

A STRUCTURAL APPROACH TO NOETHER LATTICES

E. W. JOHNSON, J. A. JOHNSON, AND J. P. LEDIAEV

0. In this paper we explore the extent to which embedding and isomorphism questions about a Noether lattice \mathcal{L} can be reduced to questions about simpler structures associated with \mathcal{L} .

In § 1, we use a variation of Dilworth's congruence approach [2] to associate a collection of semi-local Noether lattices with a given Noether lattice \mathcal{L} . We show that these semi-localizations determine \mathcal{L} to within isomorphism (Corollary 1.5); thus embedding and isomorphism questions about \mathcal{L} are largely reduced to the semi-local case.

In § 2, we consider the influence on a semi-local Noether lattice \mathcal{L} of the substructure $\partial\mathcal{L}$ consisting of all elements, all of whose associated primes are maximal. Here we find that if $\partial\mathcal{L}$ can be embedded in a semi-local Noether lattice \mathcal{L}^* , then \mathcal{L} can be embedded in an extension $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ of \mathcal{L}^* . Further, since $\partial\mathcal{L}$ splits in such a way that each component can be embedded in a localization of \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{L} can be embedded in the direct sum of local Noether lattices, each of which is an extension of a localization of \mathcal{L} . It follows that embedding problems for \mathcal{L} are largely dependent on the localizations of \mathcal{L} . The main tool of this section is that of an A -sequence [4]. The collection of all A -sequences in \mathcal{L} is closely related to the A -adic completion of a Noetherian ring.

1. Let \mathcal{L} be a Noether lattice, S a non-empty subset of \mathcal{L} , and $A \in \mathcal{L}$. If $A = Q_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Q_k$ is a normal decomposition of A where Q_i is P_i -primary, we set $A_s = \bigwedge \{Q_i; P_i \leq X, \text{ for some } X \in S\}$. Since $\{P_i; P_i \leq X, \text{ for some } X \in S\}$ is an isolated set of primes of A , A_s is well-defined. We also note that $A_s = \bigwedge \{Q_i; P_i \leq X, \text{ for some } X \in S\}$ is a normal decomposition of A_s , and $(A_s)_s = A_s$. We now set $I_s = I$ and $\mathcal{L}_s = \{B \in \mathcal{L}; B = B_s\}$.

LEMMA 1.1. *The operation $A \rightarrow A_s$ has the following properties:*

- (1.0) $A \leq B$ implies $A_s \leq B_s$,
- (1.1) $(A \wedge B)_s = (A_s \wedge B_s)_s$,
- (1.2) $(A \vee B)_s = (A_s \vee B_s)_s$,
- (1.3) $(A \cdot B)_s = (A_s \cdot B_s)_s$,
- (1.4) $(A : B)_s = (A_s : B_s)_s$.

Received April 23, 1969 and in revised form, January 6, 1970.

The proofs are straightforward modifications of the special case $S = \{D\}$, which may be found in [2].

By (1.0), 0_s is a least element for \mathcal{L}_s . Since \mathcal{L}_s inherits the ascending chain condition from \mathcal{L} , it follows that every family of elements of \mathcal{L}_s has a greatest lower bound in \mathcal{L}_s . Consequently, \mathcal{L}_s is a complete lattice.

We denote the greatest lower and least upper bound operations in \mathcal{L}_s by \wedge_s and \vee^s , respectively. And we define the product of A and B in \mathcal{L}_s by $A \cdot_s B = (AB)_s$.

LEMMA 1.2. *For elements $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_s$,*

- (i) $A \wedge B = (A \wedge B)_s = A \wedge_s B$,
- (ii) $(A \vee B)_s = A \vee^s B$,
- (iii) $A \cdot_s (B \vee^s C) = (A \cdot_s B) \vee^s (A \cdot_s C)$,
- (iv) $A : B = (A : B)_s = A :_s B$.

Proof of (i). $(A \wedge B)_s \leq A_s$ and $(A \wedge B)_s \leq B_s$, and so

$$(A \wedge B)_s \leq A_s \wedge_s B_s = A \wedge_s B.$$

Furthermore, $A \wedge_s B \leq A$ and $A \wedge_s B \leq B$, and so

$$A \wedge_s B \leq A \wedge B \leq (A \wedge B)_s.$$

This establishes (i).

The remaining identities follow similarly.

