

# A CLASS OF NON-NOETHERIAN DOMAINS

JAMES A. HUCKABA<sup>1</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** A new class of non-noetherian domains, called  $\beta$ -domains, are characterized in the first part of this paper. The second part is concerned with deciding when the intersection of a  $\beta$ -domain with a valuation ring is again a  $\beta$ -domain.

**1. Introduction.** Let  $k$  be a field and  $v$  a nondiscrete valuation defined on  $k$ . All rings under consideration will be subdomains of  $k$  and will contain the multiplicative identity of  $k$ . Denote the valuation ring of  $v$  by  $R_v$  and its maximal ideal by  $M_v$ . A subdomain  $R$  of  $R_v$  is called a  $\beta$ -domain for  $v$  in case  $R$  contains a sequence  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  with the property that  $v(a_1) > v(a_2) > v(a_3) \cdots$ .  $\{a_i\}$  is called a  $\beta$ -sequence for  $v$  in  $R$ . In §2 of this paper elementary properties of  $\beta$ -domains and  $\beta$ -sequences are given,  $\beta$ -domains are characterized (Theorems 1 and 2), and sufficient conditions are given for a ring to be a  $\beta$ -domain (Proposition 1).

In general, given two subdomains of a field  $k$  it is not possible to determine whether their intersection is a noetherian domain or a non-noetherian domain. Recently Heinzer and Ohm, [5], have announced some results concerning the intersection of noetherian rings and valuation rings. In particular they have shown that if  $D$  and  $R$  are domains with the same quotient field  $k$ , and  $V$  is a rank one valuation ring of  $k$  such that  $R \not\subseteq V$  and  $D = R \cap V$ , then:

(i) if  $V$  is centered on a finitely generated ideal of  $D$ , then  $V$  is noetherian; and

(ii) if  $V$  is centered on a maximal ideal of  $D$ , then  $D$  is noetherian if and only if  $R$  and  $V$  are noetherian.

In §3 we prove theorems related to this result. Theorem 3 analyzes what happens when we consider the intersection of a  $\beta$ -domain  $R$ , for a rank one valuation  $v$ , with an arbitrary valuation ring. Theorem 4 is a version of Theorem 3 when  $v$  is assumed to be of rank  $m > 1$ .

**2.  $\beta$ -domains and  $\beta$ -sequences.**  $\beta$ -domains can be characterized very easily as follows:

---

Received by the editors July 30, 1969 and, in revised form, September 15, 1969.

*AMS Subject Classifications.* Primary 13I5, 13R8.

*Key Words and Phrases.* Valuation ring, nondiscrete valuations, value group, maximal ideal.

<sup>1</sup> This research was partially supported by NSF Grant GP 11891.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $R$  be a subdomain of  $k$ .  $R$  is a  $\beta$ -domain for some valuation  $v$  if and only if  $R$  contains a sequence  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  such that  $\{a_i/a_{i+1}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  generates a proper ideal in the ring  $T = R[a_1/a_2, a_2/a_3, \dots]$ .*

**PROOF.** Suppose that  $R$  is a  $\beta$ -domain for  $v$ , then  $R$  contains a sequence  $\{a_i\}$  such that  $v(a_i) > v(a_{i+1}) > 0$  for all  $i$ . Thus  $\{a_i/a_{i+1}\} \subset M_v \cap T \neq T$ , where  $T = R[a_1/a_2, a_2/a_3, \dots]$ . Conversely, let  $P$  be a prime ideal in  $T$  containing  $\{a_i/a_{i+1}\}$ . If  $(R_v, M_v)$  is a valuation ring in  $k$  with center  $P$  in  $T$ , then  $0 < v(a_i/a_{i+1}) = v(a_i) - v(a_{i+1})$  for each  $i$ . Q.E.D.

We now list, without proof, some elementary properties of  $\beta$ -domains and the ring  $T$ .

- (1)  $R_v$  is a  $\beta$ -domain for  $v$ .
- (2) All  $\beta$ -domains are non-noetherian.
- (3) Any ring between a  $\beta$ -domain and  $R_v$  is also a  $\beta$ -domain.
- (4) Any infinite subsequence of a  $\beta$ -sequence is still a  $\beta$ -sequence.

Let  $T$  be the ring which appeared in Theorem 1 and suppose that  $A$  is the proper ideal of  $T$  generated by  $\{a_i/a_{i+1}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ .

(5) Let  $t$  be a fixed positive integer. If  $i < t$ , then  $a_i/a_t \in A$ . If  $i > t$ , then  $a_i/a_t \notin T$ . For all  $i$ ,  $1/a_i \notin T$ .

(6) For each  $i$ ,  $a_{i+1}$  properly divides  $a_i$  in  $T$ . Hence, the ideal in  $T$  generated by  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_i$  is principal and is in fact generated by  $a_i$ .

**PROPOSITION 1.** (i) *If  $R$  is a domain which contains a prime ideal  $P$  such that  $R_P$  is a nondiscrete valuation ring, then  $R$  is a  $\beta$ -domain.*

(ii) *If  $v$  is a nondiscrete valuation on a field  $k$  and if  $R_v = R_1, R_2, \dots$ ,  $R_n$  are valuation rings with quotient field  $k$ , then  $R = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i$  is a  $\beta$ -domain.*

(iii) *If  $F$  is a field, and if  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is a set of indeterminates, then  $R = F[X_1, X_2, \dots]$  is a  $\beta$ -domain.*

**PROOF.** (i) Choose a  $\beta$ -sequence  $\{a_i\}$  in  $R_P = R_v$ . Write  $a_i = b_i/c_i$  where  $b_i, c_i \in R$  and  $c_i \notin P$ . Then  $v(a_i) = v(b_i)$  for all  $i$ , which implies that  $\{b_i\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence for  $v$  in  $R$ .

(ii) Let  $P = M_v \cap R$ . By [3, Chapter 6, p. 132], we have  $R_P = R_v$ . Now apply (i).

(iii) The proof of this statement is contained in the following more general lemma.

First we make the following definition. A finite subset  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in R$  which generates a proper ideal  $A$  of  $R$  is said to be *analytically independent* in case the following property holds: If  $f(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$  is a form of arbitrary degree in  $R[Z_1, \dots, Z_n]$  such that  $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$ , then all the coefficients of  $f$  are in the radical of  $A$ . An infinite subset  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  in  $R$  is analytically independent if  $\{a_i\}$  generates a proper

ideal in  $R$  and if each finite subset of  $\{a_i\}$  is analytically independent. Note in particular that the set  $\{X_i\}$  in part (iii) of Proposition 1, is analytically independent.

LEMMA. *If  $R$  contains an infinite analytically independent set, then  $R$  is a  $\beta$ -domain for an appropriate  $v$ .*

PROOF. Let  $\{a_i\}$  be an analytically independent subset of  $R$  and let  $T = R[a_1/a_2, a_2/a_3, \dots]$ . In view of Theorem 1, it is sufficient to show that the ideal generated by  $a_1/a_2, a_2/a_3, \dots$  is a proper ideal in  $T$ . Suppose not, then

$$1 = \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i (a_1/a_2)^{t_{1i}} (a_2/a_3)^{t_{2i}} \cdots (a_n/a_{n+1})^{t_{ni}}$$

where  $\alpha_i \in R$  and  $t_{ij}$  are nonnegative integers. Let  $t_j = \max_{i=1}^r \{t_{ji}\}$ . Then

$$(*) \quad 0 = -a_2^{t_1} a_3^{t_2} \cdots a_{n+1}^{t_n} + \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i a_2^{t_1-t_{1i}} \cdots a_{n+1}^{t_n-t_{ni}} a_1^{t_{1i}} \cdots a_n^{t_{ni}}.$$

Each term of  $(*)$  has degree  $\sum_{j=1}^n t_j$ . Since  $\{a_i\}$  is analytically independent,  $-1$  is in the radical of  $A$  where  $A = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ . Hence  $A = R$ , a contradiction. This proves the lemma and also Proposition 1 (iii).

Many non-noetherian rings contain a sequence  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  such that  $a_{i+1}$  properly divides  $a_i$  for all  $i$ , (e.g., the ring  $T$  of Theorem 1 or any nondiscrete valuation ring). In the next theorem we characterize  $\beta$ -domains which have this property.

THEOREM 2. *Let  $R$  be a domain and let  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  be a sequence in  $R$  with the property that each  $a_{i+1}$  properly divides  $a_i$  in  $R$ . Then  $c_i a_{i+1} = a_i$  where  $c_i \in R$ . A subsequence of  $\{a_i\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence in  $R$  for an appropriate valuation  $v$  if and only if there exists a maximal ideal  $M$  of  $R$  containing infinitely many  $c_i$ .*

PROOF. Suppose that  $\{c_i\}$  contains an infinite subsequence whose members lie in  $M$ , where  $M$  is a maximal ideal of  $R$ . We define a subsequence of  $\{a_i\}$  inductively. Let  $b_1 = a_1$  and assume that  $b_j$  has been defined. Then  $b_j = a_n$  for some  $n$ . Choose  $m > n$  such that  $c_{m-1} \in M$  and define  $b_{j+1} = a_m$ . Then  $b_j = a_n = c_n \cdots c_{m-1} a_m = c_n \cdots c_{m-1} b_{j+1}$ , which implies that  $b_j/b_{j+1} \in M$ . This is true for all  $j$ . Hence  $\{b_j\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence for any valuation  $v$  having center  $M$  on  $R$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\{b_j\}$  is a  $\beta$ -subsequence of  $\{a_i\}$ . Then each  $b_{j+1}$  properly divides  $b_j$ , and by Theorem 1  $\{b_j/b_{j+1}\}$  is a subset of some maximal ideal  $M$  of the ring  $T = R[b_1/b_2, b_2/b_3, \dots] = R$ . Since  $b_j = a_n = c_n \cdot \dots \cdot c_{m-1} a_m = c_n \cdot \dots \cdot c_{m-1} b_{j+1}$  for appropriate  $m$  and  $n$ , there is some  $n \leq t \leq m-1$  such that  $c_t \in M$ . This is true for all  $j$ , hence infinitely many members of  $\{c_i\}$  are in  $M$ . Q.E.D.

The next two corollaries give rings which satisfy Theorem 2.

**COROLLARY 1.** *Let  $R$  be a domain such that each nonzero principal ideal of  $R$  is contained in only finitely many maximal ideals. If  $R$  contains a sequence  $\{a_i\}$  such that each  $a_{i+1}$  properly divides  $a_i$  in  $R$ , then  $R$  is a  $\beta$ -domain.*

**PROOF.** Let  $M_1, \dots, M_t$  be the complete set of maximal ideals containing the principal ideal  $(a_1)$  and suppose that  $c_i a_{i+1} = a_i$  for all  $i$ , then  $\{c_i\} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^t M_j$ . For suppose not, then there is a  $c_r \notin \bigcup M_j$ . Pick a maximal ideal  $M$  of  $R$  containing  $c_r$ . Since  $a_1 = c_1 c_2 \cdot \dots \cdot c_r a_{r+1}$ ,  $a_1 \in M$ . Hence  $M$  is one of the  $M_j$ , a contradiction. Therefore  $\{c_i\} \subset \bigcup M_j$  and it follows that infinitely many  $c_i$  are in one of the  $M_j$ . By Theorem 2,  $R$  is a  $\beta$ -domain. Q.E.D.

A nonzero fractional ideal  $I$  of the domain  $R$  is *divisorial* in case  $I$  is the intersection of principal fractional ideals.

**COROLLARY 2.** *If  $R$  is a domain in which each nonzero ideal is divisorial and if  $R$  contains a sequence  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  such that each  $a_{i+1}$  properly divides  $a_i$ , then  $R$  is a  $\beta$ -domain.*

**PROOF.** Heinzer has proved, [4, Theorem 2.5], that each ideal of  $R$  is contained in only a finite number of maximal ideals. Apply Corollary 1. Q.E.D.

### 3. Intersection theorems.

**LEMMA.** *Let  $\{\alpha_i\}$  be a strictly decreasing sequence of positive real numbers. Then there is a subsequence  $\{\beta_j\}$  of  $\{\alpha_i\}$  such that  $\{\beta_j - \beta_{j+1}\}_{j=1}^\infty$  is a strictly decreasing sequence of positive real numbers.*

**PROOF.** Let  $\beta_1 = \alpha_1$  and  $r_1 = \lim_{i=1}^\infty \alpha_i$ . Let  $r'_2 = \beta_1 - r_1$  and  $r_2 = r'_2 / 2 + r_1$ . Choose  $\alpha_{i_2} < r_2$  and define  $\beta_2 = \alpha_{i_2}$ . By induction define  $r'_j = \beta_{j-1} - r_1$  and  $r_j = r'_j / 2 + r_1$ . Choose  $\alpha_{i_j} < r_j$  and define  $\beta_j = \alpha_{i_j}$ .  $\{\beta_j - \beta_{j+1}\}$  is the required sequence. Q.E.D.

For the concepts concerning value groups and valuation rings which are used in the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4, we refer the reader to [1] and [7].

**THEOREM 3.** *Suppose that  $R$  is a  $\beta$ -domain for a rank one valuation  $v$*

which is defined on  $k$ , the quotient field of  $R$ . Let  $\{a_i\}$  be a  $\beta$ -sequence for  $v$  in  $R$  and let  $T = R[a_1/a_2, a_2/a_3, \dots]$ . If  $w$  is a valuation on  $k$  with valuation ring  $R_w$ , then:

- (i) If  $R_w$  is noetherian, then  $R_w \cap T$  is a  $\beta$ -domain for  $v$ ;
- (ii) If  $R_w$  is non-noetherian, then  $R_w \cap T$  is a  $\beta$ -domain for  $v$  or  $R_w \cap R_P$  is a  $\beta$ -domain for both  $v$  and  $w$  with respect to every prime ideal  $P$  of  $R$  containing  $\{a_i\}$ ;
- (iii) If  $a_{i+1}$  properly divides  $a_i$  in  $R$  for all  $i$  and if  $R_w \cap T$  is a  $\beta$ -domain, then  $R_w \cap R$  is a  $\beta$ -domain.

PROOF. If  $R_w$  contains infinitely many members of the sequence  $\{a_i\}$ , then by (4)  $R_w \cap R$ ,  $R_w \cap T$ , and  $R_w \cap R_P$  are all  $\beta$ -domains. So we will assume that  $R_w$  contains only finitely many elements of  $\{a_i\}$ . Choose an infinite sequence  $\{a_{i'}\}$  of  $\{a_i\}$  such that each  $a_{i'} \notin R_w$ . Again by (4),  $\{a_{i'}\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence for  $v$  in  $R$ . Since  $v$  is a rank one valuation, its value group is an ordered additive subgroup of the real number system. By the lemma,  $\{v(a_{i'})\}$  contains an infinite subsequence  $\{v(b_j)\}$  such that  $\{v(b_j) - v(b_{j+1})\}$  is a strictly decreasing sequence of positive real numbers. Thus by (5)  $\{b_j/b_{j+1}\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence for  $v$  in  $T$ .

Since  $R_w$  is a valuation ring and since each  $b_j \notin R_w$ , we have that  $b_j^{-1}$  is a nonunit of  $R_w$ . Suppose that  $R_w$  is a noetherian valuation ring. Then there is a positive integer  $1'$  such that  $0 < w(b_{1'}^{-1}) \leq w(b_j^{-1})$  for all  $j$ . Then  $b_{1'+1}^{-1} = (b_{1'+1}^{-1}/b_{1'}^{-1})b_{1'}^{-1}$  and  $b_{1'+1}^{-1}/b_{1'}^{-1} = b_{1'}/b_{1'+1} \in R_w$ . Define  $c_1 = b_{1'}/b_{1'+1}$ . Let  $2'$  be a positive integer  $> 1'$  such that  $0 < w(b_{2'}^{-1}) \leq w(b_j^{-1})$  for all  $j > 1'$ . As above let  $c_2 = b_{2'}/b_{2'+1} \in R_w$ . By induction we construct a sequence  $\{c_k\}$  so that  $c_k = b_{k'}/b_{k'+1} \in R_w$ . Now  $v(c_k) - v(c_{k+1}) > 0$  for all  $k$ , hence  $\{c_k\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence for  $v$  in  $R_w \cap T$ . This proves (i).

Now assume that  $R_w$  is non-noetherian. Consider the previously constructed sequence  $\{b_j\}$ . Suppose there exists no strictly decreasing infinite subsequences of  $\{w(b_j^{-1})\}$ . Then, as in the noetherian case, we can show that  $R_w \cap T$  is a  $\beta$ -domain. On the other hand, suppose that  $\{b_{j'}\}$  is a subsequence of  $\{b_j\}$  such that  $w(b_{1'}^{-1}) > w(b_{2'}^{-1}) > \dots$ . Let  $P$  be any proper prime ideal of  $R$  containing  $\{b_j\}$ , (certainly any prime ideal  $P$  of  $R$  containing  $\{a_i\}$  will also contain  $\{b_j\}$ ). Clearly  $b_{j'}^2 + 1 \notin P$  for all  $j'$ , hence each  $b_{j'}/(b_{j'}^2 + 1) \in R_P$ . Also  $w[b_{j'}/(b_{j'}^2 + 1)] = -w(b_{j'}) > 0$ , which shows that each  $b_{j'}/(b_{j'}^2 + 1) \in R_w \cap R_P$ . By straightforward computation we see that  $\{b_{j'}/(b_{j'}^2 + 1)\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence for both  $v$  and  $w$  in  $R_w \cap R_P$ . This completes the proof of (ii). Part (iii) is clear. Q.E.D.

