

NERVES AND SET-THEORETICAL INDEPENDENCE

BY

B. WĘGLORZ (WROCŁAW)

I. The *nerve* of a family of sets F_1, \dots, F_n is by definition (see e. g. [1], p. 201) a geometrical complex with vertices — we shall denote it for brevity's sake also by F_1, \dots, F_n — such that any simplex of the form $(F_{k_1}, \dots, F_{k_t})$ belongs to this complex iff $F_{k_1} \cap \dots \cap F_{k_t} \neq \emptyset$.

The sets E_1, \dots, E_n are called *independent* if no atom (i. e. the intersection of some of these of sets with the complements of some other of them) is void (see e. g. [2]).

The aim of this paper is to characterize the independence of sets in terms of the geometrical structure of their nerve.

Let X denote a fixed non-void set. For every system E_1, \dots, E_n of subsets of X we denote by $U(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ the system

$$E_1, \dots, E_n, E_{n+1}, \dots, E_{2n},$$

where $E_{n+k} = E'_k = X \setminus E_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$.

It is easy to see that

(i) *A necessary and sufficient condition of the independence of sets E_1, \dots, E_n is that each system j_1, \dots, j_n of indices $1, \dots, 2n$, where no pair has the difference n , satisfies the inequality*

$$(1) \quad E_{j_1} \cap \dots \cap E_{j_n} \neq \emptyset.$$

Moreover,

(ii) *For every system E_1, \dots, E_n of subsets of X , at least one system j_1, \dots, j_n of indices $1, \dots, 2n$, where no pair has the difference n , satisfies inequality (1).*

This follows from (i) and from the fact that X is the union of all the atoms of the system E_1, \dots, E_n .

(iii) *For any system E_1, \dots, E_n of subsets of X the nerve N of the system $U(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ is of dimension $n-1$.*

Proof. Indeed, by (ii) there exists at least one system j_1, \dots, j_n of indices without pairs having the difference n and which satisfies (1).

Thus the $(n-1)$ -dimensional simplex $(E_{j_1}, \dots, E_{j_n})$ belongs to the nerve N by definition. Hence $\dim N \geq n-1$. On the other hand, $\dim N \leq n-1$, because no simplex with more than n vertices belongs to N as the intersection of more than n sets from $U(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ is void. The proof is complete.

Let us now consider, in the Euclidean space R^n , the spherical surface S_{n-1} with the centre at the origin and with a system of perpendicular half-axes L_1, \dots, L_{2n} such that every union $L_k \cup L_{n+k}$ ($k = 1, \dots, n$) forms an axis. We denote by p_i the intersection point of L_i and S_{n-1} . Thus p_k and p_{n+k} are antipodic points. There exists a decomposition of S_{n-1} into 2^n spherical simplexes such that 1° their vertices belong to the set $\{p_1, \dots, p_{2n}\}$ and 2° no simplex has a pair of antipodic vertices. These simplexes constitute evidently a triangulation of S_{n-1} . Thus the geometrical complex T consisting of this simplexes may be identified with S_{n-1} . Therefore

(iv) *The simplex $(p_{j_1}, \dots, p_{j_n})$ belongs to the complex T iff the system j_1, \dots, j_n contains no pair of numbers with difference n .*

THEOREM. *The sets E_1, \dots, E_n are independent iff the nerve N of the system $U(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ is homeomorphic with a spherical surface.*

Proof. Necessity. Let the set E_k correspond to the vertex p_k of the complex T . By (i) and (iv), T is the nerve of the system $U(E_1, \dots, E_n)$. It remains to put $N = T$.

Sufficiency. Suppose that the sets E_1, \dots, E_n are dependent. Then there exists a system j_1, \dots, j_n of indices with values from among the numbers $1, \dots, 2n$ with no pair of difference n such that $E_{j_1} \cap \dots \cap E_{j_n} = \emptyset$. Thus the simplex $(E_{j_1}, \dots, E_{j_n})$ does not belong to the nerve N .

It remains to let the set E_k correspond to the vertex p_k for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ in order to see that the nerve N is then an $(n-1)$ -dimensional proper subcomplex of T , and thus N is homeomorphic with a proper subset of the spherical surface of the same dimension.

By (iii) the Theorem may be modified as follows: *the sets E_1, \dots, E_n are independent iff the nerve N of the system $U(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ is homeomorphic with S_{n-1} .*

2. It is known that the set-theoretical independence is a special case of the general algebraic independence, namely, it coincides with the independence in the algebra $\mathfrak{B} = \langle 2^X; \cup, ' \rangle$, where 2^X denotes the class of all subsets of X (see [2] and [3]).

Besides the algebra \mathfrak{B} , it is possible to take into consideration some "weaker" algebra, e. g. $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \langle 2^X; \cup, \setminus \rangle$. The independence of sets in \mathfrak{B}_1 does not give so nice geometrical interpretation as in the case of algebra \mathfrak{B} . It is possible to give only some necessary conditions, the geometrical sense of which is much more complicated.

Marczewski [2] has proved that the independence in algebra \mathfrak{B}_1 may be characterized as follows:

(v) *The sets E_1, \dots, E_n are independent in algebra \mathfrak{B}_1 iff for each system j_1, \dots, j_n of indices with $1 \leq j_k \leq n$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ such that no pair of them has the difference equal to n and $j_k > n$ for at least one index, the relation*

$$E_{j_1} \cap \dots \cap E_{j_n} \neq \emptyset$$

holds true.

Since the independence of sets in algebra \mathfrak{B} implies their independence in algebra \mathfrak{B}_1 , we may limit ourselves to consider only the sets that are dependent in algebra \mathfrak{B} .

We shall prove

(vi) *If the sets E_1, \dots, E_n are independent in algebra \mathfrak{B}_1 and dependent in algebra \mathfrak{B} , then the nerve N of the system $U(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ is homeomorphic with an $(n-1)$ -dimensional sphere Q_{n-1} .*

Proof. If the sets E_1, \dots, E_n are dependent in the algebra \mathfrak{B} , then we have $E_{n+1} \cap \dots \cap E_{2n} = \emptyset$.

Now, if we let, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, the set E_k correspond to the vertex p_k of the complex T , then by (iv) the nerve N of the system $U(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ is given by

$$N = T \setminus (p_{n+1}, \dots, p_{2n}).$$

Therefore N is homeomorphic with Q_{n-1} .

Remark. The condition of N , being given by $N = T \setminus (p_{n+1}, \dots, p_{2n})$, is not sufficient for the sets E_1, \dots, E_n to be independent in algebra \mathfrak{B}_1 . Indeed, to see this it is sufficient to consider two sets A and B such that $A \cup B = X$ and $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Kuratowski, *Topologie I*, Warszawa 1958.
- [2] E. Marczewski, *Independence in algebras of sets and Boolean algebras*, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 48 (1960), p. 135-140.
- [3] — *Independence and homomorphisms in abstract algebras*, *ibidem* 50 (1961), p. 45-61.

Reçu par la Rédaction le 2. 1. 1964