

w -DIVISORIAL DOMAINS

SAID EL BAGHDADI AND STEFANIA GABELLI

ABSTRACT. We study the class of domains in which each w -ideal is divisorial, extending several properties of divisorial and totally divisorial domains to a much wider class of domains. In particular we consider $PvMD$ s and Mori domains.

INTRODUCTION

The class of domains in which each nonzero ideal is divisorial has been studied, independently and with different methods, by H. Bass [2], E. Matlis [25] and W. Heinzer [17] in the sixties. Following S. Bazzoni and L. Salce [3, 4], these domains are now called *divisorial domains*. Among other results, Heinzer proved that an integrally closed domain is divisorial if and only if it is a Prüfer domain with certain finiteness properties [17, Theorem 5.1].

Twenty years later E. Houston and M. Zafrullah introduced in [20] the class of domains in which each t -ideal is divisorial, which they called *TV-domains*, and characterized $PvMD$ s with this property [20, Theorem 3.1]. However they observed that an integrally closed *TV*-domain need not be a $PvMD$ [20, Remark 3.2]; thus in some sense the class of *TV*-domains is not the right setting for extending to $PvMD$ s the properties of divisorial Prüfer domains.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate *w-divisorial domains*, that is domains in which each w -ideal is divisorial. This class of domains proves to be the most suitable t -analogue of divisorial domains. In fact, by using this concept we are able to improve and generalize several results proved for Noetherian and Prüfer divisorial domains in [3, 17, 28, 31].

The main result of Section 1 is Theorem 1.5. It states that R is a w -divisorial domain if and only if R is a weakly Matlis domain (that is a domain with t -finite character such that each t -prime ideal is contained in a unique t -maximal ideal) and R_M is a divisorial domain, for each t -maximal ideal M . In this way we recover the characterization of divisorial domains given in [3, Proposition 5.4].

In Section 2, we study the transfer of the properties of w -divisibility and divisibility to certain (generalized) rings of fractions, such as localizations at (t) -prime ideals, (t) -flat overrings and (t) -subintersections.

In Section 3 we consider w -divisorial $PvMD$ s. We prove that R is an integrally closed w -divisorial domain if and only if R is a weakly Matlis $PvMD$ and each t -maximal ideal is t -invertible (Theorem 3.3). This is the t -analogue of [17, Theorem 5.1]. We also prove that when R is integrally closed, each t -linked overring of R is w -divisorial if and only if R is a generalized Krull domain and each t -prime ideal is contained in a unique t -maximal ideal (Theorem 3.5). Since in the Prüfer case generalized Krull domains coincide with generalized Dedekind domains [7], we obtain that an integrally closed domain is totally divisorial if and only if it is a divisorial generalized Dedekind domain [28, Section 4].

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 13A15; Secondary: 13F05.

Key words and phrases. Divisorial domains, Prüfer v -multiplication domains, Mori domains.

The last section is devoted to Mori w -divisorial domains. A Mori w -divisorial domain is necessarily of t -dimension one and each of its localizations at a height-one prime is Noetherian (Corollary 4.3). Noetherian divisorial and totally divisorial domains were intensely studied in [3, 2, 25, 31]. It turns out that several of the results proved there can be extended to the Mori case by using different technical tools. In Theorem 4.2 we characterize w -divisorial Mori domains and in Theorems 4.5 and 4.11 we study w -divisoriality of their overrings. In particular, we show that generalized rings of fractions of w -divisorial Mori domains are w -divisorial and we prove that a domain whose t -linked overrings are all w -divisorial is Mori if and only if it has t -dimension one.

We thank the referee for his/her careful reading and relevant observations.

Throughout this paper R will denote an integral domain with quotient field K and we will assume that $R \neq K$.

We shall use the language of star-operations. A *star operation* is a map $I \rightarrow I^*$ from the set $F(R)$ of nonzero fractional ideals of R to itself such that:

- (1) $R^* = R$ and $(aI)^* = aI^*$, for all $a \in K \setminus \{0\}$;
- (2) $I \subseteq I^*$ and $I \subseteq J \Rightarrow I^* \subseteq J^*$;
- (3) $I^{**} = I^*$.

General references for systems of ideals and star operations are [13, 15, 16, 21].

A star operation $*$ is of *finite type* if $I^* = \cup\{J^*; J \subseteq I \text{ and } J \text{ is finitely generated}\}$, for each $I \in F(R)$. To any star operation $*$, we can associate a star operation $*_f$ of finite type by defining $I^{*f} = \cup J^*$, with the union taken over all finitely generated ideals J contained in I . Clearly $I^{*f} \subseteq I^*$. A nonzero ideal I is **-finite* if $I^* = J^*$ for some finitely generated ideal J .

The identity is a star operation, called the d -operation. The v - and the t -operations are the best known nontrivial star operations and are defined in the following way. For a pair of nonzero ideals I and J of a domain R we let $(J : I)$ denote the set $\{x \in K; xI \subseteq J\}$. We set $I_v = (R : (R : I))$ and $I_t = \cup J_v$ with the union taken over all finitely generated ideals J contained in I . Thus the t -operation is the finite type star operation associated to the v -operation.

A nonzero fractional ideal I is called a **-ideal* if $I = I^*$. If $I = I_v$ we say that I is *divisorial*. For each star operation $*$, we have $I^* \subseteq I_v$, thus each divisorial ideal is a $*$ -ideal.

The set $F_*(R)$ of $*$ -ideals of R is a semigroup with respect to the **-multiplication*, defined by $(I, J) \rightarrow (IJ)^*$, with unity R . We say that an ideal $I \in F(R)$ is **-invertible* if I^* is a unit in the semigroup $F_*(R)$. In this case the **-inverse* of I is $(R : I)$. Thus I is **-invertible* if and only if $(I(R : I))^* = R$. Invertible ideals are ($*$ -invertible) $*$ -ideals.

A prime $*$ -ideal is also called a **-prime*. A **-maximal* ideal is an ideal that is maximal in the set of the proper $*$ -ideals. A $*$ -maximal ideal (if it exists) is a prime ideal. If $*$ is a star operation of finite type, an easy application of Zorn's Lemma shows that the set $*\text{-Max}(R)$ of the $*$ -maximal ideals of R is not empty. Moreover, for each $I \in F(R)$, $I^* = \cap_{M \in *\text{-Max}(R)} I^* R_M$; in particular $R = \cap_{M \in *\text{-Max}(R)} R_M$ [15].

The w -operation is the star operation defined by setting $I_w = \cap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(R)} I R_M$. An equivalent definition is obtained by setting $I_w = \cup\{(I : J) ; J \text{ is finitely generated and } (R : J) = R\}$. By using the latter definition, one can see that the notion of w -ideal coincides with the notion of *semi-divisorial* ideal introduced by S. Glaz and W. Vasconcelos in 1977 [14]. As a star-operation, the w -operation was first considered by E. Hedstrom and E. Houston in 1980 under the name of F_∞ -operation [18]. Since 1997 this star operation was intensely studied by Wang Fanggui and R.

McCasland in a more general context. In particular they showed that the notion of w -closure is a very useful tool in the study of Strong Mori domains [32, 33].

The w -operation is of finite type. We have $w\text{-Max}(R) = t\text{-Max}(R)$ and $IR_M = I_w R_M \subseteq I_t R_M$, for each $I \in F(R)$ and $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$. Thus $I_w \subseteq I_t \subseteq I_v$.

We denote by $t\text{-Spec}(R)$ the set of t -prime ideals of R . Each height one prime is a t -prime and each prime minimal over a t -ideal is a t -prime. We say that R has *t -dimension one* if each t -prime ideal has height one.

1. w -DIVISORIAL DOMAINS

A *divisorial domain* is a domain such that each ideal is divisorial [3] and we say that a domain R is *w -divisorial* if each w -ideal is divisorial, that is $w = v$. Since $I_w \subseteq I_t \subseteq I_v$, for each nonzero fractional ideal I , then R is w -divisorial if and only if $w = t = v$. A domain with the property that $t = v$ is called in [20] a *TV-domain*. Mori domains (i. e. domains satisfying the ascending chain condition on proper divisorial ideals) are *TV-domains*. A domain such that $w = t$ is called a *TW-domain* [27]. An important class of *TW-domains* is the class of *PvMDs*; in fact a *PvMD* is precisely an integrally closed *TW-domain* [22, Theorem 3.1]. (Recall that a domain R is a *Prüfer v -multiplication domain*, for short a *PvMD*, if R_M is a valuation domain for each t -maximal ideal M of R .) Since a Krull domain is a Mori *PvMD*, a Krull domain is a w -divisorial domain. An example due to M. Zafrullah shows that in general $w \neq t \neq v$ [27, Proposition 1.2]. Also there exist *TV-domains* and *TW-domains* that are not w -divisorial [27, Example 2.7].

If R is a Prüfer domain, in particular a valuation domain, then w -divisoriality coincides with divisoriality, because each ideal of a Prüfer domain is a t -ideal.

Proposition 1.1. *A w -divisorial domain R is divisorial if and only if each maximal ideal of R is a t -ideal. Hence a one-dimensional w -divisorial domain is divisorial.*

Proof. If each maximal ideal of R is a t -ideal, then each ideal of R is a w -ideal by [27, Proposition 1.3]. Hence, if R is w -divisorial it is also divisorial. The converse is clear. \square

Following [1], we say that a nonempty family Λ of nonzero prime ideals of R is of *finite character* if each nonzero element of R belongs to at most finitely many members of Λ and we say that Λ is *independent* if no two members of Λ contain a common nonzero prime ideal. We observe that a family of primes is independent if and only if no two members of Λ contain a common t -prime ideal. In fact a minimal prime of a nonzero principal ideal is a t -ideal.

The domain R has finite character (resp., t -finite character) if $\text{Max}(R)$ (resp., $t\text{-Max}(R)$) is of finite character. If the set $\text{Max}(R)$ is independent of finite character, the domain R is called by E. Matlis an *h -local domain* [26]; thus R is h -local if it has finite character and each nonzero prime ideal is contained in a unique maximal ideal. A domain R such that $t\text{-Max}(R)$ is independent of finite character is called in [1] a *weakly Matlis domain*; hence R is a weakly Matlis domain if it has t -finite character and each t -prime ideal is contained in a unique t -maximal ideal.

Clearly, a domain of t -dimension one is a weakly Matlis domain if and only if it has t -finite character. A one-dimensional domain is a weakly Matlis domain if and only if it is h -local; if and only if it has finite character.

We recall that any *TV-domain*, hence any w -divisorial domain, has t -finite character by [20, Theorem 1.3]. The main result of this section shows that w -divisorial domains form a distinguished class of weakly Matlis domains.

We start by proving some technical properties of weakly Matlis domains.

Lemma 1.2. *Let R be an integral domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a weakly Matlis domain;
- (2) For each t -maximal ideal M of R and a collection $\{I_\alpha\}$ of w -ideals of R such that $\cap_\alpha I_\alpha \neq 0$, if $\cap_\alpha I_\alpha \subseteq M$, then $I_\alpha \subseteq M$ for some α .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) follows from [1, Corollary 4.4 and Proposition 4.7], by taking $\mathcal{F} = t\text{-Max}(R)$ and then $*_{\mathcal{F}} = w$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). First, we show that each t -prime ideal is contained in a unique t -maximal ideal. We adapt the proof of [17, Theorem 2.4]. Let P be a t -prime which is contained in two distinct t -maximal ideals M_1 and M_2 . Let $\{I_\alpha\}$ be the set of all w -ideals of R which contain P but are not contained in M_1 . Such a collection is nonempty since M_2 is in it. Let $I = \cap_\alpha I_\alpha$. Then $I \not\subseteq M_1$ and $I \subseteq M_2$. Take $x \in I \setminus M_1$. Since $x^2 \notin M_1$, then $(P + x^2R)_w \in \{I_\alpha\}$ and so $x \in (P + x^2R)_w$. Thus $x \in (P + x^2R)R_{M_2} \neq R_{M_2}$ and $sx = p + x^2r$ for some $s \in R \setminus M_2$, $p \in P$ and $r \in R$. Whence $(s - rx)x = p \in P \subseteq M_1 \cap M_2$. Now $s - rx \notin P$ because $s \notin M_2$ and $rx \in I \subseteq M_2$. But also $x \notin P$, since $x \notin M_1$; a contradiction because P is prime.

Next we show that R has t -finite character. Let $0 \neq x \in R$ and $\{M_\beta\}$ be the set of all t -maximal ideals of R which contain x . For a fixed β , let A_β be the intersection of all w -ideals of R which contain x but are not contained in M_β . By assumption $A_\beta \not\subseteq M_\beta$. Set $A = \sum_\beta A_\beta$. Then $x \in A$ and A is contained in no M_β . Hence $A_t = R$. Let $F = (a_{\beta_1}, a_{\beta_2}, \dots, a_{\beta_n})$, where $a_{\beta_i} \in A_{\beta_i}$, be a finitely generated ideal of R such that $F_t = R$. Now, if $M_\beta \notin \{M_{\beta_1}, M_{\beta_2}, \dots, M_{\beta_n}\}$, necessarily $M_\beta \supseteq F$, which is impossible because M_β is a proper t -ideal and $F_t = R$. We conclude that $\{M_\beta\} = \{M_{\beta_1}, M_{\beta_2}, \dots, M_{\beta_n}\}$ is finite. \square

Lemma 1.3. *Let R be a w -divisorial domain, M a t -maximal ideal of R and $\{I_\alpha\}$ a collection of w -ideals of R such that $\cap_\alpha I_\alpha \neq 0$. If $\cap_\alpha I_\alpha \subseteq M$, then $I_\alpha \subseteq M$ for some α .*

Proof. Set $A = \cap_\alpha I_\alpha$. Since R is a TW -domain, then the I_α 's and A are t -ideals. Since R is also a TV -domain, by [20, Lemma 1.2], if $I_\alpha \not\subseteq M$, for each α , then $A \not\subseteq M$. \square

Lemma 1.4. *If R is a weakly Matlis domain, then $I_v R_M = (IR_M)_v$, for each nonzero fractional ideal I and each t -maximal ideal M .*

Proof. Apply [1, Corollary 5.3] for $\mathcal{F} = t\text{-Max}(R)$. \square

We are now ready to prove the t -analogue of [3, Proposition 5.4], which states that a domain R is divisorial if and only if it is h -local and R_M is a divisorial domain, for each maximal ideal M . Local divisorial domains have been studied in [3, Section 5] and completely characterized in [4, Section 2].

Theorem 1.5. *Let R be an integral domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a w -divisorial domain;
- (2) R is a weakly Matlis domain and R_M is a divisorial domain, for each t -maximal ideal M ;
- (3) R is a TV -domain and R_M is a divisorial domain, for each t -maximal ideal M ;
- (4) $IR_M = (IR_M)_v = I_v R_M$, for each nonzero fractional ideal I and each t -maximal ideal M .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). That R is a weakly Matlis domain follows from Lemmas 1.3 and 1.2. Now let M be a t -maximal ideal of R and $I = JR_M$ a nonzero ideal of R_M , where J is an ideal of R . By Lemma 1.4, we have $I_v = (JR_M)_v = J_v R_M$. Since $J_v = J_w$, then $I_v = J_w R_M = JR_M = I$. Hence R_M is a divisorial domain.

(2) \Rightarrow (4) follows from Lemma 1.4.

(4) \Rightarrow (1). Let I be a nonzero fractional ideal of R . Then $I_w = \cap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(R)} IR_M = \cap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(R)} I_v R_M = I_v$. Whence R is a w -divisorial domain.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) via (2).

