

EVERY FINITE POSET IS ISOMORPHIC TO A SATURATED SUBSET OF THE SPECTRUM OF A NOETHERIAN UFD

C. COLBERT AND S. LOEPP

ABSTRACT. We show that every finite poset is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of a Noetherian unique factorization domain. In addition, we show that every finite poset is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of a quasi-excellent domain.

1. INTRODUCTION

Although commutative rings are quite possibly the most important object in commutative algebra, there remain tantalizing mysteries regarding their anatomy. In particular, the prime ideal structure is not well understood for large classes of commutative rings. In this article, we focus on better understanding the set of prime ideals of a ring – referred to as the prime spectrum of the ring – considered as a partially ordered set with respect to inclusion. On the positive side, Hochster proved a remarkable result in 1969 [5]. Given a partially ordered set X , he found necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a commutative ring R such that X is isomorphic to the prime spectrum of R as partially ordered sets. The analogous result for Noetherian rings, however, remains wide open. That is, given a partially ordered set X , it is unknown exactly when there exists a Noetherian ring R such that X is isomorphic to the prime spectrum of R . There has been progress made (see, for example, [12] for a nice survey on the topic), but the general question is still unsolved, even when the dimension of the partially ordered set is two.



Given that this open question seems so elusive even more than 50 years after Hochster’s beautiful result, it is reasonable to ask the related but less onerous question: “Which finite partially ordered sets can occur as part of the prime spectrum of a Noetherian ring?” To be more precise, we ask, “Which finite partially ordered sets can be embedded into the prime spectrum of a Noetherian ring in a way that preserves saturated chains?” We provide a rigorous definition of this notion in Section 2, and when this happens, we say that the given poset is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the prime spectrum of the ring. Finite partially ordered sets that are not catenary are of particular interest. In the early twentieth century, it was thought that, since a local (Noetherian) domain is a dense subspace of its completion, which is necessarily catenary, all local domains might be catenary. In 1956, however, Nagata constructed a family of noncatenary local domains [7]. More than 20 years later, Heitmann in [4] showed that, perhaps surprisingly, given any finite partially ordered set X , there is a Noetherian domain R such that X is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the prime spectrum of R . In other words, *any* noncatenary finite poset can occur as part of the prime spectrum of a Noetherian domain.

The first author was partially supported by a Lenfest grant from Washington and Lee University.

A natural extension is to ask which finite partially ordered sets can be embedded into the prime spectrum of a Noetherian ring with a particularly nice property. For example, the family of noncatenary Noetherian domains that Nagata constructed enjoy the property that their integral closures are catenary. So in 1956, Nagata asked the natural question of whether or not integrally closed domains must be catenary. In a 1980 paper [8], Ogoma answered this question by constructing noncatenary integrally closed local domains. Given this, one might now wonder how “nice” noncatenary rings can be. For example, regular local rings and excellent rings are necessarily catenary. As Noetherian unique factorization domains sit between integrally closed domains (which can be noncatenary) and regular local rings (which must be catenary), a next reasonable question is: do there exist noncatenary Noetherian unique factorization domains? This question was not answered until 1993 when Heitmann in [3] constructed a noncatenary unique factorization domain. This leads to the natural question: can *any* noncatenary finite poset occur as part of the prime spectrum of a Noetherian unique factorization domain? Or, more precisely, given a finite partially ordered set X , does there exist a Noetherian unique factorization domain A such that X is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the prime spectrum of A ? Partial progress on this problem is made in [1] and [6] where it is shown that certain noncatenary partially ordered sets are isomorphic to a saturated subset of the prime spectrum of a Noetherian unique factorization domain. In this article, we find a definitive answer. In a result we find rather surprising, we show that *all* finite partially ordered sets occur as part of the prime spectrum of a Noetherian unique factorization domain. In other words, we show that, given a finite partially ordered set X , there is a Noetherian unique factorization domain A such that X is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the prime spectrum of A . This shows that rings with very desirable properties can have very badly behaved prime spectra, and, in particular, that there are no restrictions on finite subsets of the prime spectra of Noetherian unique factorization domains. We note that our result generalizes the result in [4] discussed above.


We also consider quasi-excellent rings, another class of Noetherian rings that behave well, and we show that an analogous result holds. In other words, we show that, given any finite partially ordered set X , there is a quasi-excellent domain B satisfying the property that there is an embedding from X to the prime spectrum of B that preserves saturated chains. Specifically, we show that given a finite partially ordered set X , there exists a quasi-excellent domain B such that X is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the prime spectrum of B . This shows that, even though B is a ring with geometrically regular formal fibers, it can have a prime spectrum containing a finite subset that is arbitrarily badly behaved. Notice that the result cannot possibly hold for excellent rings since excellent rings are catenary. Relatedly, it is worth noting that, by choosing finite partially ordered sets that are not catenary, our result provides a large class of rings that are quasi-excellent but not excellent.

To illustrate how we construct our rings, we consider a specific example, and we informally describe our construction for that example. All of the ideas we describe in the example will be formalized later in the paper. Let X be the finite partially ordered set pictured in Figure 1, and we note that previously, it was unknown whether or not there exists a Noetherian unique factorization domain A such that X is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the prime spectrum of A . Note that X can be realized using a sequence of partially ordered sets where we start with a partially ordered set containing one element and, to get from one partially ordered set to the next, we either “grow” nodes out of a minimal node, or we “glue” two minimal nodes together. This sequence of partially

FIGURE 1. Poset X FIGURE 2. Growing and Gluing to Obtain X

ordered sets is illustrated in Figures 2 and 3. We show that, for each partially ordered set in the sequence, there is a corresponding local ring satisfying some nice properties such that the given partially ordered set is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the prime spectrum of the local ring. We also show that, if a local ring corresponding to one partially ordered set in our sequence is quasi-excellent, then so is the local ring corresponding to the next partially ordered set in the sequence. We use \mathbb{C} as our first ring, and so, since \mathbb{C} is quasi-excellent, our last local ring will be as well. It follows that the last local ring in our sequence is quasi-excellent and satisfies the property that its prime spectrum contains a saturated subset that is isomorphic to X . Finally, we use the nice properties of our local rings to show that there is a Noetherian unique factorization domain A such that X is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the prime spectrum of A .

In Section 2 we find sufficient conditions for a partially ordered set to be isomorphic to a saturated subset of the prime spectrum of a ring. In Section 3, we describe how to find rings that correspond to our growing and gluing process described in the previous paragraph, and in Section 4, we show how to construct our final Noetherian unique factorization domain. To show our result in full generality, it is necessary to show that every finite partially ordered set can be realized with our growing and

FIGURE 3. Growing and Gluing to Obtain X , continued

gluing process. This is delicate and technical and is done in Sections 5 and 6. Our main results are in Section 7.

Notation. All rings in this paper are commutative with unity. When we say a ring is local, Noetherian is implied, and we use quasi-local for a ring with one maximal ideal that is not necessarily Noetherian. If B is a local ring with maximal ideal M we use (B, M) to denote the ring. If (B, M) is a local ring, we use \widehat{B} to denote the M -adic completion of B . We use the standard abbreviations UFD for a unique factorization domain and RLR for a regular local ring, and we use the term poset for a partially ordered set. Finally, when we say the spectrum of a ring B or we write $\text{Spec}(B)$, we mean the prime spectrum of B , and $\text{Min}(B)$ denotes the minimal prime ideals of B .

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we first define what it means for a subposet Z of a poset Y to be a saturated subset of Y . Then, given two posets X and Y , we present sufficient conditions for X to be isomorphic to a saturated subset of Y .

Definition 2.1. Let X and Y be posets. We say $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a *poset map* if for all $x, y \in X$, $x \leq y$ implies $f(x) \leq f(y)$. We say a poset map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a *poset embedding* if for all $x, y \in X$, $f(x) \leq f(y)$ implies $x \leq y$. A surjective poset embedding from X onto Y is called a *poset isomorphism*.

Remark 2.2. Note that poset embeddings are necessarily injective: if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a poset embedding and $f(x) = f(y)$, then $f(x) \leq f(y)$ and $f(y) \leq f(x)$. So $x \leq y$ and $y \leq x$, and therefore $x = y$.

Definition 2.3. Let X be a poset, and let $x, y \in X$. We say y covers x if $x < y$ and for all $z \in X$, if $x \leq z \leq y$, then $x = z$ or $y = z$. We say $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a *saturated embedding* if f is a poset embedding and for all $x, y \in X$, if y covers x , then $f(y)$ covers $f(x)$ in Y . If $Z \subseteq Y$ is a subposet (i.e., Z is a poset under the same order relation on Y) we say Z is a *saturated* subset of Y if for all $u, v \in Z$, whenever v covers u in Z , it also covers u in Y .

Remark 2.4. If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a saturated embedding, then y covers x if and only if $f(y)$ covers $f(x)$. To see this, suppose $f(y)$ covers $f(x)$. Then $f(x) < f(y)$, which implies $x < y$ since f is a poset embedding. If $x \leq z \leq y$ for $z \in X$, then $f(x) \leq f(z) \leq f(y)$, so $f(x) = f(z)$ or $f(y) = f(z)$. Since every poset embedding is an injective map, $x = z$ or $y = z$.

Definition 2.5. If $C \subseteq Y$ is a subposet of Y , we say C is a *complete* subset of Y if for all $u, v \in C$, if $u \leq y \leq v$ for some $y \in Y$, then $y \in C$.

Remark 2.6. If Z is a complete subset of Y , then it must also be a saturated subset of Y . To see this, let $u, v \in Z$ such that v covers u in Z and suppose $u \leq y \leq v$ for some $y \in Y$. Then $y \in Z$ by definition, so $u = y$ or $v = y$ since v covers u in Z .

Lemma 2.7. If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a saturated embedding of posets, then f is a poset isomorphism from X onto $f(X)$, and $f(X)$ is a saturated subset of Y .

Proof. Since f maps X onto $f(X)$ and is assumed to be an embedding of posets, it follows that f is an isomorphism from X onto $f(X)$. Suppose $f(x), f(y) \in f(X)$ such that $f(y)$ covers $f(x)$ in $f(X)$. Let $z \in Y$ such that $f(x) \leq z \leq f(y)$. Since f is a poset isomorphism from X onto $f(X)$, y covers x in X . Since f is a saturated embedding from X to Y , we have that $f(y)$ covers $f(x)$ in Y . It follows that $z = f(x)$ or $z = f(y)$. Therefore, $f(X)$ is a saturated subset of Y . \square

In this article, we show that, given a finite poset X , there exists a Noetherian UFD A and a saturated embedding of posets $\psi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$. Lemma 2.7 then implies that X is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of a Noetherian UFD. Similarly, we show that, given a finite poset X , there exists a quasi-excellent domain B and a saturated embedding of posets $\varphi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B)$. Lemma 2.7 then implies that X is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of a quasi-excellent domain.

3. GROWING AND GLUING

In this section, we show that it is possible to “grow” out of a minimal node as well as “glue” minimal nodes as discussed in the introduction. We begin by describing the growing process. Let B be a local ring satisfying some mild desirable conditions. For the first result in this section, we construct a local ring S and ensure that $\text{Spec}(S)$ and $\text{Spec}(B)$ are related in a specific way. In particular, to construct S , we focus on the minimal prime ideals of B . The ring S will be of the form $B[[y, z]]/J$ where y and z are indeterminates and J is a carefully chosen ideal of $B[[y, z]]$. In particular, if $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m\}$ are the minimal prime ideals of B , we choose J such that S has a height one prime ideal that corresponds to P_1 and such that, for $j = 2, 3, \dots, m$, S has a minimal

prime ideal that corresponds to P_j . In addition, the height one prime ideal of S corresponding to P_1 contains as many minimal prime ideals of S as we desire. The idea is that the minimal prime ideals of S and B are the same, except that, in S , we have “grown” some minimal prime ideals out of P_1 .

Let X be a finite poset. In Section 6, we define precisely what we mean when we “grow” nodes out of one minimal node of X . The resulting finite poset will be called an elevation of X . Then, in Section 7, we show that, if X is a finite poset, Z an elevation of X , and $\varphi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B)$ a saturated embedding, then there is a local ring S satisfying the same desirable conditions as B and such that there is a saturated embedding $\psi : Z \rightarrow \text{Spec}(S)$. As a consequence, if X is isomorphic to a saturated subset of $\text{Spec}(B)$, then there is a local ring S satisfying the same desirable properties that B satisfies such that Z is isomorphic to a saturated subset of $\text{Spec}(S)$. This will enable us to construct rings containing larger and larger parts of our original finite poset in their spectrum. Thus we refer to this result (Theorem 3.2) as The Growing Theorem.

To prove The Growing Theorem, we begin with an elementary lemma.

Lemma 3.1. Let B be a Noetherian ring and let x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n with $n \geq 1$ be indeterminates. Let $A = B[[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]]$. Suppose that $\text{Min}(B) = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_r\}$. Then $\text{Min}(A) = \{P_1A, P_2A, \dots, P_rA\}$.

Proof. Note that, since $A/P_iA \cong B/P_i[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$, we have $P_iA \in \text{Spec}(A)$ for every i .

Suppose $Q \in \text{Spec}(A)$ with $Q \subseteq P_iA$ for some i . Then $Q \cap B \subseteq P_iA \cap B = P_i$, and so $Q \cap B = P_i$. It follows that $P_iA = (Q \cap B)A \subseteq Q$ and we have $Q = P_iA$. Therefore, P_iA is a minimal prime ideal of A for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$.

Now suppose $J \in \text{Min}(A)$. Then there is an i such that $P_i \subseteq J \cap B$, and so $P_iA \subseteq (J \cap B)A \subseteq J$. As J is minimal, $P_iA = J$. \square

We are now ready to prove The Growing Theorem.

Theorem 3.2. (The Growing Theorem) Let B be a local ring containing an infinite field K and let $T = \widehat{B}$ be the completion of B at its maximal ideal. Suppose that, if $I \in \text{Min}(T)$, then T/I is a RLR. Let $\text{Min}(B) = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m\}$. Let n be a positive integer, let y and z be indeterminates, and let $A = B[[y, z]]$. Then there are distinct prime ideals Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_n of A such that

- (1) For every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we have $Q_i \subseteq (P_j, y, z)A$ if and only if $j = 1$.
- (2) For every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, the prime ideal $(P_1, y, z)A/Q_i$ in the ring A/Q_i has height one, and
- (3) If $J = (\bigcap_{i=1}^n Q_i) \cap P'_2 \cap \dots \cap P'_m$, where $P'_j = (P_j, y, z)A$, and $S = A/J$, then, if Q is a minimal prime ideal of \widehat{S} , we have that \widehat{S}/Q is a RLR.

Proof. Since B contains K , so does A . Let β_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ be distinct elements of K . For $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, define $Q_i = (P_1, y + \beta_i z)A$. Then, $A/Q_i \cong B/P_1[[z]]$, and so Q_i is a prime ideal of A . If $Q_i = Q_\ell$ for some i and for some ℓ , then, in $A/P_1A \cong B/P_1[[y, z]]$, we have $(y + \beta_i z) = (y + \beta_\ell z)$. Hence $y + \beta_i z - y - \beta_\ell z = z(\beta_i - \beta_\ell) \in (y + \beta_i z)$. If $i \neq \ell$, then we have $z, y \in (y + \beta_i z)$, a contradiction. It follows that $i = \ell$. Therefore, the Q_i 's are distinct.

By the definition of Q_i , we have that $Q_i \subseteq (P_1, y, z)A$. If $j \neq 1$, then there is a $\gamma \in P_j$ with $\gamma \notin P_1$, and so $Q_i \not\subseteq (P_j, y, z)A$. Since the prime ideal $(P_1, y, z)A/Q_i$ in the domain A/Q_i is nonzero and principal, it has height one.

