

Hall's marriage theorem

Peter J. Cameron
University of St Andrews
pjc20@st-andrews.ac.uk

Abstract

In 1935, Philip Hall published what is often referred to as “Hall’s marriage theorem” in a short paper (P. Hall, On Representatives of Subsets, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* (1) **10** (1935), no.1, 26–30.) This paper has been very influential. I state the theorem and outline Hall’s proof, together with some equivalent (or stronger) earlier results, and proceed to discuss some the many directions in combinatorics and beyond which this theorem has influenced.

MSC: Primary 05D15; secondary 05A16, 05B15, 05C70

1 Introduction

According to the zbMath database, Philip Hall wrote only 53 papers, a relatively small number, 48 of which were single-authored. His name is known to generations of group theorists because of his profound contributions to the subject. But his most cited paper, with nearly twice as many citations as the Hall–Higman paper in second place [18], is the one in which he proved what is now called *Hall’s marriage theorem* [17]. It is titled “On representatives of subsets”, and is four and a half pages long.

The application which Hall may have had in mind is the fact that, if G is a group and H a subgroup of finite index n , then there are n elements $g_1, \dots, g_n \in G$ which are simultaneously left and right coset representatives of H in G . However, John Britnell informs me that he and Mark Wildon searched Hall’s published work and found no evidence that he ever used this result. Indeed, the result had been published by G. A. Miller in 1910 [22].

Before stating the theorem, I give one definition, with a comment. Let (T_1, \dots, T_n) be an n -tuple of subsets of a finite set S . A *system of distinct representatives* or SDR for the n -tuple is an n -tuple (a_1, \dots, a_n) of elements of S such that $a_i \in T_i$ for all i , and $a_i \neq a_j$ for $i \neq j$. (Hall calls this a complete set of distinct representatives, or CDR; to avoid confusion I have used the current term.) Also, the set $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ is called a *transversal* to the family.

Hall's Theorem states:

Theorem 1.1 *A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of an SDR for a tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) of sets is that, for $0 \leq k \leq n$, any k of the sets contain between them at least k elements of S .*

Proof The necessity of the condition is clear. I sketch Hall's proof of the sufficiency. It depends on a lemma asserting that, with the hypotheses of the theorem, if (a_1, \dots, a_n) is an SDR and

$$P = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq n, a_i \text{ lies in every SDR}\},$$

then the union of the sets T_i for $i \in P$ is $\{a_i : i \in P\}$.

Given this, the proof is by induction on n . The induction clearly starts at $n = 1$.

Suppose that the hypotheses of the theorem hold, and that the theorem is true for $n - 1$ sets. By induction, there is an SDR (a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) for (T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}) . Thus, the theorem will hold unless T_n is contained in every SDR for (T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}) . Let

$$P^* = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq n - 1, a_i \text{ lies in every SDR for } (T_1, \dots, T_{n-1})\},$$

and $R^* = \{a_i : i \in P^*\}$. If $T_n \subseteq R^*$, then the sets T_i for $i \in P^*$ or $i = n$ are $|P^*| + 1$ in number but by the lemma contain only $|P^*|$ elements among them, contrary to hypothesis.

To deduce the result about cosets, we let H be a subgroup of G of index n . Since the intersection of the conjugates of H is a normal subgroup of finite index in G , by taking the quotient we may assume that G is finite. Let L_1, \dots, L_n be the left cosets and R_1, \dots, R_n the right cosets of H in G ; for $i = 1, \dots, n$, let

$$T_i = \{j : L_i \cap R_j \neq \emptyset\}.$$

The union of k left cosets contains $k|H|$ elements, and so cannot be contained in fewer than k right cosets. So the union of k of the sets T_i has cardinality at least k , and Hall's theorem gives a SDR (a_1, \dots, a_n) . Choosing $g_i \in L_i \cap R_{a_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ gives the required coset representatives.

The name "Hall's marriage theorem" comes from the following interpretation. Let $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ be a set of boys, and S a set of girls; let A_i be the set of girls who know b_i . Then a necessary and sufficient condition for it to be possible to marry each boy to a girl he knows is that any k boys know between them at least k girls, for all k .

