

MINIMAL COCKCROFT SUBGROUPS

by JENS HARLANDER

(Received 20 July, 1992)

Statement of results. Consider any group G . A $[G, 2]$ -complex is a connected 2-dimensional CW-complex with fundamental group G . If X is a $[G, 2]$ -complex and L is a subgroup of G , let X_L denote the covering complex of X corresponding to the subgroup L . We say that a $[G, 2]$ -complex is L -Cockcroft if the Hurewicz map $h_L: \pi_2(X) \rightarrow H_2(X_L)$ is trivial. In case $L = G$ we call X Cockcroft. There are interesting classes of 2-complexes that have the Cockcroft property. A $[G, 2]$ -complex X is *aspherical* if $\pi_2(X) = 0$. It was observed in [4] that a subcomplex of an aspherical 2-complex is Cockcroft. The Cockcroft property is of interest to group theorists as well. Let X be a $[G, 2]$ -complex modelled on a presentation $\langle S; R \rangle$ of the group G . If it can be shown that X is Cockcroft, then it follows from Hopf's theorem (see [2, p. 31]) that $H_2(G)$ is isomorphic to $H_2(X)$. In particular $H_2(G)$ is free abelian. For a survey on the Cockcroft property see Dyer [5]. A collection $\{G_\alpha: \alpha \in \Omega\}$ of subgroups of a group G that is totally ordered by inclusion is called a *chain of subgroups of G* . Defining $\beta \leq \alpha$ if and only if $G_\alpha \leq G_\beta$ makes Ω into a totally ordered set. The main result of this paper is the following theorem.

THEOREM 1. *Let $\{G_\alpha: \alpha \in \Omega\}$ be a chain of subgroups of a group G . A $[G, 2]$ -complex X that is G_α -Cockcroft for all $\alpha \in \Omega$ is also $\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in \Omega} G_\alpha\right)$ -Cockcroft.*

Theorem 1 together with Zorn's lemma give the next result.

COROLLARY 1. *Let X be a Cockcroft $[G, 2]$ -complex. Then G contains a minimal subgroup L such that X is L -Cockcroft.*

It is a longstanding open question raised by J. H. C. Whitehead [9] whether a subcomplex of an aspherical complex is aspherical. Suppose X is a subcomplex of an aspherical 2-complex Y and denote by K the kernel of the map $\pi_1(X) - \pi_1(Y)$ induced by inclusion. J. F. Adams [1] showed that if X is not aspherical then K contains a nontrivial perfect subgroup. He studied a certain system of coverings $\{X_{K_\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \Omega}$ of X_K , where $\{K_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Omega}$ is the set of characteristic subgroups of K such that the quotients K/K_α are C -conservative for any abelian group C . A group G is C -conservative if the functor $C \otimes_{CG}$ detects monomorphisms between projective CG -modules; i.e. if $\Psi: P \rightarrow Q$ is a homomorphism between projective CG -modules and $C \otimes_{CG} \Psi: C \otimes_{CG} P \rightarrow C \otimes_{CG} Q$ is injective, then Ψ is injective (see also Howie [8]). Adams observed that N , the intersection of all groups K_α , is perfect and that $H_2(X_N) = 0$. If one assumes X to be non-aspherical, then the second homology of the universal covering of X is non-trivial. Thus X_N is different from the universal covering and therefore N is non-trivial (see also Howie [6] and [7]).

The proof of Theorem 1 relies on a lemma that deals with arbitrary systems of coverings $\{X_{G_\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \Omega}$ of a $[G, 2]$ -complex X . We show that $H_2(X_N)$ embeds in $\varprojlim H_2(X_{G_\alpha})$, where N is the intersection of all the G_α . We use this result also to characterize non-asphericity of a 2-complex X with $H_2(X) = 0$ by the existence of a certain minimal subgroup of $\pi_1(X)$.

THEOREM 2. *Let X be a $[G, 2]$ -complex with $H_2(X) = 0$. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) X is non-aspherical;
- (ii) there exists a non-trivial minimal subgroup L of G such that $H_2(X_L) = 0$.

Furthermore, if X is non-aspherical, then no group L as in (ii) can have a nontrivial \mathbb{Z} -conservative quotient; in particular L_{ab} is torsion.

Assume now that X is a subcomplex of an aspherical 2-complex Y . As before let K denote the kernel of the homomorphism $\pi_1(X) \rightarrow \pi_1(Y)$ induced by the inclusion map. The covering complex X_K of X can be viewed as a subcomplex of the universal covering complex \tilde{Y} of Y . Since X_K and \tilde{Y} are 2-complexes, the map $H_2(X_K) \rightarrow H_2(\tilde{Y})$ induced by inclusion is injective. Since $H_2(\tilde{Y}) = \pi_2(\tilde{Y}) = 0$ it follows that $H_2(X_K) = 0$. Theorem 2 applied to the complex X_K together with the fact that X is non-aspherical if and only if X_K is non-aspherical, yield the following result.

COROLLARY 2. *Let X be a $[G, 2]$ -complex that is a subcomplex of an aspherical 2-complex Y . Let K be the kernel of the homomorphism $\pi_1(X) \rightarrow \pi_1(Y)$ induced by inclusion. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) X is non-aspherical;
- (ii) there exists a nontrivial minimal subgroup L of K such that $H_2(X_L) = 0$.

Furthermore, if X is non-aspherical, then no group L as in (ii) can have a non-trivial \mathbb{Z} -conservative quotient; in particular L_{ab} is torsion.

I am grateful to Mike Dyer for many helpful suggestions.

Proof of results. Let X be a $[G, 2]$ -complex and let $\{G_\alpha : \alpha \in \Omega\}$ be a chain of subgroups of G . Denote by \tilde{X} the universal covering complex of X and by p the covering projection

$$p : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X.$$

The preimage $p^{-1}(c)$ of each open cell c in X consists of open cells $\tilde{c}_g, g \in G$, such that

$$p|_{\tilde{c}_g} : \tilde{c}_g \rightarrow c$$

is a homeomorphism. For each G_α , the orbit complex \tilde{X}/G_α , denoted by X_α , is the covering complex X_{G_α} with covering projection

$$p_\alpha : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X_\alpha.$$

Denote by N the intersection $\bigcap_{\alpha \in \Omega} G_\alpha$ and by p_N the covering projection

$$p_N : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X_N.$$

Let $p_{\alpha N}$ be the covering projection

$$p_{\alpha N} : X_N \rightarrow X_\alpha$$

and let $p_{\beta\alpha}$ be the covering projection

$$p_{\beta\alpha} : X_\alpha \rightarrow X_\beta$$

for $\alpha \geq \beta$. The cells in X_N and in X_α are just N and G_α orbits of cells in \tilde{X} . So if $N * \tilde{c} = \{n * \tilde{c} : n \in N, \tilde{c} \text{ an open cell of } \tilde{X}\}$ is an open cell of X_N , then $p_{\alpha N}$ sends this open

cell homeomorphically onto the open cell $G_\alpha * \bar{c}$ of X_{G_α} and $p_{\beta\alpha}$ sends the open cell $G_\alpha * \bar{c}$ of X_α homeomorphically onto the open cell $G_\beta * \bar{c}$ of X_β for $\alpha \geq \beta$. Now $(C_2(X_\alpha), p_{\alpha\beta})_{\alpha, \beta \in \Omega}$ is an inverse system of Abelian groups with inverse limit $\varprojlim C_2(X_\alpha)$.

LEMMA 1. $\varprojlim p_{\alpha N_*} : C_2(X_N) \rightarrow \varprojlim C_2(X_\alpha)$ is injective and yields an injection from $H_2(X_N)$ to $\varprojlim H_2(X_\alpha)$ when restricted to $H_2(X_N)$; in particular, if all the $H_2(X_\alpha)$ are trivial, then $H_2(X_N)$ is trivial.

Proof. First we show that if $c_1 = N * \bar{c}_1$ and $c_2 = N * \bar{c}_2$ are two different open cells in X_N , then there exists an element $\beta \in \Omega$ such that $p_{\beta N}(c_1)$ and $p_{\beta N}(c_2)$ are two different open cells in X_β . Suppose not. Then

$$G_\alpha * \bar{c}_1 = G_\alpha * \bar{c}_2$$

for all $\alpha \in \Omega$. So, in particular,

$$\bar{c}_1 \in G_\alpha * \bar{c}_2$$

for all $\alpha \in \Omega$. Then for each $\alpha \in \Omega$ there exists a g_α in G_α such that

$$\bar{c}_1 = g_\alpha * \bar{c}_2.$$

Fix an element $\gamma \in \Omega$; then $g_\alpha * \bar{c}_2 = \bar{c}_1 = g_\gamma * \bar{c}_2$ for all $\alpha \in \Omega$; hence $g_\gamma^{-1} g_\alpha * \bar{c}_2 = \bar{c}_2$ for all $\alpha \in \Omega$. Since G acts freely on the set of open cells of \tilde{X} this says that $g_\gamma^{-1} g_\alpha = 1$; thus $g_\gamma = g_\alpha \in G_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \Omega$ and therefore g_γ is an element of the intersection N . Since

