

THE GROTHENDIECK GROUP FOR STABLE HOMOTOPY IS FREE

BY PETER FREYD¹

Communicated by E. Spanier, July 5, 1966

Let H_n^m be the set of homotopy types of base-pointed finite complexes of dimension $\leq m$ and connectivity $\geq n$. We shall always assume that $2n \geq m$, in other words, that we are working in the "stable range".

H_n^m is closed under the "wedge" operation ($X \vee Y$ is obtained by identifying the base points in the disjoint union of X and Y). Chang [1] has classified the wedge indecomposables in the case $m \leq n+3$ and has shown that a unique wedge decomposition theorem holds in H_n^{n+3} , $n \geq 3$.

PROPOSITION 1. *Unique wedge decomposition fails in H_5^{10} . Indeed (H_5^{10}, \vee) fails to be a cancellation semigroup. The same pathology holds for any H_n^m , $m \geq n+5$, $2n \geq m$.*

The easiest example: Let $\nu \in \pi_9(S^6)$ be a map of order 8. Let $\text{Cone}(\nu)$ be its mapping cone. Then $S^6 \vee \text{Cone}(\nu) \simeq S^6 \vee \text{Cone}(3\nu)$ but $\text{Cone}(\nu) \not\simeq \text{Cone}(3\nu)$. (The isomorphism uses only that 3 is prime to the order of ν , the nonisomorphism uses only that 3 is not congruent to ± 1 mod the order of ν . ν could not be of order 2, 3, 4, or 6. Hence a similar example is avoided in the range covered by Chang.)

Let C_n^m be the cancellation semigroup obtained from (H_n^m, \vee) by defining $X \equiv Y$ if there exists Z such that $X \vee Z \simeq Y \vee Z$.

THEOREM 2. *$X \equiv Y$ iff for the bouquet of spheres, B , with the same Betti numbers as X it is the case that $X \vee B \simeq Y \vee B$.*

It follows that the inclusion $H_n^m \rightarrow H_{n+1}^{m+1}$ remains a monomorphism when we pass to $C_n^m \rightarrow C_{n+1}^{m+1}$. The suspension functor preserves wedges and hence we obtain a homomorphism from (H_n^m, \vee) to (H_{n+1}^{m+1}, \vee) . By Freudenthal's theorem $H_n^m \rightarrow H_{n+1}^{m+1}$ is an isomorphism. We obtain a family of monomorphisms $C_n^m \rightarrow C_{n'}^{m'}$, $n \leq n'$, $m \leq m'$ the direct limit of which we'll call S . Each C_n^m is a sub-semigroup of S and it may be noted that each of the statements below about S and its ambient group specializes nicely to C_n^m and its ambient group.

¹ This research was supported in part by grant GP 4252 from the National Science Foundation.

COROLLARY 3. *Given $\gamma \in \pi_n(S^m)$, $n \neq m$, $\gamma \neq 0$ then $[Cone(\gamma)]$ is indecomposable in \mathbf{S} .*

PROPOSITION 4. *\mathbf{S} is not free, i.e. it is not a unique factorization semigroup.*

The easiest example. Let $\alpha \in \pi_q(S^6)$ be a map of order 3, $\nu \in \pi_9(S^6)$ of order 8. Then $Cone(\alpha) \vee Cone(\nu) \simeq S^6 \vee S^{10} \vee Cone(\alpha + \nu)$. The example lives in H_5^{10} . For any $\gamma, \delta \in \pi_n(S^m)$, $n \neq m$, γ, δ of co-prime orders the same pathology may be exhibited.

The above example depends upon the mixing of prime integers. We may explicate that dependency by defining a space X to be p -primary (p a prime integer) if there exist maps $f: B \rightarrow X$, $g: X \rightarrow B$, where B is the bouquet of spheres with the same Betti numbers as X , such that $gf = p^n \cdot 1_B$, some n .

Spheres are p -primary for any p . The only spaces which are p -primary for more than one p are bouquets of spheres.

Let \mathbf{S}_p be the cancellation semigroup obtained by restricting attention to p -primary spaces.

THEOREM 5. *\mathbf{S}_p is free, i.e. a unique factorization semigroup. Moreover $[X]$ is indecomposable in \mathbf{S}_p iff X is wedge indecomposable.*

(It is known that a space in the stable range is wedge indecomposable iff its only idempotent endomorphisms are 0 and 1 [2].)

Let \mathbf{G} be \mathbf{S} made into a group (the Grothendieck group for stable homotopy). Let $B: \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$ be the map which sends $[X]$ to the bouquet of spheres $[B_X]$ with the same Betti numbers as X . B is idempotent. Let \mathbf{G}_S be its image, \mathbf{G}^* its kernel. $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_S \oplus \mathbf{G}^*$. Note that \mathbf{G}_S is clearly freely generated by the spheres. Let \mathbf{G}_p^* be the subgroup of \mathbf{G}^* generated by elements of the form $[X] - [B_X]$ where X is p -primary. Note that \mathbf{S}_p made into a group is $\mathbf{G}_S \oplus \mathbf{G}_p^*$. Hence \mathbf{G}_p^* is free.

THEOREM 6. *\mathbf{G}^* is the internal direct sum of the \mathbf{G}_p^* 's. \mathbf{G} is free. It is freely generated by the set $\{S^n \mid S^n \text{ an } n\text{-sphere}\} \cup \{[X] - [B_X] \mid X \text{ a wedge indecomposable primary space}\}$.*

The next was a contention of Milnor.

THEOREM 7. *$[X] - [Y]$ has zero component in $\mathbf{G}_S \oplus \mathbf{G}_p^*$ iff X and Y have the same Betti numbers and there exists $f: X \rightarrow Y$ such that $H_*(f; \mathbf{Z}_p)$ is an isomorphism where \mathbf{Z}_p can be interpreted either as the prime field or the p -adic integers.*

COROLLARY 8. *With the smash product as multiplication, \mathbf{G}_p^* is an ideal.*

The proofs rely heavily upon the representation of the stable homotopy category \mathfrak{S} (of which \mathbf{G} is the Grothendieck group) as the full subcategory of projectives in a Frobenius category \mathfrak{F} [3]. (A Frobenius category is an Abelian category in which projectives and injectives coincide and in which there are enough of them in both senses.) Statements 1 through 4 require repeated use of the Schanuel lemma applied in \mathfrak{F} . Theorem 5 depends upon a suitable modification of the Nakayama lemma. Theorem 6 uses the Schanuel lemma to represent the Grothendieck group in another more easily handled Grothendieck group arising from \mathfrak{F} . For Theorem 7 it is necessary to localize \mathfrak{F} by factoring out, a la Gabriel, the Serre class of objects whose identity maps are of finite order prime to p . This p -localization of \mathfrak{F} has many nice properties: it is Frobenius; its indecomposable injectives are spaces and they are absolutely indecomposable, i.e. are essential extensions of every nontrivial subobject; each of its objects has an injective envelope; it is self-dual and hence each of its objects has a projective co-envelope.

We obtain an almost-answer to the question which inaugurated the investigation: can mapping cones in the stable range be identified by their homotopy properties?

THEOREM 9. *If*

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow SX \xrightarrow{Sf} SY$$

is such that an exact sequence of abelian groups results whenever a co-representable functor is applied (or if preferred, whenever any cohomology theory is applied) then $[Z]$ is equal to $[\text{Cone}(f)]$ in the Grothendieck group, i.e. $Z \equiv \text{Cone}(f)$.

There does exist a sequence

$$S^9 \xrightarrow{\nu} S^6 \longrightarrow \text{Cone}(3\nu) \longrightarrow S^{10} \xrightarrow{S\nu} S^7$$

satisfying the hypothesis. Hence Z need not be of the same homotopy type as $\text{Cone}(f)$.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. S. C. Chang, *Homotopy invariants and continuous mappings*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Ser. A, 202 (1950), 253-263.
2. P. Freyd, *Splitting homotopy idempotents*, Proceedings of the Conference on Categorical Algebra, Springer-Verlag, 1966 (to appear).
3. ———, *Stable homotopy*, Proceedings of the Conference on Categorical Algebra, Springer-Verlag, 1966 (to appear).

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA