

ORTHOMODULAR POSETS FROM SESQUILINEAR FORMS

ROBERT PIZIAK

(Received 28th April 1971)

Communicated by P. D. Finch

In this paper, we show how to generate orthomodular posets from sesquilinear forms on a vector space.

Let E be a vector space over the division ring k . A binary relation \perp on E is called a *linear orthogonality relation* provided

- (1) $x \perp y$ iff $y \perp x$, and
- (2) for each x in E , $\{x\}^\perp = \{y \mid y \perp x\}$ is a linear subspace of E .

For a subset M of E we define the *orthogonal of M* by

$$M^\perp = \{y \mid y \perp m \text{ for all } m \text{ in } M\}.$$

Also we let $[M]$ denote the linear span of M in E .

The first lemma is trivial.

LEMMA 1. For M, M_i , and N subsets of E , we have

- (1) $M \subseteq M^{\perp\perp}$
- (2) $M \subseteq N$ implies $N^\perp \subseteq M^\perp$
- (3) $M^\perp = M^{\perp\perp\perp}$
- (4) $(\cup M_i)^\perp = \cap M_i^\perp$
- (5) M^\perp is a subspace of E
- (6) $M^\perp = [M]^\perp$ so in particular if $x \perp y$ and $x \perp z$ then $x \perp y + z$ and $x \perp \alpha y$ for all α in k .
- (7) $(0)^\perp = E$ and $E = E^{\perp\perp}$

Note that $M \mapsto M^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator on the lattice of all subspaces of E .

Let \perp be a linear orthogonality relation on E . We say \perp is *nondegenerate* when $E^\perp = (0)$. In this case we call (E, \perp) a *linear orthogonality space*.

Call a subspace M of E *orthogonally closed* or \perp -*closed* if $M = M^{\perp\perp}$. Let $P_c(E, \perp)$ denote the set of all \perp -closed subspaces of E ordered by inclusion. Using well known generalities on closure operators we see that $P_c(E, \perp)$ is a complete involution lattice with zero (0) and unit E . Also for M_i in $P_c(E, \perp)$ we have

$$\inf(M_i) = \cap M_i \text{ and } \sup(M_i) = [\cup M_i]^{\perp\perp}.$$

Call a vector x in E *isotropic* if $x \perp x$ and *anisotropic* otherwise. For a subspace F of E , define the *radical* of F by $\text{rad}(F) = F \cap F^\perp$. Say that F is *semisimple* provided $\text{rad}(F) = (0)$. Let $P_{ss}(E, \perp)$ denote the set of all semisimple subspaces of E ordered by inclusion.

It can be shown that the orthogonal of a semisimple subspace need not be semisimple. However,

$$P_{ss}(E, \perp) \cap P_c(E, \perp)$$

is easily seen to be an orthocomplemented poset under the natural involution $F \mapsto F^\perp$. It need not though be orthomodular.

LEMMA 2. Let $\{F_i\}$ be an orthogonal family of linear subspaces of E (i.e. $F_i \subseteq F_j^\perp$ for $i \neq j$). Let F be the smallest subspace of E containing all the F_i . We write $F = \sum F_i$. Then $\text{rad}(F) = \sum \text{rad}(F_i)$.

PROOF. First $\text{rad}(F) = F \cap F^\perp = F \cap (\cap F_i^\perp) = \cap (F \cap F_i^\perp)$. For each fixed j and for any i we have

$$\text{rad}(F_j) = F_j \cap F_j^\perp \subseteq F \cap F_i^\perp.$$

Hence for each j , $\text{rad}(F_j) \subseteq \text{rad}(F)$ so $\sum \text{rad}(F_i) \subseteq \text{rad}(F)$.

Conversely, suppose x is in $\text{rad}(F)$. Since x is in F we can write x as a finitely nonzero sum $x = \sum x_i$ with x_i in F_i . For each j ,

$$x_j = x - \sum_{i \neq j} x_i.$$

Since x is in $\text{rad}(F)$ then x is in F_j^\perp . Since the family $\{F_i\}$ is orthogonal, each x_i with $i \neq j$ also belongs to F_j^\perp . Thus x_j is in F_j^\perp . It follows each x_j is in $\text{rad}(F_j)$. Thus x is in $\sum \text{rad}(F_i)$.

COROLLARY 3. If $\{F_i\}$ is an orthogonal family of semisimple subspaces of E , the join exists in $P_{ss}(E, \perp)$ and in fact the join is the orthogonal direct sum of the F_i .

Next we have a technical lemma.

