y in $(\mathfrak{q}_2 \cap \ldots \cap \mathfrak{q}_l) - \mathfrak{p}$ we have that $(x_j): y = \mathfrak{p}$. Since x_j is not in $\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{p}$ and $hd\ \mathfrak{p} \leq 1$, it follows from the previous proposition that $\mathfrak{p} = (x_j)$.

THEOREM 3. *Let R be a local domain of dimension ≤ 3 such that $hd\ R/\mathfrak{p} < \infty$ for all minimal prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$. Then R is a unique factorization domain.*

Proof: Since R is a noetherian domain, it follows from reference 4; Lemma 1, pg. 408, that it suffices to show that each minimal prime ideal is principal in order to show that R is a unique factorization domain. But by Corollary 2, it will follow that a minimal prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ is principal if we can show that $hd\ R/p \leq 2$. Since $hd\ R/\mathfrak{p} < \infty$ we have by reference 1; 3.7 and 1.3 that $hd\ R/\mathfrak{p}$ + Codim $R/\mathfrak{p}$ = Codim $R \leq \dim R$. But Codim $R/\mathfrak{p} \geq 1$ and $\dim R \leq 3$. Thus $hd\ R/\mathfrak{p} \leq 2$, which completes the proof.

Since every module has finite homological dimension over a regular local ring, we have established

COROLLARY 4. *Every regular local ring of dimension ≤ 3 is a unique factorization domain.*

THEOREM 5. *Every regular local ring is a unique factorization domain.*

* Prior to this result, Zariski proved that if every complete regular local ring of dimension 3 is a unique factorization domain, then every complete regular local ring is a unique factorization domain (unpublished). Combining this with Mori's and Krull's result that a local ring is a unique factorization domain if it's completion is a unique factorization domain, we obtain another proof of this reduction theorem.

[1] Auslander, M., and D. A. Buchsbaum, "Homological Dimension in Noetherian Rings," *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, **85**, 390–405 (1957).

[2] Auslander, M., and D. Buchsbaum, "Codimension and Multiplicity," *Ann. Math.*, **68**, 625–657 (1958).

[3] Cartan, H., and S. Eilenberg, *Homological Algebra* (Princeton, 1955).

[4] Nagata, M., "A General Theory of Algebraic Geometry over Dedekind Rings II," *Am. J. Math.*, **80**, 382–420 (1958).

---

*ON THE FALSITY OF EULER'S CONJECTURE ABOUT THE NON-EXISTENCE OF TWO ORTHOGONAL LATIN SQUARES OF ORDER $4t + 2$**

BY R. C. BOSE AND S. S. SHRIKHANDE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Communicated by A. A. Albert, March 13, 1959

1. Introduction.—The purpose of this paper is to prove a general theorem on the existence of pairwise orthogonal Latin squares (p.o.l.s.) of a given order and to give a counter example to Euler's conjecture[3] that there do not exist two p.o.l.s. of order $4t + 2$.

2. Definitions.—An arrangement of v objects (called treatments) in b sets (called blocks) will be called a pairwise balanced design of index unity and type $(v;\ k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_m)$ if each block contains either $k_1, k_2, \ldots,$ or k_m treatments which are all distinct $(k_i \leq v, k_i \neq k_j)$, and every pair of distinct treatments occurs exactly in one block of the design. If the number of blocks containing k_i treatments is b_i, then clearly

$$b = \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i, \qquad v(v-1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i k_i(k_i - 1) \tag{1}$$

LEMMA 1. *Suppose there exists a set Σ of $q - 1$ p.o.l.s. of order k, then we can construct a $q \times k(k-1)$ matrix P, whose elements are the symbols $1, 2, \ldots, k$ and such that any ordered pair $\binom{i}{j} i \neq j$, occurs as a column exactly once in any two-rowed submatrix of P.*

We can take the set Σ in the standard form in which the first row of each Latin square contains the symbols $1, 2, \ldots, k$ in that order. We then prefix to the set Σ a $k \times k$ square containing the symbol i in each position in the ith column. If we then write the elements of each square in a single row such that the symbol in the ith row and jth column occupies the nth position in the row, where $n = k(i-1) + j$ then we can display these squares (as in reference 2) in the form of an orthogonal array $A[k^2, q, k, 2]$ of q rows. By deleting the first k columns, we get the matrix P with the required properties.