2 Precursors and equivalents

In fact, other mathematicians stated equivalent results before Hall. What follows is a very brief account; Hall's version became the most influential, but I leave to a more detailed historical analysis the question of why this happened. However, the legacy of this activity is shown by the wide variety of proofs of the theorem which appear in textbooks and expository accounts.

First, after some definitions, I state some results which are in a sense equivalent to Hall's theorem.

A *bipartition* of a graph is a partition of the vertex set into two parts such that each edge is incident with one vertex in each part; a graph is *bipartite* if it has a bipartition. A *matching* is a set of pairwise disjoint edges; it is *perfect* if every vertex is incident with an edge of the matching. A set of vertices is *independent* if it contains no edge. A *vertex cover* is a set of vertices meeting every edge.

Theorem 2.1 (i) *Let G be a graph with bipartition $\{A, B\}$. Suppose that, for every subset X of A , there are at least $|X|$ vertices in B which have a neighbour in A . Then G has a matching which covers every vertex in A .*

(ii) *Let M be an $n \times m$ matrix. A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of an injective map f from $\{1, \dots, n\}$ to $\{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $M_{i, f(i)} \neq 0$ for all i is that any k rows together have non-zero elements in at least k columns, for $0 \leq k \leq n$.*

(iii) *Let (T_1, \dots, T_n) be a family of subsets of S . Suppose that there is a positive integer d such that, for $1 \leq k \leq n$, any k sets from the family*

contain between them at least $k - d$ elements. Then there is a partial SDR of size $n - d$; that is, elements $a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_{n-d}}$ in S such that $a_j \in T_j$ for $j \in \{i_1, \dots, i_{n-d}\}$ and $a_j \neq a_k$ for $j \neq k$.

Proof Parts (i) and (ii) are relatively straightforward variants of Hall's theorem. For (i), for each $a \in A$, let T_a be the set of its neighbours in B ; the hypotheses in the graph imply Hall's hypotheses, and the conclusion is then equivalent to Hall's. For (ii), for each row index i of the matrix, we take T_i to be the set of columns in which the i th row has non-zero entries.

Part (iii) is the *defect form* of Hall's theorem. Though apparently more general, it is easily proved from the original form, as follows. Take a set D of d "dummy" elements not lying in any of the sets T_i , and let $T_i^* = T_i \cup D$. The sets T_i^* satisfy Hall's condition, and so have an SDR; we simply discard the sets whose representative is one of the dummies.

Part (ii) of the theorem was proved by König [19] and Egerváry [10] in 1931. Indeed, König proved the following, which is also equivalent to Hall's theorem:

Theorem 2.2 *The maximum size of a matching in a bipartite graph is equal to the minimum size of a vertex cover.*

Proof Here is the proof of Hall's theorem (in the form given in Theorem 2.1(i)) from König's. Take a bipartite graph satisfying the conditions of (ii), and suppose that a vertex cover C contains t vertices in A . Then the remaining $|A| - t$ vertices have at least $|A| - t$ neighbours in B , all of which must be included in C ; so $|C| \geq |A|$. Now König's theorem shows that there is a matching of size $|A|$, which must cover all the vertices in A , as required.

Here is the proof of König's theorem from the defect form of Hall's theorem (Theorem 2.1(iii) above). Suppose that a minimal vertex cover contains k vertices in A and l in B . Since A is a vertex cover, we have $k + l \leq |A|$; put $d = |A| - (k + l)$. Now take a set A' of m points in A , and suppose that its neighbour set B' in B has $|B'| < m - d$; then $(A \setminus A') \cup B'$ is a vertex cover with size $|A| - m + |B'| < |A| - d = k + l$, contrary to assumption. Thus A' has at least $m - d$ neighbours in B . By the defect form of Hall's theorem, there is a matching of size $a - d = k + l$.

In 1927, Karl Menger [21] proved:

Theorem 2.3 *In a graph, the maximum number of edge-disjoint paths between two vertices is equal to the minimum size of an edge cut (a set of edges whose removal separates these two vertices).*

Hall's theorem (in the bipartite graph formulation of Theorem 2.1(i)) can be proved from Menger's: add two new vertices a and b where a is joined to the vertices in A and b to the vertices in B , and applying Menger's theorem to the vertices a and b .