(3) \Rightarrow (4). Since $t = v$ in R and $d = t = v$ in R_M , for each nonzero fractional ideal I and each t -maximal ideal M of R , we have

$$IR_M = (IR_M)_v = (IR_M)_t = (I_t R_M)_t = I_t R_M = I_v R_M. \quad \square$$

Any almost Dedekind domain that is not Dedekind provides an example of a locally divisorial domain that is not w -divisorial, because it is not of finite character [13, Theorem 37.2].

Corollary 1.6. *Let R be a domain of t -dimension one. Then R is w -divisorial if and only if R has t -finite character and R_P is divisorial, for each height one prime P .*

2. LOCALIZATIONS OF w -DIVISORIAL DOMAINS

A domain whose overrings are all divisorial is called *totally divisorial* [3]. Not all divisorial domains are totally divisorial [17, Remark 5.4]; in fact a valuation domain R is divisorial if and only if its maximal ideal is principal [17, Lemma 5.2], but it is totally divisorial if and only if it is strongly discrete [3, Proposition 7.6], equivalently PR_P is a principal ideal for each prime ideal P of R [8, Proposition 5.3.8]. Since for valuation domains divisoriality coincides with w -divisoriality and each overring of a valuation domain is a localization at a certain (t -)prime, we see that w -divisoriality is not stable under localization at t -primes.

We say that an integral domain R is a *strongly w -divisorial domain* (resp., a *strongly divisorial domain*) if R is w -divisorial (resp., divisorial) and R_P is a divisorial domain for each $P \in t\text{-Spec}(R)$ (resp., $P \in \text{Spec}(R)$). Note that if R is strongly w -divisorial (resp., strongly divisorial), then R_P is strongly divisorial for each $P \in t\text{-Spec}(R)$ (resp., for each $P \in \text{Spec}(R)$).

By Theorem 1.5 (resp., [3, Proposition 5.4]), R is a strongly w -divisorial domain (resp., a strongly divisorial domain) if and only if R is a weakly Matlis domain (resp., an h -local domain) and R_P is a divisorial domain for each $P \in t\text{-Spec}(R)$ (resp., $P \in \text{Spec}(R)$).

If R has t -dimension one, then R is w -divisorial if and only if it is strongly w -divisorial.

In this section we shall study the extension of w -divisoriality and divisoriality to distinguished classes of generalized rings of fractions such as localizations at (t -)prime ideals, (t -)flat overrings and (t -)subintersections.

We recall the requisite definitions. A nonempty family \mathcal{F} of nonzero ideals of a domain R is said to be a *multiplicative system* of ideals if $IJ \in \mathcal{F}$, for each $I, J \in \mathcal{F}$. If \mathcal{F} is a multiplicative system, the set of ideals of R containing some ideal of \mathcal{F} is still a multiplicative system, which is called the *saturation* of \mathcal{F} and is denoted by $\text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$. A multiplicative system \mathcal{F} is said to be *saturated* if $\mathcal{F} = \text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$.

If \mathcal{F} is a multiplicative system of ideals, the overring $R_{\mathcal{F}} := \cup\{(R : J); J \in \mathcal{F}\}$ of R is called the *generalized ring of fractions* of R with respect to \mathcal{F} . For any fractional ideal I of R , $I_{\mathcal{F}} := \cup\{(I : J); J \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is a fractional ideal of $R_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $IR_{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq I_{\mathcal{F}}$. Clearly $I_{\mathcal{F}} = I_{\text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})}$.

The map $P \mapsto P_{\mathcal{F}}$ is an order-preserving bijection between the set of prime ideals P of R such that $P \notin \text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$ and the set of prime ideals Q of $R_{\mathcal{F}}$ such that $JR_{\mathcal{F}} \not\subseteq Q$ for any $J \in \mathcal{F}$, with inverse map $Q \mapsto Q \cap R$. In addition, $R_P = (R_{\mathcal{F}})_{P_{\mathcal{F}}}$ for each prime ideal $P \notin \text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$. If Q is a t -prime ideal of $R_{\mathcal{F}}$, then $Q \cap R$ is a t -prime ideal of R [10, Proposition 1.3].

If Λ is a nonempty family of nonzero prime ideals of R , the set $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda) = \{J; J \subseteq R \text{ is an ideal and } J \not\subseteq P \text{ for each } P \in \Lambda\}$ is a saturated multiplicative system of ideals and $I_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)} = \cap \{IR_P; P \in \Lambda\}$, for each fractional ideal I of R ; in particular $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)} = \cap \{R_P; P \in \Lambda\}$. A generalized ring of fractions of type $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is called a *subintersection of R* ; when $\Lambda \subseteq t\text{-Spec}(R)$, we say that $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is a *t -subintersection of R* .

A multiplicative system of ideals \mathcal{F} of R is *finitely generated* if each ideal $I \in \mathcal{F}$ contains a finitely generated ideal J which is still in \mathcal{F} . As in [10], we say that \mathcal{F} is a *v -finite* multiplicative system if each t -ideal $I \in \text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$ contains a finitely generated ideal J such that $J_v \in \text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$. A finitely generated multiplicative system is *v -finite*. If \mathcal{F} is *v -finite*, the set Λ of t -ideals which are maximal with respect to the property of not being in $\text{Sat}(\mathcal{F})$ is not empty, $\Lambda \subseteq t\text{-Spec}(R)$, $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ is *v -finite* and $T = R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ [10, Proposition 1.9 (a) and (b)].

An overring T of R is said to be *t -flat* over R if $T_M = R_{M \cap R}$, for each t -maximal ideal M of T [23], equivalently $T_Q = R_{Q \cap R}$, for each t -prime ideal Q of T [7, Proposition 2.6]. Flatness implies *t -flatness*, but the converse is not true [23, Remark 2.12]. By [7, Theorem 2.6], T is *t -flat* over R if and only if there exists a *v -finite* multiplicative system \mathcal{F} of R such that $T = R_{\mathcal{F}}$. Thus T is *t -flat* if and only if $T = R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$, where Λ is a family of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R and $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ is *v -finite*. It follows that a *t -flat* overring of R is a *t -subintersection of R* .

In turn, any generalized ring of fractions is a *t -linked* overring; but the converse does not hold in general [5, Proposition 2.2]. We recall that an overring T of an integral domain R is *t -linked* over R if, for each nonzero finitely generated ideal J of R such that $(R : J) = R$, we have $(T : JT) = T$ [5]. This is equivalent to say that $T = \cap T_{R \setminus P}$, where P ranges over the t -primes of R [5, Proposition 2.13(a)].

It is well known that if P is a t -prime ideal of R , then PR_P need not be a t -ideal of R_P . When PR_P is a t -prime ideal, P is called by M. Zafrullah a *well behaved t -prime* [34, page 436]. We prefer to say that P *t -localizes* or that it is a *t -localizing prime*. Height-one prime ideals and divisorial t -maximal primes, e. g. *t -invertible t -primes*, are examples of *t -localizing primes*.

A large class of domains with the property that each t -prime ideal *t -localizes* is the class of *v -coherent domains*. We recall that a domain R is called *v -coherent* if the ideal $(R : J)$ is *v -finite* whenever J is finitely generated. This class of domains properly includes *$PvMD$'s*, Mori domains and coherent domains [24, 11].

If R is a *w -divisorial* (resp., strongly *w -divisorial*) domain, then each t -maximal (resp., t -prime) ideal *t -localizes*.

Lemma 2.1. *Let Λ be a set of t -localizing t -primes of R . Then:*

- (1) $P_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)} \in t\text{-Spec}(R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)})$, for each $P \in \Lambda$.
- (2) If $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ is *v -finite*, $t\text{-Max}(R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}) = \{P_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}; P \text{ maximal in } \Lambda\}$.

Proof. Set $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ and $T = R_{\mathcal{F}}$.

(1). Let $P \in \Lambda$. Since $R_P = T_{P_{\mathcal{F}}}$ and by hypothesis $PR_P = P_{\mathcal{F}}T_{P_{\mathcal{F}}}$ is a t -ideal, then $P_{\mathcal{F}} = P_{\mathcal{F}}T_{P_{\mathcal{F}}} \cap T$ is a t -ideal of T .

(2). Since $P_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a t -ideal by part (1), we can apply [10, Proposition 1.9 (c)]. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Let Λ be a set of pairwise incomparable t -localizing t -primes of R . Then:*

- (1) Λ is independent of finite character if and only if $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ is *v -finite* and $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is a *weakly Matlis domain*.
- (2) If $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is *w -divisorial*, then Λ is independent of finite character.

Proof. Set $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ and $T = R_{\mathcal{F}}$.

(1). If \mathcal{F} is v -finite, by Lemma 2.1(2) we have $t\text{-Max}(T) = \{P_{\mathcal{F}} ; P \in \Lambda\}$. It follows that Λ is independent of finite character if and only if $t\text{-Max}(T) = \{P_{\mathcal{F}} ; P \in \Lambda\}$ is independent of finite character, that is T is a weakly Matlis domain. On the other hand, if Λ is of finite character, then \mathcal{F} is v -finite by [10, Lemma 1.16].

(2). Since T is a weakly Matlis domain, by part (1) it suffices to show that Λ is of finite character.

By Lemma 2.1(1), $P_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a t -prime of T , for each $P \in \Lambda$. We show that each proper divisorial ideal of T is contained in some $P_{\mathcal{F}}$. We have $T = \cap_{P \in \Lambda} R_P = \cap_{P \in \Lambda} T_{P_{\mathcal{F}}}$. If I is a proper divisorial ideal of T , there is $x \in K \setminus T$ (where K is the quotient field of R) such that $I \subseteq x^{-1}T \cap T$. Since $x \notin T$, there exists $P \in \Lambda$ such that $x \notin T_{P_{\mathcal{F}}}$, equivalently $x^{-1}T \cap T \subseteq P_{\mathcal{F}}$.

Since $t = v$ on T , we conclude that $t\text{-Max}(T) = \{P_{\mathcal{F}} ; P \in \Lambda\}$. Since T has t -finite character, it follows that Λ is of finite character. \square

Theorem 2.3. *Let R be a w -divisorial domain. If $\Lambda \subseteq t\text{-Max}(R)$, then $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is a t -flat w -divisorial overring of R .*

Proof. Since R is a weakly Matlis domain (Theorem 1.5), $t\text{-Max}(R)$ is independent of finite character; thus Λ has the same properties. In addition, each t -maximal ideal is a t -localizing prime ideal. It follows that $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ is v -finite and $T := R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is a t -flat weakly Matlis domain (Proposition 2.2(1)). By Lemma 2.1(2), for each $N \in t\text{-Max}(T)$, there exists $M \in \Lambda$ such that $N = M_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$. It follows that $T_N = R_M$ is divisorial and so T is w -divisorial by Theorem 1.5. \square

As we have mentioned above, the localization of a w -divisorial domain at a t -prime need not be a $(w\text{-})$ divisorial domain. Thus Theorem 2.3 does not hold for an arbitrary $\Lambda \subseteq t\text{-Spec}(R)$. However, under the hypothesis that R is strongly w -divisorial, we have a satisfying result.

Theorem 2.4. *Let R be a strongly w -divisorial domain and Λ a set of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is w -divisorial;
- (2) $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is strongly w -divisorial;
- (3) $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is a t -flat weakly Matlis domain;
- (4) $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is a t -flat TV-domain;
- (5) Λ is independent of finite character.

Proof. Set $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ and $T = R_{\mathcal{F}}$. Since R is strongly w -divisorial, each $P \in \Lambda$ t -localizes.

(1) \Rightarrow (5) by Proposition 2.2(2).

(5) \Rightarrow (3). By Proposition 2.2(1).

(3) \Rightarrow (2). If Q is a t -prime of T , then $P = Q \cap R \in t\text{-Spec}(R)$ and $T_Q = R_P$ is divisorial. Whence T is strongly w -divisorial.

(3) \Leftrightarrow (4) By t -flatness, T_M is divisorial for each t -maximal ideal M . Thus we can apply Theorem 1.5.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) is obvious. \square

Divisorial flat overrings of a strongly divisorial domain have a similar characterization. Recall that an overring T of R is flat if $T_M = R_{M \cap R}$, for each maximal ideal M of T ; in this case $T = R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$, where Λ is a set of pairwise incomparable prime ideals of R .

Corollary 2.5. *Let R be a strongly divisorial domain and $T = R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ a flat overring, where Λ is a set of pairwise incomparable prime ideals of R . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) T is divisorial;

- (2) T is strongly divisorial;
- (3) T is h -local;
- (4) Λ is independent of finite character.

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (3). By [3, Proposition 5.4], T is divisorial if and only if it is h -local and locally divisorial. But, since T is flat and R is strongly divisorial, for each maximal ideal M of T , $T_M = R_{M \cap R}$ is divisorial.

(1) \Rightarrow (2). Since T is flat and R is strongly divisorial, then $T_Q = R_{Q \cap R}$ is divisorial, for each prime ideal Q of T .

(2) \Rightarrow (4). Since R and T are divisorial, then $d = w = t = v$ in R and T . Thus we can apply Theorem 2.4 ((2) \Rightarrow (5)).

(4) \Rightarrow (1). Since $d = w = t = v$ in R , by Theorem 2.4 ((5) \Rightarrow (1)), T is w -divisorial. To prove that T is divisorial, we show that each maximal ideal of T is a t -ideal (Proposition 1.1). If M is a maximal ideal of T , by flatness we have $T_M = R_{M \cap R}$. Since R is strongly divisorial, MT_M is a t -ideal and so $M = MT_M \cap T$ is a t -ideal. \square

Corollary 2.6. *Let R be an integral domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) Each t -flat overring of R is strongly w -divisorial;
- (2) R is strongly w -divisorial and each t -flat overring is a weakly Matlis domain;
- (3) R is strongly w -divisorial and each t -flat overring is a TV-domain;
- (4) R is strongly w -divisorial and each family Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R such that $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ is v -finite is independent of finite character.

Proof. By Theorem 2.4, recalling that an overring T is t -flat over R if and only if $T = R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$, where Λ is a family of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R and $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ is v -finite. \square

In order to study t -subintersections, we need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *Let R be an integral domain and \mathcal{C} an ascending chain of t -localizing t -primes of R . If $R_{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})}$ is a TV-domain, then \mathcal{C} is stationary.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{P_\alpha\}$ and set $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ and $T = R_{\mathcal{F}}$. By Lemma 2.1(1), $(P_\alpha)_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a t -prime ideal of T , for each α . It follows that $M = \cup_\alpha (P_\alpha)_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a proper t -prime ideal of T (since it is an ascending union of t -primes) and so M is divisorial (because T is a TV-domain). We have $T = \cap_\alpha T_{R \setminus P_\alpha}$; thus the map $I \mapsto I^* = \cap_\alpha IT_{R \setminus P_\alpha}$ defines a star operation on T . Since M is divisorial, we have $M^* \subseteq M$; so that M^* is a proper ideal. It follows that there exists α such that $M \cap R \subseteq P_\alpha$. Hence $M \cap R = P_\alpha$ and so $P_\beta = P_\alpha$ for $\beta \geq \alpha$. \square

Theorem 2.8. *Let R be an integral domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) Each t -subintersection of R is strongly w -divisorial;
- (2) R is a strongly w -divisorial domain which satisfies the ascending chain condition on t -prime ideals and each family Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R is independent of finite character.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Clearly R is a strongly w -divisorial domain. If Λ is a set of pairwise incomparable t -prime ideals, then by assumption $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is strongly w -divisorial. Hence Λ is independent of finite character, by Theorem 2.4. It remains to show that R has the ascending chain condition on t -prime ideals. This follows from Lemma 2.7. In fact, if \mathcal{C} is an ascending chain of t -prime ideals of R , $R_{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})}$ is strongly w -divisorial. Hence each t -prime in \mathcal{C} t -localizes and it follows that \mathcal{C} is stationary.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). Let $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ be a t -subintersection of R . By the ascending chain condition on t -prime ideals, Λ has maximal elements; thus we can assume that Λ is a set of pairwise incomparable t -primes. The conclusion follows from Theorem 2.4. \square

Corollary 2.9. *Let R be a domain. If each t -subintersection of R is strongly w -divisorial, then each t -subintersection of R is t -flat.*

Proof. If each t -subintersection of R is strongly w -divisorial, then R satisfies the ascending chain condition on t -primes (Theorem 2.8). Thus each t -subintersection is of type $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$, where Λ is a family of pairwise incomparable t -primes. By Theorem 2.4, $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is t -flat. \square

Remark 2.10. If each subintersection of the domain R is strongly divisorial, then clearly R is strongly divisorial. In addition, since $d = w = t = v$ on R , then R satisfies the ascending chain condition on prime ideals and each family Λ of pairwise incomparable prime ideals of R is independent of finite character (Theorem 2.8).