Suppose Q is a minimal prime ideal of \widehat{S} . Then $Q \cap S$ is either Q_i/J for some $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ or $Q \cap S$ is in $\{P'_2/J, \dots, P'_m/J\}$. If $Q \cap S = Q_i/J$, then $S/(Q \cap S) \cong B/P_1[[z]]$, and so the completion of $S/(Q \cap S)$ is isomorphic to $T/P_1T[[z]]$. By Lemma 3.1, the minimal prime ideals of $T/P_1T[[z]]$ are of the form $I/P_1T[[z]]$ where $I \in \text{Min}(T)$. The ring $T/P_1T[[z]]$ modulo $I/P_1T[[z]]$ is isomorphic to $T/I[[z]]$, which is a RLR since T/I is a RLR. It follows that the completion of $S/(Q \cap S)$ modulo any of its minimal prime ideals is a RLR. Noting that $Q/(Q \cap S)\widehat{S}$ is a minimal prime ideal of $\widehat{S}/(Q \cap S)\widehat{S}$, we have that \widehat{S}/Q is a RLR. If $Q \cap S = P'_j/J$ for some $j = 2, \dots, m$, then $S/(Q \cap S) \cong B/P_j$, and so the completion of $S/(Q \cap S)$ is isomorphic to T/P_jT . If I/P_jT is a minimal prime ideal of T/P_jT , then T/P_jT modulo I/P_jT is isomorphic to T/I where I is a minimal prime ideal of T . By hypothesis, this is a RLR, and so the completion of $S/(Q \cap S)$ modulo any of its minimal prime ideals is a RLR. Since $Q/(Q \cap S)\widehat{S}$ is a minimal prime ideal of $\widehat{S}/(Q \cap S)\widehat{S}$, we have that \widehat{S}/Q is a RLR. \square

Recall that a local ring R is quasi-excellent if, for all $P \in \text{Spec}(R)$, the ring $\widehat{R} \otimes_R L$ is regular for every finite field extension L of R_P/PR_P . We now observe that, if the ring B in Theorem 3.2 is quasi-excellent, then the ring S constructed in Theorem 3.2 is quasi-excellent.

Proposition 3.3. Suppose the ring B in Theorem 3.2 satisfies the additional condition that it is quasi-excellent. Then the ring S constructed in Theorem 3.2 is also quasi-excellent.

Proof. It is shown in [10] that if B is a quasi-excellent local ring, then so is $B[[y]]$. It follows that A in Theorem 3.2 is quasi-excellent. Since a quotient ring of a quasi-excellent ring is also quasi-excellent, the result follows. \square

The next result is taken from [2]. Suppose (S, M) is a reduced local ring satisfying some mild conditions. Let $\text{Min}(S)$ be partitioned into $m \geq 1$ subcollections C_1, \dots, C_m . Theorem 3.4 shows that there exists a subring $(B, B \cap M)$ of S such that S satisfies the same mild conditions as B and such that B has exactly m minimal prime ideals. Specifically, if Q, Q' are minimal prime ideals of S then $Q \cap B = Q' \cap B$ if and only if $Q, Q' \in C_i$ for some $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. In addition, the spectrum of B when restricted to the prime ideals of positive height is isomorphic to the spectrum of S when restricted to the prime ideals of positive height. So we can think of the spectrum of B to be the same as the spectrum of S except that, to get the minimal prime ideals of B , the minimal prime ideals of S are “glued” together based on the partition of $\text{Min}(S)$. It is worth noting that there are no restrictions on the partition. That is, one can glue together the minimal primes in any prescribed way. For this reason, we refer to Theorem 3.4 as The Gluing Theorem.

Theorem 3.4 ([2], Theorem 2.14). (The Gluing Theorem) Let (S, M) be a reduced local ring containing the rationals with S/M uncountable and $|S| = |S/M|$. Suppose $\text{Min}(S)$ is partitioned into $m \geq 1$ subcollections C_1, \dots, C_m . Then there is a reduced local ring $B \subseteq S$ with maximal ideal $B \cap M$ such that

- (1) B contains the rationals,
- (2) $\widehat{B} = \widehat{S}$,

- (3) $B/(B \cap M)$ is uncountable and $|B| = |B/(B \cap M)|$,
- (4) For $Q, Q' \in \text{Min}(\widehat{S})$, $Q \cap B = Q' \cap B$ if and only if there is an $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ with $Q \in C_i$ and $Q' \in C_i$,
- (5) The map $f : \text{Spec}(S) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B)$ given by $f(P) = B \cap P$ is onto and, if P is a prime ideal of S with positive height, then $f(P)S = P$. In particular, if P and P' are prime ideals of S with positive height, then $f(P)$ has positive height and $f(P) = f(P')$ implies that $P = P'$.

We now argue that if the ring S in Theorem 3.4 is quasi-excellent, then the ring B constructed in Theorem 3.4 is quasi-excellent. We first note that in the definition of quasi-excellent, we can restrict to purely inseparable finite field extensions (see, for example, Remark 1.3 in [9]). Hence, if a local ring R contains the rationals, then R is quasi-excellent if, for all $P \in \text{Spec}(R)$, the ring $\widehat{R} \otimes_R (R_P/PR_P)$ is a regular ring. Thus, to show that R is quasi-excellent, it suffices to show that, for all $P \in \text{Spec}(R)$ and for all $Q \in \text{Spec}(\widehat{R})$ satisfying $Q \cap R = P$, we have that $(\widehat{R}/P\widehat{R})_Q$ is a RLR.

Proposition 3.5. Suppose the ring S in Theorem 3.4 satisfies the additional condition that it is quasi-excellent. Then the ring B constructed in Theorem 3.4 is also quasi-excellent.

Proof. Let $T = \widehat{B} = \widehat{S}$. We show that if $P \in \text{Spec}(B)$ and $\widehat{P} \in \text{Spec}(T)$ such that $\widehat{P} \cap B = P$, then $(T/PT)_{\widehat{P}}$ is a RLR.

First, suppose $P \in \text{Spec}(B)$ such that P has positive height, and let $\widehat{P} \in \text{Spec}(T)$ such that $\widehat{P} \cap B = P$. Let $P_S = S \cap \widehat{P}$. Then $P_S \cap B = P$. Since P has positive height, we have, by construction, that P_S has positive height and $PS = P_S$. It follows that $PT = P_S T$ and so $(T/PT)_{\widehat{P}} = (T/P_S T)_{\widehat{P}}$. Since S is quasi-excellent, $(T/P_S T)_{\widehat{P}}$ is a RLR and so $(T/PT)_{\widehat{P}}$ is as well.

Now suppose P is a minimal prime ideal of B and let $\widehat{P} \in \text{Spec}(T)$ such that $\widehat{P} \cap B = P$. Let $P_S = S \cap \widehat{P}$. If P_S has positive height, then, by construction, $B \cap P_S = P$ has positive height, a contradiction. Hence, P_S is a minimal prime ideal of S . If Q is a minimal prime ideal of T contained in \widehat{P} , then $Q \cap S \subseteq \widehat{P} \cap S = P_S$, and so $Q \cap S = P_S$. In particular, $P_S T \subseteq Q$ for all minimal prime ideals Q of T that are contained in \widehat{P} . Since S is reduced and quasi-excellent, $\widehat{S} = T$ is reduced. Thus, $T_{\widehat{P}}$ is reduced and so the intersection of its minimal prime ideals is the zero ideal. Therefore, $P_S T_{\widehat{P}}$ is the zero ideal of $T_{\widehat{P}}$. As S is quasi-excellent, $(T/P_S T)_{\widehat{P}} \cong T_{\widehat{P}}$ is a RLR. Noting that $PT \subseteq P_S T$, we have that $PT_{\widehat{P}}$ is also the zero ideal of $T_{\widehat{P}}$ and so $(T/PT)_{\widehat{P}} \cong T_{\widehat{P}}$ is a RLR. \square

Let X be a finite poset. In Section 5, we define precisely what we mean for Y to be a poset obtained from X by gluing some minimal nodes together. The resulting poset Y will be called a height zero gluing of X . Suppose that Z is a finite poset, Y is a height zero gluing of Z , (S, M) is a local ring satisfying some mild conditions, and $\psi : Z \rightarrow \text{Spec}(S)$ is a saturated embedding. In Section 7, we use Theorem 3.4 and Proposition 3.5 to show that there is a subring $(B, B \cap M)$ of S such that B satisfies the same mild conditions as S and such that there is a saturated embedding $\varphi : Y \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B)$. In other words, we show that if Y is a height zero gluing of a poset that is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of a ring satisfying our nice properties, then Y is also isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of a ring satisfying the same nice properties.

This result enables us to construct nice rings that contain height zero gluings of our posets in their spectra.

4. THE UFD THEOREM

The last step of our procedure is to construct a Noetherian UFD whose spectrum contains a saturated subset that is isomorphic to the given finite poset. In this section, we describe the construction of this UFD. We start with a local ring B that contains the rationals and that satisfies other mild conditions. The spectrum of the UFD that we construct will inherit many properties from the spectrum of B . In particular, the set of prime ideals of height at least two of our UFD and the set of prime ideals of B of height at least two will be isomorphic when viewed as posets. The construction is similar to the procedure used in [2] to prove The Gluing Theorem (Theorem 3.4). We start with the rationals and we successively adjoin uncountably many elements of B to form an increasing chain of subrings of B that satisfy desirable properties, the most important property being that they are all UFD's. Our final UFD will be the union of this increasing chain. We use Proposition 4.1 below to show that it is Noetherian and its completion is the same as that of B . We also ensure that, if P is a prime ideal of B with height at least two, then the UFD will contain a generating set for P . This property will ultimately help us show that the spectra of B and the UFD when restricted to prime ideals of height at least two are isomorphic.

Proposition 4.1 ([2], Proposition 2.6). Let (B, M) be a local ring and let $T = \widehat{B}$. Suppose $(S, S \cap M)$ is a quasi-local subring of B such that the map $S \rightarrow B/M^2$ is onto and $IB \cap S = I$ for every finitely generated ideal I of S . Then S is Noetherian and $\widehat{S} = T$. Moreover, if B/M is uncountable and $|B| = |B/M|$ then $S/(S \cap M)$ is uncountable and $|S| = |S/(S \cap M)|$.

Most of the material in this section is based on the ideas in [3]. The following definition is taken from [3].

Definition 4.2. Let (T, M) be a complete local ring and let $(R, M \cap R)$ be a quasi-local unique factorization domain contained in T satisfying:

- (1) $|R| \leq \sup(\aleph_0, |T/M|)$ with equality only if T/M is countable,
- (2) $Q \cap R = (0)$ for all $Q \in \text{Ass}(T)$, and
- (3) if $t \in T$ is regular and $P \in \text{Ass}(T/tT)$, then $\text{ht}(P \cap R) \leq 1$.

Then R is called an N-subring of T .

We modify the above definition for our purposes. In particular, we construct subrings of the ring B , which is not necessarily complete. So, instead of requiring our rings to be N-subrings, we require them to be PN-subrings as defined below.

Definition 4.3. Let (B, M) be a local domain with B/M uncountable, and let $(R, M \cap R)$ be an infinite quasi-local unique factorization domain contained in B such that $|R| < |B/M|$ and, if $b \in B$ and $P \in \text{Ass}(B/bB)$, then $\text{ht}(P \cap R) \leq 1$. Then R is called a Pseudo-N-Subring of B , or a PN-subring of B .

Note that, if B in the above definition is complete and if $(R, M \cap R)$ is a PN-subring of B , then $(R, M \cap R)$ is also an N-subring of B .

The next result describes a sufficient condition on an element x of B so that, if R is a PN-subring of B then the ring $R[x]_{(R[x] \cap M)}$ is also a PN-subring of B . This will allow us to successively adjoin

elements while maintaining the PN-subring properties. Note that if P is a prime ideal of B , then there is an injective homomorphism $R/(R \cap P) \rightarrow B/P$ and so we can view $R/(R \cap P)$ as a subring of B/P .

Lemma 4.4. Let (B, M) be a local domain with B/M uncountable, and let $(R, M \cap R)$ be a PN-subring of B . Let $C = \{P \in \text{Spec}(B) \mid P \in \text{Ass}(B/rB) \text{ for some } r \in R\}$. Let $x \in B$ be such that $x + P \in B/P$ is transcendental over $R/(R \cap P)$ for every $P \in C$. Then $S = R[x]_{(R[x] \cap M)}$ is a PN-subring of B with $|S| = |R|$. Moreover, prime elements in R are prime in S .

Proof. Since R is infinite and x is transcendental over R , we have that $|S| = |R|$, S is a UFD, and prime elements in R are prime in S . Now let $b \in B$ and $P \in \text{Ass}(B/bB)$. Since R is a PN-subring, $\text{ht}(R \cap P) \leq 1$. If $R \cap P = (0)$, then in the ring $R[x]_{(R[x] \cap P)}$, all nonzero elements of R are units, and so the ring $R[x]_{(R[x] \cap P)}$ is isomorphic to a ring $k[x]$ with some elements inverted where k is a field. It follows that the ring $R[x]_{(R[x] \cap P)}$ has Krull dimension at most 1, and so $\text{ht}(R[x] \cap P) \leq 1$. Therefore, $\text{ht}(S \cap P) \leq 1$. Now suppose $\text{ht}(R \cap P) = 1$. Then $R \cap P = zR$ for some nonzero z in R . Since $P \in \text{Ass}(B/bB)$, we have $PB_P \in \text{Ass}(B_P/bB_P)$. It follows that $\text{depth} B_P = 1$ and so $PB_P \in \text{Ass}(B_P/zB_P)$. Hence $P \in \text{Ass}(B/zB)$ and therefore $P \in C$. Let $f \in R[x] \cap P$. Then $f = r_n x^n + \cdots + r_1 x + r_0$ for $r_i \in R$. Since $x + P \in B/P$ is transcendental over $R/(R \cap P)$, we have that $r_i \in R \cap P = zR$ for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Hence, $f \in zR[x]$, and it follows that $(0) \neq R[x] \cap P \subseteq zR[x]$. We claim that $\text{ht}(zR[x]) = 1$. To see this, suppose Q is a prime ideal of $R[x]$ with $(0) \subseteq Q \subseteq zR[x]$ and $Q \neq zR[x]$. Let $q \in Q$. Then $q = zg_1$ for some $g_1 \in R[x]$. Since $z \notin Q$, we have $g_1 \in Q$. So $g_1 = zg_2$ for some $g_2 \in R[x]$. Note that $g_2 \in Q$. Continuing this process, we have that $q \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} z^i B$. Since B is Noetherian, $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} z^i B = (0)$, and it follows that $Q = (0)$. Hence, $\text{ht}(zR[x]) = 1$ and so $\text{ht}(R[x] \cap P) = 1$. Therefore, $\text{ht}(S \cap P) = 1$ and we have that S is a PN-subring satisfying the desired properties. \square

For the use of Proposition 4.1, we guarantee that our final UFD contains an element of every coset of B/M^2 . We first state a result from [3] that can be thought of as a generalization of the prime avoidance theorem. Then, in Lemma 4.6, we use this result to show that, given a PN-subring R of B , we can adjoin an element of a coset of B/M^2 to R while preserving many desirable properties.

Lemma 4.5 ([3], Lemma 3). Let (B, M) be a local ring. Let $C \subseteq \text{Spec}(B)$, let I be an ideal of B such that $I \not\subseteq P$ for every $P \in C$, and let D be a subset of B . Suppose $|C \times D| < |B/M|$. Then $I \not\subseteq \bigcup\{(P+r) \mid P \in C, r \in D\}$.

Lemma 4.6. Let (B, M) be a local domain with B/M uncountable and $\text{depth} B > 1$, and let $(R, M \cap R)$ be a PN-subring of B . Let $u \in B$. Then there exists a PN-subring $(S, M \cap S)$ of B with $R \subseteq S$, $|S| = |R|$, prime elements in R are prime in S , and S contains an element of the coset $u + M^2$.

Proof. For $P \in \text{Spec}(B)$, define $D_{(P)}$ to be a full set of coset representatives of the cosets $t+P \in B/P$ that make $(t+u)+P$ algebraic over $R/(P \cap R)$. Note that, since R is infinite, $|D_{(P)}| \leq |R|$. Let $C = \{P \in \text{Spec}(B) \mid P \in \text{Ass}(B/rB) \text{ for some } r \in R\}$, and let $D = \bigcup_{P \in C} D_{(P)}$. Since $\text{depth} B > 1$, $M \not\subseteq P$ for every $P \in C$, and so $M^2 \not\subseteq P$ for every $P \in C$. Note that $|C \times D| \leq |R| < |B/M|$. By Lemma 4.5, there is an $m \in M^2$ such that $m \notin \bigcup\{(P+r) \mid P \in C, r \in D\}$. Hence, $m+u+P$ is transcendental over $R/(P \cap R)$ for every $P \in C$. By Lemma 4.4, $S = R[m+u]_{(R[m+u] \cap M)}$ is

a PN-subring of B with $|S| = |R|$ and prime elements in R are prime in S . Finally, note that S contains $m + u$, an element of the coset $u + M^2$. \square

To obtain the desired relationship between the spectra of B and our final UFD, we ensure that the UFD contains a generating set for all prime ideals of B with height at least two. The next two lemmas will help accomplish this.

Lemma 4.7. Let (B, M) be a local domain with $T = \widehat{B}$. Suppose that if $J \in \text{Min}(T)$ then T/J is a RLR. Let $r \in B$ with $r \neq 0$ and suppose that $P \in \text{Spec}(B)$ with $P \in \text{Ass}(B/rB)$. Then $\text{ht}P = 1$.