Our next goal is to prove a version of Theorem 3 for valuations  $v$

of finite rank  $m$ , where  $m > 1$ . Recall that if  $G$  is the value group of  $v$ , then  $G$  is order isomorphic to an additive subgroup of  $\mathcal{R}^m$ ,  $\mathcal{R}$  being the real number system. Order is defined in  $\mathcal{R}^m$  as follows: Let  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m), (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathcal{R}^m$ , suppose that  $\alpha_i = \beta_i$  for  $i < p$  and  $\alpha_p \neq \beta_p$ , then  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) < (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$  if and only if  $\alpha_p < \beta_p$ .

In the situation where  $v$  is of rank  $m > 1$ , it is necessary to introduce a stronger condition than that of a  $\beta$ -sequence. Let  $R$  be a subdomain of  $R_v$ . A sequence  $\{\alpha_i\}$  of  $R$  is called a  $\beta^*$ -sequence for  $v$  in  $R$  in case (1)  $\{a_i\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence for  $v$  in  $R$ , and (2) if  $v(a_i) = (\alpha_{i1}, \dots, \alpha_{im})$  then  $\alpha_{ij} \geq 0$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . It is clear that if  $v$  is a rank one valuation, then the concepts of a  $\beta$ -sequence for  $v$  and a  $\beta^*$ -sequence for  $v$  are equivalent. However, this is not the case when  $v$  is of rank  $m > 1$ . For suppose that  $v$  has rank 2 and  $\{a_i\}$  is a sequence of elements in  $R$  with the property that  $v(a_i) = (1, -i)$  for all  $i$ . Then  $\{a_i\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence for  $v$ , but not a  $\beta^*$ -sequence for  $v$ .<sup>2</sup>

**THEOREM 4.** *The conclusions of Theorem 3 remain valid when  $v$  is assumed to be a valuation of finite rank  $m > 1$  and  $\{a_i\}$  is assumed to be a  $\beta^*$ -sequence for  $v$  in  $R$ .*

**PROOF.** As in the last proof suppose that  $\{a_{i'}\}$  is an infinite subsequence of  $\{a_i\}$  such that  $a_{i'} \notin R_w$  for each  $i'$ . From now on assume that  $G$ , the value group of  $v$ , is actually a subgroup of  $\mathcal{R}^m$ . If  $r$  is a positive integer  $\leq m$ , then  $H_r = \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in G : \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \dots = \alpha_r = 0\}$  is an isolated subgroup of  $G$ . All isolated subgroups of  $G$  can be obtained in this way. If  $H_1, \dots, H_m$  are the isolated subgroups of  $G$ , then  $G = H_0 > H_1 > \dots > H_m = (0)$ . It is possible to choose an infinite subsequence  $\{d_k\}$  of  $\{a_{i'}\}$  such that for some  $r$ ,  $v(d_k) \in H_{r-1}$  and  $v(d_k) \notin H_r$  for all  $k$ . Then for each  $k$ ,  $v(d_k) = (0, \dots, 0, \alpha_k^r, \dots, \alpha_k^m)$  where  $\alpha_k^r > 0$ . Since  $v(d_k) > v(d_{k+1})$ ,  $\alpha_k^r \geq \alpha_{k+1}^r$ . Assume that the sequence  $\{\alpha_k^r\}$  has a minimum, then there exists a  $t(1)$  such that  $\alpha_{t(1)+p}^r = \alpha_{t(1)}^r$  for  $p = 1, 2, \dots$ . Consider the infinite sequence  $\{\alpha_{t(1)+k}^{r+1}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ . If this sequence has a minimum, there is a  $t(2) > t(1)$  such that  $\alpha_{t(2)+p}^{r+1} = \alpha_{t(2)}^{r+1}$  for  $p = 1, 2, \dots$ . Continue this process, since  $v(d_k) > v(d_{k+1})$  for all  $k$ , we must eventually find a positive integer  $u$  such that the sequence  $\{\alpha_{t(u)+k}^{r+u}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  does not have a minimum. Pick a strictly decreasing subsequence from  $\{\alpha_{t(u)+k}^{r+u}\}$ . Since  $\{a_i\}$  is a  $\beta^*$ -sequence, each  $\alpha_{t(u)+k}^{r+u}$  is a positive real number. Hence it is possible to pick a subsequence  $\{\beta_j\}$ , from the strictly decreasing sequence already chosen, satisfying the lemma. Let  $b_j$  be

