

Module MA3486: Fixed Point Theorems and Economic Equilibria Hilary Term 2016 Part II (Sections 5 to 9)

D. R. Wilkins

Copyright © David R. Wilkins 2016

Contents

5	Simplices	73
5.1	Affine Independence	73
5.2	Simplices in Euclidean Spaces	74
6	Simplicial Complexes and the Simplicial Approximation Theorem	77
6.1	Faces of Simplices	77
6.2	Simplicial Complexes in Euclidean Spaces	77
6.3	Barycentric Coordinates on a Simplex	78
6.4	The Interior of a Simplex	79
6.5	Barycentric Subdivision of a Simplicial Complex	82
6.6	Piecewise Linear Maps on Simplicial Complexes	86
6.7	Simplicial Maps	88
6.8	Simplicial Approximations	89
6.9	The Simplicial Approximation Theorem	91
7	The Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem	92
7.1	Sperner's Lemma	92
7.2	Proof of Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem	93
8	Convexity and the Kakutani Fixed Point Theorem	95
8.1	Convex Subsets of Euclidean Spaces	95
8.2	The Kakutani Fixed Point Theorem	99

8.3	Zero-Sum Two-Person Games	102
8.4	Von Neumann's Minimax Theorem	105
9	Exchange Economies	107
9.1	The Existence of Equilibria in an Exchange Economy	107

5 Simplices

5.1 Affine Independence

Definition Points $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ in some Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k are said to be *affinely independent* (or *geometrically independent*) if the only solution of the linear system

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j=0}^q s_j \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{0}, \\ \sum_{j=0}^q s_j = 0 \end{cases}$$

is the trivial solution $s_0 = s_1 = \dots = s_q = 0$.

Lemma 5.1 Let $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ be points of Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k of dimension k . Then the points $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ are affinely independent if and only if the displacement vectors $\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_2 - \mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q - \mathbf{v}_0$ are linearly independent.

Proof Suppose that the points $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ are affinely independent. Let s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q be real numbers which satisfy the equation

$$\sum_{j=1}^q s_j (\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_0) = \mathbf{0}.$$

Then $\sum_{j=0}^q s_j \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{0}$ and $\sum_{j=0}^q s_j = 0$, where $s_0 = -\sum_{j=1}^q s_j$, and therefore

$$s_0 = s_1 = \dots = s_q = 0.$$

It follows that the displacement vectors $\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_2 - \mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q - \mathbf{v}_0$ are linearly independent.

Conversely, suppose that these displacement vectors are linearly independent. Let $s_0, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q$ be real numbers which satisfy the equations

$$\sum_{j=0}^q s_j \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{0} \text{ and } \sum_{j=0}^q s_j = 0. \text{ Then } s_0 = -\sum_{j=1}^q s_j, \text{ and therefore}$$

$$\mathbf{0} = \sum_{j=0}^q s_j \mathbf{v}_j = s_0 \mathbf{v}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^q s_j \mathbf{v}_j = \sum_{j=1}^q s_j (\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_0).$$

It follows from the linear independence of the displacement vectors $\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_0$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$ that

$$s_1 = s_2 = \dots = s_q = 0.$$

But then $s_0 = 0$ also, because $s_0 = -\sum_{j=1}^q s_j$. It follows that the points $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ are affinely independent, as required. ■

It follows from Lemma 5.1 that any set of affinely independent points in \mathbb{R}^k has at most $k + 1$ elements. Moreover if a set consists of affinely independent points in \mathbb{R}^k , then so does every subset of that set.

5.2 Simplices in Euclidean Spaces

Definition A q -simplex in \mathbb{R}^k is defined to be a set of the form

$$\left\{ \sum_{j=0}^q t_j \mathbf{v}_j : 0 \leq t_j \leq 1 \text{ for } j = 0, 1, \dots, q \text{ and } \sum_{j=0}^q t_j = 1 \right\},$$

where $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ are affinely independent points of \mathbb{R}^k . The points $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ are referred to as the *vertices* of the simplex. The non-negative integer q is referred to as the *dimension* of the simplex.

Example A 0-simplex in a Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k is a single point of that space.

Example A 1-simplex in a Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k of dimension at least one is a line segment in that space. Indeed let λ be a 1-simplex in \mathbb{R}^k with vertices \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \{s\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w} : 0 \leq s \leq 1, 0 \leq t \leq 1 \text{ and } s + t = 1\} \\ &= \{(1-t)\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w} : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus λ is a line segment in \mathbb{R}^k with endpoints \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} .

Example A 2-simplex in a Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k of dimension at least two is a triangle in that space. Indeed let τ be a 2-simplex in \mathbb{R}^k with vertices \mathbf{u} , \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} . Then

$$\tau = \{r\mathbf{u} + s\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w} : 0 \leq r, s, t \leq 1 \text{ and } r + s + t = 1\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{x} \in \tau$. Then there exist $r, s, t \in [0, 1]$ such that $\mathbf{x} = r\mathbf{u} + s\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w}$ and $r + s + t = 1$. If $r = 1$ then $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}$. Suppose that $r < 1$. Then

$$\mathbf{x} = r\mathbf{u} + (1-r)\left((1-p)\mathbf{v} + p\mathbf{w}\right)$$

where $p = \frac{t}{1-r}$. Moreover $0 < r \leq 1$ and $0 \leq p \leq 1$. Moreover the above formula determines a point of the 2-simplex τ for each pair of real numbers r and p satisfying $0 \leq r \leq 1$ and $0 \leq p \leq 1$.

Thus

$$\tau = \left\{ r \mathbf{u} + (1-r) \left((1-p) \mathbf{v} + p \mathbf{w} \right) : 0 \leq p, r \leq 1. \right\}.$$

Now the point $(1-p) \mathbf{v} + p \mathbf{w}$ traverses the line segment $\mathbf{v} \mathbf{w}$ from \mathbf{v} to \mathbf{w} as p increases from 0 to 1. It follows that τ is the set of points that lie on line segments with one endpoint at \mathbf{u} and the other at some point of the line segment $\mathbf{v} \mathbf{w}$. This set of points is thus a triangle with vertices \mathbf{u} , \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} .

Example A 3-simplex in a Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k of dimension at least three is a tetrahedron on that space. Indeed let \mathbf{x} be a point of a 3-simplex σ in \mathbb{R}^3 with vertices \mathbf{a} , \mathbf{b} , \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{d} . Then there exist non-negative real numbers s , t , u and v such that

$$\mathbf{x} = s \mathbf{a} + t \mathbf{b} + u \mathbf{c} + v \mathbf{d},$$

and $s+t+u+v = 1$. These real numbers s , t , u and v all have values between 0 and 1, and moreover $0 \leq t \leq 1-s$, $0 \leq u \leq 1-s$ and $0 \leq v \leq 1-s$. Suppose that $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{a}$. Then $0 \leq s < 1$ and $\mathbf{x} = s \mathbf{a} + (1-s) \mathbf{y}$, where


$$\mathbf{y} = \frac{t}{1-s} \mathbf{b} + \frac{u}{1-s} \mathbf{c} + \frac{v}{1-s} \mathbf{d}.$$

Moreover \mathbf{y} is a point of the triangle $\mathbf{b} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{d}$, because

$$0 \leq \frac{t}{1-s} \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq \frac{u}{1-s} \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq \frac{v}{1-s} \leq 1$$

and

$$\frac{t}{1-s} + \frac{u}{1-s} + \frac{v}{1-s} = 1.$$



It follows that the point \mathbf{x} lies on a line segment with one endpoint at the vertex \mathbf{a} of the 3-simplex and the other at some point \mathbf{y} of the triangle \mathbf{bcd} . Thus the 3-simplex σ has the form of a tetrahedron (i.e., it has the form of a pyramid on a triangular base \mathbf{bcd} with apex \mathbf{a}).

A simplex of dimension q in \mathbb{R}^k determines a subset of \mathbb{R}^k that is a translate of a q -dimensional vector subspace of \mathbb{R}^k . Indeed let the points $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ be the vertices of a q -dimensional simplex σ in \mathbb{R}^k . Then these points are affinely independent. It follows from Lemma 5.1 that the displacement vectors

$$\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_2 - \mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q - \mathbf{v}_0$$

are linearly independent. These vectors therefore span a q -dimensional vector subspace V of \mathbb{R}^k . Now, given any point \mathbf{x} of σ , there exist real numbers t_0, t_1, \dots, t_q such that $0 \leq t_j \leq 1$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, q$, $\sum_{j=0}^q t_j = 1$ and $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{j=0}^q t_j \mathbf{v}_j$. Then

$$\mathbf{x} = \left(\sum_{j=0}^q t_j \right) \mathbf{v}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^q t_j (\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_0) = \mathbf{v}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^q t_j (\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_0).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma = \left\{ \mathbf{v}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^q t_j (\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_0) : 0 \leq t_j \leq 1 \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, q \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \sum_{j=1}^q t_j \leq 1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $\sigma \subset \mathbf{v}_0 + V$. Moreover the q -dimensional vector subspace V of \mathbb{R}^k is the unique q -dimensional vector subspace of \mathbb{R}^k that contains the displacement vectors between each pair of points belonging to the simplex σ .

6 Simplicial Complexes and the Simplicial Approximation Theorem

6.1 Faces of Simplices

Definition Let σ and τ be simplices in \mathbb{R}^k . We say that τ is a *face* of σ if the set of vertices of τ is a subset of the set of vertices of σ . A face of σ is said to be a *proper face* if it is not equal to σ itself. An r -dimensional face of σ is referred to as an r -*face* of σ . A 1-dimensional face of σ is referred to as an *edge* of σ .

Note that any simplex is a face of itself. Also the vertices and edges of any simplex are by definition faces of the simplex.

6.2 Simplicial Complexes in Euclidean Spaces

Definition A finite collection K of simplices in \mathbb{R}^k is said to be a *simplicial complex* if the following two conditions are satisfied:—

- if σ is a simplex belonging to K then every face of σ also belongs to K ,
- if σ_1 and σ_2 are simplices belonging to K then either $\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_2 = \emptyset$ or else $\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_2$ is a common face of both σ_1 and σ_2 .

The *dimension* of a simplicial complex K is the greatest non-negative integer n with the property that K contains an n -simplex. The union of all the simplices of K is a compact subset $|K|$ of \mathbb{R}^k referred to as the *polyhedron* of K . (The polyhedron is compact since it is both closed and bounded in \mathbb{R}^k .)

Example Let K_σ consist of some n -simplex σ together with all of its faces. Then K_σ is a simplicial complex of dimension n , and $|K_\sigma| = \sigma$.

Lemma 6.1 *Let K be a simplicial complex, and let X be a subset of some Euclidean space. A function $f: |K| \rightarrow X$ is continuous on the polyhedron $|K|$ of K if and only if the restriction of f to each simplex of K is continuous on that simplex.*

Proof Each simplex of the simplicial complex K is a closed subset of the polyhedron $|K|$ of the simplicial complex K . The numbers of simplices belonging to the simplicial complex is finite. The result therefore follows from a straightforward application of Proposition 2.19. ■

We shall denote by $\text{Vert } K$ the set of vertices of a simplicial complex K (i.e., the set consisting of all vertices of all simplices belonging to K). A collection of vertices of K is said to *span* a simplex of K if these vertices are the vertices of some simplex belonging to K .

Definition Let K be a simplicial complex in \mathbb{R}^k . A *subcomplex* of K is a collection L of simplices belonging to K with the following property:—

- if σ is a simplex belonging to L then every face of σ also belongs to L .

Note that every subcomplex of a simplicial complex K is itself a simplicial complex.

6.3 Barycentric Coordinates on a Simplex

Let σ be a q -simplex in \mathbb{R}^k with vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$. If \mathbf{x} is a point of σ then there exist real numbers t_0, t_1, \dots, t_q such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^q t_j \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{x}, \quad \sum_{j=0}^q t_j = 1 \text{ and } 0 \leq t_j \leq 1 \text{ for } j = 0, 1, \dots, q.$$

Moreover t_0, t_1, \dots, t_q are uniquely determined: if $\sum_{j=0}^q s_j \mathbf{v}_j = \sum_{j=0}^q t_j \mathbf{v}_j$ and $\sum_{j=0}^q s_j = \sum_{j=0}^q t_j = 1$, then $\sum_{j=0}^q (t_j - s_j) \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{0}$ and $\sum_{j=0}^q (t_j - s_j) = 0$, and therefore $t_j - s_j = 0$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, q$, because the points $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ are affinely independent.

Definition Let σ be a q -simplex in \mathbb{R}^k with vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$, and let $\mathbf{x} \in \sigma$. The *barycentric coordinates* of the point \mathbf{x} (with respect to the vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$) are the unique real numbers t_0, t_1, \dots, t_q for which

$$\sum_{j=0}^q t_j \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{x} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=0}^q t_j = 1.$$

The barycentric coordinates t_0, t_1, \dots, t_q of a point of a q -simplex satisfy the inequalities $0 \leq t_j \leq 1$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, q$.

Example Consider the triangle τ in \mathbb{R}^3 with vertices at \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} and \mathbf{k} , where

$$\mathbf{i} = (1, 0, 0), \quad \mathbf{j} = (0, 1, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{k} = (0, 0, 1).$$

Then

$$\tau = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq x, y, z \leq 1 \text{ and } x + y + z = 1\}.$$

The barycentric coordinates on this triangle τ then coincide with the Cartesian coordinates x , y and z , because

$$(x, y, z) = x\mathbf{i} + y\mathbf{j} + z\mathbf{k}$$

for all $(x, y, z) \in \tau$.

Example Consider the triangle in \mathbb{R}^2 with vertices at $(0, 0)$, $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$. This triangle is the set

$$\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \geq 0, y \geq 0 \text{ and } x + y \leq 1.\}$$

The barycentric coordinates of a point (x, y) of this triangle are t_0 , t_1 and t_2 , where

$$t_0 = 1 - x - y, \quad t_1 = x \quad \text{and} \quad t_2 = y.$$

Example Consider the triangle in \mathbb{R}^2 with vertices at $(1, 2)$, $(3, 3)$ and $(4, 5)$. Let t_0 , t_1 and t_2 be the barycentric coordinates of a point (x, y) of this triangle. Then t_0 , t_1 , t_2 are non-negative real numbers, and $t_0 + t_1 + t_2 = 1$. Moreover

$$(x, y) = (1 - t_1 - t_2)(1, 2) + t_1(3, 3) + t_2(4, 5),$$

and thus

$$x = 1 + 2t_1 + 3t_2 \quad \text{and} \quad y = 2 + t_1 + 3t_2.$$

It follows that

$$t_1 = x - y + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad t_2 = \frac{1}{3}(x - 1 - 2t_1) = \frac{2}{3}y - \frac{1}{3}x - 1,$$

and therefore

$$t_0 = 1 - t_1 - t_2 = \frac{1}{3}y - \frac{2}{3}x + 1.$$

In order to verify these formulae it suffices to note that $(t_0, t_1, t_2) = (1, 0, 0)$ when $(x, y) = (1, 2)$, $(t_0, t_1, t_2) = (0, 1, 0)$ when $(x, y) = (3, 3)$ and $(t_0, t_1, t_2) = (0, 0, 1)$ when $(x, y) = (4, 5)$.

6.4 The Interior of a Simplex

Definition The *interior* of a simplex σ is defined to be the set consisting of all points of σ that do not belong to any proper face of σ .

Lemma 6.2 *Let σ be a q -simplex in some Euclidean space with vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$. Let \mathbf{x} be a point of σ , and let t_0, t_1, \dots, t_q be the barycentric coordinates of the point \mathbf{x} with respect to $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$, so that $t_j \geq 0$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, q$, $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{j=0}^q t_j \mathbf{v}_j$, and $\sum_{j=0}^q t_j = 1$. Then the point \mathbf{x} belongs to the interior of σ if and only if $t_j > 0$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, q$.*

Proof The point \mathbf{x} belongs to the face of σ spanned by vertices $\mathbf{v}_{j_0}, \mathbf{v}_{j_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{j_r}$, where $0 \leq j_0 < j_1 < \dots < j_r \leq q$, if and only if $t_j = 0$ for all integers j between 0 and q that do not belong to the set $\{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_r\}$. Thus the point \mathbf{x} belongs to a proper face of the simplex σ if and only if at least one of the barycentric coordinates t_j of that point is equal to zero. The result follows. ■

Example A 0-simplex consists of a single vertex \mathbf{v} . The interior of that 0-simplex is the vertex \mathbf{v} itself.

Example A 1-simplex is a line segment. The interior of a line segment in a Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k with endpoints \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} is

$$\{(1-t)\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w} : 0 < t < 1\}.$$

Thus the interior of the line segment consists of all points of the line segment that are not endpoints of the line segment.

Example A 2-simplex is a triangle. The interior of a triangle with vertices \mathbf{u} , \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} is the set

$$\{r\mathbf{u} + s\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w} : 0 < r, s, t < 1 \text{ and } r + s + t = 1\}.$$

The interior of this triangle consists of all points of the triangle that do not lie on any edge of the triangle.

Remark Let σ be a q -dimensional simplex in some Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k , where $k \geq q$. If $k > q$ then the interior of the simplex (defined according to the definition given above) will not coincide with the topological interior determined by the usual topology on \mathbb{R}^k . Consider for example a triangle embedded in three-dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^3 . The interior of the triangle (defined according to the definition given above) consists of all points of the triangle that do not lie on any edge of the triangle. But of course no three-dimensional ball of positive radius centred on any point of that triangle is wholly contained within the triangle. It follows that the topological interior of the triangle is the empty set when that triangle is considered as a subset of three-dimensional space \mathbb{R}^3 .

Lemma 6.3 *Any point of a simplex belongs to the interior of a unique face of that simplex.*

Proof let $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ be the vertices of a simplex σ , and let $\mathbf{x} \in \sigma$. Then $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{j=0}^q t_j \mathbf{v}_j$, where t_0, t_1, \dots, t_q are the barycentric coordinates of the point \mathbf{x} .

Moreover $0 \leq t_j \leq 1$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, q$ and $\sum_{j=0}^q t_j = 1$. The unique face of σ containing \mathbf{x} in its interior is then the face spanned by those vertices \mathbf{v}_j for which $t_j > 0$. ■

Proposition 6.4 *Let K be a finite collection of simplices in some Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k , and let $|K|$ be the union of all the simplices in K . Then K is a simplicial complex (with polyhedron $|K|$) if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:—*

- K contains the faces of its simplices,
- every point of $|K|$ belongs to the interior of a unique simplex of K .

Proof Suppose that K is a simplicial complex. Then K contains the faces of its simplices. We must show that every point of $|K|$ belongs to the interior of a unique simplex of K . Let $\mathbf{x} \in |K|$. Then $\mathbf{x} \in \rho$ for some simplex ρ of K . It follows from Lemma 6.3 that there exists a unique face σ of ρ such that the point \mathbf{x} belongs to the interior of σ . But then $\sigma \in K$, because $\rho \in K$ and K contains the faces of all its simplices. Thus \mathbf{x} belongs to the interior of at least one simplex of K .

Suppose that \mathbf{x} were to belong to the interior of two distinct simplices σ and τ of K . Then \mathbf{x} would belong to some common face $\sigma \cap \tau$ of σ and τ (since K is a simplicial complex). But this common face would be a proper face of one or other of the simplices σ and τ (since $\sigma \neq \tau$), contradicting the fact that \mathbf{x} belongs to the interior of both σ and τ . We conclude that the simplex σ of K containing \mathbf{x} in its interior is uniquely determined.

Conversely, we must show that if K is some finite collection of simplices in some Euclidean space, if K contains the faces of all its simplices, and if every point of the union $|K|$ of those simplices belongs to the interior of a unique simplex in the collection, then that collection is a simplicial complex. To achieve this, we must prove that if σ and τ are simplices belonging to the collection K , and if $\sigma \cap \tau \neq \emptyset$, then $\sigma \cap \tau$ is a common face of σ and τ .

Let $\mathbf{x} \in \sigma \cap \tau$. Then \mathbf{x} belongs to the interior of a unique simplex ω belonging to the collection K . However any point of σ or τ belongs to the interior of a unique face of that simplex, and all faces of σ and τ belong to

K . It follows that ω is a common face of σ and τ , and thus the vertices of ω are vertices of both σ and τ . It follows that the simplices σ and τ have vertices in common.

Let ρ be the simplex whose vertex set is the intersection of the vertex sets of σ and τ . Then ρ is a common face of both σ and τ , and therefore $\rho \in K$. Moreover if $\mathbf{x} \in \sigma \cap \tau$ and if ω is the unique simplex of K whose interior contains the point \mathbf{x} , then (as we have already shown), all vertices of ω are vertices of both σ and τ . But then the vertex set of ω is a subset of the vertex set of ρ , and thus ω is a face of ρ . Thus each point \mathbf{x} of $\sigma \cap \tau$ belongs to ρ , and therefore $\sigma \cap \tau \subset \rho$. But ρ is a common face of σ and τ and therefore $\rho \subset \sigma \cap \tau$. It follows that $\sigma \cap \tau = \rho$, and thus $\sigma \cap \tau$ is a common face of σ and τ . This completes the proof that the collection K of simplices satisfying the given conditions is a simplicial complex. ■

6.5 Barycentric Subdivision of a Simplicial Complex

Let σ be a q -simplex in \mathbb{R}^k with vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$. The *barycentre* of σ is defined to be the point

$$\hat{\sigma} = \frac{1}{q+1}(\mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{v}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{v}_q).$$

Let σ and τ be simplices in some Euclidean space. If σ is a proper face of τ then we denote this fact by writing $\sigma < \tau$.

A simplicial complex K_1 is said to be a *subdivision* of a simplicial complex K if $|K_1| = |K|$ and each simplex of K_1 is contained in a simplex of K .

Definition Let K be a simplicial complex in some Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k . The *first barycentric subdivision* K' of K is defined to be the collection of simplices in \mathbb{R}^k whose vertices are $\hat{\sigma}_0, \hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_r$ for some sequence $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ of simplices of K with $\sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \dots < \sigma_r$. Thus the set of vertices of K' is the set of all the barycentres of all the simplices of K .

Note that every simplex of K' is contained in a simplex of K . Indeed if $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r \in K$ satisfy $\sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \dots < \sigma_r$ then the simplex of K' spanned by $\hat{\sigma}_0, \hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_r$, is contained in the simplex σ_r of K .

Example Let K be the simplicial complex consisting of two triangles **a b d** and **b c d** that intersect along a common edge **b d**, together with all the edges and vertices of the two triangles, as depicted in the following diagram:

It is clear from the definition of the barycentric subdivision K' that any face of a simplex of K' must itself belong to K' . We must verify that any two simplices of K' are disjoint or else intersect in a common face.

Choose a simplex σ of K for which $\dim \sigma = \dim K$, and let $L = K \setminus \{\sigma\}$. Then L is a subcomplex of K , since σ is not a proper face of any simplex of K . Now L has fewer simplices than K . It follows from the induction hypothesis that L' is a simplicial complex and $|L'| = |L|$. Also it follows from the definition of K' that K' consists of the following simplices:—

- the simplices of L' ,
- the barycentre $\hat{\sigma}$ of σ ,
- simplices $\hat{\sigma}\rho$ whose vertex set is obtained by adjoining $\hat{\sigma}$ to the vertex set of some simplex ρ of L' , where the vertices of ρ are barycentres of proper faces of σ .

By checking all possible intersections of simplices of the above types, it is easy to verify that any two simplices of K' intersect in a common face. Indeed any two simplices of L' intersect in a common face, since L' is a simplicial complex. If ρ_1 and ρ_2 are simplices of L' whose vertices are barycentres of proper faces of σ , then $\rho_1 \cap \rho_2$ is a common face of ρ_1 and ρ_2 which is of this type, and $\hat{\sigma}\rho_1 \cap \hat{\sigma}\rho_2 = \hat{\sigma}(\rho_1 \cap \rho_2)$. Thus $\hat{\sigma}\rho_1 \cap \hat{\sigma}\rho_2$ is a common face of $\hat{\sigma}\rho_1$ and $\hat{\sigma}\rho_2$. Also any simplex τ of L' is disjoint from the barycentre $\hat{\sigma}$ of σ , and $\hat{\sigma}\rho \cap \tau = \rho \cap \tau$. We conclude that K' is indeed a simplicial complex.

It remains to verify that $|K'| = |K|$. Now $|K'| \subset |K|$, since every simplex of K' is contained in a simplex of K . Let \mathbf{x} be a point of the chosen simplex σ . Then there exists a point \mathbf{y} belonging to a proper face of σ and some $t \in [0, 1]$ such that $\mathbf{x} = (1-t)\hat{\sigma} + t\mathbf{y}$. But then $\mathbf{y} \in |L|$, and $|L| = |L'|$ by the induction hypothesis. It follows that $\mathbf{y} \in \rho$ for some simplex ρ of L' whose vertices are barycentres of proper faces of σ . But then $\mathbf{x} \in \hat{\sigma}\rho$, and therefore $\mathbf{x} \in |K'|$. Thus $|K| \subset |K'|$, and hence $|K'| = |K|$, as required. ■

We define (by induction on j) the j th barycentric subdivision $K^{(j)}$ of K to be the first barycentric subdivision of $K^{(j-1)}$ for each $j > 1$.

Lemma 6.6 *Let σ be a q -simplex and let τ be a face of σ . Let $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\tau}$ be the barycentres of σ and τ respectively. If all the 1-simplices (edges) of σ have length not exceeding d for some $d > 0$ then*

$$|\hat{\sigma} - \hat{\tau}| \leq \frac{qd}{q+1}.$$

Proof Let $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ be the vertices of σ . Let \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} be points of σ . We can write $\mathbf{y} = \sum_{j=0}^q t_j \mathbf{v}_j$, where $0 \leq t_i \leq 1$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, q$ and $\sum_{j=0}^q t_j = 1$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| &= \left| \sum_{i=0}^q t_i (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}_i) \right| \leq \sum_{i=0}^q t_i |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}_i| \\ &\leq \text{maximum} (|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}_0|, |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}_1|, \dots, |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}_q|). \end{aligned}$$

Applying this result with $\mathbf{x} = \hat{\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{y} = \hat{\tau}$, we find that

$$|\hat{\sigma} - \hat{\tau}| \leq \text{maximum} (|\hat{\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_0|, |\hat{\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_1|, \dots, |\hat{\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_q|).$$

But

$$\hat{\sigma} = \frac{1}{q+1} \mathbf{v}_i + \frac{q}{q+1} \mathbf{z}_i$$

for $i = 0, 1, \dots, q$, where \mathbf{z}_i is the barycentre of the $(q-1)$ -face of σ opposite to \mathbf{v}_i , given by

$$\mathbf{z}_i = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{v}_j.$$

Moreover $\mathbf{z}_i \in \sigma$. It follows that

$$|\hat{\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_i| = \frac{q}{q+1} |\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{v}_i| \leq \frac{qd}{q+1}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, q$, and thus

$$|\hat{\sigma} - \hat{\tau}| \leq \text{maximum} (|\hat{\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_0|, |\hat{\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_1|, \dots, |\hat{\sigma} - \mathbf{v}_q|) \leq \frac{qd}{q+1},$$

as required. ■

Definition The *mesh* $\mu(K)$ of a simplicial complex K is the length of the longest edge of K .

Lemma 6.7 Let K be a simplicial complex, and let n be the dimension of K . Let K' be the first barycentric subdivision of K . Then

$$\mu(K') \leq \frac{n}{n+1} \mu(K).$$

Proof A 1-simplex of K' is of the form $(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\sigma})$, where σ is a q -simplex of K for some $q \leq n$ and τ is a proper face of σ . Then

$$|\hat{\tau} - \hat{\sigma}| \leq \frac{q}{q+1} \mu(K) \leq \frac{n}{n+1} \mu(K)$$

by Lemma 6.6, as required. ■

Lemma 6.8 *Let K be a simplicial complex, let $K^{(j)}$ be the j th barycentric subdivision of K for all positive integers j , and let $\mu(K^{(j)})$ be the mesh of $K^{(j)}$. Then $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mu(K^{(j)}) = 0$.*

Proof The dimension of all barycentric subdivisions of a simplicial complex is equal to the dimension of the simplicial complex itself. It therefore follows from Lemma 6.7 that

$$\mu(K^{(j)}) \leq \left(\frac{n}{n+1} \right)^j \mu(K).$$

The result follows. ■

6.6 Piecewise Linear Maps on Simplicial Complexes

Definition Let K be a simplicial complex in n -dimensional Euclidean space. A function $f: |K| \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ mapping the polyhedron $|K|$ of K into m -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^m is said to be *piecewise linear* on each simplex of K if

$$f\left(\sum_{i=0}^q t_i \mathbf{v}_i\right) = \sum_{i=0}^q t_i f(\mathbf{v}_i)$$

for all vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ of K that span a simplex of K , and for all non-negative real numbers t_0, t_1, \dots, t_q satisfying $\sum_{i=0}^q t_i = 1$.

Lemma 6.9 *Let K be a simplicial complex in n -dimensional Euclidean space, and let $f: |K| \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a function mapping the polyhedron $|K|$ of K into m -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^m that is piecewise linear on each simplex of K . Then $f: |K| \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is continuous.*

Proof The definition of piecewise linear functions ensures that the restriction of $f: |K| \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ to each simplex of K is continuous on that simplex. The result therefore follows from Lemma 6.1. ■

Proposition 6.10 *Let K be a simplicial complex in n -dimensional Euclidean space and let $\alpha: \text{Vert}(K) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a function mapping the set $\text{Vert}(K)$ of vertices of K into m -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^m . Then there exists a unique function $f: |K| \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ defined on the polyhedron $|K|$ of K that is piecewise linear on each simplex of K and satisfies $f(\mathbf{v}) = \alpha(\mathbf{v})$ for all vertices \mathbf{v} of K .*

Proof Given any point \mathbf{x} of K , there exists a unique simplex of K whose interior contains the point \mathbf{x} (Proposition 6.4). Let the vertices of this simplex be $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_p$, where $p \leq n$. Then there exist uniquely-determined strictly positive real numbers t_0, t_1, \dots, t_p satisfying $\sum_{i=0}^p t_i = 1$ for which $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=0}^p t_i \mathbf{v}_i$. We then define $f(\mathbf{x})$ so that

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^p t_i \alpha(\mathbf{v}_i).$$

Defining $f(\mathbf{x})$ in this fashion at each point \mathbf{x} of $|K|$, we obtain a function $f: |K| \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ mapping Δ into \mathbb{R}^m .

Now let $\mathbf{x} \in \sigma$ for some q -simplex of K . We can order the vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ of σ so that the point \mathbf{x} belongs to the interior of the face of σ spanned by $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_p$ where $p \leq q$. Let t_1, t_2, \dots, t_q be the barycentric coordinates of the point \mathbf{x} with respect to the simplex σ . Then $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=0}^q t_i \mathbf{v}_i$, where $t_i > 0$ for those integers i satisfying $0 \leq i \leq p$, $t_i = 0$ for those integers i (if any) satisfying $p < i \leq q$, and $\sum_{i=0}^p t_i = \sum_{i=0}^q t_i = 1$. Then

$$f\left(\sum_{i=0}^q t_i \mathbf{v}_i\right) = f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^p t_i \alpha(\mathbf{v}_i) = \sum_{i=0}^q t_i f(\mathbf{v}_i).$$

The result follows. \blacksquare

Corollary 6.11 *Let K be a simplicial complex in \mathbb{R}^n and let L be simplicial complexes in \mathbb{R}^m , where m and n are positive integers, and let $\varphi: \text{Vert}(K) \rightarrow \text{Vert}(L)$ be a function mapping vertices of K to vertices of L . Suppose that*

$$\varphi(\mathbf{v}_0), \varphi(\mathbf{v}_1), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{v}_q)$$

span a simplex of L for all vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ of K that span a simplex of K . Then there exists a unique continuous map $\bar{\varphi}: |K| \rightarrow |L|$ mapping the polyhedron $|K|$ of K into the polyhedron $|L|$ of L that is piecewise linear on each simplex of K and satisfies $\bar{\varphi}(\mathbf{v}) = \varphi(\mathbf{v})$ for all vertices \mathbf{v} of K . Moreover this function maps the interior of a simplex of K spanned by vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ into the interior of the simplex of L spanned by $\varphi(\mathbf{v}_0), \varphi(\mathbf{v}_1), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{v}_q)$.

Proof It follows from Proposition 6.10 that there is a unique piecewise linear function $f: |K| \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ that satisfies $f(\mathbf{v}) = \varphi(\mathbf{v})$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in \text{Vert}(K)$. We show that $f(|K|) \subset |L|$.

Let

$$\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$$

be vertices of a simplex σ of K . Then

$$\varphi(\mathbf{v}_0), \varphi(\mathbf{v}_1), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{v}_q)$$

span a simplex of L . Let τ be the simplex of L spanned by these vertices of L , and let $\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_r$ be the vertices of τ . Then, for each integer j between 1 and r , let u_j be the sum of those t_i for which $\varphi(\mathbf{v}_i) = \mathbf{w}_j$.

Then

$$f\left(\sum_{i=0}^q t_i \mathbf{v}_i\right) = \sum_{i=0}^q t_i \varphi(\mathbf{v}_i) = \sum_{j=0}^r u_j \mathbf{w}_j$$

and $\sum_{j=0}^r u_j = 1$. It follows that $f(\sigma) \subset \tau$. Moreover, given any integer j between 1 and r , there exists at least one integer i between 1 and q for which $\varphi(\mathbf{v}_i) = \mathbf{w}_j$. It follows that $t_0, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_q$ are all strictly positive, then u_0, u_1, \dots, u_r are also all strictly positive. Therefore the piecewise linear function f maps the interior of σ into the interior of τ .

We have already shown that $f: |K| \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ maps each simplex of K into a simplex of L . Therefore there exists a uniquely-determined linear function $\bar{\varphi}: |K| \rightarrow |L|$ satisfying $\bar{\varphi}(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in |K|$. The result follows. ■

6.7 Simplicial Maps

Definition A *simplicial map* $\varphi: K \rightarrow L$ between simplicial complexes K and L is a function $\varphi: \text{Vert } K \rightarrow \text{Vert } L$ from the vertex set of K to that of L such that $\varphi(\mathbf{v}_0), \varphi(\mathbf{v}_1), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{v}_q)$ span a simplex belonging to L whenever $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ span a simplex of K .

Note that a simplicial map $\varphi: K \rightarrow L$ between simplicial complexes K and L can be regarded as a function from K to L : this function sends a simplex σ of K with vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ to the simplex $\varphi(\sigma)$ of L spanned by the vertices $\varphi(\mathbf{v}_0), \varphi(\mathbf{v}_1), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{v}_q)$.

It follows from Corollary 6.11 that simplicial map $\varphi: K \rightarrow L$ also induces in a natural fashion a continuous map $\varphi: |K| \rightarrow |L|$ between the polyhedra of K and L , where

$$\varphi\left(\sum_{j=0}^q t_j \mathbf{v}_j\right) = \sum_{j=0}^q t_j \varphi(\mathbf{v}_j)$$

whenever $0 \leq t_j \leq 1$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, q$, $\sum_{j=0}^q t_j = 1$, and $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$ span a simplex of K . Moreover it also follows from Corollary 6.11 that the interior of a simplex σ of K is mapped into the interior of the simplex $\varphi(\sigma)$ of L .

There are thus three equivalent ways of describing a simplicial map: as a function between the vertex sets of two simplicial complexes, as a function from one simplicial complex to another, and as a continuous map between the polyhedra of two simplicial complexes. In what follows, we shall describe a simplicial map using the representation that is most appropriate in the given context.

6.8 Simplicial Approximations

Definition Let $f: |K| \rightarrow |L|$ be a continuous map between the polyhedra of simplicial complexes K and L . A simplicial map $s: K \rightarrow L$ is said to be a *simplicial approximation* to f if, for each $\mathbf{x} \in |K|$, $s(\mathbf{x})$ is an element of the unique simplex of L which contains $f(\mathbf{x})$ in its interior.

Definition Let X and Y be subsets of Euclidean spaces. Continuous maps $f: X \rightarrow Y$ and $g: X \rightarrow Y$ from X to Y are said to be *homotopic* if there exists a continuous map $H: X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ such that $H(x, 0) = f(x)$ and $H(x, 1) = g(x)$ for all $x \in X$.

Lemma 6.12 *Let K and L be simplicial complexes, let $f: |K| \rightarrow |L|$ be a continuous map between the polyhedra of K and L , and let $s: K \rightarrow L$ be a simplicial approximation to the map f . Then there is a well-defined homotopy $H: |K| \times [0, 1] \rightarrow |L|$, between the maps f and s , where*

$$H(\mathbf{x}, t) = (1 - t)f(\mathbf{x}) + ts(\mathbf{x})$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in |K|$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.

Proof Let $\mathbf{x} \in |K|$. Then there is a unique simplex σ of L such that the point $f(\mathbf{x})$ belongs to the interior of σ . Then $s(\mathbf{x}) \in \sigma$. But, given any two points of a simplex embedded in some Euclidean space, the line segment joining those two points is contained within the simplex. It follows that $(1 - t)f(\mathbf{x}) + ts(\mathbf{x}) \in |L|$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in K$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. Thus the homotopy $H: |K| \times [0, 1] \rightarrow |L|$ is a well-defined map from $|K| \times [0, 1]$ to $|L|$. Moreover it follows directly from the definition of this map that $H(\mathbf{x}, 0) = f(\mathbf{x})$ and $H(\mathbf{x}, 1) = s(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in |K|$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. The map H is thus a homotopy between the maps f and s , as required. ■

Definition Let K be a simplicial complex, and let $\mathbf{x} \in |K|$. The *star neighbourhood* $\text{st}_K(\mathbf{x})$ of \mathbf{x} in K is the union of the interiors of all simplices of K that contain the point \mathbf{x} .

Lemma 6.13 *Let K be a simplicial complex and let $\mathbf{x} \in |K|$. Then the star neighbourhood $\text{st}_K(\mathbf{x})$ of \mathbf{x} is open in $|K|$, and $\mathbf{x} \in \text{st}_K(\mathbf{x})$.*

Proof Every point of $|K|$ belongs to the interior of a unique simplex of K (Proposition 6.4). It follows that the complement $|K| \setminus \text{st}_K(\mathbf{x})$ of $\text{st}_K(\mathbf{x})$ in $|K|$ is the union of the interiors of those simplices of K that do not contain the point \mathbf{x} . But if a simplex of K does not contain the point \mathbf{x} , then the same is true of its faces. Moreover the union of the interiors of all the faces of some simplex is the simplex itself. It follows that $|K| \setminus \text{st}_K(\mathbf{x})$ is the union of all simplices of K that do not contain the point \mathbf{x} . But each simplex of K is closed in $|K|$. It follows that $|K| \setminus \text{st}_K(\mathbf{x})$ is a finite union of closed sets, and is thus itself closed in $|K|$. We deduce that $\text{st}_K(\mathbf{x})$ is open in $|K|$. Also $\mathbf{x} \in \text{st}_K(\mathbf{x})$, since \mathbf{x} belongs to the interior of at least one simplex of K . ■

Proposition 6.14 *A function $s: \text{Vert } K \rightarrow \text{Vert } L$ between the vertex sets of simplicial complexes K and L is a simplicial map, and a simplicial approximation to some continuous map $f: |K| \rightarrow |L|$, if and only if $f(\text{st}_K(\mathbf{v})) \subset \text{st}_L(s(\mathbf{v}))$ for all vertices \mathbf{v} of K .*

Proof Let $s: K \rightarrow L$ be a simplicial approximation to $f: |K| \rightarrow |L|$, let \mathbf{v} be a vertex of K , and let $\mathbf{x} \in \text{st}_K(\mathbf{v})$. Then \mathbf{x} and $f(\mathbf{x})$ belong to the interiors of unique simplices $\sigma \in K$ and $\tau \in L$. Moreover \mathbf{v} must be a vertex of σ , by definition of $\text{st}_K(\mathbf{v})$. Now $s(\mathbf{x})$ must belong to τ (since s is a simplicial approximation to the map f), and therefore $s(\mathbf{x})$ must belong to the interior of some face of τ . But $s(\mathbf{x})$ must belong to the interior of $s(\sigma)$, because \mathbf{x} is in the interior of σ (see Corollary 6.11). It follows that $s(\sigma)$ must be a face of τ , and therefore $s(\mathbf{v})$ must be a vertex of τ . Thus $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \text{st}_L(s(\mathbf{v}))$. We conclude that if $s: K \rightarrow L$ is a simplicial approximation to $f: |K| \rightarrow |L|$, then $f(\text{st}_K(\mathbf{v})) \subset \text{st}_L(s(\mathbf{v}))$.

Conversely let $s: \text{Vert } K \rightarrow \text{Vert } L$ be a function with the property that $f(\text{st}_K(\mathbf{v})) \subset \text{st}_L(s(\mathbf{v}))$ for all vertices \mathbf{v} of K . Let \mathbf{x} be a point in the interior of some simplex of K with vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_q$. Then $\mathbf{x} \in \text{st}_K(\mathbf{v}_j)$ and hence $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \text{st}_L(s(\mathbf{v}_j))$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, q$. It follows that each vertex $s(\mathbf{v}_j)$ must be a vertex of the unique simplex $\tau \in L$ that contains $f(\mathbf{x})$ in its interior. In particular, $s(\mathbf{v}_0), s(\mathbf{v}_1), \dots, s(\mathbf{v}_q)$ span a face of τ , and $s(\mathbf{x}) \in \tau$. We conclude that the function $s: \text{Vert } K \rightarrow \text{Vert } L$ represents a simplicial map which is a simplicial approximation to $f: |K| \rightarrow |L|$, as required. ■

Corollary 6.15 *If $s: K \rightarrow L$ and $t: L \rightarrow M$ are simplicial approximations to continuous maps $f: |K| \rightarrow |L|$ and $g: |L| \rightarrow |M|$, where K , L and M are simplicial complexes, then $t \circ s: K \rightarrow M$ is a simplicial approximation to $g \circ f: |K| \rightarrow |M|$.*

6.9 The Simplicial Approximation Theorem

Theorem 6.16 (Simplicial Approximation Theorem) *Let K and L be simplicial complexes, and let $f: |K| \rightarrow |L|$ be a continuous map. Then, for some sufficiently large integer j , there exists a simplicial approximation $s: K^{(j)} \rightarrow L$ to f defined on the j th barycentric subdivision $K^{(j)}$ of K .*

Proof The collection consisting of the stars $\text{st}_L(\mathbf{w})$ of all vertices \mathbf{w} of L is an open cover of $|L|$, since each star $\text{st}_L(\mathbf{w})$ is open in $|L|$ (Lemma 6.13) and the interior of any simplex of L is contained in $\text{st}_L(\mathbf{w})$ whenever \mathbf{w} is a vertex of that simplex. It follows from the continuity of the map $f: |K| \rightarrow |L|$ that the collection consisting of the preimages $f^{-1}(\text{st}_L(\mathbf{w}))$ of the stars of all vertices \mathbf{w} of L is an open cover of $|K|$.

Now the set $|K|$ is a closed bounded subset of a Euclidean space. It follows that there exists a Lebesgue number δ_L for the open cover consisting of the preimages of the stars of all the vertices of L (see Proposition 3.1). This Lebesgue number δ_L is a positive real number with the following property: every subset of $|K|$ whose diameter is less than δ_L is contained in the preimage of the star of some vertex \mathbf{w} of L . It follows that every subset of $|K|$ whose diameter is less than δ_L is mapped by f into $\text{st}_L(\mathbf{w})$ for some vertex \mathbf{w} of L .

Now the mesh $\mu(K^{(j)})$ of the j th barycentric subdivision of K tends to zero as $j \rightarrow +\infty$ (see Lemma 6.8). Thus we can choose j such that $\mu(K^{(j)}) < \frac{1}{2}\delta_L$. If \mathbf{v} is a vertex of $K^{(j)}$ then each point of $\text{st}_{K^{(j)}}(\mathbf{v})$ is within a distance $\frac{1}{2}\delta_L$ of \mathbf{v} , and hence the diameter of $\text{st}_{K^{(j)}}(\mathbf{v})$ is at most δ_L . We can therefore choose, for each vertex \mathbf{v} of $K^{(j)}$ a vertex $s(\mathbf{v})$ of L such that $f(\text{st}_{K^{(j)}}(\mathbf{v})) \subset \text{st}_L(s(\mathbf{v}))$. In this way we obtain a function $s: \text{Vert } K^{(j)} \rightarrow \text{Vert } L$ from the vertices of $K^{(j)}$ to the vertices of L . It follows directly from Proposition 6.14 that this is the desired simplicial approximation to f . ■

7 The Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem

7.1 Sperner's Lemma

Definition Let K be a simplicial complex which is a subdivision of some n -dimensional simplex Δ . We define a *Sperner labelling* of the vertices of K to be a function, labelling each vertex of K with an integer between 0 and n , with the following properties:—

- for each $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, there is exactly one vertex of Δ labelled by j ,
- if a vertex \mathbf{v} of K belongs to some face of Δ , then some vertex of that face has the same label as \mathbf{v} .

Lemma 7.1 (Sperner's Lemma) *Let K be a simplicial complex which is a subdivision of an n -simplex Δ . Then, for any Sperner labelling of the vertices of K , the number of n -simplices of K whose vertices are labelled by $0, 1, \dots, n$ is odd.*

Proof Given integers i_0, i_1, \dots, i_q between 0 and n , let $N(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_q)$ denote the number of q -simplices of K whose vertices are labelled by i_0, i_1, \dots, i_q (where an integer occurring k times in the list labels exactly k vertices of the simplex). We must show that $N(0, 1, \dots, n)$ is odd.

We prove the result by induction on the dimension n of the simplex Δ ; it is clearly true when $n = 0$. Suppose that the result holds in dimensions less than n . For each simplex σ of K of dimension n , let $p(\sigma)$ denote the number of $(n - 1)$ -faces of σ labelled by $0, 1, \dots, n - 1$. If σ is labelled by $0, 1, \dots, n$ then $p(\sigma) = 1$; if σ is labelled by $0, 1, \dots, n - 1, j$, where $j < n$, then $p(\sigma) = 2$; in all other cases $p(\sigma) = 0$. Therefore

$$\sum_{\substack{\sigma \in K \\ \dim \sigma = n}} p(\sigma) = N(0, 1, \dots, n) + 2 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} N(0, 1, \dots, n - 1, j).$$

Now the definition of Sperner labellings ensures that the only $(n - 1)$ -face of Δ containing simplices of K labelled by $0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ is that with vertices labelled by $0, 1, \dots, n - 1$. Thus if M is the number of $(n - 1)$ -simplices of K labelled by $0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ that are contained in this face, then $N(0, 1, \dots, n - 1) - M$ is the number of $(n - 1)$ -simplices labelled by $0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ that intersect the interior of Δ . It follows that

$$\sum_{\substack{\sigma \in K \\ \dim \sigma = n}} p(\sigma) = M + 2(N(0, 1, \dots, n - 1) - M),$$

since any $(n-1)$ -simplex of K that is contained in a proper face of Δ must be a face of exactly one n -simplex of K , and any $(n-1)$ -simplex that intersects the interior of Δ must be a face of exactly two n -simplices of K . On combining these equalities, we see that $N(0, 1, \dots, n) - M$ is an even integer. But the induction hypothesis ensures that Sperner's Lemma holds in dimension $n-1$, and thus M is odd. It follows that $N(0, 1, \dots, n)$ is odd, as required. ■

7.2 Proof of Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem

Proposition 7.2 *Let Δ be an n -simplex with boundary $\partial\Delta$. Then there does not exist any continuous map $r: \Delta \rightarrow \partial\Delta$ with the property that $r(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \partial\Delta$.*

Proof Suppose that such a map $r: \Delta \rightarrow \partial\Delta$ were to exist. It would then follow from the Simplicial Approximation Theorem (Theorem 6.16) that there would exist a simplicial approximation $s: K \rightarrow L$ to the map r , where L is the simplicial complex consisting of all of the proper faces of Δ , and K is the j th barycentric subdivision, for some sufficiently large j , of the simplicial complex consisting of the simplex Δ together with all of its faces.

If \mathbf{v} is a vertex of K belonging to some proper face Σ of Δ then $r(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v}$, and hence $s(\mathbf{v})$ must be a vertex of Σ , since $s: K \rightarrow L$ is a simplicial approximation to $r: \Delta \rightarrow \partial\Delta$. In particular $s(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v}$ for all vertices \mathbf{v} of Δ . Thus if $\mathbf{v} \mapsto m(\mathbf{v})$ is a labelling of the vertices of Δ by the integers $0, 1, \dots, n$, then $\mathbf{v} \mapsto m(s(\mathbf{v}))$ is a Sperner labelling of the vertices of K . Thus Sperner's Lemma (Lemma 7.1) guarantees the existence of at least one n -simplex σ of K labelled by $0, 1, \dots, n$. But then $s(\sigma) = \Delta$, which is impossible, since Δ is not a simplex of L . We conclude therefore that there cannot exist any continuous map $r: \Delta \rightarrow \partial\Delta$ satisfying $r(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \partial\Delta$. ■

Theorem 7.3 (Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem) *Let X be a subset of a Euclidean space that is homeomorphic to the closed n -dimensional ball E^n , where*

$$E^n = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\mathbf{x}| \leq 1\}.$$

Then any continuous function $f: X \rightarrow X$ mapping the set X into itself has at least one fixed point \mathbf{x}^ for which $f(\mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbf{x}^*$.*

Proof The closed n -dimensional ball E^n is itself homeomorphic to an n -dimensional simplex Δ . It follows that there exists a homeomorphism $h: X \rightarrow \Delta$ mapping the set X onto the simplex Δ . Then the continuous map $f: X \rightarrow X$ determines a continuous map $g: \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$, where $g(h(\mathbf{x})) = h(f(\mathbf{x}))$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$. Suppose that it were the case that $f(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$. Then

$g(\mathbf{z}) \neq \mathbf{z}$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in \Delta$. There would then exist a well-defined continuous map $r: \Delta \rightarrow \partial\Delta$ mapping each point \mathbf{z} of Δ to the unique point $r(\mathbf{z})$ of the boundary $\partial\Delta$ of Δ at which the half line starting at $g(\mathbf{z})$ and passing through \mathbf{z} intersects $\partial\Delta$. Then $r: \Delta \rightarrow \partial\Delta$ would be continuous, and $r(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{z}$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in \partial\Delta$. However Proposition 7.2 guarantees that there does not exist any continuous map $r: \Delta \rightarrow \partial\Delta$ with these properties. Therefore the map f must have at least one fixed point, as required. ■

Corollary 7.4 *Let*

$$\Delta = \{(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : p_i \geq 0 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1\},$$

let $\mathbf{z}: \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous function mapping Δ into \mathbb{R}^n , and let

$$\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) = (z_1(\mathbf{p}), z_2(\mathbf{p}), \dots, z_n(\mathbf{p}))$$

for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta$. Suppose that $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \leq 0$ for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta$. Then there exists $\mathbf{p}^ \in \Delta$ such that $z_i(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.*

Proof Let $\mathbf{v}: \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be the function with i th component v_i given by

$$v_i(\mathbf{p}) = \begin{cases} p_i + z_i(\mathbf{p}) & \text{if } z_i(\mathbf{p}) > 0; \\ p_i & \text{if } z_i(\mathbf{p}) \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ and the components of $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p})$ are non-negative for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta$. It follows that there is a well-defined map $\varphi: \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ given by

$$\varphi(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n v_i(\mathbf{p})} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}),$$

The Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem (Theorem 7.3) ensures that there exists $\mathbf{p}^* \in \Delta$ satisfying $\varphi(\mathbf{p}^*) = \mathbf{p}^*$. Then $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}^*) = \lambda \mathbf{p}^*$ for some $\lambda \geq 1$. We claim that $\lambda = 1$.

Suppose that it were the case that $\lambda > 1$. Then $v_i(\mathbf{p}^*) > p_i^*$, and thus $z_i(\mathbf{p}^*) > 0$ whenever $p_i^* > 0$. But $p_i^* \geq 0$ for all i , and $p_i^* > 0$ for at least one value of i , since $\mathbf{p}^* \in \Delta$. It would follow that $\mathbf{p}^* \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) > 0$, contradicting the requirement that $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \leq 0$ for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta$. We conclude that $\lambda = 1$, and thus $v_i = p_i^*$ and $z_i(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq 0$ for all i , as required. ■

8 Convexity and the Kakutani Fixed Point Theorem

8.1 Convex Subsets of Euclidean Spaces

Definition A subset X of n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n is said to be *convex* if $(1 - t)\mathbf{u} + t\mathbf{v} \in X$ for all points \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} of X and for all real numbers t satisfying $0 \leq t \leq 1$.

Lemma 8.1 *An simplex in a Euclidean space is a convex subset of that Euclidean space.*

Proof Let σ be a q -simplex in n -dimensional Euclidean space, and let $\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_q$ be the vertices of σ . Let \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} be points of σ . Then there exist non-negative real numbers y_0, y_1, \dots, y_q and z_0, z_1, \dots, z_q , where $\sum_{i=0}^q y_i = 1$ and $\sum_{i=0}^q z_i = 1$, such that

$$\mathbf{u} = \sum_{i=0}^q y_i \mathbf{w}_i, \quad \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=0}^q z_i \mathbf{w}_i.$$

Then

$$(1 - t)\mathbf{u} + t\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=0}^q ((1 - t)y_i + tz_i) \mathbf{w}_i.$$

Moreover $(1 - t)y_i + tz_i \geq 0$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, q$ and for all real numbers t satisfying $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Also

$$\sum_{i=0}^q ((1 - t)y_i + tz_i) = (1 - t) \sum_{i=0}^q y_i + t \sum_{i=0}^q z_i = 1.$$

It follows that $(1 - t)\mathbf{u} + t\mathbf{v} \in \sigma$. Thus σ is a convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n . ■

Lemma 8.2 *Let X be a convex subset of n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , and let σ be a simplex contained in \mathbb{R}^n . Suppose that the vertices of σ belong to X . Then $\sigma \subset X$.*

Proof We prove the result by induction on the dimension q of the simplex σ . The result is clearly true when $q = 0$, because in that case the simplex σ consists of a single point which is the unique vertex of the simplex. Thus let σ be a q -dimensional simplex, and suppose that the result is true for all $(q - 1)$ -dimensional simplices whose vertices belong to the convex set X . Let $\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_q$ be the vertices of σ . Let \mathbf{x} be a point of σ . Then there

exist non-negative real numbers t_0, t_1, \dots, t_q satisfying $\sum_{i=0}^q t_i = 1$ such that $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=0}^q t_i \mathbf{w}_i$. If $t_0 = 1$ then $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{w}_0$, and therefore $\mathbf{x} \in X$.

It remains to consider the case when $t_0 < 1$. In that case let $s_i = t_i/(1-t_0)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, q$, and let

$$\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^q s_i \mathbf{w}_i.$$

Now $s_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, q$, and

$$\sum_{i=1}^q s_i = \frac{1}{1-t_0} \sum_{i=1}^q t_i = \frac{1}{1-t_0} \left(\sum_{i=0}^q t_i - t_0 \right) = 1,$$

It follows that \mathbf{v} belongs to the proper face of σ spanned by vertices $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_q$. The induction hypothesis then ensures that $\mathbf{v} \in X$. But then

$$\mathbf{x} = t_0 \mathbf{w}_0 + (1-t_0) \mathbf{v},$$

where $\mathbf{w}_0 \in X$ and $\mathbf{v} \in X$ and $0 \leq t_0 \leq 1$. It follows from the convexity of X that $\mathbf{x} \in X$, as required. ■

Let X be a convex set in n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n . A point \mathbf{x} of X is said to belong to the *topological interior* of X if there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that $B(\mathbf{x}, \delta) \subset X$, where

$$B(\mathbf{x}, \delta) = \{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}| < \delta\}.$$

Lemma 8.3 *Let X be a convex set in n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , and let $\mathbf{x} = (1-t)\mathbf{u} + t\mathbf{v}$ where $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in X$ and $0 < t < 1$. Suppose that either \mathbf{u} or \mathbf{v} belongs to the topological interior of X . Then \mathbf{x} belongs to the topological interior of X .*

Proof Suppose that \mathbf{v} belongs to the topological interior of X . Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $B(\mathbf{v}, \delta) \subset X$, where

$$B(\mathbf{v}, \delta) = \{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{v}| < \delta\}.$$

We claim that $B(\mathbf{x}, t\delta) \subset X$.

Let $\mathbf{x}' \in B(\mathbf{x}, t\delta)$, and let

$$\mathbf{z} = \frac{1}{t}(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}).$$

Then $\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{z} \in B(\mathbf{v}, \delta)$ and

$$\mathbf{x}' = (1 - t)\mathbf{u} + t(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{z}),$$

and therefore $\mathbf{x}' \in X$. This proves the result when \mathbf{v} belongs to the topological interior of X . The result when \mathbf{u} belongs to the topological interior of X then follows on interchanging \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} and replacing t by $1 - t$. The result follows. ■

Proposition 8.4 *Let X be a closed bounded convex subset of n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n whose topological interior contains the origin, let S^{n-1} be the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n , defined such that*

$$S^{n-1} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\mathbf{u}| = 1\},$$

and let $\lambda: S^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the real-valued function on S^{n-1} defined such that

$$\lambda(\mathbf{u}) = \sup\{t \in \mathbf{R} : t\mathbf{u} \in X\}$$

for all $\mathbf{u} \in S^{n-1}$. Then the function $\lambda: S^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous.

Proof Let $\mathbf{u}_0 \in S^{n-1}$, let $t_0 = \lambda(\mathbf{u}_0)$, and let some positive real number ε be given, where $0 < \varepsilon < t_0$. It follows from Lemma 8.3 that $(t_0 - \varepsilon)\mathbf{u}$ belongs to the topological interior of X . It then follows from the continuity of the function sending $\mathbf{u} \in S^{n-1}$ to $(t_0 - \varepsilon)\mathbf{u}$ that there exists some positive real number δ_1 such that $(t_0 - \varepsilon)\mathbf{u} \in X$ for all $\mathbf{u} \in S^{n-1}$ satisfying $|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_0| < \delta_1$. Therefore $\lambda(\mathbf{u}) \geq t_0 - \varepsilon$ whenever $|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_0| < \delta_1$.

Next we note that $(t_0 + \varepsilon)\mathbf{u}_0 \notin X$. Now X is closed in \mathbb{R}^n , and therefore the complement $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus X$ of X in \mathbb{R}^n is open. It follows that there exists an open ball of positive radius about the point $(t_0 + \varepsilon)\mathbf{u}_0$ that is wholly contained in the complement of X . It then follows from the continuity of the function sending $\mathbf{u} \in S^{n-1}$ to $(t_0 + \varepsilon)\mathbf{u}$ that there exists some positive real number δ_2 such that $(t_0 + \varepsilon)\mathbf{u} \notin X$ for all $\mathbf{u} \in S^{n-1}$ satisfying $|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_0| < \delta_2$. It then follows from the convexity of X that $t\mathbf{u} \notin X$ for all positive real numbers t satisfying $t \geq t_0 + \varepsilon$. Therefore $\lambda(\mathbf{u}) \leq t_0 + \varepsilon$ whenever $|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_0| < \delta_2$. Let δ be the minimum of δ_1 and δ_2 . Then $\delta > 0$, and

$$\lambda(\mathbf{u}_0) - \varepsilon \leq \lambda(\mathbf{u}) \leq \lambda(\mathbf{u}_0) + \varepsilon$$

for all $\mathbf{u} \in S^{n-1}$ satisfying $|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_0| < \delta$. The result follows. ■

Proposition 8.5 *Let X be a closed bounded convex subset of n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n . Then there exists a continuous map $r: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow X$ such that $r(\mathbb{R}^n) = X$ and $r(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$.*

Proof We first prove the result in the special case in which the convex set X has non-empty topological interior. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the origin of \mathbb{R}^n belongs to the topological interior of X . Let

$$S^{n-1} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\mathbf{u}| = 1\},$$

and let $\lambda: S^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the real-valued function on S^{n-1} defined such that

$$\lambda(\mathbf{u}) = \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R} : t\mathbf{u} \in X\}$$

for all $\mathbf{u} \in S^{n-1}$. Then the function $\lambda: S^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous (Proposition 8.4).

We may therefore define a function $r: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow X$ such that

$$r(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x} & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in X; \\ |\mathbf{x}|^{-1}\lambda(|\mathbf{x}|^{-1}\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x} & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin X. \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and let $\mathbf{u} = |\mathbf{x}|^{-1}\mathbf{x}$. Then $\mathbf{x} = |\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{u}$, $|\mathbf{x}| \leq \lambda(\mathbf{u})$ and $\lambda(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{u} \in X$. It follows from Lemma 8.3 that if $|\mathbf{x}| < \lambda(\mathbf{u})$ then the point \mathbf{x} belongs to the topological interior of \mathbf{u} . Thus if the point \mathbf{x} of X belongs to the closure of the complement $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus X$ of X then it does not belong to the topological interior of X , and therefore $|\mathbf{x}| = \lambda(|\mathbf{x}|^{-1}\mathbf{x})$, and therefore

$$\mathbf{x} = |\mathbf{x}|^{-1}\lambda(|\mathbf{x}|^{-1}\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}.$$

The function r defined above is therefore continuous on the closure of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus X$. It is obviously continuous on X itself. It follows that $r: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow X$ is continuous. This proves the result in the case when the topological interior of the set X is non-empty.

We now extend the result to the case where the topological interior of X is empty. Now the number of points in an affinely independent list of points of \mathbb{R}^n cannot exceed $n+1$. It follows that there exists an integer q not exceeding n such that the convex set X contains a $q+1$ affinely independent points but does not contain $q+1$ affinely independent points. Let $\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_q$ be affinely independent points of X . Let V be the q -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^n spanned by the vectors

$$\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}_2 - \mathbf{w}_0, \dots, \mathbf{w}_q - \mathbf{w}_0.$$

Now if there were to exist a point \mathbf{x} of X for which $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}_0 \notin V$ then the points $\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_q, \mathbf{x}$ would be affinely independent. The definition of q ensures that this is not the case. Thus if

$$X_V = \{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}_0 : \mathbf{x} \in X\}.$$

then $X_V \subset V$. Moreover X_V is a closed convex subset of V .

Now it follows from Lemma 8.2 that the convex set X_V contains the q -simplex with vertices

$$\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}_2 - \mathbf{w}_0, \dots, \mathbf{w}_q - \mathbf{w}_0.$$

This q -simplex has non-empty topological interior with respect to the vector space V . It follows that X_V has non-empty topological interior with respect to V . It therefore follows from the result already proved that there exists a continuous function $r_V: V \rightarrow X_V$ that satisfies $r_V(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X_V$. Basic linear algebra ensures the existence of a linear transformation $T: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow V$ satisfying $T(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in V$. Let

$$r(\mathbf{x}) = r_V(T(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}_0)) + \mathbf{w}_0$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then the function $r: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow X$ is continuous, and $r(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$, as required. ■

8.2 The Kakutani Fixed Point Theorem

Theorem 8.6 (Kakutani's Fixed Point Theorem) *Let X be a non-empty, compact and convex subset of n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , and let $\Phi: X \rightrightarrows X$ be a correspondence mapping X into itself. Suppose that the graph of the correspondence Φ is closed and that $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ is non-empty and convex for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$. Then there exists a point \mathbf{x}^* of X that satisfies $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Phi(\mathbf{x}^*)$.*

Proof There exists a continuous map $r: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow X$ from \mathbb{R}^n to X with the property that $r(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$. (see Proposition 8.5). Let Δ be an n -dimensional simplex chosen such that $X \subset \Delta$, and let $\Psi(\mathbf{x}) = \Phi(r(\mathbf{x}))$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta$. If $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Delta$ satisfies $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Psi(\mathbf{x}^*)$ then $\mathbf{x}^* \in X$ and $r(\mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbf{x}^*$, and therefore $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Phi(\mathbf{x}^*)$. It follows that the result in the general case follows from that in the special case in which the closed bounded convex subset X of \mathbb{R}^n is an n -dimensional simplex.

Thus let Δ be an n -dimensional simplex contained in \mathbb{R}^n , and let $\Phi: \Delta \rightrightarrows \Delta$ be a correspondence with closed graph, where $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ is a non-empty closed convex subset of Δ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$. We must prove that there exists some point \mathbf{x}^* of Δ with the property that $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Phi(\mathbf{x}^*)$.

Let K be the simplicial complex consisting of the n -simplex Δ together with all its faces, and let $K^{(j)}$ be the j th barycentric subdivision of K for all positive integers j . Then $|K^{(j)}| = \Delta$ for all positive integers j . Now $\Phi(\mathbf{v})$ is non-empty for all vertices \mathbf{v} of $K^{(j)}$. Now any function mapping the

vertices of a simplicial complex into a Euclidean space extends uniquely to a piecewise linear map defined over the polyhedron of that simplicial complex (Proposition 6.10). Therefore there exists a sequence f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots of continuous functions mapping the simplex Δ into itself such that, for each positive integer j , the continuous map $f_j: \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ is piecewise linear on the simplices of $K^{(j)}$ and satisfies $f_j(\mathbf{v}) \in \Phi(\mathbf{v})$ for all vertices \mathbf{v} of $K^{(j)}$.

Now it follows from the Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem Theorem 7.3 that, for each positive integer j , there exists $\mathbf{z}_j \in \Delta$ for which $f_j(\mathbf{z}_j) = \mathbf{z}_j$. For each positive integer j , there exist vertices

$$\mathbf{v}_{0,j}, \mathbf{v}_{1,j}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n,j}$$

of $K^{(j)}$ spanning a simplex of K and non-negative real numbers $t_{0,j}, t_{1,j}, \dots, t_{n,j}$ satisfying $\sum_{i=0}^n t_{i,j} = 1$ such that

$$\mathbf{z}_j = \sum_{i=0}^n t_{i,j} \mathbf{v}_{i,j}$$

for all positive integers j . Let $\mathbf{y}_{i,j} = f_j(\mathbf{v}_{i,j})$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ and for all positive integers j . Then $\mathbf{y}_{i,j} \in \Phi(\mathbf{v}_{i,j})$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ and for all positive integers j .

The function f_j is piecewise linear on the simplices of $K^{(j)}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^m t_{i,j} \mathbf{v}_{i,j} &= \mathbf{z}_j = f_j(\mathbf{z}_j) = f_j \left(\sum_{i=0}^m t_{i,j} \mathbf{v}_{i,j} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^m t_{i,j} f_j(\mathbf{v}_{i,j}) = \sum_{i=0}^m t_{i,j} \mathbf{y}_{i,j} \end{aligned}$$

for all positive integers j . Also $|\mathbf{v}_{i,j} - \mathbf{v}_{0,j}| \leq \mu(K^{(j)})$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ and for all positive integers j , where $\mu(K^{(j)})$ denotes the mesh of the simplicial complex $K^{(j)}$ (i.e., the length of the longest side of that simplicial complex). Moreover $\mu(K^{(j)}) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow +\infty$ (see Lemma 6.8). It follows that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} |\mathbf{v}_{i,j} - \mathbf{v}_{0,j}| = 0.$$

Now the multidimensional Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem (Theorem 2.5) ensures the existence of points $\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$ of the simplex Δ , non-negative real numbers t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n and an infinite sequence m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots of positive integers, where

$$m_1 < m_2 < m_3 < \dots,$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}^* &= \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{v}_{0,m_j}, \\ \mathbf{y}_i &= \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{y}_{i,m_j} \quad (0 \leq i \leq n), \\ t_i &= \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} t_{i,m_j} \quad (0 \leq i \leq n).\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$|\mathbf{v}_{i,m_j} - \mathbf{x}^*| \leq |\mathbf{v}_{i,m_j} - \mathbf{v}_{0,m_j}| + |\mathbf{v}_{0,m_j} - \mathbf{x}^*|$$

for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ and for all positive integers j . Moreover $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} |\mathbf{v}_{i,m_j} - \mathbf{v}_{0,m_j}| = 0$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} |\mathbf{v}_{i,m_j} - \mathbf{x}^*| = 0$. It follows that $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{v}_{i,m_j} = \mathbf{x}^*$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Also

$$\sum_{i=0}^n t_i = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\sum_{i=0}^n t_{i,m_j} \right) = 1.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\sum_{i=0}^n t_{i,m_j} \mathbf{v}_{i,m_j} \right) &= \sum_{i=0}^n \left(\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} t_{i,m_j} \right) \left(\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{v}_{i,m_j} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^n t_i \mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{x}^*.\end{aligned}$$

But we have also shown that $\sum_{i=0}^m t_{i,j} \mathbf{y}_{i,j} = \sum_{i=0}^m t_{i,j} \mathbf{v}_{i,j}$ for all positive integers j . It follows that

$$\sum_{i=0}^m t_i \mathbf{y}_i = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\sum_{i=0}^m t_{i,m_j} \mathbf{y}_{i,m_j} \right) = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\sum_{i=0}^m t_{i,m_j} \mathbf{v}_{i,m_j} \right) = \mathbf{x}^*.$$

Next we show that $\mathbf{y}_i \in \Phi(\mathbf{x}^*)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Now

$$(\mathbf{v}_{i,m_j}, \mathbf{y}_{i,m_j}) \in \text{Graph}(\Phi)$$

for all positive integers j , and the graph $\text{Graph}(\Phi)$ of the correspondence Φ is closed. It follows that

$$(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}_i) = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} (\mathbf{v}_{i,m_j}, \mathbf{y}_{i,m_j}) \in \text{Graph}(\Phi)$$

and thus $\mathbf{y}_i \in \Phi(\mathbf{x}_*)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$ (see Proposition 4.6).

It follows from the convexity of $\Phi(\mathbf{x}^*)$ that

$$\sum_{i=0}^q t_i \mathbf{y}_* \in \Phi(\mathbf{x}^*).$$

(see Lemma 8.2). But $\sum_{i=0}^q t_i \mathbf{y}_* = \mathbf{x}^*$. It follows that $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Phi(\mathbf{x}^*)$, as required. ■

8.3 Zero-Sum Two-Person Games

Example Consider the following hand game. This is a zero-sum two-person game. At each go, the two players present simultaneously either an open hand or a fist. If both players present fists, or if both players present open hands, then no money changes hands. If one player presents a fist and the other player presents an open hand then the player presenting the fist receives ten cents from the player presenting the open hand.

The payoff for the first player can be represented by the following payoff matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -10 \\ 10 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this matrix the entry in the first row represent the payoffs when the first player presents an open hand; those in the second row represent the payoffs when the first player presents a fist. The entries in the first column represent the payoff when the second player presents an open hand; those in the second column represent the payoffs when the second player presents a fist. In this game the second player, choosing the best strategy, is always going to play a fist, because that reduces the payoff for the first player, whatever the first player chooses to play. Similarly the first player, choosing the best strategy, is going to play a fist, because that maximizes the payoff for the first player whatever the second player does. Thus in this game, both players choosing the best strategies, play fists.

It should be noticed that, in this situation, if the second player always plays a fist, the first player would not be tempted to move from a strategy of always playing a fist in order to get a better payoff. Similarly if the first player always plays a fist, then the second player would not be tempted to move from a strategy of always playing a fist in order to reduce the payoff to the first player. This is a very simple example of a *Nash Equilibrium*. This equilibrium arises because the element in the second row and second column of the payoff matrix is simultaneously the largest element in its column and

the smallest element in its row. Matrix elements with this property are said to be *saddle points* of the matrix.

Example Now consider the game of *Rock, Paper, Scissors*. This game has a long history, and versions of this game were well-established in China and Japan in particular for many centuries.

Two players simultaneously present hand symbols representing *Rock* (a closed fist), *Paper* (a flat hand), or *Scissors* (first two fingers outstretched in a 'V'). Paper beats Rock, Scissors beats Paper, Rock beats Scissors. If both players present the same hand symbol then that round is a draw.

Ordering the strategies for the players in the order *Rock* (1st), *Paper* (2nd) and *Scissors* (3rd), the payoff matrix for the first player is the following:—

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The entry in the i th row and j th column of this payoff matrix represents the return to the first player on a round of the game if the first player plays strategy i and the second player plays strategy j .

A *pure strategy* would be one in which a player presents the same hand symbol in every round. But it is not profitable for any player in this game to adopt a pure strategy. If the first player adopts a strategy of playing *Paper*, then the second player, on observing this, would adopt a strategy of always playing *Scissors*, and would beat the first player on every round. A preferable strategy, for each player, is the *mixed strategy* of playing *Rock*, *Paper* and *Scissors* with equal probability, and seeking to ensure that the sequence of plays is as random as possible.

Let us denote by M the payoff matrix above. A *mixed strategy* for the first player is one in which, on any given round *Rock* is played with probability p_1 , *Paper* is played with probability p_2 and *Scissors* is played with probability p_3 . The mixed strategies for the first player can therefore be represented by points of a triangle Δ_P , where

$$\Delta_P = \{(p_1, p_2, p_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : p_1 \geq 0, p_2 \geq 0, p_3 \geq 0, p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = 1\}.$$

A mixed strategy for the second player is one in which *Rock* is played with probability q_1 , *Paper* with probability q_2 and *Scissors* with probability q_3 . The mixed strategies for the second player can therefore be represented by points of a triangle Δ_Q , where

$$\Delta_Q = \{(q_1, q_2, q_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : q_1 \geq 0, q_2 \geq 0, q_3 \geq 0, q_1 + q_2 + q_3 = 1\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_P$ represent the mixed strategy chosen by the first player, and $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q$ the mixed strategy chosen by the second player, where

$$\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3), \quad \mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, q_3).$$

Let M_{ij} the payoff for the first player when the first player plays strategy i and the second player plays strategy j . Then M_{ij} is the entry in the i th row and j th column of the payoff matrix M . In matrix equations we consider \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} to be column vectors, denoting their transposes by the row matrices \mathbf{p}^T and \mathbf{q}^T . The *expected payoff* for the first player is then $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$, where

$$f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{p}^T M \mathbf{q} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 p_i M_{ij} q_j.$$

Let $\mathbf{p}^* = (p_1^*, p_2^*, p_3^*)$, where

$$p_1^* = p_2^* = p_3^* = \frac{1}{3}.$$

Then $\mathbf{p}^{*T} M = (0, 0, 0)$, and therefore

$$f(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}) = 0$$

for all $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q$. Similarly let $\mathbf{q}^* = (q_1^*, q_2^*, q_3^*)$, where

$$q_1^* = q_2^* = q_3^* = \frac{1}{3}.$$

Then

$$f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}^*) = 0$$

for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_P$. Thus the inequalities

$$f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}^*) \leq f(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*) \leq f(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q})$$

are satisfied for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_P$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q$, because each of the quantities occurring is equal to zero.

Were the first player to adopt a mixed strategy \mathbf{p} , where $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3)$, $p_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = 1$, the second player could adopt mixed strategy \mathbf{q} , where $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, q_3) = (p_3, p_1, p_2)$. The payoff $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ is then

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) &= -p_1 q_2 + p_1 q_3 - p_2 q_3 + p_2 q_1 - p_3 q_1 + p_3 q_2 \\ &= -p_1^2 + p_1 p_2 - p_2^2 + p_2 p_3 - p_3^2 + p_3 p_1 \\ &= -\frac{1}{6} \left((2p_1 - p_2 - p_3)^2 + (2p_2 - p_3 - p_1)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (2p_3 - p_1 - p_2)^2 \right) \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover if $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = 0$, where $q_1 = p_3$, $q_2 = p_1$ and $q_3 = p_2$, then

$$(2p_1 - p_2 - p_3)^2 + (2p_2 - p_3 - p_1)^2 + (2p_3 - p_1 - p_2)^2 = 0$$

and therefore $2p_1 = p_2 + p_3$, $2p_2 = p_3 + p_1$ and $2p_3 = p_1 + p_2$. But then

$$3p_1 = 3p_2 = 3p_3 = p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = 1,$$

and thus $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}^*$. It follows that if $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_Q$ and $\mathbf{p} \neq \mathbf{p}^*$ then there exists $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q$ for which $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) < 0$. Thus if the first player adopts a mixed strategy other than the strategy \mathbf{p}^* in which *Rock*, *Paper*, *Scissors* are played with equal probability on each round, there is a mixed strategy for the second player that ensures that the average payoff for the first player is negative, and thus the first player will lose in the long run over many rounds. Thus strategy \mathbf{p}^* is the only sensible mixed strategy that the first player can adopt. The corresponding strategy \mathbf{q}^* is the only sensible mixed strategy that the second player can adopt. The average payoff for each player is then equal to zero.

8.4 Von Neumann's Minimax Theorem

In 1920, John Von Neumann published a paper entitled “Zur Theorie der Gesellschaftsspiele” (*Mathematische Annalen*, Vol. 100 (1928), pp. 295–320). The title translates as “On the Theory of Social Games”. This paper included a proof of the following “Minimax Theorem”, which made use of the Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem. An alternative proof using results concerning convexity was presented in the book *On the Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour* by John Von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern (Princeton University Press, 1944). George Dantzig, in a paper published in 1951, showed how the theorem could be solved using linear programming methods (see Joel N. Franklin, *Methods of Mathematical Economics*, (Springer Verlag, 1980, republished by SIAM in 1982).

Theorem 8.7 (Von Neumann's Minimax Theorem) *Let M be an $m \times n$ matrix, and let*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_P &= \left\{ (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : p_i \geq 0 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^m p_i = 1 \right\}, \\ \Delta_Q &= \left\{ (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : q_i \geq 0 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^n q_j = 1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and let

$$f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{p}^T M \mathbf{q} = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n M_{i,j} p_i q_j$$

for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_P$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q$. Then there exist $\mathbf{p}^* \in \Delta_P$ and $\mathbf{q}^* \in \Delta_Q$ such that

$$f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}^*) \leq f(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*) \leq f(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q})$$

for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_P$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q$.

Proof Let $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{p}^T M \mathbf{q}$ for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_P$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q$. Given $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q$, let

$$\mu_P(\mathbf{q}) = \sup\{f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) : \mathbf{p} \in \Delta_P\}$$

and let

$$P(\mathbf{q}) = \{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_P : f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \mu_P(\mathbf{q})\}.$$

Similarly given $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_P$, let

$$\mu_Q(\mathbf{p}) = \inf\{f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) : \mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q\}$$

and let

$$Q(\mathbf{p}) = \{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q : f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \mu_Q(\mathbf{p})\}.$$

An application of Berge's Maximum Theorem (Theorem 4.24) ensures that the functions $\mu_P: \Delta_Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mu_Q: \Delta_P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous, and that the correspondences $P: \Delta_Q \rightrightarrows \Delta_P$ and $Q: \Delta_P \rightrightarrows \Delta_Q$ are non-empty, compact-valued and upper hemicontinuous. These correspondences therefore have closed graphs (see Proposition 4.11). Moreover $P(\mathbf{q})$ is convex for all $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q$ and $Q(\mathbf{p})$ is convex for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_P$. Let $X = \Delta_P \times \Delta_Q$, and let $\Phi: X \rightrightarrows X$ be defined such that

$$\Phi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = P(\mathbf{q}) \times Q(\mathbf{p})$$

for all $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in X$. Kakutani's Fixed Point Theorem (Theorem 8.6) then ensures that there exists $(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*) \in X$ such that $(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*) \in \Phi(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)$. Then $\mathbf{p}^* \in P(\mathbf{q}^*)$ and $\mathbf{q}^* \in Q(\mathbf{p}^*)$ and therefore

$$f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}^*) \leq f(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*) \leq f(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q})$$

for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_P$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_Q$, as required. ■

9 Exchange Economies

9.1 The Existence of Equilibria in an Exchange Economy

We consider an exchange economy consisting of a finite number of commodities and a finite number of households, each provided with an initial endowment of each of the commodities. The commodities are required to be *infinitely divisible*: this means that a household can hold an amount x of that commodity for any non-negative real number x . (Thus salt, for example, could be regarded as an ‘infinitely divisible’ quantity whereas cars cannot: it makes little sense to talk about a particular household owning 2.637 of a car, for example, though such a household may well own 2.637 kilograms of salt.) Now the households may well wish to exchange commodities with one another so as to improve on their initial endowment. They might for example seek to barter commodities with one another: however this method of redistribution would not work very efficiently in a large economy.

Alternatively they might attempt to set up a price mechanism to simplify the task of redistributing the commodities. Thus suppose that each commodity is assigned a given price. Then each household could sell its initial endowment to the market, receiving in return the value of its initial endowment at the given prices. The household could then purchase from the market a quantity of each commodity so as to maximize its own preference, subject to the constraint that the total value of the commodities purchased by any household cannot exceed the value of its initial endowment at the given prices. The problem of redistribution then becomes one of fixing prices so that there is exactly enough of each commodity to go around: if the price of any commodity is too low then the demand for that commodity is likely to outstrip supply, whereas if the price is too high then supply will exceed demand. A *Walras equilibrium* is achieved if prices can be found so that the supply of each commodity matches its demand. We shall use the *Brouwer fixed point theorem* to prove the existence of a Walras equilibrium in this idealized economy.

Let our exchange economy consist of n commodities and m households. We suppose that household h is provided with an initial endowment \bar{x}_{hi} of commodity i , where $\bar{x}_{hi} \geq 0$. Thus the initial endowment of household h can be represented by a vector $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_h$ in \mathbb{R}^n whose i th component is \bar{x}_{hi} . The prices of the commodities are given by a price vector \mathbf{p} whose i th component p_i specifies the price of a unit of the i th commodity: a price vector \mathbf{p} is required to satisfy $p_i \geq 0$ for all i . Then the value of the initial endowment of household h at the given prices is $\mathbf{p} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{x}}_h$. Let $x_{hi}(\mathbf{p})$ be the quantity of com-

modity i that household h seeks to purchase at prices \mathbf{p} , and let $\mathbf{x}_h(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the vector whose i th component is $x_{hi}(\mathbf{p})$. The budget constraint certainly ensures that $\mathbf{p} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_h(\mathbf{p}) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_h) \leq 0$ (i.e., the value of the goods purchased cannot exceed the value of the initial endowment at the given prices).

We assume that the value of the commodities that each household seeks to purchase is equal to the value of its initial endowment, and thus $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x}_h(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{p} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{x}}_h$. Also the preferences of the household will only depend on the relative prices of the commodities, and therefore $\mathbf{x}_h(\lambda \mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{x}_h(\mathbf{p})$ for all $\lambda > 0$.

Now the total supply of each commodity in the economy is represented by the vector $\sum_h \bar{\mathbf{x}}_h$, and the total demand at prices \mathbf{p} is represented by $\sum_h \mathbf{x}_h(\mathbf{p})$. The *excess demand* in the economy at prices \mathbf{p} is therefore represented by the vector $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})$, where $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_h (\mathbf{x}_h(\mathbf{p}) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_h)$. Let $z_i(\mathbf{p})$ be the i th component of $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})$. Then $z_i(\mathbf{p}) > 0$ when the demand for the i th commodity exceeds supply, whereas $z_i(\mathbf{p}) < 0$ when the supply exceeds demand. Note that $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) = 0$ for any price vector \mathbf{p} . This identity, known as *Walras' Law*, follows immediately on summing the budget constraint $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x}_h(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{p} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{x}}_h$ over all households.

Consider an exchange economy consisting of a finite number of infinitely divisible commodities and a finite number of households. Let the excess demand in the economy at prices \mathbf{p} be given by $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})$, where

- (i) the excess demand vector $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})$ is well-defined for any price vector \mathbf{p} , and depends continuously on \mathbf{p} ,
- (ii) $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) = 0$ for any price vector \mathbf{p} (Walras' Law).

It then follows from Corollary 7.4 that there exist equilibrium prices \mathbf{p}^* at which $z_i(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq 0$ for all i .

The proof of the existence of Walras equilibria can readily be generalized to *Arrow-Debreu* models where economic activity is carried out by both households and firms. The problem of existence of equilibria was studied by L. Walras in the 1870s, though a rigorous proof of the existence of equilibria was not found till the 1930s, when A. Wald proved existence for a limited range of economic models. Proofs of existence using the Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem, or a more general fixed point theorem due to Katukani, were first published in 1954 by K. J. Arrow and G. Debreu and by L. McKenzie. Subsequent research has centred on problems of uniqueness and stability, and the existence theorems have been generalized to economies with an infinite number of commodities and economic agents (households and firms). An alternative approach to the existence theorems using techniques of differential topology was pioneered by G. Debreu and by S. Smale.

More detailed accounts of the theory of ‘general equilibrium’ can be found in, for example, *The theory of value*, by G. Debreu, *General competitive analysis*, by K. J. Arrow and F. H. Hahn, or *Economics for mathematicians* by J. W. S. Cassels.