

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  $\Gamma$  is the least cardinal number  $a$  such that the set of nodes of  $\Gamma$  can be divided into  $a$  subsets so that every edge of  $\Gamma$  joins nodes belonging to different subsets. It is known† that corresponding to every finite  $a$  there exists a finite graph  $\Gamma_a$  without triangles satisfying  $\chi(\Gamma_a) = a$ . In [1], Theorem 2, we have extended this result to transfinite values of  $a$ . For every graph  $\Gamma$  the order  $\phi(\Gamma)$ , i.e. the cardinal of the set of nodes of  $\Gamma$ , 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  $\Gamma_a$  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  $\Gamma_a$  and we shall at the same time prove, without using the continuum hypothesis, that our new graph  $\Gamma_a$  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  $\Gamma_a$  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  $\hat{\phantom{x}}$  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  $\alpha$  a fixed ordinal such that either  $\alpha = \omega_0$  or  $\alpha$  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  $\beta$  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  $\text{tp } A_{\nu(y)}(y) \geq \alpha$ . Put  $B_\nu = \{y : \nu(y) = \nu\}$  ( $\nu \in N$ ). Then, since  $y$  can take any value less than  $\beta$ ,  $[0, \beta) = \Sigma(\nu \in N) B_\nu$ , 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  $T_\nu$  ( $\nu < k$ ) 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  $a_\nu, b_\nu, c_\nu$  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  $T_\nu$  which have, for  $k = 3$ , the properties mentioned in Lemma 3. Then there are ordinals  $a_\nu, b_\nu$  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  $\Gamma$  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  $\Gamma$  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  $\Gamma$  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  $\lambda$ . Put  $\alpha = \omega_{\lambda+1}$ . By Lemma 5 there is a graph  $\Gamma_c'$  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

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

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.