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1. Introduction. Let $S$ be an infinite set of power $n$, and let $m \geqslant 2$ be an integer. We denote by $P_{m}(S)$ or $[S]^{m}$ the set of all subsets of $S$, of power $m$. A corollary of the main theorem proves that : if we denote by $K_{n}^{m}$ the complete hypergraph having $P_{m}(S)$ as a set of edges (so its degree is $n$ ), then $K_{n}^{m}$ has $n$ for chromatic index. This result gives a positive answer to a conjecture of C. Berge .
2. Notations. Subsequently we assume the axiom of choice : particularly every infinite cardinal is an initial ordinal, denoted by $\omega_{\alpha}$. Moreover $\omega_{o}$ is written $\omega$. If $S$ is a set, its cardinality is denoted by $|S|$. If $m<|S|$ is a cardinal, then $P_{m}(S)$ or $[S]^{m}$ is the set of all subsets $Y$ of $S$ so that $|Y|=m$ : an element of $[S]^{m}$ is called a m-tuple.
3. Theorem 1. Let $p, m$ and $n$ be three cardinals so that $p<m<n$ and $1 \leqslant p<\omega \leqslant n$. If $S$ is a set of power $n$, there exists a partition $\left(\Delta_{k}\right)_{k \in I}$ of $[s]^{m}$, with $|I|=n^{m}$, such that for every $k$ in $I$, every p-tuple is included in exactly one m-tuple, member of $\Delta_{k}$.

If $p=1$, each $\Delta_{k}$ defines a partition of $S$ : the distinct sets, members of $\Delta_{k}$, are disjoint, and $\Delta_{k}$ is a covering of $S$. This solves a conjecture of $C$. Berge : for $2 \leqslant m<\omega$ and $|s| \geqslant \omega$, the complete hypergraph has a coloring of the edges such that each vertex meets all the colors.

From $1 \leqslant p<\omega$, it follows that for any $p$-tuple $z$ of $S$ and any m-tuple $A$ of $S$, the condition $Z \subset A$ is equivalent to : $|z \cap A|=|z|=p$. So this result is a corollary of the following theorem :
4. Theorem 2. Let $p, m$ and $n$ be three cardinals so that
$1 \leqslant p<m<n$ and $n^{p}=n \geqslant \omega$. If $S$ is a set of power $n$, there exists a partition $\left(\Delta_{k}\right)_{k \in I}$ of $[s]^{m}$, with $|I|=n^{m}$, so that for every $k \varepsilon I$, on the one hand for every $p$-tuple 2 of $S$, there is a m-tuple $A$, member of $\Delta_{k}$, so that $|Z \cap A|=p=|z|$, on the other hand, for distinct members $A^{\prime}$ and $A^{\prime \prime}$ of $\Delta_{k}$, we have $\left|A^{\prime} \cap A^{\prime \prime}\right|<p$.

In this theorem, and contrary to what happens in theorem 1 , whenever $p \geqslant \omega$, we cannot suppose that every $p$-tuple is included in exactly one member of $\Delta_{k}$. In fact, if we consider a $p-t u p l e ~ Z ~ a n d ~ s u p p o s e ~ t h e r e ~$ is a unique set $A$ in $\Delta_{k}$ which contains $Z$, then let $z$ be an element of $S-A$, so $|z \cup\{z\}|=p$, and there is a set $A^{\prime}$, member of $\Delta_{k}$, which contains $Z \cup\{z\}$. From $A^{\prime} \neq A^{\prime \prime}$, we obtain a contradiction. Moreover, we cannot suppose that for every p-tuple $Z$ in $S$, there is exactly one member $A$ of $\Delta_{k}$ such that $|z \cap A|=p=|z|$ : this is a consequence of the following remark : the union of two distinct p-tuples has $P$ for power .
5. Proof of theorem 2. If such a partition exists, on one hand $n^{P}=n$, on the other hand for every distinct sets $A^{\prime}$ and $A^{\prime \prime}$ of $\Delta_{k}$, we must have $\left|A^{\prime} \cap A^{\prime \prime}\right|<p$. Therefore $\left|\Delta_{k}\right|=n$, and so $|I|=n^{m}$. Moreover $n^{P}=n=\omega_{n}$ and $n^{m}=\omega_{\alpha}$, so we denote by $\left(B_{\xi}\right)_{\xi}<\omega_{\alpha}$ an enumeration of $[\mathrm{S}]^{\mathrm{m}}$ and by $\left(\mathrm{Z}_{\lambda}\right)_{\lambda}<\omega_{\eta}$ an enumeration of $[\mathrm{s}]^{\mathrm{p}}$. If m is finite, $m-p>0$ is an integer, $n$ otherwise $m-p$ is the cardinal $m$.

Suppose we defined the family $\left(\Delta_{k}\right)_{k<\gamma}$, when $\gamma<\omega_{\alpha}$, in such a way that we have :
a. for $k^{\prime}<k^{\prime \prime}<\gamma$, the sets $\Delta_{k^{\prime}}$ and $\Delta_{k^{\prime \prime}}$ are disjoint.
b. for $k<\gamma$, if $A^{\prime}$ and $A^{\prime \prime}$ are distinct sets of $\Delta_{k}$ then $\left|A^{\prime} \cap A^{\prime \prime}\right|<p$.
c. for $k<\gamma$, and for every $p$-tuple $Z$ in $S$, there is at least one set $A$, member of $\Delta_{k}$, such that $|z \cap A|=p=|z|$. d. if $\xi<\gamma$, for some $k<\gamma$, the m-tuple $B_{\xi}$ is a member of $\Delta_{k}$.

We will construct the family $\left(\Delta_{\gamma, \rho}\right)_{\rho}<\omega_{\eta}$ of sets of m-tuples such that the union of this family is $\Delta_{\gamma}$.

1. If $B_{Y}$ is a set, member of an already constructed $\Delta_{k}$, then $\Delta_{Y, 0}$ is the empty set.
2. If $B_{\gamma}$ belongs to no $\Delta_{k}$, for $k<\gamma$, then $\Delta_{\gamma, 0}$ is the singleton ( $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{Y}}$ ).

Let $\lambda^{\prime}$ be the smallest $\lambda$ so that $\left|z_{\lambda}, \cap A\right|<p$ for every set A, member of $\Delta_{\gamma, 0}$ (we have $\lambda^{\prime}=0$ iff: $\Delta_{Y, 0}$ is empty ; or $\left.\left|Z_{o} \cap B_{Y}\right|<p\right)$. If $\Delta_{Y, 0}$ is the empty set, we put $S_{0}=Z_{\lambda}$, otherwise we put $S_{o}=Z_{\lambda}, \cup B_{\gamma}$. For every $k<\gamma$ there is at most one subset $C_{k}$ of $S$, member of $\Delta_{k}$ so that $Z_{\lambda}, \subset c_{k}$. We know that $\left[S-S_{0}\right]^{m-p}$ has $n^{m-P}=n^{m}$ elements and thus there is a subset $D$ of $S-S_{o}$ verifying $|D|=m \sim p$ and so that : for every $k<\gamma$, the set $D \cup Z_{\lambda}$, which is a m-tuple, is not a member of $A_{k}$. We remark that for every $A$, member of $\Delta_{Y, O}$, we have $\left|\left(Z_{\lambda}, \cup D\right) \cap A\right|=\left|Z_{\lambda}, \cap A\right|<p$. Let $\xi$ ' be the smallest $\xi$ in $\omega_{a}$ so that :

1. For $k<\gamma$, the set $B_{\xi}$, does not belong to $\Delta_{k}$.
2. we have $\left|z_{\lambda}, \cap B_{\xi},\right|=p$.
3. for every $A$ in $\Delta_{\gamma, 0}$, we have $\left|B_{\xi}, \cap A\right|<p$ (this is verified whenever $\Delta_{Y, 0}$ is the empty set) .

We put $\Delta_{\gamma, 1}=\Delta_{\gamma, 0} \cup\left\{B_{\xi},\right\}$
Suppose we defined $\left(\Delta_{\gamma, v}\right)_{v}<\rho$, when $1 \leqslant \rho<\omega_{\eta}$, and verifying the following properties :
i. for $v^{\prime}<v^{\prime \prime}<\rho$ the set $\Delta_{\gamma, v^{\prime}}$ is included in $\Delta_{\gamma, v^{\prime \prime}}$
ii. for distinct m-tuples $A^{\prime}$ and $A^{\prime \prime}$ in $\Delta_{\gamma, v}$, then $\left|A^{\prime} \cap A^{\prime \prime}\right|<p$ iii. if $A$ is a set of $\Delta_{Y, \nu}$, for every $k<\gamma$, the set $A$ does not belong to $A_{k}$.

If $\rho$ is a limit ordinal, then $\Delta_{\gamma, p}$ is the union, for $\nu<p$, of $\Delta_{Y_{2} v}$.

If $\rho$ is an isolated ordinal, $\rho=\theta+1$, let $S_{1}^{\prime}$ be the union of all members $A$ of $\Delta_{\gamma, \theta}$. From $|A|=m<n$ and $|\rho|<n$, it follows that $\left|S^{\prime}{ }_{1}\right|<n$. Let $\lambda^{\prime \prime}$ be the smallest $\lambda$ so that for every set $A$, member of $\Delta_{\gamma, \theta}$, we have $\left|z_{\lambda^{\prime \prime}} \cap A\right|<p$. Such a $\lambda^{\prime \prime}$ exists because $\left|s-S^{\prime}{ }_{1}\right|=n_{n}$. We put $S_{1}=Z_{\lambda^{\prime \prime} \cup S_{1}^{\prime}}^{1}$. For every $k<\gamma$ there is at most a set $D_{k}$, member of $A_{k}$, so that $z_{\lambda^{\prime \prime}} \subset D_{k}$. We know that $\left[S-S_{1}\right]^{m " p}$ has $n^{n-p}=n^{m}$ elements, and thus there is a (m-p)-tuple $G$ of $S-S_{1}$ so that : on the one hand $\left|Z_{\lambda^{\prime \prime}} \cup G\right|=m$ (obvious), on the other hand $Z^{2}$ " $\cup G$ does not belong to every already constructed $\Delta_{k}$. Moreover for every set $A$, member of $A_{Y, \theta}$, we have $\left.\mid Z_{\lambda^{\prime \prime}} \cup G\right) \cap A\left|=\left|Z_{\lambda^{\prime \prime}} \cap A\right|<p\right.$. So let $\xi^{\prime \prime}$ be the smallest $\xi$ so that :
i. for any $k<\gamma$, the set $B_{\zeta^{\prime \prime}}$ is not a member of $\Delta_{k}$.
ii. we have $\left|Z_{\lambda^{\prime \prime}} \cap_{B_{\xi^{\prime \prime}}}\right|=\mathrm{p}$.
iii. for every member $A$ of $\Delta_{\gamma, \theta}$, we have $\left|A \cap B_{\xi^{\prime \prime}}\right|<p$.

Hence, we put $\Delta_{\gamma, \rho}=\Delta_{\gamma, \theta} \cup\left\{B_{\xi^{\prime \prime}}\right\}$ -
From the construction, it follows that the family $\left(\Delta_{\gamma, v}\right)_{v} \leqslant \rho$ verifies the conditions (i) , (ii) and (iii). Moreover if the family $\left(\Delta_{\gamma, \rho}\right)_{\rho}<\omega_{\eta}$ is constructed, then we put $\Delta_{\gamma}=\underbrace{\longrightarrow}_{\rho<\omega_{\eta}} \Delta_{\gamma, \rho}$. So the family $\left(\Delta_{k}\right)_{k \leqslant \gamma}$ verifies (a), (b), (c) and (d).

Our transfinite induction is complete, and so the family $\quad\left(\Delta_{k}\right)_{k<\omega_{\alpha}}$ verifies the conclusion of theorem 2 .
6. The case when $n^{P}>n$. Now, we assume the general continuum hypothesis (g.c.h.) . Let $n$ and $p$ be two infinite cardinals such that $n^{p}>n$. From g.c.h., it follows (by well known theorems [3] ) that $n=\omega_{\eta}$ is a singular cardinal and that its cofinal type $\operatorname{cf}\left(\omega_{n}\right)=\omega_{8}$ verifies $\operatorname{cf}(n)=\omega_{\beta} \leqslant p=\omega_{\delta}$. Moreover, if $n=\omega_{n}$, then $n^{+}=\omega_{n+1}$.
6.1 Theorem 3. Let $p, m$ and $n$ be three infinite cardinals such that $\omega \leqslant p<m<n<n^{p}, \quad c f(n)<p$ and $c f(n) \neq c f(p)$. If $S$ is a set of power $n$, there exists a partition $\left(\Delta_{k}\right)_{k} \in I$ of $[S]^{m}$, with $|I|=n^{m}$, so that for every $k \in I$, on the one hand for every p-tuple $Z$ of $S$, there is at least a mrtuple $A$, member of $\Delta_{k}$, such that $|z \cap A|=p=|z|$ on the other hand, for distinct members $A^{\prime}$ and $A^{\prime \prime}$ of $\Delta_{k}$, we have $\left|A^{\prime} \cap A^{\prime \prime}\right|<p$.

Proof. Let $S$ be a set of power $n$. So $S$ is the union of an increasing family of sets $\left(S_{v}\right)_{\nu}<\omega_{B}$ such that : on one hand for $v^{\prime}<v^{\prime \prime}<\omega_{B}$ the set $S_{V^{\prime}}$ is included ${ }^{\beta}$ in $S_{\nu^{\prime \prime}}$, on the other hand, for every $v<\omega_{\beta}$, we have $m<\left|S_{v}\right|=n_{v}<n$ and $n_{v}$ is a regular cardinal. From g.c.h., it follows that $\left[S_{\nu}\right]^{p}$ is a set of power $n_{v}$. Let $L$ be the union of $\left[S_{v}\right]^{P}$ for $v<\omega_{B}$, we have $|L|=n$. If we denote by $\left(Z_{\lambda}^{\prime}\right)_{\lambda}<\omega_{n}$ an enumeration of $L$, by the method used in the proof of theorem $2,{ }^{n}$ we can construct a partition $\left(\Delta_{k}\right)_{k \in I}$ of $[S]^{m}$ such that for every $k$ in $I$, on one hand, for every p-tuple $Z^{\prime}$, member of $L$, there is a m-tuple A in $\Delta_{k}$ such that $\left|Z^{\prime} \cap A\right|=p$, on the other hand, for distinct members $A^{\prime}$ and $A^{\prime \prime}$ of $\Delta_{k}$, we have

$$
\left|A^{\prime} \cap A^{\prime \prime}\right|<p
$$

a. $p$ is a regular cardinal. Let $Z$ be a p-tuple in $S$, there exists a $v<\omega_{B}$ so that $Z \cap S_{v}=Z^{\prime}$ verifies $\left|Z^{\prime}\right|=p$ : since $\omega_{B}=c f(n)<p$ and $p=c f(p)$. Therefore, there is at least a member $A$ of $\Delta_{k}$ so that $\left|z^{\prime} \cap A\right|=p$ (indeed $z^{\prime}$ belongs to $\left[s_{v}\right]^{p}$ ) and so $|z \cap A|=p$. From these remarks, it follows that the family $\left(\Delta_{k}\right)_{k \in I}$ satisfies the conclusions of the theorem.
b. $p$ is a singular cardinal such that $c f(n)<c f(p)<p$. Let $z$ be a p -tuple in S , there is some $v$ so that $\left|Z \cap S_{v}\right|=p$ : otherwise let $Z_{v}$ be the set $Z \cap S_{v}$; from $\left|z_{v}\right|<p$ and

$$
z=\sum_{v<\omega_{B}} z_{v}
$$

it follows that $|z|<p$ (this is a consequence of $\omega_{\beta}=c f(n)<c f(p)$ ). So, we conclude as before.
c. $p$ is a singular cardinal such that $c f(p)<c f(n)<p$. If $z$ is a $p$-tuple in $S$, there is at least a $v$ such that $\left|z \cap s_{v}\right|=p$. Otherwise let $Z_{v}$ be the set $Z \cap S_{v}$, so $Z$ is the union of $Z_{v}$ for $v<\omega_{B}=\operatorname{cf}(n)$ and we have $\left|z_{v}\right|=p_{v}<p$. It follows that $p$ is the lower upper bound of the family $\left(p_{\nu}\right)_{\nu<\omega_{\beta}}$. Since $\omega_{\beta}$ is a regular cardinal, we can suppose that we have $p_{v^{\prime}},<p_{v^{\prime \prime}}$ for $v^{\prime}<v^{\prime \prime}<\omega_{\beta}$. Therefore, $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{n})=\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{p})$, and we have a contradiction. We conclude as before.

Remark. Under theorem hypotheses, if $L$ is a subset of $[s]^{P}$ such that for every distinct members $Z^{\prime}$ and $Z^{\prime \prime}$ of $L$, we have $\left|z^{\prime} \cap z^{\prime \prime}\right|<p$, then $|L| \leqslant n$. Otherwise $|L| \geqslant n^{+}=2^{n}$ and for every $z$, member of $L$, let $v(Z)$ be a $v<\omega_{B}$ such that $\left|z \cap S_{v}\right|=p$. From $n^{+}=2^{n}$ is a regular cardinal and from $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{n})=\omega_{B}<\mathrm{n}<\mathrm{n}^{+}$, it follows that for some $\nu_{0}$ there are $\mathrm{n}^{+}$members Z of L such that $\nu(\mathrm{Z})=\nu_{0}$. Consequently there are at least two members $z^{\prime}$ and $z^{\prime \prime}$ of $L$ such that $\left|s_{v_{0}} \cap Z^{\prime} \cap Z^{\prime \prime}\right|=p \quad$ (this is a consequence of $\left|\left[s_{v_{0}}\right]^{p}\right|=\left|s_{v_{0}}\right|<n^{+}$), and we obtain a contradiction. This result is due to Tarski [4].
6.2

Theorem 4. Let $\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{m}$ and n be three infinite cardinals such that $\omega \leqslant p<m<n<\overline{n^{p}}$, and either $c f(n)=p$, or $c f(n)=c f(p)$. If $S$ is a set of power $n$, there is no subset $\Delta$ of $[s]^{m}$ so that on one hand, for every $p$-tuple $Z$ in $S$ there is at least a member $A$ of such that $|Z \cap A|=P$, on the other hand for distinct members $A^{\prime}$ and $A^{\prime \prime}$ of $\Delta$, we have $\left|A^{\prime} \cap A^{\prime \prime}\right|<p$.

Consequently, there is no partition $\left(\Delta_{k}\right)_{k} \in I$ of $[S]^{m}$ such that every $\Delta_{k}$ verifies the properties of the $\Delta$ above. Frascella, in [2], uses some similar idea.

Proof. First, we will prove that if such a $\Delta$ exists, then $|\Delta| \geqslant n^{+}=2^{n}$. To show this, we suppose $|\Delta| \leqslant n$, and thus $|\Delta|=n=\omega_{n}$. We denote by $\left(A_{\xi}\right)_{\xi<n}$ an enumeration of all members of $\Delta$. We know that $n=\omega_{n}$ is the union of $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{n})=\omega_{B}$ strictly increasing sets $n_{v}$ for $v<\omega_{B}$, with $\left|n_{v}\right|<n$.
a. if we have $c f(n)=p$, then we can construct, by transfinite induction, a sequence of elements ${ }_{w}{ }_{v}$ in $S$, such that ${ }_{w}{ }_{v}$ does not belong to the union $V_{v}$ of $A_{\xi}$ for $\xi \in \in_{v}$, and ${ }_{v}$, is distinct from every already constructed $W_{v}$, This is possible : indeed let $W_{v}$ be the union of $v_{v}$ and the set of $W_{v^{\prime}}$ for $v^{\prime}<v$, we have $\left|W_{v}\right|<n$ and thus $\left|S-W_{v}\right|=n$. We denote by $Z$ the set of all $w_{v}$ for $v<p$. b. if we have $c f(n)=c f(p)<p$, then $p$ is a singular cardinal. Let $\left(p_{\nu}\right)_{\nu<c f(p)}$ be a partition of $p$ so that $\left|p_{\nu}\right|<p$ for $v<c f(p)$. We construct, by transfinite induction, a sequence of subsets $Z_{v}$ of $S$, for $v<c f(p)$, such that : on one hand $Z_{v}$ is disjoint from every already constructed $Z_{v}$, on the other hand $Z_{v}$ is disjoint from the union of $A_{\xi}$ for $\xi \in n_{v}$. We denote by $Z$ the union of $Z_{v}$ for $v<c f(p)$.

In these two cases $Z$ verifies $|Z|=p$. From the construction of $Z$, it follows that for every member $A_{\xi}$ of $\Delta$, we have $\left|z \cap A_{\xi}\right|<p$. Contradiction. So $|\Delta| \geqslant n^{+}=2^{n}$.

Every set $A_{\xi}$, member of $\Delta$, meets, for some $v<\operatorname{cf}(n)=\omega_{B}$ the set $S_{v}$ in a set $B_{\xi, v}$ of power $\geqslant p$ ( since $p<m$ ). From $n^{+}=2^{n}$, and from $\omega_{\beta_{+}}=c f(n) \leqslant p<n<n^{+}$, it follows that for some $v^{\prime}<c f(n)<n^{+}$, there are $n^{+} \operatorname{set} A_{\xi}$, members of $\Delta$, such that $\left|B_{\xi, v^{\prime}}\right| \geqslant p$. For such ( $\left.\xi, v^{\prime}\right)$ let $C_{\xi, v^{\prime}}$ be a subset of $B_{\xi, v^{\prime}}$ of power $P$. So $C_{\xi, v^{\prime}}$ is included in $A_{\xi} \cap S_{\nu^{\prime}}$ and $C_{\xi, \nu^{\prime}}$ belongs to $\left[S_{\nu}\right]^{P}$. Therefore, from $\left|S_{v^{\prime}}\right|<n$, and so $\left|\left[S_{v^{\prime}}\right]^{\mathrm{P}}\right|<n<n^{+}$(this is a consequence of g.c.h.), it follows that there are two distinct sets $A_{\xi^{\prime}}$ and $A_{\xi^{\prime \prime}}$, members of $\Delta$, so that $C_{\xi^{\prime}, v^{\prime}}=C_{\xi^{\prime \prime}, v^{\prime}}$. So $\left|A_{\xi^{\prime}} \cap A_{\xi^{\prime \prime}}\right| \geqslant p$, and we have a contradiction .

Remark. Under theorem hypotheses, if $S$ is a set of power $n$, there is a subset $L$ of $[S]^{p}$, of power $n^{+}=2^{n}$, such that for every distinct
members $Z^{\prime}$ and $Z^{\prime \prime}$ of $L$, we have $\left|Z^{\prime} \cap Z^{\prime \prime}\right|<p$ (this result is in Tarski [4] ).
7. Problem. We don't know if the theorem 2 is true whenever $p=\omega$, $m=\omega_{1}, n=\omega_{2}$ and $n^{p}=\omega_{3}=2^{p}$ : we do not suppose g.c.h. .
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