Let γ be a column of k distinct treatments $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_k$ in that order, then we shall denote by $P(\gamma)$, the $q \times k(k-1)$ matrix obtained by replacing the symbol i in P, by the treatment t_i occupying the ith position in $\gamma(i = 1, 2, \ldots, k)$. Clearly every treatment occurs exactly $k - 1$ times in every row of $P(\gamma)$, and any ordered pair $\binom{t_i}{t_j}$ occurs as a column exactly once in any two-rowed submatrix of $P(\gamma)$.

THEOREM 1. *Let there exist a pairwise balanced design of index unity and type $(v; k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_m)$ and suppose there exist $q_i - 1$ p.o.l.s. of order k_i. If*

$$q = \min(q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_m)$$

then there exist $q - 2$ p.o.l.s. of order v.

Let the treatments of the design be $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_v$, and let the blocks of the design (written out as columns) which contain k_i treatments be denoted by $\gamma_{i1}, \gamma_{i2}, \ldots, \gamma_{ib_i}$. Let P_i be the matrix of order $q_i \times k_i(k_i - 1)$ defined in Lemma 1, the elements of P_i being the symbols $1, 2, \ldots, k_i$. Let $C_{ij} = P_i(\gamma_{ij})$ be the matrix obtained from P_i and γ_{ij}. Retain only q rows of C_{ij} to get C_{ij}^*. From (1) the matrix

$$C^* = [C_{11}^*, C_{12}^*, \ldots, C_{1b_1}^*, \ldots, C_{i1}^*, C_{i2}^*, \ldots, C_{ib_i}^*, \ldots, C_{m1}^*, C_{m2}^*, \ldots, C_{mb_m}^*]$$

is of order $q \times v(v-1)$, and is such that any ordered pair of treatments $\binom{t_i}{t_j}$, $i \neq j$ occurs as a column exactly once in any two-rowed submatrix of C^*. Let C_0^* be a $q \times v$ matrix whose ith column contains t_i in every position $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, v)$. Then (from reference 2), the matrix $[C_0^*, C^*]$ is an orthogonal array $A[v^2, q, v, 2]$. Using two rows to coordinatize we get a set of $q - 2$ p.o.l.s. of order v.

3. Counter Examples to Euler's Conjecture.—Consider the balanced incomplete block (BIB) design with parameters $v^* = 15$, $b^* = 35$, $r^* = 7$, $k^* = 3$, $\lambda^* = 1$. A resolvable solution is given in Table III of reference 1. To each block of the ith complete replication add a new treatment θ_i $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, 7)$ and take a new block consisting of the treatments $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4, \theta_5, \theta_6, \theta_7$. We then get a pairwise balanced design of index unity and type (22; 4, 7). Since there exist 3 p.o.l.s. of order 4, and 6 p.o.l.s. of order 7, it follows from the theorem that there exist two orthogonal Latin squares of order 22. The squares follow.

A detailed paper generalizing and improving the results of Mann[4] and Parker[5] is being prepared where, among other things, it will be shown that there are an infinity of values of t for which there exist two or more p.o.l.s. of order $4t + 2$.

(L_1)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1	1	4	7	16	6	20	22	15	19	21	12	18	10	9	17	2	8	11	14	5	13	3
2	16	2	5	1	17	7	21	10	15	20	22	13	19	11	18	4	3	9	12	8	6	14
3	22	17	3	6	2	18	1	12	11	15	21	16	14	20	19	8	5	4	10	13	9	7
4	2	16	18	4	7	3	19	21	13	12	15	22	17	8	20	1	9	6	5	11	14	10
5	20	3	17	19	5	1	4	9	22	14	13	15	16	18	21	11	2	10	7	6	12	8
6	5	21	4	18	20	6	2	19	10	16	8	14	15	17	22	9	12	3	11	1	7	13
7	3	6	22	5	19	21	7	18	20	11	17	9	8	15	16	14	10	13	4	12	2	1
8	17	20	16	14	22	11	13	8	5	2	19	3	18	21	1	12	15	7	6	10	4	9
9	14	18	21	17	8	16	12	22	9	6	3	20	4	19	2	10	13	15	1	7	11	5
10	13	8	19	22	18	9	17	20	16	10	7	4	21	5	3	6	11	14	15	2	1	12
11	18	14	9	20	16	19	10	6	21	17	11	1	5	22	4	13	7	12	8	15	3	2
12	11	19	8	10	21	17	20	16	7	22	18	12	2	6	5	3	14	1	13	9	15	4
13	21	12	20	9	11	22	18	7	17	1	16	19	13	3	6	5	4	8	2	14	10	15
14	19	22	13	21	10	12	16	4	1	18	2	17	20	14	7	15	6	5	9	3	8	11
15	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	17	18	19	20	21	22	16	15	7	1	2	3	4	5	6
16	4	1	12	2	13	10	15	3	6	9	5	8	11	7	14	16	18	20	22	17	19	21
17	15	5	2	13	3	14	11	1	4	7	10	6	9	12	8	22	17	19	21	16	18	20
18	12	15	6	3	14	4	8	13	2	5	1	11	7	10	9	21	16	18	20	22	17	19
19	9	13	15	7	4	8	5	11	14	3	6	2	12	1	10	20	22	17	19	21	16	18
20	6	10	14	15	1	5	9	2	12	8	4	7	3	13	11	19	21	16	18	20	22	17
21	10	7	11	8	15	2	6	14	3	13	9	5	1	4	12	18	20	22	17	19	21	16
22	7	11	1	12	9	15	3	5	8	4	14	10	6	2	13	17	19	21	16	18	20	22

(L_2)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1	1	16	22	2	20	5	3	17	14	13	18	11	21	19	8	4	15	12	9	6	10	7
2	4	2	17	16	3	21	6	20	18	8	14	19	12	22	9	1	5	15	13	10	7	11
3	7	5	3	18	17	4	22	16	21	19	9	8	20	13	10	12	2	6	15	14	11	1
4	16	1	6	4	19	18	5	14	17	22	20	10	9	21	11	2	13	3	7	15	8	12
5	6	17	2	7	5	20	19	22	8	18	16	21	11	10	12	13	3	14	4	1	15	9
6	20	7	18	3	1	6	21	11	16	9	19	17	22	12	13	10	14	4	8	5	2	15
7	22	21	1	19	4	2	7	13	12	17	10	20	18	16	14	15	11	8	5	9	6	3
8	15	10	12	21	9	19	18	8	22	20	6	16	7	4	17	3	1	13	11	2	14	5
9	19	15	11	13	22	10	20	5	9	16	21	7	17	1	18	6	4	2	14	12	3	8
10	21	20	15	12	14	16	11	2	6	10	17	22	1	18	19	9	7	5	3	8	13	4
11	12	22	21	15	13	8	17	19	3	7	11	18	16	2	20	5	10	1	6	4	9	14
12	18	13	16	22	15	14	9	3	20	4	1	12	19	17	21	8	6	11	2	7	5	10
13	10	19	14	17	16	15	8	18	4	21	5	2	13	20	22	11	9	7	12	3	1	6
14	9	11	20	8	18	17	15	21	19	5	22	6	3	14	16	7	12	10	1	13	4	2
15	17	18	19	20	21	22	16	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	15	14	8	9	10	11	12	13
16	2	4	8	1	11	9	14	12	10	6	13	3	5	15	7	16	20	17	21	18	22	19
17	8	3	5	9	2	12	10	15	13	11	7	14	4	6	1	20	17	21	18	22	19	16
18	11	9	4	6	10	3	13	7	15	14	12	1	8	5	2	17	21	18	22	19	16	20
19	14	12	10	5	7	11	4	6	1	15	8	13	2	9	3	21	18	22	19	16	20	17
20	5	8	13	11	6	1	12	10	7	2	15	9	14	3	4	18	22	19	16	20	17	21
21	13	6	9	14	12	7	2	4	11	1	3	15	10	8	5	22	19	16	20	17	21	18
22	3	14	7	10	8	13	1	9	5	12	2	4	15	11	6	19	16	20	17	21	18	22