Menger's theorem also has a version for edge-disjoint paths and edge cuts. From this, it is a small step to the *Max-flow Min-cut Theorem*, for edge-weighted graphs, and so to the *Duality Theorem* of linear programming.

Other authors who proved similar or equivalent results before Hall include van der Waerden and Sperner. So it might be said that this was a well-studied topic at the time.

3 Dilworth's Theorem and perfect graphs

In 1950, Dilworth [6] proved the following theorem. A *chain* in a partially ordered set is a set of elements any two of which are comparable (that is, a totally ordered subset); an *antichain* is a set in which any pair are incomparable.

Theorem 3.1 *If the largest antichain in a finite partially ordered set P has cardinality m , then P is the union of m chains.*

This theorem implies Hall's as follows. With the hypotheses of Hall's theorem, we partially order $S \cup \{1, \dots, n\}$ by the rule that, for $a \in S$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we put $a < i$ if and only if $a \in T_i$. It is clear that the largest antichain has size $|S|$, and so we can find $|S|$ chains whose union is $S \cup \{1, \dots, n\}$: these must consist of n pairs (a_i, i) where (a_1, \dots, a_n) is a SDR, together with the $|S| - n$ unused singletons in S . In fact it is possible to go in the other direction and prove Dilworth's theorem from Hall's.

The "dual" of Dilworth's theorem, stating that if the largest chain has cardinality n , then P is the union of n antichains, is much simpler: the maximal elements of P form an antichain, and removing them reduces the size of the largest chain by 1, so induction finishes the job.

In a poset P , the *comparability graph* has as vertices the elements of P , two elements joined if they are comparable; its complement is the *incomparability graph*.

A finite graph is *perfect* if every induced subgraph has clique number equal to chromatic number. (Clique number is the size of the largest complete subgraph, while chromatic number is the smallest number of edgeless induced subgraphs required to cover the vertices.) Dilworth’s theorem asserts that the incomparability graph of a poset is perfect (since every induced subgraph of an incomparability graph is an incomparability graph); the easier dual asserts that the comparability graph is also perfect.

This led Claude Berge [3] to two conjectures, the weak and strong perfect graph conjectures:

- The weak conjecture: The complement of a perfect graph is perfect.
- The strong conjecture: A graph is perfect if and only if it has no induced subgraph which is a cycle of odd length greater than 3 or the complement of one.

The weak conjecture was proved by Lovász [20] in 1972, while the strong conjecture had to wait for the work of Chudnovsky, Robertson, Seymour and Thomas [5] in 2006.

4 Matroids

Matroids were introduced by Hassler Whitney [27], and independently by Takeo Nakasawa [23], in 1935, as a model for “independence” (which could be linear independence in a vector space, algebraic independence over a subfield, acyclicity in a graph, etc.) The definition is simple. A *matroid* consists of a ground set E together with a non-empty collection \mathcal{I} of subsets of E called *independent sets*, which is closed downwards (that is, a subset of an independent set is independent), and has the *exchange property*:

If $A, B \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|B| > |A|$, then there exists $b \in B \setminus A$ such that $A \cup \{b\} \in \mathcal{I}$.

The exchange property implies that any two maximal independent subsets of a set $X \subseteq E$ have the same cardinality, which is called the *rank* of X , denoted $r(X)$.

Matroids play a central role in combinatorics, with applications ranging from model theory to stability of frameworks.

Richard Rado generalised Hall's theorem to the setting of matroids. Let (T_1, \dots, T_n) be a collection of subsets of E . A tuple (a_1, \dots, a_n) of distinct elements of E is a *system of independent representatives* for the family if $a_i \in T_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\} \in \mathcal{I}$. Rado [24] proved:

Theorem 4.1 *Let (T_1, \dots, T_n) be a collection of subsets of the ground set of a matroid (E, \mathcal{I}) . Then the collection has a system of independent representatives if and only if, for $0 \leq k \leq n$ and any k elements $i_1, \dots, i_k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have*

$$r\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k T_{i_j}\right) \geq k.$$

Dominic Welsh [26] showed that many important results in matroid theory, including Jack Edmonds' *matroid union theorem*, follow from Rado's theorem.

5 Counting SDRs

We begin this section with an important special case of Hall's theorem.

Theorem 5.1 *Let (T_1, \dots, T_n) be a family of subsets of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Suppose that there is a positive integer r such that each set T_i has cardinality r , and each point $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ lies in exactly r of these sets. Then the family has an SDR.*

Proof Choose k of the sets, say T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_k} . The number of pairs (l, j) with $l \in \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ and $j \in T_{i_l}$ is rk ; but each point j lies in at most r of the sets $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$, and so the number of such points j is at least k . These are precisely the points in the union of the k sets, so Hall's criterion holds.

There has been a lot of interest in the question: How many SDRs must such a family have? I give some results in this section.

A square matrix M is *doubly stochastic* if its elements are all non-negative and all row and column sums of M are equal to 1.

Birkhoff's theorem [4] states:

Theorem 5.2 *The convex hull of the set of $n \times n$ permutation matrices is the set of $n \times n$ doubly stochastic matrices.*

Proof The fact that a convex combination of permutation matrices is doubly stochastic is a simple calculation. The fact that every doubly stochastic matrix occurs can be proved using Hall’s Theorem.

The proof is by induction on the number of non-zero entries in M . The smallest possible number is n , which occurs only for permutation matrices; so suppose that the result is proved for matrices with fewer non-zero entries than M . By Hall’s theorem (in the matrix form given by Theorem 2.1(ii)), there is a permutation π such that, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, the $(i, \pi(i))$ entry of M is positive. Let μ be the minimum of all such entries, and P the permutation matrix corresponding to π . Subtracting μP from M and re-scaling, we obtain a doubly stochastic matrix with fewer non-zero entries, and the induction goes through.

There is another aspect which is relevant to us. The *permanent* is a matrix function similar to the determinant but “without the signs”:

$$\text{per}(M) = \sum_{\pi \in S_n} \prod_{i=1}^n M_{i, \pi(i)}.$$

Although the determinant can be efficiently computed using linear algebra, the permanent is intractable to compute.

Suppose that M is a square matrix with all entries 0 and 1. Then M represents a bipartite graph on vertices $\{r_i, c_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$, where r_i and c_j are joined if and only if $M_{i,j} = 1$. Then a non-zero term in the permanent corresponds to a matching in the graph, so $\text{per}(M)$ counts the matchings. So Theorem 2.1(ii) gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the permanent to be non-zero.

The *van der Waerden conjecture* asserted that the permanent of an $n \times n$ doubly stochastic matrix is at least $n!/n^n$, with equality if and only if every entry of the matrix is $1/n$. This was proved indepently by Egorychev [11] and Falikman [12] in 1980. From it we can deduce a lower bound for the number of matchings in the special case of Theorem 5.1. Let M be the matrix defined from the graph by the procedure of the last paragraph. Then M has row and column sums r , so $(1/r)M$ is doubly stochastic. We conclude that $\text{per}(M) \geq (r/n)^n n!$, and this number is a lower bound for the number of matchings. We will use this in the next section.

6 Latin squares

Let m, n be positive integers with $m \leq n$. An $m \times n$ *Latin rectangle* is an $m \times n$ array with entries from an alphabet of size n , such that each letter occurs once in each row and at most once in each column. If $m = n$, it is a Latin square. Latin squares first arose in connection with magic squares, and have applications in universal algebra, graph theory, statistics, and cryptography.

Proposition 6.1 *A Latin rectangle can be extended to a Latin square by adding extra rows.*

Clearly it suffices to show that, if $m < n$, then one more row can be added. The letters (a_1, \dots, a_n) in the added row must be all distinct, and must not occur in the m elements in their column in the given rectangle; so they must form an SDR for the sets T_1, \dots, T_n , where T_i is the set of letters not appearing in the i th column. Each set T_i has cardinality $n - m$, and each letter lies in $n - m$ of these sets (those corresponding to columns not containing that letter). By Theorem 5.1, the SDR exists (and, indeed, there are many SDRs).

Using the result of the last section, we can obtain a lower bound for the number of Latin squares. The number of possible $(m + 1)$ st rows is at least $((n - m)/n)^n n!$; so the number of Latin squares is at least

$$\prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{n - m}{n} \right)^n (n!) = \frac{(n!)^{2n}}{n^{n^2}}.$$

Using Stirling's formula, this is roughly $(n/e^2)^{n^2}$, so asymptotic in the logarithm to the total number of $n \times n$ arrays over an alphabet of size n .

A variant of Latin squares used in statistics are the designs known as *Youden squares* [28, 13]. In one formulation, a Youden square is a Latin rectangle whose columns are the blocks of a symmetric balanced incomplete-block design on the set of letters. The existence of Youden squares is a consequence of Theorem 5.1, and the enumeration results above give estimates for the number of such designs. Indeed, the design needs to be equireplicate but balance is not required.

7 Algorithmic version

Hall's theorem guarantees the existence of a system of distinct representatives. But the condition itself appears to involve a lot of checking, since we need to consider every subset of the index set.

The proof of the Max-Flow Min-Cut theorem by Ford and Fulkerson [15] was used by Dinic [7] and Edmonds and Karp [9] to give an efficient algorithm. In the situation of Hall's theorem, it starts with a partial SDR, and returns either a larger partial SDR or a failure of Hall's condition. Each round of the algorithm runs in polynomial time, and it only has to be repeated at most n times.

However, Dima Fon-Der-Flaass [14] showed that the problem of finding a 2-dimensional array of distinct representatives is NP-hard. (In this problem we are given a rectangular array of sets and asked to find representatives such that the representatives in any row or column of the array are distinct.)

8 The infinite

Hall's theorem fails in the infinite case. Marshall Hall Jr. (no relation) gave the following example: take S to be the set of positive integers, $T_0 = S$ and $T_i = \{i\}$ for $i > 0$. Each set T_i for $i > 0$ must be represented by its unique element, leaving no representative for T_0 . On the other hand, any k of the sets contain either k or infinitely many elements between them, depending on whether T_0 is included.

Marshall Hall [16, p. 51] proved a version of Hall's Theorem for the infinite case:

Theorem 8.1 *Let $(T_i : i \in I)$ be a family of finite subsets of an infinite set S . Then the family has a system of distinct representatives if and only if, for every natural number k , any k of the sets contain at least k elements between them.*

A recent application by Downarowicz, Huczek and Zhang [8] uses Hall's theorem to show that any countable amenable group G has a tiling into finite tiles of only finitely many distinct shapes, where the tiles are almost invariant under any given finite subset of G . (I am grateful to Josh Frisch for this information.) They use a slightly different infinite version of Hall's theorem: they assume a countable set \mathcal{T} of subsets of a countable set X such

that there exists a positive integer N with the property that each point of X lies in at most N members of \mathcal{T} , while each set in \mathcal{T} contains at least N members of X .

A general necessary and sufficient condition for an arbitrary family of sets to have a transversal was found by Aharoni, Nsh-Williams and Shelah [2]. I will not describe the precise result here.

9 A final variant

I will finish with a generalization of Hall's theorem due to Aharoni and Haxell [1]. This uses the notion of a *hypergraph*, a structure consisting of a set of vertices and a collection of subsets called *edges* (or sometimes *hyperedges*). The authors define a *system of distinct representatives* for a family $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, \dots, H_m\}$ of hypergraphs to be a function f which selects an edge $f(H_i)$ of each hypergraph H_i in such a way that $f(H_i) \in H_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

A *matching* is a set of pairwise disjoint edges. A set F of edges is said to be *pinned* by a set K of edges if every edge in F is met by some edge in K .

Theorem 9.1 *A sufficient condition for a family \mathcal{A} of hypergraphs to have an SDR is that, for every subfamily \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{A} , there is a matching M in $\cup \mathcal{B}$ which cannot be pinned by fewer than $|\mathcal{B}|$ disjoint edges from $\cup \mathcal{B}$.*

If each edge in each hypergraph is a singleton, the hypothesis reduces to that of Hall's theorem (each hypergraph can be represented as a set, the union of its singleton edges), and the conclusion is the same as Hall's.

A feature of the proof is that it is topological: it uses Sperner's Lemma [25].

Acknowledgement I am grateful to several people including John Britnell, Josh Frisch, Scott Harper, and two reviewers for very helpful comments which have improved the paper.

References

- [1] R. Aharoni and P. Haxell, Hall's theorem for hypergraphs, *J. Graph Theory* **35** (2000), 83–88.

- [2] R. Aharoni, C. St J. A. Nash-Williams and S. Shelah, A general criterion for the existence of transversals, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, III. Ser., **47** (1983), 43–68.
- [3] C. Berge, Perfect graphs, *Six Papers on Graph Theory*, Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta, 1963, pp. 1–21.
- [4] G. Birkhoff, Tres observaciones sobre el algebra lineal, *Univ. Nac. Tucumán. Revista A.* 5 (1946), 147–151.
- [5] M. Chudnovsky, N. Robertson, P. Seymour and R. Thomas, The strong perfect graph theorem, *Ann. Math.* **164** (2006), 51–229.
- [6] R. P. Dilworth, A decomposition theorem for partially ordered sets, *Ann. Math.*, **51** (1950), 161–166.
- [7] E. A. Dinic, Algorithm for solution of a problem of maximum flow in a network with power estimation, *Soviet Math. (Doklady)* **11** (1970), 1277–1280.
- [8] T. Downarowicz, D. Huczek and G. Zhang, Tilings of amenable groups, *J. reine angew. Math.* **747** (2019), 277–298.
- [9] J. Edmonds and R. M. Karp, Theoretical improvements in algorithmic efficiency for network flow problems *J. ACM* **19** (1972), 248–264.
- [10] E. Egerváry, Über kombinatorische Eigenschaften von Matrizen, *Mat. Fiz. Lapok* **38** (1931), 16–28.
- [11] G. P. Egorychev, A solution of the Van der Waerden’s permanent problem, Preprint IFSO-L3 M, Academy of Sciences SSSR, Krasnoyarsk (1980); published in *Sib. Mat. Zh.* **22** (1981), 6, 65–71.
- [12] D. I. Falikman, The proof of the Van der Waerden’s conjecture regarding to doubly stochastic matrices, *Mat. Zametki* **29** (6) (1981).
- [13] R. A. Fisher, The mathematics of experimentation, *Nature* **142** (1938) 442–443 (reprinted in: J. H. Bennett (Ed.), *Collected Papers of R. A. Fisher*, Vol. 4, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, 1974, pp. 155–158).
- [14] D. G. Fon-Der-Flaass, Arrays of distinct representatives — a very simple NP-complete problem, *Discrete Math.* **171** (1997), 295–298.

- [15] L. R. Ford Jr. and D. R. Fulkerson, Maximal flow through a network, *Canad. J. Math.* **8** (1956), 399–404.
- [16] M. Hall Jr., *Combinatorial Theory* (2nd ed.), John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1986.
- [17] P. Hall, On representatives of subsets, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* (1) **10** (1935), 26–31.
- [18] P. Hall and G. Higman, On the p -length of p -soluble groups and reduction theorems for Burnside’s problem, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3) **6** (1956), 1–42.
- [19] D. König, Graphen und Matrices, *Mat. Fiz. Lapok* **38** (1931), 116–119.
- [20] L. Lovász, Normal hypergraphs and the perfect graph conjecture, *Discrete Math.* **2** (1972), 253–267.
- [21] K. Menger, Zur allgemeinen Kurventheorie, *Fund. Math.* **10** (1927), 96–115.
- [22] G. A. Miller, On a method due to Galois, *Quart. J. Math.* **41** (1910), 382–384.
- [23] T. Nakasawa, Zur Axiomatik der linearen Abhängigkeit, I, *Sc. Rep. Tokyo Bunrika Daigaku* (A) **2** (1935), 235–255; II, *ibid.* (A) **3** (1936), 45–69; III, *ibid.* (A) **3** (1936), 123–136.
- [24] R. Rado, A theorem on independence relations, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford* **13** (1942), 83–89.
- [25] E. Sperner, Neuer Beweis für die Invarianz der Dimensionzahl und des Gebietes, *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg* **6** (1928), 265–272.
- [26] D. J. A. Welsh, On matroid theorems of Edmonds and Rado, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* (2) **2** (1970), 251–256.
- [27] H. Whitney, On the abstract properties of linear dependence, *Amer. J. Math.* **57** (1935), 509–533.
- [28] W. J. Youden, Use of incomplete block replication in estimating tobacco-mosaic virus, *Contrib. Boyce Thompson Institute* **9** (1937), 41–48.