

On Taylor's problem

P. Komjáth and S. Shelah

By extending finite theorems Erdős and Rado proved that for every infinite cardinal κ there is a κ -chromatic triangle-free graph [3]. In later work they were able to add the condition that the graph itself be of cardinal κ [4]. The next stage, eliminating 4-circuits, turned out to be different, as it was shown by Erdős and Hajnal [1] that every uncountably chromatic graph contains a 4-circuit. In fact, every finite bipartite graph must be contained, but odd circuits can be omitted up to a certain length. This solved the problem "which finite graphs must be contained in every κ -chromatic graph" for every $\kappa > \omega$. The next result was given by Erdős, Hajnal, and Shelah [2], namely, every uncountably chromatic graph contains all odd circuits from some length onward. They, as well as Taylor, asked the following problem. If κ, λ are uncountable cardinals and X is a κ -chromatic graph, is there a λ -chromatic graph Y such that every finite subgraph of Y appears as a subgraph of X . In [2] the following much stronger conjecture was posed. If X is uncountably chromatic, then for some n it contains all finite subgraphs of the so-called n -shift graph. This conjecture was, however, disproved in [5].

Here we give some results on Taylor's conjecture when the additional hypotheses $|X| = \kappa, |Y| = \lambda$ are imposed.

We describe some (countably many) classes $\mathcal{K}^{n,e}$ of finite graphs and prove that if $\lambda^{\aleph_0} = \lambda$ then every λ^+ -chromatic graph of cardinal λ^+ contains, for some n, e , all members of $\mathcal{K}^{n,e}$ as subgraphs. On the other hand, it is consistent for every regular infinite cardinal κ that there is a κ^+ -chromatic graph on κ^+ that contains finite subgraphs only from $\mathcal{K}^{n,e}$. We get, therefore, some models of set theory, where the finite subgraphs of graphs with $|X| = \text{Chr}(X) = \kappa^+$ for regular uncountable cardinals κ are described.

We notice that in [6] all countable graphs are described which appear in every graph with uncountable coloring number.

Notation. \bar{x} will denote a finite string of ordinals. $\bar{x} < \bar{y}$ means that $\max(\bar{x}) < \min(\bar{y})$.

Definition. Assume that $1 \leq n < \omega, e : \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a function with $|f^{-1}(0)| = n$. We are going to define the structures in $\mathcal{K}^{n,e}$ as follows. They will be of the form $H = (V, <, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n)$ where $(V, <)$ is a finite linearly ordered set, $U \subseteq V, X$ is a graph on $U, h_i : U \rightarrow V$ satisfy $h_1(x) < \dots < h_n(x) = x$ for $x \in U$. The elements in $\mathcal{K}_0^{n,e}$ are those isomorphic to $(V, <, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n)$ where $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, <$ is the natural ordering, $U = \{n\}, X = \emptyset, h_i(n) = i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$).

If $H = (V, <, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n)$ is a structure of the above form, and $x \in V$, we form the edgeless amalgamation $H' = H +_x H$ as follows. Put $H' = H +_x H = (V', <', U', X', h'_1, \dots, h'_n)$ where $(V', <')$ has the $<'$ -ordered decomposition $V' = W \cup V_0 \cup V_1$, if we put $V'_i = W \cup V_i$ for $i < 2$ then the structures

$$(V'_i, <' | V'_i, U' \cap V'_i, h'_1 | V'_i, \dots, h'_n | V'_i)$$

The first author acknowledges the support of the Hungarian OTKA grant 2117.

Publication number No. 346 on the second author's list. His research was partially covered by the Israel Academy Basic Research Fund.

are both isomorphic to H for $i < 2$ and $\min(V_i)$ correspond to x under the isomorphisms.

If $H = (V, <, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n)$ is a structure of the above form, and $x \in U$, we also form the one-edge amalgamation $H' = H *_x H$ as follows. Enumerate in increasing order $e^{-1}(0)$ as $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and $e^{-1}(1)$ as $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$. Put $H' = (V', <', U', X', h'_1, \dots, h'_n)$ where $(V', <')$ has the ordered decomposition $V' = V_0 \cup V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_{2n}$; $H'|_{(V_0 \cup \bigcup\{V_i : e(i) = \varepsilon\})}$ are isomorphic to H ($\varepsilon = 0, 1$) if x_0, x_1 are the points corresponding to x , then $h'_i(x_0) = \min(V_{a_i}), h'_i(x_1) = \min(V_{b_i})$, and the only extra edge in X' is $\{x_0, x_1\}$.

