PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 20, No. 3, 1967

ENDOMORPHISM RINGS OF PRIMARY ABELIAN GROUPS

ROBERT W. STRINGALL

This paper is concerned with the study of certain homomorphic images of the endomorphism rings of primary abelian groups. Let $E(G)$ denote the endomorphism ring of the abelian p-group G, and define $H(G) = \{\alpha \in E(G) \mid x \in G, px = 0$ and height $x < \infty$ imply height $\alpha(x) >$ height $x\}$. Then $H(G)$ is a two sided ideal in $E(G)$ which always contains the Jacobson radical. It is known that the factor ring $E(G)/H(G)$ is naturally isomorphic to a subring R of a direct product $\Pi_{n=1}^{\infty} M_n$ with $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} M_n$ contained in R and where each M_n is the ring of all linear transformations of a Z_p space whose dimension is equal to the $n-1$ Ulm invarient of G. The main result of this paper provides a partial answer to the unsolved question of which rings R can be realized as $E(G)/H(G)$.

THEOREM. Let R be a countable subring of $\Pi_{\aleph_0} Z_p$ which contains the identity and $\sum_{\aleph_0} Z_p$. Then there exists a p-group G with a standard basic subgroup and containing no elements of infinite height such that $E(G)/H(G)$ is isomorphic to R. Moreover, G can be chosen without proper isomorphic subgroups; in this case, $H(G)$ is the Jacobson radical of $E(G)$.

1. Preliminaries.

(1.1) Throughout this paper p- represents a fixed prime number, N the natural numbers, Z the integers and Z_{p^n} the ring of integers modulo p^n. All groups under consideration will be assumed to be p-primary and abelian. With few exceptions, the notation of [3], [5], and [8] will prevail.

Let $h_G(x)$ and $E(x)$ denote, respectively, the p-height of x in G and the exponential order of x. If A is any subset of the group G, then $\{A\}$ will denote the subgroup of G generated by A. Denote the p^n layer of G by $G[p^n]$. Finally, if A is any set, let $|A|$ be the cardinal number of A.

(1.2) Let G be a p-primary group and B a basic subgroup of G. The group B can be written as $B = \sum_{n \in N} B_n$ where each B_n is a direct sum of, say $f(n)$, copies of Z_{p^n}. That is, $B_n = \sum_{f(n)} \{b_i\}$ where $E(b_i) = n$. Define $H_n = \{p^n G, B_{n+1}, B_{n+2}, \cdots\}$. It is readily verified that $G = B_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus B_n \oplus H_n$ for each $n \in N$. Thus, it is possible to define the projections π_n $(n = 1, 2, \cdots)$ of G onto H_n corresponding to the decomposition $G = B_1 \oplus B_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus B_n \oplus H_n$. Define $\rho_1 = 1 - \pi_1$ and

$\rho_n = \pi_{n-1} - \pi_n$ for $n > 1$. It follows that $\rho_n(G) = B_n$ and that ρ_n is the projection of G onto B_n.

2. Endomorphism rings. A few preliminary notions are needed before the main results can be presented. Although given in a different context, many of the results of this section are patterned after those of R. S. Pierce in his work [8].

LEMMA 2.1. *Let G be a p-group and $B = \sum_{n \in N} B_n$ a basic subgroup of G. If α is an endomorphism of $B_n[p]$, then α can be extended to an endomorphism β of G such that $j \neq n$ implies $\beta(B_j) = 0$.*

Proof. Since $G = B_1 \oplus B_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus B_m \oplus H_m$ for each $m \in N$, for each $m \in N$, it is enough to show that α can be extended to B_n. Let

$$B_n = \sum_{i=1}^{f(n)} \{b_i\}$$

where, for each i, $E(b_i) = n$. For $b_i \in B_n$, write

$$\alpha(p^{n-1}b_i) = a_1 p^{n-1} b_1 + \cdots + a_k p^{n-1} b_k$$
$$\beta(b_i) = a_1 b_1 + \cdots + a_k b_k$$

where k and the integers a_j $(0 \leqq a_j < p)$ are determined by α. Compute $\beta(b_i)$ in this way for each $b_i \in B_n$, and extend β linearly to B_n. It follows that β is the desired extension of α to B_n.

LEMMA 2.2. *If G is a p-group and B a basic subgroup of G, then any bounded homomorphism of B into G can be extended to a bounded endomorphism of G.*

Proof. By definition, G/B is divisible. Consequently,

$$G/B = p^n(G/B) = \frac{B + p^n G}{B}$$

for each positive integer n. It follows that $G = B + p^n G$ for each $n \in N$. Let $k \in N$ be such that $p^k \alpha = 0$, and write $x \in G$ as $x = b + p^k y$ where $b \in B$ and $y \in G$. It is easy to check that $x \rightarrow \alpha(b)$ defines a bounded extension of α to an endomorphism of G.

For proof of the following lemma see [8], Lemma 13.1.

LEMMA 2.3. *An endomorphism α of the p-group G is an automorphism if and only if* $\ker \alpha \cap G[p] = 0$ *and* $\alpha(G[p] \cap p^n G) = G[p] \cap p^n G$ *for each integer $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$.*

For the p-group G, let $E(G)$ denote the ring of all endomorphisms of G. If $E_p(G)$ denotes the subcollection of $E(G)$ consisting of all bounded endomorphisms of G, then it is not difficult to show that $E_p(G)$ is a two sided ideal of $E(G)$.

LEMMA 2.4. *Let*

$$H_p(G) = \{\alpha \in E_p(G) \mid x \in G[p] \text{ and } h_G(x) \in N \text{ imply } h_G(\alpha(x)) > h_G(x)\}\ ,$$
$$K_p(G) = \{\alpha \in E_p(G) \mid \alpha(G[p]) = 0\}\ , \text{ and}$$
$$L_p(G) = \{\alpha \in E_p(G) \mid \alpha(G) \subseteqq pG\}\ .$$

Then $H_p(G)$, $K_p(G)$ and $L_p(G)$ are two sided ideals of $E_p(G)$ contained in the Jacobson radical, $J(E_p(G))$, of $E_p(G)$. What is more, $K_p(G) + L_p(G) \subseteqq H_p(G)$.

Proof. It is easy to check that $H_p(G)$, $K_p(G)$ and $L_p(G)$ are two sided ideals of both $E_p(G)$ and $E(G)$. It is also easy to verify that $K_p(G) \subseteqq H_p(G)$. It remains only to show that $L_p(G) \subseteqq H_p(G) \subseteqq J(E_p(G))$. To this end, suppose $\alpha \in L_p(G)$, $x \in G[p]$ and $h_G(x) = k \in N$. Since $h_G(x) = k$, it is possible to write $x = p^k y$ for some $y \in G$. It follows that

$$\alpha(x) = \alpha(p^k y) = p^k \alpha(y) \in p^k pG = p^{k+1}G$$

Hence, $h_G(\alpha(x)) \geqq k + 1 > h(x)$ and $\alpha \in H_p(G)$. Therefore, $L_p(G)$ is contained in $H_p(G)$. To show that $H_p(G)$ is contained in $J(E_p(G))$, let $\alpha \in H_p(G)$. Since $\alpha \in E_p(G)$, there exists a positive integer k such that $p^k\alpha = 0$. Thus, if $x \in G[p]$ and $h_G(x) \geqq k$, then $\alpha(x) = 0$. Since $x \in G[p]$ implies $h_G(\alpha^k(x)) > k$, it follows that $\alpha^{k+1}(x) = 0$ for all $x \in G[p]$. If $x \in G[p]$ and $(1 - \alpha)(x) = 0$, then

$$x = \alpha(x) = \alpha^2(x) = \cdots = \alpha^{k+1}(x) = 0\ .$$

Thus, $1 - \alpha$ is one-to-one on $G[p]$. Also, if $x \in G[p]$, then

$$(1 - \alpha)(x + \alpha(x) + \cdots + \alpha^k(x)) = x\ .$$

Therefore, $(1 - \alpha)(G[p] \cap p^nG) = G[p] \cap p^nG$ for each $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Applying 2.3, it is seen that $1 - \alpha$ has an inverse. Since $H_p(G)$ is an ideal of $E(G)$, $\alpha \in J(E(G)) \cap E_p(G) = J(E_p(G))$ (see [4], pp. 9 and 10).

It becomes necessary, at least for the remainder of this section, to fix the basic subgroup B and a decomposition $B = \sum B_n$. This, naturally, determines the subgroup H_n, the cardinals $f(n)$ and the maps π_n and β_n.

LEMMA 2.5. *There are group homomorphisms ρ of $E_p(G)$ into $E_p(G)$, σ of $E_p(G)$ into $K_p(G)$ and τ of $E_p(G)$ into $L_p(G)$ such that for $\alpha \in E_p(G)$*

$$(*)(\sigma\alpha)(b_n) = (1 - \pi_{n-1})(\alpha(b_n)),\ (\tau\alpha)(b_n) = \pi_n(\alpha(b_n))$$

and $(\rho\alpha)(b_n) = \rho_n(\alpha(b_n))$ *for* $b_n \in B_n$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$. *Moreover,*

$$\rho^2 = \rho, \sigma^2 = \sigma, \tau^2 = \tau, \rho\sigma = \sigma\rho = \rho\tau = \tau\rho = \sigma\tau = \tau\sigma = 0, \rho + \sigma + \tau = 1,$$

and $\rho_n(\rho\alpha)\rho_n(b_n) = \rho\alpha(b_n)$ *for all* $b_n \in B_n$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$.