LEMMA 4. Let F and G be linear subspaces of E . Suppose $F \subseteq G$ and $G \subseteq F + F^\perp$. Let G be semisimple. Then $G \cap F^\perp$ is semisimple.

PROOF. If $G \cap F^\perp$ were not semisimple, we would have a vector w different from zero with w belonging to

$$\text{rad}(G \cap F^\perp) = (G \cap F^\perp) \cap (G \cap F^\perp)^\perp.$$

Since G is semisimple and w is in G we cannot have w in G^\perp . Thus there

is a vector y in G such that y fails to be orthogonal to w . Since G is contained in $F + F^\perp$ and F is contained in G we see

$$G = F + (F^\perp \cap G).$$

Hence we can write $y = u + x$ where u belongs to F and x is in $F^\perp \cap G$. Since w is in F^\perp and w is in $(F^\perp \cap G)^\perp$, then w is orthogonal to y , a contradiction.

A subspace F of the linear orthogonality space (E, \perp) is called *splitting* if $E = F + F^\perp$. Let $P_s(E, \perp)$ denote the set of all splitting subspaces of E again ordered by inclusion.

The next lemma is straightforward and we omit the proof.

- LEMMA 5. (1) (0) and E are splitting subspaces
 (2) if F is in $P_s(E, \perp)$ then so is F^\perp
 (3) every splitting subspace is closed and semisimple
 (4) $P_s(E, \perp)$ is an orthocomplemented poset under the involution $F \rightarrow F^\perp$.

The next lemma establishes the first crucial property of an orthomodular poset.

LEMMA 6. Finite orthogonal joins exist in $P_s(E, \perp)$.

PROOF. Let e be any vector in E . Let F and G be in $P_s(E, \perp)$ with $F \subseteq G^\perp$. We claim

$$F + G = F \oplus G$$

is in $P_s(E, \perp)$. First $e = w + w_1$ with w in G and w_1 in G^\perp and $e = v + v_1$ with v in F and v_1 in F^\perp . Clearly

$$e = (v + w) + x$$

where $x = e - v - w, v_1 - w = w_1 - v$. Since v_1 is in F^\perp and w is in G then x is in F^\perp . Similarly, x is in G^\perp . Thus e is in

$$(F + G) + (F^\perp \cap G^\perp) = (F + G) + (F + G)^\perp.$$

Hence $E = (F + G) + (F + G)^\perp$

We now come to the main result.

THEOREM 7. Let (E, \perp) be a linear orthogonality space. Then $P_s(E, \perp)$ is an orthomodular poset.

PROOF. We have already that $P_s(E, \perp)$ is an orthocomplemented poset with zero (0) and unit E under the involution $F \mapsto F^\perp$. Orthogonal joins are just orthogonal direct sums. It suffices then to show the orthomodular identity. Let F and G be splitting subspaces with $F \subseteq G$. Then $G^\perp \leq F^\perp$ so F is orthogonal to G^\perp so $F \vee G^\perp = F + G^\perp$. Thus

$$(F \vee G^\perp)^\perp = (F + G^\perp)^\perp = F^\perp \cap G.$$

Now $G = G \cap E = G \cap (F + F^\perp) = F + (G \cap F^\perp) = F \vee (F \vee G^\perp)^\perp$ which completes the proof.

Note if E is finite dimensional, $P_s(E, \perp)$ is necessarily an atomic orthomodular poset. Also note that linear orthogonality relations exist in great abundance. Let E be any vector space. Let Φ be a θ -sesquilinear nondegenerate orthosymmetric form on E . For x and y in E , define $x \perp y$ by $\Phi(x, y) = 0$. Then $(E, \perp) = (E, \Phi)$ is a linear orthogonality space. Call such a *quadratic space*. We have characterized which linear orthogonality spaces are quadratic spaces elsewhere. For a quadratic space (E, Φ) it can also be shown that $P_s(E, \Phi)$ is an ample atomic orthomodular poset with the ortho-covering and ortho-exchange properties.

A crucial problem is to determine when $P_s(E, \Phi)$ is a lattice. The next theorem provides an important partial answer. We are indebted to H. R. Fischer for the proof.

THEOREM 8. *Let (E, Φ) be a quadratic space of dimension at least 4 over a field of characteristic different from two. Suppose not every vector of E is isotropic. If $P_s(E, \Phi)$ is a lattice then Φ admits no non-zero isotropic vectors.*

PROOF.

Suppose on the contrary that Φ admits a nonzero isotropic vector. Since every nondegenerate space of dimension at least 4 contains a four dimensional semisimple subspace, it suffices to consider the case where the dimension of E equals 4 and show that E contains two distinct three dimensional semisimple subspaces whose intersection is a degenerate plane, but not totally isotropic (i.e. with radical properly contained in this plane, thus of dimension one).

