THE KAPLANSKY TEST PROBLEMS FOR $\aleph_1$-SEPARABLE GROUPS

PAUL C. EKLOF AND SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. We answer a long-standing open question by proving in ordinary set theory, ZFC, that the Kaplansky test problems have negative answers for $\aleph_1$-separable abelian groups of cardinality $\aleph_1$. In fact, there is an $\aleph_1$-separable abelian group M such that M is isomorphic to $M \oplus M \oplus M$ but not to $M \oplus M$. We also derive some relevant information about the endomorphism ring of M.

Introduction

Kaplansky [15, pp. 12f] posed two test problems in order to "know when we have a satisfactory [structure] theorem. ... We suggest that a tangible criterion be employed: the success of the alleged structure theorem in solving an explicit problem." The two problems were:

(I) If A is isomorphic to a direct summand of B and conversely, are A and B isomorphic?

(II) If $A \oplus A$ and $B \oplus B$ are isomorphic, are A and B isomorphic?

In fact, he says ([15, p. 75]) that he invented the problems "to show that Ulm's theorem [a structure theory for countable abelian p-groups] could really be used". For some other classes of abelian groups, such as finitely-generated groups, free groups, divisible groups, or completely decomposable torsion-free groups, the existence of a structure theory leads to an affirmative answer to the test problems. On the other hand, negative answers are taken as evidence of the absence of a useful classification theorem for a given class; Kaplansky says "I believe their defeat is convincing evidence that no reasonable invariants exist" [15, p. 75]. Negative answers to both questions have been proven, for example, for the class of uncountable abelian p-groups and for the class of countable torsion-free abelian groups.

Of particular interest is the method developed by Corner (cf. [1], [2],[4]) which, by realizing certain rings as endomorphism rings of groups, provides negative answers to both test problems (for a given class) as special cases of an even more extreme pathology. More precisely, Corner's method — where applicable — yields, for any positive integer r, an abelian group G_r (in the class) such that for any positive integers m and k, the direct sum of m copies of G_r is isomorphic to the direct sum of k copies of G_r if and only if m is congruent to k mod r. (See, for example, [2] or [11, Thm 91.6, p. 145].) Then we obtain negative answers to both test problems by letting $A = G_2$ ($\cong G_2 \oplus G_2 \oplus G_2$) and $B = G_2 \oplus G_2$.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20K20; Secondary 03E35.

Key words and phrases. Kaplansky test problems, $\aleph_1$-separable group, endomorphism ring.

Travel supported by NSF Grant DMS-9501415.

Research supported by German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research & Development Grant No. G-294.081.06/93. Pub. No. 625.

Our focus here is on the class of $\aleph_1$-separable abelian groups (of cardinality $\aleph_1$). We will prove, in ordinary set theory (ZFC), that both test problems have negative answers by deriving the Corner pathology:

Theorem 0.1. *For any positive integer r there is an $\aleph_1$-separable group $M = M_r$ of cardinality $\aleph_1$ such that for any positive integers m and k, M^m is isomorphic to M^k if and only if m is congruent to k mod r.*

(Here M^m denotes the direct sum of m copies of M.) We do not determine the endomorphism ring of M, even modulo an ideal. However, we can derive a property of the endomorphism ring of M which is sufficient to imply the Corner pathology: see section 3.

A group M is called $\aleph_1$-separable [10, p. 184] (respectively, strongly $\aleph_1$-free) if it is abelian and every countable subset is contained in a countable free direct summand of M (resp., contained in a countable free subgroup H which is a direct summand of every countable subgroup of M containing H). Obviously, an $\aleph_1$-separable group is strongly $\aleph_1$-free, so a negative answer to one of the test problems for the class of $\aleph_1$-separable groups implies a negative answer to the problem for the class of strongly $\aleph_1$-free groups. (It is independent of ZFC whether these classes are different for groups of cardinality $\aleph_1$: the weak Continuum Hypothesis ($2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$) implies that there are strongly $\aleph_1$-free groups of cardinality $\aleph_1$ which are not $\aleph_1$-separable; on the other hand, Martin's Axiom (MA) plus the negation of the Continuum Hypothesis ($\neg$CH) implies that every strongly $\aleph_1$-free group of cardinality $\aleph_1$ is $\aleph_1$-separable; cf.[16])

Dugas and Göbel [5] proved that ZFC + $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$ implies that the Corner pathology exists for the class of strongly $\aleph_1$-free groups of cardinality $\aleph_1$; in fact, they showed that there is a strongly $\aleph_1$-free group G whose endomorphism ring is an appropriate ring (the ring $A = A_r$ of the next section). (See also [12].) This group G cannot be $\aleph_1$-separable since the endomorphism ring of an $\aleph_1$-separable group has too many idempotents. However, Thomé ([20] and [21]) showed that ZFC plus V = L (Gödel's Axiom of Constructibility) implies the Corner pathology for $\aleph_1$-separable groups of cardinality $\aleph_1$; he did this by constructing an $\aleph_1$-separable G such that End(G) is a split extension of A by I (in the sense of [3, p. 277]), where I is the ideal of endomorphisms with a countable image.

It follows from known structure theorems for the class of $\aleph_1$-separable groups of cardinality $\aleph_1$ under the hypothesis MA + $\neg$CH that the Dugas-Göbel and Thomé realization results are *not* theorems of ZFC (cf. [7] or [17]). The fact that there *are* positive structure theorems for the class of $\aleph_1$-separable groups assuming MA + $\neg$CH or the stronger Proper Forcing Axiom (PFA) — see, for example, [8] or [18] — led to the question of whether the Kaplansky test problems could have affirmative answers for this class assuming, say, PFA. Thomé [21] gave a negative answer to the second test problem in ZFC, using a result of Jónsson [14] for countable torsion-free groups; however, till now, the first test problem as well as the Corner pathology were open (in ZFC).

Our construction of the Corner pathology involves a direct construction of the pathological group M using a tree-like ladder system and a "countable template" which comes from the Corner example for countable torsion-free groups. A key role is played by a paper of Göbel and Goldsmith [13] which — while it does not itself prove any new results about the Kaplansky test problems for strongly $\aleph_1$-free or $\aleph_1$-separable groups — provides the tools for creating a suitable template from the Corner example.

1. The countable template

Fix a positive integer r. For this r, let $A = A_r$ be the countable ring constructed by Corner in [2]. (See also [11, p. 146].) Specifically, A is the ring freely generated by symbols ρ_i and σ_i $(i = 0, 1, ..., r)$ subject to the relations

$$\rho_j \sigma_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{r} \sigma_i \rho_i = 1.$$

Then A is free as an abelian group, and $\sigma_0\rho_0, ..., \sigma_r\rho_r$ are pairwise orthogonal idempotents. Moreover, if M is a right A-module, then $M = M\sigma_0\rho_0 \oplus M\sigma_1\rho_1 \oplus ... \oplus M\sigma_r\rho_r$ and $M\sigma_i\rho_i \cong M$ because $\sigma_i\rho_i\sigma_i : M \to M\sigma_i\rho_i$ and $\rho_i\sigma_i\rho_i : M\sigma_i\rho_i \to M$ are inverses; therefore $M \cong M^{r+1}$.

Our construction will work for any countable torsion-free ring A whose additive subgroup is free; but hereafter A will denote the ring A_r just defined.

Corner shows that there is a torsion-free countable abelian group G whose endomorphism ring is A; thus G is an A-module and hence $G \cong G^{r+1}$. Furthermore, he shows that G^ℓ is not isomorphic to G^n if $1 \leq \ell < n \leq r$, and hence G^m is not isomorphic to G^k if m is not congruent to k mod r. We shall require these and further properties of G, which we summarize in the following:

Proposition 1.1. *There are countable free A-modules $B \subseteq H$ such that $G \cong H/B$ and B is the union of a chain of free A-modules, $B = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} B_n$, such that $B_0 = 0$ and for all $n \in \omega$, H/B_n and B_{n+1}/B_n are free A-modules of rank ω. Moreover for any positive integers m and k, if m is not congruent to k mod r, then $G^m \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)}$ is not isomorphic to $G^k \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)}$.*

The main work in proving Proposition 1.1 will be done in two lemmas from [13]. For the first one, we give a revised proof (cf. [13, p. 343]). We maintain the notation above.

Lemma 1.2. *The group G is the union, $G = \bigcup_{n\geq 1} G_n$, of an increasing chain of free A-modules.*

Proof. By [1, p. 699] G is the pure closure $\langle G_1 \rangle_*$ in $\hat{A}$ of a free A-module $G_1 = \bigoplus_{i\in I} e_i A \oplus A$ containing A. Here $\hat{A}$ is the natural, or $\mathbf{Z}$-adic, completion of A (cf. [1, p. 692]). We will define inductively $G_n = \bigoplus_{i\in I} e_{i,n} A \oplus A$ such that $G_n \supseteq G_{n-1}$ and for all $i \in I$, $ne_{i,n} + A = e_{i,n-1} + A$. Let $e_{i,1} = e_i$ for all $i \in I$. If $G_{n-1} \subseteq G$ has been defined for some $n > 1$, then since A is dense in $\hat{A}$, there exists $e_{i,n} \in \hat{A}$ such that $ne_{i,n} + A = e_{i,n-1} + A$; say $ne_{i,n} = e_{i,n-1} + a_i$. By the definition of G, $e_{i,n} \in G$. We need to show that $\{e_{i,n} : i \in I\} \cup \{1\}$ is A-linearly independent. Suppose that $\Sigma_{i\in I} e_{i,n} c_i + 1 \cdot c_0 = 0$ for some $c_0, c_i \in A$. Then $\Sigma_{i\in I} n e_{i,n} c_i + nc_0 = 0$, so $\Sigma_{i\in I} e_{i,n-1} c_i + 1 \cdot (\Sigma_{i\in I} a_i c_i + nc_0) = 0$. By the A-linear independence of $\{e_{i,n-1} : i \in I\} \cup \{1\}$, we can conclude that each c_i equals 0 and hence also c_0 equals 0. This completes the definition of G_n.

It remains to prove that $G \subseteq \bigcup_{n \geq 1} G_n$. Let $g \in G \setminus G_1$. For some $n > 1$, $ng \in G_1$. We claim that $g \in G_n$. Since $ng \in G_{n-1}$, $ng = \Sigma_{i \in I} e_{i,n-1} c_i + c_0$ for some $c_i, c_0 \in A$. Then

$$ng = \Sigma_{i \in I}(ne_{i,n} - a_i)c_i + c_0 = n\Sigma_{i \in I} e_{i,n} c_i + a'$$

for some $a' \in A$. Since A is pure in $\hat{A}$, $a' = na''$ for some $a'' \in A$. Thus $g = \Sigma_{i \in I} e_{i,n} c_i + a'' \in G_n$. □

The second lemma is proved in [13, Lemma 2.5] generalizing a result in [9, Lemma XII.1.4]. We state it here for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 1.3. *Let G be a countable A-module which is the union, $G = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} G_n$, of an increasing chain of free A-modules, then there exist countable free A-modules $B \subseteq H$ such that $G \cong H/B$ and B is the union of a chain of free A-modules, $B = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} B_n$, such that for all $n \geq 1$, H/B_n and B_{n+1}/B_n are free A-modules.* □

Proof of Proposition 1.1. The existence of H, B, and the B_n is now an immediate consequence of Lemmas 1.2 and 1.3. All that is left to show is that if m is not congruent to k mod r, then $G^m \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)}$ is not isomorphic to $G^k \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)}$. Since G^m is not isomorphic to G^k, it is enough to show that $R_{\mathbf{Z}}(G^l \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)}) = G^l$ for any $l \in \omega$. Here $R_{\mathbf{Z}}(N)$ is the $\mathbf{Z}$-radical of N, that is, $R_{\mathbf{Z}}(N) = \cap\{\ker(\varphi) : \varphi : N \to \mathbf{Z}\}$. (See, for example, [9, pp. 289f].) To show that $R_{\mathbf{Z}}(G^l \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)}) = G^l$ it is enough to show that $\mathrm{Hom}(G^l, \mathbf{Z}) = 0$, or, equivalently, $\mathrm{Hom}(G, \mathbf{Z}) = 0$. This follows from Observation 2.7 of [13], but we give here a self-contained argument based on the notation of Lemma 1.2. Suppose $\psi \in \mathrm{Hom}(G, \mathbf{Z})$; we can regard ψ as an endomorphism of G by identifying $\mathbf{Z}$ with the subgroup $\langle 1 \rangle$ of $A \subseteq G$ which is generated by the unit 1 of A. Since the endomorphism ring of G is A, there is $a \in A$ such that $\psi(g) = ga$ for all $g \in G$. By considering $\psi(1) = 1a = a$, we see that $a \in \langle 1 \rangle$. Now consider $\psi(e_i)$ for any e_i; since $\psi(e_i) = e_i a$ and since $e_i A \cap \langle 1 \rangle = \{0\}$ we see that $a = 0$. □

2. The main construction

Fix a positive integer r and let A, H, B, B_n and G be as in Proposition 1.1. For each $n \in \omega$, fix a basis $\{b_{n,i} + B_n : i \in \omega\}$ of B_{n+1}/B_n (as A-module). Also, fix a set of representatives $\{h_i : i \in \omega\}$ for H/B where $h_0 = 0$; thus each coset $h + B$ equals $h_i + B$ for a unique $i \in \omega$.

Fix a stationary subset E of ω_1 consisting of limit ordinals and a ladder system $\{\eta_\delta : \delta \in E\}$. That is, for every δ in E, $\eta_\delta : \omega \to \delta$ is a strictly increasing function whose range is cofinal in δ; we shall also choose η_δ so that its range is disjoint from E. Furthermore, we choose a ladder system which is *tree-like*, that is, for all $\delta, \gamma \in E$ and $n, m \in \omega$, $\eta_\delta(n) = \eta_\gamma(m)$ implies that $m = n$ and $\eta_\delta(l) = \eta_\gamma(l)$ for all $l < n$ (cf. [9, pp. 368, 386]).

Inductively define free A-modules M_β ($\beta < \omega_1$) as follows: if β is a limit ordinal, $M_\beta = \bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} M_\alpha$; if $\beta = \alpha + 1$ where $\alpha \notin E$, let

$$M_\beta = M_\alpha \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in \omega} x_{\alpha,i} A.$$

If $\beta = \delta + 1$ where $\delta \in E$, define an embedding $\iota_\delta : B \to M_\delta$ by sending the basis element $b_{n,i}$ to $x_{\eta_\delta(n),i}$. Essentially $M_{\delta+1}$ will be defined to be the pushout of

$$\begin{array}{lcl} M_\delta & & \\ \uparrow \iota_\delta & & \\ B & \hookrightarrow & H \end{array}$$

but we will be more explicit in order to avoid the necessity of identifying isomorphic copies. Let $y_{\delta,0} = 0$ and let $\{y_{\delta,i} : i \in \omega \setminus \{0\}\}$ be a new set of distinct elements (not in M_δ). Then define $M_{\delta+1}$ to be $\{y_{\delta,i} + u : u \in M_\delta,\ i \in \omega\}$ where the operations on $M_{\delta+1}$ extend those on M_δ and are otherwise determined by the rules

$$\begin{array}{ll} y_{\delta,i} + y_{\delta,j} = y_{\delta,k} + \iota_\delta(b) & \text{if} \quad h_i + h_j = h_k + b \\ y_{\delta,i} a = y_{\delta,\ell} + \iota_\delta(b) & \text{if} \quad h_i a = h_\ell + b \end{array}$$

where $b \in B$ and $a \in A$. Then there is an embedding $\theta_\delta : H \to M_{\delta+1}$ extending ι_δ which takes h_i to $y_{\delta,i}$ and induces an isomorphism of H/B with $M_{\delta+1}/M_\delta$.

This completes the inductive definition of the M_β. Let $M = \bigcup_{\beta<\omega_1} M_\beta$. Note that it follows from the construction that every element of M has a unique representation in the form

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s} y_{\delta_j,n_j} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{t} x_{\alpha_\ell,i_\ell} a_\ell$$

where $\delta_1 < \delta_2 < \ldots < \delta_s$ are elements of E, $n_j \in \omega \setminus \{0\}$, $\alpha_\ell \in \omega_1 \setminus E$, $i_\ell \in \omega$, $a_\ell \in A$, and the pairs (α_ℓ, i_ℓ) $(\ell = 1, \ldots, t)$ are distinct.

Since M is constructed to be an A-module, M is isomorphic to M^{r+1}. We claim that

(†) M is $\aleph_1$-separable; in fact for all $\alpha < \omega_1$, $M_{\alpha+1}$ is a free direct summand of M.

Assuming this for the moment, we can show that

(††) M^m is not isomorphic to M^k if m is not congruent to k mod r.

In brief this is because M^m and M^k are not quotient-equivalent (cf. [9, pp. 251f]) since for all $\delta \in E$, $(M_{\delta+1}/M_\delta)^m \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)}$ is not isomorphic to $(M_{\delta+1}/M_\delta)^k \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)}$ by Proposition 1.1. In more detail, if there is an isomorphism $\varphi : M^m \to M^k$, then there is a closed unbounded subset C of ω_1 such that for $\beta \in C$, $\varphi[M_\beta^m] = M_\beta^k$. Since E is stationary in ω_1, there exist $\delta \in C \cap E$; choose $\beta > \delta$ such that $\beta \in C$. Then φ induces an isomorphism of M_β^m/M_δ^m with M_β^k/M_δ^k. Since $M_\beta/M_{\delta+1}$ is free (of infinite rank) by (†), we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} (M_{\delta+1}/M_\delta)^m \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)} &\cong (M_{\delta+1}^m/M_\delta^m) \oplus (M_\beta^m/M_{\delta+1}^m) \cong M_\beta^m/M_\delta^m \cong M_\beta^k/M_\delta^k \\ &\cong (M_{\delta+1}^k/M_\delta^k) \oplus (M_\beta^k/M_{\delta+1}^k) \cong (M_{\delta+1}/M_\delta)^k \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)} \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts Proposition 1.1.

We are left with the task of proving (†). First we shall show that each $M_{\alpha+1}$ is a direct summand of M by defining a projection π_α of M onto $M_{\alpha+1}$ (that is, $\pi_\alpha | M_{\alpha+1}$ is the identity). For every integer k there is a projection $\rho_k : H \to B_{k+1}$ since H/B_{k+1} is free. Given α, for each $\delta \in E$ with $\delta > \alpha$, let k_δ be the maximal integer k such that $\eta_\delta(k) \leq \alpha$. For each $\delta \in E$, we let π_α act like ρ_{k_δ} on the isomorphic copy, $\theta_\delta[H]$, of H. More precisely, for each element z of $\theta_\delta[H]$, define $\pi_\alpha(z)$ to be $\theta_\delta(\rho_{k_\delta}(\theta_\delta^{-1}(z)))$; if $\nu \notin \bigcup\{\text{ran}(\eta_\delta) : \delta \in E\}$ and $\nu > \alpha$, define $\pi_\alpha(x_{\nu,i}) = 0$. Extend to an arbitrary element of M by additivity; this will define a homomorphism on M provided that π_α is well-defined. It is easy to see, using the unique representation of elements, that the question of well-definition reduces to showing that the definition of $\pi_\alpha(x_{\beta,i})$ for $x_{\beta,i} \in \theta_\delta[H]$ is independent of δ. If $\beta \leq \alpha$, then $\pi_\alpha(x_{\beta,i}) = x_{\beta,i}$. Say $\beta > \alpha$ and $\beta = \eta_\delta(n) = \eta_\gamma(n)$; by the tree-like property, $\eta_\delta(m) = \eta_\gamma(m)$ for all $m \leq n$, and hence $k_\delta = k_\gamma$. Hence $\pi_\alpha(x_{\beta,i})$ is well-defined because $\rho_{k_\delta} = \rho_{k_\gamma}$ and thus $\theta_\delta(\rho_{k_\delta}(\theta_\delta^{-1}(x_{\beta,i}))) = \theta_\gamma(\rho_{k_\gamma}(\theta_\gamma^{-1}(x_{\beta,i})))$.