Proof. It is clear that conditions (*) determine bounded homomorphisms of B into G, which by 2.2 extend to G as bounded endomorphisms. The remainder of the proof is similar to that of 13.4 in [8] and will not be given.

(2.6) LEMMA. *The mapping*

$$\lambda: \alpha \to ((\rho\alpha) \mid B_1[p], (\rho\alpha) \mid B_2[p], \cdots)$$

is a ring homomorphism of $E_p(G)$ *onto the ring direct sum*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E(B_n[p]) .$$

The kernel of λ *is* $\{\alpha \in E_p(G) \mid \rho\alpha \in K_p(G)\}$.

Proof. It is clear that λ maps onto $\sum_{n \in N} E(B_n[p])$. In fact, if $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_n, 0, 0, \cdots) \in \sum_{n \in N} E(B_n[p])$ where $\alpha_k \in E(B_k[p])$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, n$, then by 2.1, each of the α_k have extensions β_k to G such that $j \neq k$ implies $\beta_k(B_j) = 0$. Obviously,

$$\lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i\right) = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_n, 0, 0, \cdots)$$

and $p^n \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i = 0$. Thus, λ is onto $\sum_{n \in N} E(B_n[p])$. Clearly, λ is additive. To show that λ preserves products, let $b \in B_n[p]$. Then $h(b) = n - 1$, so that for some $c \in B_n$, $b = p^{n-1}c$. Also,

$$\rho(\alpha\beta(b)) = \rho_n(\alpha\beta(b)) = \rho_n(\alpha((\sigma\beta)(b) + (\rho\beta)(b) + (\tau\beta)(b))) .$$

Now, $\sigma\beta \in K_p(G)$ and $b \in G[p]$. Thus, $\sigma\beta(b) = 0$. Also, $\tau\beta \in L_p(G)$ implies that $\tau\beta(b) = \tau\beta(p^{n-1}c) = p^{n-1}\tau\beta(c) \in p^nG$, so that

$$\rho_n\alpha(\tau\beta(b)) \in p^nG \cap B_n = p^nB_n = 0 .$$

Finally, $\rho\beta(b) = \rho_n\rho\beta(b)$. Thus,

$$\rho(\alpha\beta(b)) = \rho_n(\alpha\beta(b)) = \rho_n\alpha((\rho\beta)(b)) = (\rho\alpha)((\rho\beta)(b)) .$$

Consequently, $\lambda(\alpha\beta) = \lambda(\alpha)\lambda(\beta)$. To show that the kernel of λ is $\{\alpha \in E_p(G) \mid \rho\alpha \in K_p(G)\}$, observe that $\lambda(\alpha) = 0$ if and only if $\rho\alpha \mid B_n[p] = 0$ for all $n \in N$. This condition is equivalent to $\rho\alpha(B[p]) =$

0 which, since $\rho\alpha$ is bounded, is equivalent to $\rho\alpha(G[p]) = 0$. Therefore, $\operatorname{Ker}(\lambda) = \{\alpha \in E_p(G) \mid \rho\alpha \in K_p(G)\}$.

THEOREM 2.7. *The Jacobson radical of $E_p(G)$ is $H_p(G)$, and $K_p(G) + L_p(G) = H_p(G)$. Also, $E_p(G)/H_p(G)$ is ring isomorphic to the ring direct sum $\sum_{n\in N} M_n$ where each M_n is the ring of all linear transformations of a Z_p-space of dimension $f(n)$.*

Proof. By 2.6 there is a ring homomorphism λ of $E_p(G)$ onto a ring isomorphic to $\sum_{n\in N} M_n$. Moreover, the kernel, of λ is $\{\alpha \in E_p(G) \mid \rho\alpha \in K_p(G)\}$. The rings M_n are surely primitive. Thus, by [4], proposition 1, p. 10, the Jacobson radical of $E_p(G)$ is contained in $\bigcap_{n\in N} \operatorname{Ker}(\delta_n\lambda) = \operatorname{Ker}\lambda$ where δ_n $(n = 1, 2, \cdots)$ is, temporarily, the projection map of $\sum_{n\in N} M_n$ onto M_n. Hence by 2.4,

$$K_p(G) + L_p(G) \subseteqq H_p(G) \subseteqq J(E_p(G)) \subseteqq \operatorname{Ker}\lambda .$$

To show that the kernel of λ is contained in $K_p(G) + L_p(G)$, let $\alpha \in E_p(G)$ be such that $\rho\alpha \in K_p(G)$. By 2.5, $\rho\alpha + \sigma\alpha + \tau\alpha = \alpha$. It follows that $\alpha \in K_p(G) + L_p(G)$. Thus,

$$\operatorname{Ker}\lambda = \{\alpha \in E_p(G) \mid \rho\alpha \in K(G)\} \subseteqq K_p(G) + L_p(G) .$$

Hence,

$$\operatorname{Ker}\lambda = J(E_p(G)) = K_p(G) + L_p(G) = H_p(G) .$$

For proof of the following lemma, the reader is directed to R. S. Pierce's work [8], p. 284.

LEMMA 2.8. *Suppose R is an associative ring and S any two-sided ideal of R. Let $J(S)$ be the Jacobson radical of S and*

$$J(R, S) = \{x \in R \mid xz \in J(S) \text{ for all } z \in S\} .$$

Then the following statements are valid:

(a) *$J(R, S)$ is a two-sided ideal of R containing $J(R)$ the Jacobson radical of R;*

(b) *$J(R, S) = \{x \in R \mid wxz$ is quasi-regular for all z, w in $S\}$;*

(c) *$J(R, S) = \{x \in R \mid zx \in J(S)$ for all $z \in S\}$;*

(d) *$J(R, S) \cap S = J(S)$;*

(e) *the image of S under the natural projection of R onto $R/J(R, S)$ is an ideal which isomorphic to $S/J(S)$.*

Recall that M_n $(n = 1, 2, \cdots)$ is defined to be the ring of all linear transformations of a Z_p-space of dimension $f(n)$.

If ξ is the natural map of $E(G)$ onto $E(G)/J(E(G), E_p(G))$, then, by 2.8 (e), $\xi(E_p(G))$ is isomorphic to $E_p(G)/J(E_p(G))$. By 2.7, there is an isomorphism λ of $E_p(G)/J(E_p(G))$ onto the ring direct sum $\sum_{n\in N} M_n$. Let δ_n be the ring homomorphism of $E_p(G)$ onto M_n obtained by composing $\lambda\xi$ with the projection of $\sum_{n\in N} M_n$ onto M_n. That is, for $\alpha \in E_p(G)$

$$\lambda\xi(\alpha) = (\delta_1\alpha, \delta_2\alpha, \cdots) .$$

It is easy to see that if ρ_n $(n = 1, 2, \cdots)$ are as defined in 1.2, then

$$\delta_n(\rho_m) = 0 \quad \text{for } m \neq n \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_n(\rho_n) = 1 .$$

For $\alpha \in E(G)$, set $\mu(\alpha) = (\delta_1(\alpha\rho_1), \delta_2(\alpha\rho_2), \delta_3(\alpha\rho_3), \cdots)$.

THEOREM 2.9. *The correspondence*

$$\alpha \xrightarrow{\mu} (\delta_1(\alpha\rho_1), \delta_2(\alpha\rho_2), \delta_3(\alpha\rho_3), \cdots)$$

is a ring homomorphism of $E(G)$ onto a subring R of the ring direct product $\prod_{n\in N} M_n$ with kernel $J(E(G), E_p(G))$. Moreover, R contains both the identity of $\prod_{n\in N} M_n$ and the ring direct sum $\sum_{n\in N} M_n$.

Proof. See the proof of Theorem 14.3 in [8].

The following lemma gives an interesting characterization of $J(E(G), E_p(G))$.

LEMMA 2.10. $J(E(G), E_p(G)) = \{\alpha \in E(G) \mid x \in G[p]$ *and* $h_G(x) \in N$ *imply* $h_G(\alpha(x)) > h_G(x)\}$.

Proof. Suppose $\alpha \in E(G)$ and $h_G(\alpha(x)) > h(x)$ for all $x \in G[p]$ such that $h(x)$ is finite. Then if $\beta \in E(G)$, the product $\alpha\beta$ satisfies this same condition. That is, for elements x in $G[p]$ of finite height, $h_G(\alpha\beta(x)) > h_G(x)$. In particular, if $\beta \in E_p(G)$, then $\alpha\beta$ is bounded and satisfies the foregoing condition. Thus, for $\beta \in E_p(G)$, $\alpha\beta \in H_p(G)$ which by 2.7 is $J(E_p(G))$. Consequently, $\alpha \in J(E(G), E_p(G))$ by definition. Conversely, suppose $\alpha \in J(E(G), E_p(G))$, $x \in G[p]$ and $h_G(x) < \infty$. The existence of a bounded endomorphism β such that $\beta(x) = x$ is easy to verify (see, for example, [3], Theorem 24.7). By definition, $\alpha\beta \in J(E_p(G))$. Consequently, $h_G(\alpha(x)) = h_G(\alpha\beta(x)) > h_G(x)$.

The following two results will be needed later.

LEMMA 2.11. *Let α be any automorphism of the p-group G without* *elements of infinite height. If* $\beta \in J(E(G), E_p(G))$, *then* $\alpha - \beta$ *is one-to-one.*

Proof. Suppose $0 \neq x \in G[p]$ and $(\alpha - \beta)(x) = 0$. Then by 2.10,

$$h_G(x) < h_G(\beta(x)) = h_G(\alpha(x)) \leqq h_G(\alpha^{-1}(\alpha(x))) = h_G(x) ,$$

a contradiction. Thus, $\ker(\alpha - \beta) \cap G[p] = 0$. This is enough to ensure that $\alpha - \beta$ is one-to-one.

