

Domains Integral over Each Underring

David E. DOBBS* and S. B. MULAY

University of Tennessee
(Communicated by K. Ogiue)

§1. Introduction and notation.

Let R be a (commutative integral) domain with quotient field K . One has often studied R by analyzing properties of its overrings (that is, the rings contained between R and K). This article contributes to “dual” analyses via underrings. (We shall say that B is an *underring* of R in case B is a subring of R also having quotient field K .) Some studies of domains via underrings have already been done in [3], [4]. For instance, [4, Theorem 2.2] characterized the R such that each underring of R is seminormal. (It turned out that the same class of rings is characterized if “underring” is replaced by “subring” and/or “seminormal” is replaced by “a Euclidean domain.” The rings R in question are the overrings of \mathbf{Z} (up to isomorphism) and the fields algebraic over a finite field.) This work completed earlier studies such as [5], [1, Proposition 2.11], and [3].

The domains characterized in [4, Theorem 2.2] may also be viewed as the domains each of whose underrings (resp., subrings) is integrally closed. One would nevertheless expect, rather generally, that requiring prescribed behavior of the underrings of R would be less restrictive than requiring analogous behavior of all the subrings of R . To test this intuition and seek results with different flavor, we move to the “other extreme” from [4, Theorem 2.2]: we now ask to characterize the R such that R is integral over each of its underrings. It should be noted that the answer to *this* question changes if “underrings” is replaced by “subrings.” The answers are given in Proposition 2.2, our main results (Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 3.6), and Remark 2.4(a)–(c). It will be seen that consideration of *underrings* leads to certain global fields of positive

Received December 25, 1986

Revised June 9, 1987

* Supported in part by NATO Collaborative Research Grant RG. 85/0035.