It remains to prove that each M_β is $\aleph_1$-free (as abelian group). Since A is free as abelian group, it suffices to show that $M_{\delta+1}$ is a free A-module for every $\delta \in E$. We will inductively define S_n so that

$$B = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} S_n \cup \{x_{\nu,i} : \nu \in \delta \setminus (E \cup \bigcup\{\text{ran}(\eta_\mu) : \mu \in E \cap (\delta+1)\}), i \in \omega\}$$

is an A-basis of $M_{\delta+1}$. Let S_0 be the image under θ_δ of a basis of H. Fix a bijection $\psi : \omega \to E \cap \delta$; also, for convenience, let $\psi(-1) = \delta$. Suppose that S_m has been defined for $m \leq n$ so that $\bigcup_{m\leq n} S_m$ is A-linearly independent and generates $\bigcup\{\theta_{\psi(m)}[H] : -1 \leq m < n\}$. Let $\gamma = \psi(n)$ and let $k = k_n$ be maximal such that $\eta_\gamma(k) = \eta_{\psi(m)}(k)$ for some $-1 \leq m < n$. Notice that $\{x_{\eta_\gamma(\ell),i} : \ell \leq k, i \in \omega\}$ is contained in the A-submodule generated by $\bigcup_{m\leq n} S_m$. Since H/B_{k+1} is A-free, we can write $H = B_{k+1} \oplus C_k$ for some A-free module C_k $(= \ker(\rho_k))$; let S_{n+1} be the image under θ_γ of a basis of C_k. This completes the inductive construction. One can then easily verify that B is an A-basis of $M_{\delta+1}$; indeed, the fact that $\bigcup_{m\leq n} S_m$ is A-linearly independent can be proved by induction on n, using the unique representation of elements of M to show that if $\sum_{i=1}^{r} z_i a_i \in \left\langle \bigcup_{m\leq n} S_m \right\rangle$, where $z_1, ..., z_r$ are distinct elements of S_{n+1}, then $a_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, ..., r$.

3. The endomorphism ring of M

While we cannot show that $\text{End}(M)$ is a split extension of A by an ideal, we can obtain enough information about $\text{End}(M)$ to imply the negative results on the Kaplansky test problems. (A similar idea is used in [19, p. 118].)

The ring A is naturally a subring of $\text{End}(M)$. We say that A is *algebraically closed* in $\text{End}(M)$ when every finite set of ring equations with parameters from A (i.e., polynomials in several variables over A) which is satisfied in $\text{End}(M)$ is also satisfied in A.

Proposition 3.1. *If $A = A_r$ is as in section 1, and A is algebraically closed in* $\text{End}(M)$*, then for any positive integers m and k, M^m is isomorphic to M^k if and only if m is congruent to k mod r.*

Proof. Since M is an A-module, $M \cong M^{r+1}$. If M^ℓ is isomorphic to M^n where $1 \leq \ell < n \leq r$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} M\sigma_i\rho_i \cong \sum_{i=1}^{n} M\sigma_i\rho_i$, so by Lemma 2 of [2], there are elements x and y of $\text{End}(M)$ such that $xy = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sigma_i\rho_i$ and $yx = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i\rho_i$. So by hypothesis, such elements x and y exist in A. We then obtain a contradiction as in [2, p. 45]. □

Proposition 3.2. *If M is defined as in section 2, then A is algebraically closed in* $\text{End}(M)$.

Proof. For any $\sigma \in \text{End}(M)$, there is a closed unbounded subset C_σ of ω_1 such that for all $\alpha \in C_\sigma$, $\sigma[M_\alpha] \subseteq M_\alpha$. For any $\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_n$ in $\text{End}(M)$, choose $\alpha < \beta$

in $C_{\sigma_1} \cap ... \cap C_{\sigma_n}$ so that also $\alpha \in E$. Then each σ_i induces an endomorphism, also denoted σ_i, of M_β/M_α. The endomorphism ring of M_β/M_α is $\mathrm{End}(G \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)})$ and restriction to G defines a natural homomorphism, π, of $\mathrm{End}(G \oplus \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)})$ onto $\mathrm{End}(G) \cong A$ because $\mathrm{Hom}(G, \mathbf{Z}^{(\omega)}) = 0$. If $\sigma_i = a \in A$ (regarded as an element of $\mathrm{End}(M)$), then $\pi(a) = a$. Hence if $\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_m$ satisfy some ring equations over A, then so do $\pi(\sigma_1), ..., \pi(\sigma_m)$. □

Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 provide an alternative proof of (††).

References

[1] A. L. S. Corner, *Every countable reduced torsion-free ring is an endomorphism ring*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **13** (1963), 687–710.

[2] A. L. S. Corner, *On a conjecture of Pierce concerning direct decompositions of Abelian groups*, in Proceedings of the Colloquium on Abelian Groups, Tihany, Budapest (1964), 43–48.

[3] A. L. S. Corner, *On endomorphism rings of primary Abelian groups*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford **20** (1969), 277–296.

[4] A. L. S. Corner and R. Göbel, *Prescribing endomorphism algebras, a unified treatment*, Proc. London Math. Soc (3) **50** (1985), 447–479.

[5] M. Dugas and R. Göbel, *Every cotorsion-free ring is an endomorphism ring*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **45** (1982), 319–336.

[6] M. Dugas and R. Göbel, *Every cotorsion-free algebra is an endomorphism algebra*, Math. Z. **181** (1982), 451–470.

[7] P. C. Eklof, *The structure of ω_1-separable groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **279** (1983), 497–523.

[8] P. C. Eklof, *Set theory and structure theorems*, in **Abelian Group Theory**, Lec. Notes in Math. No. 1006 (1983), Springer-Verlag, 275-284.

[9] P. C. Eklof and A. H. Mekler, **Almost Free Modules**, North-Holland (1990).

[10] L. Fuchs, **Abelian Groups**, Pergamon Press (1960).

[11] L. Fuchs, **Infinite Abelian Groups**, vol. II, Academic Press (1973).

[12] R. Göbel, *An easy topological construction for realising endomorphism rings*, Proc. Royal Irish Acad. Sect. A **92** (1992), 281–284.

[13] R. Göbel and B. Goldsmith, *The Kaplansky test problems - an approach via radicals*, J. Pure and Appl. Algebra **99** (1995), 331–344.

[14] B. Jónsson, *On direct decompositions of torsion-free abelian groups*, Math. Scand. **5** (1957), 230-235.

[15] I. Kaplansky, **Infinite abelian groups**, rev. ed., Univ. of Michigan Press (1969).

[16] A. H. Mekler, *How to construct almost free groups*, Can. J. Math. **32** (1980), 1206–1228.

[17] A. H. Mekler, *Proper forcing and abelian groups*, in **Abelian Group Theory**, Lecture Notes in Mathematics No. 1006, Springer-Verlag, 285–303.

[18] A. H. Mekler, *The structure of groups that are almost the direct sum of countable abelian groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **303** (1987), 145–160.

[19] S. Shelah, *Kaplansky test problem for R-modules*, Israel J. Math. **74** (1991), 91–127.

[20] B. Thomé, **Aleph-1-separable Groups, Kaplansky's Test Problems, and Endomorphism Rings,** Ph.D. Dissertation, Univ. of California, Irvine (1988).

[21] B. Thomé, *$\aleph_1$-separable groups and Kaplansky's test problems*, Forum Math. **2** (1990), 203–212.

Department of Mathematics,University of California, Irvine 92697
Email address: pceklof@uci.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin, WI
Current address: Institute of Mathematics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904
Email address: shelah@math.huji.ac.il