FINITE LATTICES AND JORDAN-HÖLDER SETS[1]

RICHARD P. STANLEY

1. Introduction

In this paper we extend some aspects of the theory of 'supersolvable lattices' [3] to a more general class of finite lattices which includes the upper-semimodular lattices. In particular, all conjectures made in [3] concerning upper-semimodular lattices will be proved. For instance, we will prove that if L is finite upper-semimodular and if L' denotes L with any set of 'levels' removed, then the Möbius function of L' alternates in sign. Familiarity with [3] will be helpful but not essential for the understanding of the results of this paper. However, many of the proofs are identical to the proofs in [3] (once the machinery has been suitably generalized) and will be omitted.

2. Admissible labelings

Let L be a finite lattice with bottom $\hat{0}$ and top $\hat{1}$, such that every maximal chain of L has the same length n. Hence L has a rank function ϱ satisfying $\varrho(\hat{0})=0$, $\varrho(\hat{1})=n$, and $\varrho(y)=1+\varrho(x)$ whenever y covers x in L. We call L a *graded* lattice.

Let I denote the set of join-irreducible elements of L. A *labeling* ω of L is any map $\omega: I\to\mathbf{P}$, where $\mathbf{P}$ denotes the positive integers. A labeling ω is said to be *natural* if $z, z'\in I$ and $z\leq z'$ implies $\omega(z)\leq\omega(z')$. If $x<y$ in L and ω is a fixed labeling of L, define

$$\gamma(x, y)=\min\{\omega(z) \mid z\in I,\ x<x\vee z\leq y\}.$$

Thus, $\gamma(x, y)$ is the least label of a join-irreducible which is less than or equal to y but not less than or equal to x. Note that $\gamma(x, y)$ is always defined since y is a join of join-irreducibles. We are now able to make the key definition of this paper. A labeling ω is said to be *admissible* if whenever $x<y$ in L, there is a *unique* unrefinable chain $x=x_0<x_1<\cdots<x_m=y$ between x and y (so $m=\varrho(y)-\varrho(x)$) such that

$$\gamma(x_0, x_1)\leq\gamma(x_1, x_2)\leq\cdots\leq\gamma(x_{m-1}, x_m). \tag{1}$$

We then call the pair (L, ω) an *admissible* lattice. Our motivation for this definition is that admissibility seems to be the weakest condition for which Theorem 3.1 holds.

[1]) The research was supported by a Miller Research Fellowship at the University of California at Berkeley.

Presented by R. P. Dilworth. Received July 9, 1973. Accepted for publication in final form June 20, 1974.

The idea for this definition came from [3, Cor. 1.3] and its relation to [3, Thm. 2.1]. Our present Theorem 3.1 is a generalization of [3, Thm. 2.1].

We first note a simple property of admissible labelings.

2.1. PROPOSITION. *Let ω be an admissible labeling of a finite graded lattice L. Then ω is natural.*

Proof. Suppose $z, z' \in I$ with $z<z'$ and $\omega(z)>\omega(z')$. Since z is join-irreducible, it covers a unique element x. Similarly z' covers a unique element y. Hence any unrefinable chain between x and z' has the form $x<z=y_0<y_1<\cdots<y_m=y<z'$ (possibly $m=0$ so $z=y$). Since z is join-irreducible, it follows from the definition of γ that $\gamma(x, z)=\omega(z)$. Similarly $\gamma(y, z')=\omega(z')$. Since $\omega(z)>\omega(z')$, ω cannot be admissible. □

We know of two main classes of admissible lattices. The first class is given by the next proposition.

First recall that a lattice L of finite length is said to *upper-semimodular* if it is a graded lattice whose rank function ϱ satisfies $\varrho(x)+\varrho(y)\geq\varrho(x\vee y)+\varrho(x\wedge y)$ for all $x, y\in L$. Equivalently, L is upper-semimodular if whenever x covers y, then $x\vee z$ covers or equals $y\vee z$, for all $x, y, z\in L$.

2.2. PROPOSITION. *Let L be a finite upper-semimodular lattice and ω a natural labeling of L such that whenever z and z′ are incomparable join-irreducibles then $\omega(z)\neq\omega(z')$. (Such a labeling of L is clearly possible; in fact, an injective natural labeling can always be found.) Then ω is admissible.*

To prove this result, we first need a lemma.