$$\bar{c}_1 = g_\gamma * \bar{c}_2,$$

we have $c_1 = N * \bar{c}_1 = N * \bar{c}_2 = c_2$, which contradicts our assumption that c_1 and c_2 are different cells. Suppose now that

$$z = \sum_{k=1}^m n_k c_k,$$

is a nontrivial element of $C_2(X_N)$, so that the integers n_k are nonzero and the cells c_k are different 2-cells of X_N . If $m = 1$, then

$$p_{\alpha N_*}(z) = n_1 p_{\alpha N}(c_1) \neq 0$$

for all $\alpha \in \Omega$. If $m > 1$ then for every pair $\{i, j\}$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we can find an element $\beta(i, j) \in \Omega$ such that $p_{\beta(i, j) N}(c_i)$ and $p_{\beta(i, j) N}(c_j)$ are two different 2-cells of $X_{\beta(i, j)}$. Let β be the largest element among the finitely many $\beta(i, j)$. Then $p_{\beta N}(c_i)$ and $p_{\beta N}(c_j)$ are different cells for any pair (i, j) , $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, so

$$p_{\beta N_*}(z) = \sum_{k=1}^m n_k p_{\beta N}(c_k) \neq 0.$$

This shows that

$$\varprojlim p_{\alpha N_*}(z) \neq 0.$$

LEMMA 2. $(\varprojlim p_{\alpha N_*}) \circ h_N = \varprojlim h_\alpha$.

Proof. From the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \pi_2(X) & \xrightarrow{p_{\#}^{-1}} & \pi_2(\bar{X}) & \xrightarrow{h} & H_2(\bar{X}) & \longrightarrow & C_2(\bar{X}) \\
 & \searrow^{h_N} & & & \downarrow p_N & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & H_2(X_L) & \longrightarrow & C_2(X_L)
 \end{array}$$

we see that for every $\alpha \in \Omega$,

$$p_{\alpha N_*} \circ h_N = p_{\alpha N_*} \circ p_N \circ h \circ p_{\#}^{-1} = p_{\alpha_*} \circ h \circ p_{\#}^{-1} = h_{\alpha}.$$

Hence $(\varprojlim p_{\alpha N_*}) \circ h_N = \varprojlim h_{\alpha}$.

Proof of Theorem 1. Since X is G_{α} -Cockcroft for every $\alpha \in \Omega$, each h_{α} is the zero map. Hence $\varprojlim h_{\alpha}$ is the zero map. Lemma 2 and the fact that, by Lemma 1, $\varprojlim p_{\alpha N_*}$ is injective show that h_N is the zero map as well. So X is N -Cockcroft.

Proof of Theorem 2. Only the direction (i) \Rightarrow (ii) requires a proof. If $\{G_{\alpha} : \alpha \in \Omega\}$ is a chain of subgroups of G such that $H_2(X_{\alpha}) = 0$ for all α , then $H_2(X_N) = 0$ by Lemma 1; as before X_{α} is the 2-complex $\bar{X}_{G_{\alpha}}$ and N is the intersection of all the G_{α} . The existence of a minimal subgroup L such that $H_2(X_L) = 0$ now follows from Zorn's Lemma. If L/K were a non-trivial \mathbb{Z} -conservative quotient of L , then K would be a proper subgroup of L with $H_2(X_K) = 0$ by definition of \mathbb{Z} -conservative. This contradicts minimality of L .

REFERENCES

1. J. F. Adams, A new proof of a theorem of W. H. Cockcroft, *J. London Math. Soc.* **30** (1955), 482–488.
2. K. S. Brown, *Cohomology of groups* (Springer, 1982).
3. W. A. Bogley, Unions of Cockcroft two-complexes, preprint.
4. W. H. Cockcroft, On two-dimensional aspherical complexes, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) **4** (1954), 375–384.
5. M. N. Dyer, Cockcroft 2-complexes, preprint.
6. J. Howie, Aspherical and acyclic 2-complexes, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) **20** (1979), 549–558.
7. J. Howie, On the fundamental group of an almost-acyclic 2-complex, *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.* (2) **24** (1981), 119–122.
8. J. Howie, How to generalize one-relator group theory, *Combinatorial group theory and topology*, ed. S. M. Gersten and J. R. Stallings (Ann. of Math. Stud. 111, Princeton Univ. Press, 1987), 53–78.
9. J. H. C. Whitehead, On adding relations to homotopy groups, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **42** (1941), 409–428.

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK
JOHANN WOLFGANG GOETHE-UNIVERSITÄT
6000 FRANKFURT/MAIN 11