Proof. Since the completion of B/rB is T/rT , there is a $Q \in \text{Spec}(T)$ such that $Q \in \text{Ass}(T/rT)$, and $PT \subseteq Q$. Let J be a minimal prime ideal of T contained in Q . Then $Q/J \in \text{Ass}(\frac{T/J}{r(T/J)})$. Now, T/J is a RLR and so it satisfies Serre's (S_2) condition. It follows that $\text{ht}(Q/J) \leq 1$ in T/J . Since this holds for every minimal prime ideal J contained in Q , we have $\text{ht}Q \leq 1$, and so $\text{ht}P = \text{ht}(PT \cap B) \leq \text{ht}(Q \cap B) \leq 1$. Since $r \in P$ with $r \neq 0$, we have $\text{ht}P = 1$. \square

Lemma 4.8. Let (B, M) be a local domain with $\dim B \geq 2$ and with B/M uncountable, and let $(R, M \cap R)$ be a PN-subring of B . Let $T = \widehat{B}$ and suppose that if $J \in \text{Min}(T)$ then T/J is a RLR. Suppose Q is a prime ideal of B with height at least two. Then there exists a PN-subring $(S, M \cap S)$ of B such that $|S| = |R|$, prime elements in R are prime in S , and S contains a generating set for Q .

Proof. Let $Q = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$, and let $C = \{P \in \text{Spec}(B) \mid P \in \text{Ass}(B/rB) \text{ for some } r \in R\}$. By Lemma 4.7, if $P \in C$, then $\text{ht}P \leq 1$ and so $Q \not\subseteq P$. Now use Lemma 4.5 with $D = \{0\}$ to find $z_1 \in Q$ such that $z_1 \notin P$ for every $P \in C$. Note that $M \not\subseteq P$ for every $P \in C$. Suppose $P \in C$ and $x_1 + tz_1 + P = x_1 + t'z_1 + P$ with $t, t' \in B$. Then $z_1(t - t') \in P$ and since $z_1 \notin P$, we have $t + P = t' + P$. It follows that $x_1 + tz_1 + P = x_1 + t'z_1 + P$ if and only if $t + P = t' + P$. Let $D_{(P)}$ be a full set of coset representatives for the cosets $t + P \in B/P$ that make $x_1 + z_1t + P$ algebraic over $R/(R \cap P)$. Note that $|D_{(P)}| \leq |R| < |B/M|$. Now use Lemma 4.5 with $D = \bigcup_{P \in C} D_{(P)}$ to find $m_1 \in M$ such that $m_1 \notin \bigcup\{(P + r) \mid P \in C, r \in D\}$. Then $x_1 + z_1m_1 + P$ is transcendental over $R/(R \cap P)$ for every $P \in C$. By Lemma 4.4, $R_1 = R[x_1 + z_1m_1]_{(R[x_1 + z_1m_1] \cap M)}$ is a PN-subring of B with $|R_1| = |R|$ and prime elements in R are prime in R_1 . Note that $(x_1 + z_1m_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) + MQ = Q$ and so by Nakayama's Lemma, $(x_1 + z_1m_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = Q$.

Repeat this procedure with R replaced by R_1 and x_1 replaced by x_2 to find $z_2 \in Q$ and $m_2 \in M$ such that $R_2 = R_1[x_2 + z_2m_2]_{(R_1[x_2 + z_2m_2] \cap M)}$ is a PN-subring of B with $|R_2| = |R_1|$, prime elements in R_1 are prime in R_2 , and $(x_1 + z_1m_1, x_2 + z_2m_2, x_3, \dots, x_k) = Q$.

Continue this process to find PN-subrings R_3, \dots, R_k so that R_k is a PN-subring of B satisfying $R \subseteq R_k$, $|R_k| = |R|$, prime elements in R are prime in R_k , $Q = (x_1 + z_1m_1, x_2 + z_2m_2, \dots, x_k + z_km_k)$, and $x_j + z_jm_j \in R_k$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Then $S = R_k$ is the desired PN-subring of B . \square

Recall that, to use Proposition 4.1, we need our subring A of B to satisfy the condition that, if I is a finitely generated ideal of A , then $IB \cap A = I$. We use Lemma 4.9 repeatedly to do this.

Lemma 4.9. Let (B, M) be a local domain with B/M uncountable, and let $(R, M \cap R)$ be a PN-subring of B . Suppose I is a finitely generated ideal of R and $c \in R$ with $c \in IB$. Then there exists a PN-subring S of B with $R \subseteq S$, $|S| = |R|$, prime elements in R are prime in S , and $c \in IS$.

Proof. Lemma 4 in [3] is the analogous statement of this result for N-subrings. For the proof of Lemma 4, the author only uses that the ring is complete in the case that the residue field is

countable. Since we are assuming that B/M is uncountable, the proof of Lemma 4 in [3] works for this result. \square

The next lemma gives sufficient conditions on an ascending chain of PN-subrings of B to ensure that the union is also a PN-subring of B . Before we state and prove the lemma, we provide a technical definition.

Definition 4.10. Let Ψ be a well-ordered set and let $\alpha \in \Psi$. Define $\gamma(\alpha) = \sup\{\beta \in \Psi \mid \beta < \alpha\}$.

Lemma 4.11. Let (B, M) be a local domain with B/M uncountable, and let R_0 be a PN-subring of B . Let Ω be a well-ordered set with least element 0, and assume that for every $\alpha \in \Omega$, $|\{\beta \in \Omega \mid \beta < \alpha\}| < |B/M|$. Suppose $\{R_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Omega\}$ is an ascending collection of rings such that if $\gamma(\alpha) = \alpha$, then $R_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} R_\beta$ while if $\gamma(\alpha) < \alpha$, R_α is a PN-subring of B with $R_{\gamma(\alpha)} \subseteq R_\alpha$ and prime elements in $R_{\gamma(\alpha)}$ are prime in R_α .

Then $S = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Omega} R_\alpha$ satisfies all conditions to be a PN-subring of B except for possibly the condition that $|S| < |B/M|$. Moreover, $|S| \leq \sup(|R_0|, |\Omega|)$ and elements that are prime in some R_α are prime in S .

Proof. The result follows from the proof of Lemma 6 in [3]. \square

We next show that we can construct a PN-subring of B with many of our desired properties.

Lemma 4.12. Let (B, M) be a local domain with $\dim B \geq 2$ and with B/M uncountable, and let $(R, M \cap R)$ be a PN-subring of B . Let $T = \widehat{B}$ and suppose that if $J \in \text{Min}(T)$ then T/J is a RLR. Suppose Q is a prime ideal of B with height at least two and let $u \in B$. Then there is a PN-subring $(S, M \cap S)$ of B such that $R \subseteq S$, $|S| = |R|$, prime elements in R are prime in S , S contains an element of the coset $u + M^2$, S contains a generating set for Q , and, for every finitely generated ideal I of S , $IB \cap S = I$.

Proof. Lemma 4.7 implies that $\text{depth} B > 1$. By Lemma 4.6, there is a PN-subring $(R', M \cap R')$ of B with $R \subseteq R'$, $|R'| = |R|$, prime elements in R are prime in R' , and R' contains an element of the coset $u + M^2$. By Lemma 4.8, there exists a PN-subring $(R_0, M \cap R_0)$ of B such that $|R_0| = |R'|$, prime elements in R' are prime in R_0 , and R_0 contains a generating set for Q . Define

$$\Omega = \{(I, c) \mid I \text{ is a finitely generated ideal of } R_0 \text{ and } c \in IB \cap R_0\}.$$

Then $|\Omega| = |R_0| = |R|$. Well-order Ω , letting 0 denote its first element. We recursively define a family of PN-subrings as follows. R_0 is already defined. Suppose $\alpha \in \Omega$ and R_β has been defined for all $\beta < \alpha$. If $\gamma(\alpha) < \alpha$, then define R_α to be the subring obtained from Lemma 4.9 so that, if $\gamma(\alpha) = (I, c)$ then R_α is a PN-subring of B with $R_{\gamma(\alpha)} \subseteq R_\alpha$, $|R_\alpha| = |R_{\gamma(\alpha)}|$, prime elements in $R_{\gamma(\alpha)}$ are prime in R_α , and $c \in IR_\alpha$. If, on the other hand, $\gamma(\alpha) = \alpha$, define $R_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} R_\beta$. Let $R_1 = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Omega} R_\alpha$. By Lemma 4.11, R_1 is a PN-subring of B and elements that are prime in R_0 are prime in R_1 . In addition, by our construction, if I is a finitely generated ideal of R_0 and $c \in IB \cap R_0$, then $c \in IR_1$ and so $IB \cap R_0 \subseteq IR_1$ for all finitely generated ideals I of R_0 .

Repeat this process replacing R_0 with R_1 to obtain a PN-subring R_2 such that $R_1 \subseteq R_2$, $|R_2| = |R_1|$, prime elements in R_1 are prime in R_2 , and, if I is a finitely generated ideal of R_1 , then $IB \cap R_1 \subseteq IR_2$. Continue to obtain an ascending chain of PN-subrings $R_0 \subseteq R_1 \subseteq R_2 \subseteq \dots$ such that, for every $i \geq 0$, $|R_{i+1}| = |R_i|$, prime elements in R_i are prime in R_{i+1} , and, if I is a finitely

generated ideal of R_i then $IB \cap R_i \subseteq IR_{i+1}$. Let $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i$. By Lemma 4.11, S is a PN-subring of B with $R \subseteq S$, $|S| = |R|$, and prime elements of R are prime in S . Also note that S contains an element of the coset $u + M^2$ and S contains a generating set for Q . Now suppose that I is a finitely generated ideal of S . Then $I = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$ for some $a_i \in S$. Let $c \in IB \cap S$. Then there is an R_m such that $c \in R_m$ and $a_i \in R_m$ for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. By construction, we have that $c \in (a_1, \dots, a_k)B \cap R_m \subseteq (a_1, \dots, a_k)R_{m+1} \subseteq (a_1, \dots, a_k)S = I$. It follows that $IB \cap S = I$ for every finitely generated ideal I of S . \square

We are now ready for the construction of our final UFD.

Theorem 4.13. Let (B, M) be a local domain containing the rationals with $\dim B \geq 3$, B/M uncountable, and $|B| = |B/M|$. Let $T = \widehat{B}$ and suppose that if $J \in \text{Min}(T)$ then T/J is a RLR. Then there exists a quasi-local UFD $(A, M \cap A)$ such that

- (1) $A \subseteq B$,
- (2) The map $A \rightarrow B/M^2$ is onto,
- (3) $IB \cap A = I$ for every finitely generated ideal I of A , and
- (4) If $Q \in \text{Spec}(B)$ with $\text{ht}Q \geq 2$ then A contains a generating set for Q .

Proof. Let $R_0 = \mathbb{Q}$ and note that R_0 is a PN-subring of B . Let $\Omega_1 = B/M^2$ and let $\Omega_2 = \{Q \in \text{Spec}(B) \mid \text{ht}Q \geq 2\}$. Note that $|B/M^2| = |B/M|$ and $|\Omega_2| \leq |B| = |B/M|$. Suppose $|\Omega_2| < |B/M|$, and let P be a height one prime ideal of B that is contained in a height two prime ideal of B . Then $\dim(B/P) \geq 2$ and the cardinality of the set of height one prime ideals of B/P is less than $|B/M|$. Letting C be the set of height one prime ideals of B/P and $D = \{0\}$, Lemma 4.5 gives us that there is an $\overline{m} \in M/P$ such that \overline{m} is not in a height one prime ideal of B/P , a contradiction. It follows that $|\Omega_1| = |\Omega_2|$. Well-order Ω_1 and Ω_2 using the same index set Ψ such that the first element of Ψ is 0 and such that, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, each element of Ω_i has fewer than $|\Omega_i|$ predecessors. If $\alpha \in \Psi$, denote the element in Ω_1 that corresponds to α by $b_\alpha + M^2$ and denote the element in Ω_2 that corresponds to α by Q_α .

We now recursively define a family of PN-subrings $\{R_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Psi\}$. We have already defined R_0 . Let $\alpha \in \Psi$ and assume that R_β has been defined for all $\beta < \alpha$. If $\gamma(\alpha) < \alpha$ define R_α to be the PN-subring obtained from Lemma 4.12 so that $R_{\gamma(\alpha)} \subseteq R_\alpha$, $|R_\alpha| = |R_{\gamma(\alpha)}|$, prime elements in $R_{\gamma(\alpha)}$ are prime in R_α , R_α contains an element of the coset $b_{\gamma(\alpha)} + M^2$, R_α contains a generating set for $Q_{\gamma(\alpha)}$, and, for every finitely generated ideal I of R_α , $IB \cap R_\alpha = I$. If $\gamma(\alpha) = \alpha$, define $R_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} R_\beta$.

Define $A = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Psi} R_\alpha$. By Lemma 4.11, $(A, M \cap A)$ satisfies the conditions for being a PN-subring except for the condition that $|A| < |B/M|$. In particular, A is a UFD. We now show that $IB \cap A = I$ for every finitely generated ideal I of A . Let $I = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ be a finitely generated ideal of A and let $c \in IB \cap A$. Then there is an $\alpha \in \Psi$ such that $c, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in R_\alpha$ and $IB \cap R_\alpha = I$ for every finitely generated ideal J of R_α . Letting $J = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)R_\alpha$, we have $c \in (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)B \cap R_\alpha = J \subseteq JA = I$, and it follows that $IB \cap A = I$. By construction, A satisfies the rest of the numbered conditions in the statement of the theorem. \square

Finally, we show that the UFD constructed in Theorem 4.13 satisfies our desired properties.

Theorem 4.14. (The UFD Theorem) Let (B, M) be a local domain containing the rationals with $\dim B \geq 3$, B/M uncountable, and $|B| = |B/M|$. Let $T = \widehat{B}$ and suppose that if $J \in \text{Min}(T)$ then T/J is a RLR. Then there exists a local UFD $(A, M \cap A)$ such that

- (1) $A \subseteq B$,
- (2) $\widehat{A} = \widehat{B} = T$,
- (3) The map $f : \text{Spec}(B) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ given by $f(P) = A \cap P$ is onto and, if P is a prime ideal of B with height at least two, then $f(P)B = P$. In particular, if P and P' are prime ideals of B with height at least two, then $f(P)$ has height at least two and $f(P) = f(P')$ implies that $P = P'$.

Proof. Let A be the UFD obtained from Theorem 4.13. By Proposition 4.1, A is Noetherian and $\widehat{A} = \widehat{B} = T$. If $J \in \text{Spec}(A)$, then there is a prime ideal P of T such that $P \cap A = J$. Noting that $(B \cap P) \cap A = P \cap A = J$, we have that f is onto. Suppose P is a prime ideal of B with height at least two. Then A contains a generating set for P and so $f(P)B = (A \cap P)B = P$. Hence, $A \cap P \neq (0)$. If the height of $A \cap P$ is one, then, since A is a UFD, $A \cap P = xA$ for some $x \in A$. Therefore, $P = (A \cap P)B = xB$ has height one, a contradiction. Thus, $A \cap P$ has height at least two. Finally, if $P, P' \in \text{Spec} B$ with $\text{ht} P \geq 2$ and $\text{ht} P' \geq 2$, then $(A \cap P)B = P$ and $(A \cap P')B = P'$. Therefore, if $f(P) = f(P')$ we have $P = P'$. \square

The properties of f ensure that it is onto, order-preserving and, when restricted to the prime ideals of B with height at least two, is a poset isomorphism from the prime ideals of B of height at least two to the prime ideals of A of at least two. In other words, the parts of the spectra of B and A of heights at least two are the same. While we use The UFD Theorem to prove our main result, it is an interesting theorem in its own right. Essentially, The UFD Theorem says that, given a local ring B satisfying the hypothesis of the theorem, one can find a Noetherian UFD with the same completion as B and such that a large part of the spectrum of B and the spectrum of the UFD are the same.

In Sections 5 and 6, we define precisely what we mean by growing and gluing, and we show that every finite poset can be realized by our growing and gluing process. Then, in Section 7, we use results from Section 3 to construct a ring with nice properties such that the spectrum of the ring contains a saturated subposet that is an isomorphic copy of our given finite poset. In addition, we ensure that all elements of the spectrum of the ring that correspond to the given finite poset have height at least two. Finally, we use Theorem 4.14 to show that our given finite poset is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of a Noetherian UFD.

5. GLUING & SPLITTING NODES IN PARTIAL ORDERS

Given a finite poset X that we wish to be a saturated subset of a Noetherian UFD, we begin the process by first picking a special height-one node $z \in X$ that covers height-zero nodes x_1, \dots, x_m in X . We then split each x_i into several nodes y_{ij} in a new poset Z in such a way that z is the only node in Z that covers each y_{ij} , yet Z otherwise looks like the original poset X . Then, we retract the nodes y_{ij} into z and proceed by a fairly involved inductive argument. In this section, we make precise the sense of splitting nodes by first defining what it means to glue nodes together in a rigorous sense.