We then put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{t+1}^{n,e} = & \{H +_x H : H = (V, <, U, \dots) \in \mathcal{K}_t^{n,e}, x \in V\} \\ & \cup \{H *_y H : H = (V, <, U, \dots) \in \mathcal{K}_t^{n,e}, y \in U\}, \end{aligned}$$

and finally $\mathcal{K}^{n,e} = \bigcup\{\mathcal{K}_t^{n,e} : t < \omega\}$.

Theorem 1. *If $|G| = \text{Chr}(G) = \lambda^+$, $\lambda^{\aleph_0} = \lambda$, then, for some n, e , G contains every graph in $\mathcal{K}^{n,e}$ as subgraph.*

We start with some technical observations.

Lemma 1. *If $t_n : \lambda^+ \rightarrow \lambda^+$ are functions ($n < \omega$), then there is a λ -coloring $F : \lambda^+ \rightarrow \lambda$ such that for $F(\alpha) = F(\beta)$, $i, j < \omega$, $\alpha < t_i(\beta) < t_j(\alpha)$ may not hold.*

Proof. As $\lambda^{\aleph_0} = \lambda$, it suffices to show this for two functions $t_0(\alpha), t_1(\alpha)$, with $t_1(\alpha) > \alpha$. We prove the stronger statement that there is a function $F : \lambda^+ \rightarrow [\lambda]^\lambda$ such that if $\alpha < t_0(\beta) < t_1(\alpha)$ then $F(\alpha) \cap F(\beta) = \emptyset$. Let $\langle N_\xi : \xi < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a continuous, increasing sequence of elementary submodels of $\langle \lambda^+; <, t_0, t_1, \dots \rangle$ with $\gamma_\xi = N_\xi \cap \lambda^+ < \lambda^+$. $C = \{\gamma_\xi : \xi < \lambda^+\}$ is closed, unbounded. We define $F|\gamma_\xi$ by transfinite recursion on ξ . If $F|\gamma_\xi$ is given, and β has $t_0(\beta) < \gamma_\xi \leq \beta < \gamma_{\xi+1}$, by elementarity $\tau = \sup\{t_1(\alpha) : \alpha < t_0(\beta)\} < \gamma_\xi$, and there is a β' with $t_0(\beta') = t_0(\beta)$, $\tau < \beta' < \gamma_\xi$. Put $H(\beta) = F(\beta')$, otherwise, i.e., when $\gamma_\xi \leq t_0(\beta)$, put $H(\beta) = \lambda$. To get $F|\gamma_\xi$, we disjointize $\{H(\beta) : \gamma_\xi \leq \beta < \gamma_{\xi+1}\}$, i.e., find $F(\beta) \subseteq H(\beta)$ of cardinal λ such that $F(\beta_0) \cap F(\beta_1) = \emptyset$ for $\beta_0 \neq \beta_1$. We show that this F works. Assume that $F(\alpha), F(\beta)$ are not disjoint. By induction we can assume that either α or β is between γ_ξ and $\gamma_{\xi+1}$. By the disjointization process some of them must be smaller than γ_ξ . If $\beta < \gamma_\xi \leq \alpha < \gamma_{\xi+1}$ then $t_0(\beta) < \gamma_\xi$ as N_ξ is an elementary submodel, so $t_0(\beta) < \alpha$. Assume now that $\alpha < \gamma_\xi \leq \beta < \gamma_{\xi+1}$. Our construction then selected a β' with $t_0(\beta') = t_0(\beta)$ and $F(\beta) \subseteq H(\beta) = F(\beta')$ which is, by the inductive hypothesis, disjoint from $F(\alpha)$. \square

