ON FORMULAE OF THOM AND WU

By J. F. ADAMS

[Received 5 January 1961]

1. RECENTLY, in preparing a set of lectures on characteristic classes, I had occasion to consider the formulae of Thom and Wu (**10**) which relate Stiefel–Whitney classes to Steenrod squares. Briefly, they are as follows. Let M be a compact differentiable n-manifold, not necsssarily orientable, with fundamental class $\mu \in H_n(M; Z_2)$. Then there is a unique class $v_i \in H^i(M; Z_2)$ such that

$$\langle Sq^i x, \mu \rangle = \langle v_i x, \mu \rangle$$

for each $x \in H^{n-i}(M; Z_2)$; and the Stiefel–Whitney classes $w_k \in H^k(M; Z_2)$ satisfy

$$w_k = \sum_{i+j=k} Sq^j v_i.$$

Although these formulae are simple and attractive, I did not feel that they gave me that complete understanding which I sought. For example, they raise a problem first recorded by Thom (**9**); briefly, it is as follows. One may use these formulae to define Stiefel–Whitney classes w_k in the cohomology of a manifold which is not necessarily differentiable, or indeed, to define Stiefel–Whitney classes in any algebra over Z_2 which admits operations Sq^i and satisfies suitable axioms. Do these generalized Stiefel–Whitney classes satisfy every formula which holds in the differentiable case? In particular, in the differentiable case we have

$$Sq^i w_k = Q(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{i+k})$$

for a certain polynomial $Q = Q(i, k)$; does this formula hold for the generalized Stiefel–Whitney classes?

We shall prove that the answer to this question of Thom is in the affirmative (see Corollary 3 below). The paper is arranged as follows. In §§ 2, 3 we consider abstract algebras of the sort indicated above, and attempt to obtain a better understanding of their theory. § 2 contains sufficient to answer Thom's question, and § 3 contains the remainder of the work. In § 4 we make some supplementary remarks.

It is a pleasure to express my gratitude to R. Thom for a helpful letter. A similar acknowledgement to F. Hirzebruch appears in context in § 4.

2. We have said that generalized Stiefel–Whitney classes are defined in any algebra over Z_2 which admits operations Sq^i and satisfies suitable axioms. In this section, therefore, the initial object of study will be a

Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 11 (1961) 741–52

graded, anticommutative algebra $H = \sum_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant n} H^i$ over the field Z_p which admits operations Sq^i (if $p = 2$) or P^k (if $p > 2$). More precisely, if $p = 2$ we define A to be the mod 2 Steenrod algebra (**3**, **6**); if $p > 2$ we define A to be that subalgebra of the mod p Steenrod algebra which is generated by the P^k; we now assume that H is a graded left module over the graded algebra A. We impose the following axioms.

(*a*) (Cartan formula.) Let $\Delta: A \to A \otimes A$ be the diagonal map (**6**); as a standard convention, we will write

$$\Delta a = \sum_r a'_r \otimes a''_r.$$

Then we have $$a(hk) = \sum_r (a'_r h)(a''_r k) \quad (h, k \in H).$$

(We need no signs in this formula, because either $p = 2$ or the elements of A are of even degree.)

(*b*) (Dimension axiom.) If $p = 2$, $h \in H^i$ and $i < j$, then $Sq^j h = 0$. If $p > 2$, $h \in H^i$, and $i < 2k$, then $P^k h = 0$.

(*c*) (Poincaré duality.) There is given an element μ in the vector-space dual of H^n. We write $\langle h, \mu \rangle$ for $\mu(h)$, to preserve the analogy with the topological case. The bilinear function $\langle hk, \mu \rangle$ of the variables $h \in H^i$, $k \in H^{n-i}$ gives a dual pairing from the finite-dimensional vector spaces H^i and H^{n-i} to Z_p.

For example, let M be a compact topological n-manifold, without boundary; and if $p > 2$, let M be oriented. Then the cohomology ring $H = H^*(M; Z_p)$ satisfies all these axioms, provided that we take μ to be the fundamental class.

If H is an algebra satisfying the axioms we have given, then we can make H into a graded right module over A; in fact, if $h \in H^i$, $a \in A^j$ we define ha by the equation

$$\langle ha . k, \mu \rangle = \langle h . ak, \mu \rangle \quad (k \in H^{n-i-j}).$$

However, we cannot assert that these operations of A on the right commute with those on the left; nor can we assert that they satisfy the Cartan formula or the dimension axiom.