5.1. Complete Subsets and Equivalence Relations on Finite Partial Orders. Let (X, \leq) be a poset. Recall from Definition 2.5 that if $S \subseteq X$ is a subposet of X , we call S a *complete subset*

of X if for all $s, t \in S$ and $x \in X$, if $s \leq x \leq t$, then $x \in S$. Fix a poset (X, \leq) , and a complete subposet $S \subseteq X$. Define $x \sim y$ if and only if $x = y$ or both x and y are in S .

Consider $X/\sim = \{[x] : x \in X\}$, where $[x]$ is the equivalence class containing x , and define $g_S : X \rightarrow X/\sim$ as $g_S(x) = [x]$. Declare $[x] \leq_\sim [y]$ if and only if $x \leq_X y$ or there are $s_1, s_2 \in S$ such that $x \leq_X s_1$, and $s_2 \leq_X y$. It is a straightforward (albeit tedious) exercise to show that this order is well-defined.

Lemma 5.1. With g_S, X , and \sim as above, if S is a complete subset of X , then $(X/\sim, \leq_\sim)$ is a poset. Moreover, if $h : X \rightarrow Z$ is any poset map such that h is constant on S , then there is a unique poset map $\varphi : X/\sim \rightarrow Z$ such that $\varphi g_S = h$.

Proof. The relation \leq_\sim is clearly reflexive, so we need only show that it is anti-symmetric and transitive.

(Anti-Symmetry) Suppose $[x] \leq_\sim [y]$, and $[y] \leq_\sim [x]$. If $x \leq_X y$, and $y \leq_X x$, then $x = y$, so $[x] = [y]$. If $x \not\leq_X y$, and $y \leq_X x$, then there are $s_1, s_2 \in S$ such that $x \leq_X s_1$, and $s_2 \leq_X y$. Then

$$s_2 \leq_X y \leq_X s_1,$$

so $y \in S$ since S is a complete subset of X . Therefore, $x \in S$, so $[x] = [y]$. The case where $x \leq_X y$, and $y \not\leq_X x$ is similar. Lastly, if $x \not\leq_X y$, and $y \not\leq_X x$, then there are $s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4 \in S$ such that $x \leq_X s_1, s_2 \leq_X y \leq_X s_3$, and $s_4 \leq_X x$. Therefore, both $x, y \in S$, so $[x] = [y]$.

(Transitivity) Suppose $[x] \leq_\sim [y]$, and $[y] \leq_\sim [z]$. If $x \leq_X y$, and $y \leq_X z$, then $x \leq_X z$. If $x \not\leq_X y$, and $y \leq_X z$, then there are $s_1, s_2 \in S$ such that $x \leq_X s_1$, and $s_2 \leq_X y \leq_X z$, so $[x] \leq_\sim [z]$. The case where $x \leq_X y$, and $y \not\leq_X z$ is similar. Finally, if neither $x \leq_X y$ nor $y \leq_X z$, then there are $s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4 \in S$ such that $x \leq_X s_1, s_2 \leq_X y, y \leq_X s_3$, and $s_4 \leq_X z$, so $[x] \leq_\sim [z]$.

Let $h : X \rightarrow Z$ be any poset map. Define $\varphi : X/\sim \rightarrow Z$ as $\varphi([x]) = h(x)$. Now φ is well-defined because h is constant on S . If $[x] \leq_\sim [y]$, and $x \not\leq_X y$, then there are $s, t \in S$ such that $x \leq_X s$ and $t \leq_X y$. Therefore, $h(x) \leq_Z h(s) = h(t) \leq_Z h(y)$. By construction, $\varphi g_S = h$. If φ' is any other poset map such that $\varphi' g_S = h$, and $[x] \in X/\sim$, then $[x] = g_S(x)$, so

$$\varphi'([x]) = \varphi' g_S(x) = h(x) = \varphi g_S(x) = \varphi([x]).$$

So φ is unique. □

Recall that if X is a poset, and $A \subseteq X$, we say A is an *antichain* if for all $a, b \in A$, $a \leq b$ implies that $a = b$.

Lemma 5.2. Let (X, \leq) be a poset. The following sets are complete subsets of X :

- (1) Any antichain in X . In particular, any subset of $\min X$ or $\max X$.
- (2) The set $g^{-1}(y)$, where $g : X \rightarrow Y$ is any poset map, and $y \in Y$.
- (3) $G_X(x) := \{u \in X : x \leq_X u\}$, where $x \in X$.
- (4) $L_X(x) := \{u \in X : u \leq_X x\}$, where $x \in X$.
- (5) The intersection of any collection of complete subsets of X .

Proof. We prove the second and fifth statements. The rest follow immediately from their definitions. For (2), if $c \leq_X x \leq_X d$ for $c, d \in g^{-1}(y)$, then

$$y \leq_Y g(x) \leq_Y y,$$

so $g(x) = y$, and $x \in g^{-1}(y)$. For statement (5), if $\{S_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a collection of complete subsets, and $c \leq_X x \leq_X d$ for c and d in $\bigcap_{i \in I} S_i$, then $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I} S_i$ since each S_i is complete. \square

5.2. Gluing Nodes in a Poset.

Definition 5.3. Let X and Y be posets, and let $g : X \rightarrow Y$ be a surjective poset map. If Z is a poset and $h : X \rightarrow Z$ is any poset map, we say h is *compatible* with g if, for each $y \in Y$, the restriction of h to $g^{-1}(y)$ is constant.

Remark 5.4. Suppose X and Z are posets. To test that $h : X \rightarrow Z$ is compatible with g , it suffices to show that if $g(x) = g(y)$, then $h(x) = h(y)$.

Definition 5.5. Let X be a poset. We say that the poset Y is a *gluing* of X with gluing map $g : X \rightarrow Y$ if whenever $h : X \rightarrow Z$ is compatible with g , there exists a unique poset map $\varphi : Y \rightarrow Z$ such that $\varphi g = h$.

If \mathcal{C} is a collection of subposets of X , we say Y is a *gluing of X along the collection \mathcal{C}* if there exists a gluing map $g : X \rightarrow Y$ such that

- (1) g is constant on C for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, and
- (2) if $g(x) = g(x')$ for distinct $x, x' \in X$, then both $x, x' \in C$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$.

If $\mathcal{C} = \{C\}$ consists of a single subposet of X , and Y is a gluing of X along \mathcal{C} , we shall simply say Y is a gluing of X along C with gluing map g .

Remark 5.6. There is some flexibility with \mathcal{C} in the above definition. Specifically, let X and Y be posets, and let $g : X \rightarrow Y$ be a surjective poset map. If Y is a gluing of X with gluing map g , then it is in particular a gluing of X along $\mathcal{C} = \{g^{-1}(y) : |g^{-1}(y)| \neq 1\}$. If Y is a gluing of X along \mathcal{D} with gluing map $h : X \rightarrow Y$, it is also a gluing along $\mathcal{D}' = \{A \in \mathcal{D} : |A| \geq 2\}$. It need not be the case that the elements of \mathcal{D} do not overlap. It could be that $D_1 \cap D_2$ is nonempty for distinct $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{D}$. Of course, if this happens, then h must carry $D_1 \cup D_2$ to a point in Y . In particular, \mathcal{D} could be reduced in this case by replacing D_1 and D_2 with $D_1 \cup D_2$ and preserving everything about h .

Finally, one may be interested in enlarging \mathcal{C} by including certain singleton subsets $\{x\}$ of X . This works as well, since if g is a gluing along \mathcal{C} , it is also a gluing along $\mathcal{C} \cup \{\{x\}\}$ for each $x \in X$.

Theorem 5.7. If (X, \leq) is a poset and S is a complete subset of X , then there is a gluing Y of X along S .

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 5.1, where $Y = X / \sim$, and the gluing map is $g_S : X \rightarrow X / \sim$. \square




FIGURE 4. A gluing example

Example 5.8. Consider Figure 4. Let X be the poset on the left, and let S be the set of nodes that are colored blue in X . S is an antichain, so there is a gluing of X along S by Theorem 5.7. The poset Y on the right is what results after gluing along S .

Lemma 5.9. Let (X, \leq) be a poset.

- (1) Suppose \mathcal{C} is a collection of subposets of X . If Y_1 is a gluing of X along \mathcal{C} with gluing map $g_1 : X \rightarrow Y_1$, and Y_2 is a gluing of X along \mathcal{C} with gluing map g_2 , then the map $\varphi_1 : Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$ from Definition 5.5 is an isomorphism, and $\varphi_1 g_1 = g_2$.
- (2) If Y_1 is a gluing of X along $\mathcal{C} = \{C_a : a \in A\}$ with gluing map g_1 , and Y_2 is a gluing of Y_1 along $\mathcal{D} = \{D_b : b \in B\}$ with gluing map g_2 , then Y_2 is a gluing of X along

$$\mathcal{E} = \{C_a, g_1^{-1}(D_b) : a \in A, b \in B\}$$

with gluing map $g_2 g_1$ (here A and B are indexing sets).

- (3) If Y is a gluing of X with gluing map g , and $h : X \rightarrow Z$ is a gluing of X along $\mathcal{C} = \{C_a : a \in A\}$ with gluing map that is compatible with g , then Z is a gluing of Y along $\mathcal{D} = \{g(C_a) : a \in A\}$ with gluing map $\varphi : Y \rightarrow Z$, where φ is the induced map from Definition 5.5.
- (4) If Y is a gluing of X along a complete subset S of X with gluing map $h : X \rightarrow Y$, then whenever $h(x) \leq_Y h(y)$ for $x, y \in X$, either $x \leq_X y$, or there are $s, t \in S$ such that $x \leq_X s$ and $t \leq_X y$.
- (5) If Y is a gluing of X along \mathcal{C} with gluing map $g : X \rightarrow Y$, and $y \in Y$ is such that $|g^{-1}(y)| \neq 1$, then $g^{-1}(y)$ is a union of elements in \mathcal{C} . If $C_1 \cap C_2 = \emptyset$ for all distinct pairs of sets $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$, then $g^{-1}(y) = C$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$.


Proof. (1) Since g_2 is compatible with g_1 , there is a poset map $\varphi_1 : Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$ such that $\varphi_1 g_1 = g_2$. Likewise, since g_1 is compatible with g_2 , there is a poset map $\varphi_2 : Y_2 \rightarrow Y_1$ such that $\varphi_2 g_2 = g_1$. Therefore, $\varphi_1 \varphi_2(g_2) = g_2$, and since g_2 is surjective, $\varphi_1 \varphi_2 = \text{id}_{Y_2}$. Likewise, $\varphi_2 \varphi_1 = \text{id}_{Y_1}$. So φ_1 is an isomorphism.

(2) If $h : X \rightarrow Z$ is a poset map that is compatible with $g_2 g_1 : X \rightarrow Y_2$, then it is compatible with $g_1 : X \rightarrow Y_1$ because if $g_1(x) = g_1(y)$, then $g_2 g_1(x) = g_2 g_1(y)$, so $h(x) = h(y)$. In particular, there is a poset map $h_1 : Y_1 \rightarrow Z$ such that $h_1 g_1 = h$. If $g_2(x) = g_2(y)$, and $x = g_1(x')$, and $y = g_1(y')$, then $h(x') = h(y')$ since h is compatible with $g_2 g_1$. Therefore,

$$h_1(x) = h_1(g_1(x')) = h(x') = h(y') = h_1(g_1(y')) = h_1(y).$$

So $h_1 : Y_1 \rightarrow Z$ is compatible with g_2 , and therefore there is a poset map $h_2 : Y_2 \rightarrow Z$ such that $h_2 g_2 = h_1$. Therefore, $h_2(g_2 g_1) = h_1 g_1 = h$. So, Y_2 is a gluing of X with gluing map $g_2 g_1$. To finish this part, we must show it is a gluing along \mathcal{E} . To this end, it suffices to show that if $u, v \in X$ are distinct, and $g_2 g_1(u) = g_2 g_1(v)$, then both $u, v \in E$ for some $E \in \mathcal{E}$. If $g_1(u) = g_1(v)$, then $u, v \in C$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. If $g_1(u) \neq g_1(v)$, then since g_2 is a gluing map, it follows that $g_1(u), g_1(v) \in D$ for some $D \in \mathcal{D}$. In particular, both u and v are in $g_1^{-1}(D) \in \mathcal{E}$.

(3) Suppose $f : Y \rightarrow W$ is a poset map that is compatible with $\varphi : Y \rightarrow Z$. For this part, consider the following commutative diagram, where $\psi : Y \rightarrow W$ is the map we seek:



Now, fg is compatible with h because if $h(x) = h(y)$, then $\varphi g(x) = \varphi g(y)$. Therefore, $fg(x) = fg(y)$, since f is compatible with φ . So, there is a poset map $\psi : Z \rightarrow W$ such that $\psi h = fg$. Since $h = \varphi g$, we have $\psi \varphi g = fg$, and since g is surjective, it follows that $\psi \varphi = f$. Therefore, Z is a gluing of Y with gluing map φ . If $g(C_a) \in \mathcal{D}$, then $\varphi g(C_a) = h(C_a)$, which is a point in Z . If $g(x) \neq g(y)$ for $g(x), g(y) \in Y$, and $\varphi(g(x)) = \varphi(g(y))$, then $h(x) = h(y)$, and $x \neq y$. So both $x, y \in C_a$ for some $a \in A$, so $g(x), g(y) \in g(C_a)$, which belongs to \mathcal{D} .

(4) Let $g_S : X \rightarrow X/\sim$ be as in Lemma 5.1. Then X/\sim and Y are both gluings of X along S . So, by Lemma 5.9, there is an isomorphism $\varphi : Y \rightarrow X/\sim$ such that $\varphi h = g_S$. In particular, if $h(x) \leq_Y h(y)$, then $g_S(x) \leq g_S(y)$, so $x \leq_X y$ or there are $s, t \in S$ such that $x \leq_X s$, and $t \leq_X y$.

(5) For each pair a, b of distinct nodes in $g^{-1}(y)$, let $C_{ab} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $a, b \in C_{ab}$. Then $g^{-1}(y)$ is the union of all C_{ab} . If \mathcal{C} consists of pairwise disjoint sets, and $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is such that $g(C) = y$, then take $z \in C$ and $x \neq z$ such that $g(x) = g(z) = y$. Then $x, z \in C'$ for some $C' \in \mathcal{C}$, and since $z \in C' \cap C$, it follows that $C' = C$. So, $x \in C$. \square

Definition 5.10. Let \mathcal{C} be a collection of pairwise disjoint subposets of a poset X . We say a sequence of nodes (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) is a \mathcal{C} -sequence in X if, for all $1 \leq i < n$, we have $u_i \leq u_{i+1}$ or both $u_{i+1}, u_i \in C$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$.

Theorem 5.11. If Z is a gluing of X along a finite collection \mathcal{C} of pairwise disjoint sets with gluing map $h : X \rightarrow Z$, and $x, y \in X$ are such that $h(x) \leq_Z h(y)$, then there is a \mathcal{C} -sequence in X from x to y .

Proof. We argue by induction on $|\mathcal{C}|$. If $\mathcal{C} = \{C\}$, then $C = g^{-1}(z)$ for some $z \in Z$, so C is complete by part 2 of Lemma 5.2. By part (4) of Lemma 5.9, either $x \leq_X y$ or there are $s, t \in C$ such that $x \leq_X s$, and $t \leq_X y$. In the first case, (x, y) is a \mathcal{C} -sequence, and in the latter case, (x, s, t, y) is a \mathcal{C} -sequence.

Suppose $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and we have proved the proposition for all gluings along pairwise disjoint collections with n elements. Assume \mathcal{C} is a collection with $n+1$ elements, and suppose Z is a gluing of X along \mathcal{C} with gluing map $h : X \rightarrow Z$. Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$. By part (5) of Lemma 5.9, $C = h^{-1}(z)$ for some $z \in Z$. So C is complete, and there is a gluing Y of X along C with gluing map $g : X \rightarrow Y$. Since h is compatible with g , the induced map $\varphi : Y \rightarrow Z$ is a gluing map, and it is a gluing along $\mathcal{D} = \{g(D) : D \in \mathcal{C}\}$ by part (3) of Lemma 5.9. Now, $g(C)$ is a point in Y , and therefore, by Remark 5.6, φ is a gluing along $\mathcal{D}' := \mathcal{D} \setminus \{g(C)\}$, which has n elements. In particular, if $x, y \in X$ with $h(x) \leq_Z h(y)$, then $\varphi g(x) \leq_Z \varphi g(y)$, so, by the induction hypothesis, there is a \mathcal{D}' -sequence $(g(x_1), g(x_2), \dots, g(x_{n-1}), g(x_n))$ in Y from $g(x_1) = g(x)$ to $g(x_n) = g(y)$. For each $1 \leq i < n$, we will create a \mathcal{C} -sequence (x_i, p_i, q_i, x_{i+1}) of X . If we accomplish this, then their concatenation

$$(x_1, p_1, q_1, x_2, p_2, q_2, x_3, \dots, x_{n-1}, p_{n-1}, q_{n-1}, x_n)$$

will be a \mathcal{C} -sequence in X . Fix $1 \leq i < n$. If $g(x_i) \leq_Y g(x_{i+1})$, then there are $c, c' \in C$ such that $x_i \leq_X c$ and $c' \leq_X x_{i+1}$. In this case, set $p_i = c$ and $q_i = c'$. Otherwise, $g(x_i), g(x_{i+1}) \in D$ for some $D \in \mathcal{D}'$. In particular, $h(x_i) = h(x_{i+1})$. So either $x_i = x_{i+1}$ or $x_i, x_{i+1} \in C'$ for some $C' \in \mathcal{C}$. In either case, set $p_i = x_i$, and $q_i = x_{i+1}$. \square

Theorem 5.11 has some important consequences. Note that in order to apply Theorem 5.11, we need to know that \mathcal{C} is a collection of pairwise disjoint sets. However, all gluings Y of X with gluing map g are gluings along such a set (just take $\mathcal{C} = \{g^{-1}(y) : |g^{-1}(y)| \neq 1\}$). So, for the next two corollaries, we will assume that \mathcal{C} has the desired form.

Corollary 5.12. Suppose Y is a gluing of X along a finite collection \mathcal{C} with gluing map g . If each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is an antichain, and if $g(y)$ covers $g(x)$ in Y , then there exist $x', y' \in X$ such that y' covers x' in X and $g(x') = g(x)$ and $g(y') = g(y)$.

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{S} := (x := x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n := y)$$

be a \mathcal{C} -sequence from x to y , which exists by Theorem 5.11. If $g(x_i) = g(x_{i+1})$ for all i , then $g(x) = g(y)$, an impossibility. So there is i such that $g(x_i) \neq g(x_{i+1})$. Since \mathcal{S} is a \mathcal{C} -sequence, we must have $x_i < x_{i+1}$ and thus $g(x_i) < g(x_{i+1})$. Set $x' := x_i$ and $y' := x_{i+1}$. Now,

$$g(x) \leq g(x') < g(y') \leq g(y),$$

and since $g(y)$ covers $g(x)$, it follows that $g(x) = g(x')$ and $g(y) = g(y')$. If $x' \leq z \leq y'$, then $g(x') = g(z)$ or $g(y') = g(z)$ since $g(y)$ covers $g(x)$ in Y . If $g(x') = g(z)$ then either $x' = z$ or $x', z \in C$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$. In the latter case, $x' = z$ still since C is an antichain. Likewise, if $g(y') = g(z)$, then $y' = z$. So y' covers x' in X . \square

Corollary 5.13. Let Y be a gluing of X along \mathcal{C} with gluing map g , and write $\mathcal{C} = \{g^{-1}(y) : |g^{-1}(y)| \neq 1\}$. If $\dim X$ and $\dim Y$ are finite, and $C \subseteq \min X$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$, then $\min X = g^{-1}(\min Y)$, and $\dim X = \dim Y$. An analogous conclusion also holds if $C \subseteq \max X$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proof. If $x <_X y$, and $g(x) = g(y)$, then $x, y \in C$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$, which is impossible because $C \subseteq \min X$ and $x <_X y$. So $g(x) <_Y g(y)$. In particular, $\dim X \leq \dim Y$. Let

$$g(x_1) <_Y g(x_2) <_Y \cdots <_Y g(x_n) \tag{1}$$

be a chain in Y . By Theorem 5.11, there is a \mathcal{C} -sequence in X of the form (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) , where $z_1 = x_1$ and $z_m = x_2$. If $z_{i+1} = z_i$ or both $z_{i+1}, z_i \in C$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$ for all $1 \leq i < m$, then

$$g(x_1) = g(z_1) = g(z_2) = \dots = g(z_m) = g(x_2),$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, there is i such that $z_i <_X z_{i+1}$. In particular, $z_i <_X x_2$. If $k \geq 2$, and $(w_1, \dots, w_{m'})$ is a \mathcal{C} -sequence from x_k to x_{k+1} , then no w_j could possibly be in C for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$, so we must have $w_i \leq_X w_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i < m'$. In particular, $x_k <_X x_{k+1}$.

Therefore, $x_k <_X x_{k+1}$. So

$$z_i <_X x_2 <_X x_3 <_X \cdots <_X x_n$$

is a chain in X of whose length is equivalent to the length of chain (1). In particular, $\dim Y \leq \dim X$. So $\dim Y = \dim X$.

If $g(x) \in \min Y$, we claim $x \in \min X$. If $x' \leq_X x$, then $g(x') = g(x)$. If $x' \neq x$, then $x, x' \in C$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$, which is absurd because $C \subseteq \min X$. So $x = x'$, and thus $x \in \min X$ as claimed.

Conversely, suppose $x \in \min X$, and $g(x') \leq_Y g(x)$. Then there is a \mathcal{C} -sequence (r_1, \dots, r_t) from $x' = r_1$ to $x = r_t$. Either both $r_{t-1}, r_t \in C$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$, or $r_{t-1} \leq_X r_t = x$. In the first case, $g(r_{t-1}) = g(r_t)$. In the second case, $r_{t-1} = r_t$ because $r_t = x$ is a minimal node of X . In either case, $g(r_{t-1}) = g(r_t) = g(x)$. Repeating this argument, we obtain

$$g(x') = g(r_1) = \dots = g(r_{t-1}) = g(r_t) = g(x).$$

The proof of the other case is very similar. \square

The types of gluings discussed in the hypotheses of Corollary 5.13 will be important for our purposes, so we give them a name:

Definition 5.14. If (X, \leq) is a poset and Y is a gluing of X along \mathcal{C} , where $C \subseteq \min X$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, then we say Y is a *height zero gluing* of X .

Remark 5.15. If Y is a gluing of X along $\mathcal{C} = \emptyset$, then Y is a height zero gluing of X since, vacuously, if $C \in \mathcal{C}$, then $C \subseteq \min X$.

5.3. Chain Decompositions & Splitting Nodes in a Poset. We now begin the process of describing what it means to split nodes in a poset. Essentially, we take a finite poset X , and we choose a special finite disjoint union of chains D and a surjective map $g : D \rightarrow X$ such that X is a gluing of D with gluing map g . To split a minimal node $x \in X$, we then consider the space of all “intermediate” gluings between D and X such that g does not identify the elements of $g^{-1}(x)$, and we choose a poset F in this space such that all sets of the form $g^{-1}(y)$ for $y \neq x$ have been identified to a point in X . This F will be the poset we seek.

Definition 5.16. Let $\{(X_a, \leq_a) : a \in A\}$ be a nonempty collection of posets indexed by A whose sets of nodes are pairwise disjoint. Define $(\oplus_{a \in A} X_a, \leq)$ to be a poset whose sets of nodes are $\cup_{a \in A} X_a$, and whose order relation is defined as $x \leq y$ if and only if $x \leq_a y$ for some $a \in A$. This is known as the *disjoint sum* of the collection (see [11]).

Definition 5.17. Let $D = \oplus_{a \in A} D_a$ be a disjoint sum of chains, and let Z be a poset. We say D is a *chain decomposition* of Z if there exists a surjective poset map $\varphi : D \rightarrow Z$ such that:

- (1) the restriction of φ to D_a is an isomorphism from D_a onto $\varphi(D_a)$;
- (2) $\varphi(D_a)$ is a maximal chain in Z for all $a \in A$; and
- (3) if C is a maximal chain in Z , then $C = \varphi(D_a)$ for some $a \in A$.

Lemma 5.18. Every nonempty poset X has a chain decomposition D , and if $\varphi : D \rightarrow X$ is a map as in Definition 5.17, then X is a gluing of D with gluing map φ .

Proof. Let (X, \leq) be a poset, and let $\{C_a : a \in A\}$ be the collection of its maximal chains. For each $a \in A$, let D_a be a chain that is isomorphic to C_a via an isomorphism $\varphi_a : D_a \rightarrow C_a$. Consider $D := \oplus_{a \in A} D_a$, and define $\varphi : D \rightarrow X$ as $\varphi(x) = \varphi_a(x)$ where a corresponds to the unique D_a in which x lies. It is clear that φ satisfies the conditions in Definition 5.17.

Now, suppose D is any chain decomposition of X with map $\varphi : D \rightarrow X$, and let $h : D \rightarrow Z$ be a poset map that is compatible with φ . If $\varphi(x) \leq_X \varphi(y)$, then $\{\varphi(x), \varphi(y)\} \subseteq C$ for some maximal chain C . By condition (3) of Definition 5.17, $C = \varphi_a(D_a)$, where $\varphi_a : D_a \rightarrow C$ is the restriction

of φ to D_a , which is an isomorphism. So, $\varphi(x) = \varphi_a(x')$ and $\varphi(y) = \varphi_a(y')$ for some $x', y' \in D_a$. Therefore, $x' \leq_D y'$, and so

$$h(x) = h(x') \leq_Z h(y') = h(y),$$

where the first and last equalities follow from compatibility of h with φ . In particular, the map $f : X \rightarrow Z$ given by $f(\varphi(x)) := h(x)$ is a well-defined poset map such that $f \circ \varphi = h$. So φ is a gluing map. \square

Lemma 5.19. If D is a chain decomposition of X with map $\varphi : D \rightarrow X$, then $\min D = \varphi^{-1}(\min X)$, and $\max D = \varphi^{-1}(\max X)$.

Proof. Write $D = \bigoplus_{a \in A} D_a$, and let $\varphi : D \rightarrow X$ be the chain decomposition map. If $d \in \min D$, then $d \in \min D_c$ for some $c \in A$. If $K = \varphi_c(D_c)$ is the maximal chain in X that is the image of D_c under φ_c , then $\varphi_c(d) \in \min K \subseteq \min X$, since K is a maximal chain in X . Conversely, if $\varphi(d) \in \min X$, then let D_r be the unique maximal chain in D on which d lies. So $\varphi(d) = \varphi_r(d)$, where $\varphi_r : D_r \rightarrow \varphi(D_r)$ is an isomorphism, and $\varphi_r(D_r)$ is a maximal chain in X . Since $\varphi(d) = \varphi_r(d) \in \min X$, it must be the minimal element of $\varphi_r(D_r)$. Consequently, $d \in \min D_r$ and hence $d \in \min D$. The proof of $\varphi^{-1}(\max X) = \max D$ is similar. \square

Definition 5.20. Fix a finite poset X , and finite chain decomposition D of X with map $\varphi : D \rightarrow X$. Let \mathcal{D} be the set of all pairwise non-isomorphic posets A such that:

- (1) A is a gluing of D with gluing map $t_A : D \rightarrow A$;
- (2) X is a gluing of A with gluing map $f_A : A \rightarrow X$; and
- (3) $f_A t_A = \varphi$.

For the rest of this section, fix a finite poset X and a finite chain decomposition $D = \bigoplus_{a \in A} D_a$ of X with map $\varphi : D \rightarrow X$.

Lemma 5.21. Let $F \in \mathcal{D}$ with gluing maps $t_F : D \rightarrow F$ and $f_F : F \rightarrow X$. View F as a gluing of D along

$$\mathcal{C} = \{t_F^{-1}(u) : |t_F^{-1}(u)| \neq 1\}.$$

If (d_1, \dots, d_m) is a \mathcal{C} -sequence in D with respect to t_F , then it is also a \mathcal{C} -sequence in D with respect to φ . That is, if (d_1, \dots, d_m) is such that for all $1 \leq i < m$, we have $d_i \leq d_{i+1}$ or $t_F(d_i) = t_F(d_{i+1})$, then for all such i we also have $d_i \leq d_{i+1}$ or $\varphi(d_i) = \varphi(d_{i+1})$. Furthermore, $\min D = t_F^{-1}(\min F)$ and $\max D = t_F^{-1}(\max F)$.

Proof. Let (d_1, \dots, d_m) be a \mathcal{C} -sequence in D with respect to t_F , and suppose $1 \leq i < m$ and $d_i \not\leq d_{i+1}$. Then $t_F(d_i) = t_F(d_{i+1})$. So

$$\varphi(d_i) = f_F t_F(d_i) = f_F t_F(d_{i+1}) = \varphi(d_{i+1}).$$

Therefore, (d_1, \dots, d_m) is a \mathcal{C} -sequence with respect to φ .

Let $d \in \min D$, and suppose $t_F(d') \leq t_F(d)$ for some $d' \in D$. By Theorem 5.11, there is a \mathcal{C} -sequence in D of the form

$$(d' := d_1, \dots, d := d_m)$$

from d' to d . So $\varphi(d_i) \leq \varphi(d_{i+1})$ for all $1 \leq i < m$. By Lemma 5.19, $\varphi(d) = \varphi(d_m) \in \min X$, so $\varphi(d_i) = \varphi(d)$ for all $1 \leq i < m$, and since $\min D = \varphi^{-1}(\min X)$ by Lemma 5.19, it follows that

$d_i \in \min D$ for all $1 \leq i < m$. In particular, for all $1 \leq i < m$, either $d_i \leq d_{i+1}$, in which case $d_i = d_{i+1}$ since $d_{i+1} \in \min D$, or $t_F(d_i) = t_F(d_{i+1})$. In either case, $t_F(d_i) = t_F(d_{i+1})$, so

$$t_F(d') = t_F(d_1) = \dots = t_F(d_m) = t_F(d).$$

So $\min D \subseteq t_F^{-1}(\min F)$. Conversely, if $t_F(d) \in \min F$, and $d' \leq d$, then $t_F(d') = t_F(d)$. So $\varphi(d') = \varphi(d)$. Now, $d', d \in D_a$ for some $a \in A$, and $d' \leq d$ on D_a , so $\varphi_a(d') = \varphi_a(d)$, and thus $d' = d$ since φ_a is an isomorphism. So d is minimal in D . The proof that $\max D = t_F^{-1}(\max F)$ is similar. \square

Lemma 5.22. View X as a gluing of D along $\mathcal{C} := \{\varphi^{-1}(x) : |\varphi^{-1}(x)| \neq 1\}$. If $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, then there exists $F \in \mathcal{D}$ such that F is a gluing of D along \mathcal{E} with gluing map $t_F : D \rightarrow F$.

Proof. If $\mathcal{E} = \emptyset$, take $F = D$, $t_F = \text{id}_D$, and $f_F = \varphi$. Otherwise, write \mathcal{E} as

$$\mathcal{E} := \{\varphi^{-1}(x_1), \dots, \varphi^{-1}(x_k)\},$$

where each x_i is distinct, and define

$$\mathcal{E}_j := \{\varphi^{-1}(x_1), \dots, \varphi^{-1}(x_j)\},$$

for each $1 \leq j \leq k$. By Lemma 5.2, $\varphi^{-1}(x_1)$ is a complete subset of D , so there exists a gluing F_1 of D along \mathcal{E}_1 with gluing map $t_{F_1} : D \rightarrow F_1$. Now, φ is compatible with t_{F_1} , so there is a map $f_{F_1} : F_1 \rightarrow X$ such that $f_{F_1} t_{F_1} = \varphi$. By Lemma 5.9, f_{F_1} is a gluing map. So $F_1 \in \mathcal{D}$.

