## A BORSUK-ULAM THEOREM FOR MAPS FROM A SPHERE TO A COMPACT TOPOLOGICAL MANIFOLD
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## 1. Introduction, notation

It is the purpose of this paper to prove the following Borsuk-Ulam-typetheorem:

Theorem 1. Let $f: S^{n} \rightarrow M^{k}$ be a map from the $n$-sphere to a compact topological $k$-manifold $M^{k}$; let $A(f)=\left\{x \in S^{n} ; f(x)=f(-x)\right\}$. Then
(a) if $n>k$, then $\operatorname{dim}(A(f)) \geq n-k$;
(b) if $n=k$ and $f^{*}: H^{n}\left(M^{n} ; \overline{Z_{2}}\right) \rightarrow H^{n}\left(S^{n} ; Z_{2}\right)$ is zero, then $A(f) \neq \emptyset$.

If one restricts to manifolds admitting a differentiable structure the theorem may be found in [1]; the restriction to the case $M^{k}=R^{k}$ is known as the Bourgin-Yang-theorem (see [5] and [6]); our line of reasoning is close to that of [1].

As for notation the following should be noted: All coefficient groups are $Z_{2}$; therefore, they shall be suppressed from the notation. $H_{*}\left(H^{*}\right)$ denotes singular homology (cohomology), and $\bar{H}^{*}$ denotes Alexander-Spanier cohomology in the sense of Section 6.1 of [2] (see also Section 6.4 of [2]). By dim we understand the usual topological dimension. Finally manifold is taken to mean topological manifold, and the word closed (for a manifold) is an abbreviation for "compact and without boundary".

## 2. Reduction of the problem

Throughout this section and the next one $M^{k}$ will be a closed, connected manifold of dimension $k \leq n$, and $f: S^{n} \rightarrow M^{k}$ will be a fixed map, taking the south-pole into $x_{0}$. On the manifold $Y=S^{n} \times M^{k} \times M^{k}$ there is an involution $T$ given by the formula $T(x, y, z)=(-x, z, y)$; letting $\Delta\left(M^{k}\right)$ be the diagonal in $M^{k} \times M^{k}$ we have in $Y$ two submanifolds $S^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)$ and $S^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)$; they are both invariant under $T$, so they project to give submanifolds
$\left(S^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)\right) / T=P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right) \quad$ and $\quad\left(S^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)\right) / T=P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)$ of the orbit manifold $Y / T$. -Also the map $\bar{s}: S^{n} \rightarrow Y$, given by

$$
\bar{s}(x)=(x, f(x), f(-x))
$$

induces a map $s: P^{n} \rightarrow Y / T$; letting $A(f)=\left\{x \in S^{n} ; f(x)=f(-x)\right\}$ and denoting by $B(f)$ the image of $A(f)$ under the natural map $S^{n} \rightarrow P^{n}$, we have
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$$
B(f)=s^{-1}\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)\right)
$$

Now let $\varphi \epsilon H^{k}(Y / T)$ be the Poincare-dual of the orientation class $\sigma$ of the submanifold $P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)$ of $Y / T$; we then have the following.

Lemma 2.1. If $s^{*}(\varphi) \neq 0$, then $\bar{H}^{n-k}(B(f)) \neq 0$.
Proof. The following proof is just a rearrangement of the proof of [1, (33.2)]. -We first show
(2.1) for every neighbourhood $U$ of $P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)$ in $Y / T$ we have

$$
\varphi \in \operatorname{Im}\left(H^{k}(Y / T, Y / T-U) \rightarrow H^{k}(Y / T)\right)
$$

To prove this assertion we let $V$ be an open neighbourhood of $P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)$ with $V \subseteq U$; we then read off (2.1) from the commutative diagram

where $\bar{\gamma}_{v}$ denotes duality in the sense of [2, (6.2.17)], $i$ is the natural transformation from $\bar{H}$ to $H$ (see [2, p. 289]), and all the unlabelled maps are induced by appropriate inclusions.

Next we prove ( $c$ is the generator of $H^{1}\left(P^{n}\right)$ )
(2.2) for every neighbourhood $V$ of $B(f)$ in $P^{n}$ we have

$$
c^{k} \in \operatorname{Im}\left(H^{k}\left(P^{n}, P^{n}-V\right) \rightarrow H^{k}\left(P^{n}\right)\right)
$$

Since for every neighbourhood $V$ of $B(f)$ in $P^{n}$ there is a neighbourhood $U$ of $P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)$ in $Y / T$ with $s^{-1}(U) \subseteq V$, it is clearly sufficient to prove (2.2) with $V=s^{-1}(U), U$ a neighbourhood of $P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)$ in $Y / T$; and in this case the assertion follows immediately from the commutative diagram

using (2.1) and the hypothesis that $s^{*}(\varphi)=c^{k}$.
Now, assume that $\bar{H}^{n-k}(B(f))=0$; then $c^{n-k}$ maps to zero under the composition

$$
H^{n-k}\left(P^{n}\right) \stackrel{i^{-1}}{\cong} \bar{H}^{n-k}\left(P^{n}\right) \rightarrow \bar{H}^{n-k}(B(f))
$$

therefore, by the definition of $\bar{H}$ there is an open neighbourhood $U$ of $B(f)$
in $P^{n}$, such that $c^{n-k}$ maps to zero under $H^{n-k}\left(P^{n}\right) \rightarrow H^{n-k}(U)$, i.e. we have (2.3) $c^{n-k} \epsilon \operatorname{Im}\left(H^{n-k}\left(P^{n}, U\right) \rightarrow H^{n-k}\left(P^{n}\right)\right)$ for some open neighbourhood $U$ of $B(f)$ in $P^{n}$.
Using (2.3) and (2.2) with $V$ closed and $V \subseteq U$ we get that

$$
c^{n}=c^{k} \cdot c^{n-k} \epsilon \operatorname{Im}\left(H^{n}\left(P^{n}, U \mathbf{u}\left(P^{n}-V\right)\right) \rightarrow H^{n}\left(P^{n}\right)\right) ;
$$

since $H^{n}\left(P^{n}, U \mathbf{u}\left(P^{n}-V\right)\right)=H^{n}\left(P^{n}, P^{n}\right)=0$ this gives the desired contradiction and Lemma 2.1 is proved.

This lemma reduces the proof of Theorem 1 to a consideration of $s^{*}(\varphi)$; however, there is a further reduction which is only implicitly contained in [1], but which we shall here need in an explicit form. It is stated in the next two lemmas.

Lemma 2.2. If $k<n$, and

$$
j_{*}: H_{n+k}\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)\right) \rightarrow H_{n+k}\left(Y / T, Y / T-P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)\right)
$$

is non-zero, then $\bar{H}^{n-k}(B(f)) \neq 0$.
Proof. Changing $f$ by a homotopy will change $s$ by a homotopy; since we only have to prove that $s^{*}(\varphi) \neq 0$, we may, therefore, assume that $f$ maps the lower hemisphere $E^{n}$ to $x_{0}$; then the restriction of $s$ to $P^{n-1}$ imbeds $P^{n-1}$ in the standard manner in $P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)$; we then have the commutative diagram

and it is sufficient to prove that $i_{3}^{*}(\varphi) \neq 0$ (since then $i_{2}^{*} s^{*}(\varphi)=i_{1}^{*} i_{3}^{*}(\varphi)=$ $i_{1}^{*}\left(c^{k} \otimes 1\right)=c^{k}$, and $\left.s^{*}(\varphi) \neq 0\right)$; but $i_{3}^{*}(\varphi) \neq 0$ follows immediately from the assumptions of the lemma combined with the commutative diagram


Lemma 2.3. If $k=n, f^{*}: H^{n}\left(M^{n}\right) \rightarrow H^{n}\left(S^{n}\right)$ is zero and

$$
j_{*}: H_{n+k}\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)\right) \rightarrow H_{n+k}\left(Y / T, Y / T-P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)\right)
$$

is nom-zero, then $\vec{H}^{0}(B(f)) \neq 0$.

Proof. As above we may assume that $f: S^{n}, E^{n} \rightarrow M^{n}, x_{0}$; then $s$ factors through $Y^{\prime} / T=\left(S^{n} \times\left(M^{n} \vee M^{n}\right)\right) / T$ as shown in the diagram


Consider now the diagram

where $i_{3}, i_{4}$, and $i_{5}$ are inclusions, $h$ is the obvious homeomorphism, and $p_{1}$ is the map induced by the projection $Y^{\prime}=S^{n} \times\left(M^{n} \vee M^{n}\right) \rightarrow S^{n}$. Since $p_{1} s_{1}=1$ we have that $s_{1}^{*}\left(p_{1}^{*}\left(c^{n}\right)\right)=c^{n}$; let $\gamma=p_{1}^{*}\left(c^{n}\right)$; then

$$
i_{5}^{*}(\gamma)=\left(p_{1} i_{5}\right)^{*}\left(c^{n}\right)=h^{*}\left(c^{n}\right)=c^{n} \otimes 1 \epsilon H^{n}\left(P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)\right) ;
$$

also, precisely as in the proof of Lemma 2.2 we have that $i_{3}^{*}(\varphi) \neq 0$, i.e. $i_{3}^{*}(\varphi)=c^{n} \otimes 1$; now

$$
i_{5}^{*}\left(i_{4}^{*}(\varphi)+\gamma\right)=i_{3}^{*}(\varphi)+i_{5}^{*}(\gamma)=c^{n} \otimes 1+c^{n} \otimes 1=0
$$

so that $i_{4}^{*}(\varphi)+\gamma \in \operatorname{Im}\left(j_{1}^{*}\right)$, where $j_{1}$ is the inclusion $Y^{\prime} / T \rightarrow Y^{\prime} / T$, $P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)$. If we can now prove that the composition

$$
H^{n}\left(Y^{\prime} / T, P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)\right) \xrightarrow{j_{1}^{*}} H^{n}\left(Y^{\prime} / T\right) \xrightarrow{s_{1}^{*}} H^{n}\left(P^{n}\right)
$$

is zero, we then get that $s_{1}^{*}\left(i_{4}^{*}(\varphi)+\gamma\right)=s^{*}(\varphi)+c^{n}=0$, from which $s^{*}(\varphi)=c^{n} \neq 0$.

We may, therefore, concentrate on proving that $s_{1}^{*} j_{1}^{*}=0$. -To that end let $t$ be the involution on $M^{n} \vee M^{n}$ given by

$$
t\left(y, x_{0}\right)=\left(x_{0}, y\right) \quad \text { and } t\left(x_{0}, y\right)=\left(y, x_{0}\right)
$$

the projection $S^{n} \times\left(M^{n} \vee M^{n}\right) \rightarrow M^{n} \vee M^{n}$ induces a map

$$
b: Y^{\prime} / T \rightarrow\left(M^{n} \vee M^{n}\right) / t
$$

and the $\operatorname{map} \bar{F}: S^{n} \rightarrow M^{n} \vee M^{n}$, given by $\bar{F}(x)=(f(x), f(-x))$, induces a map

$$
F: P^{n} \rightarrow\left(M^{n} \vee M^{n}\right) / t
$$

these two maps serve to make the diagram

commutative. -Looking at the commutative diagram

where the isomorphism to the left is that induced by the obvious homeomorphism

$$
\left(M^{n} \vee M^{n}\right) / t \rightarrow M^{n}
$$

and the isomorphisms to the right are all standard isomorphisms, we see that $F^{*}=0$. Consider next the commutative diagram

where $a(x, y)=\operatorname{cls}\left(x, y, x_{0}\right), a^{\prime}(y)=\operatorname{cls}\left(y, x_{0}\right)$, and $b^{\prime}$ is projection.
It is easy to see that $a$ is a relative homeomorphism; also $S^{n} \times x_{0}$ is a strong deformation retract of one of its closed neighbourhoods $N$ in $S^{n} \times M^{n}$ (e.g. $N=S^{n} \times D, D$ a closed disc around $x_{0}$ in $M^{n}$ ); hence (see e.g. [2, (4.8.9)])

$$
a_{*}: H_{n}\left(S^{n} \times M^{n}, S^{n} \times x_{0}\right) \rightarrow H_{n}\left(\left(S^{n} \times\left(M^{n} \vee M^{n}\right)\right) / T, P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)\right)
$$

is an isomorphism; since coefficients are $Z_{2}$ we also get that

$$
a^{*}: H^{n}\left(\left(S^{n} \times\left(M^{n} \vee M^{n}\right)\right) / T, P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)\right) \rightarrow H^{n}\left(S^{n} \times M^{n}, S^{n} \times x_{0}\right)
$$

is an isomorphism. $\left(a^{\prime}\right)^{*}$ and $\left(b^{\prime}\right)^{*}$ are easily seen to be isomorphisms; and we get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
b^{*}: H^{n} & \left(\left(M^{n} \vee M^{n}\right) / t,\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)\right) \\
& \rightarrow H^{n}\left(\left(S^{n} \times\left(M^{n} \vee M^{n}\right)\right) / T, P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

is an isomorphism. -Putting in " $F^{*}=0$ " and " $b$ * iso" in the diagram (2.4) we get $s_{1}^{*} j_{1}^{*}=0$ as desired.

Remark. What is actually proved in the first part of this section is the following more general proposition:

Let $M^{k}$ be a (normal, Hausdorff or something like that) topological space; suppose you have an element $\varphi \in H^{k}(Y / T)$ such that (2.1) holds, and such that $s^{*}(\varphi) \neq 0$; then $\bar{H}^{n-k}(B(f)) \neq 0$.

## 3. Proof of " $j_{*} \neq 0$ "

In this section we keep the notation from Section 2; we start the section with the assumption that
(3.1) $j_{*}: H_{n+k}\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)\right) \rightarrow H_{n+k}\left(Y / T, Y / T-P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)\right)$ is zero, and we finish it by a contradiction.

Since $H_{n+k}$ has compact support (in the sense of [2, 4.8.11]) we have a closed set $B \subseteq Y / T-P^{n} \times\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)$ such that $H_{n+k}\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)\right) \rightarrow$ $H_{n+k}(Y / T, B)$ is zero; $B$ is of the form $B^{\prime} / T$, where $B^{\prime}$ is a closed subset of $S^{n} \times\left(M^{k} \times M^{k}-\left(x_{0}, x_{0}\right)\right)$; now $B^{\prime}$ is contained in

$$
S^{n} \times\left(M^{k} \times M^{k}-D \times D\right)
$$

for some $\operatorname{disc} D$ around $x_{0}$ in $M^{k}$; also we may suppose that $D$ is an open disc, contained (properly) in some other open disc $D^{\prime}$ around $x_{0}$ in $M^{k}$. Then $B \subseteq\left(S^{n} \times\left(M^{k} \times M^{k}-D \times D\right)\right) / T$, and from the above we have

$$
\begin{align*}
j_{*}: H_{n+k}\left(P^{n}\right. & \left.\times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)\right) \rightarrow \\
& H_{n+k}\left(Y / T,\left(S^{n} \times\left(M^{k} \times M^{k}-D \times D\right)\right) / T\right) \text { is zero. } \tag{3.2}
\end{align*}
$$

Consider then $P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}-D\right)$; this is a submanifold of $P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right)$ with boundary; therefore, in the commutative diagram

(where the column is part of the exact sequence of the pair) the upper left hand group is zero; from (3.2) we then get that $j_{*}^{\prime}$ is not monic.

Now

$$
P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}-D^{\prime}\right)
$$

is closed and contained in the interior of $P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}-D\right)$; also

$$
\left(S^{n} \times\left(M^{k} \times M^{k}-D^{\prime} \times D^{\prime}\right)\right) / T
$$

is closed and contained in the interior of $\left(S^{n} \times\left(M^{k} \times M^{k}-D \times D\right)\right) / T$; hence in the diagram

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H_{n+k}\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(D^{\prime}\right), P^{n} \times \Delta\left(D^{\prime}-D\right)\right) \xrightarrow{j_{*}^{\prime \prime}} H_{n+k} \\
& \cdot\left(\left(S^{n} \times D^{\prime} \times D^{\prime}\right) / T,\left(S^{n} \times\left(D^{\prime} \times D^{\prime}-D \times D\right)\right) / T\right) \\
& H_{n+k}\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}\right), P^{n} \times \Delta\left(M^{k}-D\right)\right) \\
& \quad \xrightarrow{j_{*}^{\prime \prime}} H_{n+k}\left(\left(S^{n} \times M^{k} \times M^{k}\right) / T,\left(S^{n} \times\left(M^{k} \times M^{k}-D \times D\right)\right) / T\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

the vertical maps are excision-isomorphisms, and we get that
(3.3) $j_{*}^{\prime \prime}$ is not monic.

Considering next the pair-sequences of the pairs involved in (3.3) and noticing that $H_{n+k}\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(D^{\prime}\right)\right)=0$ we get

$$
\begin{align*}
j_{*}^{(3)}: H_{n+k-1} & \left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(D^{\prime}-D\right)\right) \\
& \rightarrow H_{n+k-1}\left(\left(S^{n} \times\left(D^{\prime} \times D^{\prime}-D \times D\right)\right) / T\right) \text { is not monic. } \tag{3.4}
\end{align*}
$$

We now assume that $D$ is a disc around 0 of radius 1 in euclidean $k$-space, and that $D^{\prime}$ is a disc around 0 of radius (say) 2 in euclidean $k$-space. There is then a continuous map

$$
\bar{R}: S^{n} \times\left(D^{\prime} \times D^{\prime}-D \times D\right) \times I \rightarrow S^{n} \times\left(D^{\prime} \times D^{\prime}-D \times D\right)
$$

given by

$$
\begin{array}{rlr}
\bar{R}(x, y, z, t) & =(x,((1 /\|y\|-1) t+1) y, z), & y \in D^{\prime}-D, z \in \bar{D}, \\
& =(x, y,((1 /\|z\|-1) t+1) z), & y \in \bar{D}, z \in D^{\prime}-D \\
& =(x,((1 /\|y\|-1) t+1) y,((1 /\|z\|-1) t+1) z) \\
& y \in D^{\prime}-D, z \in D^{\prime}-D .
\end{array}
$$

Since $\bar{R}$ is equivariant it induces a map
$R:\left(S^{n} \times\left(D^{\prime} \times D^{\prime}-D \times D\right)\right) / T \times I \rightarrow\left(S^{n} \times\left(D^{\prime} \times D^{\prime}-D \times D\right)\right) / T$,
which is easily seen to give deformation retractions from $\left.S^{n} \times\left(D^{\prime} \times D^{\prime}-D \times D\right)\right) / T$ to $\left(S^{n} \times\left(\bar{D}^{\cdot} \times \bar{D}\right.\right.$ ч $\left.\left.\bar{D} \times \bar{D}^{\cdot}\right)\right) / T\left({ }^{-}\right.$is closure, is boundary) and from $\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(D^{\prime}-D\right)\right)$ to $P^{n} \times \Delta\left(\bar{D}^{\cdot}\right)$.

Therefore, in the diagram

the vertical maps are isomorphisms, and we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
j_{*}^{(4)}: H_{n+k-1}\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(\bar{D}^{\bullet}\right)\right) \rightarrow H_{n+k-1}\left(\left(S^{n} \times\left(\bar{D} \times \bar{D} \text { ч } \bar{D} \times \bar{D}^{\bullet}\right)\right) / T\right. \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

is not monic (and, hence, zero).
We have now reformulated our assumption in terms of differentiable manifolds, and we may proceed as follows:

Let $N$ denote the normal bundle of the imbedding

$$
P^{n} \times \Delta\left(\bar{D}^{\cdot}\right) \subseteq\left(S^{n} \times\left(\bar{D}^{\cdot} \times \bar{D} \cup \bar{D} \times \bar{D}^{\cdot}\right)\right) / T
$$

and let $\bar{N}$ be the normal bundle of the imbedding

$$
\Delta\left(\bar{D}^{\cdot}\right) \subseteq\left(\bar{D} \times \bar{D} \cup \bar{D} \times \bar{D}^{\cdot}\right)
$$

then from [1, (32.3)] we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
w_{k}(N)=\sum_{\mu=0}^{k} c^{\mu} \otimes w_{k-\mu}(\bar{N}) \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand Thom ([4], see also [1, pp. 84, 85]) has proved that $w_{k}(N)$ is the image of the orientation class of $P^{n} \times \Delta\left(\bar{D}^{\cdot}\right)$ under the map

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{n+k-1}\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(\bar{D}^{\cdot}\right)\right) & \xrightarrow{j_{*}^{(4)}} H_{n+k-1}\left(\left(S^{n} \times\left(\bar{D}^{\cdot} \times \bar{D} \cup \bar{D} \times \bar{D}^{\cdot}\right)\right) / T\right) \\
& \xrightarrow{\gamma_{U}} H^{k}\left(\left(S^{n} \times\left(\bar{D} \times \bar{D} \cup \bar{D} \times \bar{D}^{\cdot}\right)\right) / T\right) \xrightarrow{\left(j^{(4)}\right)^{*}} H^{k}\left(P^{n} \times \Delta\left(\bar{D}^{\cdot}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

so $w_{k}(N)=0$, which clearly contradicts (3.6).

## 4. Proof of Theorem 1

Step 1. $M^{k}$ is closed and connected. Using Lemma 2.2, Lemma 2.3, and Lemma 3.1 one only has to notice that $\operatorname{dim}(A(f)) \geq \operatorname{dim}(B(f))$.

Step 2. $M^{k}$ is compact and connected but with boundary. Since the boundary of $M^{k}$ is collared in $M^{k}$ (see [3, IV]) we have the usual construction of the "double of $M^{k}$ " $W$ ( $W$ consists of two copies of $M^{k}$, identified along their common boundary); applying step 1 to $W$ we get the result.

Step 3. $M$ is compact, but not connected. Since $f$ maps $S^{n}$ into a connectedness component of $M^{k}$, the theorem follows from the other cases.

Remark. If one knew that a compact subset of an arbitrary manifold is contained in some compact submanifold one could of course drop the assumption of compactness of $M^{k}$; the author, however, has no knowledge concerning that point.
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