Lemma 2. *If $C = \{\delta_\xi : \xi < \lambda^+\}$ is a club then there is a function $K : [\lambda^+]^{\aleph_0} \rightarrow \lambda$ such that if $K(A) = K(B)$ and $A \cap [\delta_\xi, \delta_{\xi+1}) \neq \emptyset$ and $B \cap [\delta_\xi, \delta_{\xi+1}) \neq \emptyset$ for some $\xi < \lambda^+$ then $A \cap \delta_{\xi+1} = B \cap \delta_{\xi+1}$ and so $A \cap B$ is an initial segment both in A and B .*

Proof. Fix for every $\beta < \lambda^+$ an into function $F_\beta : \alpha \rightarrow \lambda$ such that for $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2$, $F_{\beta_1}(\beta_0) \neq F_{\beta_2}(\beta_1)$ holds. This can be done by a straightforward inductive construction.

If $A \in [\lambda^+]^{\aleph_0}$ put $X(A) = \{\xi : A \cap [\delta_\xi, \delta_{\xi+1}) \neq \emptyset\}$. Let $\text{tp}(X(A)) = \eta$. Enumerate $X(A)$ as $\{\tau_\theta^A : \theta < \eta\}$. Let $K(A)$ be a function with domain η , at $\theta < \eta$, if $\tau_\theta^A = \xi$, let

$$K(A)(\theta) = \langle \{F_{\tau_\theta^A}(\tau_{\theta'}^A) : \theta' < \theta\}, \{F_{\delta_{\xi+1}}(y) : y \in A \cap \delta_{\xi+1}\} \rangle.$$

Assume now that $K(A) = K(B)$, $\xi \in X(A) \cap X(B)$. If $\xi = \tau_\theta^A = \tau_{\theta'}^B$ then $\theta = \theta'$ by the properties of F above. The second part of the definition of $K(A)$ gives that $A \cap \delta_{\xi+1} = B \cap \delta_{\xi+1}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. We first show that one can assume that G is λ^+ -chromatic on every closed unbounded set.

Lemma 3. *There is a function $f : \lambda^+ \rightarrow \lambda^+$ such that if $C \subseteq \lambda^+$ is a closed unbounded set then $\bigcup\{[\alpha, f(\alpha)] : \alpha \in C\}$ is λ^+ -chromatic.*

Proof. Assume that the statement of the Lemma fails. Put $f_0(\alpha) = \alpha$, for $n < \omega$ let C_n witness that $f_n : \lambda^+ \rightarrow \lambda^+$ is not good and $f_{n+1}(\alpha) = \min(C_n - (\alpha + 1))$. As, by assumption, $\bigcup\{[\alpha, f_n(\alpha)] : \alpha \in C_n, n < \omega\}$ is $\leq \lambda$ -chromatic, there is a

$$\gamma \notin \bigcup\{[\alpha, f_n(\alpha)] : \alpha \in C_n, n < \omega\}, \gamma > \min\left(\bigcap\{C_n : n < \omega\}\right).$$

Clearly, $\gamma \notin C_n$ ($n < \omega$), and if now $\alpha_n = \max(\gamma \cap C_n)$, then $\alpha_n < \gamma$, and $\alpha_{n+1} < \alpha_n$ ($n < \omega$), a contradiction. \square

By slightly re-ordering λ^+ we can state Lemma 3 as follows. If $C \subseteq \lambda^+$ is a closed unbounded set, then $S(C) = \bigcup\{[\lambda\alpha, \lambda(\alpha + 1)) : \alpha \in C\}$ is λ^+ -chromatic. Put, for $\tau < \lambda$, $C \subseteq \lambda^+$ a club set, $S_\tau(C) = \bigcup\{\lambda\alpha + \tau : \alpha \in C\}$. If, for every $\tau < \lambda$ there is some closed unbounded C_τ that $S_\tau(C_\tau)$ is λ -chromatic, then for $C = \bigcap\{C_\tau : \tau < \lambda\}$, $S(C)$ is the union of at most λ graphs, each $\leq \lambda$ -chromatic, a contradiction.

There is, therefore, a $\tau < \lambda$ such that $S_\tau(C)$ is λ^+ -chromatic whenever C is a closed unbounded set. Mapping $\lambda\alpha + \tau$ to α we get a graph on λ^+ , order-isomorphic to a subgraph of the original graph which is λ^+ -chromatic on every closed unbounded set. From now on we assume that our original graph G has this property.

We are going to build a model $M = \langle \lambda^+; <, \lambda, G, \dots \rangle$ by adding countably many new functions.

For n, e as in the Definition, φ a first order formula, let $G_\varphi^{n,e}$ be the following graph. The vertex set is $V_\varphi = \{\langle \bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n \rangle : \bar{x}_0 < \dots < \bar{x}_n, M \models \varphi(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n)\}$ and $\langle \bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n \rangle, \langle \bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_n \rangle$ are joined, if $\bar{x}_0 = \bar{y}_0$, $\{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}, \{\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_n\}$ interlace by e , and finally $\{\min(\bar{x}_n), \min(\bar{y}_n)\} \in G$. We introduce a new quantifier $Q^{n,e}$ with $Q^{n,e}\varphi$ meaning that the above graph, $G_\varphi^{n,e}$ is λ^+ -chromatic. If, however, $\text{Chr}(G_\varphi^{n,e}) \leq \lambda$, we add a good λ -coloring to M . We also assume that M is endowed with Skolem functions.

Lemma 4. *There exist n, e and $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_n < \lambda^+$ such that $t(\alpha_i) < \alpha_{i+1}$ if $t : \lambda^+ \rightarrow \lambda^+$ is a function in M and if $\bar{x}_0 \subseteq \alpha_1, \bar{x}_i \subseteq [\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1})$ ($1 \leq i < n$), $\bar{x}_n \subseteq [\alpha_n, \lambda^+)$, $\min(\bar{x}_i) = \alpha_i$, and φ is a formula, $M \models \varphi(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$, then $M \models Q^{n,e}\varphi$.*

Proof. Assume that the statement of the Lemma does not hold, i.e., for every $n, e, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ there exist $\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n$ contradicting it.

Let, for $\alpha < \lambda^+$, $B_\alpha \subseteq \lambda^+$ be a countable set such that $\alpha \in B_\alpha$, and if $n, e, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in B_\alpha$ are given, then a counter-example as above is found with $\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n \subseteq B_\alpha$. We require that B_α be Skolem-closed. Let B_α^+ be the ordinal closure of B_α , $B_\alpha^+ =$

$\{\gamma(\alpha, \xi) : \xi \leq \xi_\alpha\}$ be the increasing enumeration, $\alpha = \gamma(\alpha, \tau_\alpha)$. Let $\{M_\xi : \xi < \lambda^+\}$ be a continuous, increasing chain of elementary submodels of M such that $\delta_\xi = M_\xi \cap \lambda^+ < \lambda^+$. Clearly, $C = \{\delta_\xi : \xi < \lambda^+\}$ is a closed, unbounded set. We take a coloring of the sets $\{B_\alpha^+ : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$ by λ colors that satisfies Lemma 2, if α, β get the same color then the structures $(B_\alpha^+; B_\alpha, M)$ and $(B_\beta^+; B_\beta, M)$ are isomorphic and we also require that if $\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n \subseteq B_\alpha$ and $\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_n \subseteq B_\beta$ are in the same positions, i.e., are mapped onto each other by the order isomorphism between B_α and B_β and $(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$ is colored by the λ -coloring of $G_\varphi^{n,e}$, then $(\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_n)$ is also colored and gets the same color. All this is possible, as $\lambda^{\aleph_0} = \lambda$. We also assume that our coloring satisfies Lemma 1 with some functions $\{t_n : n < \omega\}$ that $B_\alpha^+ = \{t_n(\alpha) : n < \omega\}$.

As G is λ^+ -chromatic on C , there are $\alpha < \beta$, both in C , joined in G , getting the same color. By our conditions, $B_\alpha^+ \cap B_\beta^+$ is initial segment in both, and beyond that they do not even intersect into the same complementary interval of C . As our structures are isomorphic, this holds for B_α, B_β , as well.

We now let $B_\alpha^+ = \bigcup\{B_\alpha^+(i) : i < i_\alpha\}$, $B_\beta^+ = \bigcup\{B_\beta^+(i) : i < i_\beta\}$ be the ordered decompositions given by the following equivalence relations. For $x, y \in B_\alpha^+$, $x \leq y$, $x \sim y$ if either $[x, y] \cap B_\beta^+ = \emptyset$ or $[x, y] \cap B_\beta^+ \supseteq [x, y] \cap B_\alpha^+$. Similarly for B_β^+ . By Lemma 2, $B_\alpha^+ \cap B_\beta^+ = B_\alpha^+(0) = B_\beta^+(0)$.

Lemma 5. i_α, i_β are finite.

Proof. Otherwise, as B_α^+, B_β^+ are ordinal closed, $\gamma = \min(B_\alpha^+(\omega)) = \min(B_\beta^+(\omega))$ is in $B_\alpha^+ \cap B_\beta^+$, so $\gamma \in B_\alpha^+(0)$, a contradiction. \square

Enumerate

$$\left\{ \xi \leq \xi_\alpha : \text{there is a } 0 < i < \omega \text{ such that either } \gamma(\alpha, \xi) = \min(B_\alpha^+(i)) \right. \\ \left. \text{or } \gamma(\beta, \xi) = \min(B_\beta^+(i)) \right\} \cup \left\{ \tau_\alpha \right\}$$

as $\xi_1 < \xi_2 < \dots < \xi_n$. By Lemma 1, if $\alpha < \beta$, $\alpha = \min(B_\alpha^+(i_\alpha - 1))$, $\beta = \min(B_\beta^+(i_\beta - 1))$, $B_\alpha^+(i_\alpha - 1) < B_\beta^+(i_\beta - 1)$. So $\xi_n = \tau_\alpha$. We let $\alpha_i = \gamma(\alpha, \xi_i)$, $\beta_i = \gamma(\beta, \xi_i)$. If $\alpha_i = \min(B_\alpha^+(j))$ then $\alpha_i \in B_\alpha$ and, by isomorphism, $\beta_i \in B_\beta$. We show that for every $i < n$, $t \in M$, $t(\alpha_i) < \alpha_{i+1}$ and $t(\beta_i) < \beta_{i+1}$. As $(B_\alpha^+; B_\alpha, M)$ and $(B_\beta^+; B_\beta, M)$ are isomorphic, for every i it suffices to show this either for α_i or for β_i . For $i = n - 1$ this follows from the fact that α (as well as β) is from C . If $i < n$ then either α_{i-1} and α_i are separated by an element of B_β^+ or vice versa. Assume the former. Then, by Lemma 2, α_{i-1} and α_i are in different intervals of C so necessarily $t(\alpha_{i-1}) < \alpha_i$ holds.

Let e be the interlacing type of $\{\alpha_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$, $\{\beta_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. By our indirect assumption, there are a formula φ , \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_i ($0 \leq i \leq n$) in the same position in B_α, B_β such that $\bar{x}_i \subseteq [\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1})$, $\bar{y}_i \subseteq [\beta_i, \beta_{i+1})$ etc, and $M \models \varphi(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n) \wedge \varphi(\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_n)$ and $(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n), (\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_n)$ are joined in $G_\varphi^{n,e}$, but they get the same color in the good coloring of $G_\varphi^{n,e}$, a contradiction which proves Lemma 4. \square

Now fix n, e , and $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_n < \lambda^+$ as in Lemma 4. We call a formula φ dense if there exist $\bar{x}_0 \subseteq \alpha_1$, $\bar{x}_i \subseteq [\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1})$ ($1 \leq i < n$), $\bar{x}_n \subseteq [\alpha_n, \lambda^+)$, $\min(\bar{x}_i) = \alpha_i$ such that $M \models \varphi(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$. If $H = (V, <, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n) \in \mathcal{K}^{n,e}$, $V = \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$, a φ -rich copy of H is some string $(\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_s)$ such that $\bar{y}_0 < \dots < \bar{y}_s$, if $\{i, j\} \in X$ then $\{\min(\bar{y}_i), \min(\bar{y}_j)\} \in G$ and for every $v \in U$, $M \models \varphi(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_{h_1(v)}, \dots, \bar{y}_{h_n(v)})$.

Lemma 5. *For every $H \in \mathcal{K}^{n,e}$ if φ is dense there is a φ -rich copy of H in G .*

Lemma 6. *For every $H = (V, <, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n) \in \mathcal{K}^{n,e}$, $q \in U$, if φ is dense, there is a φ -rich copy $(\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_s)$ of H such that $\min(\bar{y}_{h_i(q)}) = \alpha_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

We notice that Lemma 5 obviously concludes the proof of Theorem 1 and Lemma 6 clearly implies Lemma 5. Also, they trivially hold for $H \in \mathcal{K}_0^{n,e}$. We prove these two Lemmas simultaneously.

Claim 1. *If Lemma 5 holds for some H then Lemma 6 holds for H , as well.*

Proof. Assume that Lemma 5 holds for $H = (V, <, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n) \in \mathcal{K}^{n,e}$ and for any dense φ but Lemma 6 fails for a certain $q \in U$ and a dense φ . This statement can be written as a formula $\theta(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$. As φ is dense, $M \models \varphi(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$ for some appropriate strings, so also $M \models \psi(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$ where $\psi = \varphi \wedge \theta(\min(\bar{x}_1), \dots, \min(\bar{x}_n))$. As ψ is dense, by Lemma 5 there is a ψ -rich copy $(\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_s)$ of H but then $M \models \theta(\min(\bar{y}_{h_1(q)}), \dots, \min(\bar{y}_{h_n(q)}))$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 2. *If Lemma 6 holds for $H = (V, <, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n)$ and $x \in V$ then Lemma 5 holds for $H' = H +_x H$.*

Proof. Select $q \in U$ such that $x = h_i(q)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. By Lemma 6, there is a φ -rich copy $(\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_s)$ of H such that $\min(\bar{y}_{h_i(q)}) = \alpha_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. As $\alpha_i > t(\alpha_{i-1})$ holds for every function t in the skolemized structure M there are φ -rich copies of H which agree with this below x but their x elements are arbitrarily high. We can, therefore, get a φ -rich copy of H' . \square

Claim 3. *If Lemma 6 holds for $H = (V, <, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n)$ and $y \in U$ then Lemma 5 holds for $H' = H *_y H$.*

Proof. Let $(\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_s)$ be a φ -rich copy of H such that $\min(\bar{y}_{h_i(q)}) = \alpha_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. The elements in the $(\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_s)$ string can be redistributed as $(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$ such that $\min(\bar{x}_i) = \alpha_i$ and then the fact that they form a φ -rich copy of H can be written as $M \models \psi(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$ for some formula ψ . As ψ is dense, by Lemma 4, $M \models Q^{n,e}\psi$ holds, so there are two strings, $(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$ and $(\bar{x}'_0, \dots, \bar{x}'_n)$ both satisfying ψ , interlacing by e , and $\{\min(\bar{x}_n), \min(\bar{x}'_n)\} \in G$. This, however, gives a φ -rich copy of H' . \square

Theorem 2. *If n, e are as in the Definition, λ is an infinite cardinal, $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$, then there exists a λ^+ -c.c., $<$ λ -closed poset $Q = Q_{n,e,\lambda}$ which adds a λ^+ -chromatic graph of cardinal λ^+ all whose finite subgraphs are subgraphs of some element of $\mathcal{K}^{n,e}$.*

Proof. Put $q = (V, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n) \in Q$ if $V \in [\lambda^+]^{<\lambda}$, $U \subseteq V$, $X \subseteq [V]^2$, every h_i is a function $U \rightarrow V$ with $h_1(x) < \dots < h_n(x) = x$ for $x \in U$ and every finite

substructure of $(q, <)$ is a substructure of some element of $\mathcal{K}^{n,e}$. Order Q as follows. $q' = (V', U', X', h'_1, \dots, h'_n) \leq q = (V, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n)$ iff $V' \supseteq V$, $U = U' \cap V$, $X = X' \cap [V]^2$, $h'_i \supseteq h_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$). Clearly, (Q, \leq) is $< \lambda$ -closed.

Lemma 7. (Q, \leq) is λ^+ -c.c.

Proof. By the usual Δ -system arguments it suffices to show that if the conditions $q^i = (V \cup V^i, U^i, X^i, h_1^i, \dots, h_n^i)$ are order isomorphic ($i < 2$), $V < V^0 < V^1$ then they are compatible. A finite subset of $V \cup V^0 \cup V^1$ can be included into some $s \cup s_0 \cup s_1$ where s_0 and s_1 are mapped onto each other by the isomorphism between q_0 and q_1 . By condition, $q|s \cup s_0$ is a substructure of some structure $H \in \mathcal{K}^{n,e}$. But then $q|s \cup s_0 \cup s_1$ is a substructure of an edgeless amalgamation of H . \square

If $G \subseteq Q$ is generic then $Y = \bigcup \{X : (V, U, X, \dots) \in G\}$ is a graph on a subset of λ^+ all whose finite subgraphs are subgraphs of some member of $\mathcal{K}^{n,e}$. The following Lemma clearly concludes the proof of the Theorem.

Lemma 8. $\text{Chr}(Y) = \lambda^+$.

Proof. Assume, toward a contradiction, that 1 forces that $f : \lambda^+ \rightarrow \lambda$ is a good coloring of Y . Let $M_1 \prec M_2 \prec \dots \prec M_n$ be elementary submodels of $(H((2^\lambda)^+); Q, f, \dots)$ with $\lambda \subseteq M_0$, $[M_i]^{<\lambda} \subseteq M_i$. Put $\delta_i = M_i \cap \lambda^+ < \lambda^+$. Notice that $\text{cf}(\delta_i) = \lambda$. Let $p' = (V', U', X', h'_1, \dots, h'_n)$ where $V = \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$, $U = \{\delta_n\}$, $X = \emptyset$, $h_i(\delta_n) = \delta_i$. Choose $p = (V, U, X, h_1, \dots, h_n) \leq p'$ forcing $f(\delta_n) = \xi$ for some $\xi < \lambda$. Let $\psi_n(\pi, x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be the following formula. π is an order isomorphism $V \rightarrow \lambda^+$, $\pi(\delta_i) = x_i$ and $\pi(p)$ forces that $f(x_n) = \xi$. Let $\delta_{n+1} = \lambda$. For $0 \leq i < n$ define $\psi_i(\pi, x_1, \dots, x_i)$ meaning that $\pi : V \cap \delta_{i+1} \rightarrow \lambda^+$ is order preserving and there are arbitrarily large $x_{i+1} < \lambda^+$ and $\pi' \supseteq \pi$ such that $\psi_{i+1}(\pi', x_1, \dots, x_{i+1})$ holds.

Claim 4. $\psi_i(\text{id}|V \cap \delta_{i+1}, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_i)$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. This is obvious for $i = n$. If $\psi_i(\text{id}|V \cap \delta_{i+1}, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_i)$ fails, then, by definition, there would be a bound for the possible x_{i+1} values for which $\psi_{i+1}(\pi', \delta_1, \dots, \delta_i, x_{i+1})$ holds for some $\pi' \supseteq \text{id}|V \cap \delta_{i+1}$. But then this bound is smaller than δ_{i+1} so ψ_{i+1} fails, too. \square

Returning to the proof of Lemma 8, we define the following function t . Let $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$, $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ be as in the definition of the one-edge amalgamation. Put, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $t(i) = j$ iff $b_{j-1} < a_i < b_j$ where $b_0 = 0$, $b_{n+1} = 2n + 1$. Set $\pi_0 = \text{id}|V \cap \delta_1$. We know that $\psi_0(\pi_0)$ holds. By induction on $1 \leq i \leq n$ select π_i in such a way that $\pi_{i+1} \supseteq \pi_i$, if we let $\pi_i(\delta_i) = \delta'_i$ then $\psi_i(\pi_i, \delta'_1, \dots, \delta'_i)$ holds and $\text{sup}(V \cap \delta_{t(i)}) < \delta'_i$ and $\text{Ran}(\pi_i) < \delta_{t(i)}$. This is possible as M_1, \dots, M_n are elementary submodels. Finally, $\pi_n(p)$ is a condition interlacing with p by e and it forces that $f(\delta'_n) = \xi$. Now if we take the union of them plus the edge $\{\delta_n, \delta'_n\}$ then an argument as in Lemma 7 shows that we get a condition which forces a contradiction. \square