Let $j \geq 1$, and suppose we have constructed $F_j \in \mathcal{D}$ with gluing maps $t_{F_j} : D \rightarrow F_j$ and $f_{F_j} : F_j \rightarrow X$ such that $f_{F_j} t_{F_j} = \varphi$, and such that F_j is a gluing of D along \mathcal{E}_j . If $j < k$, we construct $F_{j+1} \in \mathcal{D}$ that is a gluing of D along \mathcal{E}_{j+1} . Now, $t_{F_j} \varphi^{-1}(x_{j+1}) = f_{F_j}^{-1}(x_{j+1})$, so $t_{F_j} \varphi^{-1}(x_{j+1})$ is a complete subset of F_j by Lemma 5.2. So there is a gluing F_{j+1} of F_j along $t_{F_j} \varphi^{-1}(x_{j+1})$, with gluing map $h : F_j \rightarrow F_{j+1}$. Set $t_{F_{j+1}} := h t_{F_j}$. Since F_j is a gluing of D along \mathcal{E}_j , and F_{j+1} is a gluing of F_j along $\{t_{F_j} \varphi^{-1}(x_{j+1})\}$, it follows, by Lemma 5.9, that F_{j+1} is a gluing of D along

$$\mathcal{E}_j \cup \{t_{F_j}^{-1}(t_{F_j} \varphi^{-1}(x_{j+1}))\}.$$

If $t_{F_j}(d) = t_{F_j}(d')$, where $d' \in D$ is such that $\varphi(d') = x_{j+1}$, then either $d = d'$ or not. If $d \neq d'$, then both $d, d' \in E$ for some $E \in \mathcal{E}_j$ since F_j is a gluing of D along \mathcal{E}_j by the induction hypothesis. That is, $\varphi(d) = \varphi(d') = x_t$ for some $1 \leq t \leq j$, which is a contradiction. So $d = d'$, and therefore $t_{F_j}^{-1} t_{F_j} \varphi^{-1}(x_{j+1}) \subseteq \varphi^{-1}(x_{j+1})$, and thus are equal. In particular, F_{j+1} is a gluing of D along \mathcal{E}_{j+1} . Since $\varphi : D \rightarrow X$ is compatible with $t_{F_{j+1}}$, there is a map $f_{F_{j+1}} : F_{j+1} \rightarrow X$ such that $f_{F_{j+1}} t_{F_{j+1}} = \varphi$. Lemma 5.9 implies that $f_{F_{j+1}}$ is a gluing map. So $F_{j+1} \in \mathcal{D}$, and this completes the inductive step. Upon setting $F := F_k \in \mathcal{D}$, we get that F is a gluing of D along $\mathcal{E}_k = \mathcal{E}$. \square

Recall that if (X, \leq) is a poset, we say y covers x if $x <_X y$ and no $w \in X$ satisfies $x <_X w <_X y$. If y covers x in X , we write $x <_c y$.

Corollary 5.23. Let $u_1 \in \min X$, and suppose $u_1 <_c u_2$ for some $u_2 \in X$. There exists $F \in \mathcal{D}$ such that X is a height zero gluing of F along $f_F^{-1}(u_1)$. Moreover, if $f_F(v_1) = u_1$, and $f_F(v_2) = u_2$, and $v_1 \leq v_2$ in F , then $v_1 <_c v_2$, and v_2 is the only node in F that covers v_1 .

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be as in the statement of Lemma 5.22. Either $\varphi^{-1}(u_1) \in \mathcal{C}$ or not. If it is not, then we claim we may take $F = X$ and $f_F = \text{id}_X$. To this end, suppose $u' \in X$ is another cover of u_1 , different from u_2 . Then u_1 must lie on at least two different maximal chains in X , so is an element of the images of at least two different chains in D . So, $\varphi^{-1}(u_1)$ is not a singleton and is thus an

element of \mathcal{C} , which is a contradiction. Therefore, the only cover of u_1 in X is u_2 in this case, and $F = X$ does indeed work.

Now assume $\varphi^{-1}(u_1) \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\varphi^{-1}(u_1)\}$. By Lemma 5.22, there is $F \in \mathcal{D}$ such that F is a gluing of D along \mathcal{E} . Since $F \in \mathcal{D}$, there are gluing maps $t_F : D \rightarrow F$ and $f_F : F \rightarrow X$. By Lemma 5.9, X is a gluing of F along $\mathcal{F} := \{t_F(C) : C \in \mathcal{C}\}$. If $C \in \mathcal{E}$, then t_F is constant on C ; that is, $t_F(C)$ is singleton. We may thus shrink \mathcal{F} by removing the singletons to realize X as a gluing of F along $\mathcal{F}' = \{t_F \varphi^{-1}(u_1)\}$. Since $f_F t_F = \varphi$, it follows that $\mathcal{F}' = \{f_F^{-1}(u_1)\}$. By Lemma 5.21, $t_F^{-1}(\min F) = \min D$, and since t_F is surjective, it follows that $t_F(\min D) = \min F$. Since $u_1 \in \min X$, $\varphi^{-1}(u_1) \subseteq \min D$, so $t_F \varphi^{-1}(u_1) = f_F^{-1}(u_1) \subseteq \min F$. Therefore, X is a height zero gluing of F along \mathcal{F}' .

Suppose $f_F(v_1) = u_1$ and $f_F(v_2) = u_2$, and $v_1 \leq v_2$ in F . If $v_1 = v_2$, then $u_1 = u_2$, which is impossible, so $v_1 < v_2$. If $v_1 \leq w \leq v_2$, then $u_1 = f_F(v_1) = f_F(w)$ or $f_F(w) = f_F(v_2) = u_2$ because u_2 covers u_1 in X . If $f_F(v_2) = f_F(w)$, and $w \neq v_2$, then $w, v_2 \in f_F^{-1}(u_1)$, since X is a gluing of F along $f_F^{-1}(u_1)$, so $f_F(v_2) = u_1$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $w = v_2$ in that case. In the other case, if $w = t_F(d)$, then $d \in \min D$, so $w \in \min F$ which implies that $w = v_1$. Therefore, $v_1 <_c v_2$.

Suppose, for sake of contradiction, that v_3 is another cover of v_1 , different from v_2 . Write $v_1 = t_F(d_1)$, $v_2 = t_F(d_2)$, and $v_3 = t_F(d_3)$. If $d \in D$ is such that $t_F(d) = t_F(d_1)$, then $d = d_1$, because otherwise $d, d_1 \in E$ for some $E \in \mathcal{E}$, so we would have, upon application of f_F , that $\varphi(d) = \varphi(d_1) \neq u_1$, which is impossible. Therefore, d_1 is the only element of D such that its image under t_F is v_1 .

By Theorem 5.11, there is a \mathcal{E} -sequence in D of the form

$$(d_1 := d'_1, \dots, d'_m := d_2), \quad (2)$$

and another \mathcal{E} -sequence in D of the form

$$(d_1 := d''_1, \dots, d''_n := d_3). \quad (3)$$

Since $v_1 <_c v_2$ in F , and $v_1 \leq t_F(d'_i) \leq t_F(d'_j) \leq v_2$ for all $j \geq i$, we have that for each i , either $t_F(d'_i) = v_1$ or $t_F(d'_i) = v_2$. Moreover, since d_1 is the only lifting of $t_F(d_1)$ into D , it follows that if $t_F(d'_i) = t_F(d_1)$, then $d'_i = d_1$. A similar observation holds for the \mathcal{E} -sequence (3). Since $v_1 \neq v_2$, there exists i such that $t_F(d'_i) \neq t_F(d''_{i+1})$. Choose the least such i . Then $d'_i < d''_{i+1}$, and $d'_i = d_1$. So $d_1 < d''_{i+1}$. Note that $t_F(d''_r) = v_2$ for all $r > i$. Choose a similar such j corresponding to (3). Then $d_1 < d''_{j+1}$. Since D is a disjoint sum of chains, and d''_{i+1} and d''_{j+1} exceed a common element, they must lie on the same chain in D . So $d''_{i+1} \leq d''_{j+1}$ or $d''_{j+1} \leq d''_{i+1}$. Without loss of generality, assume $d''_{i+1} \leq d''_{j+1}$. Then we have

$$v_2 = t_F(d''_{i+1}) = \dots = t_F(d''_m) \leq t_F(d''_{j+1}) \leq v_3,$$

a contradiction. So there is not another cover of v_1 in F . \square

6. ELEVATIONS & G-EXTENSIONS

Having described the process for splitting nodes in the previous section, we now take up the task of what we mean by retracting nodes y_1, \dots, y_k into a node $z \in Z$ such that each $y_i < z$. To accomplish this, we note that $L_Z(z) = \{w \in Z : w \leq z\}$ is a complete subset of Z , in the sense of Definition 2.5, so may be glued to a point. We think of this gluing as a retraction of everything below z , including y_1, \dots, y_k , into z .

Definition 6.1. Let Z be a poset, and let $z \in Z$ be a node such that $\text{ht } z = 1$ and if $w \in Z$ is such that $w < z$, then z is the *only* node in Z that covers w . We say a poset X is a *retraction* of $L_Z(z)$ into z if X is a gluing of Z along $L_Z(z)$ with gluing map $r : Z \rightarrow X$. In this case, we call r a *retraction map*. Likewise, we say Z is an *elevation* of X if X is a retraction of $L_Z(z)$ into z for some suitable $z \in Z$.

Definition 6.2. If X is a retraction of $L_Z(z)$ into z via a retraction map $r : Z \rightarrow X$, then we say a poset map $e : X \rightarrow Z$ is an *elevation map* with respect to r if $re = \text{id}_X$ and $e(r(z)) = z$. In this case, we say Z is an *elevation* of X via e .

Remark 6.3. If $e : X \rightarrow Z$ is an elevation map with respect to r , then we will sometimes simply say that $e : X \rightarrow Z$ is an elevation map. Note that if e is an elevation map, then it is an embedding of posets since if $x, y \in X$, we have:

$$e(x) \leq_Z e(y) \implies re(x) \leq_X re(y) \implies x \leq_X y.$$

As a final note, if $z \in Z$ is such that X is a retraction of $L_Z(z)$ into z via r , and $p = r(z)$ in X , then one can think of Z as “elevating” p by “growing” new height zero nodes out of p , thus turning p into a height-one node in a new poset Z that otherwise mirrors the original poset X .

Lemma 6.4. Let X and Z be posets such that X is a retraction of $L_Z(z)$ into z via retraction map $r : Z \rightarrow X$. Then there exists a unique elevation map $e : X \rightarrow Z$ with respect to r . Moreover, $Z = L_Z(z) \cup e(X)$ and $\min Z = \min L_Z(z) \cup e(\min X \setminus \{r(z)\})$.

Proof. First, note that if $w \in Z$, and $w \geq_Z u$ for some $u \in L_Z(z)$, then $w \geq_Z z$. Indeed, if $u \neq z$, then u is minimal in Z , and thus w must be at least as great as some height-one node in Z that exceeds u . But the only such node is z . So $w \geq_Z z$. Let $x \in X$. If $|r^{-1}(x)| = 1$, then there is a unique $w \in Z$ such that $r(w) = x$. Set $e(x) = w$ in this case. Otherwise, set $e(x) = z$. Note that if $x = r(z)$, then $r^{-1}(x) = L_Z(z)$ which has at least two elements because $\text{ht } z = 1$ in Z . So $e(x) = z$ in this case. That is, $e(r(z)) = z$, and $e(x) \in L_Z(z)$ for some $x \in X$ if and only if $x = r(z)$.

We now show e is a poset map. Suppose $x \leq_X y$. Write $x = r(w_1)$, and $y = r(w_2)$. By part (4) of Lemma 5.9, either $w_1 \leq_Z w_2$, or there are $s, t \in L_Z(z)$ such that $w_1 \leq_Z s$, and $t \leq_Z w_2$. If $|r^{-1}(x)| = 1$, then $w_1 \notin L_Z(z)$ (because $|L_Z(z)| \geq 2$). So $w_1 \not\leq_Z s$ for any $s \in L_Z(z)$, and therefore $w_1 \leq_Z w_2$, and in particular, $w_2 \notin L_Z(z)$. So $e(x) = w_1 \leq_Z w_2 = e(y)$. Otherwise, $|r^{-1}(x)| \neq 1$, so $w_1 \in L_Z(z)$, and $e(x) = z$. So $e(x) = z \leq_Z w_2$ by the comment at the beginning of this proof. If $w_2 = z$, then $e(x) = e(y)$. Otherwise, $e(y) = w_2$, and still $e(x) = z <_Z w_2 = e(y)$. Finally, to see that $re = \text{id}_X$, if $w_1 \in L_Z(z)$, then $r(w_1) = r(z)$, and thus $re(x) = r(z)$. Otherwise, $re(w_1) = r(w_1)$.

To see that e is unique, suppose that $e' : X \rightarrow Z$ is another elevation map with respect to r , and let $t \in X$. Then $t = re(t) = re'(t)$. Since r is a gluing map, either $e(t) = e'(t)$ or both $e(t), e'(t) \in L_Z(z)$. In the first case, we are done. In the second case, $e(t) \in L_Z(z)$, so $t = r(z)$ by construction of e . Since e' is an elevation map, $e'(r(z)) = z = e(r(z))$. Thus, $e = e'$.

We now show that $Z = L_Z(z) \cup e(X)$, and we conclude that $\min Z = \min L_Z(z) \cup e(\min X \setminus \{r(z)\})$. If $w \in Z$, either $r(w) = r(z)$ or not. If $r(w) = r(z)$, and $w \neq z$, then both $w, z \in L_Z(z)$ since r is a gluing map along $L_Z(z)$. Otherwise, $r(w) \neq r(z)$, and since r is a gluing map, $r^{-1}(r(w)) = \{w\}$, in which case $w = e(r(w))$. If $w \in \min Z \setminus L_Z(z)$, then $w = e(x)$ for some $x \in X$. We claim $x \in \min X$. If $x' \leq_X x$, then $e(x') = e(x)$ so $x' = x$ because e is an embedding. So $\min Z \subseteq \min L_Z(z) \cup e(\min X \setminus \{r(z)\})$. Conversely, if $w \in \min L_Z(z)$, then it is surely minimal in Z . If

$w \in e(\min X \setminus \{r(z)\})$, then $w = e(x)$ for some $x \in \min X \setminus \{r(z)\}$. If $w' \leq_Z w = e(x)$, then $r(w') \leq_X x$, so $r(w') = x = r(w)$. If $w' \neq w$, then both $w', w \in L_Z(z)$, and thus $x = r(z)$, a contradiction. So $w' = w$. \square

Remark 6.5. If Z is an elevation of X with elevation map $e : X \rightarrow Z$, then X is *a priori* a retraction of $L_Z(z)$ for some $z \in Z$, with retraction map $r : Z \rightarrow X$ such that $re = \text{id}_X$, as in Definition 6.1, and Lemma 6.4. Moreover, if X is a retraction of $L_Z(z)$ into z , and $w \in Z$ is such that $w \notin e(X)$, then we must have $w < z$.

Definition 6.6. Let X_1 and X_2 be posets. We say X_1 is a *G-extension* of X_2 if there exists a finite poset Z such that Z is an elevation of X_2 via $e : X_2 \rightarrow Z$, and X_1 is a height-zero gluing of Z with gluing map h .


Theorem 6.7. Let F_1 be a finite poset such that $\dim F_1 \neq 0$. There exists a finite poset F_2 such that F_1 is a *G-extension* of F_2 . Moreover, if $x \in F_1$ is a height-one node on a chain of maximal length in F_1 , then Z, F_2 , and $g : Z \rightarrow F_1$ can be chosen such that F_2 is a retraction of $L_Z(g^{-1}(x))$ into $g^{-1}(x)$.

Proof. Let $K \subseteq F_1$ be a chain of maximal length (i.e., the length of K is $\dim F_1$), and let $x \in K$ be a height-one node in F_1 .

Let $m(x)$ be the total number of minimal nodes $u \in F_1$ such that $u < x$, yet x is not the unique cover of u in F_1 . If $m(x) = 0$, set $Z = F_1$, and $g = \text{id}_Z$. Then g is a gluing map along $\mathcal{C} = \emptyset$, which is a height zero gluing. Since $m(x) = 0$, every minimal node of $L_Z(x)$ is covered only by x . Moreover, since $L_Z(x)$ is a complete subset of Z by Lemma 5.2, there is a gluing F_2 of Z along $L_Z(x)$ with gluing map r by Lemma 5.1. So, F_2 is a retraction of Z , and therefore Z is an elevation of F_2 via $e : F_2 \rightarrow Z$ constructed from Lemma 6.4. In particular, F_1 is a *G-extension* of F_2 .

Assume $m(x) > 0$, and for all finite posets F such that there is height-one node y on a chain of maximal length in F with $0 \leq m(y) < m(x)$, F is a *G-extension* of F' for some finite poset F' , and Z , and $g : Z \rightarrow F$ are such that F' is a retraction of $L_Z(g^{-1}(y))$ into $g^{-1}(y)$. Let $u \in F_1$ such that $u <_c x$, but x is not the only cover of u . Let $D = \bigoplus_{a \in A} D_a$ be a chain decomposition of F_1 with map $\varphi : D \rightarrow F_1$, and let \mathcal{D} be as in Definition 5.20. By Corollary 5.23, there is $F \in \mathcal{D}$ such that F_1 is a height zero gluing of F with map $f_F : F \rightarrow F_1$, D is a chain decomposition of F with map $t_F : D \rightarrow F$; and $t_F f_F = \varphi$. Moreover, if $y \in F$ is the unique node such that $f_F(y) = x$, and $t_F(v) = u$, where $v <_F y$, then $v <_c y$, and y is the only cover of v in F . Since x lies on chain K , by the proof of Corollary 5.13, there is a chain K' of F such that $|K'| = |K|$, and $f_F(K') = K$. In particular, $y \in K'$, where K' is a chain in F of maximal length. If $w \in F$ is covered by y and y' , for $y \neq y'$, then $w \notin f_F^{-1}(u)$ (by choice of F), and $f_F(w) <_c f_F(y)$ and $f_F(w) <_c f_F(y')$, where $f_F(y) \neq f_F(y')$ because neither y nor y' are minimal, and F_1 is a height zero gluing of F . In particular, if $\{u_1 = u, u_2, \dots, u_{m(x)}\}$ are the set of nodes in F_1 that are covered by x and another node in F_1 , and $w \in F$ is a node that is covered by y and another node in F , then $f_F(w) = u_i$ for $2 \leq i \leq m(x)$, and since no such $w \in f_F^{-1}(u)$, there must be fewer than $m(x)$ such nodes in F ; that is $m(y) < m(x)$.

So F is a *G-extension* of F_2 for some F_2 , and there exists a finite poset Z such that there is an elevation map $e : F_2 \rightarrow Z$, and a height zero gluing map $g : Z \rightarrow F$. The relevant maps are shown below:



By Lemma 5.9, F_1 is a height zero gluing of Z , so F_1 is a G -extension of F_2 . Moreover, since F_2 is a retraction of $L_Z(g^{-1}(y))$ into $g^{-1}(y)$, and $y = f_F^{-1}(x)$, it follows that F_2 is a retraction of $L_Z((f_F g)^{-1}(x))$ into $(f_F g)^{-1}(x)$. \square

Corollary 6.8. If X is a finite poset such that $\dim X \neq 0$, there exists a finite sequence of finite posets $F_1 := X, F_2, \dots, F_n$, such that F_i is a G -extension of F_{i+1} for $1 \leq i < n$, and $\dim F_n < \dim F_1$.

Proof. If X is any finite poset, let $\eta(X)$ be the number of chains of maximal length in X . Define $F_1 = X$, suppose $\eta(F_1) = 1$, and take $x \in F_1$ of height one on a chain K of maximal length. By Theorem 6.7, there is a poset F_2 such that F_1 is a G -extension of F_2 , and F_2 is a retraction of $L_Z(g^{-1}(x))$ into $g^{-1}(x)$, where Z is as in Definition 6.6 and Theorem 6.7. Since F_1 is a height zero gluing of Z via g , we have $\dim Z = \dim F_1$. If C is a chain in Z of length $\dim Z$, then $g^{-1}(x) \in C$ by the proof of Corollary 5.13, and the fact that F_1 is a height zero gluing of Z . Since F_2 is a retraction of $L_Z(g^{-1}(x))$ into $g^{-1}(x)$, we must have

$$\dim F_2 < \dim Z = \dim F_1.$$

Now, assume $\eta(F_1) > 1$, and construct F_2 as in the previous paragraph. If $\dim F_2 = \dim F_1$, then $\eta(F_2) < \eta(F_1)$ since F_2 is a retraction of $L_Z(g^{-1}(x))$ into $g^{-1}(x)$. Choose a height-one x_2 on a chain K_2 of maximal length in F_2 , and find a finite poset F_3 such that F_2 is a G -extension of F_3 , and F_3 is a retraction of $L_{Z_2}(g_2^{-1}(x_2))$ into $g_2^{-1}(x_2)$. If $\dim F_3 < \dim F_2$, we are done. Otherwise, $\eta(F_3) < \eta(F_2)$. Repeat as necessary to find a finite poset F_n such that F_{n-1} is a G -extension of F_n , and $\dim F_n < \dim F_{n-1}$. \square

Example 6.9. Figures 5 and 6 illustrate Corollary 6.8. In each figure, the blue node represents a choice of a height-one node on a chain of maximal length. Let F_1 be the poset on the far left of Figure 5, and let f_1 be the blue node depicted in F_1 . Let J be the poset to the immediate right of F_1 . The two nodes x_1, x_2 below f_1 get “split” in the sense that F_1 is a gluing of J along a suitable set of nodes that glues to x_1, x_2 . Moreover, in J , the blue node j is the only node that covers the nodes that it exceeds. If F_2 is the poset to the immediate right of J , then F_2 is a retraction of $L_J(j)$ into j . Put another way, J is an elevation of F_2 . In particular, F_1 is a G -extension of F_2 because it is an elevation followed by a height-zero gluing. Specifically, in the context of Definition 6.6, X_1 is F_1 , X_2 is F_2 , and Z is J . The rest of the figures proceed in a similar fashion until a poset of dimension zero is obtained. The reader may notice that the number of steps required to reduce the dimension n of the starting poset (in this case F_1) depends on the number of chains of length n in the starting poset.

Figures 5 and 6 also illustrate the general strategy of how we seek to prove the main result. The techniques that we use to manipulate prime ideal spectra within Noetherian rings via gluing and growing only works suitably well if we are “growing” prime ideals out of height-zero prime ideals, and if we are gluing height-zero prime ideals together. In particular, we need a way to obtain a

given poset X from a point, say, via a sequence of growing (e.g. poset elevations) and height-zero gluings. Corollary 6.8 shows that this can be done. Specifically, starting with a finite poset X of nonzero dimension, first we reduce X to a zero-dimensional poset in the way demonstrated in the figures. In our case, we will always end up with a point at the end of the process because we will assume that X has a single maximal node without loss of generality. We embed the point into the spectrum of a suitable, easy Noetherian ring (\mathbb{C} in our case), and we grow and glue nodes carefully out of the point to reconstruct X after several steps. This corresponds to going backwards, from the far right of Figure 6 to the far left of Figure 5, after the reverse sequence (starting from F_1) has been established via Corollary 6.8.




FIGURE 5. G-Extension Example




FIGURE 6. G-Extension Example, continued

7. THE MAIN RESULTS

In this section we prove our two main results, Corollary 7.8 and Theorem 7.9. Corollary 7.8 states that every finite poset is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of a quasi-excellent domain and Theorem 7.9 states that every finite poset is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of a Noetherian UFD. We begin with a preliminary lemma. Then, in Lemma 7.2, we use Theorem 3.2 to show that if Z is an elevation of the finite poset X , and B is a local ring (satisfying some nice properties) whose spectrum contains a saturated subset that is isomorphic to X , then there is a local ring S (also satisfying some nice properties) whose spectrum contains a saturated subset that is isomorphic to Z .

Lemma 7.1. Let B be a Noetherian ring, let y and z be indeterminates, let $A = B[[y, z]]$, and let X be a poset. Suppose $\phi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B)$ is a saturated embedding. Then $\Psi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ given by $\Psi(u) = (\phi(u), y, z)A$ is a saturated embedding.

Proof. Suppose $u, v \in X$ with $u \leq v$. Then $\phi(u) \subseteq \phi(v)$ and so $\Psi(u) \subseteq \Psi(v)$. Now suppose $u, v \in X$ with $\Psi(u) \subseteq \Psi(v)$. Then $(\phi(u), y, z)A \subseteq (\phi(v), y, z)A$. Note that, if $P \in \text{Spec}(B)$, then

$(P, y, z)A \cap B = P$, and so, intersecting with B , we have $\phi(u) \subseteq \phi(v)$. It follows that $u \leq v$, and so Ψ is a poset embedding.

Now let $u, v \in X$ and suppose v covers u . Since ϕ is a saturated embedding, $\phi(v)$ covers $\phi(u)$. In particular, we have $\phi(u) \subseteq \phi(v)$ and so $\Psi(u) \subseteq \Psi(v)$. Suppose $Q \in \text{Spec}(A)$ with $(\phi(u), y, z)A \subseteq Q \subseteq (\phi(v), y, z)A$. Intersecting with B , we have $\phi(u) \subseteq Q \cap B \subseteq \phi(v)$. Since $\phi(v)$ covers $\phi(u)$, $Q \cap B = \phi(u)$ or $Q \cap B = \phi(v)$. Suppose $Q \cap B = \phi(u)$, and let $f(y, z) \in Q$. Then, since Q contains y and z , the constant term of f is in Q , and so it is in $Q \cap B = \phi(u)$. It follows that $f \in (\phi(u), y, z)A$, and so $Q = (\phi(u), y, z)A$. If $Q \cap B = \phi(v)$, then for $g(y, z) \in (\phi(v), y, z)A$, we have that the constant term of g is in $\phi(v) \subseteq Q$. So, as $y, z \in Q$ and the constant term of g is in Q , we have $g \in Q$. Hence, $Q = (\phi(v), y, z)A$, and it follows that $\Psi(v)$ covers $\Psi(u)$. \square

Lemma 7.2. Let X and Z be finite posets, and suppose Z is an elevation of X . Let B be a reduced local ring containing the rationals with $|B| = |B/M| = c$. Let $T = \widehat{B}$ be the completion of B at its maximal ideal, and assume that if $I \in \text{Min}T$, then T/I is a RLR. Suppose $\varphi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B)$ is a saturated embedding such that $\varphi(\min X) = \text{Min}(B)$. Then there exists a local ring S such that

- (1) S is reduced,
- (2) S contains the rationals,
- (3) If N is the maximal ideal of S , then $|S| = |S/N| = c$,
- (4) If Q is a minimal prime ideal of \widehat{S} , then \widehat{S}/Q is a RLR, and
- (5) There is a saturated embedding $\psi : Z \rightarrow \text{Spec}(S)$ such that $\psi(\min Z) = \text{Min}(S)$.

Moreover, if B is quasi-excellent, then so is S .

Proof. Let $z \in Z$ be such that X is a retraction of $L_Z(z)$ into z with gluing map $r : Z \rightarrow X$, as in Definition 6.1, and let $e : X \rightarrow Z$ be the elevation map. Let $p = r(z) \in X$. Enumerate $\min L_Z(z)$ as q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n . Write $\text{Min}(B) = \{\varphi(p) := P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m\}$. Let $S = B[[y, z]]/J$ be as in the conclusion of Theorem 3.2 applied to $\text{Min}(B)$ and $n = |\min L_Z(z)|$, and let $Q_1/J, \dots, Q_n/J$ be the corresponding prime ideals of S . Since $A = B[[y, z]]$ is local, so is S . Since the ideal J obtained from Theorem 3.2 is the intersection of prime ideals, $S = A/J$ is reduced. Since B contains the rationals, so does S . The maximal ideal of S is $N = (M, y, z)$, and so $S/N \cong B/M$, and we have $|S/N| = |B/M| = c$. Recall that $c^{\aleph_0} = c$ and so $|B| = |B[[y, z]]|$. It follows that $|S| \leq |B[[y, z]]| = |B| = |B/M| = |S/N|$. Since $|S/N| \leq |S|$, we have $|S| = |S/N| = c$. Therefore, S satisfies parts (1) – (3) of this lemma, and part (4) follows from part (3) of Theorem 3.2. Let $\psi_X : X \rightarrow \text{Spec} A$ be defined as $\psi_X(u) := (\varphi(u), y, z)A$. By Lemma 7.1, ψ_X is a saturated embedding. We now use ψ_X to construct $\psi : Z \rightarrow \text{Spec}(S)$. Let $w \in Z$. By Lemma 6.4, either $w \in e(X)$ or $w \in L_Z(z)$. If $w = e(x)$ for some $x \in X$, then define $\psi(w) = \psi(e(x)) := (\varphi(x), y, z)A/J$. Otherwise, if $w \notin e(X)$, then $w = q_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. In this case, set $\psi(w) := Q_i/J$.

We now show $\psi : Z \rightarrow \text{Spec}(S)$ has the desired properties. Suppose $\psi(w_1) \subseteq \psi(w_2)$. Either $w_1 = q_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$ or not. Suppose $w_1 \neq q_i$ for all i . Then $w_1 = e(x_1)$ for some $x_1 \in X$, and it must be the case that $w_2 = e(x_2)$ for some $x_2 \in X$. Therefore,

$$\psi(w_1) = (\varphi(x_1), y, z)A/J \subseteq (\varphi(x_2), y, z)A/J = \psi(w_2),$$

which implies $\varphi(x_1) \subseteq \varphi(x_2)$. Since φ is an embedding, it follows that $x_1 \leq x_2$ in X , so $w_1 = e(x_1) \subseteq e(x_2) = w_2$. Now suppose $w_1 = q_i$ for some i . Then $Q_i/J \subseteq \psi(w_2)$. If $\psi(w_2) = Q_i/J$, then $w_2 = q_i$ by construction of ψ . Otherwise, $\psi(w_2) = (\varphi(x'), y, z)/J$ for some $x' \in X$. In the proof of Theorem

3.2, Q_i is constructed as $Q_i := (\varphi(p), y + \alpha z)A$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$. So $(\varphi(p), y, z)A \subseteq (\varphi(x'), y, z)A$, and therefore $\varphi(p) \subseteq \varphi(x')$. Since φ is an embedding, it follows that $p \leq x'$ in X , so $e(p) = z \leq e(x') = w_2$. Since $q_i < z$ in Z , we have $q_i < w_2$. To show that ψ is cover-preserving, we argue similarly. Suppose w_2 covers w_1 in Z , and $w_1 \neq q_i$ for any i . Then $\psi(w_2)$ must cover $\psi(w_1)$ in S by Lemma 7.1 and properties of quotient rings. If $w_1 = q_i$ for some i , then $w_2 = e(p)$ because $e(p) = z$ is the only cover of q_i in Z . By part (2) of Theorem 3.2, $(\varphi(p), y, z)A/Q_i$ has height one in A/Q_i , so $(\varphi(p), y, z)/J$ covers Q_i/J in S .

Lastly, if $\min X = \{p_1 := p, p_2, \dots, p_m\}$, where $\varphi(p_i) = P_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Min}(S) &= \{Q_1/J, \dots, Q_n/J, (\varphi(p_2), y, z)/J, \dots, (\varphi(p_m), y, z)/J\} \\ &= \psi(\{q_1, \dots, q_n, e(p_2), \dots, e(p_m)\}) \\ &= \psi(\min L_Z(z) \cup e(\min X \setminus \{p_1\})) \\ &= \psi(\min Z), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 6.4 (recall $z = e(p_1) = e(p)$).

Finally, by Proposition 3.3, if B is quasi-excellent, then so is S . \square

We now work to prove an analogous result for height zero gluings. That is, if Z is a finite poset, Y a height zero gluing of Z , and S a local ring (satisfying some nice properties) whose spectrum contains a saturated subset that is isomorphic to Z , we show in Theorem 7.4 that there is a local ring B (also satisfying some nice properties) whose spectrum contains a saturated subset that is isomorphic to Y . The main tool for our proof is Theorem 3.4. We start with a preliminary lemma.

Lemma 7.3. Let (S, M) and $(B, B \cap M)$ be two reduced local rings such that $B \subseteq S$ and $\widehat{B} = \widehat{S}$. Suppose $f : \text{Spec}(S) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B)$ given by $f(P) := P \cap B$ is surjective and satisfies $f(P)S = P$ for all prime ideals P of S whose height is positive. Then we have the following:

- (1) If Q is a minimal prime ideal of S , then $Q \cap B$ is a minimal prime ideal of B .
- (2) If $P_1 \cap B = P_2 \cap B$ for prime ideals P_1, P_2 of S , then either $P_1 = P_2$ or both P_1 and P_2 are minimal prime ideals of S .
- (3) If $P_1 \cap B \supseteq P_2 \cap B$ for prime ideals P_1, P_2 of S , then there exists a prime ideal Q of S such that $P_1 \supseteq Q$ and $Q \cap B = P_2 \cap B$.

Proof. Let $T := \widehat{S} = \widehat{B}$.

(1) Suppose Q is a minimal prime ideal of S and $Q \cap B \supseteq P$, where P is a prime ideal of B . Let Q' be a prime ideal of T such that $Q' \cap S = Q$. Since T is also the completion of B , there exists a prime ideal Q'' of T such that $Q' \supseteq Q''$ and $Q'' \cap B = P$ by the Going-Down Theorem. Therefore, $Q' \cap S = Q = Q'' \cap S$ because Q is a minimal prime ideal of S and $Q' \cap S \supseteq Q'' \cap S$. Consequently, $Q \cap B = Q' \cap B = Q'' \cap B = P$. So $Q \cap B$ is a minimal prime ideal of B .

(2) Suppose not both P_1 and P_2 are minimal prime ideals of S . Then $\text{ht } P_1 > 0$ without loss of generality. Since $P_1 \cap B = P_2 \cap B$, we have that

$$P_1 = (P_1 \cap B)S = (P_2 \cap B)S \subseteq P_2.$$

So $\text{ht } P_2 > 0$, and thus $P_2 = (P_2 \cap B)S$ so that $P_1 = P_2$.

(3) Choose a prime ideal P'_1 of T such that $P'_1 \cap S = P_1$. Then $P'_1 \cap B = P_1 \cap B$. By the Going-Down Theorem, there exists a prime ideal P'_2 of T such that $P'_1 \supseteq P'_2$ and $P'_2 \cap B = P_2 \cap B$. Let

$Q := P'_2 \cap S$. Then

$$P_1 = P'_1 \cap S \supseteq P'_2 \cap S = Q,$$

and $Q \cap B = P_2 \cap B$. \square

Theorem 7.4. Let Z be a finite poset, and let Y be a height zero gluing of Z . Let (S, M) be a reduced local ring containing \mathbb{Q} such that S/M is uncountable and $|S| = |S/M|$. Suppose $\psi : Z \rightarrow \text{Spec } S$ is a saturated embedding such that $\psi(\min Z) = \text{Min}(S)$. Then there exists a reduced local ring $B \subseteq S$ with maximal ideal $B \cap M$ such that

- (1) B contains \mathbb{Q} ,
- (2) $\widehat{B} = \widehat{S}$,
- (3) $B/(B \cap M)$ is uncountable, $|B| = |B/(B \cap M)|$, and
- (4) There is a saturated embedding $\varphi : Y \rightarrow \text{Spec } B$ such that $\varphi(\min Y) = \text{Min}(B)$.

Moreover, if S is quasi-excellent, then so is B .

Proof. Let \mathcal{D} be such that Y is a gluing of Z along \mathcal{D} with respect to gluing map $g : Z \rightarrow Y$. Then there exists \mathcal{C} such that g is a gluing along \mathcal{C} where \mathcal{C} is a partition of $\min Z$ (see Remark 5.6). Write $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$, and note that $\psi(\mathcal{C})$ is a partition of $\text{Min}(S)$. Let B be the reduced local ring obtained from the conclusion of Theorem 3.4 applied to $\psi(\mathcal{C})$, and let $g' : Z \rightarrow \text{Spec } B$ be defined as $g' := f\psi$, where $f : \text{Spec } S \rightarrow \text{Spec } B$ is given by $f(P) = P \cap B$. We claim g' is compatible with g in the sense of Definition 5.3. Suppose $g'(a) = g'(b)$ where $a \neq b$. If $\psi(a) = \psi(b)$, then $a = b$ since ψ is an embedding. Assume $\psi(a) \neq \psi(b)$. By part (5) of Theorem 3.4 and part (2) of Lemma 7.3, if $P_1 \cap B = P_2 \cap B$ for prime ideals P_1, P_2 of S , then $P_1 = P_2$ or both P_1, P_2 are minimal primes of S . In particular, since $\psi(a) \neq \psi(b)$, it follows by part (4) of Theorem 3.4 that both $\psi(a), \psi(b) \in \psi(C_i)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$. So $a, b \in C_i$, and therefore $g(a) = g(b)$. Since g' is compatible with g , there exists a poset map $\varphi : Y \rightarrow \text{Spec } B$ such that $\varphi g = g' = f\psi$.

The ring B satisfies (1) – (3), so we need only show that φ is a saturated embedding satisfying (4). In particular, we must show that if $\varphi(g(x)) \subseteq \varphi(g(y))$, then $g(x) \leq g(y)$ in Y to demonstrate that φ is an embedding from Y into $\text{Spec}(B)$. Suppose $\varphi(g(x)) \subseteq \varphi(g(y))$. Then

$$f\psi(x) = \psi(x) \cap B \subseteq \psi(y) \cap B = f\psi(y).$$

Let $P_1 = \psi(x)$ and $P_2 = \psi(y)$. Then $P_1 \cap B \subseteq P_2 \cap B$. If $\text{ht } P_1 \neq 0$, then $P_1 \subseteq P_2$ by part (5) of Theorem 3.4, and since ψ is an embedding, we have $x \leq y$ in Z so $g(x) \leq g(y)$ in Y . Otherwise, $\text{ht } P_1 = 0$. By part (3) of Lemma 7.3, there exists a prime ideal Q of S such that $P_2 \supseteq Q$ and $Q \cap B = P_1 \cap B$. Therefore, both Q and $P_1 \in \psi(C_i)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$. Write $Q = \psi(c)$ for some $c \in C_i$. Then $g(x) = g(c)$ because both $x, c \in C_i$, and $\psi(c) \subseteq \psi(y)$ implies that $c \leq y$ in Z since ψ is an embedding. Therefore, $g(x) = g(c) \leq g(y)$ in Y and so φ is an embedding.

To see that φ is saturated, suppose that $g(y)$ covers $g(x)$ in Y . Each C_i is a subset of $\min Z$ and so is an antichain in Z . Therefore, by Corollary 5.12, there exist $x', y' \in Z$ such that $g(x') = g(x)$ and $g(y') = g(y)$ and y' covers x' in Z . Since ψ is a saturated embedding, we have that $P'_2 := \psi(y')$ covers $P'_1 := \psi(x')$ in $\text{Spec}(S)$. We claim $P'_2 \cap B$ covers $P'_1 \cap B$ in $\text{Spec}(B)$. Suppose not. Then there is a prime ideal P of B such that $P'_2 \cap B \not\supseteq P \supseteq P'_1 \cap B$. Since f is onto, there is a prime ideal P' of S such that $P = P' \cap B$. So we have

$$P'_2 \cap B \not\supseteq P' \cap B \supseteq P'_1 \cap B \tag{4}$$

for some prime ideal P' of S . Note that by Lemma 7.3, $\text{ht } P' \neq 0$ so that $P'_2 \supseteq P'$.

Suppose that $\text{ht } P'_1 = 0$. By Lemma 7.3 there is a prime ideal Q' of S such that $P' \supseteq Q'$ and $Q' \cap B = P'_1 \cap B$. Then both P'_1 and Q' belong to $\psi(C_j)$ for some j , so $Q' = \psi(d)$ for some $d \in C_j$. Note that $x' \in C_j$ as well so that $g(x') = g(d)$. In particular, $\psi(d) \subsetneq \psi(y')$ in $\text{Spec}(S)$, and thus $d < y'$ in Z . Now, y' cannot cover d in Z because ψ is a saturated embedding and $\psi(y') = P'_2$ does not cover $\psi(d) = Q'$ in $\text{Spec}(S)$. So there exists $e \in Z$ such that $d < e < y'$. Note that $g(e) \neq g(d)$ because e is not minimal in Z , and likewise $g(y') \neq g(e)$. But

$$g(x) = g(x') = g(d) < g(e) < g(y') = g(y),$$

a contradiction because $g(y)$ covers $g(x)$ in Y . Therefore, $\text{ht } P'_1 \neq 0$, and since $\text{ht } P'_2 \neq 0$ and $\text{ht } P' \neq 0$, we have, upon extending (4) to S , that $P'_2 \supseteq P' \supseteq P'_1$. So $P' = P'_2$ or $P' = P'_1$, and thus either $P'_2 \cap B = P' \cap B$ or $P' \cap B = P'_1 \cap B$, which violates (4). So there are no prime ideals of B strictly between $P'_2 \cap B$ and $P'_1 \cap B$. That is, $P'_2 \cap B$ covers $P'_1 \cap B$ in $\text{Spec}(B)$. In summary, since y' covers x' in Z , $\psi(y')$ covers $\psi(x')$ in $\text{Spec}(S)$, and we have just shown that $f\psi(y')$ must cover $f\psi(x')$ in $\text{Spec}(B)$. In particular, $\varphi g(y) = \varphi g(y') = f\psi(y')$ covers $f\psi(x') = \varphi g(x') = \varphi g(x)$. So φ is a saturated embedding.

Now, $\psi(\min Z) = \text{Min}(S)$ implies $f(\psi(\min Z)) = f(\text{Min}(S)) = \text{Min}(B)$ on one hand. On other hand, $f(\psi(\min Z)) = \varphi(g(\min Z)) = \varphi(\min Y)$, where the latter equality follows from Corollary 5.13. Thus, $\varphi(\min Y) = \text{Min}(B)$.

Finally, by Proposition 3.5, if S is quasi-excellent, then so is B . \square

By combining Lemma 7.2 and Theorem 7.4, we show that, if X and Y are finite posets with Y a G -extension of X and B_X is a local ring containing an isomorphic copy of X in its spectrum, then there is a local ring B_Y containing an isomorphic copy of Y in its spectrum.

Corollary 7.5. Let X and Y be finite posets, and suppose Y is a G -extension of X . Suppose $\varphi_X : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B_X)$ is a saturated embedding into the spectrum of a reduced local ring (B_X, M) such that

- (1) B_X contains \mathbb{Q} ,
- (2) $|B_X| = |B_X/M| = c$,
- (3) $\varphi_X(\min X) = \text{Min} B_X$, and
- (4) $\widehat{B_X}/I$ is a RLR for every $I \in \text{Min}(\widehat{B_X})$.

Then there is a reduced local ring (B_Y, N) and a saturated embedding $\varphi_Y : Y \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B_Y)$ such that B_Y and φ_Y satisfy (1)-(4) above. Moreover, if B_X is quasi-excellent, then so is B_Y .

Proof. Since Y is a G -extension of X , there is an elevation Z of X such that Y is a height zero gluing of Z . By Lemma 7.2, there is a reduced local ring (S, N') containing the rationals such that $c = |S| = |S/N'|$, \widehat{S}/Q is a RLR for each minimal prime ideal Q of \widehat{S} , and such that there is a saturated embedding $\psi : Z \rightarrow \text{Spec } S$ satisfying $\psi(\min Z) = \text{Min}(S)$. In addition, if B_X is quasi-excellent, then so is S . Since Y is a height zero gluing of Z , by Theorem 7.4, there is a reduced local subring (B_Y, N) of S such that $N = N' \cap B_Y$, B_Y contains the rationals, and $\widehat{B_Y} = \widehat{S}$. In addition, there is a saturated embedding $\varphi_Y : Y \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B_Y)$ satisfying (3). Since the completion of B_Y coincides with the completion of S , part (4) follows, and in particular their residue fields must be the same. Therefore, $|B_Y| \geq |B_Y/N| = |S/N'| = c$. Since B_Y is a subring of S , we have $|B_Y| \leq |S| = c$.

Therefore, $|B_Y| = c$. If S is quasi-excellent, then, by Theorem 7.4, so is B_Y . Therefore, if B_X is quasi-excellent, then so is B_Y . \square

The next result shows that, without loss of generality, we may assume that our given finite poset X has one maximal (or one minimal) element.

Lemma 7.6. If X is a finite poset, then there exists a finite poset K such that K has a single maximal node, $\dim K > \dim X$, and X is a saturated subset of K . Similarly, there is a finite poset K' such that K' has a single minimal node, $\dim K' > \dim X$, and X is a saturated subset K' .

Proof. Consider $K = X \cup \{k\}$, where k is not in X . Declare $a \leq_K b$ if and only if $a \leq_X b$ or $b = k$. The map $f : X \rightarrow K$ defined as $f(x) = x$ is a saturated embedding. The construction of K' is similar. \square

We now show that, if X is a finite poset, we can apply Corollary 7.5 repeatedly to find a suitable local domain whose spectrum contains an isomorphic copy of X .

Corollary 7.7. If X is a finite poset, then there exists a local domain (B, M) and a saturated embedding $\varphi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B)$ such that:

- (1) B contains \mathbb{Q} ,
- (2) $\dim B \geq 3$,
- (3) $|B| = |B/M| = c$,
- (4) If T is the completion of B , then T/I is a RLR for each $I \in \text{Min}T$, and
- (5) If $x \in X$, then $\text{ht } \varphi(x) \geq 2$.
- (6) B is quasi-excellent

Proof. Choose, by repeated application of Lemma 7.6, a finite poset K such that X is a saturated subset of K , K has a single maximal node, a single minimal node, $\dim K \geq 3$, and such that $\text{ht}_K x \geq 2$ for all $x \in X$. Set $F_1 := K$. By repeated application of Corollary 6.8, there is a sequence of finite posets $F_1, F_2, F_3, \dots, F_m$ such that F_i is a G -extension of F_{i+1} for all $1 \leq i < m$, and $\dim F_m = 0$. Note that $F_m = \{p\}$ is a point since K has only one maximal node. We now construct reduced local rings (B_i, M_i) for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, where B_1 will be the ring we seek. Set $B_m := \mathbb{C}$, and let $\varphi_m : F_m \rightarrow \text{Spec}(\mathbb{C})$ be defined as $\varphi_m(p) = (0)$. Note that B_m is quasi-excellent. Apply Corollary 7.5 $m - 1$ times to obtain $\varphi_1 : F_1 = K \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B_1)$, where φ_1 and B_1 satisfy the conclusions of Corollary 7.5 and B_1 is quasi-excellent. Set $B_1 := B$, and define φ to be φ_1 restricted to X . Since K is isomorphic to a saturated subset of $\text{Spec}(B)$ and $\dim K \geq 3$, it follows that $\dim B \geq 3$. Moreover, B has only one minimal prime ideal because its prime ideals are in one-to-one correspondence with the prime ideals of K . In particular, since B is reduced, it must be a domain. Finally, if $x \in X$, then $\text{ht } \varphi(x) \geq 2$ since $\text{ht}_K x \geq 2$. \square

Our first main result, Corollary 7.8, follows directly from Corollary 7.7 and Lemma 2.7.

Corollary 7.8. Every finite poset is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of a quasi-excellent domain.

Proof. The result follows from Corollary 7.7 and Lemma 2.7. \square

We are now ready to use Corollary 7.7 and Theorem 4.14 to prove our second main result.

Theorem 7.9. Every finite poset is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of some Noetherian unique factorization domain.

Proof. Let X be a finite poset. Choose a local domain (B, M) and a saturated embedding $\varphi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B)$ satisfying the conclusions of Corollary 7.7. By Theorem 4.14, there is a local UFD $(A, M \cap A)$ contained in B such that $\widehat{A} = \widehat{B}$. Moreover, the map $f : \text{Spec}(B) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ given by $f(P) = P \cap A$ is onto and, if P is a prime ideal of B with height at least two, then $f(P)B = P$. Define $\psi : X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ by $\psi(x) = f(\varphi(x))$. Since φ is a saturated embedding, and since f is a poset isomorphism from the prime ideals of B of height at least two to the prime ideals of A of height at least two, ψ is a saturated embedding of posets. Lemma 2.7 then implies that X is isomorphic to a saturated subset of the spectrum of the Noetherian UFD A . \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Chloe I. Avery, Caitlyn Booms, Timothy M. Kostolansky, S. Loepp, and Alex Semendinger, *Characterization of completions of noncatenary local domains and noncatenary local UFDs*, J. Algebra **524** (2019), 1–18, DOI 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2018.12.016. MR3902351 \uparrow 2
- [2] Cory H. Colbert and S. Loepp, *Gluing Minimal Prime Ideals in Local Rings* (2021), available at [arXiv:2112.13278](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.13278). \uparrow 7, 9
- [3] Raymond C. Heitmann, *Characterization of completions of unique factorization domains*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **337** (1993), no. 1, 379–387, DOI 10.2307/2154327. MR1102888 \uparrow 2, 9, 10, 11, 12
- [4] ———, *Examples of noncatenary rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **247** (1979), 125–136, DOI 10.2307/1998777. MR517688 \uparrow 1, 2
- [5] M. Hochster, *Prime ideal structure in commutative rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **142** (1969), 43–60, DOI 10.2307/1995344. MR251026 \uparrow 1
- [6] Susan Loepp and Alex Semendinger, *Maximal chains of prime ideals of different lengths in unique factorization domains*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **49** (2019), no. 3, 849–865, DOI 10.1216/RMJ-2019-49-3-849. MR3983303 \uparrow 2
- [7] Masayoshi Nagata, *On the chain problem of prime ideals*, Nagoya Math. J. **10** (1956), 51–64. MR78974 \uparrow 1
- [8] Tetsushi Ogoma, *Noncatenary pseudogeometric normal rings*, Japan. J. Math. (N.S.) **6** (1980), no. 1, 147–163, DOI 10.4099/math1924.6.147. MR615018 \uparrow 2
- [9] Christel Rotthaus, *Excellent rings, Henselian rings, and the approximation property*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **27** (1997), no. 1, 317–334, DOI 10.1216/rmjm/1181071964. MR1453106 \uparrow 8
- [10] ———, *Komplettierung semilokaler quasiausgezeichneter Ringe*, Nagoya Math. J. **76** (1979), 173–180 (German). MR550860 \uparrow 7
- [11] W. Trotter, R. L. Graham (ed.), M. Grötschel (ed.), and L. Lovász (ed.), *Partially Ordered Sets*, Handbook of Combinatorics (1995), 433–480. \uparrow 20
- [12] R. Wiegand and S. Wiegand, *Prime ideals in Noetherian rings: a survey*, Trends Math., Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2010. \uparrow 1