In particular, we shall have much to do with the classes $\mathscr{E}_H a$, where $\mathscr{E}_H$ is the unit in H. The characteristic property of $\mathscr{E}_H a$ is

$$\langle \mathscr{E}_H a . k, \mu \rangle = \langle ak, \mu \rangle.$$

If we take $p = 2$, then $\mathscr{E}_H Sq^i$ is the class v_i which appears in the formulae of Thom and Wu.

In any algebra H, we can define various classes by starting from the unit $\mathscr{E}_H$ and iterating the operations we have mentioned above. (For example,

$$w_k = \sum_{i+j=k} Sq^i(\mathscr{E}_H Sq^j)$$

is a class of this sort, and so is $Sq^l w_k$.) We wish to study how many classes we can obtain in this way, and what universal formulae they satisfy; that is, what formulae hold in every H. We therefore proceed as follows.

We first define a class of 'words' W, by laying down the following four inductive rules:

(i) The letter $\mathscr{E}$ is a word.

(We emphasize that here $\mathscr{E}$ is merely a formal symbol; in particular, it should not be confused with the unit of any particular algebra H.)

(ii) If W is a word and $a \in A$, then aW and Wa are words.
(iii) If W and W' are words, then the 'cup-product' WW' is a word.
(iv) If W and W' are words and $\lambda, \mu \in Z_p$, then $\lambda W + \mu W'$ is a word.

For example, if $p = 2$, the following formula is a word:

$$Sq^2\{[(\mathscr{E}Sq^1)(\mathscr{E}Sq^2)] + (\mathscr{E}Sq^3)\}.$$

And, in general, a formula W is a word if and only if it is shown to be such by a finite number of applications of the four given rules.

If H is an algebra, satisfying the axioms we have given above, then we can regard each word W as a formula defining a specific element of H. More formally, we can define a function θ_H which assigns to each word W an element of H, by giving the following four inductive rules.

(i) $\theta_H(\mathscr{E}) = \mathscr{E}_H$.
(ii) $\theta_H(aW) = a(\theta_H(W))$, $\quad \theta_H(Wa) = (\theta_H(W))a$.
(iii) $\theta_H(WW') = (\theta_H(W))(\theta_H(W'))$.
(iv) $\theta_H(\lambda W + \mu W') = \lambda(\theta_H(W)) + \mu(\theta_H(W'))$.

We may refer to $\theta_H(W)$ as 'the value of W in H'.

We now divide the words W into equivalence classes, putting W and W' into the same class if we have $\theta_H(W) = \theta_H(W')$ for every H. We take these equivalence classes as the elements of a 'universal domain' U. The problem mentioned above is therefore equivalent to determining the structure of U.

It is trivial to check that U admits well-defined cup-products, linear combinations, and operations from A (both on the left and right). The operations from A are linear; the operations on the left satisfy the Cartan formula and the dimension axiom.

The ring-structure of U is given by Theorem 1 below; the remaining structure of U will be given in section 3.

THEOREM 1. *U is a polynomial algebra on the generators $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_i, \ldots$ defined below.*

In order to define u_i, we write χ for the canonical anti-automorphism of A (**6**); this is defined, inductively, by the equations

$$\chi(1) = 1, \qquad \sum_r \chi(a'_r)a''_r = 0 \quad (\dim a > 0)$$

(where $\Delta a = \sum_r a'_r \otimes a''_r$, as always). We now define $u_i = \mathscr{E}(\chi Sq^i)$ if $p = 2$, $u_k = \mathscr{E}(\chi P^k)$ if $p > 2$.

The degree of u_i is thus i if $p = 2$, and $2i(p-1)$ if $p > 2$.

Our next theorem will show that U is faithfully represented in the cohomology of differentiable manifolds.

THEOREM 2. *Suppose given an integer N; let* M *run over those monomials in the u_i $(i > 0)$ whose degree is N or less. Then there is a differentiable manifold D (orientable if $p > 2$) such that the values in $H^*(D; Z_p)$ of the monomials* M *are linearly independent.*

Theorems 1 and 2 lead immediately to the following corollary.

COROLLARY 3. *Let W be a word of the sort considered above. Suppose that the value of W in $H^*(D; Z_p)$ is zero for every differentiable manifold D; then the value of W in H is zero for any H.*

It is clear that this corollary answers Thom's question in the affirmative. In fact, let us take $p = 2$; then

$$w_k = \sum_{i+j=k} Sq^i(\mathscr{E} Sq^j)$$

is a word of the sort considered; hence so is

$$W = Sq^i w_k - Q(w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{i+k})$$

for any polynomial Q. If we choose Q so that $W = 0$ in every differentiable manifold, then the corollary shows that $W = 0$ in every H.

The remainder of this section will be devoted to proving Theorems 1 and 2. The manifolds D which we exhibit to prove Theorem 2 are cartesian products of projective spaces. We begin work as follows.

LEMMA 4. *Take $p = 2$; let x be the cohomology generator in $H^1(RP^\infty; Z_2)$. If $a \in A^i$ and $i+j+k = 2^s-1$, then*

$$x^j . ax^k = x^k . (\chi a)x^j.$$

Take $p > 2$; let y be the cohomology generator in $H^2(CP^\infty; Z_p)$. If $a \in A^{2i}$ and $i+j+k = p^s-1$, then

$$y^j . ay^k = y^k . (\chi a)y^j.$$

In proving this lemma, and later, it will be convenient to make a convention concerning the expansion

$$\Delta a = \sum_r a'_r \otimes a''_r.$$

If $\dim a > 0$, we may assume that this expansion contains the term $a \otimes 1$ (for $r = \alpha$, say) and the term $1 \otimes a$ (for $r = \omega$, say), while the remaining terms have $\dim a'_r > 0$, $\dim a''_r > 0$.

We give the proof of Lemma 4 for the case $p > 2$; the case $p = 2$ is closely similar. We proceed by induction over $\dim a$. The result is trivial if $\dim a = 0$; as an inductive hypothesis, we suppose it true if $\dim a < l$ $(l > 0)$; we must deduce it when $\dim a = l$.

It is easy to see that if $N = p^s - 1$ and $m > 0$, then the operation

$$P^m\colon H^{2N-2m(p-1)}(CP^\infty; Z_p) \to H^{2N}(CP^\infty; Z_p)$$

is zero. Hence any operation a taking values in $H^{2N}(CP^\infty; Z_p)$ is zero, at least if $\dim a > 0$. In particular, if $a \in A^{2i}$ and $i+j+k = N$, we have $a(y^k . y^j) = 0$. That is,

$$ay^k . y^j + \sum_{r \neq \alpha} a'_r y^k . a''_r y^j = 0.$$

Using the inductive hypothesis, we have

$$ay^k . y^j + \sum_{r \neq \alpha} y^k . \chi(a'_r) a''_r y^j = 0.$$

Using the characteristic property of χ, we have

$$ay^k . y^j = y^k . \chi(a) y^j.$$

This completes the induction.

From this point onwards, we shall permit ourselves to write $\mathscr{E}$ instead of $\mathscr{E}_H$ for the unit in any algebra H under consideration.

LEMMA 5. *Take $p = 2$, $n = 2^s - 2$ $(s \geqslant 2)$, $M = RP^n$, and let x be the cohomology generator in $H^1(M; Z_2)$. Then in $H^*(M; Z_2)$ we have $\mathscr{E}(\chi Sq^1) = x$ and $\mathscr{E}(\chi Sq^i) = 0$ for $i > 1$.*

Take $p > 2$, $m = p^s - 2$ $(s \geqslant 2)$, $M = CP^m$, and let y be the cohomology generator in $H^2(M; Z_p)$. Then in $H^*(M; Z_p)$ we have $\mathscr{E}(\chi P^1) = y^{p-1}$ and $\mathscr{E}(\chi P^k) = 0$ for $k > 1$.

Proof. According to Lemma 4, the calculation of an operation χa which maps into the top dimension of M reduces to the calculation of ax or ay, as the case may be. The values of $Sq^i x$ and $P^k y$ are well known, and lead to the result stated.

LEMMA 6. *In a product manifold $M = M' \times M''$, the values of the classes $\mathscr{E}a$ are given by*

$$\mathscr{E}a = \sum_r \mathscr{E}' a'_r \otimes \mathscr{E}'' a''_r,$$

where $\mathscr{E}'b$ and $\mathscr{E}''c$ denote the corresponding classes in M' and M''.

The verification is obvious.

We will now prove Theorem 2. We take the manifold D to be a cartesian product of N factors, where each factor is a projective space RP^n (if $p = 2$) or CP^m (if $p > 2$). We suppose, of course, that $n = 2^s - 2 \geqslant N$, or that $m = p^s - 2 \geqslant \frac{1}{2}N$, according to the case considered. If $p = 2$, we write $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N$ for the cohomology generators in the separate factors; if $p > 2$, we call them $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_N$.

LEMMA 7. *If $p = 2$, $\mathscr{E}(\chi Sq^i)$ is the i-th elementary symmetric function in $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N$.*

If $p > 2$, $\mathscr{E}(\chi p^k)$ is the k-th elementary symmetric function in $(y_1)^{p-1}$, $(y_2)^{p-1}, \ldots, (y_N)^{p-1}$.

This lemma follows immediately from Lemmas 5 and 6; and it completes the proof of Theorem 2.

In order to prove Theorem 1, it is now sufficient to show that U is multiplicatively generated by the elements u_i, $i > 0$. We begin work as follows:

LEMMA 8 (i). *If* $\dim a > 0$ *and* $h \in H$, *then*

$$(\mathscr{E}a).h = ah + \sum_{r \neq \alpha, \omega} (a'_r h)a''_r + ha.$$

(ii) *If* $\dim a > 0$ *and* $u \in U$, *then*

$$(\mathscr{E}a).u = au + \sum_{r \neq \alpha, \omega} (a'_r u)a''_r + ua.$$

(iii) *If* $\dim a > 0$, *then*

$$(\mathscr{E}a).(\mathscr{E}b) = a(\mathscr{E}b) + \sum_{r \neq \alpha, \omega} (a'_r(\mathscr{E}b))a''_r + \mathscr{E}ba.$$

Proof. We begin with (i). If k is also in H and of the appropriate dimension, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle (\mathscr{E}a).h.k, \mu\rangle &= \langle a(hk), \mu\rangle \\ &= \langle ah.k, \mu\rangle + \sum_{r \neq \alpha, \omega} \langle a'_r h.a''_r k, \mu\rangle + \langle h.ak, \mu\rangle \\ &= \langle ah.k, \mu\rangle + \sum_{r \neq \alpha, \omega} \langle (a'_r h)a''_r.k, \mu\rangle + \langle ha.k, \mu\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for each k, it establishes (i).

Now take an element $u \in U$. The equation

$$(\mathscr{E}a).u = au + \sum_{r \neq \alpha, \omega} (a'_r u)a''_r + ua$$

holds in every H; therefore it holds in U. This proves part (ii). Part (iii) follows by substituting $u = \mathscr{E}b$.

LEMMA 9. *U is multiplicatively generated by the elements $\mathscr{E}a$, $a \in A$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that if $a \in A$, and W is a polynomial in the elements $\mathscr{E}b$, then aW, Wa may also be written as polynomials in the $\mathscr{E}b$. We will prove this proposition by induction over $\dim a$. The proposition is trivial if $\dim a = 0$; as an inductive hypothesis, we suppose it true when $\dim a < k$ $(k > 0)$; we must deduce it when $\dim a = k$.

We begin with the expression $a(\mathscr{E}b)$. Consider the equation of Lemma 8 (iii). The terms $(\mathscr{E}a).(\mathscr{E}b)$, and $\mathscr{E}ba$ are already polynomials in the $\mathscr{E}c$; and each term $(a'_r(\mathscr{E}b))a''_r$ can be written in that form, by the inductive hypothesis. Hence $a(\mathscr{E}b)$ can be written as a polynomial in the $\mathscr{E}c$.

If W is a polynomial in the $\mathscr{E}b$, then aW can be expanded (by linearity and the Cartan formula) in terms of expressions $c(\mathscr{E}b)$ with $\dim c \leqslant k$. Each of the expressions $c(\mathscr{E}b)$ can be written as a polynomial in the $\mathscr{E}d$, as we have just shown; hence aW can be written as a polynomial in the $\mathscr{E}d$.

This completes the inductive step, so far as aW is concerned; we turn to Wa. By Lemma 8 (ii) we have

$$Wa = (\mathscr{E}a).W - aW - \sum_{r \neq \alpha,\omega} (a'_r W)a''_r.$$

The term $(\mathscr{E}a)W$ is already a polynomial in the $\mathscr{E}b$; aW can be written in that form, as we have just shown; and so can each term $(a'_r W)a''_r$, by the inductive hypothesis. Hence Wa can be written as a polynomial in the $\mathscr{E}b$. This completes the induction, and the proof of Lemma 9.

We have yet to show that U is multiplicatively generated by the u_i $(i > 0)$. Let us write $I(U) = \sum_{j>0} U^j$, and let $D(U)$ be the set of decomposable elements in U, that is, those which can be written in the form $u = \sum_r u'_r u''_r$ with $u'_r \in I(U)$, $u''_r \in I(U)$. Our task amounts to calculating $I(U)/D(U)$.

LEMMA 10. *If* $u \in D(U)$, $a \in A$, *then* $ua \in D(U)$.

The proof is by induction over $\dim a$. The result is trivial when $\dim a = 0$; as an inductive hypothesis, we suppose it true when $\dim a < k$ $(k > 0)$; we must deduce it when $\dim a = k$.

Consider the equation of Lemma 8 (ii). The term $(\mathscr{E}a).u$ is certainly decomposable. Since u is decomposable, au is decomposable, by the Cartan formula; and similarly, each term $a'_r u$ is decomposable. By the inductive hypothesis, each term $(a'_r u)a''_r$ is decomposable. Hence ua is decomposable. This completes the induction.

LEMMA 11. *If* $\dim b > 0$, *then*

$$a(\mathscr{E}b) = \mathscr{E}b\chi(a) \mod D(U).$$

The proof is again by induction over $\dim a$. The result is trivial when $\dim a = 0$; as an inductive hypothesis, we suppose it true when $\dim a < k$ $(k > 0)$; we must deduce the result when $\dim a = k$.

By Lemma 8 (iii) we have

$$a(\mathscr{E}b) = (\mathscr{E}a).(\mathscr{E}b) - \mathscr{E}ba - \sum_{r \neq \alpha,\omega} (a'_r(\mathscr{E}b))a''_r.$$

Since $\dim b > 0$, the term $(\mathscr{E}a).(\mathscr{E}b)$ is decomposable. By the inductive hypothesis, the term $a'_r(\mathscr{E}b)$ yields $\mathscr{E}b\chi(a'_r)$, modulo $D(U)$. Using Lemma 10, the term $(a'_r(\mathscr{E}b))a''_r$ yields $\mathscr{E}b\chi(a'_r)a''_r$, modulo $D(U)$. Hence

$$a(\mathscr{E}b) = -\mathscr{E}ba - \sum_{r \neq \alpha,\omega} \mathscr{E}b\chi(a'_r)a''_r$$

modulo $D(U)$. Using the characteristic property of χ, we find

$$a(\mathscr{E}b) = \mathscr{E}b\chi(a)$$

modulo $D(U)$. This completes the induction.

LEMMA 12. *$I(U)/D(U)$ is spanned by the elements u_i, $i > 0$.*

We will give the proof for the case $p > 2$. We easily see (using Lemma 9) that $I(U)/D(U)$ is spanned by the elements $\mathscr{E}a$, where $\dim a > 0$. In fact, it is spanned by the elements $\mathscr{E}a$ as a runs over a set of elements which span $I(A) = \sum_{i>0} A^i$.

Consider the set S of elements

$$P^{k_1}P^{k_2}\dots P^{k_t}$$

such that $k_1 \geqslant pk_2$, $k_2 \geqslant pk_3, \dots, k_{t-1} \geqslant pk_t > 0$. It is easy to show from the Adem relations that these elements do span $I(A)$. It is well known (3) that they form a base for it; but we do not need this fact here.

The set S contains the elements P^k $(k > 0)$. Every other element in S can be written in the form P^lc with $0 < \dim c < 2l$. As a runs over S, χa runs over a set χS which also spans $I(A)$. The set χS contains the elements χP^k $(k > 0)$; every other element in χS can be written in the form $d\chi(P^l)$ with $0 < \dim d < 2l$. By Lemma 11, we have

$$\mathscr{E}d\chi(P^l) = P^l(\mathscr{E}d) \quad \operatorname{mod} D(U).$$

But $P^l(\mathscr{E}d)$ is zero, because $\dim(\mathscr{E}d) < 2l$. We have shown that $\mathscr{E}d\chi(P^l)$ is decomposable. Hence $I(U)/D(U)$ is spanned by the elements $\mathscr{E}\chi(P^k)$ $(k > 0)$. This completes the proof in case $p > 2$.

The proof in case $p = 2$ is closely similar. We begin with the set S of elements

$$Sq^{i_1}Sq^{i_2}\dots Sq^{i_t}$$

such that $i_1 \geqslant 2i_2$, $i_2 \geqslant 2i_3, \dots, i_{t-1} \geqslant 2i_t > 0$. The set χS contains the elements χSq^i $(i > 0)$; every other element in χS can be written in the form $d\chi(Sq^j)$ with $0 < \dim d < j$; $Sq^j(\mathscr{E}d)$ is zero, and therefore $\mathscr{E}d\chi(Sq^j)$ is decomposable. This completes the proof of Lemma 12.

Lemma 12 shows that U is multiplicatively generated by the elements u_i $(i > 0)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-11068-6 - The Selected Works of J. Frank Adams, Volume II
Edited by J. P. May and C. B. Thomas
Excerpt
More information

3. In this section we shall complete the description of U, by describing its operations from A (on the left and on the right). This description is given in Theorem 13 below. After proving this theorem, the section concludes by remarking that U can be given the structure of a Hopf algebra.

THEOREM 13. *Let $P(u_1, u_2,\ldots)$ be a polynomial in the u_i. Then in U we have*

$$a(P(u_1, u_2,\ldots)) = Q(u_1, u_2,\ldots),$$
$$(P(u_1, u_2,\ldots))a = R(u_1, u_2,\ldots),$$

where the polynomials Q and R are constructed according to the method given below.

We now give the method for constructing Q and R. If $p = 2$, take $N \geqslant \dim a + \dim P$, and take a cartesian product of N copies of RP^∞, with fundamental classes $x_1, x_2,\ldots, x_N$. Let σ_i be the ith elementary symmetric function in $x_1, x_2,\ldots, x_N$; set $X = x_1 x_2 \ldots x_N$. Solve the equations

$$a(P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2,\ldots)) = Q(\sigma_1, \sigma_2,\ldots),$$
$$(\chi a)(XP(\sigma_1, \sigma_2,\ldots)) = XR(\sigma_1, \sigma_2,\ldots)$$

for Q and R.

If $p > 2$, take $2N \geqslant \dim a + \dim P$, and take a cartesian product of N copies of CP^∞, with fundamental classes $y_1, y_2,\ldots, y_N$. Let σ_i be the ith elementary symmetric function in $(y_1)^{p-1}, (y_2)^{p-1},\ldots, (y_N)^{p-1}$; set $Y = y_1 y_2 \ldots y_N$. Solve the equations

$$a(P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2,\ldots)) = Q(\sigma_1, \sigma_2,\ldots),$$
$$(\chi a)(YP(\sigma_1, \sigma_2,\ldots)) = YR(\sigma_1, \sigma_2,\ldots)$$

for Q and R.

Example. Take $p = 2$, $P = \mathscr{E}$, $a = Sq^3$; we will calculate R. We have

$$\begin{aligned}(\chi a)X &= (Sq^2Sq^1)(x_1 x_2 \ldots x_N)\\ &= Sq^2(\textstyle\sum x_1^2 x_2 \ldots x_N)\\ &= \textstyle\sum x_1^4 x_2 \ldots x_N + \sum x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3^2 x_4 \ldots x_N\\ &= X(\textstyle\sum x_1^3 + \sum x_1 x_2 x_3).\end{aligned}$$

But $\sum x_1^3 + \sum x_1 x_2 x_3 = \sigma_1^3 + \sigma_1\sigma_2$; therefore $\mathscr{E}Sq^3 = u_1^3 + u_1 u_2$.

Caution. This representation of U (for $p = 2$) does not throw w_k onto the elementary symmetric function σ_k.

We give the proof of Theorem 13 for the case $p > 2$; the case $p = 2$ is closely similar. Lemma 7 shows that U is faithfully represented (up to any given dimension) in $H^*(D; Z_p)$, where D is a certain cartesian product of projective spaces CP^m with $m = p^s - 2$. Moreover, in this representation, u_i becomes the ith elementary symmetric function σ_i in $(y_1)^{p-1}$, $(y_2)^{p-1},\ldots, (y_N)^{p-1}$. If we find formulae $aP = Q$, $Pa = R$ which hold in