<sup>2</sup> This fact was pointed out to the author by the referee.

the element of  $\{a_i\}$  such that  $v(b_j) = (0, \dots, 0, \gamma_j', \dots, \gamma_j^{t+u-1}, \beta_j, \dots, \gamma_j^m)$ . Note that by our construction we have  $\gamma_j' = \gamma_{j+1}'$ ,  $\gamma_j^{t+1} = \gamma_{j+1}^{t+1}$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $\gamma_j^{t+u-1} = \gamma_{j+1}^{t+u-1}$  for all  $j$ . Hence  $v(b_j/b_{j+1}) = (0, \dots, 0, \beta_j - \beta_{j+1}, \dots, \gamma_j^m - \gamma_{j+1}^m)$  which implies that  $v(b_j/b_{j+1}) > v(b_{j+1}/b_{j+2})$ , for each  $j$ . By (5) each  $b_j/b_{j+1} \in T$ . Thus  $\{b_j/b_{j+1}\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence for  $v$  in  $T$ . To complete the proof proceed exactly as we did in the proof of Theorem 3, (starting with the second paragraph of the proof of Theorem 3).

**COROLLARY 3.** *Assume the same hypothesis as in Theorem 4. If  $P$  is any prime ideal of  $R$  containing  $\{a_i\}$ , then  $R_P \cap R_w$  is a  $\beta$ -domain for  $v$ .*

**PROOF.**  $R_P$  is a  $\beta$ -domain with  $\beta$ -sequences  $\{a_i\}$ . If infinitely many  $a_i$  are in  $R_w$ , then  $R_w \cap R_P$  is a  $\beta$ -domain. Assume there are only finitely many  $a_i \in R_w$ , then we choose an infinite subsequence  $\{b_j\}$  of  $\{a_i\}$  such that each  $b_j \notin R_w$ . Let  $P$  be a prime ideal of  $R$  containing  $\{a_i\}$ , and hence  $\{b_j\}$ . Then, as in the proof of Theorem 3,  $b_j/(b_j^2 + 1) \in R_P \cap R_w$  for all  $j$  and  $\{b_j/(b_j^2 + 1)\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence for  $v$  in  $R_P \cap R_w$ .

We conclude with a remark on regular rings. Auslander and Buchsbaum, [2], defined a noetherian ring  $R$  to be regular in case  $R_P$  is a regular local ring for each prime ideal  $P$  in  $R$ . Generalize this by defining a ring  $R$ , not necessarily noetherian, to be regular in case  $R_P$  is a regular local ring for each prime ideal  $P$  in  $R$ . Nakano gives, in [6], an example of a regular non-noetherian ring. We were led to the study of  $\beta$ -domains by trying to determine all non-noetherian regular rings. This we have not been able to do. However,  $\beta$ -domains do give some information about non-noetherian regular domains, though negative in character. In fact any  $\beta$ -domain is necessarily nonregular. To see this, suppose that  $R$  is a  $\beta$ -domain for  $v$  and that  $\{a_i\}$  is a  $\beta$ -sequence in  $R$ . Let  $P$  be a prime ideal of  $R$  containing  $\{a_i\}$ . Then  $R \subset R_P \subset R_v$ . By (3),  $R_P$  is a  $\beta$ -domain and is therefore non-noetherian. Hence  $R_P$  is not a regular local ring.

## REFERENCES

1. S. Abhyankar, *Ramification theoretic methods in algebraic geometry*, Ann. of Math. Studies, no. 43, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N. J., 1959. MR 21 #4158.
2. M. Auslander and D. A. Buchsbaum, *Homological dimension in local rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 85 (1957), 390-405. MR 19, 249.
3. N. Bourbaki, *Algèbre commutative*, Chapitres 3, 5, 6, Actualités Sci. Indust., nos. 1293; 1308, Hermann, Paris, 1961; 1964. MR 30 #2027; MR 33 #2660.
4. W. Heinzer, *Integral domains in which each non-zero ideal is divisorial*, Mathematika 15 (1968), 164-170.

5. W. Heinzer and J. Ohm, *Noetherian and non-noetherian commutative rings*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. 16 (1969), 264. Abstract #663-606.

6. N. Nakano, *Idealtheorie in einem speziellen unendlichen algebraischen Zahlkörper*, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A. 16 (1953), 425-439. MR 15, 510.

7. O. Zariski and P. Samuel, *Commutative algebra*. Vol. II, University Series in Higher Math., Van Nostrand, Princeton, N. J., 1960. MR 22 #11006.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI