

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

**A CONVERSE OF HELLY'S THEOREM ON CONVEX SETS**

ARIEH DVORETZKY

# A CONVERSE OF HELLY'S THEOREM ON CONVEX SETS

ARYEH DVORETZKY

**1. Introduction.** Helly's well known theorem on convex sets states that families of compact convex sets in Euclidean  $n$ -space  $E^n$ , have the following property:

*Property  $\mathcal{H}$ : If every  $n + 1$  of the sets have a point in common, then there exists a point common to all sets of the family.*

If a family of compact sets in  $E^n$  has property  $\mathcal{H}$  this, clearly, does not imply that the sets are convex. The purpose of this short note is to show that (loosely speaking) if the family possesses property  $\mathcal{H}$  not accidentally but by virtue of the geometric structure of its sets, then all the sets of the family are convex. The proof of our result is rather simple, but as far as we are aware no theorems converse to Helly's have been noticed before.

In order to state our result briefly we make the following definition:

**DEFINITION.** A family of sets  $K_\alpha$  in  $E^n$  is said to have property  $\mathcal{GH}$  if every family  $\{K'_\alpha\}$ , with  $K'_\alpha = T_\alpha K_\alpha$  an affine<sup>1</sup> transform of  $K_\alpha$ , possesses property  $\mathcal{H}$ .

We may now formulate our result.

**THEOREM.** Let  $\{K_\alpha\}$  be a family of more than  $n + 1$  compact sets in  $E^n$ , all having linear dimension  $n$  (that is, no  $K_\alpha$  lies in a hyperplane). If the family has property  $\mathcal{GH}$  then all sets  $K_\alpha$  are convex.

**2. Proof.** We shall show that if one of the sets of the family, say  $K_0$ , is not convex then the family cannot have property  $\mathcal{GH}$ .

Since  $K_0$  is closed and its linear dimension is  $n$ , there exist  $n + 1$  points  $P_1, \dots, P_{n+1} \in K_0$  forming the vertices of a simplex whose interior contains points not belonging to  $K_0$ . Let  $P_0$  be such a point.

---

<sup>1</sup>By an affine transformation we understand a nonsingular one.

The family contains more than  $n + 1$  sets. Let  $K_1, K_2, \dots, K_{n+1}$  be  $n + 1$  arbitrary sets of the family different<sup>2</sup> from  $K_0$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$  let  $\hat{K}_i$  denote the convex hull of  $K_i$ . Let  $Q_0^{(i)}$  be any extreme point of  $\hat{K}_i$  (that is,  $Q_0^{(i)} \in \hat{K}_i$  and it is not an interior point of any segment contained in  $\hat{K}_i$ ). Since  $K_i$  is compact and not empty there exists such a point and, moreover,  $Q_0^{(i)} \in K_i$ . Let  $\pi_i$  be a hyperplane containing  $Q_0^{(i)}$  and such that all other points of  $\hat{K}_i$  are in one of the open half-spaces, say  $\pi_i^+$ , determined by it (such a plane  $\pi_i$  exists since  $Q_0^{(i)}$  is an extreme point of  $\hat{K}_i$ ). As  $K_i$  has linear dimension  $n$  there exist points  $Q_1^{(i)}, \dots, Q_n^{(i)} \in K_i$ , such that the  $n + 1$  points  $Q_0^{(i)}, Q_1^{(i)}, \dots, Q_n^{(i)}$  form the vertices of a simplex. Let  $T_i$  be an affine transformation sending  $Q_0^{(i)}$  into  $P_0$  and  $Q_1^{(i)}, \dots, Q_n^{(i)}$  into the  $n$  points  $P_j$  with  $1 \leq j \leq n + 1$  and  $j \neq i$ .

Let  $T_0$  denote the identity transformation. Also, if the family contains more than  $n + 2$  sets, associate with every set  $K_\beta$ , different from the  $n + 2$  sets already considered, an affine transformation  $T_\beta$  such that  $T_\beta K_\beta$  contains the  $n + 1$  points  $P_1, \dots, P_{n+1}$  (this is possible since the linear dimension of  $K_\beta$  is  $n$ ).

Put  $K'_\alpha = T_\alpha K_\alpha$  (for  $K_\alpha = K_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n + 1$  as well as for  $K_\beta = K_\alpha$ ). Now every  $n + 1$  of the sets  $K'_\alpha$  have a point in common. Indeed, the sets  $K'_1, \dots, K'_{n+1}$  have the point  $P_0$  in common, while any other collection of  $n + 1$  sets  $K'_\alpha$  must omit at least one of these sets, say  $K'_i$  and then  $P_i$  belongs to all the  $K'_\alpha$  in the collection. On the other hand we shall prove that there is no point common to all  $K'_\alpha$ . This will be done by showing that  $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n+1} K'_i = \phi$  (the void set).

This last assertion is established as follows. (i) Since

$$K_i \subset Q_i^{(0)} \cup \pi_i^+$$

we have

$$K'_i \subset P_0 \cup T_i \pi_i^+$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$ , and, therefore,

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{n+1} K'_i \subset P_0 \cup \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^{n+1} T_i \pi_i^+ \right).$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Different means labelled differently. The theorem applies also to families in which one set appears several times, for example, to a family consisting of  $n + 2$  identical sets.

(ii) For  $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$  let  $C_i$  denote the closed polyhedral cone with vertex at  $P_0$  and edges obtained by prolongation of the  $n$  directed segments  $\overrightarrow{P_j P_0}$  ( $1 \leq j \leq n + 1, j \neq i$ ). Since

$$P_j \in K'_i \cap T_i \pi_i^+$$

for these  $j$ , we have  $C_i \cap T_i \pi_i^+ = \phi$ ; also, since  $P_0$  is an interior point of the simplex with vertices  $P_1, \dots, P_{n+1}$ , we have  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} C_i = E^n$ , the whole space. Therefore

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{n+1} T_i \pi_i^+ = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} \left( C_i \cap \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^{n+1} T_i \pi_i^+ \right) \right) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} (C_i \cap T_i \pi_i^+) = \phi.$$

(iii) Combining this with the result of (i) we have

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{n+1} K'_i \subset P_0.$$

Thus  $P_0$  is the only common point of  $K'_1, \dots, K'_{n+1}$ , but  $P_0 \notin K'_0 = K_0$ , hence there is no common point to the  $n + 2$  sets  $K'_0, K'_1, \dots, K'_{n+1}$ . Q.e.d.

**3. Generalizations.** We indicate two stronger versions of the theorem of § 1.

3.1. Similarly to the way we defined property  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{H}$ , we can define the weaker property  $\mathcal{A}^+\mathcal{H}$  by restricting the affine transformations  $T_\alpha$  in the definition, to those for which the determinant of the non-translational part is positive. Only minor modifications are required in the proof in order to show that the theorem of § 1 remains valid if property  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{H}$  is replaced by property  $\mathcal{A}^+\mathcal{H}$ .

3.2. Let  $K$  be a closed set in  $E^n$  having linear dimension  $n$ , and such that its complement in  $E^n$  contains a nondegenerate cone. It can then be shown that there exist points  $Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_n \in K$  forming the vertices of a simplex, and having the further property that  $Q_0$  is the only point belonging to  $K$  in the closed cone having  $Q_0$  as vertex and whose edges are the prolongations of  $Q_i Q_0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Using this fact the proof of § 2 easily yields the theorem of § 1 with the assumption of compactness weakened to: every  $K_\alpha$  is closed and its complement contains a nondegenerate cone.

3.3. For  $n \geq 2$  both 3.1 and 3.2 can be carried out simultaneously. That this cannot be done for  $n = 1$  is shown by the following example: A family of

3 sets, one consisting of two points and the other two being two equally directed closed half lines.

**4. Remarks.** It might be interesting to consider the necessity of the various assumptions made in the theorem.

4.1. It is natural to ask whether property  $\mathcal{A}$  could be weakened in that we would allow not all affine transformations but only some transformations of a special kind. As shown in 3.1 it is possible to do something in this direction; however not much more can be done as is seen from examples that follow.

The theorem would become false if in defining property  $\mathcal{A}$  we would have restricted the affine transformations by the extra condition that the determinant of the nontranslational part of the transformation be rational. Indeed, let the family contain  $n + 2$  sets  $S_1, \dots, S_{n+2}$ , each  $S_i$  consisting of  $n + 1$  points forming the vertices of a simplex. Let  $V_i$  be the volume of the simplex whose set of vertices is  $S_i$  and assume the numbers  $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{n+2}$  to be rationally independent. We claim that  $S'_i = T_i S_i$ , ( $i = 1, \dots, n + 2$ ) with  $T_i$  being affine transformations with rational determinants, has property  $\mathcal{A}$ . In fact, otherwise we would have  $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n+2} S'_i = \phi$  while any  $n + 1$  of the sets  $S'_i$  would have a point in common. This would be possible only if  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n+2} S'_i$  consists of exactly  $n + 2$  points, and the  $n + 2$  sets  $S'_i$  are all the different subsets of  $n + 1$  points of  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n+2} S'_i$ . We may denote the points by  $Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{n+2}$  in such a way that  $S'_i$  consists of all these points except  $Q_i$ . Let  $v_i$  be the volume of  $S_i$  then either (i) one  $v_i$  is equal to the sum of the  $n + 1$  numbers  $v_j$  with  $i \neq j$  (this happens if one of the points  $Q_1, \dots, Q_{n+2}$  is an interior point of the simplex formed by the other points); or (ii) the sum  $v_i + v_j$  of two volumes equals the sum of two of the  $n$  remaining  $v_k$ , (this happens if the previous case does not occur). But  $v_i = |d_i| V_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n + 2$ ) where  $d_i$  is the determinant (of the non-translational part) of  $T_i$ , and either (i) or (ii) would imply a rational relation between the  $V_i$  contrary to our assumption.

An argument of the same kind shows the existence of  $n + 2$  sets  $S_i$  as above having the property obtained from  $\mathcal{A}$  by restricting the affine transformations by the condition that the determinants be bounded and bounded away from zero. Such an argument also applies if instead of considering all affine transformations we consider, say, the similarities, that is, those obtained by combinations of translations, stretchings and orthogonal transformations; etc.

It should be noticed that in the above counterexamples the families consist of  $n + 2$  sets; thus they apply even if in the theorem the assumption "the family

has property  $\mathcal{A}'$  is strengthened to "every subfamily of more than  $n + 1$  sets has property  $\mathcal{A}'$ ". On the other hand it is easily seen that with this new formulation (but not with the original one) the theorem remains valid if we restrict the consideration to affine transformations with determinants bounded by an arbitrary positive number (or, alternatively, with determinants bounded away from zero).

4.2. In 3.2 we remarked that the assumption of compactness could be weakened; it is, however, impossible to dispense with it altogether. To see this let  $O_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ,  $N > n + 1$ ) be nonvoid, open and convex sets in  $E^n$ . Let  $O_i^*$  be a set obtained from  $O_i$  by deleting a single point  $P_i$  from it. The sets  $O_i^*$  are not convex, yet we claim that the family consisting of these  $N$  sets has property  $\mathcal{A}$ . Indeed, let  $T_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) be affine transformations. If every  $n + 1$  of the sets  $T_i O_i^*$  have a point in common, so do a fortiori every  $n + 1$  of the sets  $T_i O_i$ . But the sets  $T_i O_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) are convex and, it is well known that finite families of arbitrary convex sets have property  $\mathcal{H}$ . Therefore  $\bigcap_{i=1}^N T_i O_i \neq \phi$ , but  $\bigcap_{i=1}^N T_i O_i$  is an open set, hence it must contain other points besides  $T_i P_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ). Since

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^N T_i O_i \subset \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^N T_i O_i^* \right) \cup \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^N T_i P_i \right)$$

it follows that  $\bigcap_{i=1}^N T_i O_i^* \neq \phi$ , that is, our family has property  $\mathcal{A}$  as claimed.

It is even impossible, unless some precautions are taken, to replace the word "compact" in the theorem by the word "closed". One has merely to think of the family  $\{K_1, \dots, K_{n+2}\}$  where  $K_1, \dots, K_{n+1}$  are arbitrary sets of linear dimension  $n$  and  $K_{n+2} = E^n$ .

4.3. Finally, it is easy to see that the assumption about the linear dimension of the sets  $K_\alpha$  is essential. The simplest example proving this is obtained by considering the case when each  $K_\alpha$  consists of  $n$  (or fewer) points. The sets  $K'_\alpha$  consist also of fewer than  $n + 1$  points and a trivial argument shows that the family  $\{K'_\alpha\}$  has property  $\mathcal{H}$ .

It is also impossible to improve the theorem by dropping the assumption about the linear dimension and replacing the conclusion by "each set is either convex or has linear dimension  $n$ ". A trivial counterexample is obtained by taking one arbitrary set and all other sets consisting of single points. It is possible to construct more ingenious examples showing, for example, that one

cannot replace the assumption that the linear dimension is  $n$  by the assumption that the sets contain more than  $n$  points.

HEBREW UNIVERSITY,  
JERUSALEM.

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

## EDITORS

H.L. ROYDEN  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

E. HEWITT  
University of Washington  
Seattle 5, Washington

R. P. DILWORTH  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena 4, California

\* Alfred Horn  
University of California  
Los Angeles 24, California

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

H. BUSEMANN	P.R. HALMOS	R.D. JAMES	GEORGE PÓLYA
HERBERT FEDERER	HEINZ HOPF	BØRGE JESSEN	J.J. STOKER
MARSHALL HALL	ALFRED HORN	PAUL LEVY	KOSAKU YOSIDA

## SPONSORS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA  
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA  
OREGON STATE COLLEGE  
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
\* \* \*  
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY  
HUGHES AIRCRAFT COMPANY  
SHELL DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

## UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

---

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be typewritten (double spaced), and the author should keep a complete copy. Manuscripts may be sent to any of the editors. Manuscripts intended for the outgoing editors should be sent to their successors. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, Alfred Horn, at the University of California Los Angeles 24, California.

50 reprints of each article are furnished free of charge; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

---

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published quarterly, in March, June, September, and December. The price per volume (4 numbers) is \$12.00; single issues, \$3.50; back numbers (Volumes 1, 2, 3) are available at \$2.50 per copy. Special price to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: \$4.00 per volume; single issues, \$1.25.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to the publishers, University of California Press, Berkeley 4, California.

Printed at Ann Arbor, Michigan. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Berkeley, California.

\* During the absence of E.G. Straus.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS • BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES

COPYRIGHT 1955 BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Nesmith Cornett Ankeny and S. Chowla, <i>On the divisibility of the class number of quadratic fields</i> .....	321
Cecil Edmund Burgess, <i>Collections and sequences of continua in the plane</i> .....	325
Jane Smiley Cronin Scanlon, <i>The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear elliptic equations</i> .....	335
Arieh Dvoretzky, <i>A converse of Helly's theorem on convex sets</i> .....	345
Branko Grünbaum, <i>On a theorem of L. A. Santaló</i> .....	351
Moshe Shimrat, <i>Simple proof of a theorem of P. Kirchberger</i> .....	361
Michael Oser Rabin, <i>A note on Helly's theorem</i> .....	363
Robert E. Edwards, <i>On factor functions</i> .....	367
Robert E. Edwards, <i>On certain algebras of measures</i> .....	379
Harley M. Flanders, <i>Methods in affine connection theory</i> .....	391
Alfred Huber, <i>The reflection principle for polyharmonic functions</i> .....	433
Geoffrey Stuart Stephen Ludford, <i>Generalised Riemann invariants</i> .....	441
Ralph Gordon Selfridge, <i>Generalized Walsh transforms</i> .....	451