

A CONSTRUCTION OF GRAPHS WITHOUT TRIANGLES HAVING
PRE-ASSIGNED ORDER AND CHROMATIC NUMBER

P. ERDÖS and R. RADO*.

1. *Introduction and statement of result.*

The chromatic number $\chi(\Gamma)$ of a combinatorial graph Γ is the least cardinal number a such that the set of nodes of Γ can be divided into a subsets so that every edge of Γ joins nodes belonging to different subsets. It is known† that corresponding to every finite a there exists a finite graph Γ_a without triangles satisfying $\chi(\Gamma_a) = a$. In [1], Theorem 2, we have extended this result to transfinite values of a . For every graph Γ the order $\phi(\Gamma)$, i.e. the cardinal of the set of nodes of Γ , satisfies $\phi(\Gamma) \geq \chi(\Gamma)$. The construction used in [1] was of considerable complexity and did not allow us to prove that it was most economical, i.e. that it leads to a graph Γ_a such that $\phi(\Gamma_a) = a$. This equation was only established ([1], Theorem 3) when essential use was made of a form of the general continuum hypothesis.

In the present note we describe a much simpler construction of such a graph Γ_a and we shall at the same time prove, without using the continuum hypothesis, that our new graph Γ_a satisfies $\phi(\Gamma_a) = \chi(\Gamma_a) = a$. Trivially, for instance by adding isolated nodes to the graph, we can make its order equal to any given cardinal b such that $b \geq a$, without changing the chromatic number or introducing any triangles.

THEOREM. *Given $a \geq \aleph_0$, there is a graph Γ_a without triangles such that*

$$\phi(\Gamma_a) = \chi(\Gamma_a) = a.$$

The proof depends on some lemmas, each a special case of a more general proposition. An essential part is played by Lemma 4, which is an adaptation of a result due to Specker [2].

2. *Notation.*

We use the notation set out in [1], §2. Every small letter, unless the contrary is stated, denotes an ordinal. The order type of an ordered set A is denoted by $\text{tp } A$. If A, B, \dots are elements of an ordered set then the symbol $\{A, B, \dots\}_<$ denotes the set $\{A, B, \dots\}$ and at the same time expresses the fact that $A < B < \dots$. For a cardinal r , the partition relation‡

$$\alpha \rightarrow (\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_n)^r \tag{1}$$

* Received 25 June, 1959; read 19 November, 1959.

† [3], [4], [5].

‡ The obliteration operator $\hat{}$ removes from a well-ordered sequence the term above which it is placed.

expresses the fact that whenever $\text{tp } A = \alpha$; $[A]^r = \Sigma(\nu < n) K_\nu$, there is a subset B of A and an ordinal $\nu < n$ such that $\text{tp } B = \beta_\nu$; $[B]^r \subset K_\nu$. If $\theta_0 = \dots = \hat{\beta}_n = \beta$ we write (1) also in the form

$$\alpha \rightarrow (\beta)_{|n|}^r.$$

The logical negation of (1) is denoted by

$$\alpha \nrightarrow (\beta_0, \dots, \hat{\beta}_n)^r.$$

3. Lemmas.

Throughout Lemmas 1-5 we denote by α a fixed ordinal such that either $\alpha = \omega_0$ or α is of the form $\omega_{\lambda+1}$. In the proofs of Lemmas 2, 3, 5 only the case $\alpha = \omega_{\lambda+1}$ is considered. The case $\alpha = \omega_0$ can be dealt with by making the obvious modifications and is easier.

LEMMA 1. *Let β be an ordinal and c a cardinal such that*

$$\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha)_c^1; \beta \rightarrow (\beta)_c^1.$$

Then

$$\alpha\beta \rightarrow (\alpha\beta)_c^1.$$

Proof. Let $S = \{(y, x) : x < \alpha; y < \beta\}$, and order S lexicographically. Then $\text{tp } S = \alpha\beta$. Let $|N| = c$; $S = \Sigma(\nu \in N) S_\nu$. Choose any $y < \beta$. Put $A_\nu(y) = \{x : (y, x) \in S_\nu\}$ ($\nu \in N$). Then, since every $x < \alpha$ is a member of some $A_\nu(y)$, $[0, \alpha) = \Sigma(\nu \in N) A_\nu(y)$, and by $\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha)_{|N|}^1$ there is an element $\nu(y)$ of N with $\text{tp } A_{\nu(y)} \geq \alpha$. Put $B_\nu = \{y : \nu(y) = \nu\}$ ($\nu \in N$). Then, since y can take any value less than β , $[0, \beta) = \Sigma(\nu \in N) B_\nu$, and by $\beta \rightarrow (\beta)_{|N|}^1$ there is $\nu_0 \in N$ such that $\text{tp } B_{\nu_0} \geq \beta$. Then $\text{tp } A_{\nu_0}(y) \geq \alpha$ ($y \in B_{\nu_0}$), and the set $D = \{(y, x) : y \in B_{\nu_0}; x \in A_{\nu_0}(y)\}$ satisfies

$$D \subset S_{\nu_0}; \text{tp } S_{\nu_0} \geq \text{tp } D = \alpha\beta.$$

This proves Lemma 1.

LEMMA 2. $\alpha^3 \rightarrow (\alpha^3)_p^1$ for every cardinal p such that $p < |\alpha|$.

Proof. We need only consider the case $\alpha = \omega_{\lambda+1}$; $p = \aleph_\lambda$. Let $[0, \alpha) = \Sigma(\nu < \omega_\lambda) S_\nu$. If for all $\nu < \omega_\lambda$ we have $|S_\nu| \leq \aleph_\lambda$ then the contradiction $\aleph_{\lambda+1} \leq \Sigma(\nu < \omega_\lambda) |S_\nu| \leq \aleph_\lambda^2 = \aleph_\lambda$ follows. Hence there is $\nu_0 < \omega_\lambda$ with $|S_{\nu_0}| = \aleph_{\lambda+1}$, and so $\text{tp } S_{\nu_0} = \alpha$. This proves $\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha)_{\aleph_\lambda}^1$, and Lemma 2 follows by two applications of Lemma 1.

LEMMA 3. *Let $k < \omega_0$, and let V be a set of vectors (x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_k) with $x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_k < \alpha$, ordered lexicographically. Let $\text{tp } V = \alpha^k$. Then there are sets $T_\nu(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_k) \subset [0, \alpha)$ with $\text{tp } T_\nu(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_k) = \alpha$ ($\nu < k$; $x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_k < \alpha$) such that the relations $x_\nu \in T_\nu(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_k)$ ($\nu < k$) imply $(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_k) \in V$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha = \omega_{\lambda+1}$. The assertion holds for $k = 0$. Let $k \geq 1$, and use induction with respect to k . Put

$$f(x_0) = \{(x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_k) : (x_0, x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_k) \in V\} \quad (x_0 < \alpha).$$

Then $\text{tp} f(x) \leq \alpha^{k-1} (x < \alpha)$; $\text{tp} V = \Sigma(x < \alpha) \text{tp} f(x)$.

Put $T_0 = \{x : \text{tp} f(x) = \alpha^{k-1}\}$.

Assume that $\text{tp} T_0 < \alpha$.

Then $\text{tp} T_0 < \omega_{\lambda+1}$; $|T_0| \leq \aleph_\lambda$, and T_0 is not cofinal in $[0, \alpha)$. There is $\beta < \alpha$ with $T_0 \subset [0, \beta)$. If $k = 1$ then the contradiction

$$\alpha = \text{tp} V = \Sigma(x < \beta) \text{tp} f(x) \leq \beta$$

follows. Now let $k \geq 2$. Then $\text{tp} f(x) \leq \alpha^{k-2} \delta(x)$ where

$$\delta(x) < \alpha; \quad |\delta(x)| \leq \aleph_\lambda \quad (\beta \leq x < \alpha).$$

If $\beta \leq \gamma < \alpha$ then

$$|\delta(\beta) + \dots + \hat{\delta}(\gamma)| \leq \aleph_\lambda |\gamma| \leq \aleph_\lambda; \quad \delta(\beta) + \dots + \hat{\delta}(\gamma) < \omega_{\lambda+1} = \alpha.$$

Hence $\sigma = \delta(\beta) + \dots + \hat{\delta}(\alpha) \leq \alpha$, and we obtain the contradiction

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tp} V &\leq \Sigma(x < \beta) \alpha^{k-1} + \Sigma(\beta \leq x < \alpha) \alpha^{k-2} \delta(x) = \alpha^{k-1} \beta + \alpha^{k-2} \sigma \\ &\leq \alpha^{k-1} (\beta + 1) < \alpha^k. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the assumption is false, and $\text{tp} T_0 = \alpha$.

Let $x_0 \in T_0$. By induction hypothesis, applied to $f(x_0)$, there are sets

$$T_\nu(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_\nu) \subset [0, \alpha) \quad (1 \leq \nu < k; x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_\nu < \alpha)$$

with $\text{tp} T_\nu(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_\nu) = \alpha \quad (1 \leq \nu < k; x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_\nu < \alpha)$

such that whenever

$$x_\nu \in T_\nu(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_\nu) \quad (1 \leq \nu < k)$$

then $(x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_k) \in f(x_0)$. Put

$$T_\nu(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_\nu) = [0, \alpha) \quad (1 \leq \nu < k; x_0 \in [0, \alpha) - T_0; x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_\nu < \alpha).$$

Then the sets T_ν ($\nu < k$) satisfy the assertion of Lemma 3.

LEMMA 4. $\alpha^3 \mapsto (3, \alpha^3)^2$.

Proof. Put $S = \{(x, y, z) : x, y, z < \alpha\}$ and order S lexicographically. Then $\text{tp} S = \alpha^3$; $[S]^2 = K_0 + K_1$; $K_0 K_1 = \emptyset$,

$$K_0 = \left\{ \{(a_0, a_1, a_2), (b_0, b_1, b_2)\} : a_1 < b_0 < a_2 < b_1 < \alpha \right\}.$$

If ordinals a_ν, b_ν, c_ν satisfy

$$[\{(a_0, a_1, a_2), (b_0, b_1, b_2), (c_0, c_1, c_2)\}]^2 \subset K_0$$

then the contradiction $a_2 < b_1 < c_0 < a_2$ follows.

If, on the other hand, a subset V of S satisfies $\text{tp} V = \alpha^3$; $[V]^2 \subset K_1$ then there are sets T_ν which have, for $k = 3$, the properties mentioned in Lemma 3. Then there are ordinals a_ν, b_ν such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 \in T_0; \quad a_1 \in T_1(a_0) - [0, a_0 + 1); \quad b_0 \in T_0 - [0, a_1 + 1), \\ a_2 \in T_2(a_0, a_1) - [0, b_0 + 1); \quad b_1 \in T_1(b_0) - [0, a_2 + 1); \quad b_2 \in T_2(b_0, b_1). \end{aligned}$$

But then the contradiction $\{(a_0, a_1, a_2), (b_0, b_1, b_2)\}_{<} \in K_0[V]^2 = \emptyset$ follows. This proves Lemma 4.

LEMMA 5. *There is a graph Γ without triangles such that, if $\chi(\Gamma) = e$,*

$$\phi(\Gamma) = |\alpha|; \quad \alpha^3 \rightarrow (\alpha^3)_e^1.$$

Proof. Let $\alpha = \omega_{\lambda+1}$; $\text{tp } S = \alpha^3$. By Lemma 4 there is a partition $[S]^2 = K_0 + K_1$ such that (i) there is no $A \subset S$ such that $\text{tp } A = 3$; $[A]^2 \subset K_0$, (ii) there is no $B \subset S$ such that $\text{tp } B = \alpha^3$; $[B]^2 \subset K_1$. Put $\Gamma = (S, K_0)$. Then Γ has no triangle, and $\phi(\Gamma) = |S| = |\alpha^3| = \aleph_{\lambda+1}$. Let $|N| = \chi(\Gamma)$. Then there is a function g from S into N such that $g(x) = g(y)$ implies $\{x, y\} \notin K_0$. Then $S = \sum(\nu \in N) S_\nu$, where $S_\nu = \{x: g(x) = \nu\}$ ($\nu \in N$). Let $\nu \in N$. If $x, y \in S_\nu$, then $g(x) = \nu = g(y)$; $\{x, y\} \notin K_0$. Hence $[S_\nu]^2 \subset K_1$; whence by (ii) above $\text{tp } S_\nu < \alpha^3$. This proves $\alpha^3 \rightarrow (\alpha^3)_{|N|}^1$ and completes the proof of Lemma 5.

Proof of the Theorem.

Case 1. $a = \aleph_0$. By Lemma 5, with $\alpha = \omega_0$, there is a graph Γ without triangles such that $\phi(\Gamma) = \aleph_0$; $\omega_0^3 \rightarrow (\omega_0^3)_e^1$, where $e = \chi(\Gamma)$. By Lemma 2 it follows that $e \geq \aleph_0$. Hence $\aleph_0 \leq \chi(\Gamma) \leq \phi(\Gamma) = \aleph_0$, and we may put $\Gamma_a = \Gamma$.

Case 2. $a > \aleph_0$. Put $M = \{b^+: \aleph_1 \leq b^+ \leq a\}$, where b^+ denotes the next larger cardinal to the cardinal b . Then $\aleph_1 \in M$; $|M| \leq a$. Let $c = b^+ \in M$. Then $b = \aleph_\lambda$ for some λ . Put $\alpha = \omega_{\lambda+1}$. By Lemma 5 there is a graph Γ_c' without triangles such that $\phi(\Gamma_c') = \aleph_{\lambda+1}$; $\alpha^3 \rightarrow (\alpha^3)_e^1$, where $e = \chi(\Gamma_c')$. Then, by Lemma 2, $e \geq c$. We can arrange that $\Gamma_c' = (A_c, B_c)$, where $A_{c_0} A_{c_1} = \emptyset$ ($\{c_0, c_1\}_{<} \subset M$). Put

$$\Gamma_a = \left(\sum(c \in M) A_c, \sum(c \in M) B_c \right).$$

Then $\chi(\Gamma_a) \geq \chi(\Gamma_{\aleph_1}') \geq \aleph_1$. If $\chi(\Gamma_a) = d < a$, then $\aleph_2 \leq d^+ \leq a$; $d^+ \in M$, and we obtain the contradiction $\chi(\Gamma_a) \geq \chi(\Gamma_{d^+}') \geq d^+$. Hence

$$a \leq \chi(\Gamma_a) \leq \phi(\Gamma_a) = |\sum(c \in M) A_c| \leq \sum(c \in M) a = a |M| \leq a,$$

and the theorem is proved.

References.

1. P. Erdős and R. Rado, "Partition relations connected with the chromatic number of graphs", *Journal London Math. Soc.*, 34 (1959), 63-72.
2. E. Specker, "Teilmengen von Mengen mit Relationen", *Commentarii Math. Helvetii*, 31 (1957), 302-314.
3. Blanche Descartes, "A three colour problem", *Eureka* (April, 1947) (Solution: March, 1948).
4. ———, "Solution to Advanced Problem No. 4526", *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 61 (1954), 352.
5. J. B. Kelly and L. M. Kelly, "Paths and circuits in critical graphs", *Amer. J. of Math.*, 76 (1954), 729.

The University, Birmingham.

The University, Reading.