Conversely, assume that R is a strongly divisorial domain satisfying the ascending chain condition on prime ideals and that each family Λ of pairwise incomparable prime ideals of R is independent of finite character.

Then each subintersection T of R is of type $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$, where Λ is a family of pairwise incomparable prime ideals independent of finite character. Thus $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ is finitely generated [10, Lemma 1.16] and T is strongly w -divisorial and t -flat by Theorem 2.4. We conclude that T is (strongly) divisorial if and only if each maximal ideal of T is a t -ideal (Proposition 1.1) if and only if T is flat.

We observe that in general, if \mathcal{F} is a finitely generated multiplicative system of ideals, then $R_{\mathcal{F}}$ need not be a flat extension of R [9, pag. 32]. On the other hand, we do not know any example of a strongly divisorial domain R with a finitely generated multiplicative system \mathcal{F} such that $R_{\mathcal{F}}$ is not flat.

If R is any domain, we say that $\text{Spec}(R)$ (resp., $t\text{-Spec}(R)$) is *treed* (under inclusion) if any maximal (resp., t -maximal) ideal of R cannot contain two incomparable primes (resp., t -primes). The Spectrum of a Prüfer domain and the t -Spectrum of a $PvMD$ are treed. If $\text{Spec}(R)$ is treed, then $\text{Spec}(R) = t\text{-Spec}(R)$ [23, Proposition 2.6]; in particular each maximal ideal is a t -ideal and so w -divisibility coincides with divisoriality by Proposition 1.1.

If $t\text{-Spec}(R)$ is treed and $t\text{-Max}(R)$ is independent of finite character, then each family Λ of pairwise incomparable t -prime ideals of R is independent of finite character. Hence the next results are easy consequences of Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 2.8 respectively.

Corollary 2.11. *Let R be an integral domain such that $t\text{-Spec}(R)$ is treed. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is strongly w -divisorial;
- (2) $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is a t -flat w -divisorial domain, for each set Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes;
- (3) $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}$ is a t -flat strongly w -divisorial domain, for each set Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes.

If R has t -dimension one, then clearly $t\text{-Spec}(R)$ is treed. In this case, The conditions stated in Corollary 2.11 are all satisfied if R is w -divisorial (cf. Theorem 2.3).

Corollary 2.12. *Let R be an integral domain such that $t\text{-Spec}(R)$ is treed. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a strongly w -divisorial domain which satisfies the ascending chain conditions on t -prime ideals;
- (2) Each t -subintersection of R is t -flat and strongly w -divisorial.

3. INTEGRALLY CLOSED w -DIVISORIAL DOMAINS

W. Heinzer proved in [17] that an integrally closed domain is divisorial if and only if it is an h -local Prüfer domain with invertible maximal ideals. We start this section by showing that integrally closed w -divisorial domains have a similar characterization among $PvMD$ s. Note that a divisorial $PvMD$ is a Prüfer domain.

Lemma 3.1. *Let R be a w -divisorial domain and $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) M is t -invertible;
- (2) MR_M is a principal ideal;
- (3) R_M is a valuation domain.

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2). Since $t\text{-Max}(R)$ has t -finite character (Theorem 1.5), we can apply [34, Theorem 2.2 and Proposition 3.1].

(2) \Rightarrow (3) follows from [31, Lemme 1, Section 4], because R_M is a divisorial domain (Theorem 1.5), and (3) \Rightarrow (2) follows from [17, Lemma 5.2]. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Let R be a w -divisorial domain. Then R is a $PvMD$ if and only if each t -maximal ideal of R is t -invertible.*

Theorem 3.3. *Let R be an integral domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is an integrally closed w -divisorial domain;
- (2) R is a weakly Matlis $PvMD$ and each t -maximal ideal of R is t -invertible.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). A domain R is a $PvMD$ if and only if R is an integrally closed TW -domain [22, Theorem 3.5]. Hence an integrally closed w -divisorial domain is a $PvMD$. By Theorem 1.5, R is a weakly Matlis domain and by Proposition 3.2 each t -maximal ideal is t -invertible.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). A t -maximal ideal M of a $PvMD$ is t -invertible if and only if MR_M is a principal ideal [19]. Since R_M is a valuation domain, this means that R_M is divisorial [17, Lemma 5.2]. Now we can apply Theorem 1.5. \square

The previous theorem can be proved also by using the fact that a domain R is a $PvMD$ if and only if R is an integrally closed TW -domain [22, Theorem 3.5] and the characterization of $PvMD$ s which are TV -domains given in [20, Theorem 3.1].

Recall that a Prüfer domain R is strongly discrete if $P^2 \neq P$ for each nonzero prime ideal P of R [8, Section 5.3] and that a generalized Dedekind domain is a strongly discrete Prüfer domain with the property that each ideal has finitely many minimal primes [30]. We say that a $PvMD$ R is *strongly discrete* if $(P^2)_t \neq P$, for each $P \in t\text{-Spec}(R)$ [7, Remark 3.10]. If R is a strongly discrete $PvMD$ and each t -ideal of R has only finitely many minimal primes, then R is called a *generalized Krull domain* [7].

The next theorem shows that the class of strongly w -divisorial domains and the class of strongly discrete $PvMD$ s are strictly related to each other.

Lemma 3.4. *Let R be a domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a strongly discrete $PvMD$;
- (2) R_M is a strongly discrete valuation domain, for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$;
- (3) R_P is a strongly discrete valuation domain, for each $P \in t\text{-Spec}(R)$;
- (4) R_P is a valuation domain and PR_P is a principal ideal, for each $P \in t\text{-Spec}(R)$;

(5) R_P is a divisorial valuation domain, for each $P \in t\text{-Spec}(R)$.

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (4). For each t -prime ideal P of R , we have $(P^2)_t = P^2 R_P \cap R$ [19, Proposition 1.3]. Hence $(P^2)_t \neq P$ if and only if $P^2 R_P \neq P R_P$. Now recall that a maximal ideal of a valuation domain is not idempotent if and only if it is principal.

(2) \Leftrightarrow (3) because each overring of a strongly discrete valuation domain is a strongly discrete valuation domain [8, Proposition 5.3.1(3)].

(3) \Leftrightarrow (4) by [8, Proposition 5.3.8 ((2) \Leftrightarrow (6))].

(4) \Leftrightarrow (5) by [17, Lemma 5.2]. \square

Theorem 3.5. *Let R be an integral domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a strongly discrete PvMD and a weakly Matlis domain;
- (2) R is an integrally closed strongly w -divisorial domain;
- (3) R is integrally closed and each t -flat overring of R is w -divisorial;
- (4) R is integrally closed and each t -linked overring of R is w -divisorial;
- (5) R is a w -divisorial generalized Krull domain;
- (6) R is a generalized Krull domain and each t -prime ideal of R is contained in a unique t -maximal ideal.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Clearly R is integrally closed. In addition, by Lemma 3.4, R_P is a divisorial domain, for each $P \in t\text{-Spec}(R)$. Hence R is a strongly w -divisorial domain.

(2) \Rightarrow (3). By Theorem 3.3, R is a PvMD; in particular $t\text{-Spec}(R)$ is treed. Thus we can apply Corollary 2.11.

(3) \Rightarrow (1). By Theorem 3.3, R is a weakly Matlis PvMD. Now, given $P \in t\text{-Spec}(R)$, R_P is a divisorial valuation domain. Hence R is a strongly discrete PvMD by Lemma 3.4.

(3) \Leftrightarrow (4). By Theorem 3.3, statements (3) and (4) imply that R is a PvMD. The conclusion now follows from the fact that each t -linked overring of a PvMD R is t -flat [23, Proposition 2.10].

(1) \Rightarrow (5). By (1) \Rightarrow (2), R is a w -divisorial domain. To show that R is a generalized Krull domain, let I be a t -ideal of R . Since R has t -finite character, then I is contained in only finitely many t -maximal ideals. Furthermore, each t -prime ideal is contained in a unique t -maximal ideal. Thus I has just finitely many minimal (t)-prime ideals. We conclude by using [7, Theorem 3.9].

(5) \Rightarrow (6) is clear.

(6) \Rightarrow (1). It is enough to show that R has t -finite character. This follows from the fact that each nonzero principal ideal has finitely many minimal (t)-primes. \square

As a consequence of Theorem 3.5, we obtain the following characterization of integrally closed totally divisorial domains (see also [28]).

Corollary 3.6. *Let R be an integral domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is an integrally closed totally divisorial domain;
- (2) R is integrally closed and each flat overring of R is divisorial;
- (3) R is an integrally closed strongly divisorial domain;
- (4) R is an h -local strongly discrete Prüfer domain;
- (5) R is a divisorial generalized Dedekind domain;
- (6) R is a generalized Dedekind domain and each nonzero prime ideal is contained in a unique maximal ideal.

Proof. This follows from the fact that in a Prüfer domain the d - and t -operation coincide, that each overring of a Prüfer domain is a flat Prüfer domain, and that

a Prüfer domain is a generalized Krull domain if and only if it is a generalized Dedekind domain [7]. \square

Recall that the *complete integral closure* of R is the overring $\tilde{R} := \cup\{(I : I) ; I \text{ nonzero ideal of } R\}$. If $R = \tilde{R}$, we say that R is *completely integrally closed*.

Proposition 3.7. *Let R be an integral domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is an integrally closed w -divisorial domain of t -dimension one;
- (2) R is an integrally closed domain of t -dimension one and each t -linked overring of R is w -divisorial;
- (3) R is a completely integrally closed w -divisorial domain;
- (4) R is a Krull domain.

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (4). Clearly a w -divisorial domain of t -dimension one is strongly w -divisorial. Since a generalized Krull domain of t -dimension one is a Krull domain [7, Theorem 3.11], we can conclude by applying Theorem 3.5.

(3) \Leftrightarrow (4) because a completely integrally closed TV -domain is Krull [20, Theorem 2.3]. \square

It is well-known that a divisorial Krull domain is a Dedekind domain; hence by the previous proposition we recover that a completely integrally closed divisorial domain is a Dedekind domain [17, Proposition 5.5].

Remark 3.8. Recall that, for any domain R , \tilde{R} is integrally closed and t -linked over R [5, Corollary 2.3]. Since each localization of a t -linked overring of R is still t -linked over R , if each t -linked overring of R is w -divisorial, we have that \tilde{R} is an integrally closed strongly w -divisorial domain. In this case, by Theorem 3.5, \tilde{R} is a weakly Matlis strongly discrete $PvMD$. If in addition \tilde{R} is completely integrally closed, for example if $(R : \tilde{R}) \neq 0$, by Proposition 3.7 \tilde{R} is a Krull domain.

In a similar way, by using Corollary 3.6, we see that if R is totally divisorial, the integral closure of R is an h -local strongly divisorial Prüfer domain.

4. MORI w -DIVISORIAL DOMAINS

We start by recalling some properties of Noetherian divisorial domains proved in [17, 31].

Proposition 4.1. *Let R be a domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a one-dimensional w -divisorial Mori domain;
- (2) R is a divisorial Mori domain;
- (3) R is a divisorial Noetherian domain;
- (4) R is a Mori domain and each two generated ideal of R is divisorial;
- (5) R is a one-dimensional Mori domain and $(R : M)$ is a two generated ideal, for each $M \in \text{Max}(R)$;
- (6) R is a one-dimensional Noetherian domain and $(R : M)$ is a two generated ideal, for each $M \in \text{Max}(R)$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) by Proposition 1.1.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) because each v -ideal of a Mori domain is v -finite.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) because Noetherian divisorial domains are one-dimensional [17, Corollary 4.3].

(3) \Leftrightarrow (6) and (2) \Leftrightarrow (4) \Leftrightarrow (5) by [31, Theorem 3, Section 2]. \square

An integrally closed w -divisorial Mori domain is a Krull domain. In fact it has to be a $PvMD$ (Theorem 3.3). By Proposition 4.1, any Noetherian integrally closed

domain of dimension greater than one is a w -divisorial Noetherian domain that is not divisorial.

We say that a nonzero fractional ideal I of R is a w -divisorial ideal if $I_v = I_w$. With this notation, a w -divisorial domain is a domain in which each nonzero ideal is w -divisorial. We also say that, for $n \geq 1$, I is n w -generated if $I_w = (a_1 R + \cdots + a_n R)_w$, for some a_1, \dots, a_n in the quotient field of R .

Theorem 4.2. *Let R be a Mori domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a w -divisorial domain;
- (2) Each two generated nonzero ideal is w -divisorial;
- (3) R has t -dimension one and $(R: M)$ is a two w -generated ideal, for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) is clear.

(2) \Rightarrow (3). Let $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$. Since R is a Mori domain, then M is a divisorial ideal. Let $x \in (R: M) \setminus R$, then $(R: M) = (R + Rx)_v$. So that by assumption $(R: M) = (R + Rx)_w$. To conclude, we show that R_M is one-dimensional. Let I be a nonzero two generated ideal of R_M . Then, we can assume that $I = (a, b)R_M$ for some $a, b \in I \cap R$. Since R is a Mori domain, then $I_v = ((a, b)R_M)_v = (a, b)_v R_M$. Hence $I_v = (a, b)_w R_M = (a, b)R_M = I$. Thus each two generated ideal of R_M is divisorial. It follows from Proposition 4.1 that R_M is one-dimensional.

(3) \Rightarrow (1). Since R is a TV -domain, by Theorem 1.5, it is enough to show that R_M is a divisorial domain for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$. This follows again from Proposition 4.1. In fact, by assumption R_M is a Mori domain of dimension one. Let $(R: M) = (a, b)_w$ for some $a, b \in (R: M)$. Then $(R_M: MR_M) = (R: M)R_M = (a, b)_w R_M = (a, b)R_M$ is two generated (the first equality holds because M is v -finite). \square

Recall that a *Strong Mori domain* is a domain satisfying the ascending chain condition on w -ideals. A domain R is a Strong Mori domain if and only if it has t -finite character and R_M is Noetherian, for each t -maximal ideal M [33, Theorem 1.9]. Thus a Mori domain is Strong Mori if and only if R_M is Noetherian, for each t -maximal ideal M .

Corollary 4.3. [27, Corollary 2.5] *A w -divisorial Mori domain is a Strong Mori domain of t -dimension one.*

Proof. A w -divisorial Mori domain is Strong Mori (because $w = v$) and has t -dimension one by Theorem 4.2. \square

We next investigate w -divisibility of overrings of Mori domains. Our first result in this direction shows that, if R is Mori, w -divisibility is inherited by generalized ring of fractions. This improves [27, Theorem 2.4].

We observe that a Mori domain is a v -coherent TV -domain, because each t -ideal of a Mori domain is v -finite. We also recall that if R is v -coherent, we have $I_t R_S = (I R_S)_t$, for each nonzero fractional ideal I and each multiplicative set S .