Theorem 3. If GCH holds there is a cardinal, cofinality, and GCH preserving (class) notion of forcing in which for every n, e , and regular $\lambda \geq \omega$ there is a λ^+ -chromatic graph on λ^+ all whose finite subgraphs are subgraphs of some elements of $\mathcal{K}^{n,e}$.

Proof. For $\lambda \geq \omega$ regular let Q_λ be the product of $Q_{n,e,\lambda}$ of Theorem 2 with finite supports if $\lambda = \omega$, and complete supports otherwise. Notice that Q_λ is a λ^+ -c.c. notion of forcing of cardinal λ^+ . For λ singular let Q_λ be the trivial forcing.

Our notion of forcing is the Easton-support limit of the Q_λ 's, i.e., the direct limit of P_α where $P_{\alpha+1} = P_\alpha \oplus Q_\alpha$ with Q_α defined in the ground model. For α limit, $p \in P_\alpha$ iff $p(\beta) \in Q_\beta$ for all $\beta < \alpha$, and $|\text{Dom}(p) \cap \kappa| < \kappa$ for $\kappa \leq \alpha$ regular.

Given n , e , and λ as in the statement of the Theorem, the extended model can be thought as the generic extension of some model first with $Q_{n,e,\lambda}$ then with P_λ which is of cardinal λ so it cannot change the chromatic number of a graph from λ^+ to λ .

Assume that the cofinality of some ordinal α collapses to a regular λ . P splits as $P_\lambda \oplus Q_\lambda \oplus R$ where R is $\leq \lambda$ -closed, $|P_\lambda| \leq \lambda$ and Q_λ is λ^+ -c.c., so in fact the λ^+ -c.c. $P_{\lambda+1}$ changes the cofinality of α which is impossible. This also implies that no cardinals are collapsed.

If τ is regular, all subsets of τ are added by the τ^+ -c.c. $P_{\tau+1}$ of cardinal τ^+ so 2^τ remains τ^+ . If τ is singular we must bound $\tau^{\text{cf}(\tau)}$. The sets of size $\text{cf}(\tau)$ are added by $P_{\text{cf}(\tau)+1}$ so we can bound the new value of $\tau^{\text{cf}(\tau)}$ by $\tau^{\text{cf}(\tau)^+} = \tau^+$. \square

References

- [1] P.Erdős, A.Hajnal: On chromatic number of graphs and set-systems, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung.* **17** (1966), 61–99.
- [2] P.Erdős, A.Hajnal, S.Shelah: On some general properties of chromatic number, in: Topics in Topology, Keszthely (Hungary), 1972, *Coll. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai* **8**, 243–255.
- [3] P.Erdős, R.Rado: Partition relations connected with the chromatic number of graphs, *Journal of London Math. Soc.* **34** (1959), 63–72.
- [4] P.Erdős, R.Rado: A construction of graphs without triangles having pre-assigned order and chromatic number, *Journal of London Math. Soc.* **35** (1960), 445–448.
- [5] A.Hajnal, P.Komjáth: What must and what need not be contained in a graph of uncountable chromatic number?, *Combinatorica* **4** (1984), 47–52.
- [6] P.Komjáth: The colouring number, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **54** (1987), 1–14.
- [7] W.Taylor: Atomic compactness and elementary equivalence, *Fund. Math.* **71** (1971), 103–112.
- [8] W.Taylor: Problem 42, Comb. Structures and their applications, *Proc. of the Calgary International Conference*, 1969.

Péter Komjáth
 Department of Computer Science
 Eötvös University
 Budapest, Múzeum krt. 6–8
 1088, Hungary
 e-mail: kope@cs.elte.hu

Saharon Shelah
 Institute of Mathematics
 Hebrew University
 Givat Ram
 Jerusalem, Israel
 e-mail: shelah@math.huji.ac.il