Using the relations thus far developed, it is easy to see that \mathcal{L}_s is a Noether lattice: every element is the finite join of elements E_s , where E is principal in \mathcal{L} , and elements of this type are principal in \mathcal{L}_s . It is also seen that for elements $Q, P \in \mathcal{L}_s$, Q is P -primary in \mathcal{L}_s if, and only if, Q is P -primary in \mathcal{L} .

We note that if $A \in \mathcal{L}$ and $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, then there is a finite subset T of \mathcal{L} such that $A_T = A_s$. This is so because every prime of A_s is a prime of A , and $(A_s)_T = A_T$. Also, if $A_T = A_s$ and $T \subseteq U \subseteq S$, then $A_U = A_s$. Hence, if F is any finite subset of \mathcal{L} , then S has a finite subset T such that $A_s = A_T$ for all $A \in F$. As a consequence, we have the following lemma.

LEMMA 1.3. *Let A and B be elements of \mathcal{L} and $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. Let K be the set of primes associated with any of the elements $A_s, B_s, (A \wedge B)_s, (A \vee B)_s, (AB)_s$. If T is any subset of S such that each element of K is contained in an element of T , then*

- (i) $A_s, B_s \in \mathcal{L}_T$,
- (ii) $A_s \wedge_s B_s = A_s \wedge_T B_s$,
- (iii) $A_s \vee^s B_s = A_s \vee^T B_s$,
- (iv) $A_s \cdot_s B_s = A_s \cdot_T B_s$,
- (v) $A_s :_s B_s = A_s :_T B_s$,

Proof. Since each prime of $A_s, B_s, (A \vee B)_s, (A \wedge B)_s$, and $(AB)_s$ is

contained in an element of T , we have that $A_s = A_T, B_s = B_T, (A \wedge B)_s, (A \vee B)_s$, and $(AB)_s$ are elements of \mathcal{L}_T . Then, for example,

$$\begin{aligned} A_s \vee^s B_s &= (A_s \vee B_s)_s = (A \vee B)_s = (A \vee B)_T \\ &= (A_T \vee B_T)_T = A_T \vee^T B_T = A_s \vee^T B_s \end{aligned}$$

(Lemma 1.2). The rest of the lemma follows similarly.

We are now in a position to prove the following.

THEOREM 1.4. *Let \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}_* be Noether lattices, $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, and ψ a map of S into \mathcal{L}_* . Assume that, for every finite subset T of S , there is given a multiplicative lattice morphism φ_T of \mathcal{L}_T into $\mathcal{L}_{*\psi(T)}$ in such a way that $T_1 \subseteq T_2$ implies $\varphi_{T_1} \leq \varphi_{T_2}$. Then there is a unique morphism φ_S of \mathcal{L}_S into $\mathcal{L}_{*\psi(S)}$ such that $\varphi_T \leq \varphi_S$ for every finite subset T of S . Furthermore,*

- (i) φ_S is onto if each map φ_T is onto,
- (ii) φ_S is one-to-one if each map φ_T is one-to-one,
- (iii) φ_S preserves residuals if each map φ_T does,
- (iv) φ_S takes primaries to primaries, primes to primes, and principal elements to principal elements if each map φ_T does.

Proof. Let S_f be the collection of finite subsets of S . Then $\mathcal{L}_S = \bigcup_{T \in S_f} \mathcal{L}_T$, and so the uniqueness of φ_S is immediate. Also, if $A \in \mathcal{L}_{T_1} \cap \mathcal{L}_{T_2}$ and if $T = T_1 \cup T_2$, then $\mathcal{L}_{T_1} \cup \mathcal{L}_{T_2} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_T$ and $\varphi_{T_1}(A) = \varphi_T(A) = \varphi_{T_2}(A)$. Hence we can define φ_S on \mathcal{L}_S by $\varphi_S(A) = \varphi_T(A)$ if $A \in \mathcal{L}_T$ or, equivalently, $\varphi_S(A) = \bigwedge_{T \in S_f} \varphi_T(A_T)$. Then, given $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_S$, there is only a finite number of primes associated with $A, B, (A \vee B)_s$, and $(AB)_s$, and so we can choose a finite subset T_1 of S such that each prime of $A, B, (A \vee B)_s$, and $(AB)_s$ is contained in an element of T_1 . Similarly, we can choose a finite subset T_2 of S so that each prime of $\varphi_S(A)_{\psi(S)}, \varphi_S(B)_{\psi(S)}, (\varphi_S(A) \vee \varphi_S(B))_{\psi(S)}$, and $(\varphi_S(A)\varphi_S(B))_{\psi(S)}$ is contained in an element of $\psi(T_2)$. Set $T = T_1 \cup T_2$. Then by Lemma 1.3, $\varphi_S(A \vee^s B) = \varphi_T(A \vee^T B) = \varphi_T(A) \vee^{\psi(T)} \varphi_T(B) = \varphi_S(A) \vee^{\psi(T)} \varphi_S(B)$, and similarly for $A \wedge_s B, A \cdot_s B$. Hence φ_S is a morphism of \mathcal{L}_S into $\mathcal{L}_{*\psi(S)}$. It is immediate that φ_S is one-to-one if each map φ_T is one-to-one, and also that φ_S is onto if each φ_T is onto. If each φ_T preserves residuals (i.e., $\varphi_T(A :_T B) = \varphi_T(A) :_{\psi(T)} \varphi_T(B)$), then φ_S preserves residuals by Lemma 1.3. Since the primaries and primes of \mathcal{L}_S are the primaries and primes of \mathcal{L} which are elements of \mathcal{L}_S , it is clear that φ_S preserves primes and primaries if each φ_T does.

Now, assume that each φ_T preserves principal elements. Let E be principal in \mathcal{L}_S . Then E_T is principal in $\mathcal{L}_T = (\mathcal{L}_S)_T$, and thus $\varphi_T(E_T)$ is principal in $\mathcal{L}_{*\psi(T)}$. From this we conclude that $\varphi_S(E)$ is principal in $\mathcal{L}_{*\psi(S)}$ (Lemma 1.3).

Let $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L})$ denote the set of all maximal elements of \mathcal{L} .

COROLLARY 1.5. *Let \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}_* be Noether lattices and ψ a map of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L})$ onto $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_*)$. Assume that for each finite subset S of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L})$ there is a morphism*

φ_S of \mathcal{L}_S into $\mathcal{L}_{*\psi(S)}$ in such a way that $S_1 \subseteq S_2$ implies $\varphi_{S_1} \leq \varphi_{S_2}$. Then there is a unique morphism φ of \mathcal{L} into \mathcal{L}_* such that $\varphi_S \leq \varphi$ for all $S \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L})_f$. As in Theorem 1.4, φ inherits the special properties of the maps φ_S . In particular, φ is a Noether lattice embedding (in the sense of [1]) if each of the maps φ_S is.

We note that for $S \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L})_f$, \mathcal{L}_S is a semi-local Noether lattice. Hence, a Noether lattice is determined by its semi-localizations.

2. We are now interested primarily in semi-local Noether lattices. For such a Noether lattice \mathcal{L} , we let $\partial\mathcal{L}$ denote the subset consisting of I and all elements A such that every associated prime is a maximal element. We use $\partial\mathcal{L}^0$ to denote $\partial\mathcal{L} \cup \{0\}$. Then $\partial\mathcal{L}^0$ is a complete, modular, multiplicative lattice. In this section, we use $\partial\mathcal{L}$ to reduce the embedding problem for a semi-local Noether lattice to the local case. Before we begin, however, we require some definitions.

(2.0). If $\{B_i\}$ is any sequence of elements of \mathcal{L} and $A \in \mathcal{L}$, then $\{B_i\}$ is an A -sequence if, given $n \geq 1$, it follows that $B_i \vee A^n$ is constant for large i .

(2.1). An A -sequence $\{B_i\}$ is a regular A -sequence if, given n , it follows that $B_i \vee A^n$ is constant for all $i \geq n$.

(2.2). An A -sequence $\{B_i\}$ is a completely regular A -sequence if $B_{n+1} \vee A^n = B_n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

(2.3). \mathcal{L} is A -complete if, given any completely regular A -sequence $\{B_i\}$, it follows that $B_n = (\bigwedge_i B_i) \vee A^n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

If $\{B_i\}$ is any A -sequence and if $C_i = \bigwedge_j (B_j \vee A^i)$, then $\{C_i\}$ is a completely regular A -sequence. This follows since if $B_j \vee A^i$ and $B_j \vee A^{i+1}$ are constant for $j \geq k$, then $C_i = B_j \vee A^i = (B_j \vee A^{i+1}) \vee A^i = C_{i+1} \vee A^i$.

We note that if $\bigwedge_i (B \vee A^i) = B$ for all $B \in \mathcal{L}$, then a sequence $\{B_i\}$ of elements of \mathcal{L} is an A -sequence if, and only if, $\{B_i\}$ is a Cauchy sequence relative to the metric: $d(D, C) = 1/2^n$ if $D \vee A^n = C \vee A^n$ and $D \vee A^{n+1} \neq C \vee A^{n+1}$.

LEMMA 2.1. *Let A, B , and C be elements of \mathcal{L} . Then there is a positive integer k such that $A \wedge (B \vee C^n) \leq (A \wedge B) \vee AC^{n-k}$ for all $n \geq k$.*

Proof. By the Artin-Rees Lemma for Noether lattices [3],

$$(A \vee B) \wedge (B \vee C^n) \leq [(A \vee B) \wedge (B \vee C^k)](B \vee C^{n-k}) \vee B,$$

for some k and for all $n \geq k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} A \wedge (B \vee C^n) &\leq (A \vee B) \wedge (B \vee C^n) \\ &\leq ((A \wedge (B \vee C^k)) \vee B)(B \vee C^{n-k}) \vee B = (A \wedge (B \vee C^k))C^{n-k} \vee B, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} A \wedge (B \vee C^n) &\leq A \wedge ((A \wedge (B \vee C^k))C^{n-k} \vee B) \\ &\leq (A \wedge (B \vee C^k))C^{n-k} \vee (A \wedge B) \leq (A \wedge B) \vee AC^{n-k}. \end{aligned}$$

COROLLARY 2.2. Let A_1, \dots, A_s and C be elements of \mathcal{L} . Then for some k and for all $n \geq k$,

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^s (A_i \vee C^n) \leq \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^s A_i \right) \vee C^{n-k}.$$

Proof. By induction, we can assume that

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^{s-1} (A_i \vee C^n) \leq \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{s-1} A_i \right) \vee C^{n-k_1} \quad \text{for all } n \geq k_1.$$

By Lemma 2.1, we can choose k_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{s-1} A_i \right) \vee C^{n-k_1} \right) \wedge (A_s \vee C^{n-k_1}) &= \left(\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{s-1} A_i \right) \wedge (A_s \vee C^{n-k_1}) \right) \vee C^{n-k_1} \\ &\leq \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^s A_i \right) \vee C^{n-k_1-k_2} \vee C^{n-k_1} \\ &= \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^s A_i \right) \vee C^{n-k_1-k_2} \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq k_1 + k_2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \bigwedge_{i=1}^s (A_i \vee C^n) &\leq \left(\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{s-1} A_i \right) \vee C^{n-k_1} \right) \wedge (A_s \vee C^n) \\ &\leq \left(\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{s-1} A_i \right) \vee C^{n-k_1} \right) \wedge (A_s \vee C^{n-k_1}) \\ &\leq \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^s A_i \right) \vee C^{n-k}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq k = k_1 + k_2$.

COROLLARY 2.3. Let A, B , and C be elements of \mathcal{L} . Then, for some k and all $n \geq k$,

$$(A \vee C^n):(B \vee C^n) \leq (A:B) \vee C^{n-k}.$$

Proof. If B is principal, we choose k such that

$$(A \vee C^n) \wedge B \leq (A \wedge B) \vee BC^{n-k}$$

for all $n \geq k$ (Lemma 2.1). Then

$((A \vee C^n):B)B = (A \vee C^n) \wedge B \leq (A \wedge B) \vee BC^{n-k} = ((A:B) \vee C^{n-k})B$
and hence $(A \vee C^n):(B \vee C^n) \leq (A \vee C^n):B \leq (A:B) \vee C^{n-k}$, for all $n \geq k$.

If B is arbitrary, we write B as the join $B = B_1 \vee \dots \vee B_s$ of principal elements. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (A \vee C^n):(B \vee C^n) &= (A \vee C^n):B = (A \vee C^n):(B_1 \vee \dots \vee B_s) \\ &= \bigwedge_{i=1}^s (A \vee C^n):B_i \leq \bigwedge_{i=1}^s ((A:B_i) \vee C^{n-k_i}), \end{aligned}$$

where k_i is chosen for B_i as above. Let $k' = \max\{k_1, \dots, k_s\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bigwedge_{i=1}^s ((A : B_i) \vee C^{n-k_i}) &\cong \bigwedge_{i=1}^s ((A : B_i) \vee C^{n-k'}) \\ &\cong \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^s (A : B_i) \right) \vee C^{n-k'-k''}, \end{aligned}$$

for some k'' and all $n \geq k' + k''$. Since $\bigwedge_{i=1}^s (A : B_i) = A : (\bigvee_{i=1}^s B_i) = A : B$, we have $(A \vee C^n) : (B \vee C^n) \cong (A : B) \vee C^{n-k}$, for all $n \geq k = k' + k''$.

Now, let $\partial_C(\mathcal{L}) = \{A \in \mathcal{L}; A \geq C^n, \text{ for some } n\}$, so that $\partial_C(\mathcal{L})$ is a sub-multiplicative lattice of \mathcal{L} . Let $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$ denote the greatest lower bound of the collection of maximal elements of \mathcal{L} .

THEOREM 2.4. *Let C and C_* be elements of Noether lattices \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}_* , respectively, and $\partial\varphi$ a morphism of $\partial_C(\mathcal{L})$ into $\partial_{C_*}(\mathcal{L}_*)$ such that $\partial\varphi(C) = C_*$. If \mathcal{L}_* is C_* -complete and $C_* \leq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_*)$, then $\partial\varphi$ extends uniquely to a morphism φ of \mathcal{L} into \mathcal{L}_* . Furthermore:*

- (i) φ preserves residuals if $\partial\varphi$ preserves residuals;
- (ii) φ is one-to-one if $\partial\varphi$ is one-to-one and $C \leq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$;
- (iii) If $\partial\varphi$ maps $\partial_C(\mathcal{L})$ onto $\partial_{C_*}(\mathcal{L}_*)$, \mathcal{L} is C -complete, and either $\partial\varphi$ is one-to-one or \mathcal{L}/C is finite-dimensional, then φ maps \mathcal{L} onto \mathcal{L}_* .

Proof. Set $\varphi(A) = \bigwedge_n \partial\varphi(A \vee C^n)$. Then

$$\partial\varphi(A \vee C^{n+1}) \vee C_*^n = \partial\varphi(A \vee C^{n+1}) \vee \partial\varphi(C^n) = \partial\varphi(A \vee C^n),$$

and so $\{\partial\varphi(A \vee C^n)\}$ is a completely regular C_* -sequence in \mathcal{L}_* . Since \mathcal{L}_* is C_* -complete, it follows that

$$\varphi(A) \vee C_*^n = \bigwedge_i \partial\varphi(A \vee C^i) \vee C_*^n = \partial\varphi(A \vee C^n)$$

for all n . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(A) \vee \varphi(B) \vee C_*^n &= \partial\varphi(A \vee C^n) \vee \partial\varphi(B \vee C^n) \\ &= \partial\varphi(A \vee B \vee C^n) = \varphi(A \vee B) \vee C_*^n, \end{aligned}$$

for all n . Hence, by the intersection theorem and the relation $C_* \leq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_*)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(A) \vee \varphi(B) &= \bigwedge_n (\varphi(A) \vee \varphi(B) \vee C_*^n) \\ &= \bigwedge_n (\varphi(A \vee B) \vee C_*^n) = \varphi(A \vee B). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi(A)\varphi(B)) \vee C_*^n &= ((\varphi(A) \vee C_*^n)(\varphi(B) \vee C_*^n)) \vee C_*^n \\ &= (\partial\varphi(A \vee C^n)\partial\varphi(B \vee C^n)) \vee \partial\varphi(C^n) = \partial\varphi((A \vee C^n)(B \vee C^n)) \vee C^n \\ &= \partial\varphi(AB \vee C^n) = \varphi(AB) \vee C_*^n, \end{aligned}$$

for all n , and thus $\varphi(A)\varphi(B) = \varphi(AB)$.

To see that φ preserves meets, we use Corollary 2.2 to choose k so that $(A \vee C^n) \wedge (B \vee C^n) \leq (A \wedge B) \vee C^{n-k}$, for all $n \geq k$. Then

$$\varphi(A) \wedge \varphi(B) \leq (\varphi(A) \vee C_*^n) \wedge (\varphi(B) \vee C_*^n) = \partial\varphi(A \vee C^n) \wedge \partial\varphi(B \vee C^n) \\ = \partial\varphi((A \vee C^n) \wedge (B \vee C^n)) \leq \partial\varphi((A \wedge B) \vee C^{n-k}) = \varphi(A \wedge B) \vee C_*^{n-k},$$

for all $n \geq k$. Thus $\varphi(A) \wedge \varphi(B) \leq \bigwedge_n (\varphi(A \wedge B) \vee C_*^{n-k}) = \varphi(A \wedge B)$. Since φ is clearly isotone, it follows that $\varphi(A \wedge B) = \varphi(A) \wedge \varphi(B)$.

To see that φ preserves residuals if $\partial\varphi$ does, we use Corollary 2.3 to choose k so that $(A \vee C^n):(B \vee C^n) \leq (A:B) \vee C^{n-k}$, for all $n \geq k$. Then

$$(\varphi(A):\varphi(B)) \leq (\varphi(A) \vee C_*^n):(\varphi(B) \vee C_*^n) = \partial\varphi(A \vee C^n):\partial\varphi(B \vee C^n) \\ = \partial\varphi((A \vee C^n):(B \vee C^n)) \leq \partial\varphi((A:B) \vee C^{n-k}) = \varphi(A:B) \vee C_*^{n-k},$$

for all $n \geq k$. Thus $\varphi(A):\varphi(B) \leq \bigwedge_n (\varphi(A:B) \vee C_*^{n-k}) = \varphi(A:B)$. Also, since φ is isotone, we have $\varphi(A:B)\varphi(B) = \varphi((A:B)B) \leq \varphi(A)$, so that $\varphi(A:B) \leq \varphi(A):\varphi(B)$. Hence $\varphi(A:B) = \varphi(A):\varphi(B)$, if $\partial\varphi$ preserves residuals.

Assume now that $\partial\varphi$ is one-to-one and that $C \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$. Then $\varphi(A) = \varphi(B)$ implies $\partial\varphi(A \vee C^n) = \varphi(A) \vee C_*^n = \varphi(B) \vee C_*^n = \partial\varphi(B \vee C^n)$, for all n . Hence $A \vee C^n = B \vee C^n$, for all n , and therefore

$$A = \bigwedge_n (A \vee C^n) = \bigwedge_n (B \vee C^n) = B.$$

We now assume that \mathcal{L} is C -complete and that $\partial\varphi$ maps $\partial_C(\mathcal{L})$ onto $\partial_{C_*}(\mathcal{L}_*)$. If $\partial\varphi$ is one-to-one and $D_* \in \mathcal{L}_*$, then for each i there is a unique $D_i \geq C^i$ such that $\partial\varphi(D_i) = D_* \vee C_*^i$. Further, since

$$\partial\varphi(D_{i+1} \vee C^i) = (D_* \vee C_*^{i+1}) \vee C_*^i = \partial\varphi(D_i),$$

we have that $\{D_i\}$ is a completely regular C -sequence in \mathcal{L} . If $D = \bigwedge_i D_i$, then $D \vee C^i = D_i$ for all i , and so

$$\varphi(D) \vee C_*^i = \varphi(D \vee C^i) = \varphi(D_i) = D_* \vee C_*^i,$$

for all i , and therefore $\varphi(D) = \bigwedge_i (\varphi(D) \vee C_*^i) = \bigwedge_i (D_* \vee C_*^i) = D_*$. On the other hand, if \mathcal{L}/C is finite-dimensional, then \mathcal{L}/C^i is finite-dimensional for all i [3]. In this case, if $D_* \in \mathcal{L}_*$ we choose $D'_i \geq C^i$ for each i such that $\varphi(D'_i) = D_* \vee C_*^i$, but of course D'_i need not be uniquely determined. Set $\bar{D}_i = \bigwedge_{j \leq i} D'_j$. Then $\{\bar{D}_i\}$ is a decreasing sequence in \mathcal{L} such that

$$\varphi(\bar{D}_i) = \varphi\left(\bigwedge_{j \leq i} D'_j\right) = \bigwedge_{j \leq i} \varphi(D'_j) = \bigwedge_{j \leq i} (D_* \vee C_*^j) = D_* \vee C_*^i.$$

Then by the descending chain condition in \mathcal{L}/C^i , it follows that $\{\bar{D}_i\}$ is a C -sequence. Set $D_i = \bigwedge_j (\bar{D}_j \vee C^i)$, and $D = \bigwedge_i D_i$. Then $\{D_i\}$ is a completely regular C -sequence with $\varphi(D_i) = D_* \vee C_*^i$, for all i . Therefore, $D_* \leq D_* \vee C_*^i = \varphi(D_i) \leq \varphi(D \vee C^i) = \varphi(D) \vee C_*^i$. Hence

$$D_* \leq \bigwedge_n (\varphi(D) \vee C_*^n) = \varphi(D) \leq \bigwedge_n \varphi(D_n) = \bigwedge_n (D_* \vee C_*^n) = D_*.$$

If \mathcal{L} is a semi-local Noether lattice, then $\mathcal{L}/\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})$ is finite-dimensional. Also, in this case, $\partial_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{L}) = \partial(\mathcal{L})$. Hence we have the following result.

COROLLARY 2.5. *Let \mathcal{L} be a semi-local Noether lattice and \mathcal{L}_* an arbitrary Noether lattice. Let $\partial\varphi$ be a morphism of $\partial\mathcal{L}$ into \mathcal{L}_* with $\partial\varphi(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})) = C_* \cong \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}_*)$. If \mathcal{L}_* is C_* -complete, then $\partial\varphi$ extends to a morphism φ of \mathcal{L} into \mathcal{L}_* . Further, φ maps \mathcal{L} onto \mathcal{L}_* if $\partial\varphi$ maps $\partial\mathcal{L}$ onto $\partial\mathcal{L}_*$ and \mathcal{L} is \mathcal{I} -complete. And φ is one-to-one if $\partial\varphi$ is one-to-one.*

Proof. If $\partial\varphi(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})) = C_*$, then $A \cong \mathcal{I}^n$ implies $\partial\varphi(A) \cong \partial\varphi(\mathcal{I}^n) = (\partial\varphi(\mathcal{I}))^n = C_*^n$, and thus $\partial\varphi$ is a morphism of $\partial_{\mathcal{I}}\mathcal{L}$ into $\partial_{C_*}(\mathcal{L}_*)$ with $\partial\varphi(\mathcal{I}) = C_*$.

Hence, a semi-local Noether lattice \mathcal{L} which is $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})$ -complete is determined by $\partial\mathcal{L}$. It will be shown later that a semi-local Noether lattice \mathcal{L} is embeddable in a semi-local Noether lattice \mathcal{L}^* which is $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}^*)$ -complete and has the property that $\partial\mathcal{L} \cong \partial\mathcal{L}^*$. In fact, if \mathcal{L} is the lattice of ideals of a Noetherian ring R , then \mathcal{L}^* is the lattice of ideals of the completion R^* of R in the Jacobson radical topology. For the present, however, we are interested in the structure of semi-local Noether lattices \mathcal{L} which are $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})$ -complete.

LEMMA 2.6. *Let \mathcal{L} be a semi-local Noether lattice which is $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})$ -complete, and let P be a maximal prime of \mathcal{L} . Then \mathcal{L} is P -complete.*

Proof. Let $\{A_i\}$ be a completely regular P -sequence in \mathcal{L} . Then $\{A_i\}$ is decreasing, and so by the descending chain condition in $\mathcal{L}/\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})^n$, $\{A_i\}$ is a $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})$ -sequence. For each i , set $B_i = \bigwedge_j (A_j \vee \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})^i)$. Then $A_j \leq B_i \leq A_j \vee \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})^i \leq A_i$, for large j , and thus $\bigwedge_i B_i = \bigwedge_i A_i$. Since \mathcal{L} is $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})$ -complete, the result follows.

COROLLARY 2.7. *Let \mathcal{L} be a semi-local Noether lattice which is $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})$ -complete. If P is any maximal prime of \mathcal{L} , then $\mathcal{L}_P = \mathcal{L}_{\{P\}}$ is P -complete.*

Proof. Let $\{A_i\}$ be any completely regular P -sequence in \mathcal{L}_P . Then $\{A_i\}$ is a completely regular P -sequence in \mathcal{L} , and so for each n , $A_n = (\bigwedge_i A_i) \vee P^n$. Hence $A_n = (A_n)_P = ((\bigwedge_i A_i) \vee P^n)_P = (\bigwedge_i A_i) \vee^P P^n$. It follows that \mathcal{L}_P is P -complete.

THEOREM 2.8. *Let \mathcal{L} be a semi-local Noether lattice which is $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L})$ -complete. Let P_1, \dots, P_k be the maximal primes of \mathcal{L} . Then \mathcal{L} is the direct sum of the local Noether lattices $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{t}} = \mathcal{L}_{P_i}$.*

Proof. Let A be any element of $\partial\mathcal{L}$. Then A has a decomposition $A = Q_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Q_k$ where, for each i , either Q_i is P_i -primary or $Q_i = I$. Since each of the primes of A is maximal, it follows that the decomposition is unique and that $A = Q_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Q_k = Q_1 \dots Q_k$. Consequently, the map $(Q_1, \dots, Q_k) \rightarrow Q_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Q_k$ of $\partial\mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \partial\mathcal{L}_k$ to $\partial\mathcal{L}$ is a multiplicative lattice isomorphism.

