ell y) \vee (zz^\ell x \wedge zz^\ell z) \\ &= yy^\ell (x \wedge y) \vee zz^\ell (x \wedge z). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows by left–right duality. □

The only difference between these inequalities and the usual distributive law is the presence of the idempotents yy^ℓ and zz^ℓ, or $y^r y$ and $z^r z$. For some special instances of x, y, z we obtain the full distributive law.

Corollary 2.2. *Suppose that either $ya = x = zb$ or $ay = x = bz$ holds in an ℓ-pregroup for some a and b. Then $x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z)$.*

Proof. In the former case we have $yy^\ell(x \wedge y) = (yy^\ell ya \wedge yy^\ell y) = ya \wedge y = x \wedge y$ and likewise $zz^\ell(x \wedge z) = x \wedge z$. The latter case follows by left–right duality. $\square$

Another form of distributivity will in fact be more useful in our proofs.

Proposition 2.3. *The following inequalities hold in all ℓ-pregroups:*

$$x \wedge (y \vee z) \leq yy^\ell(x \wedge y) \vee z,$$
$$x \wedge (y \vee z) \leq (x \wedge y)y^r y \vee z.$$

Proof. In the former case it suffices to observe that $zz^\ell(x \wedge z) \leq zz^\ell x \wedge zz^\ell z \leq zz^\ell x \wedge z \leq z$. The latter case follows by left–right duality. $\square$

Corollary 2.4. *Suppose that either $ya = x$ or $ay = x$ holds in an ℓ-pregroup for some a. Then $x \wedge (y \vee z) \leq (x \wedge y) \vee z$.*

Proof. In the former case $x \wedge (y \vee z) \leq yy^\ell(x \wedge y) \vee z = (yy^\ell ya \wedge yy^\ell y) \vee z = (ya \wedge y) \vee z = (x \wedge y) \vee z$. The latter case follows by left–right duality. $\square$

We now use this limited form of distributivity to prove that ℓ-pregroups are semidistributive.

Lemma 2.5. *The inequality $x' \wedge (y' \vee z') \leq (x' \wedge y') \vee z'$ holds whenever there are x and y such that one of the following four cases obtains:*

$$x' = y^\ell x, \qquad x' = xy^\ell, \qquad x' = y^r x, \qquad x' = xy^r,$$
$$y' = y^\ell y, \qquad y' = yy^\ell, \qquad y' = y^r y, \qquad y' = yy^r.$$

Proof. This follows from Corollary 2.4, since $y^\ell yy^\ell = y^\ell$ and $y^r yy^r = y^r$. $\square$

Theorem 2.6. *Each ℓ-pregroup is semidistributive.*

Proof. By order duality it suffices to prove meet semidistributivity, i.e. that $x \wedge y = x \wedge z$ implies $x \wedge (y \vee z) \leq y$. Suppose therefore that $x \wedge y = x \wedge z$ and let $x' = y^\ell x$, $y' = y^\ell y$, and $z' = y^\ell z$. It follows that $x' \wedge y' = x' \wedge z'$.

Lemma 2.5 now implies that $x' \wedge (y' \vee z') \leq (x' \wedge y') \vee z' = (x' \wedge z') \vee z' = z'$, therefore $x' \wedge (y' \vee z') \leq x' \wedge z' = x' \wedge y' \leq y'$. But multiplying the inequality $x' \wedge (y' \vee z') \leq y'$ by y on the left yields that $x \wedge (y \vee z) \leq yy^\ell(x \wedge (y \vee z)) = y(x' \wedge (y' \vee z')) \leq yy' = yy^\ell y = y$. $\square$

Each modular join semidistributive (or meet semidistributive) lattice is in fact distributive: modularity implies that it does not contain the pentagon $\mathbf{N_5}$ as a sublattice, while semidistributivity implies that it does not contain the diamond $\mathbf{M_3}$ as a sublattice.

Corollary 2.7. *Each modular ℓ-pregroup is distributive.*

The problem of determining whether ℓ-pregroups are distributive is therefore equivalent to the problem of determining whether they are modular, i.e. whether some ℓ-pregroup contains the pentagon $\mathbf{N_5}$ as a sublattice.

We can in fact obtain more information about the lattice reducts of ℓ-pregroups with the help of Lemma 2.5, namely that certain non-distributive lattices cannot occur as sublattices of ℓ-pregroups.

Recall that the *monolith* of a subdirectly irreducible algebra is its smallest congruence other than the identity relation.

Definition 2.8. Let $\mathbf{L}$ be a subdirectly irreducible lattice and μ be its monolith. We shall say that μ *involves* a if $\langle a, b\rangle \in \mu$ for some b distinct from a, i.e. if the μ-equivalence class of a is not a singleton. A triple of elements $\langle a, b, c\rangle$ of $\mathbf{L}$ will be called *forbidden* if $a \wedge (b \vee c) \nleq (a \wedge b) \vee c$ and moreover μ involves b. The lattice $\mathbf{L}$ will be called *forbidden* if it contains a forbidden triple.

Theorem 2.9. *Forbidden lattices are not sublattices of any ℓ-pregroup.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{L}$ be a subdirectly irreducible sublattice of an ℓ-pregroup $\mathbf{G}$ with monolith μ and a forbidden triple $\langle a, b, c\rangle$. Then $\langle b, d\rangle \in \mu$ for some $d \in \mathbf{L}$ distinct from b. We may assume without loss of generality that either $d > b$ or $d < b$. Suppose first that $d > b$.

We use $\lambda_y \colon \mathbf{L} \to \mathbf{G}$ to denote the left multiplication map $\lambda_y \colon x \mapsto yx$ and $\rho_y \colon \mathbf{L} \to \mathbf{G}$ to denote the right multiplication map $\rho_y \colon x \mapsto xy$. Recall that these maps are lattice homomorphisms.

Firstly, observe that $\lambda_{bb^\ell} \colon \mathbf{L} \to \mathbf{G}$ is a lattice embedding: if it were not, then $b = \lambda_{bb^\ell} b = \lambda_{bb^\ell} d \geq d$, since $\langle b, d\rangle \in \mu$. It follows that the map $\lambda_{b^\ell} \colon \mathbf{L} \to \mathbf{G}$ is also a lattice embedding, since $\lambda_{bb^\ell} = \lambda_b \circ \lambda_{b^\ell}$.

Lemma 2.5 states that $\lambda_{b^\ell} a \wedge (\lambda_{b^\ell} b \vee \lambda_{b^\ell} c) \leq (\lambda_{b^\ell} a \wedge \lambda_{b^\ell} b) \vee \lambda_{b^\ell} c$. Since λ_{b^ℓ} is a lattice embedding, it follows that $a \wedge (b \vee c) \leq (a \wedge b) \vee c$, contrary to the hypothesis that $\langle a, b, c\rangle$ is a forbidden triple.

If instead of $d > b$ we have $d < b$, we use the map $\rho_{b^\ell b}$ instead of λ_{bb^ℓ} to show that $\rho_{b^\ell} \colon \mathbf{L} \to \mathbf{G}$ is a lattice embedding. Then again $\rho_{b^\ell} a \wedge (\rho_{b^\ell} b \vee \rho_{b^\ell} c) \leq (\rho_{b^\ell} a \wedge \rho_{b^\ell} b) \vee \rho_{b^\ell} c$ by Lemma 2.5, hence $a \wedge (b \vee c) \leq (a \wedge b) \vee c$ using the fact that ρ_{b^ℓ} is a lattice embedding. □

Corollary 2.10. *A simple non-distributive lattice cannot occur as a sublattice of an ℓ-pregroup.*

It is not immediately obvious that this corollary does not follow directly from semidistributivity by some lattice-theoretic argument. For example, the only simple semidistributive lattice with a greatest (or least) element is the two-element chain (see [4]), therefore the corollary does not provide any new information about which lattices with a greatest (or least) element occur as sublattices of ℓ-pregroups. Nevertheless, it is indeed not a direct consequence of semidistributivity: Freese & Nation [4] managed to construct a simple semidistributive lattice which is not distributive.

Finally, let us show that in ℓ-pregroups only powers of positive elements are positive, a fact which is well known in the case of ℓ-groups. The argument in fact applies to each lattice-ordered monoid satisfying $x \approx (1 \wedge x)(1 \vee x)$ where products distribute over joins and meets. The fact that each ℓ-pregroup satisfies this equation was proved in [5, Lemma 1].