2.3. LEMMA. *Let (L, ω) satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 2.2, and let $x<y$ in L. Let z be a minimal element of the set J of all join-irreducibles z′ of L satisfying $\omega(z')=\gamma(x, y)$ and $x<x\vee z'\leq y$. (J is not empty by definition of $\gamma(x, y)$.) Then $x\vee z$ covers x.*

Proof. Let I denote as before the set of join-irreducibles of L. Let $I'\subseteq I$ be the set of all $z'\in I$ satisfying $z'<z$. Let $z'\in I'$. Since $z'<z$, $x\leq x\vee z'\leq y$. Since ω is natural, $\omega(z')\leq\omega(z)$. If $\omega(z')<\omega(z)$, then by definition of $\gamma(x, y)$ we cannot have $x<x\vee z'\leq y$, so $x=x\vee z'$. On the other hand, if $\omega(z')=\omega(z)$, then by hypothesis we cannot have $x<x\vee z'\leq y$, so once again $x=x\vee z'$. Thus $x=x\vee z'$ for all $z'\in I'$. Let $w=\bigvee_{z'\in I'} z'$. Since z is join-irreducible, $w<z$. Since $x=x\vee z'$ for all $z'\in I'$, we have $x\vee w=x$.

Now if z doesn't cover w, then $w<w'<z$ for some $w'\in L$. But then there is a new join-irreducible $v<z$ such that $w<w\vee v\leq w'$, contradicting the definition of w. Hence z covers w. But by upper-semimodularity, if z covers w, then $x\vee z$ covers or equals $x\vee w=x$. By assumption, $x<x\vee z$, so $x\vee z$ covers x. □

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Let $x<y$ in L, and let $m=\varrho(y)-\varrho(x)$. We first show the existence of an unrefinable chain $x=x_0<x_1<\cdots<x_m=y$ between x and y satis-

fying (1). Let z_1 be a minimal element of the set J_1 of join-irreducibles z satisfying $\omega(z)=\gamma(x_0, y)$ and $x<x\vee z\leq y$. Let $x_1=x_0\vee z_1$. By Lemma 2.3, x_1 covers x_0, while by definition $x_1\leq y$.

If $m=1$, we are done, so assume $m\geq 2$. Let z_2 be a minimal element of the set J_2 of join-irreducibles z satisfying $\omega(z)=\gamma(x_1, y)$ and $x_1<x_1\vee z\leq y$. Let $x_2=x_1\vee z_2$. Once again by Lemma 2.3 x_2 covers x_1, while again by definition $x_2\leq y$. Now by definition of $\gamma(x_0, y)$ we have $\omega(z_1)=\gamma(x_0, y)\leq\omega(z_2)=\gamma(x_1, y)$. Continuing in this way, after m steps we get an unrefinable chain $x=x_0<x_1<\cdots<x_m=y$ satisfying $\gamma(x_0, y)\leq\gamma(x_1, y)\leq\cdots\leq\gamma(x_{m-1}, y)$. But clearly by definition of γ and the x_i's, $\gamma(x_i, y)=\gamma(x_i, x_{i+1})$. Hence we have constructed a chain C satisfying (1).

It remains to show the uniqueness of C. We shall prove the following two results:

(i) If $x'\in L$ is such that x' covers x, $x'\leq y$, and $\gamma(x, x')=\gamma(x, y)$, then $x'=x_1$;

(ii) If $x=x'_0<x'_1<\cdots<x'_m=y$ is any unrefinable chain satisfying (1), then $\gamma(x'_1, x)=\gamma(x, y)$.

Thus (i) and (ii) imply that x'_1 is uniquely determined, viz., $x'_1=x_1$ (where $x_1=x_0\vee z_1$ as defined above). Hence the proof of the proposition follows by induction on m.

Proof of (i). Suppose $x''\neq x'$ also is such that x'' covers x, $x''\leq y$, and $\gamma(x, x'')=\gamma(x, y)$. Thus there exist $z', z''\in I$ such that $\omega(z')=\omega(z'')=\gamma(x, y)$, $x\vee z'=x'$, $x\vee z''=x''$. Since x' and x'' both cover x, they are incomparable. Hence z' and z'' are incomparable. Thus by hypothesis $\omega(z')\neq\omega(z'')$, a contradiction. Hence x'' cannot exist.