* This research was supported by the United States Air Force through the Air Force Office of Scientific Research of the Air Research and Development Command, under Contract No. AF 49(638)-213. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

[1] Bose, R. C., S. S. Shrikhande, and K. N. Bhattacharya, "On the Construction of Group Divisible Incomplete Block Designs," *Ann. Math. Stat.*, **24**, 167–195 (1953).

[2] Bush, K. A., "Orthogonal Arrays of Index Unity," *Ann. Math. Stat.*, **23**, 426–434 (1952).

[3] Euler, L., "Recherches sur une Nouvelle Espéce de Quarres Magiques," *Verh. Genootsch. der Wet. Vlissingen*, **9**, 85–232 (1782).

[4] Mann, H. B., *Analysis and Design of Experiments* (Dover, 1949), p. 105.
[5] Parker, E. T., "Construction of Some Sets of Pairwise Orthogonal Latin Squares," *Am. Math. Soc. Notices*, 5, 815 (1958).

WHICH LIE GROUPS ARE HOMOTOPY-ABELIAN?

BY IOAN JAMES AND EMERY THOMAS*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY AND UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (BERKELEY)

Communicated by N. E. Steenrod, March 9, 1959

1. Let H be a subgroup of a topological group G. We describe H as *homotopy-abelian* in G if $f \simeq \bar{f}: H \times H \to G$ where $f, \bar{f}$ are the maps given by

$$f(x, y) = xy = \bar{f}(y, x) \qquad (x, y \in H).$$

This is the case, for example, when G is pathwise-connected and H is conjugate to a subgroup whose elements commute with those of H. If H is homotopy-abelian in G, then any subgroup of H is homotopy-abelian in any group which contains G as a subgroup. A homotopy-abelian group is one which is homotopy-abelian in itself. There exist homotopy-abelian groups, such as the stable classical groups,[1] which are not abelian.

Consider the nonabelian classical groups[2]

$$SO(n) \quad (n \geqq 3), \qquad U(n) \quad (n \geqq 2), \qquad Sp(n) \quad (n \geqq 1);$$

subject to the standard embeddings $(m > n)$:

$$SO(n) \subset SO(m), \qquad U(n) \subset U(m), \qquad Sp(n) \subset Sp(m).$$

Because their elements commute with those of appropriate conjugate subgroups it follows that $SO(n)$, $U(n)$, $Sp(n)$ are homotopy-abelian in $SO(2n)$, $U(2n)$, $Sp(2n)$, respectively. We shall prove

THEOREM (1.1). *$U(n)$ is not homotopy-abelian in $U(2n - 1)$.*

THEOREM (1.2). *$Sp(n)$ is not homotopy-abelian in $Sp(2n - 1)$.*

The analogous statement is not true in the case of rotation groups since, for example, $SO(4)$ is homotopy-abelian in[3] $SO(7)$. However, we shall prove

THEOREM (1.3). *If n is odd, $SO(n)$ is not homotopy-abelian in $SO(2n - 2)$.*

COROLLARY (1.4). *If n is even, $SO(n)$ is not homotopy-abelian in $SO(2n - 4)$.*

These results imply that none of the groups $SO(n)$, $U(n)$, $Sp(n)$ is homotopy-abelian. Furthermore we shall prove

THEOREM (1.5). *The classical structure classes contain no Lie group which is homotopy-abelian but not abelian.*

Although it seems probable that the only homotopy-abelian Lie groups are abelian, we have not been able to eliminate the possibility that certain of the exceptional groups are homotopy-abelian. Our method is a development of one employed by Samelson[4] to show that $Sp(1)$ cannot be homotopy-abelian. It involves consideration of the pairing in the homotopy groups of G, called the Samelson product, whose definition[5] depends on the operation of commutation in G. This pairing is related to the Whitehead product in the homotopy groups of