

## The ordinary $Z_2$ -homology theory and singular bordism theories

By Michihiro TAKAHASHI

(Received Aug. 3, 1976)

(Revised Aug. 3, 1977)

### Introduction.

The first part (§1~§5) of this paper is devoted to describe the ordinary  $Z_2$ -homology theory from the viewpoint of the singular bordism theory developed in [2].

Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the category whose objects are homogeneous finite simplicial complexes which have mod 2 boundaries and whose morphisms are  $pl$ -imbeddings which take boundary into boundary.

Then we have our main result (Theorem 2 in §4) which shows that the ordinary  $Z_2$ -homology theory is reconstructed with  $\mathcal{K}$  by the analogous method of [2].

The latter part (§6 and §7) is devoted to explain the relation of singular complex theory and singular bordism theory.

For the purpose, we introduce notions of bordism category and (generalized) singular bordism theory. Our bordism category is a generalization of both chain complex and cobordism category defined by R. E. Stong [4] from the categorical point of view. A bordism category defines a singular bordism theory if it is regular, that is, it has finite sums and an initial object. Every chain complex becomes a bordism category as discrete category, but unfortunately it is not regular and induces no singular bordism theory. Therefore the classical singular complex theory is not singular bordism theory.

On the other hand, our category  $\mathcal{K}$  is a regular bordism category and induces a singular bordism theory which defines the ordinary  $Z_2$ -homology theory.

### §1. $Z_2$ -complexes.

(1.1) *Simplicial complexes* which we consider in this paper are finite simplicial complexes in some Euclidean spaces. The underlying space of a simplicial complex  $K$  is denoted by  $|K|$  as usual if it is necessary to distinguish them, but we will often write  $K$  for  $|K|$  for convenience. We regard the empty set

$\emptyset$  as a simplex so that  $\emptyset \in K$  for any simplicial complex  $K$ . Also by the same symbol  $\emptyset$  we denote the complex which consists of only one simplex  $\emptyset$ . For two simplexes  $s$  and  $s'$  of  $K$ , we write  $s' \prec s$ , if  $s'$  is a face of  $s$ , so that  $\emptyset \prec s$  and  $s \prec s$  for any simplex  $s$ .

(1.2) A map from a simplicial complex  $K$  to a simplicial complex  $L$  is a continuous map  $f: |K| \rightarrow |L|$ , and is denoted by  $f: K \rightarrow L$ .

A subdivision  $K'$  of  $K$  is a complex such that  $|K'| = |K|$  and each simplex of  $K'$  is contained in a simplex of  $K$ . We write  $K' < K$  if  $K'$  is a subdivision of  $K$ .

A map  $f: K \rightarrow L$  between finite simplicial complexes is *piecewise linear* if there exists a subdivision  $K'$  of  $K$  so that  $f$  maps each simplex of  $K'$  linearly into a simplex of  $L$ .

(1.3) A simplicial complex  $K$  is a  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex if  $K$  is made up of only finite  $n$ -simplexes and their faces. In particular empty complex  $\emptyset$  is a  $Z_2$ -complex. If  $K$  is a  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex, then we may define the boundary  $\partial K$  of  $K$  as follows.  $\partial K$  is the subcomplex of  $K$  which is made up of  $(n-1)$ -simplexes which are faces of an odd number of  $n$ -simplexes of  $K$ , and their faces. In particular we notice that  $\partial K^0 = \emptyset$  for any 0-dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex  $K^0$ , and  $\partial \emptyset = \emptyset$ . Then  $\partial K$  is again a  $Z_2$ -complex.

An incidence number  $[s^m: s^{m-1}]$  is an element of  $Z_2$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} [s^m: s^{m-1}] &= 1, \quad \text{if } s^{m-1} \text{ is a face of } s^m, \\ &= 0, \quad \text{if } s^{m-1} \text{ is not a face of } s^m. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $[s^0: \emptyset] = 1$ .

The following properties are checked by the standard methods from our definitions:

PROPOSITION 1.

- (1)  $s^{m-1} \prec s^m$  if and only if  $[s^m: s^{m-1}] = 1$ .
- (2) If  $K$  is a  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex, then

$$s^{n-1} \in \partial K \text{ if and only if } \sum_{s^n \in K} [s^n: s^{n-1}] = 1 \quad (n \geq 1).$$

- (3) For any pair of  $s^n$  and  $s^{n-2}$  of  $K$ ,

$$\sum_{s^{n-1} \in K} [s^n: s^{n-1}][s^{n-1}: s^{n-2}] = 0 \quad (n \geq 1).$$

- (4)  $\partial \partial K = \emptyset$  for any  $Z_2$ -complex  $K$ .

(1.4) Since the composition of  $pl$ -imbeddings is a  $pl$ -imbedding, there exists a category  $\mathcal{K}$  whose objects are  $Z_2$ -complexes and whose morphisms are  $pl$ -imbed-

dings which take boundary into boundary (cf. §7). This category  $\mathcal{K}$  has *finite sums* by the disjoint union and has an *initial object* given by the empty complex  $\emptyset$ . By  $K+L$  we denote an object which is a sum for  $K$  and  $L$ .

(1.5) Let  $K$  and  $L$  be  $Z_2$ -complexes.

If  $K$  is simplicial isomorphic to  $L$ , we write  $K \cong L$ , and if  $K$  is piecewise linear isomorphic to  $L$ , we write  $K \simeq L$ .

Then we have easily :

PROPOSITION 2.

(1)  $K \cong L$  implies  $K \simeq L$ .

(2)  $K \simeq L$  implies that there are  $K'$  and  $L'$  such that  $K' < K$ ,  $L' < L$  and  $K' \cong L'$ .

(3)  $K' < K$  implies  $\partial K' \simeq \partial K$ . (4)  $K \simeq L$  implies  $\partial K \simeq \partial L$ .

PROOF. (1), (2) and (3) are well-known.

Proof of (4). Let  $K \simeq L$ . From (2), there exist  $K' < K$  and  $L' < L$  such that  $K' \cong L'$ , therefore  $\partial K' \cong \partial L'$ . From (3),  $\partial K \simeq \partial K' \cong \partial L' \simeq \partial L$ .

**§ 2. Bordism groups of the category  $\mathcal{K}$ .**

(2.1) A  $Z_2$ -complex  $K$  is *closed* if  $\partial K = \emptyset$ ,  $K$  *bounds* if there is a  $Z_2$ -complex  $W$  with  $\partial W$  piecewise linear isomorphic to  $K$ . Generally we say that two closed  $Z_2$ -complexes  $K$  and  $L$  are *bordant* if there exists a  $Z_2$ -complex  $W$  such that  $\partial W \simeq K+L$ . This will be written  $K \sim L$ ; we refer to this relation as the *bordism relation*.

We have easily :

PROPOSITION 3.

(1)  $K$  closed and  $K \simeq L$  implies  $L$  closed.

(2)  $K$  bounds and  $K \simeq L$  implies  $L$  bounds.

(3)  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation on the closed  $Z_2$ -complexes.

PROOF. (1) and (2) are trivially verified.

Proof of (3). (i) Since  $K$  is closed, we have  $\partial(I \times K) \simeq K+K$ . This implies  $K \sim K$ . (ii)  $K \sim L$  implies  $\partial W \simeq K+L$  for some  $W$ .  $K+L \simeq L+K$  implies  $\partial W \simeq L+K$ . This means  $L \sim K$ . (iii) Let  $\partial U \simeq K+L$  and  $\partial V \simeq L+N$ . We may suppose that  $L$  is a full subcomplex in  $U$  and  $V$ . Let  $W = U \underset{\mathbf{L}}{\oplus} V$  be a complex obtained from  $U+V$  by identifying two subcomplexes of  $U$  and  $V$  which are  $pl$ -isomorphic to  $L$ . Then we have easily  $W \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\partial W \simeq K+N$ . This completes the proof.

(2.2) The bordism relation  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation on the class of closed  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complexes. The resulting set  $\Omega_n(\mathcal{K})$  of equivalence classes is an abelian group with addition induced by disjoint union. Since  $\partial(I \times K) \simeq K+K$  for each closed  $Z_2$ -complex  $K$ , every element in  $\Omega_n(\mathcal{K})$  has order two.

(2.3) THEOREM 1.

$$\Omega_n(\mathcal{K}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \neq 0, \\ Z_2 & \text{if } n = 0. \end{cases}$$

PROOF. Let  $K$  be any closed  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex for  $n > 0$ , and  $v * K$  be the corn over  $K$  (where  $*$  denotes the join of a point  $v$  and  $K$ ), then we have  $\partial(v * K) = K$ . This shows  $\Omega_n(\mathcal{K}) = 0$  for  $n > 0$ . For  $n = 0$ , any 0-dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex  $K^0$  is closed by the definition. Now let  $r$  be numbers of vertices of  $K^0$ , then  $\partial(v * K^0) = K^0$  if  $r$  is even, and  $\partial(v * K^0) = K^0 + v$  if  $r$  is odd, which shows

$$K^0 \sim 0 \quad \text{if } r \text{ is even, and}$$

$$K^0 \sim v \quad \text{if } r \text{ is odd.}$$

Since a point  $v$  is closed, but not bounds, we have  $\Omega_0(\mathcal{K}) = Z_2$ .

### § 3. Singular $Z_2$ -complexes of pairs of spaces.

(3.1) Let  $(X, A)$  be a pair of a space  $X$  and its subspace  $A$ . A  $n$ -singular  $Z_2$ -complex in  $(X, A)$  is a pair  $(K, f)$  consisting of a  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex  $K$  and a continuous map  $f: (K, \partial K) \rightarrow (X, A)$ . If  $A = \emptyset$  then of course  $\partial K = \emptyset$  also.

Two singular  $Z_2$ -complexes  $(K, f)$  and  $(L, g)$  are *equivalent*, written  $(K, f) \simeq (L, g)$ , if there is a  $pl$ -homeomorphism  $\phi: K \rightarrow L$  such that  $f = g \circ \phi$ .

A  $n$ -singular  $Z_2$ -complex  $(K, f)$  in  $(X, A)$  is said to *bord* if and only if there is  $(n+1)$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex  $W$  and a map  $F: W \rightarrow X$  for which

(1) there is a  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex  $K'$  such that

$$|K'| \subset |\partial W| \quad \text{and} \quad F(|\partial W| \setminus |K'|) \subset A,$$

(2)  $(K', F|_{K'}) \simeq (K, f)$ .

From two singular  $Z_2$ -complexes  $(K, f)$  and  $(L, g)$  in  $(X, A)$  a disjoint union  $(K+L, f+g)$  is defined where  $K+L \simeq K \cup L$ ,  $K \cap L = \emptyset$ ,  $f+g|_K = f$  and  $f+g|_L = g$ .

A pair  $(K, f)$  and  $(L, g)$  of singular  $Z_2$ -complexes in  $(X, A)$  are *bordant* if and only if the disjoint union  $(K+L, f+g)$  bords in  $(X, A)$ . This will be written  $(K, f) \equiv (L, g)$ .

By the definition we have easily:

LEMMA 1.  $(K, f) \simeq (L, g)$  implies  $(K, f) \equiv (L, g)$ .

In particular,  $K' < K$  and  $f' = f$  implies  $(K', f') \equiv (K, f)$ .

Combining Lemma 1 with the fact that if  $|L| \subset |K|$ , then there are  $L'$  and  $K'$  such that  $L' < L$ ,  $K' < K$  and  $L' \subset K'$ , we can say as follows:

$(K, f)$  bords in  $(X, A)$  if and only if there exists  $(K', f')$  with  $(K', f') \simeq (K, f)$  such that there is a  $(n+1)$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex  $W'$  and a map  $F': W' \rightarrow X$  for which

- (1)'  $K' \subset \partial W'$  and  $F'(\partial W' \setminus K') \subset A$ ,
- (2)'  $F'|_{K'} = f'$ .

PROPOSITION 4.  $\equiv$  is an equivalence relation on the singular  $Z_2$ -complexes in  $(X, A)$ .

PROOF. In order to see that  $(K, f)$  in  $(X, A)$  is bordant to itself, form the  $Z_2$ -complex  $I \times K$  where  $I$  is the unit interval, and define a map  $F: I \times K \rightarrow X$  by  $F(t, x) = f(x)$  for  $t \in I$  and  $x \in K$ . Then  $0 \times K \cup 1 \times K$  is a subcomplex of  $\partial(I \times K)$  such that  $F|_{0 \times K \cup 1 \times K} = f + f$  and  $F(\partial(I \times K) \setminus 0 \times K \cup 1 \times K) \subset A$ . Hence  $(K + K, f + f)$  bords.

The bordism relation  $\equiv$  is clearly symmetric. Finally for the proof of transitivity, suppose  $(K, f) \equiv (L, g)$  and  $(L, g) \equiv (N, h)$ , where  $K, L$  and  $N$  are  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complexes. Then there are  $(n+1)$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complexes  $W$  and  $Z$  with maps  $F: W \rightarrow X$  and  $G: Z \rightarrow X$ . We may suppose without loss of generality that  $L$  is full in  $W$  and  $Z$  respectively. Let  $C$  be the complex obtained from  $W + Z$  by identifying two subcomplexes in  $W$  and  $Z$  which are isomorphic to  $L$ ; we write  $C = W \underset{L}{\oplus} Z$ . Then  $C$  is a  $(n+1)$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex, and we can construct a map  $H: C \rightarrow X$  so that  $(C, H)$  gives  $(K, f) \equiv (N, h)$ .

(3.2) LEMMA 2. Let  $K$  be any  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex. Suppose  $P$  and  $Q$  are closed disjoint subsets of the space  $|K|$ . Then there exists a  $Z_2$ -complex  $L$  such that

- (1)  $L$  is a  $n$ -dimensional subcomplex of an iterated barycentric subdivision  $Sd^k K$  of  $K$ .
- (2)  $P \subset |L|$  and  $|L| \cap Q = \emptyset$ .
- (3)  $|\partial L| \cap P = |\partial K| \cap P$ .

PROOF. Let  $\rho$  be the distance of  $P$  and  $Q$ , then  $\rho > 0$  and  $\text{mesh}(Sd^k K) < \rho$  for some large integer  $k (\geq 2)$ , where  $Sd^k K$  is the  $k^{\text{th}}$  barycentric subdivision of  $K$ .

For any point  $x$  of  $|Sd^k K|$ ,  $s(x)$  denotes the smallest simplex of  $Sd^k K$  which contain  $x$ . Define  $St(s(x))$  by

$$St(s(x)) = \{ \sigma \mid \sigma \prec \tau \text{ and } s(x) \prec \tau \in Sd^k K \}.$$

Clearly it is a  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex. Finally we define  $St(P)$  as follows:

$$St(P) = \bigcup_{x \in P} St(s(x)).$$

$St(P)$  is also a  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex.

From the above constructions we can see easily that  $P \subset |St(P)|$  and  $Q \cap |St(P)| = \emptyset$ . To complete the proof of Lemma 2 is only necessary to verify that  $St(P)$  has the property (3). Let  $L = St(P)$ . Then it is sufficient to show that  $|\partial L| \cap P = |\partial Sd^k K| \cap P$ . Suppose given any point  $x$  of  $|\partial L| \cap P$ . Then  $x \in |\partial L|$  implies  $s(x) \in \partial L$ . Since  $\partial L$  is a  $Z_2$ -complex, there is a  $(n-1)$ -simplex  $s^{n-1}$  such that  $s(x) \prec s^{n-1} \in \partial L$ . It follows from  $s^{n-1} \in \partial L$  that the number of  $n$ -

simplexes  $s^n$  in  $L$  with  $s^{n-1} \prec s^n$  is odd. And write them  $s_1^n, \dots, s_q^n$ . Let  $\tau^n$  be any  $n$ -simplex of  $Sd^k K$  with  $s^{n-1} \prec \tau$ . Then  $s(x) \prec s^{n-1} \prec \tau \in Sd^k K$ . By the definition of  $St(P)$ , we have  $\tau \in L = St(P)$ . Therefore there is no other  $n$ -simplex  $\tau$  with  $s^{n-1} \prec \tau^n$  and  $\tau^n \neq s_1^n, \dots, s_q^n$ . Thus we have  $s^{n-1} \in \partial Sd^k K$ . It follows that  $s(x) \in \partial Sd^k K$  which shows  $x \in |\partial Sd^k K|$ . Since  $x \in P$ , we have  $x \in |\partial Sd^k K| \cap P$ . This proves that  $|\partial L| \cap P \subset |\partial Sd^k K| \cap P$ . Finally we must prove that  $|\partial L| \cap P \supset |\partial Sd^k K| \cap P$ . Suppose given  $x$  of  $|\partial Sd^k K| \cap P$ . Then  $x \in |\partial Sd^k K|$  implies  $s(x) \in \partial Sd^k K$ . Since  $\partial Sd^k K$  is a  $Z_2$ -complex, there is a  $(n-1)$ -simplex  $s^{n-1}$  with  $s(x) \prec s^{n-1}$ .  $s^{n-1} \in \partial Sd^k K$  implies that the number of  $n$ -simplexes  $s^n$  with  $s^{n-1} \prec s^n$  is odd. We denote them by  $s_1^n, \dots, s_q^n$ . Then  $x \in P, s(x) \prec s_1^n, \dots, s_q^n \in Sd^k K$ . From the definition of  $L = St(P)$ , it follows that  $s_1^n, \dots, s_q^n \in L$ . Thus we have  $s^{n-1} \in \partial L$ , so that  $s(x) \in \partial L$ . Hence  $x \in |\partial L|$ . This completes the proof of Lemma 2.

**§ 4. The singular bordism groups of pairs of spaces.**

(4.1) Denote the bordism class of  $(K^n, f)$  by  $[K^n, f]$ , and the collection of all such bordism classes by  $\mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$ . An abelian group structure is imposed on  $\mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$  by disjoint union; that is,  $[K_1^n, f_1] + [K_2^n, f_2] = [K_1^n + K_2^n, f_1 + f_2]$ . It is seen that the class of all  $(K^n, f)$  which bord forms the zero element. Let  $\mathcal{A}_*(X, A)$  be the weak direct sum  $\sum \mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$ .

Given a map  $\phi : (X, A) \rightarrow (Y, B)$  there is associated a natural homomorphism  $\phi_* : \mathcal{A}_n(X, A) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n(Y, B)$  given by  $\phi_*[K^n, f] = [K^n, \phi \circ f]$ . There is also a homomorphism  $\tilde{\delta}_n : \mathcal{A}_n(X, A) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{n-1}(A, \emptyset)$  given by  $\tilde{\delta}_n[K^n, f] = [\partial K^n, f|_{\partial K^n}]$ . It is easy to see that  $\tilde{\delta}_n$  is well defined and associative.

The following proposition is trivially verified:

PROPOSITION 5.

- (1) If  $i : (X, A) \rightarrow (X, A)$  is the identity map then  $i_* : \mathcal{A}_n(X, A) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$  is the identity automorphism.
- (2) If  $\phi : (X_1, A_1) \rightarrow (X_2, A_2)$  and  $\theta : (X_2, A_2) \rightarrow (X_3, A_3)$ , then  $(\theta \circ \phi)_* = \theta_* \circ \phi_*$ .
- (3) For any map  $\phi : (X, A) \rightarrow (Y, B)$  the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A}_n(X, A) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}_n} & \mathcal{A}_{n-1}(A, \emptyset) \\
 \downarrow \phi_* & \tilde{\delta}_n & \downarrow (\phi|_A)_* \\
 \mathcal{A}_n(Y, B) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{A}_{n-1}(B, \emptyset)
 \end{array}$$

is commutative.

Proposition 5 shows  $\{\mathcal{A}_n(\ , \ ), \tilde{\delta}_n\}$  is a covariant functor on the category of pairs of spaces, and  $\tilde{\delta}_n$  is a natural transformation.

(4.2) Our main theorem is the following, which will be proved in the next section.

**THEOREM 2.** *On the category of pairs of spaces and maps the singular bordism functors*

$$\{\mathcal{A}_*(X, A), \phi_*, \tilde{\delta}_*\}$$

*satisfies the Eilenberg-Steenrod axioms for a homology theory. For a single point pt., we have*

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\text{pt.}, \emptyset) \approx \Omega_n(\mathcal{K}) \approx \begin{cases} 0 & n \neq 0, \\ Z_2 & n = 0. \end{cases}$$

**§ 5. The Eilenberg-Steenrod axioms.**

(5.1) 
$$\mathcal{A}_n(\text{pt.}, \emptyset) \approx \Omega_n(\mathcal{K}).$$

**PROOF.** For any closed  $Z_2$ -complex  $K^n$ , a map  $f: K^n \rightarrow \text{pt.}$  is unique. Inversely given any singular  $Z_2$ -complex  $(K^n, f)$  in  $(\text{pt.}, \emptyset)$ ,  $K^n$  is closed. Therefore there is a one to one correspondence between closed  $Z_2$ -complexes and singular  $Z_2$ -complexes in  $(\text{pt.}, \emptyset)$ , which shows  $\mathcal{A}_n(\text{pt.}, \emptyset) \approx \Omega_n(\mathcal{K})$ .

(5.2) *If  $\phi_0, \phi_1: (X, A) \rightarrow (Y, B)$  are homotopic, then  $\phi_{0*} = \phi_{1*}$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $h: (I \times X, I \times A) \rightarrow (Y, B)$  be a homotopy joining  $\phi_0$  and  $\phi_1$ . For  $(K^n, f)$  a singular  $Z_2$ -complex in  $(X, A)$  define  $\theta: I \times K \rightarrow Y$  by  $\theta(t, x) = h(t, f(x))$ ; then  $\theta(0, x) = \phi_0 \circ f(x)$  and  $\theta(1, x) = \phi_1 \circ f(x)$ . Now  $I \times K^n$  is a  $(n+1)$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex and  $\partial(I \times K^n) = (\partial I \times K^n) \cup (I \times \partial K^n)$ . Thus  $1 \times K^n \cup 0 \times K^n$  is a subcomplex of  $\partial(I \times K^n)$ , and  $\theta(I \times \partial K^n) \subset B$ . Hence  $[K^n, \phi_0 \circ f] = [K^n, \phi_1 \circ f]$ .

(5.3) We need a lemma before proving exactness.

**LEMMA 3.** *Let  $L$  be a  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex and a subcomplex of a closed  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complex  $K$ . If  $f: K \rightarrow X$  is a map with  $f(K \setminus L) \subset A$ , then  $[K, f] = [L, f|L]$  in  $\mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$ .*

**PROOF.** Define  $F: I \times K^n \rightarrow X$  by  $F(t, x) = f(x)$ . Now  $\partial(I \times K^n) = \partial I \times K^n$  and  $1 \times L^n \cup 0 \times K^n$  is a subcomplex of  $\partial(I \times K^n)$ , for  $K^n$  is closed. Since  $F(1 \times (K^n \setminus L^n)) \subset A$  then  $[K^n, f] = [L^n, f|L^n]$ .

(5.4) **PROPOSITION 6.** *For every pair  $(X, A)$  the sequence*

$$\dots \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}} \mathcal{A}_n(A, \emptyset) \xrightarrow{i_*} \mathcal{A}_n(X, \emptyset) \xrightarrow{j_*} \mathcal{A}_n(X, A) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}} \mathcal{A}_{n-1}(A, \emptyset) \longrightarrow \dots$$

*is exact.*

**PROOF.** (5.4.1) 
$$\tilde{\delta} j_* = 0.$$

If  $[K^n, f] \in \mathcal{A}_n(X, \emptyset)$ , then  $\partial K = \emptyset$  and  $\tilde{\delta} j_* [K^n, f] = [\partial K^n, jf| \partial K^n] = [\emptyset, \phi] = 0$ .

(5.4.2) 
$$\text{Im } j_* \supset \text{Ker } \tilde{\delta}.$$

Consider  $[K^n, f] \in \mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$  in the kernel of  $\tilde{\delta}$ ; then  $\tilde{\delta}[K^n, f] = [\partial K^n, f|_{\partial K^n}] = 0$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{n-1}(A, \emptyset)$ .

By Lemma 1 we may suppose that  $\partial K^n$  is full in  $K^n$ . Since  $[\partial K^n, f|_{\partial K^n}] = 0$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{n-1}(A, \emptyset)$ , there is a  $Z_2$ -complex  $W^n$  and a map  $F: W^n \rightarrow A$  with  $\partial W^n = \partial K^n$  and  $F|_{\partial K^n} = f|_{\partial K^n}$ . It is also no loss of generality to suppose that  $\partial W^n$  is full in  $W^n$ . Construct a complex  $Z^n$  identifying the boundary  $\partial W^n$  of  $W^n$  with the boundary  $\partial K^n$  of  $K^n$  from the disjoint sum  $W^n + K^n$ ; we write  $Z^n = W \bigoplus_{\partial W = \partial K} K$ . Then  $Z^n$  is a closed  $Z_2$ -complex. Define  $g: Z^n \rightarrow X$  by  $g|_W = F$  and  $g|_K = f$ , then  $[Z^n, g] \in \mathcal{A}_n(X, \emptyset)$  and  $j_*[Z^n, g] = [Z^n, jg]$  coincides with  $[K^n, f]$  by Lemma 3.

$$(5.4.3) \quad j_* i_* = 0.$$

If  $[K^n, f] \in \mathcal{A}_n(A, \emptyset)$ , then  $\partial K^n = \emptyset$ ,  $f: K^n \rightarrow A$  and  $j_* i_* [K^n, f] = [K^n, jif]$ . Define  $F: I \times K^n \rightarrow X$  by  $F(t, x) = f(x)$ , then  $0 \times K^n$  is a subcomplex of  $\partial(I \times K^n)$ ,  $F|_{0 \times K^n} = f$  and  $F(\partial(I \times K^n) \setminus 0 \times K^n) \subset A$ . Hence  $[K^n, f] = 0$  in  $\mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$ .

$$(5.4.4) \quad \text{Im } i_* \supset \text{Ker } j_*.$$

Let  $[K^n, f]$  be an element of  $\mathcal{A}_n(X, \emptyset)$  with  $j_*[K^n, f] = 0$  in  $\mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$ . Then we may find a representative  $(K, f)$  for which there is a  $Z_2$ -complex  $W^{n+1}$  and a map  $F: W^{n+1} \rightarrow X$  such that

$$(1) \quad K^n \subset \partial W^{n+1},$$

$$(2) \quad F|_{K^n} = f \text{ and } F(\partial W^{n+1} \setminus K^n) \subset A.$$

Let  $Z^{n+1}$  be the complex obtained from the disjoint sum  $W^{n+1} + (I \times K^n)$  by identifying the subcomplex  $K^n$  of  $W^{n+1}$  with the subcomplex  $1 \times K^n$  of  $I \times K^n$ , i. e.  $Z^{n+1} = W^{n+1} \bigoplus_{K=1 \times K} I \times K^n$ .

Define  $G: Z^{n+1} \rightarrow X$  by  $G|_{W^{n+1}} = F$  and  $G(t, x) = f(x)$  for  $t \in I$  and  $x \in K$ . Denote  $0 \times K^n$  by  $K^n$ , then

$$(3) \quad K^n \subset \partial Z^{n+1},$$

$$(4) \quad G|_{K^n} = f \text{ and } G(\partial Z^{n+1} \setminus K^n) \subset A.$$

Let  $L^n = \partial Z^{n+1} \setminus K^n$ , then by the construction  $\partial L^n = \emptyset$ ,  $L^n \cap K^n = \emptyset$  and  $\partial Z^{n+1} = L^n + K^n$ . Hence  $G|_{K^n \cup L^n} = f \cup G|_{L^n}$ . Since  $[L^n, G|_{L^n}] \in \mathcal{A}_n(A, \emptyset)$ ,  $i_*[L^n, G|_{L^n}]$  coincides with  $[K^n, f]$  in  $\mathcal{A}_n(X, \emptyset)$ .

$$(5.4.5) \quad i_* \tilde{\delta} = 0.$$

Let  $[K^n, f]$  be an element of  $\mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$  such that  $i_* \tilde{\delta}[K^n, f] = [\partial K^n, if|_{\partial K^n}] = 0$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{n-1}(X, \emptyset)$ . Since  $\partial K$  is the boundary of  $K^n$  and  $f|_{\partial K^n}$  is a restriction of  $f: K^n \rightarrow X$ , the singular  $Z_2$ -complex  $(\partial K^n, f|_{\partial K^n})$  bords in  $(X, \emptyset)$ .

$$(5.4.6) \quad \text{Im } \bar{\delta} \supset \text{Ker } i_* .$$

Let  $[K^{n-1}, f]$  be an element of  $\mathcal{A}_{n-1}(A, \emptyset)$  such that  $i_*[K^{n-1}, f]=[K^{n-1}, if]=0$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{n-1}(X, \emptyset)$ . Since  $f: K^{n-1} \rightarrow A \subset X$ ,  $\partial K^{n-1} = \emptyset$  and  $[K^{n-1}, f]=0$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{n-1}(X, \emptyset)$ , we may find a representative  $(K, f)$  for which there is a  $Z_2$ -complex  $W^n$  and a map  $F: W^n \rightarrow X$  with  $K^{n-1} = \partial W^n$  and  $F|_{K^{n-1}} = f$ . Then  $F: (W^n, \partial W^n) \rightarrow (X, A)$ ,  $[W^n, F] \in \mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$  and  $\bar{\delta}[W^n, F] = [\partial W^n, F|_{\partial W^n}] = [K^{n-1}, f]$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{n-1}(A, \emptyset)$ .

(5.5) PROPOSITION 7.

If  $U$  is an open set with  $\bar{U} \subset \text{Int } A$ , then the inclusion  $i: (X \setminus U, A \setminus U) \rightarrow (X, A)$  induces an isomorphism  $i_*: \mathcal{A}_n(X \setminus U, A \setminus U) \approx \mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$ .

PROOF. (5.5.1)  $i^*$  is an epimorphism.

Let  $(K^n, f)$  be a singular  $Z_2$ -complex in  $(X, A)$ ;  $f: (K^n, \partial K^n) \rightarrow (X, A)$ . Let  $P = f^{-1}(X \setminus \text{Int } A)$ ,  $Q = f^{-1}(\bar{U})$ . There exists, by Lemma 2, a  $Z_2$ -complex  $L^n$  with  $P \subset |L^n|$  and  $Q \cap |L^n| = \emptyset$ . Furthermore  $L^n$  is a subcomplex of a sufficiently fine barycentric subdivision  $K'^n$  of  $K^n$ . Now we show that  $f(\partial L) \subset A$ . Let  $x$  be any point of  $|\partial L|$ . In the case  $x \notin P$ , it follows from the definition of  $P$  that  $f(x) \in A$ . In the case when  $x \in P$ , we know from Lemma 2 that  $x \in |\partial L| \cap P = |\partial K| \cap P$ . Therefore  $x \in |\partial K|$ . Since  $f(\partial K) \subset A$ , we know that  $f(x) \in A$ . Thus  $[L^n, f|_{L^n}] \in \mathcal{A}_n(X \setminus U, A \setminus U)$ .

Define  $F: I \times K'^n \rightarrow X$  by  $F(t, x) = f(x)$ . Then  $1 \times L^n \cup 0 \times K'^n$  is a subcomplex of  $\partial(I \times K'^n) = \partial I \times K'^n \cup I \times \partial K'^n$  and  $F(\partial(I \times K'^n) \setminus 1 \times L^n \cup 0 \times K'^n) \subset A$ . Hence  $[L^n, f|_{L^n}] = [K'^n, f] = [K^n, f]$  in  $\mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$ .

(5.5.2)  $i_*$  is a monomorphism.

Let  $[K^n, f]$  be any element of the kernel of  $i_*$ ;

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (K^n, \partial K) & \xrightarrow{f} & (X \setminus U, A \setminus U) \\ & \searrow^{if} & \downarrow i \\ & & (X, A) \end{array}$$

and  $i_*[K^n, f] = [K^n, if] = 0$  in  $\mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$ .

Let  $P_1 = f^{-1}(X \setminus \text{Int } A)$  and  $Q_1 = f^{-1}(\bar{U})$ , then there exists, by Lemma 2, a  $Z_2$ -complex  $K_1^n$  such that it is a subcomplex of a sufficiently fine barycentric subdivision  $K'^n$  of  $K^n$  with  $P_1 \subset |K_1^n|$  and  $Q_1 \cap |K_1^n| = \emptyset$ .

Consider  $F_1: (I \times K'^n) \rightarrow X \setminus U$  by  $F_1(t, x) = f(x)$ , then

$$F_1|_{K_1 \cup K'} = f|_{K_1 \cup K'} \quad \text{and} \quad F_1(\partial(I \times K'^n) \setminus K_1 \cup K') \subset A \setminus U.$$

Hence  $[K_1, f|_{K_1}] = [K, f]$  in  $\mathcal{A}_n(X \setminus U, A \setminus U)$ . Let  $f|_{K_1} = f_1$ , then  $f_1(K_1) \cap \bar{U} = \emptyset$ . Since  $[K_1, f_1] = [K, f] = 0$  in  $\mathcal{A}_n(X, A)$ , we may find a representative  $(K_1, f_1)$  for which there is a  $Z_2$ -complex  $W^{n+1}$  and a map  $F: W^{n+1} \rightarrow X$  such that

- (1) 
$$K_1 \subset \partial W^{n+1},$$
- (2) 
$$F|_{K_1} = f_1 \text{ and } F(\partial W \setminus K_1) \subset A.$$

Let  $P' = F^{-1}(X \setminus \text{Int } A)$  and  $Q = F^{-1}(\bar{U})$ , then  $P'$  and  $Q$  are closed sets with  $P' \cap Q = \emptyset$ . Now let  $P = P' \cup K_1$ , then  $P$  is also a closed set. Since  $K_1 \cap Q = \emptyset$  by the construction of  $K_1$ ,  $P$  and  $Q$  are closed sets with  $P \cap Q = \emptyset$ . By Lemma 2, there exists a  $Z_2$ -complex  $W_1 \subset W$  with  $P \subset |W_1|$  and  $Q \cap |W_1| = \emptyset$ . Since  $K_1 \subset W_1 \subset W$ ,  $K_1 \subset P$  and  $|\partial W| \cap P = |\partial W_1| \cap P$ , we know that  $K_1 \subset \partial W_1$ .

Next we show that  $F(\partial W_1 \setminus K_1) \subset A$ . Let  $x \in |\partial W_1 \setminus K_1|$ . In the case when  $x \notin P$ , we know that  $x \in F^{-1}(X \setminus \text{Int } A)$ . It follows that  $F(x) \notin (X \setminus \text{Int } A)$  which shows  $F(x) \in A$ . In the case when  $x \in P$ , we see that  $x \in |\partial W_1| \cap P = |\partial W| \cap P$ .  $x \in |\partial W|$  and  $x \notin K_1$  implies  $x \in |\partial W \setminus K_1|$ . Since  $F(\partial W \setminus K_1) \subset A$ , we know  $F(x) \in A$ . This completes the proof of  $F(\partial W_1 \setminus K_1) \subset A$ . Since  $K_1 \subset \partial W_1$ ,  $F(\partial W_1 \setminus K_1) \subset A \setminus U$  and  $F|_{W_1} : W_1 \rightarrow X \setminus U$ , then  $[K_1, f_1] = 0$  in  $\mathcal{A}_n(X \setminus U, A \setminus U)$ .

**§ 6. Bordism categories.**

(6.1) A category with sum  $\mathcal{C} = \langle \mathcal{C}, +, \emptyset \rangle$  is a category  $\mathcal{C}$  with a bifunctor  $+$  :  $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , an object  $\emptyset$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  and following three natural isomorphisms ;

- (1) 
$$A + B \simeq B + A,$$
- (2) 
$$(A + B) + C \simeq A + (B + C),$$
- (3) 
$$\emptyset + A \simeq A.$$

Notice that every category with sum is a monoidal category in the sense of S. MacLane [3].

(6.2) A bordism category  $\mathcal{C} = \langle \mathcal{C}, \partial, +, \emptyset \rangle$  is a category with sum  $\langle \mathcal{C}, +, \emptyset \rangle$ , a functor  $\partial : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  and following three natural isomorphisms ;

- (1) 
$$\partial \circ \partial A \simeq \emptyset \text{ for any object } A \text{ of } \mathcal{C},$$
- (2) 
$$\partial(A + B) \simeq \partial A + \partial B,$$
- (3) 
$$\partial \emptyset \simeq \emptyset.$$

(6.3) If  $\mathcal{C} = \langle \mathcal{C}, \partial, +, \emptyset \rangle$  is a bordism category, we say that the objects  $A$  and  $B$  are *bordant* if there exist objects  $U$  and  $V$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $A + \partial U \simeq B + \partial V$ . This will be written  $A \equiv B$ . Then we have easily that  $\equiv$  is an equivalence relation on the objects of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Denote the equivalence class of  $A$  by  $[A]$  and define the *sum*  $[A] + [B]$  by  $[A + B]$ . An object  $A$  is *closed* if  $\partial A \simeq \emptyset$  and  $A$  is *bounds* if  $A \equiv \emptyset$ .

(6.4) The bordism semi-group  $\Omega(\mathcal{C})$  of the bordism category  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of equivalence classes of closed objects of  $\mathcal{C}$  with the operation induced by the sum in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Indeed  $\Omega(\mathcal{C})$  is a commutative semi-group with a unit.

(6.5) A *graded bordism category*  $\mathcal{C} = \{\langle \mathcal{C}_n, +_n, \emptyset_n \rangle, \partial_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a sequence  $\{\langle \mathcal{C}_n, +_n, \emptyset_n \rangle\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of categories with sum, a sequence  $\{\partial_n\}$  of functors  $\partial_n: \mathcal{C}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{n-1}$  and following natural isomorphisms;

$$(1) \quad \partial_n(A+B) \simeq \partial_n A + \partial_n B,$$

$$(2) \quad \partial_{n-1} \circ \partial_n A \simeq \emptyset_{n-2},$$

$$(3) \quad \partial_n \emptyset_n \simeq \emptyset_{n-1}.$$

Then  $\langle \mathcal{C}, \partial, +, \emptyset \rangle = \langle \{\mathcal{C}_n\}, \{\partial_n\}, \{+_n\}, \{\emptyset_n\} \rangle$  is a bordism category. Objects of  $\mathcal{C}_n$  and morphisms in  $\mathcal{C}_n$  will be called respectively  $n$ -objects of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $n$ -morphisms in  $\mathcal{C}$ .  $n$ -objects  $A$  and  $B$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  are *bordant* if there exist  $(n+1)$ -objects  $U$  and  $V$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $A + \partial U \simeq B + \partial V$ . This will be written  $A \equiv_n B$ . Then we may define a  $n$ -dimensional bordism semi-group  $\Omega_n(\mathcal{C})$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  as the set of equivalence classes of closed  $n$ -objects of  $\mathcal{C}$ , and we have  $\Omega(\mathcal{C}) \simeq \{\Omega_n(\mathcal{C})\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ .

(6.6) A category is *discrete* when every morphism is an identity. Every set  $C$  is the set of objects of a discrete category (just add one identity morphism  $c \rightarrow c$  for each  $c \in C$ ), and every discrete category is so determined by its set of objects. For every abelian group  $C$  with an operation  $+$  and a unit  $0$ ,  $\langle C, +, 0 \rangle$  is regarded as a discrete category with sum.

For every chain complex  $(C, d)$ ,  $\langle C, d, +, 0 \rangle$  is a discrete bordism category. We have easily:

**THEOREM 3.** *Every chain complex is a discrete graded bordism category, and its homology groups coincide with its bordism groups.*

### § 7. Singular bordism theories.

(7.1) A category with sum  $\mathcal{C} = \langle \mathcal{C}, +, \emptyset \rangle$  is *regular*, when  $+$  is the finite sums in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\emptyset$  is an initial object of  $\mathcal{C}$ . A bordism category  $\langle \mathcal{C}, \partial, +, \emptyset \rangle$  is *regular*, if  $\langle \mathcal{C}, +, \emptyset \rangle$  is regular.

(7.2) Let  $\mathcal{X} = \langle \mathcal{X}, +, \emptyset \rangle$  be a regular category with sum. A *singular bordism theory*  $\langle \mathcal{C}, F, l \rangle$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  is a triple in which;

- (1)  $\mathcal{C} = \langle \mathcal{C}, \partial, +, \emptyset \rangle$  is a regular bordism category,
- (2)  $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is a functor such that

$$i) \quad F(A+B) = F(A) + F(B),$$

$$ii) \quad F(\emptyset) = \emptyset,$$

(3)  $l: F \circ \partial \rightarrow F$  is a natural transformation.

(7.3) Let  $\langle \mathcal{C}, F, l \rangle$  is a singular bordism theory on  $\mathcal{X}$ . For any object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{X}$ , form a category  $\mathcal{C}/X$  whose objects are pairs  $(A, f)$  with  $A$  an object of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $f \in \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{X}}(F(A), X)$  and whose morphisms are given by letting  $\text{Mor}_{\mathcal{C}/X}((A, f), (B, g))$  be the set of morphisms  $\phi \in \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$  such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(A) & \xrightarrow{F(\phi)} & F(B) \\ & \searrow f & \nearrow g \\ & & X \end{array}$$

commutes.

If  $(A, f)$  and  $(B, g)$  are objects of  $\mathcal{C}/X$  and  $A+B$  is a finite sum for  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , then  $F(A+B)$  is a finite sum for  $F(A)$  and  $F(B)$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ . The morphisms  $f$  and  $g$  give a unique morphism  $f+g: F(A)+F(B) \rightarrow X$ , and  $(A, f) \widetilde{+} (B, g) = (A+B, f+g)$  is the sum of  $(A, f)$  and  $(B, g)$  in  $\mathcal{C}/X$ . If  $\emptyset$  is an initial object of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\phi: F(\emptyset) \rightarrow X$  is the unique morphism, then  $\tilde{\emptyset} = (\emptyset, \phi)$  is an initial object of  $\mathcal{C}/X$ . From our definitions and regularity of  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ , we have:

PROPOSITION 8.  $\langle \mathcal{C}/X, \widetilde{+}, \tilde{\emptyset} \rangle$  is a regular category with sum.

(7.4) Let  $\tilde{\partial}(A, f) = (\partial A, f \circ l_A)$  and  $\tilde{\partial}(\emptyset, \phi) = (\emptyset, \phi)$ , then  $\tilde{\partial}\tilde{\partial}(A, f) = (\partial\partial A, f \circ l_A \circ l_{\partial A}) \simeq (\emptyset, \phi)$ .

If  $\tilde{\phi}: (A, f) \rightarrow (B, g)$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{C}/X$ , then there exists a morphism  $\phi: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F(\partial A) & \xrightarrow{\iota_A} & F(A) & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ \downarrow F(\partial\phi) & & \downarrow F(\phi) & & \nearrow g \\ F(\partial B) & \xrightarrow{\iota_B} & F(B) & & \end{array}$$

commutes.

Let  $\tilde{\partial}(\tilde{\phi}) = \partial\phi$  to define the functor  $\tilde{\partial}: \mathcal{C}/X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/X$ . It is easily checked that the functor  $\tilde{\partial}: \mathcal{C}/X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/X$  has properties (1), (2) and (3) of (6.2).

PROPOSITION 9.  $\langle \mathcal{C}/X, \tilde{\partial}, \widetilde{+}, \tilde{\emptyset} \rangle$  is a regular bordism category.

(7.5) Define  $\tilde{F}: \mathcal{C}/X \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  by  $\tilde{F}(A, f) = F(A)$  for any object  $(A, f)$  of  $\mathcal{C}/X$  and  $\tilde{F}(\tilde{\phi}) = F(\phi)$  for any morphism  $\tilde{\phi}: (A, f) \rightarrow (B, g)$  such that  $\tilde{\phi} = \phi: A \rightarrow B$ . Then  $\tilde{F}\{(A, f) \widetilde{+} (B, g)\} = \tilde{F}\{(A+B, f+g)\} = F(A+B) = \tilde{F}(A, f) + \tilde{F}(B, g)$  and  $\tilde{F}(\tilde{\emptyset}, \phi) = F(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ .

Define the natural transformation  $\tilde{l}: \tilde{F}\tilde{\partial} \rightarrow \tilde{F}$  by  $\tilde{l}_{(A, f)} = l_A: F(\partial A) \rightarrow F(A)$  for an object  $(A, f)$  of  $\mathcal{C}/X$ . From the above definitions and Proposition 9, we have

following theorem ;

**THEOREM 4.** *If  $\langle C, F, l \rangle$  is a singular bordism theory on  $\mathcal{X}$  then  $\langle C/X, \tilde{F}, \tilde{l} \rangle$  is also a singular bordism theory on  $\mathcal{X}$  for any object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{X}$ .*

(7.6) Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the category whose  $n$ -objects are  $n$ -dimensional  $Z_2$ -complexes and whose  $n$ -morphisms are  $pl$ -imbeddings which take boundary into boundary. This category  $\mathcal{K}$  has finite sums  $+$  given by the disjoint union and has an initial object  $\emptyset$  given by the empty  $Z_2$ -complex, so that  $\langle \mathcal{K}, \partial, +, \emptyset \rangle$  is a regular graded bordism category.

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be the category of topological spaces and continuous maps, then  $\mathcal{X}$  has finite sums  $+$  given by the disjoint union and an initial object  $\emptyset$  given by the empty space, so that  $\langle \mathcal{X}, +, \emptyset \rangle$  is a regular category with sum. Let  $F: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  be the forgetful functor, then the natural transformation  $l: F\partial \rightarrow F$  are given by the inclusion  $l_K: |\partial K| \rightarrow |K|$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  for each object  $K$  of  $\mathcal{K}$ .  $\langle \mathcal{K}, F, l \rangle$  is a singular bordism theory on  $\mathcal{X}$  and this singular bordism theory defines the ordinary  $Z_2$ -homology theory on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

For any space  $X$ ,  $\langle \mathcal{K}/X, \tilde{F}, \tilde{l} \rangle$  is also a singular bordism theory on  $\mathcal{X}$ , and  $\Omega_n(\mathcal{K}/X) \approx H_n(X; Z_2)$ ,  $\Omega_n(\mathcal{K}/X/Y) \approx H_n(X \times Y; Z_2)$ .

**REMARK 1)** We may consider the oriented case by a suitable generalization of the notion of orientation.

**REMARK 2)** Given two singular bordism theories on  $\mathcal{X}$ , there exists their product singular bordism theory on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

(7.7) Other examples are classical bordism theories (cf. [2] and [4]). Let  $\mathcal{D}_0$  be the graded category whose  $n$ -objects are oriented  $n$ -dimensional compact differential manifolds and whose  $n$ -morphisms are orientation preserving differential imbeddings which take boundary into boundary. Let  $F$  be the forgetful functor  $F: \mathcal{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ , then there exists a natural transformation  $l: F\partial \rightarrow F$  and  $\langle \mathcal{D}_0, F, l \rangle$  is the singular bordism theory on  $\mathcal{X}$  which define a generalized homology theory on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

### References

- [ 1 ] I. Bucur and A. Deleanu, Introduction to the Theory of Categories and Functors, John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., London-New York-Sydney, 1968.
- [ 2 ] P.E. Conner and E.E. Floyd, Differentiable Periodic Maps, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1964.
- [ 3 ] S. MacLane, Categories for the Working Mathematician, Springer, New York-Heidelberg-Berlin, 1971.
- [ 4 ] R.E. Stong, Notes on cobordism theory, Mathematical Notes, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1968.

- [ 5 ] G. W. Whitehead, Generalized homology theories, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 102 (1962), 227-283.

Michihiro TAKAHASHI  
Department of Mathematics  
Faculty of General Education  
Kobe University  
Nada, Kobe  
Japan