Proof of (ii). Let $x=x'_0<x'_1<\cdots<x'_m=y$ be an unrefinable chain satisfying (1). Hence $\gamma(x, x'_1)\geq\gamma(x, y)$. Suppose $\gamma(x, x'_1)>\gamma(x, y)$. Let $z\in I$ satisfy $\omega(z)=\gamma(x, y)$ and $x<x\vee z\leq y$. Let i be the least positive integer for which $x\vee z\leq x'_i$. (Clearly i exists since $x\vee z\leq x'_m$.) Then $x'_{i-1}\vee z=x'_i$, so $\gamma(x'_{i-1}, x'_i)=\gamma(x, y)<\gamma(x, x'_1)$. Thus (1) cannot hold. □

The second main class of admissible lattices are the *supersolvable lattices* [3]. If L is a finite lattice and Δ a maximal chain of L, we call the pair (L, Δ) a supersolvable lattice (or *SS*-lattice) if the sublattice of L generated by Δ and any chain in L is distributive. It is easily seen that if (L, Δ) is an *SS*-lattice, then L is graded (cf. [3, § 1]).

2.4. PROPOSITION. *Let (L, Δ) be an SS-lattice with Δ given by $\hat{0}=x_0<x_1<\cdots<x_n=\hat{1}$. Define a labeling $\omega: I\to\mathbf{P}$ by letting $\omega(z)$ be the least positive integer t for which $z\leq x_t$. Then ω is admissible*

Proof. Recall that an interval $[u, v]$ of a lattice is *prime* if it contains exactly two elements, i.e., if v covers u. In a distributive lattice D, two prime intervals $[x, y]$ and $[u, v]$ are said to be *projective* if there is a unique join-irreducible z such that $y=x\vee z$ and $v=u\vee z$. This is easily seen to be equivalent to the usual definition of projectivity (e.g., [1, p. 14]) if one thinks of D as being coordinatized by a ring of sets.

If y covers x in L, then it is easily seen [3, p. 198] that there is a unique positive integer t, which we denote by $\gamma'(x, y)$, for which the prime intervals $[x, y]$ and $[x_{t-1}, x_t]$ are projective in the distributive lattice D_{xy} generated by Δ and $\{x, y\}$. In [3, Cor. 1.3], it was shown that for any $x' < y'$ in L, there is a unique unrefinable chain $x' = x'_0 < x'_1 < \cdots < x'_m = y$ between x' and y' such that

$$\gamma'(x'_0, x'_1) < \gamma'(x'_1, x'_2) < \cdots < \gamma'(x'_{m-1}, x'_m).$$

Hence it suffices to prove that $\gamma(x, y) = \gamma'(x, y)$ whenever y covers x.

We shall need the following elementary facts concerning projectivity in a finite distributive lattice D. The proofs are immediate from the above definition of projectivity.

(a) The prime intervals $[x, y]$ and $[u, v]$ are projective in D if and only if $x = (x \vee u) \wedge y$ and $y = (x \vee v) \wedge y$.

(b) If $[x, y]$ and $[u, v]$ are projective prime intervals in D, then $y \nleq u$.

(c) Suppose $[w, z]$ is a prime interval in D and z is join-irreducible. If y covers x in D and $z \leq y$, $z \nleq x$, then $[w, z]$ and $[x, y]$ are projective.

We proceed to prove that if y covers x in L, then $\gamma(x, y) = \gamma'(x, y)$. By definition of $\gamma(x, y)$, there is a join-irreducible z satisfying $x \vee z = y$ and $\omega(z) = \gamma(x, y)$. Let w be the unique element of L covered by z, and set $s = \omega(z)$. By (c), $[w, z]$ and $[x_{s-1}, x_s]$ are projective in the distributive lattice D_{wz} generated by Δ and $\{w, z\}$, so $\gamma'(w, z) = s$. If z' is a join-irreducible of L such that $z' < z$, then it follows from (b) (taking D to be generated by Δ and $\{z, z'\}$) that $\omega(z') \neq \omega(z)$. Since $\omega(z') \leq \omega(z)$, thus $\omega(z') < \omega(z)$.

We claim that $w \leq x$. It suffices to prove $z' \leq x$ for all join-irreducibles $z' \leq w$. If z' is such a join-irreducible, then by the above $\omega(z') < \omega(z)$. Hence by the definition of z, $x \vee z' = y$. But $x \vee z' \leq y$ since $z \leq y$. Since y covers x, we must have $z' \leq x$. Hence $w \leq x$.

We need to show $\omega(z) = t$, i.e., $s = t$. By (a) and (c) this is equivalent to $w = (w \vee x_{t-1}) \wedge z$ and $z = (w \vee x_t) \wedge z$. Since $\gamma'(x, y) = t$, we know by (a) that

$$x = (x \vee x_{t-1}) \wedge y \tag{2}$$

$$y = (x \vee x_t) \wedge y. \tag{3}$$

Since $w \leq x$, $z \nleq x$, $z \leq y$, and z covers w, from (2) we get $w = x \wedge z = (x \vee x_{t-1}) \wedge z$. Thus since $w \leq x$ and $w \leq z$, $w \leq (w \vee x_{t-1}) \wedge z \leq (x \vee x_{t-1}) \wedge z = w$ so $w = (w \vee x_{t-1}) \wedge z$ as desired. To prove the other equality $z = (w \vee x_t) \wedge z$, we need to show $w \vee x_t \geq z$. Since w is the only element which z covers, this is equivalent to $x_t \nleq w$. But if $x_t \leq w$, then $x_t \leq x$ since $w \leq x$. From (3) this would imply $y = x \wedge y = x$, a contradiction. □

It follows from Proposition 2.4 that the theory of SS-lattices, as developed in [3], is a special case of the theory of admissible lattices. A large class of examples of SS-lattices, some of which are not semimodular, is given in [3, §2].

3. Jordan-Hölder sequences

Let (L, ω) be an admissible finite graded lattice. Let $x \leq y$ in L, and suppose K is an unrefinable chain in L between x and y given by $x = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_m = y$. Define the *Jordan-Hölder sequence* (or *J-H sequence*) associated with K to be the sequence $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$ of positive integers given by $a_i = \gamma(x_{i-1}, x_i)$. We shall denote this sequence by π_K and shall write

$$\pi_K = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m).$$

In [3] π_K was called a '*J-H* permutation' but here repetitions among the a_i are possible.

Now define the *Jordan-Hölder set* (or *J-H set*) $\mathscr{J}_{xy}(L, \omega)$ of $(L, \omega; x, y)$ (denoted $\mathscr{J}_{xy}$ for short) to be the set of all *J-H* sequences π_K, *including repetitions*, as K ranges over all unrefinable chains between x and y. It follows from the definition of an admissible labeling that there is a unique element $\pi_K = (a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ of $\mathscr{J}_{xy}$ satisfying $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \cdots \leq a_m$. If $x = \hat{0}$ and $y = \hat{1}$, we denote $\mathscr{J}_{xy}(L, \omega)$ simply by $\mathscr{J}(L, \omega)$ or just $\mathscr{J}$, and call it the *J-H set of* (L, ω).

If $k \in \mathbf{P}$, let $\mathbf{k}$ denote the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$. We also write $S = \{m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_s\}_<$ to signify that $S = \{m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_s\}$ and $m_1 < m_2 < \cdots < m_s$. Suppose L is a finite graded lattice and $[x, y]$ is an interval of L of length (rank) m, i.e., $\varrho(y) - \varrho(x) = m$. If $\{m_1, \ldots, m_s\}_< = S \subseteq \mathbf{m-1}$, define $\alpha_{xy}(S)$ to be the number of chains

$$x < y_1 < \cdots < y_s < y$$

in L satisfying $\varrho(y_i) - \varrho(x) = m_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s$. Thus if $S = \{k\}$, then $\alpha_{xy}(S)$ is the number of elements z of $[x, y]$ of rank k in $[x, y]$ (i.e., $\varrho(z) - \varrho(x) = k$). Moreover, $\alpha_{xy}(\phi) = 1$ and $\alpha_{xy}(\mathbf{m-1})$ is the total number of unrefinable chains in L between x and y. Now define for $S \subseteq \mathbf{m-1}$,

$$\beta_{xy}(S) = \sum_{T \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S-T|} \alpha_{xy}(T),$$

so by the Principle of Inclusion-Exclusion [2],

$$\alpha_{xy}(S) = \sum_{T \subseteq S} \beta_{xy}(T).$$

As mentioned in [3, p. 198], if $L_{xy}(S)$ denotes the partially ordered set of all $z \in L$ satisfying either (a) $z = x$; (b) $z = y$; or (c) $x < z < y$ and $\varrho(z) - \varrho(x) \in S$, then

$$\mu_S(x, y) = (-1)^{s+1} \beta_{xy}(S), \tag{4}$$

where μ_S is the Möbius function of $L_{xy}(S)$ and $|S| = s$. For this reason we call the function $\beta_{xy}(\cdot)$ the *rank-selected Möbius invariant* of the interval $[x, y]$.

If $\pi=(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$ is a finite sequence of integers, then a pair $a_j > a_{j+1}$ is called a *descent* of π, and the set

$$D(\pi)=\{j: a_j > a_{j+1}\}$$

is called the *descent set* of π. We can now state the fundamental combinatorial property of *J-H* sets. This result is a direct generalization of [3, Thm. 1.2]. The proof is identical to the proof of [3, Thm. 1.2], except that here the definition of an admissible lattice plays the role of Lemma 3.1 of [3]. Thus no condition is needed about distributive sublattices of L.

3.1. THEOREM. *Let (L, ω) be an admissible lattice, and let $[x, y]$ be an interval of L of length m. If $S \subseteq \mathbf{m-1}$, then the number of sequences π in the J-H set $\mathcal{J}_{xy}(L, \omega)$ with descent set $D(\pi)=S$ is equal to $\beta_{xy}(S)$. (The reader is reminded that $\mathcal{J}_{xy}(L, \omega)$ contains one sequence π for each maximal chain of $[x, y]$, so that repeated sequences are taken into account.)*

3.2. COROLLARY. *Let (L, ω) be an admissible lattice. If $[x, y]$ is an interval of L of length m and if $S \subseteq \mathbf{m-1}$, then $\beta_{xy}(S) \geq 0$.* □

In view of (4), Corollary 3.2 may be restated as follows:

3.2′. COROLLARY. *Let (L, ω) be an admissible lattice of length n, and let $S \subseteq \mathbf{n-1}$. Then the Möbius function μ_S of the rank-selected partially ordered set $L(S)$ alternates in sign; i.e., if $[x, y]$ is an interval in $L(S)$ of length k, then*

$$(-1)^k \mu_S(x, y) \geq 0. \quad \square$$

Since by Proposition 2.2 every finite upper-semimodular lattice has an admissible labeling, Corollary 3.2′ applies to all such lattices, and in particular, to finite geometric lattices.

3.3. COROLLARY. *Let (L, ω) be an admissible lattice and $[x, y]$ an interval of L of length m. Let μ denote the Möbius function of L. Then $(-1)^m \mu(x, y)$ is equal to the number of unrefinable chains $x=x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_m = y$ between x and y satisfying*

$$\gamma(x_0, x_1) > \gamma(x_1, x_2) > \cdots > \gamma(x_{m-1}, x_m).$$

Proof. Let $S=\mathbf{m-1}$ in Theorem 3.1, and use (4). □

4. Applications

We shall state those results in [3] proved for *SS*-lattices which remain true for admissible lattices. The proofs are exactly the same as in the *SS*-case once suitable analogues are given for two concepts in [3]. First, the role of the 'induced M-chain Δ_{xy} between x and y' is replaced by the unique unrefinable chain $x=x_0<x_1<\cdots<x_m=y$ between x and y satisfying $\gamma(x_0, x_1)\leq\gamma(x_1, x_2)\leq\cdots\leq\gamma(x_{m-1}, x_m)$. Secondly, we need a replacement for statement (A) in the proof of Theorem 5.2 of [3]. Although a direct analogue of (A) can be given, it is simpler to use the following fact:

4.1. LEMMA. *If $[x, y]$ is an interval of an upper-semimodular admissible lattice (L, ω) such that y is the join of atoms of $[x, y]$, then there is an unrefinable chain $x=x_0<x_1<\cdots<x_m=y$ between x and y such that $\gamma(x_0, x_1)>\gamma(x_1, x_2)>\cdots>\gamma(x_{m-1}, x_m)$.*

Proof. Recall that a *geometric lattice* is an upper-semimodular lattice whose join-irreducibles are its atoms. If L' denotes the partially ordered set of all elements of $[x, y]$ which are a join of atoms of $[x, y]$ (including x as the void join), then L' has the structure of a geometric lattice (though L' is not necessarily a sublattice of L). If μ denotes the Möbius function of L and μ' that of L', then from [2, Cor. on p. 349] we conclude $\mu(x, y)=\mu'(x, y)$. Hence by [2, §7, Thm. 4], $\mu(x, y)\neq 0$. The desired result now follows from Corollary 3.3. □

The reader can now verify that the proofs of the following results are the same as the analogous results for SS-lattices given in [3].

4.2. PROPOSITION. (Generalizes [3, Prop. 3.3]). *Let (L, ω) be an admissible lattice, and let $[x, y]$ be an interval of L length m. Let $S\subseteq\mathbf{m-1}$. If $\beta_{xy}(S)>0$ and $T\subseteq S$, then $\beta_{xy}(T)>0$.* □

Suppose L is a finite geometric lattice. Then L is upper-semimodular, so by Proposition 2.2 L possesses an admissible labeling. Moreover, every interval of L is a geometric lattice, and the Möbius function of L is never 0. It follows from (4) and Proposition 4.2 that Corollary 3.2′ can be strengthened in the case of geometric lattices as follows:

4.3. COROLLARY. *Let L be a finite geometric lattice of rank n, and let $S\subseteq\mathbf{n-1}$. Then the Möbius function μ_S of the rank-selected partially ordered set $L(S)$ strictly alternates in sign; i.e., if $[x, y]$ is an interval in $L(S)$ of length k, then*

$$(-1)^k\,\mu_S(x, y)>0. \quad \square$$

For some related properties of geometric lattices, see the next section.

Recall [3, §5] that a *Loewy chain* between x and y in a lattice L of finite length is a chain $x=x_0<x_1<\cdots<x_r=y$ such that each x_i, $i\in\mathbf{r}$, is the join of the atoms of the interval $[x_{i-1}, x_i]$.

4.4. PROPOSITION. (Generalizes [3, Lemma 5.1]). *Let (L, ω) be an admissible* *lattice with* $[x, y]$ *an interval of length m. Let K be an unrefinable chain in L between x and y*:

$$K\colon x=y_0<y_1<\cdots<y_m=y.$$

Let $0<m_1<m_2<\cdots<m_r=m$. *Then the subchain*

$$x=y_0<y_{m_1}<y_{m_2}<\cdots<y_{m_r}=y$$

of K is a Loewy chain between x and y if

$$\mathbf{m-1}-D(\pi_K)\subseteq\{m_1, m_2,\dots, m_{r-1}\}.\quad\square$$

4.5. THEOREM. (Generalizes [3, Thm. 5.2]). *Let L be a finite upper-semimodular lattice with* $[x, y]$ *an interval of L of length m. Let* $S=\{m_1, m_2,\dots, m_s\}_<\subseteq\mathbf{m-1}$. *There exists a chain C,*

$$C\colon x=y_0<y_1<\cdots<y_s<y_{s+1}=y$$

satisfying the two conditions

(i) $\varrho(y_i)-\varrho(x)=m_i$, $1\le i\le s$ *(where* ϱ *as usual is the rank function of L)*;

(ii) *C is a Loewy chain between x and y,*

if and only if $\beta_{xy}((\mathbf{m-1})-S)>0$.

Now recall [3, §6] that if q is a fixed positive integer, then a *q-lattice* is a lattice L of finite length with the property that every interval $[x, y]$ of L for which y is the join of atoms of $[x, y]$ is isomorphic to the lattice of subspaces of a projective geometry of degree q (or to a Boolean algebra if $q=1$). Such a lattice is necessarily upper-semimodular [3, pp. 213–214] and hence possesses an admissible labeling. A q-lattice, however, need not be supersolvable, so the next proposition is strictly stronger than the corresponding Lemma 6.4 of [3]. For instance, let L' be the lattice of subgroups of a finite abelian p-group of type (3,3). Let L be L' truncated above rank 3, i.e., identify all elements of L' of rank at least 4. Then L is a p-lattice but is not supersolvable.

4.6. PROPOSITION. (Replaces [3, Lemma 6.4]). *Let* (L, ω) *be an admissible q-lattice of rank n. Let* $S\subseteq\mathbf{n-1}$, *with* $(\mathbf{n-1})-S=\{j_1, j_2,\dots, j_{t-1}\}_<$. *Also let* $j_0=0$, $j_t=n$. *Define* $N(S)$ *to be the number of maximal chains K of L satisfying* $D(\pi_K)\supseteq S$, *where* $D(\pi_K)$ *is the descent set of the J-H sequence* π_K. *Then* $N(S)=q^kM$, *where*

$$k=\sum_{n=1}^{t}\binom{j_r-j_{r-1}}{2}\tag{5}$$

and where M is the number of Loewy chains

$$\hat{0}=y_0<y_1<\cdots<y_t=\hat{1}\tag{6}$$

such that $\varrho(y_i)=j_i$, $0\le i\le t$.

Since Proposition 4.6 is not a strict analogue of [3, Lemma 6.4], we shall give a proof.

Proof. If K is a maximal chain of L such that $D(\pi_K)\supseteq S$, then by Proposition 4.4 the subchain C of K consisting of all $x\in K$ such that $\varrho(x)=j_i(0\le i\le t)$ is a Loewy chain. Hence it suffices to prove that if we have a Loewy chain (6) with $\varrho(y_i)=j_i$, then the number of refinements of C to a maximal chain K satisfying $D(\pi_K)\supseteq S$ is equal to q^k, where k is given by (5).

Assume we have such a Loewy chain C. Since L is a q-lattice, each interval $[y_{r-1}, y_r]$ $(1\le r\le t)$ is a projective geometry of degree q (or a Boolean algebra if $q=1$). Hence $\mu(y_{r-1}, y_r)=(-1)^b q^{k_r}$, where $b=j_r-j_{r-1}$ and $k_r=\binom{j_r-j_{r-1}}{2}$. Now by Corollary 3.3 the number of maximal chains $y_{r-1}=z_0<z_1<\cdots<z_b=y_r$ of the interval $[y_{r-1}, y_r]$ such that

$$\gamma(z_0, z_1)>\gamma(z_1, z_2)>\cdots>\gamma(z_{b-1}, z_b)$$

is just $(-1)^b\mu(y_{r-1}, y_r)=q^{k_r}$. Hence the total number of refinements of C to a maximal chain K satisfying $D(\pi_K)\supseteq S$ is equal to $q^{k_1}q^{k_2}\dots q^{k_t}=q^k$, and the proof follows. □

4.7. COROLLARY. (Generalizes [3, Corollary 6.5]). *Let L be a q-lattice of rank n, and let $S\subseteq \mathbf{n-1}$, with $(\mathbf{n-1})-S=\{j_1, j_2,\dots, j_{t-1}\}_<$ and $j_0=0, j_t=n$. Then $\beta(S)$ is divisible by q^k, where k is given by* (6).

The derivation of Corollary 4.7 from Proposition 4.6 is not quite as trivial as the derivation of [3, Corollary 6.5] from [3, Lemma 6.4], so we shall give a proof.

Proof. Fix an admissible labeling ω of L. By Theorem 3.1, $\beta(S)$ is equal to the number of maximal chains K of L satisfying $D(\pi_K)=S$. Hence if $N(S)$ is defined as in Proposition 4.6, we have

$$N(S)=\sum_{T\supseteq S}\beta(T),$$

so

$$\beta(S)=\sum_{T\supseteq S}(-1)^{|T-S|}N(T). \tag{7}$$

Suppose we have $\mathbf{n-1}\supseteq T\supseteq S$ where $(\mathbf{n-1})-T=\{i_1, i_2,\dots, i_{s-1}\}_<$ and $(\mathbf{n-1})-S=\{j_1, j_2,\dots, j_{t-1}\}_<$, and $i_0=j_0=0$, $i_s=j_t=n$. An easy computation shows that

$$\sum_{r=1}^{s}\binom{i_r-i_{r-1}}{2}\ge\sum_{r=1}^{t}\binom{j_r-j_{r-1}}{2}.$$

It follows from Proposition 4.6 that each term $N(T)$ appearing in (7) is divisible by q^k, so the proof follows. □

4.8. THEOREM. (Generalizes [3, Theorem 6.6]). *Let L be a q-lattice of rank n, and let* $S \subseteq \mathbf{n-1}$ *with* $|S| = s$. *Then* $\beta(S)$ *is divisible by* $q^{Q(n,s)}$, *where*

$$Q(n, s) = \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{n}{n-s}\right]\left(n+s-(n-s)\left[\frac{n}{n-s}\right]\right)$$

(brackets denote the integer part). This result is best possible in the sense that given n and $0 \leq s \leq n-1$, *there exists a q-lattice (which can even be chosen to be modular) of rank n and a set* $S \subseteq \mathbf{n-1}$ *of cardinality s such that* $\beta(S) = q^{Q(n,s)}$ (see [3, p. 216]). □

5. The broken circuit theorem

In this section we shall point out the connection between our work and the so-called 'broken circuit theorem' of G.-C. Rota [2, Prop. 1, p. 358], which generalizes to arbitrary finite geometric lattices a result of Whitney on graphs. The reader should be warned that [2, Prop. 1, p. 358] is *false* when $k > 1$. However, the proof is valid when $k = 1$, and this is the case which will concern us here.

We proceed to describe the broken circuit theorem. Let L be a finite geometric lattice of rank n, and let $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_t$ be an ordering of the atoms A of L. A subset C of A is called a *circuit* if the rank of the join of the elements of C is $|C| - 1$, while the rank of the join of the elements of any proper subset C' of C is $|C'|$. A subset $B = \{a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}, \ldots, a_{i_j}\}$ of A is called a *broken circuit* if there exists an atom a_m such that $m > i_r$ for $r = 1, 2, \ldots, j$, and such that $B \cup \{a_m\}$ is a circuit. Note that the notion of a circuit depends only on L, while that of a broken circuit also depends on the ordering chosen for the elements of A.

BROKEN CIRCUIT THEOREM (G.-C. Rota). *Let L be a finite geometric lattice of rank n with an ordering* $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_t$ *of the atoms of L. Let* μ *be the Möbius function of L. Then* $(-1)^n \mu(\hat{0}, \hat{1})$ *is equal to the number of sets of n atoms of L not containing any broken circuit.* □

Given an ordering $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_t$ of the atoms of a finite geometric lattice L of rank n, define a labeling ω of L by $\omega(a_i) = t - i + 1$, so $i < j$ implies $\omega(a_i) > \omega$. By Proposition 2.2, (L, ω) is an admissible lattice. Let $\hat{0} = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_n = \hat{1}$ be a maximal chain K in L satisfying

$$\gamma(x_0, x_1) > \gamma(x_1, x_2) > \cdots > \gamma(x_{n-1}, x_n). \tag{8}$$

We know by Corollary 3.3 that the number of such maximal chains K is $(-1)^n \mu(\hat{0}, \hat{1})$. We would like to relate this fact to the Broken Circuit Theorem by constructing an explicit one-to-one correspondence λ between maximal chains K satisfying (8) and sets of n atoms of L containing no broken circuit.

This correspondence λ is defined as follows. Given a maximal chain K satisfying (8), let $\lambda(K)$ be the set $\{b_1, b_2, ..., b_n\}$ of those n atoms defined by $\omega(b_j)=\gamma(x_{j-1}, x_j)$.

5.1. PROPOSITION. *The function λ defines a one-to-one correspondence between maximal chains K of L satisfying* (8), *and sets of n atoms of L containing no broken circuit.*

Proof. We first prove that $\lambda(K)$ contains no broken circuits. Suppose $B=\{b_{i_1}, b_{i_2}, ..., b_{i_s}\}$ is a broken circuit contained in $\lambda(K)$ with $i_1<i_2<\cdots<i_s$, i.e., $\omega(b_{i_1})>\omega(b_{i_2})>\cdots>\omega(b_{i_s})$. By definition of broken circuit, there exists an atom a of L such that $\omega(b_{i_r})>\omega(a)$ for $r=1, 2, ..., s$ and $B\cup\{a\}$ is a circuit. By definition of the b_i's and γ, $x_{i_s-1}\vee b_{i_s}=x_{i_s}$ and $b_{i_r}\leq x_{i_s-1}$ for $r=1, 2, ..., s-1$. Hence since $B\cup\{a\}$ is a circuit, $x_{i_s-1}\vee a=x_{i_s}$. By definition of γ, this means $\omega(b_{i_s})<\omega(a)$, a contradiction. Hence $\lambda(K)$ contains no broken circuit.

Now let $B=\{b_1, b_2, ..., b_n\}$ be a set of n atoms containing no broken circuit, with $\omega(b_1)>\omega(b_2)>\cdots>\omega(b_n)$. Recall that a *basis* of L is a set of n atoms $c_1, c_2, ..., c_n$ of L such that $\varrho(c_1\vee c_2\vee\cdots\vee c_n)=n$. Equivalently, a basis is a set of n atoms containing no circuit. Now note that B is a basis, since if it contained a circuit it would contain a broken circuit. If $\lambda(K)=B$, then K must be given by $x_j=b_1\vee b_2\vee\cdots\vee b_j$, so λ is injective. It remains to prove that these x_j's satisfy $\gamma(x_{j-1}, x_j)=\omega(b_j)$, which shows λ is surjective. By definition of the x_i's, $x_{j-1}\vee b_j=x_j$. Suppose a is an atom such that $x_{j-1}\vee a=x_j$ and $\omega(a)<\omega(b_j)$. Thus the set $\{b_1, b_2, ..., b_j, a\}$ contains a circuit C. Moreover, $a\in C$ since the b_i's are independent. Since $\omega(b_1)>\omega(b_2)>\cdots>\omega(b_j)$ and $\omega(b_j)>\omega(a)$, $\omega(a)<\omega(b_i)$ for $1\leq i\leq j$. Hence $C-\{a\}$ is a broken circuit, a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

REFERENCES

[1] Garrett Birkhoff, *Lattice Theory*, 3rd Ed., American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1967.

[2] G.-C. Rota, *On the foundations of combinatorial theory: I: Theory of Möbius functions*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie, *2* (1964), 340–368.

[3] R. Stanley, *Supersolvable lattices*, Algebra Universalis, *2* (1972), 197-217.

University of California at Berkeley
Berkeley, California
U.S.A.