Proposition 2.11. *In every ℓ-pregroup $1 \wedge x^n \leq x$ holds for each $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. We first observe that $1 \wedge y \leq x(1 \vee x)^m$ if and only if $1 \wedge y \leq x(1 \vee x)^{m+1}$ for all $m \geq 0$ (where $z^0 := 1$ for each z):

$$\begin{aligned}
1 \wedge y \leq x(1 \vee x)^m &\iff 1 \wedge y \leq (1 \wedge x)(1 \vee x)(1 \vee x)^m \\
&\iff 1 \wedge y \leq (1 \wedge x)(1 \vee x)^{m+1} \\
&\iff 1 \wedge y \leq (1 \vee x)^{m+1} \wedge x(1 \vee x)^{m+1} \\
&\iff 1 \wedge y \leq (1 \vee x)^{m+1} \text{ and } 1 \wedge y \leq x(1 \vee x)^{m+1} \\
&\iff 1 \wedge y \leq x(1 \vee x)^{m+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $1 \wedge x^n \leq x$ holds if and only if $1 \wedge x^n \leq x(1 \vee x)^{n-1}$. But $1 \wedge x^n \leq x^n \leq xx^{n-1} \leq x(1 \vee x)^{n-1}$. □

Corollary 2.12. *Let $n \geq 1$. In every ℓ-pregroup $1 \leq x^n$ if and only if $1 \leq x$.*

This yields an alternative proof of the following known fact.

Corollary 2.13. *In every ℓ-pregroup $1 \leq x \vee x^\ell$.*

Proof. By the previous corollary it suffices to prove that $1 \leq (x \vee x^\ell)^2$: $1 \leq xx^\ell \leq xx \vee xx^\ell \vee x^\ell x \vee x^\ell x^\ell = (x \vee x^\ell)^2$. □

References

[1] Buszkowski, W.: Lambek grammars based on pregroups. In: P. de Groote, G. Morrill, C. Retoré (eds.) Logical aspects of computational linguistics, LACL 2001, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2099, pp. 95–109. Springer (2001)

[2] Buszkowski, W.: Pregroups: models and grammars. In: H.C.M. de Swart (ed.) Relational Methods in Computer Science, RelMiCS 2001, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2561, pp. 35–49. Springer (2002)

[3] Buszkowski, W.: Type logic and pregroups. Studia Logica **87**(2–3), 145–169 (2007)

[4] Freese, R., Nation, J.: A simple semidistributive lattice (2020). Preprint available at `http://math.hawaii.edu/~ralph/Preprints/simpleSD.pdf`

[5] Galatos, N., Jipsen, P.: Periodic lattice-ordered pregroups are distributive. Algebra universalis **68**(1–2), 145–150 (2012)

[6] Galatos, N., Jipsen, P., Kowalski, T., Ono, H.: Residuated lattices: an algebraic glimpse and substructural logics, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 151. Elsevier (2007)

[7] Galatos, N., Tsinakis, C.: Generalized MV-algebras. Journal of Algebra **283**(1), 254–291 (2005)

[8] Lambek, J.: Some lattice models of bilinear logic. Algebra Universalis **34**, 541–550 (1995)

[9] Lambek, J.: Type grammar revisited. In: A. Lecomte, F. Lamarche, G. Perrier (eds.) Logical aspects of computational linguistics, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 1582, pp. 1–27. Springer (1999)

[10] Lambek, J.: Type grammars as pregroups. Grammars **4**, 21–39 (2001)

Nick Galatos
Department of Mathematics
University of Denver
Denver, CO 80208
USA
URL: `https://cs.du.edu/~ngalatos/`
e-mail: `ngalatos@du.edu`

Peter Jipsen
Mathematics
Chapman University
Orange, CA 92866
USA
URL: `https://www1.chapman.edu/~jipsen/`
e-mail: `jipsen@chapman.edu`

Michael Kinyon
Department of Mathematics
University of Denver
Denver, CO 80208
USA
URL: `https://cs.du.edu/~mkinyon/`
e-mail: `mkinyon@du.edu`

Adam Přenosil*
Department of Mathematics
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37240
USA
URL: `https://sites.google.com/site/adamprenosil`
e-mail: `adam.prenosil@vanderbilt.edu`