THEOREM 2.12. *If G is without elements of infinite height and has no proper isomorphic subgroups, then* $J(E(G), E_p(G)) = J(E(G))$.

Proof. If $\alpha \in J(E(G), E_p(G))$, then $1 - \alpha$ is an isomorphism by Lemma 2.11. Since G has no proper isomorphic subgroups, $1 - \alpha$ is an automorphism. Therefore, α is quasi-regular for each $\alpha \in J(E(G), E_p(G))$ (see [4], p. 7). Since $J(E(G), E_p(G))$ is a right ideal, it follows that $J(E(G), E_p(G)) \subseteqq J(E(G))$ ([4], Theorem 1, p. 9). Finally, $J(E(G)) \subseteqq J(E(G), E_p(G))$ by 2.8 (a).

3. **Realizations of $E(G)$.** The primary concern of this paper is with the endomorphism rings of p-primary groups without elements of infinite height. The study of such rings can be greatly eased with the employment of some fairly simple notions.

Let G be a p-group without elements of infinite height and $B = \sum_{n \in N} B_n$ a basic subgroup of G. Let $\bar{B}$ denote the closure (or torsion completion) of B. The group $\bar{B}$ can be defined as the torsion subgroup of the direct product $\prod_{n \in N} B_n$. That is,

$$\bar{B} = \{x \in \prod_{n \in N} B_n \mid p^k x = 0 \text{ for some } k \in N\} .$$

Naturally, B is identified with the subgroup of $\bar{B}$ consisting of those elements which have at most a finite number of nonzero components. Thus, B is a pure subgroup of $\bar{B}$. It is well known that there is a B-isomorphism of G onto a pure subgroup of $\bar{B}$ (see [3], § 33). Thus, in a sense, the study of p-groups without elements of infinite height can be reduced to the study of pure subgroups of suitable closed groups $\bar{B}$.

It has already been asserted that G should be a p-group with fixed basic subgroup B. In order that the above remarks will apply to G, require, in addition, that G be without elements of infinite height. That is, both B and $\bar{B}$ are fixed and G is a pure subgroup of $\bar{B}$ which contains B.

If α, β are endomorphisms of G which agree on B, then B is contained in the kernel of the difference $\gamma = \alpha - \beta$. Thus, $\gamma(G)$ is a homomorphic image of the divisible group G/B, and, for this reason, is divisible. Since G is reduced and since $\gamma(G) \subseteqq G$, it follows that $\gamma(G) = (\alpha - \beta)(G) = 0$. Thus, $\alpha = \beta$. Consequently, if G is a reduced p-group, then every endomorphism of G is completely determined by its effect on the elements of any basic subgroup.

By 2.2 and the above remarks, it follows that each bounded endomorphism of B has a unique extension to an endomorphism of G. Because of this, it may be assumed that $E(G)$, the endomorphism ring of G, contains an embedded copy, denoted by $E_p(B)$, of the ring of all bounded endomorphisms of B. Thus, identify $E_p(B)$ with

$$\{\alpha \in E_p(G) \mid \alpha(B) \subseteqq B\} .$$

Suppose that $B \subseteqq G \subseteqq \bar{B}$ where G is a pure subgroup of $\bar{B}$. It has been shown that every endomorphism of G has a unique extension to $\bar{B}$ (see, for example, [6], pp. 84–85). Thus, it is possible to adopt the very useful convention of identifying the endomorphism ring of G with the subring of the endomorphism ring of $\bar{B}$ consisting of endomorphisms of $\bar{B}$ which map G into itself. That is,

$$E(G) = \{\alpha \in E(\bar{B}) \mid \alpha(G) \subseteqq G\} .$$

With this identification, $E_p(G)$ (the torsion subring of $E(G)$) becomes a subring of $E_p(\bar{B})$; namely,

$$E_p(G) = \{\alpha \in E_p(\bar{B}) \mid \alpha(G) \subseteqq G\} .$$

It is reasonable to expect the above identifications to carry over in some way to the images $\mu(E(G))$ where μ is the map defined in Theorem 2.9. The following results show that this is indeed the case.

Let ξ be the map of Theorem 2.9 developed for $E(\bar{B})$. Then by using the definition of ξ and the above convention, it is not hard to show, for pure subgroups G of $\bar{B}$ containing B, that $\xi \mid E(G)$ and the map μ, defined in 2.9 for $E(G)$, are identical. Because of this, it is possible to confine the investigation of all such maps μ to the map ξ and its restrictions to subrings of $E(\bar{B})$.

By way of summation, the following is given.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let G be pure subgroup of $\bar{B}$ which contains B. Let ξ be the map of Theorem 2.9 defined for the p-group $\bar{B}$. The restriction of ξ to $E(G)$ and the map of 2.9 developed for G agree. Moreover, $J(E(G), E_p(G)) = J(E(\bar{B}), E_p(\bar{B})) \cap E(G)$.*

LEMMA 3.2. *If $G = B$ or $G = \bar{B}$, then $\xi(E(G)) = \prod M_n$.*

Proof. Suppose $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots)$ is an arbitrary element of $\prod M_n$.

Each α_i ($i = 1, 2, \cdots$) may be considered as an endomorphism of $B_i[p]$. By 2.1, each α_i has an extension to an endomorphism β_i of B such that $\beta_i(B_j) = 0$ if $i \neq j$. Let α be the endomorphism of B determined by the conditions:

$$\alpha(b_i) = \beta_i(b_i) \text{ for } b_i \in B_i \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots .$$

By Lemma 2.2, α can be extended to $\bar{B}$. In either case, $\xi(\alpha) = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots)$.

Up to this point it has been shown that $\prod M_n$ can be realized as a homomorphic image of $E(B)$ and $E(\bar{B})$. Using an example of R. S. Pierce, it can be shown that not every pure subgroup G of $\bar{B}$ which contains B can be so classified.

First, consider the ring of p-adic integers, R_p (see [3], § 6). This ring can be thought of as the collection of all infinite sums of the form

$$r = r_0 + r_1 p + r_2 p^2 + \cdots$$

where $0 \leqq r_i < p$. Suppose $x \in G$, and $r \in R_p$ where

$$r = r_0 + r_1 p + r_2 p^2 + \cdots$$

and $0 \leqq r_i < p$. It is possible to assign a meaning to the product rx, namely,

$$rx = r_0 x + r_1 px + r_2 p^2 x + \cdots + r_n p^n x$$

where n is any integer greater than $E(x)$. Clearly, this definition is independent of the integer n. It is easy to check that with this definition, G becomes an R_p-module. Consequently, every element r of R_p induces an endomorphism of G, $x \rightarrow rx$, which will also be labeled r. What is more important, it is not difficult to show that this correspondence, between the elements of R_p and the elements of $E(G)$, is a ring isomorphism. With this in mind, it is possible to assume that R_p is a subring of the ring of all endomorphisms of G.

Definition 3.3. An endomorphism α of the p-group G is said to be a *small endomorphism* of G provided the following condition is satisfied:

(*) for all $k \geqq 0$ there exists an integer n such that $0(x) \leqq k$ and $h_G(x) \geqq n$ imply $\alpha(x) = 0$.

Remark. The concept of small endomorphism is due to R. S. Pierce and can be found in his paper [8]. The equivalence of the above definition and that appearing in [8] can be shown using 3.1 and 2.10 in the above mentioned paper.

It is an easy consequence of the above definition that the collection of all small endomorphisms forms a subring $E_s(G)$ of the ring $E(G)$. Moreover, $E_s(G)$ is an ideal of $E(G)$.

R. S. Pierce has shown that there exists a p-group H without elements of infinite height such that $E(H) = E_s(H) + R_p$ ([8], p. 297). The following results demonstrate a few of the many curious properties of such groups.

LEMMA 3.4. *If $E(H) = E_s(H) + R_p$, then $E_s(H)$ and R_p are disjoint.*

Proof. Let $r \in R_p$ and $r = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} r_i p^i$ where $0 \leqq r_i < p$. By definition, r is a small endomorphism if and only if for all $k \geqq 0$ there exists an integer n such that $x \in H$, $E(x) \leqq k$ and $h_H(x) \geqq n$ collectively imply $r(x) = 0$. Let h be the least index such that $r_h \neq 0$. Let $k > h$, and for $l > k$ let $x_l = p^{l-k} b_l$ where $b_l \in B_l$, $E(b_l) = l$ and $h_H(b_l) = 0$. (Recall that $B = \sum_{n \in N} B_n$ is a basic subgroup of H). Then $x_l \in B \subseteqq H$, $E(x_l) = k$, $r(x_l) \neq 0$, and $h_H(x_l)$ increases indefinitely as l increases. Thus r is not a small endomorphism, and $E_s(H) \cap R_p = 0$.

LEMMA 3.5. *$\xi(E_s(H)) = \sum M_n$ and $\xi(R_p) = \{1\}$ where 1 is the identity of $\sum^c M_n$.*

Proof. It is easy to see from the definitions of ξ and $E_s(H)$ that $\xi(E_s(H)) \subseteqq \sum M_n$. Since $E_p(B) \subseteqq E_p(H) \subseteqq E_s(H)$ and $\xi(E_p(B)) = \sum M_n$, it follows that $\xi(E_s(H)) = \sum M_n$. Suppose $r = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} r_i p^i \in R_p$. Write $r = r_0 + ps$ where $s = \sum_{i \in N} r_i p^{i-1}$. Clearly,

$$\xi(r) = \xi(r_0 + ps) = \xi(r_0) + \xi(ps) = \xi(r_0) \in \{1\}.$$

LEMMA 3.6.

$$\operatorname{Ker}(\xi \mid E(H)) = J(E_s(H)) + J(R_p) = J(E(H), E_p(H)) .$$

Proof. By 3.1, $\operatorname{Ker}(\xi \mid E(H)) = J(E(H), E_p(H))$. To show that $\operatorname{Ker}(\xi \mid E(H)) = J(E_s(H)) + J(R_p)$, let $\alpha + r$ be an arbitrary element in $E(H)$ where $\alpha \in E_s(H)$ and $r \in R_p$. Suppose, in addition, that $\xi(\alpha + r) = 0$. Since $\sum M_n$ and $\{1\}$ are obviously independent and since $\xi(\alpha + r) = \xi(\alpha) + \xi(r) \in \sum M_n + \{1\}$ by the foregoing lemma, $\xi(\alpha + r) = 0$ if and only if both $\xi(\alpha) = 0$ and $\xi(r) = 0$. Surely, $\xi(r) = 0$ if and only if $r \in pR_p$. Since pR_p is the unique maximal ideal in R_p, $J(R_p) = pR_p$ (see [4], p. 9). Thus, the conditions $\xi(r) = 0$ and $r \in J(R_p)$ are equivalent. Moreover, $\xi(\alpha) = 0$ and $\alpha \in E_s(H)$ if and only if $\alpha \in J(E(H), E_p(H)) \cap E_s(H)$. By Lemmas 2.9 and 2.8 (d) of this paper and 14.4 of [8], $\xi(\alpha) = 0$ if and only if

$$\alpha \in J(E(H), E_s(H)) \cap E_s(H) = J(E_s(H)).$$

Thus,

$$\operatorname{Ker}(\xi \mid E(H)) = J(E_s(H)) + J(R_p) = J(E(H), E_p(H)) .$$

LEMMA 3.7. *If* $K(G) = \{\alpha \in E(G) \mid \alpha(G[p]) = 0\}$, *then* $K(G)$ *is a two sided ideal of* $E(G)$ *which is contained in the Jacobson radical of* $E(G)$.

Proof. It is obvious that $K(G)$ is an ideal of $E(G)$. Moreover, if $\alpha \in K(G)$, then $\ker(1-\alpha) \cap G[p] = 0$ and $(1-\alpha)(G[p] \cap p^nG) = G[p] \cap p^nG$. Thus, $1-\alpha$ is an automorphism by 2.3. It follows that $K(G)$ is a quasi regular ideal in $E(G)$; and is, therefore, contained in the Jacobson radical of $E(G)$ (see [4], p. 9, Theorem 1).

THEOREM 3.8. $E(H)/J(E(H)) = E(H)/J(E(H), E_p(H))$ *is ring isomorphic to* $\sum M_n + \{1\}$.

Proof. By 3.5 and 3.6, ξ maps $E(H)$ onto $\sum M_n + \{1\}$ with kernel $J(E(H), E_p(H)) = J(E_s(H)) + J(R_p)$. Also, by 2.8 (a), $J(E(H)) \subseteqq J(E_s(H)) + J(R_p)$. Thus, it remains only to show that $J(R_p)$ and $J(E_s(H))$ are contained in $J(E(H))$. Since $E_s(H)$ is a two sided ideal of $E(H)$, $J(E_s(H)) = J(E(H)) \cap E_s(H)$ (see [4], p. 10). Thus, $J(E_s(H)) \subseteqq J(E(H))$. Since $J(R_p) = pR_p$ (pR_p is the unique maximal ideal of R_p) and since $J(E(H))$ is an ideal, Lemma 3.7 is enough to insure that $J(R_p) \subseteqq J(E(H))$.

4. An extension property. In § 3, it was shown, using suitable pure subgroups of $\bar{B}$, that there are at least two distinct rings of the form $E(G)/J(E(G), E_p(G))$, namely, $\prod M_n$ and $\sum M_n + \{1\}$. It is the objective of the remainder of this paper to investigate some of the possible images $\xi(E(G))$ for $B \subseteqq G \subseteqq \bar{B}$.

For the duration, assume that $B = \sum_{i \in N} B_i$ where each $B_i = \{b_i\}$ is of rank one and of order p^i. In this case each M_i automatically becomes fixed as a single copy of Z_p. That is, each M_i will be the ring of all endomorphisms of a cyclic group, $\{c_i\}$, of order p.

For a subset A of N, let $t(A)$ be the element of $\prod_{n \in N} M_n$ defined by the conditions

$$t(A)(c_j) = \begin{cases} c_j & \text{if } j \in A \\ 0 & \text{if } j \notin A . \end{cases}$$

It is obvious that if r is any element of $\prod_{n \in N} M_n$ and if for each $i = 0, 1, \cdots, p-1$ $A_i(r) = \{j \in N \mid r(c_j) = ic_j\}$, then r can be written in the form $r = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} it(A_i(r))$.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let R be any subring of $\prod_{n\in N} M_n$ with identity e. (The identity of $\prod_{n\in N} M_n$ and e are not assumed to be identical.) Then $e = t(M)$ for some subset M of N. Moreover, the collection $K(R) = \{A \subseteq N \mid t(A) \in R\}$ forms a Boolean algebra of subsets of M.*

Proof. Using Fermat's theorem

$$e = e^{p-1} = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} it(A_i(e))\right)^{p-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{p=1} i^{p-1}t(A_i(e)) = \sum_{i=1}^{p=1} t(A_i(e)) = t(M)$$

where $M = \{i \in N \mid e(c_i) \neq 0\}$. If $t(A), t(B)$ are members of R, then $t(A \cap B) = t(A)t(B) \in R$ and $t(A \cap B) = t(A) + t(B) - t(A \cap B) \in R$. Since $t(A) = e \cdot t(A) = t(M) \cdot t(A) = t(M \cap A)$, it follows that $A \subseteq M$ for all $A \in K(R)$. Thus, $t(M - A) = t(M) - t(A) = e - t(A) \in R$ for all $A \in K(R)$. This shows that $K(R)$ does indeed form a subalgebra of $P(M) = \{A \mid A \subseteq M\}$.

LEMMA 4.2. *Let R be a subring of $\prod_{n\in N} M_n$ with identity $e = t(M)$. If $r \in R$, then $t(A_k(r)) \in R$ for each $k = 0, 1, \cdots, p-1$.*

Proof.

$$r = 0 \cdot t(A_0(r)) + t(A_1(r)) + 2t(A_2(r)) + \cdots + (p-1)t(A_{p-1}(r)) .$$

Consider the product

$$s = \prod_{i \neq k, i=0,1,\cdots,p-1} (ie - r) .$$

It follows that $s \in R$. Clearly, if $i \notin A_k(r)$, then $s(c_j) = 0$ since $j \in A_i(r)$ for some i and

$$(ie - r)(c_j) = ic_j - r(c_j) = ic_j - ic_j = 0 .$$

Also, if $j \in A_k(r)$, then

$$s(c_j) = (0-k)(1-k)(2-k) \cdots ((k-1)-k)((k+1)-k) \cdots ((p-1)-k)(c_j) = (p-1)!\, c_j .$$

By Wilson's theorem, $(p-1)! \equiv -1$ (modulo p); consequently, $t(A_k(r)) = -s \in R$.

Suppose R is a subring of $\prod M_n$ which contains $\sum M_n + \{1\}$. For each $A \in K(R)$, let $\rho(A) = \sum_{i\in A} \rho_i$. Define $\Gamma(R)$ to be the subgroup of $E(\bar{B})$ generated by the collection $\{\rho(A) \mid A \in K(R)\}$. Using Lemma 4.1 and 4.2 some elementary properties of $\Gamma(R)$ can be stated.

LEMMA 4.3. *If $\alpha \in \Gamma(R)$, then there exists an integer $n \geqq 0$, integers $a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n$ and disjoint elements $A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_n$ in $K(R)$ such that*

$$\alpha = a_1\rho(A_1) + a_2\rho(A_2) + \cdots + a_n\rho(A_n) .$$

Moreover, the group $\Gamma(R)$ is a subring of $E(\bar{B})$.

Proof. For the first statement, induction can be used. For the induction step, it is enough to show that if

$$\alpha = a_1\rho(A_1) + a_2\rho(A_2) + \cdots + a_{n-1}\rho(A_{n-1}) + a_n\rho(A_n)$$

where $A_1, \cdots, A_{n-1}$ are disjoint, then the result holds. Using 4.1, $A_1, \cdots, A_n \in K(R)$ imply that

$$A_1 \cap A_n, \cdots, A_{n-1} \cap A_n; A_1 - A_n, \cdots, A_{n-1} - A_n;$$

and $A_n - \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} A_i$ are members of $K(R)$. Moreover, these sets are disjoint. Thus, if α is written

$$\alpha = a_1\rho(A_1 - A_n) + \cdots + a_{n-1}\rho(A_{n-1} - A_n) + (a_1 + a_n)\rho(A_1 \cap A_n) + \cdots + (a_{n-1} + a_n)\rho(A_{n-1} - A_n) + a_n\rho\left(A_n - \bigcup_{i-1}^{n-1} A_i\right) ,$$

then it is easily checked that this is the desired decomposition. To show that $\Gamma(R)$ and the subring of $E(\bar{B})$ generated by $\Gamma(R)$ are identical, it is enough to show that $\Gamma(R)$ is closed under composition. It suffices to note that if $A_1, A_2 \in K(R)$, then $\rho(A_1)\rho(A_2) = \rho(A_1 \cap A_2) \in \Gamma(R)$. This is obvious by Lemma 4.1 and the definition of $\Gamma(R)$.

LEMMA 4.4. $R = \xi(\Gamma(R))$.

Proof. If $r \in R$, then $r = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} it(A_i(r))$ where $A_i(r) \in K(R)$ (see 4.2). Let $\alpha = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} i\rho(A_i(r))$. Then $\alpha \in \Gamma(R)$ and $\xi(\alpha) = r$. Thus, $R \subseteqq \xi(\Gamma(R))$. On the other hand, suppose

$$\alpha = a_1\rho(A_1) + \cdots + a_n\rho(A_n) \in \Gamma(R) ,$$

where $a_1, \cdots, a_n \in Z$ and $A_1, \cdots, A_n \in K(R)$. Applying ξ,

$$\xi(\alpha) = a_1\xi\rho(A_1) + \cdots + a_n\xi\rho(A_1) + \cdots + a_n\xi(\rho(A_n)) = a_1t(A_1) + \cdots + a_nt(A_n) \in R$$

(see the definition of $K(R)$ in Lemma 4.1).

The following lemma is needed before the main result of this section can be given.

LEMMA 4.5. *Let $y = h\sum_{j \geqq k} a_j p^{j-k} b_j$ where $h \in Z$, $k \in N$ and each $a_j (j \geqq k)$ is an integer such that $0 \leqq a_j < p$. If $A \subseteqq N$ and $i \in N$, then $p^{i-1}y \neq 0$ and $\rho(A)(p^{i-1}y) \in B$ imply that $\rho(A)(y) \in B$.*

Proof. Suppose $\rho(A)(y) \notin B$. Then if $A_0 = \{i \in A \mid a_i \neq 0\}$, A_0 is infinite. Since $\rho(A)(p^{i-1}y) \in B$, there is some $n \in A_0$ such that $\rho_n\rho(A)(p^{i-1}y) = 0$. Thus,

$$0 = \rho_n\rho(A)(p^{i-1}y) = \rho_n(p^{i-1}y) = p^{i-1}ha_np^{n-k}b_n = ha_np^{n+i-k-1}b_n ,$$

so that p^{k+1-i} divides h. Since $p^{i-1}y \neq 0$, this cannot be the case.

THEOREM 4.6. *Let G be a pure subgroup of $\bar{B}$ such that $B \subseteqq G$ and $\gamma(G) \subseteqq G$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma(R)$. Suppose $x \in \bar{B}[p]$ is such that $\Gamma(R)(x) \cap G[p] \subseteqq B[p]$. Then there is a pure subgroup H of $\bar{B}$ such that*

(i) $B \subseteqq G \subseteqq H$

(ii) $H[p] = G[p] + \Gamma(R)(x)$

(iii) *$\gamma(H) \subseteqq H$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma(R)$.*

Proof. Write $x = \sum_{i \geqq k_0} a_ip^{i-1}b_i$ where $k_0 > 0$, $0 \leqq a_i < p$ for $i \geqq k_0$ and $a_{k_0} \neq 0$. Let K be the subgroup of $\bar{B}$ generated by B and the collection consisting of all sums of the form $\sum_{i \geqq k} a_ip^{i-k}b_i$ where $k \geqq k_0$. Consider the group $\bar{K}$ generated by all elements of the form $\gamma(z)$ for $z \in K$ and $\gamma(R)$. It is claimed that the group $H = \bar{K} + G$ has all the desired properties. First, note that K is exactly the subset of $\bar{B}$ consisting of all elements which can be written as $b + h\sum_{j \geqq k} a_jp^{j-k}b_j$ for some $b \in B, h \in Z$ and $k \in N$ (the integers a_j for $j \geqq k$ are determined by the element x). Also, if $y = b + h\sum_{j \geqq k} a_jp^{j-k}b_j \in K$, then y may be written as $y = b' + p^nh\sum_{j \geqq k+n} a_jp^{j-(k+n)}b_j$, where $b' = b + h\sum_{j=k}^{k+n-1} a_jp^{j-k}b_j \in B$ and $\sum_{j \geqq k+n} a_jp^{j-(k+n)}b_j \in K$. Thus, K/B is divisible. Suppose $n \in N, \gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_k \in \Gamma(R)$ and $x_1, \cdots, x_k \in K$. Using the divisibility of K/B, choose $y_1, \cdots, y_k \in K$ such that $x_i - p^ny_i \in B$ for each $i = 1, \cdots, k$. Since $\gamma \in \Gamma(R)$ implies $\gamma(B) \subseteqq B$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_1(x_1) &+ \cdots + \gamma_k(x_k) - p^n(\gamma_1(y_1) + \cdots + \gamma_k(y_k)) \\ &= \gamma_1(x_1) - \gamma_1(p^ny_1) + \cdots + \gamma_k(x_k) - \gamma_k(p^ny_k) \\ &= \gamma_1(x_1 - p^ny_1) + \cdots + \gamma_k(x_k - p^ny_k) \in B .\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\bar{K}/B$ is divisible. (Note that $B \subseteqq \bar{K}$ since $1 \in \Gamma(R)$ and $B \subseteqq K$.) Now, both $\bar{K}/B$ and G/B are divisible. Consequently, $H = \bar{K} + G$ is a pure subgroup of $\bar{B}$ since $(\bar{K} + G)/B = (\bar{K}/B) + (G/B)$ is a sum of divisible groups and hence divisible. Since, $\alpha, B \in \Gamma(R)$ imply that $\alpha\beta \in \Gamma(R)$ (see 4.3), it follows that $\gamma(\bar{K}) \subseteqq \bar{K}$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma(R)$. Thus, $\gamma(H) \subseteqq H$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma(R)$. It remains only to show that $H[p] = G[p] + \Gamma(R)(x)$. First, suppose that

$$y = h\sum_{j \geqq k} a_jp^{i-k}b_j \in K \quad \text{and} \quad A \in K(R)$$

Then $\rho(A)(y) \in G$ if and only if $\rho(A)(y) \in B$. To show that this assertion is correct, suppose that $\rho(A)(y)$ is a member of G. Then, if $i = E(y)$, $p^{i-1}y = h'x - b'$ for suitable $h' \in Z$ and $b' \in B$. Thus, since $\Gamma(R)(x) \cap G \subseteqq B$ and $B \subseteqq G$, it follows that $\rho(A)(p^{i-1}y + b') = \rho(A)(h'x) \in B$ and that $\rho(A)(p^{i-1}y) \in B$. But, $\rho(A)(p^{i-1}y) \in B$, $p^{i-1}y \neq 0$ and $y = h \sum_{j \geqq k} a_j p^{j-k} b_j$ imply, via 4.5 and the restriction on the $a_i (i \geqq k)$, that $\rho(A)(y) \in B$. The converse is trivial. Let

$$x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n \in K, z \in G \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \cdots, \gamma_n \in \Gamma .$$

Suppose

$$p(\gamma_1(x_1) + \gamma_2(x_2) + \cdots + \gamma_n(x_n) + z) = 0 .$$

For each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$, let $x_i = d_i + h_i \sum_{j \geqq k_i} a_j p^{j-k_i} b_j$ where $d_i \in B$, $h_i \in Z$ and $k_i \in N$. Let k' be any positive integer greater than each of the integers $k_1, k_2, \cdots, k_n$. It is easily checked that there exist integers $m_1, m_2, \cdots, m_n$ and elements $d'_1, d'_2, \cdots, d'_n$ of B such that for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$

$$x_i = d'_i + m_i \sum_{j \geqq k'} a_j p^{j-k'} b_j .$$

Thus, if $y = \sum_{j \geqq k'} a_j p^{j-k'} b_j$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1(x_1) + \cdots + \gamma_n(x_n) &= \gamma_1(d'_1 + m_1 y) + \cdots + \gamma_n(d'_n + m_n y) \\ &= \gamma_1(d'_1) + \cdots + \gamma_n(d'_n) + (m_1\gamma_1 + \cdots + m_n\gamma_n)(y) \\ &= b + \gamma(y) \end{aligned}$$

where $b \in B$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Since $\gamma \in \Gamma$, it is possible to write $\gamma = e_1\rho(A_1) + \cdots + e_m\rho(A_m)$ where $A_1, \cdots, A_m$ are disjoint members of $K(R)$ and where $e_1, \cdots, e_m \in Z$ (see 4.3). Now,

$$p(\gamma_1(x_1) + \gamma_2(x_2) + \cdots + \gamma_n(x_n) + z) = 0$$

implies $p(b + \gamma(y) + z) = 0$; and, therefore, $p\gamma(y) \in G + B = G$. Suppose that $e_i\rho(A_i)(y) \notin B$ for some $i = 1, \cdots, m$. Then since $b \in G$, $p\gamma(y) \in G$ and $\rho(A_i)(G) \subseteqq G$, it follows that

$$\rho(A_i)(p\gamma(y)) = pe_i\rho(A_i)(y) = \rho(A_i)(pe_i y) \in G .$$

Thus, as was noted, $\rho(A_i)(pe_i y) \in B$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(A_i)(pe_i y) &= \rho(A_i)\Big(pe_i \sum_{j \geqq k'} a_j p^{j-k'} b_j\Big) \\ &= pe_i \sum_{\substack{j \geqq k' \\ j \in A_i}} a_j p^{j-k'} b_j \in B . \end{aligned}$$

Since, by assumption, $e_i\rho(A_i)(y) \notin B$, it follows that $\rho(A_i)(y) \notin B$. Thus, $p^{k'-1}$ divides e_i. Therefore, $e_i y = e'_i x - b'$ for suitable $e'_i \in Z$ and $b' \in B$.

Consequently, $e_i\rho(A_i)(y) = \rho(A_i)(e_i y) \in \Gamma(R)(x) + B$. It follows that $\gamma_1(x_1) + \cdots + \gamma_n(x_n) \in \Gamma(R)(x) + B$ and that

$$\gamma_1(x_1) + \cdots + \gamma_n(x_n) + z \in \Gamma(R)(x) + G .$$

Thus, $\gamma_1(x_1) + \cdots + \gamma_n(x_n) + z = y + w$ where $y \in \Gamma(R)(x)$ and $w \in G$. Also,

$$0 = p(\gamma_1(x_1) + \cdots + \gamma_n(x_n) + z) = p(y + w) = pw$$

and $w \in G[p]$. This shows that $H[p] \subseteqq G[p] + \Gamma(R)(x)$. The opposite inclusion is obvious.

5. The image.

This section is devoted to the construction of a class of pure subgroups of $\bar{B}$ having suitably restricted endomorphism rings. The methods used here are similar to those employed by P. Crawley in [2] and R. S. Pierce in [7].

DEFINITION 5.1. (*R. S. Pierce*) A family $\mathscr{F}$ of subsets of a set F is called *weakly independent* if whenever $A_0, A_1, \cdots, A_n$ are distinct elements of $\mathscr{F}$, then A_0 is not contained in the union of the remaining sets $A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_n$.

THEOREM 5.2. (*R. S. Pierce*) *Let F be a set of infinite cardinality φ. If ψ is a cardinal number such that $0 < \psi \leqq \varphi$, then there is a family $\mathscr{F}$ of subsets of F such that*

(a) *$\mathscr{F}$ is weakly independent,*

(b) *$|A| = \psi$ for all $A \in \mathscr{F}$,*

(c) *$|\mathscr{F}| = \varphi^{\psi}$.*

Proof. (See [8], p. 261.)

At this point it is convenient to set $\Theta = \{\alpha \mid \bar{B}[p] \mid \alpha \in E(\bar{B})\}$. It is clear that Θ is a ring with identity. For the moment, only the additive group structure of Θ will be considered.

LEMMA 5.3. *Let $\Gamma = \{\alpha_0 = 0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots\}$ be any countable subgroup of Θ satisfying the following condition:*

(*) *for all nonzero $\alpha \in \Gamma$, $\alpha(c_j) \neq 0$ for an infinite number of indices $j \in N$.*

There is a collection $T(\Gamma)$ of element in $\bar{B}[p]$ such that

(i) $|T(\Gamma)| = 2^{\aleph_0}$,

(ii) *$\sum_{x \in T(\Gamma)} \Gamma(x)$ is direct ($\Gamma(x) = \{\alpha(x) \mid \alpha \in \Gamma\}$).*

(iii) *$\alpha_i(x) \neq \alpha_j(x)$ for all $x \in T(\Gamma)$ and for all $i \neq j$,*

(iv) *$\alpha_i(x) = 0$ for some $x \in T(\Gamma)$ implies $\alpha_i = 0$.*

Proof. Let $K = N \times N$. Well order K in the following way: $(i, j) < (k, h)$ if $i + j < k + h$ or if $i + j = k + h$ and $i < k$. Now, each element of Γ satisfies (*). Thus, since the set

$$\{(i, j) \in K \mid (i, j) < (k, h)\}$$

is finite for all elements $(k, h) \in K$, it is possible to define, inductively, an order preserving one-to-one map f of K into N such that $h_{\bar{B}}(\alpha_i(c_{f(i,j)}))$ is finite (i.e., $\alpha_i(c_{f(i,j)}) \neq 0$) and is greater than the height or every nonzero element in the finite subgroup of $\bar{B}[p]$ generated by the collection $\{\alpha_k(c_{f(m,n)}) \mid k \leqq i \text{ and } (m, n) < (i, j)\}$. Let $\mathscr{F}$ be any weakly independent collection of subsets of N such that $|\mathscr{F}| = 2^{\aleph_0}$. If $S \in \mathscr{F}$, let $x(S) \in \bar{B}[p]$ be defined by the expression:

$$x(S) = \sum_{j \in S} c_{f(i,j)} .$$

Let $T(\Gamma) = \{x(S) \mid S \in \mathscr{F}\}$. Suppose $S_1, S_2, \cdots, S_{n_0} \in \mathscr{F}$ are distinct, $x_i = x(S_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n_0$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \alpha_{k_i}(x_i) = 0$$

for positive integers $k_1, k_2, \cdots, k_{n_0}$. Since $\mathscr{F}$ is weakly independent, there exists for each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n_0$ an integer

$$m_i \in S_i - \bigcup_{\substack{j \neq i \\ j \leqq n_0}} S_j .$$

Let k_i be the largest integer in the collection $\{k_1, \cdots, k_{n_0}\}$. Let $h_i = h_{\bar{B}}(\alpha_{k_i}(c_{f(k_i,m_i)})) + 1$. It follows that

$$(1) \qquad (1 - \pi_{h_i})\alpha_{k_i}(c_{f(k_i,m_i)}) \neq 0$$

and

$$(2) \qquad \begin{aligned} &(1 - \pi_{h_i})\alpha_{k_i}(c_{f(k_i,m_i)}) + (1 - \pi_{h_i})\alpha_{k_i}(x - c_{f(k_i,m_i)}) \\ &+ (1 - \pi_{h_i}) \sum_{\substack{j \neq i \\ j=1,2,\cdots,n_0}} \alpha_{k_j}(x_j) = 0 . \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 - \pi_{h_i})\alpha_{k_i}(x - c_{f(k_i,m_i)}) + (1 - \pi_{h_i}) \sum_{\substack{j \neq i \\ j=1,2,\cdots,n_0}} \alpha_{k_j}(x_j) \\ &= (1 - \pi_{h_i})\alpha_{k_i}(1 - \pi_{h_i})(x_i - c_{f(k_i,m_i)}) \\ &+ (1 - \pi_{h_i}) \sum_{\substack{j \neq i \\ j=1,2,\cdots,n_0}} \alpha_{k_j}(1 - \pi_{h_i})(x_j) . \end{aligned}$$

Since $m_i \in S_i$, it follows from the definition of $x_i = x(S)$ and the order preserving property of the mapping f that

$$(1 - \pi_{h_i})(x_i - c_{f(k_i, m_i)}) = \sum_{\substack{(m,n) < (k_i, m_i) \\ n \in S_i}} c_{f(m,n)} .$$

Hence, $\alpha_{k_i}(1 - \pi_{h_i})(x_i - c_{f(k_i, m_i)})$ belongs to the subgroup S of $\bar{B}[p]$ generated by the collection

$$\{\alpha_k(c_{f(m,n)}) \mid k \leqq k_i, (m, n) < (k_i, m_i)\} .$$

Also, if $j \neq i$, then $m_i \notin S_j$ and $k_j \leqq k_i$. Therefore,

$$(1 - \pi_{h_i})(x_j) = \sum_{\substack{(m,n) < (k_i, m_i) \\ n \in S_j}} c_{f(m,n)} ;$$

and because of this, $\alpha_{k_j}((1 - \pi_{h_i})(x_j)) \in S$. Thus, from (1), (2) and the above, $(1 - \pi_{h_i})\alpha_{k_i}(c_{f(k_i, m_i)}) = (1 - \pi_{h_i})(z) \neq 0$ for some z in S. It follows that $h_{\bar{B}}(\alpha_{k_i}(c_{f(k_i, m_i)}) = h_{\bar{B}}(z)$, a contradiction of the definition of the map f. Thus, $\sum_{x \in T(\Gamma)} \Gamma(x)$ is direct. Condition (i) is clear from the definition of $T(\Gamma)$. Condition (iv) follows from the preceding argument with $n = 1$. Since Γ is a group, condition (iii) follows easily from (iv).

DEFINITION 5.4. Let Γ be a subgroup of Θ. An element α in Θ will be called Γ-exceptional provided there exists a collection $T(\Gamma, \alpha)$ of elements in $\bar{B}[p]$ such that

(i) $| T(\Gamma, \alpha) | = 2^{\aleph_0}$,

(ii) $\Gamma(x), \Gamma(y), \{\alpha(x)\}, \{\alpha(y)\}$ are independent for all distinct $x, y \in T(\Gamma, \alpha)$,

(iii) $\alpha(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in T(\Gamma, \alpha)$.

An endomorphism $\alpha \in E(\bar{B})$ will be called Γ-exceptional if $\alpha \mid \bar{B}[p]$ is Γ-exceptional.

REMARK. If $\alpha \in E(\bar{B})$ and $\alpha \mid \bar{B}[p] = 0$, then by 3.7 and 2.8 (a) $\alpha \in J(E(\bar{B}), E_p(\bar{B}))$. Thus, the kernel of the map $\alpha \to \alpha \mid B[p]$ is contained in $J(E(\bar{B}), E_p(\bar{B}))$. It follows that ξ can be considered as a map from Θ to $\prod M_n$ by defining for each $\alpha \in \Theta$, $\xi(\alpha) = \xi(\beta)$ where $\beta \in E(B)$ and $\alpha = \beta \mid \bar{B}[p]$. Extensive use will be made of this convention in what follows.

LEMMA 5.5. *Let Γ be any countable subgroup of Θ. Suppose $\alpha \in \Theta$ is such that $\alpha \notin \Gamma$ and $\Delta = \{\Gamma, \alpha\}$ satisfies the following condition:*

(*) *for all nonzero $\beta \in \Delta$, $\beta(c_j) \neq 0$ for an infinite number of indices $j \in N$. Then α is Γ-exceptional.*

Proof. Since $\Delta = \{\Gamma, \alpha\}$ is obviously countable and satisfies (*), Lemma 5.3 can be applied to conclude that there exists a collection $T(\Delta)$ with the properties:

(i) $|T(\Delta)| = 2^{\aleph_0}$,

(ii) $\sum_{x \in T(\Delta)} \Delta(x)$ is direct.

(iii) $\gamma(x) \neq \beta(x)$ for all $x \in T(\Delta)$ and distinct $\beta, \gamma \in \Delta$,

(iv) $\beta \in \Delta$ and $\beta(x) = 0$ for some $x \in T(\Delta)$ implies $\beta = 0$.

Set $T(\Gamma, \alpha) = T(\Delta)$. Clearly, conditions (i) and (iii) of 5.4 are satisfied. Let $x, y \in T(\Gamma, \alpha)$ be distinct, and suppose there is a relation of the form $\beta(x) + k\alpha(x) + \gamma(y) + h\alpha(y) = 0$ where $\beta, \gamma \in \Gamma$ and $h, k \in Z$. By (ii), it is clear that both $\beta(x) + k\alpha(x) = 0$ and $\gamma(y) + h\alpha(y) = 0$. It follows by (iv) that $\beta + k\alpha = 0$ and $\gamma + h\alpha = 0$. Since $E(\alpha) = 1$ and $\alpha \notin \Gamma$, this last condition implies that both $h\alpha = 0$ and $k\alpha = 0$. Thus $\beta(x) = k\alpha(x) = \gamma(y) = h\alpha(y) = 0$, and condition (ii) of 5.4 is also satisfied. This completes the proof.

COROLLARY 5.6. *Let Γ by any countable subgroup of Θ satisfying*

(*) *for all nonzero $\gamma \in \Gamma, \gamma(c_j) \neq 0$ for an infinite number of indices $j \in N$.*

Suppose $\alpha \in \Theta$ is such that $\xi(\alpha)$ is not a member of $\xi(\Gamma) + (\sum M_n)$. Then α is Γ-exceptional.

Proof. Clearly, $\alpha \notin \Gamma$ since $\xi(\alpha) \notin \xi(\Gamma)$. Consequently, it is enough to show that $\Delta = \{\Gamma, \alpha\}$ satisfies condition (*). Suppose, to the contrary, that there exist $n \in N$ and $\beta \in \Delta$ such that $\beta \neq 0$ and $\beta(c_j) = 0$ for all $j > n$. It is possible to write $\beta = \gamma + k\alpha$ where $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $k \in Z$. Since Γ satisfies (*) and $E(\alpha) = 1$, it can be assumed that $k \not\equiv 0$ (modulo p). Now, $\beta = \gamma + k\alpha$ and

$$\xi(k\alpha) = \xi(\beta - \gamma) = \xi(\beta) - \xi(\gamma) \in \sum M_n + \xi(\Gamma) .$$

Since k is relatively prime to p, it follows that $\xi(\alpha) \in \sum M_n + \xi(\Gamma)$, a contradiction.

COROLLARY 5.7. *Let Γ be any countable subgroup of Θ satisfying the following condition:*

(**) *for all nonzero $\gamma \in \Gamma$ there exists a sequence of integers $\{a_i\}_{i \in N}$ such that $\gamma(c_i) = a_i c_i$ for each $i \in N$, and $a_i c_i \neq 0$ for an infinite number of indices $i \in N$.*

Let $\alpha \in \Theta$ be such that $\alpha(c_i) - \rho_i \alpha(c_i) \neq 0$ for an infinite number of indices $i \in N$. Then α is Γ-exceptional.

Proof. If $\gamma \in \Gamma$, then $\gamma(c_i) - \rho_i \gamma(c_i) = a_i c_i - a_i c_i = 0$ for all $i \in N$. Thus, $\alpha \notin \Gamma$. As before, let $\Delta = \{\Gamma, \alpha\}$, suppose $\gamma + k\alpha \in \Delta$. If $k \equiv 0$ (modulo p), then either $\gamma = 0$ or $(\gamma + k\alpha)(c_i) = \gamma(c_i) \neq 0$ for an infinite number of indices $i \in N$. If $\gamma = 0$, then $\gamma + k\alpha = 0$; and there is nothing to show. Suppose $k \not\equiv 0$ (modulo p). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}(1-\rho_i)(\gamma+k\alpha)(c_i) &= (\gamma+k\alpha)(c_i)-\rho_i(\gamma+k\alpha)(c_i)\\ &= (\gamma-\rho_i\gamma)(c_i)+k(\alpha-\rho_i\alpha)(c_i)\\ &= k(\alpha-\rho_i\alpha)(c_i)\neq 0\end{aligned}$$

for an infinite number of indices $i \in N$. Consequently, $\gamma + k\alpha$ must have this same property, and by 5.5, α is Γ-exceptional.

Let R be any countable subring of $\prod M_n$ which contains $\sum M_n + \{1\}$. Let $\Gamma(R)$ be as defined in § 4. That is, $\Gamma(R)$ is the subgroup of $E(\bar{B})$ generated by the collection $\{\rho(A) \mid A \in K(R)\}$. Define Γ to be the subgroup of Θ defined by $\Gamma = \{\gamma \mid \bar{B}[p] \mid \gamma \in \Gamma(R)\}$. Note that Γ is a p-group in which every element has order p. By Zorn's lemma, it is possible to choose a subgroup Δ of Γ which contains the identity and which is maximal with respect to having only the zero element in common with the subgroup $\{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \xi(\gamma) \in \sum M_n\}$. Obviously, Δ is a countable subgroup of Θ which satisfies condition (*) of 5.3. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be the collection of all those elements in Θ which are Δ-exceptional. By 5.6, if $\alpha \in \Theta$ and $\xi(\alpha) \notin \xi(\Delta) + \sum M_n$, then α is Δ-exceptional. Since $\xi(\Delta) + (\sum M_n)$ is countable and since ξ maps onto $\prod M_n$ by Lemma 3.2, it follows that $|\mathscr{E}| = 2^{\aleph_0}$. Let Ω be the first ordinal of cardinality $2^{\aleph_0}$, and let $\varphi \leftrightarrow \alpha_\varphi$ be a one-to-one correspondence between the elements of $\mathscr{E}$ and the ordinals $\varphi < \Omega$.

LEMMA 5.8. *There exist collections* $\{G_\varphi \mid \varphi < \Omega\}$, $\{P_\varphi \mid \varphi < \Omega\}$ *and* $\{U_\varphi \mid \varphi < \Omega\}$ *such that*

(i) *for all* $\varphi < \Omega$, G_φ *is a pure subgroup of* $\bar{B}$ *containing* B, $P_\varphi = G_\varphi[p]$ *and* U_φ *is a subset of* $\bar{B}[p]$,

(ii) $G_\varphi \subseteqq G_\chi$ *and* $U_\varphi \subseteqq U_\chi$ *whenever* $\varphi \leqq \chi < \Omega$,

(iii) $|P_\varphi| \leqq (|\varphi| + 1)\aleph_0$ *and* $|U_\varphi| \leqq (|\varphi| + 1)\aleph_0$,

(iv) $\gamma(G_\varphi) \subseteqq G_\varphi$ *for all* $\gamma \in \Gamma(R)$ *and each* $\varphi < \Omega$,

(v) $P_\varphi \cap U_\varphi = \varnothing$ *for all* $\varphi < \Omega$,

(vi) *for each* $\varphi < \Omega$ *there exists* $z_\varphi \in P_\varphi$ *such that* $\alpha_\varphi(z_\varphi) \in U_\varphi$.

Proof. The proof is by transfinite induction. Suppose G_φ and U_φ exist for all $\varphi < \chi$. Let $G'_\chi = \bigcup_{\varphi<\chi} G_\varphi + B$. $P'_\chi = \bigcup_{\varphi<\chi} P_\varphi + B[p]$ and $U'_\chi = \bigcup_{\varphi<\chi} U_\varphi$. Note that $G'_\chi[p] = P'_\chi$, that $\gamma(G'_\chi) \subseteqq G'_\chi$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma(R)$, and that G'_χ is a pure subgroup of $\bar{B}$. Suppose there is an element z in $P'_\chi \cap U'_\chi$. The existence of z implies the existence of ordinals $\psi < \chi$ and $\omega < \chi$ such that $z \in U_\psi$ and $z \in P_\omega + B[p] = P_\omega$. Let φ be largest of ψ and ω. Then $z \in [P_\varphi + B[p]] \cap U_\varphi = P_\varphi \cap U_\varphi$, contrary to the induction hypothesis. Thus, $P'_\chi \cap U'_\chi = \varnothing$. Since $|P_\varphi| \leqq (|\varphi| + 1)\aleph_0$ and $|U_\varphi| \leqq (|\varphi| + 1)\aleph_0$ for each $\varphi < \chi$, it follows that $|P'_\chi| \leqq (|\chi| + 1)\aleph_0$ and $|U'_\chi| \leqq (|\chi| + 1)\aleph_0$. Thus,

$$|\{P'_\chi, U'_\chi, B[p]\}| \leqq |P'_\chi|\,|U'_\chi|\,\aleph_0 \leqq (|\chi| + 1)\aleph_0 < 2^{\aleph_0}$$

Since α_χ is Δ-exceptional, there is a collection $T(\alpha_\chi) \subseteqq \bar{B}[p]$ such that
(a) $|T(\alpha_\chi)| = 2^{\aleph_0}$
(b) $y, z \in T(\alpha_\chi)$ imply that $\Delta(y), \Delta(z), \{\alpha_\chi(y)\}, \{\alpha_\chi(z)\}$
are independent and $\alpha_\chi(y), \alpha_\chi(z)$ are nonzero. Therefore, it is possible to find $z_\chi \in T(\alpha_\chi)$ such that $\alpha_\chi(z_\chi) \neq 0$ and

$$(\sharp) \qquad \{\Delta(z_\chi), \alpha_\chi(z_\chi)\} \cap \{P'_\chi, U'_\chi, B[p]\} = 0 .$$

Now suppose $\gamma \in \Gamma(R)$. Since every element of Γ has order p and since Δ is maximal with respect to having zero intersection with $\{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \xi(\gamma) \in \sum M_n\}$, it is possible to write $\gamma \mid \bar{B}[p]$ as $\alpha + \beta$ where $\alpha \in \Delta, \beta \in \Gamma$ and $\xi(\beta) \in \sum M_n$. Since $\xi(\beta) \in \sum M_n$, it follows from the definition of $\Gamma(R)$ that $\beta(\bar{B}[p]) \subseteqq B[p]$. Therefore,

$$\gamma(z_\chi) = \alpha(z_\chi) + \beta(z_\chi) \in \Delta(z_\chi) + B[p] .$$

Consequently, if $\gamma(z_\chi) \in G'_\chi[p] = P'_\chi$, then (using ($\sharp$)) $\gamma(z_\chi) \in B[p]$. Thus, G'_χ and z_χ satisfy the hypothesis of 4.6. Let G_χ be the pure subgroup of $\bar{B}$ obtained by the application of 4.6. Then

$$P_\chi = G_\chi[p] = G'_\chi[p] + \Gamma(R)(z_\chi) = P'_\chi + \Delta(z_\chi)$$

and $\gamma(G_\chi) \subseteqq G_\chi$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma(R)$. Also, $|P_\chi| \leqq (|\chi| + 1)\aleph_0$. Let U_χ be the set obtained by adjoining $\alpha_\chi(z_\chi)$ to U'_χ. Then $|U_\chi| \leqq (|\chi| + 1)\aleph_0$, and conditions (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi) obviously are satisfied. To show that (v) holds, suppose $z \in P_\chi \cap U_\chi$. There are two cases to consider:

Case 1. $z = \alpha_\chi(z_\chi)$ and $z = y + \beta(z_\chi)$ for $y \in P'_\chi$ and $\beta \in \Delta$. By ($\sharp$), $\alpha_\chi(z_\chi) - \beta(z_\chi) = y = 0$. Thus, applying (b), it is clear that $\alpha_\chi(z_\chi) = 0$. This is a contradiction of the choice of z_χ.

Case 2. $z \in U'_\chi$ and $z = y + \beta(z_\chi)$ for $y \in P'_\chi$ and $\beta \in \Delta$. In this case, $0 = z - y = \beta(z_\chi)$ by ($\sharp$). Consequently, $y = z \in U'_\chi$. This is a contradiction since $U'_\chi \cap P'_\chi = \varnothing$.

LEMMA 5.9. *Let* $G(R) = \bigcup_{\chi<\Omega} G_\chi$, $P(R) = \bigcup_{\chi<\Omega} P_\chi$ *and* $U(R) = \bigcup_{\chi<\Omega} U_\chi$. *Then*
(i) $G(R)$ *is a pure subgroup of* $\bar{B}$,
(ii) $G(R)[p] = P(R)$,
(iii) $P(R) \cap U(R) = \varnothing$,
(iv) $\gamma(G(R)) \subseteqq G(R)$ *for each* $\gamma \in \Gamma(R)$,
(v) *if* $\alpha \in E(\bar{B})$ *and if* α *is* Δ-*exceptional, then* $\alpha \notin E(G(R))$.

Proof. The arguments for (i), (ii), (ii), and (iv) are quite easy and can be found in the proof of 5.8. To show (v), suppose α is

Δ-exceptional. Then there exist $\varphi < \Omega$ and $z_\varphi \in P(R)$ such that $\alpha(z_\varphi) \in U_\varphi$ (see (vi) of 5.8). Since $P(R) \cap U(R) = \varnothing$ and $G(R)[p] = P(R)$ by (iii) and (ii), it follows that $\alpha \notin E(G(R))$.

THEOREM 5.10. *Let R be any countable subring of the ring direct product $\prod M_n$. Suppose that R contains $\sum M_n + \{1\}$. There is a pure subgroup G of $\bar{B}$, containing B, such that $\xi(E(G)) = R$. Moreover,*

$$\frac{E(G)}{J(E(G), E_p(G))} \cong R .$$

Proof. Let $G = G(R)$. By 4.4, $R = \xi(\Gamma(R))$. Thus, since $\Gamma(R) \subseteqq E(G)$ by (iv) of 5.9, $R \subseteqq \xi(E(G(R)))$. Suppose $\alpha \in E(G(R))$ and $\xi(\alpha) \notin R$. By 4.4, $\xi(\Delta) \subseteqq \xi(\Gamma) \subseteqq \xi(\Gamma(R)) = R$. Thus, $\xi(\Delta) + (\sum M_n) \subseteqq R$, and Lemma 5.6 may be applied to infer that α is Δ-exceptional. This is contrary to (v) of 5.9. Therefore, $\xi(E(G(R))) = R$. It follows from 3.1 that

$$\frac{E(G)}{J(E(G), E_p(G))} \cong R .$$

LEMMA 5.12. *Let U and V be vector spaces over a field such that $V \subseteqq U$. Let U/V be finite dimensional. Suppose $\alpha \in E(U)$, α is one-to-one and $\alpha(V) = V$. Then α is an automorphism of U.*

Proof. Since $\alpha(V) = V$, α induces an endomorphism α' of U/V ($\alpha'(u + V) = \alpha'(u) + V$ for $u \in U$). Moreover, α' is one-to-one; and, consequently, the dimensions of U/V and $\alpha'(U/V)$ are equal and finite. It follows that $\alpha'(U/V) = U/V$; and therefore, $\alpha(U) = U$ by a standard argument.

THEOREM 5.13. *The groups $G = G(R)$ have no proper isomorphic subgroups.*

Proof. Let α be an isomorphism of G into G. By (v) of 5.9, α is not Δ-exceptional. By 5.6, 5.7 and the definition of the map ξ, there must exist an integer n and an element $\beta \in \Delta$ such that $\alpha(c_i) = \beta(c_i)$ for all $i > n$. Since α is an isomorphism, $0 \neq \alpha(c_i) = \beta(c_i)$ for all $i > n$. It follows that α and β agree on $(\pi_n G)[p] = \pi_n(G[p])$ (see § I for the definition of π_n). Now, $\Delta \subset \Gamma = \{\gamma \mid \bar{B}[p] \mid \gamma \in \Gamma(R)\}$, $\beta \in \Delta$ and $\beta(c_i) \neq 0$ for $i > n$ imply, using Fermat's theorem, that β^{p-1} acts as the identity on $\pi_n G[p]$. It follows that β maps $(\pi_n G)[p] \cap p^k(\pi_n G)$ onto itself for each $k = 0, 1, \cdots$. Thus,

$$\alpha(G[p] \cap p^k G) = \alpha((\pi_n G)[p] \cap p^k(\pi_n G) = (\pi_n G)[p] \cap p^k(\pi_n G) = G[p] \cap p^k G$$

for each $k = n, n+1, \cdots$. Suppose $m \geqq 1$ is the largest integer such that $\alpha(G[p] \cap p^{m-1}G) \neq G[p] \cap p^{m-1}G$. It has been shown that if m exists, then $m \leqq n$. An application of 5.12 to $U = G[p] \cap p^{m-1}G$ and $V = G[p] \cap p^{m}G$ shows that the existence of such an integer m is impossible. Consequently, $\alpha(G[p] \cap p^{k}G) = G[p] \cap p^{k}G$ for all $k \geqq 0$. By Lemma 2.3, it follows that α is an automorphism of G.

COROLLARY 5.14. *Let R be any countable subring of the ring direct product $\prod M_n$. Suppose that R contains $\sum M_n + \{1\}$. There is a pure subgroup G of $\bar{B}$ which contains B such that*

$$\frac{E(G)}{J(E(G))} \cong R .$$

Proof. Let $G = G(R)$ and apply 5.10, 5.13 and 2.12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. A. L. S. Corner, *Every countable reduced torsion-free ring is an endomorphism ring*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **52** (1963), 687-710.
2. P. Crawley, *An infinite primary Abelian group without proper isomorphic subgroups*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **68** (1962), 463-467.
3. L. Fuchs, *Abelian Groups*, Budapest, 1958.
4. N. Jacobson, *Structure of Rings*, Providence, 1956.
5. I. Kaplansky, *Infinite Abelian Groups*, Ann. Arbor, 1954.
6. H. Leptin, *Zur theorie der überabzählbaren Abelschen p-gruppen*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg **24** (1960), 79-90.
7. R. S. Pierce, *Endomorphism rings of primary Abelian groups*, Proc. Colloquium on Abelian Groups, Budapest, 1963.
8. ———, *Homomorphisms of primary Abelian groups*, Topics in Abelian Groups, Chicago, 1963.

Received January 20, 1966. This research was partially supported by NSF Grant number GP-3919.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS