Universal graphs without large cliques

P. Komjáth, S. Shelah*

Dedicated to the memory of Alan Mekler

0. Introduction

The theory of universal graphs originated from the observation of R. Rado [4,5] that a universal countable graph X exists, i.e., X is countable and isomorphically embeds every countable graph. He also showed that under GCH, there is a universal graph in every infinite cardinal. Since then, several results have been proved about the existence of universal elements in different classes of graphs. For example, a construction similar to Rado's shows, that for every natural number $n \geq 3$, there is a universal $K(n)$-free countable graph, or, if GCH is assumed, there is one in every infinite cardinal (here $K(n)$ denotes the complete graph on n vertices). This result also follows from the existence theorem of universal and special models.

The following folklore observation shows that this cannot be extended to $K(\omega)$. Assume that $X = (V, E)$ is a $K(\omega)$-free graph of cardinal λ that embeds every $K(\omega)$-free graph of cardinal λ. Let $a \notin V$, and define the graph X' on $V' = V \cup \{a\}$ as follows. X' on V is identical with X, a is joined to every vertex of V. Clearly, X' is $K(\omega)$-free. So, by assumption, there is an embedding $g: V' \to V$ of X' into X. Put $a_0 = a$, and, by induction, $a_{n+1} = g(a_n)$. As g is edge preserving, we get, by induction on n, that a_n is joined to every a_t with $t > n$, so they are distinct, and form a $K(\omega)$ in X', a contradiction.

In Section 1 we give some existence/nonexistence statements on universal graphs, which under GCH give a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a universal graph of size λ with no $K(\kappa)$, namely, if either κ is finite or $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$. The special case when $\lambda^{<\kappa} = \lambda$ was first proved by F. Galvin.

In Section 2 we investigate the question that if there is no universal $K(\kappa)$-free graph of size λ then how many of these graphs embed all the other. It was proved in [1], that if $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$ (e.g., if λ is regular and the GCH holds below λ), and $\kappa = \omega$, then this number is λ^+. We show that this holds for every $\kappa \leq \lambda$ of countable cofinality. On the other hand, even for $\kappa = \omega_1$, and any regular $\lambda \geq \omega_1$ it is consistent that the GCH holds below λ, 2^λ is as large as we wish, and the above number is either λ^+ or 2^λ, so both extremes can actually occur. Similar results when the excluded graphs are disconnected, were proved in [2] and [3].

Notation. We use the standard axiomatic set theory notation. If X is a set, κ a cardinal, $[X]^\kappa = \{Y \subseteq X: |Y| = \kappa\}$, $[X]^{<\kappa} = \{Y \subseteq X: |Y| < \kappa\}$. A *graph* is a pair $X = (V, E)$ where V is some set, and $E \subseteq [V]^2$, i.e., we exclude loops and parallel edges. If $|V| = \lambda$, we call X a *λ-graph*, and whenever possible, we outright assume that $V = \lambda$. A graph $X = (V, E)$ is *$K(\kappa)$-free*, if there is no clique of cardinal κ, i.e., $[T]^2 \not\subseteq E$ holds for every $T \in [V]^\kappa$. A *(λ, κ)-graph* is a $K(\kappa)$-free λ-graph. If $X_i = (V_i, E_i)$ $(i < 2)$ are graphs, the one-to-one function $f: V_0 \to V_1$ is a *weak (strong) embedding* if $\{x, y\} \in E_0$ implies $\{f(x), f(y)\} \in E_1$ (if $\{x, y\} \in E_0$ iff $\{f(x), f(y)\} \in E_1$). A *weakly (strongly) (λ, κ)-universal graph* is a (λ, κ)-graph X that weakly (strongly) embeds every (λ, κ)-graph.

* Publication No. 492. Research partially supported by BSF.

1. When GCH holds

Lemma 1. *If λ is strong limit, $\lambda > \kappa \geq \omega$, $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$ then there exists a strongly (λ, κ)-universal graph.*

Proof. Let $\lambda = \sup\{\lambda_\alpha : \alpha < \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)\}$, where the sequence is continuous, and $2^{\lambda_\alpha} \leq \lambda_{\alpha+1}$, $\lambda_0 = 0$. Let T be a tree of height $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$ in which every α-branch has $\lambda_{\alpha+2}$ extensions on the α-th level. Clearly, $|T| = \lambda^{<\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)} = \lambda$. The vertex set of the universal graph X will be the disjoint union of some sets $\{A(t) : t \in T\}$ with $|A(t)| = \lambda_{\alpha+1}$. No edge of X will go between $A(t)$ and $A(t')$ when t, t' are incomparable in T. By induction on $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$, we determine for each $t \in T$ of height α how to build X on $A(t)$, and how to join the vertices of $A(t)$ into $\bigcup\{A(t') : t' < t\}$. This latter set is of cardinal λ_α, with a graph on it, and we make sure that it will be extended to a set of cardinal $\lambda_{\alpha+1}$, i.e., to some $A(t)$, in all possible ways, such that the graph on $A(t)$ is $K(\kappa)$-free. This is possible, as for every branch we have enough extensions reserved. It is immediately seen that every (λ, κ)-graph embeds into X, one only has to select the right branch.

The vertex set is of cardinal $\leq |T|\lambda = \lambda$. Finally, a $K(\kappa)$ could only be produced along a branch $\{A(t) : t \in b\}$, but as $|b| \leq \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)$, some $A(t)$ must contain a $K(\kappa)$, a contradiction, i.e., X is a (λ, κ)-graph.

Lemma 2. *(F. Galvin) If $\lambda^{<\kappa} = \lambda$, then there is no weakly (λ, κ)-universal graph.*

Proof. Assume that $X = (\lambda, E)$ is (λ, κ)-universal. Let $Y = (V, G)$ be the following graph. The elements of V are those functions f with $\mathrm{Dom}(f) < \kappa$ such that $\mathrm{Ran}(f)$ is a clique in E. $\{f, g\} \in G$ iff $f \subset g$. Clearly, $|V| = \lambda^{<\kappa} = \lambda$. If $\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ form a $K(\kappa)$, then they are compatible functions, and their union $f = \bigcup\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ injects κ into a clique of X, a contradiction, as X is $K(\kappa)$-free.

Assume that $g : V \to \lambda$ is a weak embedding of Y into X. By induction on $\alpha < \kappa$ we define $x_\alpha < \lambda$, $f_\alpha \in V$ such that for $\beta < \alpha$ $\{x_\beta, x_\alpha\} \in E$, $f_\beta \subset f_\alpha$ (so $\{f_\beta, f_\alpha\} \in G$) should hold. If we succeed, we are done, as $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is a clique again. If $\{x_\beta, f_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ are defined, let f_α be the following function: $\mathrm{Dom}(f_\alpha) = \alpha$, $f_\alpha(\beta) = x_\beta$ $(\beta < \alpha)$. $f_\alpha \in V$, as its range, $\{x_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ is a clique. Put $x_\alpha = g(f_\alpha)$. As by the way f_α is constructed, $f_\beta \subset f_\alpha$ $(\beta < \alpha)$, and g is a weak embedding, x_α will indeed, be joined into x_β for $\beta < \alpha$, and so the inductive step is successfully completed.

Lemma 3. *If λ is strong limit, $\kappa \leq \lambda$, $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \leq \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$, then there is no weakly (λ, κ)-universal graph.*

Proof. We can assume that $\kappa > \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$, as otherwise Lemma 2 gives the result. Assume that $X = (\lambda, E)$ is (λ, κ)-universal. Let $\{\kappa_\alpha : \alpha < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)\}$ be an increasing sequence of regular cardinals, cofinal in κ, with $\kappa_0 > \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$. Let F be the set of those f functions which satisfy the following requirements. $\mathrm{Dom}(f) < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)$, for $\alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(f)$, $f(\alpha)$ is a bounded subset of λ with $|f(\alpha)| = \kappa_\alpha$, and $\bigcup\{f(\alpha) : \alpha < \mathrm{Dom}(f)\}$ is a clique in X. Let V, the vertex set of the graph $Y = (V, G)$ be the disjoint union of the sets $\{A(f) : f \in F\}$ where $|A(f)| = \kappa_\alpha$ if $\mathrm{Dom}(f) = \alpha$. Two distinct vertces are joined iff one of them is in $A(f)$ the other in $A(f')$ for some $f \subseteq f'$.

Clearly, $|V| \leq \kappa|F| = \lambda$. Assume that T spans a clique in Y and $|T| = \kappa$. Then $T \subseteq \bigcup\{A(f_\gamma): \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ for a collection of pairwise compatible f_γ's. $\sup(\mathrm{Dom}(f_\gamma)) = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)$ as otherwise $|T| < \kappa$, but then $\bigcup\{\mathrm{Ran}(f_\gamma): \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ is a $K(\kappa)$ in X, a contradiction. We therefore established that Y is a (λ, κ)-graph.

Assume that $g: V \to \lambda$ is a weak embedding of Y into X. By induction on $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)$ we are going to define $f_\alpha \in F$ such that $\mathrm{Dom}(f_\alpha) = \alpha$, $f_{\alpha+1}(\alpha) \subseteq g''A(f_\alpha)$, and $f_\beta \subset f_\alpha$ whenever $\beta < \alpha$. If this can be carried out, we reached a contradiction as then $\bigcup\{\mathrm{Ran}(f_\alpha): \alpha < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)\}$ is a $K(\kappa)$ in X. There is no problem with the definition of f_α if $\alpha = 0$ or limit. Assume that f_α is given. $g''A(f_\alpha)$ is a clique in X of size $\kappa_\alpha = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa_\alpha) > \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$, so, there is a bounded (in λ) subset of it of cardinal κ_α, say, S. We can now define $f_{\alpha+1}(\alpha) = S$, $f_{\alpha+1}(\beta) = f_\alpha(\beta)$ $(\beta < \alpha)$, the vertices in $f_\alpha(\beta)$ will be joined to S, as by condition, $f_\alpha(\beta) = f_{\beta+1}(\beta) \subseteq g''A(f_\beta)$, $A(f_\beta)$ is joined to $A(f_\alpha)$ by the condition $f_\beta \subset f_\alpha$, and g is a weak embedding.

From the known results and Lemmas 1–3 we can deduce the following.

Theorem 1. *(GCH) Given $\lambda \geq \kappa$, $\lambda \geq \omega$, there is a weakly/strongly (λ, κ)-universal graph iff $\kappa < \omega$ or $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$.*

2. The structure of the class of (λ, κ)-graphs

In this Section we investigate the complexity of the class of (λ, κ)-graphs when there is no universal element in it.

Definition. For $\lambda \geq \kappa$, $\mathrm{CF}(\lambda, \kappa)$ is the minimal cardinal μ such that there is a family $\{X_\alpha: \alpha < \mu\}$ of (λ, κ)-graphs, with the property that every (λ, κ)-graph is weakly embedded into some X_α. $\mathrm{CF}^+(\lambda, \kappa)$ is the same with strong embeddings.

Clearly, $\mathrm{CF}(\lambda, \kappa) \leq \mathrm{CF}^+(\lambda, \kappa) \leq 2^\lambda$. Also, $\mathrm{CF}(\lambda, \kappa) \leq \lambda$ iff $\mathrm{CF}(\lambda, \kappa) = 1$ iff there is a weakly (λ, κ)–universal graph, and likewise for $\mathrm{CF}^+(\lambda, \kappa)$.

It was observed in [1] that $\mathrm{CF}^+(\omega, \omega) = \omega_1$. We slightly extend that result.

Theorem 2. *If $\lambda \geq \kappa$, λ is either strong limit or of the form $\lambda = \mu^+ = 2^\mu$, $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) = \omega$, then $\mathrm{CF}^+(\lambda, \kappa) = \lambda^+$.*

Proof. From Lemmas 2–3, $\mathrm{CF}(\lambda, \kappa) \geq \lambda^+$. Fix an increasing sequence $\kappa_n \to \kappa$, $\kappa_0 = 0$. Call a structure $(A, <, X, R)$ a *ranked graph* if $(A, <)$ is a well–ordered set, X is a graph on A, and R is a function mapping those bounded cliques of X with order–type some κ_n into the ordinals, with the property that if clique C' end–extends clique C, then $R(C') < R(C)$. Obviously, then X will be $K(\kappa)$–free. On the other hand, if a $K(\kappa)$–free graph X is given on a well–ordered set $(A, <)$, then the tree

$$T(X) = \{C \subseteq A: \mathrm{type}(C) = \kappa_n \text{ (some } n), C \text{ clique }\}$$

endowed with end-extension, as the partial order, will be ω-branchless, so an ordinal valued function R as above exists. If $|A| = \lambda$, then $|T| = \lambda$, so only λ ordinals are used, therefore $R(0) < \lambda^+$ holds. We call the minimal possible $R(0)$ the rank of X.

Assume first that λ is strong limit. Fix a continuous, cofinal sequence $\{\lambda_\alpha: \alpha < \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)\}$ of cardinals with $\lambda_0 = 0$ and $2^{\lambda_\alpha} \leq \lambda_{\alpha+1}$.

For every $\xi < \lambda^+$ we are going to construct a graph that embeds all graphs with rank ξ.

Let T be a tree with height $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$, with one root, such that whenever $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$, then every α-branch has $\lambda_{\alpha+2}$ extensions to the α-th level. For $t \in T$ on the α-th level, let $A(t)$ be an ordered set of order-type $\lambda_{\alpha+1}$, such that the sets $\{A(t): t \in T\}$ are pairwise disjoint. The vertex set V of our graph will be the union V of these sets. We partially order V by assuming $A(t) < A(t')$ for $t < t'$, i.e., all elements of $A(t)$ precede all elements of $A(t')$.

For every $t \in T$, put $B(t) = \bigcup\{A(t'): t' < t\}$. By induction on the height of t we define $S(t)$, a ranked graph with ranks $\leq \xi$ on $B(t) \cup A(t)$ such that if b is an α-branch, then all possible end-extensions (if there are any) of the already defined structure on $\bigcup\{A(t): t \in b\}$ actually occur. This is possible, as there are enough extensions of b to the α-th level.

It is now obvious that all (λ, κ)-graphs of rank $\leq \xi$ embed into our tree. One only has to select the appropriate branch through T. Also, $|V| = |T|\lambda = \lambda^{<\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)} = \lambda$.We need to show that there is no $K(\kappa)$ in the resulting graph. Assume that U is a clique, $|U| = \kappa$. As we joined vertices only in comparable $A(t)$'s, $U \subseteq \bigcup\{A(t): t \in b\}$ for some branch b. For some $t_n \in b$ $(n = 0, 1, \ldots)$, it is true that the first κ_n elements of U are bounded in $S(t_n)$, so they get a decreasing sequence of ordinals as ranks, a contradiction.

The case $\lambda = \mu^+ = 2^\mu$ is actually simpler, we need one–element $A(t)$'s, and having μ^+ extensions of every branch of length $< \mu^+$.

Finally we show that under $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa$, $\mathrm{CF}(\kappa, \omega_1)$ can be as small as κ^+, and as large as 2^κ, and this latter value as large as we wish.

Theorem 3. *Assume that in V, a model of GCH, μ, $\kappa > \omega$ are cardinals, $\mathrm{cf}(\mu) > \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)$, then in a cardinal and cofinality preserving forcing extension V^P, the GCH holds below κ and $\mathrm{CF}(\kappa, \omega_1) = 2^\kappa = \mu$.*

Proof. If $\kappa = \lambda^+$, with $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda) = \omega$, then we first add a $\square_\lambda$-sequence, i.e., a sequence $\{C_\alpha: \alpha < \kappa, \text{ limit}\}$ with the following properties:

(1) $C_\alpha \subseteq \alpha$ is closed, unbounded ;

(2) if γ is a limit point of C_α, then $C_\gamma = \gamma \cap C_\alpha$;

(3) $|C_\alpha| < \kappa$.

It is well known that such a sequence can be added by a cardinal and cofinality preserving forcing of size κ, so we may assume that it exists in V. Fix such a sequence, and a sequence of cardinals $\lambda_n \to \lambda$, and a one-to-one mapping $\phi_{\alpha,\beta}: [\alpha, \beta) \to \lambda$ for each $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$.

We call a countable set $A \subseteq \kappa$ *low*, if $\mathrm{tp}(A)$ is limit, and, if we put $\delta = \sup(A)$, $C_\delta = \{c_\xi: \xi < \mathrm{tp}(C_\delta)\}$ the increasing enumeration of C_δ, then for some $n < \omega$, $\phi_{c_\xi, c_{\xi+1}}(a) < \lambda_n$ holds for $a \in A$, $c_\xi \leq a < c_{\xi+1}$.

If $\kappa > \omega_1$ is not of the form $\kappa = \lambda^+$, with $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda) = \omega$, then we call every countable subset of limit type low.

Claim 1. *The number of low subsets of some $\alpha < \kappa$ is $< \kappa$.*

Proof. If κ is not of the form λ^+ with $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda) = \omega$, then $|\alpha|^\omega < \kappa$. In the other case the statement follows from property (3).

Claim 2. *If $B \subseteq \kappa$ is of order-type ω_1, then for some cofinal subset $B' \subseteq B$ it is true that if $\gamma < \sup(B')$ is a limit point of B', then $B' \cap \gamma$ is low.*

Proof. Put $\delta = \sup(B)$. Shrink B to a cofinal $B' \subseteq B$, such that the elements of B' are separated by C_δ, and there is an $n < \omega$, such that if $c_\xi \leq b < c_{\xi+1}$ for some ξ, then $\phi_{c_\xi, c_{\xi+1}}(b) < \lambda_n$ $(b \in B')$. Then the Claim follows from property (2) of the $\square$-sequence.

If κ is not of the form $\kappa = \lambda^+$ with $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda) = \omega$ the choice $B' = B$ works.

The poset $(P, \leq)$ of the proof of the Theorem will be the $< \kappa$ support product of μ copies of some poset $(Q, \leq)$ to be described below.

$q \in Q$ if $q = (\delta, X, \mathcal{A})$ where $\delta < \kappa$, $X \subseteq [\delta]^2$, X is $K(\omega_1)$-free, if $\kappa > \omega_1$ the $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of low subsets of δ, if $\kappa = \omega_1$, then $\mathcal{A}$ is a countable family of countable subsets of δ of limit type. Moreover, we require that if $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $\sup(A) \leq x < \delta$, then $A \times \{x\} \not\subseteq X$.

$q' = (\delta', X', \mathcal{A}') \leq q = (\delta, X, \mathcal{A})$ iff $\delta' \geq \delta$, $X = X' \cap [\delta]^2$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}' \cap [\delta]^{\aleph_0}$.

Claim 3. $|Q| = \kappa$.

Proof. For every $\delta < \kappa$ there are at most κ many possibilities of selecting X, $\mathcal{A}$ such that $(\delta, X, \mathcal{A}) \in Q$.

Claim 4. *Forcing with $(Q, \leq)$ does not introduce new sequences of ordinals of length $< \kappa$.*

Proof. If $\kappa = \omega_1$, then $(Q, \leq)$ is $< \omega_1$-closed.

If $\kappa > \omega_1$, assume that $q \Vdash f\colon \tau \to \mathrm{OR}$, $\tau < \kappa$. We construct the decreasing sequence of conditions $\{q_\alpha = (\delta_\alpha, X_\alpha, \mathcal{A}_\alpha)\colon \alpha \leq \tau\}$ such that $q_0 = q$, $q_{\alpha+1} \Vdash f(\alpha) = g(\alpha)$, and if α is limit, then $\delta_\alpha = \sup\{\delta_\beta\colon \beta < \alpha\}$, $X_\alpha = \bigcup\{X_\beta\colon \beta < \alpha\}$. If $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) \neq \omega$ then $\mathcal{A}_\alpha = \bigcup\{\mathcal{A}_\beta\colon \beta < \alpha\}$, otherwise we add all the low subsets that are cofinal in δ_α, to $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$, as well. If we can carry out the construction, we are done, q_τ determines all values of f. The only problem is if some of the X_α's is not $K(\omega_1)$-free. Let $\alpha \leq \tau$ be minimal such that there exists an uncountable clique $T \subseteq \delta_\alpha$. Clearly, $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \omega_1$. For some cofinal $T' \subseteq T$, if $\gamma < \delta_\alpha$ is a limit point of T', then $T' \cap \gamma$ is low. There is a limit $\beta < \alpha$ such that δ_β is a limit point of T', so by our construction $T' \cap \delta_\beta \in \mathcal{A}_\beta$, so $T' \cap \delta_\beta$ may not have been later extended to an ω_1-clique.

Claim 5. *Forcing with $(P, \leq)$ does not introduce new sequences of ordinals of length $< \kappa$.*

Proof. Similar to the previous proof.

Claim 6. *$(P, \leq)$ is κ^+-c.c.*

Proof. By Claim 3 and Δ-system arguments.

If, in V^P, $\mathrm{CF}(\kappa, \omega_1) < \mu$, then a family of graphs witnessing this is in a $< \mu$ sized subproduct of P. By the product lemma we only need to show that forcing with $(Q, \leq)$ introduces a (κ, ω_1)-graph that cannot be embedded into any ground model (κ, ω_1)-graph. If $G \subseteq Q$ is generic, put $Y = \bigcup\{X\colon (\delta, X, \mathcal{A}) \in G\}$.

Claim 7. *Y is $K(\omega_1)$-free.*

Proof. If $\kappa = \omega_1$, $q \Vdash T$ is an ω_1-clique, select a decreasing sequence $q = q_0 \geq q_1 \geq \ldots$ such that $q_{n+1} = (\delta_{n+1}, X_{n+1}, \mathcal{A}_{n+1}) \Vdash t_n \in T$, $\delta_n < t_n < \delta_{n+1}$, and then put $q' =$

$(\delta, X, \mathcal{A})$ where $\delta = \lim \delta_n$, $X = \bigcup\{X_n : n < \omega\}$, and $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup\{\mathcal{A}_n : n < \omega\} \cup \{\{t_n : n < \omega\}\}$. Then $q' \Vdash T \subseteq \delta$, a contradiction.

If $\kappa > \omega_1$, then by Claim 4 some $q = (\delta, X, \mathcal{A})$ determines all elements of T, the alleged ω_1-clique. We can assume that $T \subseteq \delta$, but then X is not $K(\omega_1)$-free, a contradiction.

Claim 8. *Y does not embed into any ground model (κ, ω_1)-graph.*

Proof. Assume that $q \Vdash f : \kappa \to \kappa$ is an embedding of Y into some ground model (κ, ω_1)-graph, Z. By induction on $\alpha < \omega_1$ construct the decreasing sequence $q_\alpha = (\delta_\alpha, X_\alpha, \mathcal{A}_\alpha)$ such that $q_0 = q$, $q_{\alpha+1} \Vdash f(\delta_\alpha) = g(\alpha)$, for α limit $\delta_\alpha = \lim\{\delta_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$, $X_\alpha = \bigcup\{X_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$, $\{\delta_\beta, \delta_\alpha\} \in X_{\alpha+1}$ for $\beta < \alpha$, and $\mathcal{A}_\alpha = \bigcup\{\mathcal{A}_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$. The only problem with the definition would be that $A \subseteq \{\delta_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ for some $A \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$. But then, $\sup(A)$ is of the form δ_γ for some limit $\gamma \le \alpha$, and no set of that form was added to $\mathcal{A}_\gamma$.

We can therefore define the sequence, but then the range of g will be a $K(\omega_1)$ in Z, a contradiction.

Theorem 4. *If, in a model of GCH, μ, $\kappa > \omega$ are cardinals, with $\mathrm{cf}(\mu) > \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)$, then, in some cardinal and cofinality preserving extension the GCH holds below κ, $2^\kappa = \mu$, and $\mathrm{CF}^+(\kappa, \omega_1) = \kappa^+$.*

Proof. Again, as in the proof of Theorem 3, we can assume, that if $\kappa = \lambda^+$, with $\lambda > \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) = \omega$, then $\square_\lambda$ holds in the ground model. We also assume that the GCH holds below κ and $2^\kappa = \mu$.

In a $< \kappa$-support iteration of length κ^+, we add a family witnessing $\mathrm{CF}^+(\kappa, \omega_1) = \kappa^+$. Factor Q_α will add a (κ, ω_1)-graph that strongly embeds every (κ, ω_1)-graph of V^{P_α}. Notice, that if the forcing does not collapse cardinals, then $\square_\lambda$ will still hold at every stage.

We first define and investigate one step of the iteration.

Let $(Q, \le)$ be the following poset. $q = (\delta, X, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Z}, F) \in Q$, if $\delta < \kappa$, $X \subseteq [\delta]^2$ is a $K(\omega_1)$-free graph, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\delta]^{\aleph_0}$ is a family of low sets ($\kappa > \omega_1$), is a countable family of limit type subsets of δ ($\kappa = \omega_1$). $\mathcal{Z}$ is a family of $< \kappa$ many (κ, ω_1)-graphs, $F : \mathcal{Z} \times \delta \to \delta$ is a function such that if $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ then the mapping $x \mapsto F(Z, x)$ is a strong embedding of $Z|\delta$ into X, and the following two more conditions hold.

(1) If $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $\sup(A) \le x < \delta$, then $A \times \{x\} \not\subseteq X$;
(2) if $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, then $A \not\subseteq F''(\{Z\} \times \delta)$.

$q' = (\delta', X', \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{Z}', F') \le q = (\delta, X, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Z}, F)$ if $\delta' \ge \delta$, $X = X' \cap [\delta]^2$, $\mathcal{Z}' \supseteq \mathcal{Z}$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}' \cap [\delta]^{\aleph_0}$ and, moreover,

(3) if $Z_0 \ne Z_1 \in \mathcal{Z}$, $\delta \le x, y < \delta'$, then $F'(Z_0, x) \ne F'(Z_1, y)$.

Claim 1. *$(Q, \le)$ is transitive.*

Proof. Assume that $q_0 \ge q_1 \ge q_2$, $q_i = (\delta_i, X_i, \mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{Z}_i, F_i)$ $(i < 3)$. In establishing $q_0 \ge q_2$ only condition (3) could cause problems, but it will not: if $Z_0 \ne Z_1 \in \mathcal{Z}_0$, $\delta_0 \le x < \delta_1 \le y < \delta_2$, then $F_2(Z_0, x) \ne F_2(Z_1, y)$ as the first element is in $[\delta_0, \delta_1)$, the second is in $[\delta_1, \delta_2)$.

Claim 2. *If $\varepsilon < \kappa$, $D = \{(\delta, X, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Z}, F) : \delta \ge \varepsilon\}$ is dense.*

Proof. We can extend a given $(\delta, X, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Z}, F)$ to a large enough δ' by mapping $Z|[\delta, \delta')$ $(Z \in \mathcal{Z})$ onto disjoint sets, not extending $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{Z}$, and adjusting X. Conditon (1) won't cause problem, as by (2) no $A \in \mathcal{A}$ will be forced to be joined to a vertex.

Claim 3. *If Z is a (κ, ω_1)-graph, then $D = \{(\delta, X, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Z}, F) : Z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$ is dense.*

Proof. A similar argument works.

Claim 4. *Forcing with $(Q, \leq)$ doesn't introduce sequences of ordinals of length $< \kappa$.*

Proof. $(Q, \leq)$ is $< \omega_1$-closed, and this is enough if $\kappa = \omega_1$.

Assume that $\kappa > \omega_1$. Let $q \Vdash f : \tau \to \mathrm{OR}$, $\tau < \kappa$. By induction on $\alpha \leq \tau$ we define the decreasing sequence $\{q_\alpha = (\delta_\alpha, X_\alpha, \mathcal{A}_\alpha, \mathcal{Z}_\alpha, F_\alpha) : \alpha \leq \tau\}$ such that $q_{\alpha+1} \Vdash f(\alpha) = g(\alpha)$, and for limit α, $\delta_\alpha = \sup\{\delta_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$, $X_\alpha = \bigcup\{X_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$, $\mathcal{Z}_\alpha = \bigcup\{\mathcal{Z}_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$, $F_\alpha = \bigcup\{F_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$. If $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) > \omega$, we take $\mathcal{A}_\alpha = \bigcup\{\mathcal{A}_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$, otherwise we add all cofinal in δ_α low subsets A, for wich there is no $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_\alpha$ with $A \subseteq F''_\alpha(\{Z\} \times \delta_\alpha)$. The only thing we have to show is that no $K(\omega_1)$ will be created. We may assume, that $\alpha \leq \tau$ is limit, $T \subseteq \delta_\alpha$ is cofinal, and T is an uncountable clique in X_α. We can assume that segments of T of limit type are low sets. As T could grow, for a club subset $C \subseteq \alpha$, of order type ω_1, it is true that if $\beta \in C$, then $T \cap \delta_\beta \subseteq F''_\beta(\{Z\} \times \delta_\beta)$ for some $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_\beta$. By conditon (3), there can be only one such Z. If, moreover β is a limit point of limit points of C, then there is a $h(\beta) < \beta$, such that for $h(\beta) < \gamma \leq \beta$ this Z for γ is the same. By the pressing down lemma, h is bounded on an unbounded subset, so $T \cap \delta_\beta \subseteq F''_\alpha(\{Z\} \times \delta_\beta)$ for uncountably many $\beta < \alpha$, but then the inverse image of T will be a $K(\omega_1)$ in Z, a contradiction.

Let Y be the graph added by Q, i.e., if $G \subseteq Q$ is generic, then $Y = \bigcup\{X : (\delta, X, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Z}, F) \in G\}$.

Claim 5. *Y is $K(\omega_1)$-free.*

Proof. If $\kappa = \omega_1$, $q \Vdash T$ is an ω_1-clique in Y, then an argument as above shows that there is a decreasing sequence $\{q_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ determining more and more elements of T, and we can freeze T unless it is covered by $\bigcup\{F''_\alpha(\{Z\} \times \delta_\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ for some Z, which again gives a $K(\omega_1)$ in Z.

If $\kappa > \omega_1$, by the above Claim, the supposed clique T is in the ground model, some $q \in G$ contains in its X-part, a contradiction.

The iteration $(P_\alpha, Q_\alpha : \alpha \leq \kappa^+)$ is defined as a $< \kappa$-support iteration, with Q_α as the above Q, defined in V^{P_α}.

In Q_α, let D_α be the set of those conditons of the form $q = (\delta, X, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Z}, F)$ for which it is true that $Z_0 \neq Z_1 \in \mathcal{Z}$ implies that $Z_0|\delta \neq Z_1|\delta$.

Claim 6. *D_α is dense in Q_α.*

Proof. Using Claim 1, with ε large enough.

If $q = (\delta, X, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Z}, F) \in Q_\alpha$ we put $\ell(q) = (\delta, X, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Z}|\delta, F)$. Let E_α be the following subset of P_α. $p \in P_\alpha$ if for all $\beta < \alpha$, $p|\beta$ determines $\ell(p(\beta))$ and forces that $p(\beta) \in D_\beta$.

Claim 7. *For every $\alpha \leq \kappa^+$*
(a) E_α is dense in P_α ;
(b) forcing with P_α does not add sequences of ordinals of length $< \kappa$.

Proof. Assume first that $\kappa > \omega_1$. The proof is by induction on $\alpha \leq \kappa^+$. If (b) holds for α, then it holds for $\alpha+1$, by Claim 4. Assume that (a) and (b) hold for α, and $p \in P_{\alpha+1}$. We may assume that $p|\alpha \Vdash p(\alpha) \in D_\alpha$. As (b) holds for α, there is a $q \leq p|\alpha$ which determines $p(\alpha)$. Extend q to an $r \in E_\alpha$, then take $r \cup p(\alpha) \in E_{\alpha+1}$.

Assume that α is limit, $p \in P\alpha$. In order to prove (a) for α, we may assume that supp(p) is cofinal in α, let $\{\alpha_\xi : \xi < \tau\}$ converge to α. We define $\{p_\xi : \xi < \tau\}$, a decreasing sequence of conditions. $p_0 = p$. $p_\xi|\alpha_\xi \in E_{\alpha_\xi}$, and $p_\xi \leq p_\zeta$, $p_\xi|[\alpha_\xi, \alpha) = p_\zeta|[\alpha_\zeta, \alpha)$ hold for $\zeta < \xi$. If ξ is limit, $\beta \geq \alpha_\xi$, the names $p_\zeta(\beta)$ are identical, so we can take it as $p_\xi(\beta)$. If $\beta < \alpha_\xi$, we take $p_\xi(\beta)$ as $\bigcup\{p_\zeta(\beta)\}$ by adding all low subsets which can be added, as in Claim 4. We show that p_ξ is a condition. To this end, we show by induction on $\beta < \alpha$ that $p_\xi|\beta$ is a condition. The limit case is trivial. The problem with $p_\xi(\beta)$ can only be that its X part contains a $K(\omega_1)$, but then, as in the proof of Claim 4, we get that $p_\xi|\beta \Vdash Z$ is not $K(\omega_1)$-free for some $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$.

If α is limit and we are to show (b) for α, and $p \Vdash f : \tau \to \mathrm{OR}$ for some $\tau < \kappa$, we can define a decreasing, continuous sequence $\{p_\xi : \xi \leq \tau\}$ with $p_\xi \Vdash f(\xi) = g(\xi)$, $p_\xi \in E_\alpha$. This can be carried out, as above, and then p_τ decides f.

For $\kappa = \omega_1$, (b) follows from the fact that we iterate a countably closed poset with countable supports, and for (a) an easy inductive proof can be given, as for the other case above.

Claim 8. *P_{κ^+} is κ^+-c.c.*

Proof. Given κ^+ conditions, we can assume that they are from E_{κ^+}. By the usual Δ-system arguments we can find two of them p and p' such that $\ell(p(\alpha)) = \ell(p'(\alpha))$ holds for every $\alpha \in \mathrm{supp}(p) \cap \mathrm{supp}(p')$. We show that $p \cup p'$ is a condition (though not necessarily in E_{κ^+}).

To this end, we show that $(p \cup p')|\alpha \in P_\alpha$ by induction on α. All cases are trivial, except when $\alpha = \beta + 1$, $\beta \in \mathrm{supp}(p) \cap \mathrm{supp}(p')$. What we have to show is that the F part of $(p \cup p')(\beta)$ is well-defined, i.e., if $Z = Z'$ are from the $\mathcal{Z}$ part, then $F(Z, x) = F(Z', x)$ $(x < \delta)$. But this will hold (or, more precisely, will be forced to hold by $(p \cup p')|\beta)$ as $F(Z, x)$ is determined by $Z|\delta$ and by x, and it is determined the same way in p and p'.

From the last Claim, every (κ, ω_1)-graph appears in some intermediate extension, and so it is embedded into the next graph, Y_α, by Q_α. We still have to show that Y_α remains $K(\omega_1)$-free under the further extensions. This follows from Claim 7(b) if $\kappa > \omega_1$, and from the following statement which is a special case of a well-known lemma about forcing.

Claim 9. *If, in V, Y is a $K(\omega_1)$-free graph, P is an $< \omega_1$-closed frocing, then, in V^P, Y is still $K(\omega_1)$-free.*

Proof. If $p \Vdash T$ is an uncountable clique, select $\{p_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ fixing more and more elements of T, $p_0 = p$.

Remark. With the technique of Theorem 4 it is possible to show that if $\mu \geq \nu > \kappa$, $\mathrm{cf}(\mu) > \kappa$, and ν, κ are regular, then it is consistent that $2^\kappa = \mu$, $\mathrm{CF}(\kappa, \omega_1) = \nu$, and GCH holds below κ. Add a sequence $\{Y_\alpha : \alpha < \nu\}$, rather than of length κ^+, as in Theorem 4. One only has to observe that Y_α does not embed into any $K(\omega_1)$-free graph in V^{P_α}, this can be proved similarly to Claim 8 in Theorem 3.

References

[1] A. Hajnal, P. Komjáth: Embedding graphs into colored graphs, *Trans. of the Amer. Math. Soc.* **307** (1988), 395–409.

[2] P. Komjáth and János Pach, Universal elements and the complexity of certain classes of infinite graphs, *Discrete Math.* **95** (1991) 255–270.

[3] P. Komjáth, J. Pach: The complexity of a class of infinite graphs, *Combinatorica*, to appear.

[4] R. Rado: Universal graphs and universal functions, *Acta Arith.*, **9** (1964), 331–340.

[5] R. Rado: Universal graphs, in: *A Seminar in Graph Theory*, (eds. Harary, Beineke), Holt, Rinehart, and Winston Co., 1967.