

P. Erdős and A. Hajnal

Mathematical Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences

B. Rothchild

University of California, Los Angeles

§ 1. Introduction

The aim of this note is to correct a mistake the first two authors made in [1]. Set theoretical notation will be standard otherwise we will use the graph theoretical notation described in [1].

One of the main results of [1] Corollary 5.6 states that every graph of chromatic number $> \omega$ contains complete bipartite graphs $[i, \omega_i]$ for $i < \omega$.

At the end of our paper in 12.1 we claimed the following generalization of this result for uniform set systems.

If $\mathcal{H} = \langle h, H \rangle$ is a uniform set system with $\chi(\mathcal{H}) = k$, $2 \leq k < \omega$, $\beta \geq \omega$ then either the colouring number of \mathcal{H} is at most β or there is $H' \subset H$, $|H'| = \beta^+$ such that $|\bigcap H'| \geq k-1$. For $k=2$ this is a trivial consequence of e.g. [1] 5.6. In [1] we omitted the "proof". We verified the result for $\chi(\mathcal{H}) = \alpha = \beta^+$ and thought that the induction method described in [1] § 4 yields the general result. However, this is not true and we are going to state a correct version of the theorem.

To have a brief notation we introduce a relation

$$R(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, k, i)$$

Definition. Let α, β, γ be cardinals, $2 \leq k < \omega$ $1 \leq i < k$. $R(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, k, i)$ is said to hold if for every uniform set system $\mathcal{H} = \langle h, H \rangle$, with $\chi(\mathcal{H}) = \alpha$,

$\kappa(\mathcal{H}) = \kappa$ either there is $H' \subset H$, $|H'| = \delta$
 with $|\bigcap H'| \geq i$ or $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \beta$.

The false theorem claimed that $R(\alpha, \beta, \beta^+, k, k-1)$ holds
 for $\beta \geq \omega$, $2 \leq k < \omega$, and for every α

Theorem 1. Let $\beta = \omega_{\xi}$, $3 \leq k < \omega$. Then

$$R(\alpha, \beta, \beta^+, k, k-1) \text{ holds for } \alpha = \beta^+$$

$$R(\alpha, \beta, \beta^+, k, 2) \text{ holds for } \alpha \leq \omega_{\xi+k-2}$$

Put $\text{exp}_0(\beta) = \beta$, $\text{exp}_{k+1}(\beta) = 2^{\text{exp}_k(\beta)}$ for $k < \omega$

On the other hand we have

Theorem 2. Let $\beta = \omega_{\xi}$, $3 \leq k < \omega$, $2 \leq i \leq k-1$
 and put $\alpha = (\text{exp}_{k-i}(\beta))^+$

Then $R(\alpha, \beta, 2, k, i)$ is false.

If we now denote by $f(\beta, k, i)$ the minimal α , for which
 $R(\alpha, \beta, 2, k, i)$ is false for $\beta \geq \omega$, $3 \leq k < \omega$
 $2 \leq i \leq k-1$ then assuming G.C.H. we obtain the following

Corollary:

$$f(\beta, k, 2) = \omega_{\xi+k-1}$$

$$f(\beta, k, k-1) = \omega_{\xi+2}$$

$$f(\beta, k, i) \leq \omega_{\xi+k-i+1} \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq k-1$$

We have an example to show that the upper estimate is not best possible.

Theorem 3. Assume $k = \binom{\ell}{t}$, $\alpha = (\text{exp}_{t-1}(\beta))^+$, $k > 1$

$i = \binom{\ell-1}{t} + 1$. Then $R(\alpha, \beta, 2, k, i)$ is false.

As a corollary if G.C.H. is assumed and $\beta = \omega_{\xi}$ we get

$$f(\beta, k, \binom{l-1}{t} + 1) \leq \omega_{\xi+t}$$

E.g. in case $k=6, l=4$ we get

$$f(\beta, 6, 4) \leq \omega_{\xi+2} \quad \text{while } k-i+1=3$$

Note that assuming G.C.H. the simplest unsolved problem is the following:

Does $R(\omega_2, \omega, 2, 5, 3)$ hold?

We can not determine $f(\beta, k, i)$ for other values of i , however with Galvin the first two authors have a number of similar but more complicated results giving sharp upper estimations for the chromatic number of uniform set systems not containing certain types of finite subsystems. These will appear in a forthcoming triple paper of Erdős, Hajnal and Galvin.

Before we turn to the proofs we mention a few other problems which led us to discover our mistake.

Let β be a cardinal. Let $H_0(\beta)$ be the minimal γ , for which there is a partition I of length γ of $\mathcal{P}(\beta)$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{P}(\beta) = \bigcup_{\nu < \gamma} I_\nu \quad \text{such that no } I_\nu \text{ contains three different sets, } A, B, C \text{ with } A \cup B = C$$

The function H_0 was introduced by Hanson for finite β . Hanson proved

$$(1) \quad c\sqrt{\beta} < H_0(\beta) \leq \frac{\beta}{2} + 2 \quad \text{for } \beta < \omega$$

A theorem of Erdős and Komlós implies that in (1) we have $\frac{\beta}{4} < H_0(\beta)$ as well.

For $\beta \geq \omega$, G. Elekes proved recently that $H_0(\omega) > \omega$. See [2]. For more problems arising here see [3].

Later Erdős considered the following similar problem.

Let $H_1(\beta)$ be the smallest γ for which there is

$\mathcal{P}(\beta) = \bigcup_{\nu < \gamma} I_\nu$ such that there are no distinct $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{P}(\beta)$
in the same I_ν satisfying

$$(2) \quad A \cup B = C, \quad A \cap B = D$$

For finite β a theorem of Erdős and Kleitman gives

$$c_1 \beta^{1/4} < H_1(\beta) < c_2 \beta^{1/2}$$

Meditation shows that $R(2^\beta, \gamma, 2, 4, 3)$ implies $H_1(\beta) \leq \beta$
hence, by the false "theorem", $H_1(\beta) \leq \omega$ for every β .
Investigation of $H_1(\beta)$ led us finally to the simple proof of
Theorem 2.

It is worth to remark that by the above consideration and by
Theorem 1 we have

$$(3) \quad 2^\beta = \beta^+ \quad \text{implies} \quad H_1(\beta) = \beta \quad \text{for} \quad \beta \geq \omega$$

$H_1(\beta)$ will be studied in the forthcoming Erdős-Galvin-Hajnal
paper as well.

§ 2. Proofs

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $\mathcal{H} = \langle h, H \rangle$ be a uniform set system
with $\alpha(\mathcal{H}) = \alpha$, $\chi(\mathcal{H}) = k$ and assume $2 \leq i \leq k-1$,
 $\beta < \alpha$ and

$$(4) \quad |\bigcap H^i| < \beta \quad \text{for} \quad H^i \subset H, \quad |H^i| = \beta^+$$

It follows easily from the Lemmas stated in [1] § 4 that then there is a sequence B_ξ , $\xi < \alpha$ of disjoint subsets of α , satisfying the following conditions

$$(5) \quad |B_\xi| < \alpha \quad \text{for } \xi < \alpha; \quad \bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} B_\xi = h$$

$$(6) \quad \text{If } C_\xi = \bigcup_{\eta < \xi} B_\eta, \quad X \in H, \quad |X \cap C_\xi| \geq i$$

then $X \subset C_\xi$ for $\xi < \alpha$.

To prove statement (i) of Theorem 1. let $\alpha = \beta^+$, $i = k-1$. Then, by (5), $|B_\xi| \leq \beta$ for $\xi < \alpha$. Then there are sets D_ν , $\nu < \beta$ such that $h = \bigcup_{\nu < \beta} D_\nu$ and $|D_\nu \cap B_\xi| \leq 1$ for $\nu < \beta$, $\xi < \alpha$. Then, by (6), $X \not\subset D_\nu$ for $X \in H$ otherwise there is a maximal ξ with $X \cap B_\xi = \{u\}$ for some u , and $X - \{u\} \subset C_\xi$, $|X - \{u\}| = k-1$ implies $u \in C_\xi$ a contradiction. Hence $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \beta$

To prove part (ii) we apply induction on α . We assume that (ii) is true for every \mathcal{H}' with $\alpha(\mathcal{H}') < \alpha$, $\chi(\mathcal{H}') = \ell$, $3 \leq \ell < \omega$. Since $R(\beta, \beta, \dots)$ is true we may assume $\beta < \alpha \leq \omega_{\xi+k-2}$ and that (4), (5) and (6) hold with $i=2$ and we have to prove $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \beta$.

By part (i) we may assume $k > 3$.

For $X \in H$ let $\xi(X) = \max\{\xi < \alpha : B_\xi \cap H \neq \emptyset\}$

$$H_\xi = \{X \in H : \xi(X) = \xi\}; \quad H = \bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} H_\xi$$

Then, by (6), $|X \cap B_\xi| \geq k-1 \geq 3$ for $X \in H_\xi$. Hence there is a uniform set system $\mathcal{H}_\xi = \langle \mathcal{B}_\xi, \hat{H}_\xi \rangle$ such that

$$(7) \quad \alpha(\mathcal{H}_\xi) = |\mathcal{B}_\xi| \leq \omega_{\xi+k-3} \quad \text{for each } \xi < \alpha, \quad \chi(\mathcal{H}_\xi) = k-1$$

and there is $Y \in \hat{H}_\xi$, $Y \subset X$ for $X \in H_\xi$

Then obviously $\bigcap H' \subset 2$ for $H' \subset \hat{H}_\xi$, $|H'| = \beta^+$

Applying the induction hypothesis for the set systems \mathcal{H}_ξ we get that there are sets

$$D_{\xi, \nu} \subset B_\xi \quad ; \quad \bigcup_{\nu < \beta} D_{\xi, \nu} = B_\xi$$

such that $Y \not\subset D_{\xi, \nu}$ for $Y \in \hat{H}_\xi$, $\xi < \alpha$, $\nu < \beta$.

Put $D_\nu = \bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} D_{\xi, \nu}$. Then $\bigcup_{\nu < \beta} D_\nu = H$

Let $\nu < \beta$, $X \in H$. Then $X \in H_\xi$ for some $\xi < \alpha$

Then by (7) there is $Y \in \hat{H}_\xi$, $Y \subset X$

Since $Y \not\subset D_{\xi, \nu}$, $X \not\subset D_\nu$. Hence

$$\text{Chr}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \beta.$$

Proof of Theorem 2. Put

$$h = [\alpha]^{k-i+1}, \quad 2 \leq k-i+1 < k$$

Let $X \in [\alpha]^k$, $X = \{x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$, $x_0 < \dots < x_{k-1}$

We define $Z(X) \in [h]^k$ by

$$Z(X) = \left\{ \{u_0^j, \dots, u_{k-i}^j\} \in h : j < k \text{ and } u_\nu^j = x_{j+\nu \bmod k} \text{ for } \nu \leq k-i \right\}$$

i.e. $Z(X)$ consists of the k intervals of length k^{-i+1} of X considered in the cyclical order x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_0 .

By $k^{-i+1} < k$, $|Z(X)| = k$.

Put $H = \{Z(X) : X \in [\alpha]^k\}$

$\mathcal{H} = \langle h, H \rangle$. Then $\alpha(\mathcal{H}) = \alpha = (\exp_{k^{-i}}(\beta))^+$

Let now $X \neq Y \in [\alpha]^k$, then there are $X \in X - Y$, $Y \in Y - X$. Hence

$$|Z(X) - Z(Y)| \geq k^{-i+1}, |Z(Y) - Z(X)| \geq k^{-i+1}$$

and thus

$$|Z(X) \cap Z(Y)| \leq \frac{2k - 2(k^{-i+1})}{2} = i-1$$

Thus $H' \subset H$, $|H'| = 2$ implies $|\cap H'| < i$

We prove $\text{Chr}(\mathcal{H}) > \beta$

Let $h = \bigcup_{v < \beta} D_v$ be a partition of h . Then by

$h = [\alpha]^{k^{-i+1}}$ and as a corollary of the Erdős-Rado

theorem $(\exp_{k^{-i}}(\beta))^+ \rightarrow (\beta^+)_\beta^{k^{-i+1}}$ there is $X \subset \alpha$, $|X| = k$

which is homogeneous, i.e. there is $v < \beta$ such that

$$[X]^{k^{-i+1}} \subset D_v. \text{ But then } Z(X) \subset D_v, Z(X) \in H$$

for this X . Hence \mathcal{H} has the properties to show that

$R(\alpha, \beta, 2, k, i)$ is false.

As to the proof of Theorem 3, take

$$h = [\alpha]^t, H = \{[X]^t : X \in [\alpha]^k\}, \mathcal{H} = \langle h, H \rangle$$

It follows quite similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2 that \mathcal{H} disproves $R(\alpha, \beta, 2, k, i)$

References

- [1] P. Erdős and A. Hajnal, On chromatic number of graphs and set systems, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. 17(1966)61-99.
- [2] G. Elekes, On a partition property of infinite subsets of a set. Periodica Math. Hung. to appear.
- [3] P. Erdős and A. Hajnal, Unsolved and solved problems in set theory, Proceedings of the Berkeley Symposium 1971, to appear.