The proof proceeds as follows: we shall construct in E a plane $[x, y]$ such that $x \perp x$, $y \not\perp y$, and $x \perp y$. Then we shall find two distinct three dimensional semisimple spaces F and G in E such that $F \cap G = [x, y]$. Once this is done, it is clear that F and G do not possess any infimum in $P_s(E, \Phi)$; $[y]$ and $[x + y]$ are distinct noncomparable lower bounds of F and G in $P_s(E, \Phi)$.

The construction is as follows. Choose any nonzero x in E such that $x \perp x$. Then $[x]^\perp$ is a subspace of dimension three. Therefore it cannot be totally isotropic. Now choose anisotropic y in $[x]^\perp$. Then $[x, y]$ is the required plane. It is degenerate with $\text{rad}([x, y]) = [x]$.

Next $[y]^\perp$ is three dimensional and semisimple. Since x is in $[y]^\perp$ there exists a in $[y]$ such that $x \not\perp a$. If a is anisotropic, let $z = a$. If a is isotropic, let $z = a + x$. This will be anisotropic and still not orthogonal to x . In either case we have an anisotropic z in $[y]^\perp$ such that $x \not\perp z$. From this it follows that $[x, y, z]$ is semisimple; its radical is properly contained in $[x]$ whence is (0) .

The three dimensional space $F = [x, y, z]$ is also spanned by x , $x + y$, and z .

Since $x + y$ is anisotropic $[x + y]^\perp$ is semisimple. Hence, x being in $[x + y]$ there is an anisotropic u in $[x + y]^\perp$ such that $x \not\perp u$. Then $[x, x + y, u] = [x, y, u]$ is again semisimple and of dimension three.

We now have two cases:

case a : u is not in $[x, y, z]$. Then we put $G = [x, y, u]$ and get $F \cap G = [x, y]$.

case b : u is in $[x, y, z]$. By construction, $\{x, x + y, u\}$ is a linearly independent subset of F and hence is a basis of F . In particular, $[x, x + y, u]^\perp = [u]^\perp \cap [x]^\perp = [x + y]^\perp$ is one dimensional semisimple, i.e. is spanned by an anisotropic vector a . Now u is in $[x + y]^\perp = [u] \oplus M$, M of dimension two and semisimple. Note that $M = [u]^\perp \cap [x + y]^\perp$. Also $[a] = [u]^\perp \cap [x]^\perp \cap [x + y]^\perp = [x]^\perp \cap M$. Thus there exists an anisotropic vector w in M such that $a \perp w$. Clearly then w is not in $[x]^\perp$ but w is in $[x + y]^\perp$. In this case we put $G = [x, x + y, w] = [x, y, w]$. Again we have $F \cap G = [x, y]$ both F and G semisimple of dimension three. This completes the proof.

We remark that if the dimension of E does not exceed 3, then $P_s(E, \Phi)$ is a lattice simply because there is not enough height for things to go wrong. If in the above theorem, the dimension of E is finite and Φ admits no nonzero isotropic vectors, then $P_s(E, \Phi) = P_{ss}(E, \Phi)$ is the lattice of all subspaces of E . Also in particular we note that if Φ is the Minkowski metric for space-time, then $P_s(\mathbb{R}^4, \Phi)$ is an orthomodular poset that is not an orthomodular lattice.

We close with some open questions:

QUESTION 1. *What about the converse of Theorem 8?*

QUESTION 2. *What is the cut completion of $P_s(E, \perp)$?*

Acknowledgement

The author wishes to express his thanks to D. J. Foulis for his help.

References

- [1] N. Bourbaki, *Livre II Algèbre, Chapitre IX, Forme Sesquilineaire et Formes Quadratiques* (Hermann, Paris, VI, 1959),
- [2] O. T. O'Maera, *Introduction to Quadratic Forms* (Springer Verlag, Band 117, (1963)).
- [3] J. C. T. Pool, *Simultaneous Observability and the Logic of Quantum Mechanics*, (Ph. D. Thesis, Iowa University, 1963).
- [4] R. Piziak, *An Algebraic Generalization of Hilbert Space Geometry* (Ph. D. Thesis, Massachusetts 1969).
- [5] A. Ramsay, 'A Theorem on Two Commuting Observables' *J. Math. and Mech.* 15 (1966). 227–234.

Department of Mathematics
University of Florida
205 Walker Hall, Gainesville
Florida 32601 U. S. A.