The maximal primes of $\mathcal{L}^* = \mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{L}_k$ are the elements $(I, \dots, P_i, \dots, I)$, thus $\partial \mathcal{L}^* = \partial \mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \partial \mathcal{L}_k$ and $\partial \mathcal{L}^* \cong \partial \mathcal{L}$. Also, each component \mathcal{L}_i of \mathcal{L}^* is P_i -complete (Lemma 2.7), and hence \mathcal{L}^* is \mathcal{J} -complete. It follows (Corollary 2.5) that $\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{L}^* = \mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{L}_k$.

THEOREM 2.9. *Let \mathcal{L} be a semi-local Noether lattice. Then \mathcal{L} is a sublattice of a Noether lattice \mathcal{L}_* which is semi-local and $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_*)$ -complete, and has the property that $\partial \mathcal{L} \cong \partial \mathcal{L}_*$.*

Proof. Let P_1, \dots, P_k be the maximal elements of \mathcal{L} , and set $\mathcal{L}_i = \mathcal{L}_{P_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. In [4] it was shown that any local Noether lattice (\mathcal{L}_i, P_i) can be embedded in a local Noether lattice (\mathcal{L}_i^*, P_i^*) which is P_i^* -complete in such a way that $\partial \mathcal{L}_i \cong \partial \mathcal{L}_i^*$. We use that result and set

$$\mathcal{L}_* = \mathcal{L}_1^* \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{L}_k^*.$$

It follows that \mathcal{L}_* is $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_*)$ -complete. Also, since

$$\partial \mathcal{L} \cong \partial \mathcal{L}_{P_1} \oplus \dots \oplus \partial \mathcal{L}_{P_k} \cong \partial \mathcal{L}_1^* \oplus \dots \oplus \partial \mathcal{L}_k^*,$$

it follows from Corollary 2.5 that \mathcal{L} is embedded in \mathcal{L}_* in the desired way.

THEOREM 2.10. *Let $(\mathcal{L}, P_1, \dots, P_k)$ and $(\mathcal{L}^*, P_1^*, \dots, P_k^*, \dots, P_n^*)$ be semi-local Noether lattices. Assume that, for each $i = 1, \dots, k$ there is a morphism φ_i of \mathcal{L}_{P_i} into $\mathcal{L}^*_{P_i^*}$. If \mathcal{L}^* is $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}^*)$ -complete, then there is a morphism φ of \mathcal{L} into \mathcal{L}^* . Further, φ is one-to-one if each φ_i is one-to-one.*

Proof. In this case, there is a natural morphism $\partial \varphi$ of

$$\partial \mathcal{L} = \partial \mathcal{L}_{P_1} \oplus \dots \oplus \partial \mathcal{L}_{P_k}$$

into $\partial \mathcal{L}^* = \partial \mathcal{L}^*_{P_1^*} \oplus \dots \oplus \partial \mathcal{L}^*_{P_k^*} \oplus \dots \oplus \partial \mathcal{L}^*_{P_n^*}$ defined by

$$\partial \varphi(A_1, \dots, A_k) = (\varphi_1(A_1), \dots, \varphi_k(A_k), I, I, \dots, I).$$

The result follows from Corollary 2.5.

REFERENCES

1. K. P. Bogart, *Structure theorems for regular local Noether lattices*, Michigan Math. J. 15 (1968), 167–176.
2. R. P. Dilworth, *Abstract commutative ideal theory*, Pacific J. Math. 12 (1962), 481–498.
3. E. W. Johnson, *A-transforms and Hilbert functions in local lattices*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 137 (1969), 125–140.
4. E. W. Johnson and J. A. Johnson, *M-primary elements of a local Noether lattice*, Can. J. Math. 22 (1970), 327–331.
5. O. Zariski and P. Samuel, *Commutative algebra*, Vol. II, The University Series in Higher Mathematics (Van Nostrand, Princeton, N.J.–Toronto–London–New York, 1960).

University of Iowa,
 Iowa City, Iowa;
 University of Houston,
 Houston, Texas;
 University of Iowa,
 Iowa City, Iowa