Proposition 4.4. *Let R be a v -coherent domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a TW -domain;
- (2) All the nonzero ideals of R_M are t -ideals, for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$;
- (3) All the nonzero ideals of R_P are t -ideals, for each $P \in t\text{-Spec}(R)$;
- (4) Each t -flat overring of R is a TW -domain.

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2). Let I be a nonzero ideal and M a t -maximal ideal of R . If $t = w$ on R , then $I R_M = I_w R_M = I_t R_M = (I R_M)_t$.

Conversely, we have $IR_M = (IR_M)_t = I_t R_M$. Thus

$$I_w = \cap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(R)} IR_M = \cap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(R)} I_t R_M = I_t.$$

(2) \Rightarrow (3). Let I be a nonzero ideal of R , P a t -prime of R and M a t -maximal ideal containing P . Then

$$IR_P = (IR_M)R_P = (IR_M)_t R_P = (I_t R_M)R_P = I_t R_P = (IR_P)_t.$$

(3) \Rightarrow (4). Let T be a t -flat overring of R . Then T is a v -coherent domain [10, Proposition 3.1]. If N is a t -maximal ideal of T , then $P = N \cap R$ is a t -prime of R and $T_N = R_P$. Hence, if (3) holds, each nonzero ideal of T_N is a t -ideal and T is a TW -domain by (2) \Rightarrow (1).

(4) \Rightarrow (1) is clear. \square

Theorem 4.5. *Let R be a Mori domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is w -divisorial;
- (2) R is strongly w -divisorial;
- (3) Each t -flat overring of R is w -divisorial;
- (4) Each generalized ring of fractions of R is w -divisorial;
- (5) R_M is a divisorial domain, for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$.

Proof. Each generalized ring of fractions of a Mori domain is Mori [31, Corollaire 1, Section 3]; thus it is a TV -domain. In addition, each generalized ring of fractions of a Mori domain is t -flat, because each t -ideal is v -finite and so each multiplicative system of ideals is v -finite. Hence we can apply Proposition 4.4. \square

t -linked overrings of Mori domains do not behave as well as generalized rings of fractions. In fact a Mori non-Krull domain has t -linked overrings which are not t -flat [6, Corollary 2.10]. Also, if each t -linked overring of a Mori domain R is Mori, then R has t -dimension one [5, Proposition 2.20]. The converse holds if R is a Strong Mori domain; precisely, we have the following result.

Proposition 4.6. *Each t -linked overring of a Strong Mori domain of t -dimension one is either a field or a Strong Mori domain of t -dimension one.*

Proof. It follows from [33, Theorem 3.4] recalling that an overring of a domain is a w -module if and only if it is t -linked [5, Proposition 2.13 (a)]. \square

Corollary 4.7. *If R is a w -divisorial Mori domain, then each t -linked overring of R is either a field or a Strong Mori domain of t -dimension one.*

Proof. It follows from Corollary 4.3 and Proposition 4.6. \square

Our next purpose is to improve and generalize to Mori domains some results proved in [3] for Noetherian totally divisorial domains.

Proposition 4.8. *Let R be a domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a one-dimensional domain and each t -linked overring of R is w -divisorial;
- (2) R is a one-dimensional totally divisorial domain;
- (3) R is a Noetherian totally divisorial domain;
- (4) Each ideal of R is two generated.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Since $\dim(R) = 1$, each overring of R is t -linked over R [5, Corollary 2.7 (b)]. Hence each overring T of R is w -divisorial. Assume that T is not a field. To prove that T is divisorial it suffices to check that $\dim(T) = 1$ (Proposition 1.1). Let R' be the integral closure of R and T' that of T . Since R' is one-dimensional and w -divisorial, then R' is divisorial. Thus R' , being integrally closed, is a Prüfer domain [17, Theorem 5.1]. It follows that the extension $R' \subseteq T'$

is flat, and so $\dim(T') \leq \dim(R') = 1$. Hence $\dim(T) = \dim(T') = 1$. We conclude that T is divisorial and therefore R is totally divisorial.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) by [3, Proposition 7.1].

(3) \Rightarrow (1) by Proposition 4.1.

(3) \Leftrightarrow (4) by [3, Theorem 7.3], because in the Noetherian case a domain is totally divisorial if and only if it is totally reflexive [29, Section 3]. \square

Lemma 4.10 below is similar to [26, Theorem 26(2)]. We will need the following version of Chinese Remainder Theorem, whose proof is straightforward.

Lemma 4.9. *Let R be an integral domain, I an ideal of R , P_1, \dots, P_n a set of pairwise incomparable prime ideals and $S = R \setminus (P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n)$. If $x_1, \dots, x_n \in I$, there exists $x \in IR_S$ such that $x \equiv x_i \pmod{IP_iR_{P_i}}$, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

Lemma 4.10. *Let R be an integral domain which has t -finite character and I a nonzero ideal of R . Let n be a positive integer and assume that, for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$, a minimal set of generators of IR_M has at most n elements. Then I is w -generated by a number of generators $m \leq \max(2, n)$.*

Proof. If I is not contained in any t -maximal ideal, then $I_w = R$. Otherwise, let M_1, \dots, M_r be the t -maximal ideals of R which contain I . For $i = 1, \dots, r$, let $a_{1i}, \dots, a_{ni} \in I$ be such that $IR_{M_i} = (a_{1i}, \dots, a_{ni})R_{M_i}$. By Lemma 4.9, if $S = R \setminus (M_1 \cup \dots \cup M_r)$, for each $j = 1, \dots, n$, there exists $a_j \in IR_S \subseteq IR_{M_i}$ such that $a_j \equiv a_{ji} \pmod{IM_iR_{M_i}}$, for each $i = 1, \dots, r$. By going modulo $IM_iR_{M_i}$ and using Nakayama's Lemma, we get $IR_{M_i} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)R_{M_i}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, r$. We can assume that the a_j 's are in I and $a_1 \neq 0$. Let N_1, \dots, N_s be the set of t -maximal ideals which contain a_1 , with $N_1 = M_1, \dots, N_r = M_r$. Let $b \in I \setminus \cup_{j=r+1}^s M_j$. Then $IR_{N_j} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)R_{N_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$ and $IR_{N_j} = (a_1, b)R_{N_j} = R_{N_j}$ for $j = r+1, \dots, s$. By arguing as above, there exist $b_1 = a_1, b_2, \dots, b_n \in I$ such that $IR_{N_j} = (b_1, \dots, b_n)R_{N_j}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, s$. We claim that $I_w = (b_1, \dots, b_n)_w$. Let M be a t -maximal ideal of R . If $M = N_j$ for some j , then $IR_M = (b_1, \dots, b_n)R_M$. If $M \neq N_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$, then $IR_M = R_M = (b_1, \dots, b_n)R_M$, since $b_1 = a_1 \notin M$. \square

Theorem 4.11. *Let R be a domain. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R has t -dimension one and each t -linked overring of R is w -divisorial;
- (2) R is a Mori domain and each t -linked overring of R is w -divisorial;
- (3) R is a Mori domain and R_M is totally divisorial, for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$;
- (4) Each nonzero ideal of R is a two w -generated w -divisorial ideal;
- (5) Each nonzero ideal of R is two w -generated.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). R has t -finite character, because it is w -divisorial (Theorem 1.5). We now show that, for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$, R_M is Noetherian. Since R_M is a one-dimensional t -linked overring of R , then R_M is divisorial (Proposition 1.1). In addition, each overring T of R_M is t -linked over R_M [5, Corollary 2.7] and so it is t -linked over R . Thus T is a w -divisorial domain. By Proposition 4.8, R_M is Noetherian. We conclude that R is a (Strong) Mori domain.

(2) \Rightarrow (3). R is clearly w -divisorial. Hence R_M is a one-dimensional Noetherian domain (Corollary 4.3). Let T be a t -linked overring of R_M . Hence T is t -linked over R and so by assumption it is w -divisorial. By Proposition 4.8 R_M is totally divisorial.

(3) \Rightarrow (4). R is w -divisorial by Theorem 4.5. Hence R_M is one-dimensional and Noetherian by Corollary 4.3. Thus, for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$, each ideal of R_M is two generated by Proposition 4.8. By using Lemma 4.10, we conclude that every nonzero ideal of R is a two w -generated w -divisorial ideal.

(4) \Rightarrow (5) is clear.

(5) \Rightarrow (3). If (5) holds, R is a Strong Mori domain and so R_M is a Noetherian domain, for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$. Let IR_M be a nonzero ideal of R_M , where I is an ideal of R . By assumption, $I_w = (a, b)_w$ for some $a, b \in R$. Thus $IR_M = (a, b)_w R_M = (a, b)R_M$ is a two generated ideal. It follows from Proposition 4.8 that R_M is a totally divisorial domain.

(3) \Rightarrow (2). R is w -divisorial by Theorem 4.5. Let T be a t -linked overring of R , $T \neq R$. By Corollary 4.7, T is a Mori domain. To show that T is w -divisorial, by Theorem 4.5, we have to prove that T_N is a divisorial domain, for each $N \in t\text{-Max}(T)$. Since $R \subseteq T$ is t -linked, then $Q = (N \cap R)_t \neq R$ [5, Proposition 2.1]; but as R has t -dimension one (Corollary 4.3), then Q is a t -maximal ideal of R . Since R_Q is totally divisorial and $R_Q \subseteq T_N$, then T_N is a divisorial domain.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) by Corollary 4.3. \square

Corollary 4.12. *Let R be a domain and assume that each t -linked overring of R is w -divisorial. Then R is a Mori domain if and only if it has t -dimension one.*

Example 4.13. Mori non-Krull and non-Noetherian domains satisfying the equivalent conditions of Theorem 4.11 can be constructed by using pullbacks, as the following example shows.

Let T be a Krull domain having a maximal ideal M of height one and assume that the residue field $K = T/M$ has a subfield k such that $[K : k] = 2$. Let $R = \varphi^{-1}(k)$ be the pullback of k with respect to the canonical projection $\varphi : T \rightarrow K$.

The domain R is Mori and it is Noetherian if and only if T is Noetherian [11, Theorems 4.12 and 4.18]. M is a maximal ideal of R that is divisorial; thus $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$. Since R_M is the pullback of k with respect to the natural projection $T_M \rightarrow K$, R_M is divisorial by [27, Corollary 3.5]. In addition T_M is the only overring of R_M . In fact each overring of R_M is comparable with T_M under inclusion; but T_M is a *DVR* and $[K : k] = 2$. Thus R_M is totally divisorial.

If N is a t -maximal ideal of R and $N \neq M$, there is a unique t -maximal ideal N' of T such that $N' \cap R = N$ [12, Theorem 2.6(1)] and for this prime $T_{N'} = R_N$. Thus R_N is a *DVR*. It follows that R_N is totally divisorial, for each $N \in t\text{-Max}(R)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. D. Anderson and M. Zafrullah, *Independent Locally-Finite Intersections of Localizations*, Houston J. Math. **25** (1999), 433-452.
- [2] H. Bass, *On the ubiquity of Gorenstein rings*, Math. Z. **82** (1963), 8-28.
- [3] S. Bazzoni and L. Salce, *Warfield Domains*, J. Algebra **185** (1996), 836-868.
- [4] S. Bazzoni, *Divisorial Domains*, Forum Math. **12** (2000), 397-419.
- [5] D.E. Dobbs, E.G. Houston, T.G. Lucas, and M. Zafrullah, *t -linked overrings and Prüfer v -multiplication domains*, Comm. Algebra, **17** (1989), 2835-2852.
- [6] D.E. Dobbs, E.G. Houston, T.G. Lucas, and M. Zafrullah, *t -linked overrings as intersections of localizations*, Proc. AMS, **109** (1990), 637-646.
- [7] S. El Baghdadi, *On a class of Prüfer v -multiplication domains*, Comm. Algebra **30** (2002), 3723-3742.
- [8] M. Fontana, J. Huckaba, and I. Papick, *Prüfer domains*, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 203, M. Dekker, New York, 1997.
- [9] R. M. Fossum, *The divisor class group of a Krull domain*, Springer-Verlag, 1973.
- [10] S. Gabelli, *On Nagata's Theorem for the class group, II*, Lecture notes in Pure and appl. Math., vol. 206, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1999, pp. 117-142.
- [11] S. Gabelli and E.G. Houston, *Coherent-like conditions in pullbacks*, Michigan Math. J. **44** (1997), 99-123.
- [12] S. Gabelli and E.G. Houston, *Ideal theory in pullbacks*, Non-Noetherian Commutative Ring Theory, 199-227, Math. Appl., 520, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2000.
- [13] R. Gilmer, *Multiplicative ideal theory*, Dekker, New York, 1972.
- [14] S. Glaz and W. Vasconcelos, *Flat ideals, II*, Manuscripta Math. **22** (1977), 325-341.
- [15] M. Griffin, *Some results on v -multiplication rings*, Canad. J. Math. **19** (1967), 710-722.

- [16] F. Halter-Koch, *Ideal systems. An introduction to multiplicative ideal theory*, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 211, M. Dekker, New York, 1998.
- [17] W. J. Heinzer, *Integral domains in which each non-zero ideal is divisorial*, *Matematika* **15** (1968), 164-170.
- [18] J. R. Hedstrom and E. G. Houston, *Some remarks on star-operations*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **18** (1980), 37-44.
- [19] E. G. Houston, *On divisorial prime ideals in Prüfer v -multiplication domains*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **42** (1986), 55-62.
- [20] E. G. Houston and M. Zafrullah, *Integral domains in which each t -ideal is divisorial*, *Michigan Math. J.* **35** (1988), 291-300.
- [21] P. Jaffard, *Les Systèmes d'Ideaux*, Dunod, Paris, 1970.
- [22] B.G. Kang, *Prüfer v -multiplication domains and the ring $R[X]_{N_v}$* , *J. Algebra* **123** (1989), 151-170.
- [23] D.J. Kwak and Y.S. Park, *On t -flat overrings*, *Chinese J. Math.* **23** (1995), 17-24.
- [24] D. Nour el Abidine, *Groupe des classes de certain anneaux intègres et idéaux transformés*, Thèse de Doctorat, Lyon, 1992.
- [25] E. Matlis, *Reflexive domains*, *J. Algebra* **8** (1968), 1-33.
- [26] E. Matlis, *Torsion-free Modules*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago-London, 1972.
- [27] A. Mimouni, *TW-domains and Strong Mori domains*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **177** (2003), 79-93.
- [28] B. Olberding, *Globalizing Local Properties of Prüfer Domains*, *J. Algebra* **205** (1998), 480-504.
- [29] B. Olberding, *Stability, Duality, 2-Generated Ideals and a Canonical Decomposition of Modules*, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova*, **106** (2001), 261-290.
- [30] N. Popescu, *On a class of Prüfer domains*, *Rev. Roumaine Math. Pure Appl.* **29** (1984), 777-786.
- [31] J. Querré, *Sur les anneaux reflexifs*, *Can. J. Math.*, vol. XXVII, n. 6 (1975), 1222-1228.
- [32] Wang Fanggui and R.L. McCasland, *On w -modules over Strong Mori domains*, *Comm. Algebra* **25** (1997), 1285-1306.
- [33] Wang Fanggui and R.L. McCasland, *On Strong Mori domains*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **135** (1999), 155-165.
- [34] M. Zafrullah, *Putting t -invertibility to use*, *Non-Noetherian Commutative Ring Theory*, 429-458, *Math. Appl.*, 520, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2000.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES ET TECHNIQUES, P.O. BOX 523, BENI MELLAL, MOROCCO

E-mail address: baghdadi@fstbm.ac.ma

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI ROMA TRE, LARGO S. L. MURIALDO, 1, 00146 ROMA, ITALY

E-mail address: gabelli@mat.uniroma3.it