ON INCOMPACTNESS FOR CHROMATIC NUMBER OF GRAPHS

SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. We deal with incompactness. Assume the existence of non-reflecting stationary set of cofinality κ. We prove that one can define a graph G whose chromatic number is $> \kappa$, while the chromatic number of every subgraph $G' \subseteq G, |G'| < |G|$ is $\leq \kappa$. The main case is $\kappa = \aleph_0$.

Date: April 5, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 03E05; Secondary: 05C15.

Key words and phrases. set theory, graphs, chromatic number, compactness, non-reflecting stationary sets.

The author thanks Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

We would like to thank the Israel Science Foundation for partial support of this research. Publication 1006.

Anotated Content

§ 0. Introduction

§ 0(A). **The questions and results.**

During the Hajnal conference (June 2011) Magidor asked me on incompactness of "having chromatic number $\aleph_0$"; that is, there is a graph G with λ nodes, chromatic number $> \aleph_0$ but every subgraph with $< \lambda$ nodes has chromatic number $\aleph_0$ when:

$(*)_1$ λ is regular $> \aleph_1$ with a non-reflecting stationary $S \subseteq S^\lambda_{\aleph_0}$, possibly though better not, assuming some version of GCH.

Subsequently also when:

$(*)_2$ $\lambda = \aleph_{\omega+1}$.

Such problems were first asked by Erdös-Hajnal, see [EH74]; we continue [Sh:347].

First answer was using BB, see [Sh:309, 3.24] so assuming

$\boxplus$ (a) $\lambda = \mu^+$
(b) $\mu^{\aleph_0} = \mu$
(c) $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0\}$ is stationary not reflecting

or just

$\boxplus'$ (a) $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$
(b) $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < \lambda$
(c) as above.

However, eventually we get more: if $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0} = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$ and $S \subseteq S^\lambda_{\aleph_0}$ is stationary non-reflective then we have λ-incompactness for $\aleph_0$-chromatic. In fact, in §2 we replace $\aleph_0$ by $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) < \lambda$ using a stronger hypothesis.

Moreover, if $\lambda^\kappa > \lambda$ we still get $(\lambda^\kappa, \lambda)$-incompactness for $\aleph_0$-chromatic number and even $(\kappa, \aleph_0)$-chromatic number. In §2 we use quite free family of countable sequences.

In subsequent work we shall solve also the parallel of the second question of Magidor, i.e.

$(*)_2$ for regular $\kappa > \aleph_0$ colours getting $\aleph_{\kappa \cdot \varepsilon + 1}$ for every $\varepsilon < \kappa$.

We thank Menachem Magidor for asking, Peter Komjath for stimulating discussion and Paul Larson and Shimoni Garti for some comments.

§ 0(B). **Preliminaries.**

Definition 0.1. For a graph G, let $\mathrm{ch}(G)$, the chromatic number of G be the minimal cardinal χ such that there is colouring $\mathbf{c}$ of G with χ colours, that is $\mathbf{c}$ is a function from the set of nodes of G into χ or just a set of of cardinality $\leq \chi$ such that $\mathbf{c}(x) = \mathbf{c}(y) \Rightarrow \{x, y\} \notin \mathrm{edge}(G)$.

Definition 0.2. 1) We say "we have λ-incompactness for the $(< \chi)$-chromatic number" or $\mathrm{INC}_{\mathrm{chr}}(\lambda, < \chi)$ <u>when</u>: there is a graph G with λ nodes, chromatic number $\geq \chi$ but every subgraph with $< \lambda$ nodes has chromatic number $< \chi$.
2) If $\chi = \mu^+$ we may replace "$< \chi$" by μ; similarly in 0.3.

We also consider

Definition 0.3. 1) We say "we have (μ, λ)-incompactness for $(< \chi)$-chromatic number" or $\mathrm{INC}_{\mathrm{chr}}(\mu, \lambda, < \chi)$ <u>when</u> there is an increasing continuous sequence $\langle G_i : i \leq \lambda \rangle$ of graphs each with $\leq \mu$ nodes, G_i an induced subgraph of G_λ with $\mathrm{ch}(G_\lambda) \geq \chi$ but $i < \lambda \Rightarrow \mathrm{ch}(G_i) < \chi$.
2) Replacing (in part (1)) χ by $\bar{\chi} = (< \chi_0, \chi_1)$ means $\mathrm{ch}(G_\lambda)) \geq \chi_1$ and $i < \lambda \rightarrow \mathrm{ch}(G_i) < \chi_0$; similarly in 0.2 and parts 3),4) below.
3) We say we have incompactness for length λ for $(< \chi)$-chromatic (or $\bar{\chi}$-chromatic) number <u>when</u> we fail to have (μ, λ)-compactness for $(< \chi)$-chromatic (or $\bar{\chi}$-chromatic) number for some μ.
4) We say we have $[\mu, \lambda]$-incompactness for $(< \chi)$-chromatic number or $\mathrm{INC}_{\mathrm{chr}}[\mu, \lambda, < \chi]$ <u>when</u> there is a graph G with μ nodes, $\mathrm{ch}(G) \geq \chi$ but $G^1 \subseteq G \wedge |G^1| < \lambda \Rightarrow \mathrm{ch}(G^1) < \chi$.
5) Let $\mathrm{INC}^+_{\mathrm{chr}}(\mu, \lambda, < \chi)$ be as in part (1) but we add that even the $c\ell(G_i)$, the colouring number of G_i is $< \chi$ for $i < \lambda$, see below.
6) Let $\mathrm{INC}^+_{\mathrm{chr}}[\mu, \lambda, < \chi)$ be as in part (4) but we add $G^1 \subseteq G \wedge |G^1| < \lambda \Rightarrow c\ell(G^1) < \chi$.
7) If $\chi = \kappa^+$ we may write κ instead of "$< \chi$".

Definition 0.4. 1) For regular $\lambda > \kappa$ let $S^\lambda_\kappa = \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$.
2) We say C is a $(\geq \theta)$-closed subset of a set B of ordinals where: if $\delta = \sup(\delta \cap B) \in B, \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \geq \theta$ and $\delta = \sup(C \cap \delta)$ then $\delta \in C$.

Definition 0.5. For a graph G, the colouring number $c\ell(G)$ is the minimal κ such that there is a list $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(*) \rangle$ of the nodes of G such that $\alpha < \alpha(*) \Rightarrow \kappa > |\{\beta < \alpha : \{a_\beta, a_\alpha\} \in \mathrm{edge}(G)\}$.

§ 1. From non-reflecting stationary in cofinality $\aleph_0$

Claim 1.1. *There is a graph G with λ nodes and chromatic number $> \kappa$ but every subgraph with $< \lambda$ nodes have chromatic number $\leq \kappa$ when:*

$\boxplus$ (a) λ, κ *are regular cardinals*
(b) $\kappa < \lambda = \lambda^\kappa$
(c) $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ *is stationary, not reflecting.*

Proof. Stage A: Let $\bar{X} = \langle X_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ be a partition of λ to sets such that $|X_i| = \lambda$ or just $|X_i| = |i|^\kappa$ and $\min(X_i) \geq i$ and let $X_{<i} = \cup\{X_j : j < i\}$ and $X_{\leq i} = X_{<(i+1)}$. For $\alpha < \lambda$ let $\mathbf{i}(\alpha)$ be the unique ordinal $i < \lambda$ such that $\alpha \in X_i$. We choose the set of points = nodes of G as $Y = \{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha < \beta < \lambda, \mathbf{i}(\beta) \in S$ and $\alpha < \mathbf{i}(\beta)\}$ and let $Y_{<i} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in Y : \mathbf{i}(\beta) < i\}$.

Stage B: Note that if $\lambda = \kappa^+$, the complete graph with λ nodes is an example (no use of the further information in $\boxplus$). So without loss of generality $\lambda > \kappa^+$.

Now choose a sequence satisfying the following properties, exists by [Sh:g, Ch.III]:

$\boxplus$ (a) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$
(b) $C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)$
(c) $\mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa$
(d) $\bar{C}$ guesses clubs.

Let $\langle \alpha^*_{\delta,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle$ list C_δ in increasing order.

For $\delta \in S$ let Γ_δ be the set of sequence $\bar{\beta}$ such that:

$\boxplus_{\bar{\beta}}$ (a) $\bar{\beta}$ has the form $\langle \beta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle$
(b) $\bar{\beta}$ is increasing with limit δ
(c) $\alpha^*_{\delta,\varepsilon} < \beta_{2\varepsilon+i} < \alpha^*_{\delta,\varepsilon+1}$ for $i < 2, \varepsilon < \kappa$
(d) $\beta_{2\varepsilon+i} \in X_{<\alpha^*_{\delta,\varepsilon+1}} \backslash X_{\leq \alpha^*_{\delta,\varepsilon}}$ for $i < 2, \varepsilon < \kappa$
(e) $(\beta_{2\varepsilon}, \beta_{2\varepsilon+1}) \in Y$ hence $\in Y_{<\alpha^*_{\delta,\varepsilon+1}} \subseteq Y_{<\delta}$ for each $\varepsilon < \kappa$

(can ask less).

So $|\Gamma_\delta| \leq |\delta|^\kappa \leq |X_\delta| \leq \lambda$ hence we can choose a sequence $\langle \bar{\beta}_\gamma : \gamma \in X'_\delta \subseteq X_\delta \rangle$ listing Γ_δ.

Now we define the set of edges of G: $\mathrm{edge}(G) = \{\{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), (\min(C_\delta), \gamma)\} : \delta \in S, \gamma \in X'_\delta$ hence the sequence $\bar{\beta}_\gamma = \langle \beta_{\gamma,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle$ is well defined and we demand $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \{(\beta_{\gamma,2\varepsilon}, \beta_{\gamma,2\varepsilon+1}) : \varepsilon < \kappa\}\}$.

Stage C: In every subgraph of G of cardinality $< \lambda$ has chromatic number $\leq \kappa$.

For this we shall prove that:

$\oplus_1$ $\mathrm{ch}(G{\restriction}Y_{<i}) \leq \kappa$ for every $i < \lambda$.

This suffice as λ is regular, hence every subgraph with $< \lambda$ nodes is included in $Y_{<i}$ for some $i < \lambda$.

For this we shall prove more by induction on $j < \lambda$:

$\oplus_{2,j}$ if $i < j, i \notin S, \mathbf{c}_1$ a colouring of $G{\restriction}Y_{<i}, \mathrm{Rang}(\mathbf{c}_1) \subseteq \kappa$ and $u \in [\kappa]^\kappa$ <u>then</u> there is a colouring $\mathbf{c}_2$ of $G{\restriction}Y_{<j}$ extending $\mathbf{c}_1$ such that $\mathrm{Rang}(\mathbf{c}_2{\restriction}(Y_{<j} \backslash Y_{<i})) \subseteq u$.

<u>Case 1</u>: $j = 0$

Trivial.

<u>Case 2</u>: j successor, $j - 1 \notin S$

By the induction hypothesis without loss of generality $j = i+1$, but then every node from $Y_j \backslash Y_i$ is an isolated node in $G{\restriction}Y_{<j}$, because if $\{(\alpha,\beta),(\alpha',\beta')\}$ is an edge of $G{\restriction}Y_j$ then $\mathbf{i}(\beta), \mathbf{i}(\beta') \in S$ hence necessarily $\mathbf{i}(\beta) \neq j-1 = i, \mathbf{i}(\beta') \neq j - 1 = i$ hence both $(\alpha,\beta),(\alpha,\beta')$ are from Y_i.

<u>Case 3</u>: j successor, $j - 1 \in S$

Let $j - 1$ be called δ so $\delta \in S$. But $i \notin S$ by the assumption in $\oplus_{2,j}$ hence $i < \delta$. Let $\varepsilon(*) < \kappa$ be such that $\beta_{\delta,\varepsilon(*)} > i$.

Let $\langle u_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \kappa \rangle$ be a sequence of subsets of u, a partition of u to sets each of cardinality κ; actually the only disjointness used is that $u_\kappa \cap (\bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon<\kappa} u_\varepsilon) = \emptyset$.

We let $i_0 = i, i_{1+\varepsilon} = \cup\{\beta_{\delta,\varepsilon(*)+1+\zeta} + 1 : \zeta < 1 + \varepsilon\}, i_\kappa = \delta, i_{\kappa+1} = \delta + 1 = j$.

Note that:

- $\varepsilon < \kappa \Rightarrow i_\varepsilon \notin S_j$.

[Why? For $\varepsilon = 0$ by the assumption on i, for ε successor i_ε is successor and for i limit clearly $\mathrm{cf}(i_\varepsilon) = \mathrm{cf}(\varepsilon) < \kappa$ and $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$.]

We now choose $\mathbf{c}_{2,\zeta}$ by induction on $\zeta \leq \kappa + 1$ such that:

- $\mathbf{c}_{2,0} = \mathbf{c}_1$
- $\mathbf{c}_{2,\zeta}$ is a colouring of $G{\restriction}Y_{<i_\zeta}$
- $\mathbf{c}_{2,\zeta}$ is increasing with ζ
- $\mathrm{Rang}(\mathbf{c}_{2,\zeta}{\restriction}(Y_{<i_{\xi+1}} \backslash Y_{<i_\xi})) \subseteq u_\xi$ for every $\xi < \zeta$.

For $\zeta = 0, \mathbf{c}_{2,0}$ is $\mathbf{c}_1$ so is given.

For $\zeta = \varepsilon + 1 < \kappa$: use the induction hypothesis, possible as necessarily $i_\varepsilon \notin S$.

For $\zeta \leq \kappa$ limit: take union.

For $\zeta = \kappa + 1$, note that each node of $Y_{<i_\zeta} \backslash Y_{<i_\kappa}$ is not connected to any other such node and connected to some node in $Y_{<i_\kappa}$ has the form $(\min(C_\delta), \gamma), \gamma \in X'_\delta$, hence $\bar\beta_\gamma$ is well defined, so the node $(\min(C_\delta),\gamma)$ is connected in G, more exactly in $G{\restriction}Y_{\leq\delta}$ exactly to the κ nodes $\{(\beta_{\gamma,2\varepsilon}, \beta_{\gamma,2\varepsilon+1}) : \varepsilon < \kappa\}$, but for every $\varepsilon < \kappa$ large enough, $\mathbf{c}_{2,\kappa}((\beta_{\gamma,2\varepsilon}, \beta_{\gamma,2\varepsilon+1})) \in u_\varepsilon$ hence $\notin u_\kappa$ and $|u_\kappa| = \kappa$ so we can choose a colour.

<u>Case 4</u>: j limit

By the assumption of the claim there is a club e of j disjoint to S and without loss of generality $\min(e) = i$. Now choose $\mathbf{c}_{2,\xi}$ a colouring of $Y_{<\xi}$ by induction on $\xi \in e \cup \{j\}$, increasing with ξ such that $\mathrm{Rang}(\mathbf{c}_{2,\xi}{\restriction}(Y_{<\varepsilon} \backslash Y_{<i})) \subseteq u, \mathbf{c}_{2,0} = \mathbf{c}_1$

- For $\xi = \min(e) = i$ the colouring $\mathbf{c}_{2,\xi} = \mathbf{c}_{2,i} = \mathbf{c}_1$ is given,
- for ξ successor in e, i.e. $\in \mathrm{nacc}(e) \backslash \{i\}$, use the induction hypothesis with $\xi, \max(e \cap \xi)$ here playing the role of j, i there recalling $\max(e \cap \xi) \in e, e \cap S = \emptyset$
- for $\xi = \sup(e \cap \xi)$ take union.

Lastly, for $\xi = j$ we are done.

Stage D: $\mathrm{ch}(G) > \kappa$.

Why? Toward a contradiction, assume $\mathbf{c}$ is a colouring of G with set of colours $\subseteq \kappa$. For each $\gamma < \lambda$ let $u_\gamma = \{\mathbf{c}((\alpha,\beta)) : \gamma < \alpha < \beta < \lambda$ and $(\alpha,\beta) \in Y\}$. So $\langle u_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda\rangle$ is $\supseteq$-decreasing sequence of subsets of κ and $\kappa < \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$, hence for some $\gamma(*) < \lambda$ and $u_* \subseteq \kappa$ we have $\gamma \in (\gamma(*),\lambda) \Rightarrow u_\gamma = u_*$.

Hence $E = \{\delta < \lambda : \delta$ is a limit ordinal $> \gamma(*)$ and $(\forall \alpha < \delta)((\mathbf{i}(\alpha) < \delta)$ and for every $\gamma < \delta$ and $i \in u_*$ there are $\alpha < \beta$ from (γ,δ) such that $(\alpha,\beta) \in Y$ and $\mathbf{c}((\alpha,\beta)) = i\}$ is a club of λ.

Now recall that $\bar{C}$ guesses clubs hence for some $\delta \in S$ we have $C_\delta \subseteq E$, so for every $\varepsilon < \kappa$ we can choose $\beta_{2\varepsilon} < \beta_{2\varepsilon+1}$ from $(\alpha^*_{\delta,\varepsilon}, \alpha^*_{\delta,\varepsilon+1})$ such that $(\beta_{2\varepsilon},\beta_{2\varepsilon+1}) \in Y$ and $\varepsilon \in u_* \Rightarrow \mathbf{c}((\beta_{2\varepsilon},\beta_{2\varepsilon+1})) = \varepsilon$. So $\langle \beta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\rangle$ is well defined, increasing and belongs to Γ_δ, hence $\bar{\beta}_\gamma = \langle \beta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\rangle$ for some $\gamma \in X_\delta$, hence $(\alpha^*_{\delta,0},\gamma)$ belongs to Y and is connected in the graph to $(\beta_{2\varepsilon},\beta_{2\varepsilon+1})$ for $\varepsilon < \kappa$. Now if $\varepsilon \in u_*$ then $\mathbf{c}((\beta_{2\varepsilon},\beta_{2\varepsilon+1})) = \varepsilon$ hence $\mathbf{c}((\alpha^*_{\delta,0},\gamma)) \neq \varepsilon$ for every $\varepsilon \in u_*$, so $\mathbf{c}((\alpha^*_{\delta,0},\gamma)) \in \kappa \backslash u_*$. But $u_* = u_{\alpha^*_{\delta,0}}$ and $\mathbf{c}((\alpha^*_{\delta,0},\gamma)) \in \kappa\backslash u_*$, so we get contradiction to the definition of $u_{\alpha^*_{\delta,0}}$. $\square_{1.1}$

Similarly

Claim 1.2. *There is an increasing continuous sequence $\langle G_i : i \le \lambda\rangle$ of graphs each of cardinality λ^κ such that $\mathrm{ch}(G_\lambda) > \kappa$ and $i < \lambda \Rightarrow \mathrm{ch}(G_i) \le \kappa$ when:*

$\boxplus$ (a) $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$

(b) $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$ *is stationary not reflecting.*

Proof. Like 1.1 but the X_i are not necessarily $\subseteq \lambda$ or use 2.2. $\square_{1.2}$

§ 2. From almost free

Definition 2.1. Suppose $\eta_\beta \in {}^\kappa\mathrm{Ord}$ for every $\beta < \alpha(*)$ and $u \subseteq \alpha(*)$, and $\alpha < \beta < \alpha(*) \Rightarrow \eta_\alpha \neq \eta_\beta$.
1) We say $\{\eta_\alpha : \alpha \in u\}$ is free when there exists a function $h : u \to \kappa$ such that $\langle \{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) : \varepsilon \in [h(\alpha), \kappa)\} : \alpha \in u\rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint sets.
2) We say $\{\eta_\alpha : \alpha \in u\}$ is weakly free <u>when</u> there exists a sequence $\langle u_{\varepsilon,\zeta} : \varepsilon < \kappa\rangle$ of subsets of u with union u, such that the function $\eta_\zeta \mapsto \eta_\zeta(\varepsilon)$ is a one-to-one function on $u_{\varepsilon,\zeta}$, for each $\varepsilon < \kappa$.

Claim 2.2. *1) We have* $\mathrm{INC}_{\mathrm{chr}}(\mu, \lambda, \kappa)$ *and even* $\mathrm{INC}^+_{\mathrm{chr}}(\mu, \lambda, \kappa)$*, see Definition 0.3(1)* <u>*when*</u>*:*

$\boxplus$ (a) $\alpha(*) \in [\mu, \mu^+)$ *and* λ *is regular* $\leq \mu$ *and* $\mu = \mu^\kappa$
(b) $\bar\eta = \langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(*)\rangle$
(c) $\eta_\alpha \in {}^\kappa\mu$
(d) $\langle u_i : i \leq \lambda\rangle$ *is a* $\subseteq$*-increasing continuous sequence of subsets of* $\alpha(*)$ *with* $u_\lambda = \alpha(*)$
(e) $\bar\eta \restriction u_\alpha$ *is free* <u>*iff*</u> $\alpha < \lambda$ <u>*iff*</u> $\bar\eta \restriction u_\alpha$ *is weakly free.*

2) We have $\mathrm{INC}_{\mathrm{chr}}[\mu, \lambda, \kappa]$ *and even* $\mathrm{INC}^+_{\mathrm{chr}}[\mu, \lambda, \kappa]$ *, see Definition 0.3(4)* <u>*when*</u>*:*

$\boxplus_2$ (a), (b), (c) *as in* $\boxplus$ *from 2.2*
(d) $\bar\eta$ *is not free*
(e) $\bar\eta \restriction u$ *is free when* $u \in [\alpha(*)]^{<\lambda}$.

Proof. For $\mathscr{A} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mathrm{Ord}$, we define $\tau_{\mathscr{A}}$ as the vocabulary $\{P_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{A}\} \cup \{F_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\}$ where P_η is a unary predicate, F_ε a unary function (may be partial).

For part (1) without loss of generality for each $i < \lambda, u_i$ is an initial segment of $\alpha(*)$ and let $\mathscr{A} = \{\eta_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(*)\}$.

For part (2) let $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(*)\rangle$ list $\mathscr{A}$ and in both cases let $<_{\mathscr{A}}$ be the well ordering $\{(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\beta) : \alpha < \beta < \alpha(*)\}$ of $\mathscr{A}$.

We further let $K_{\mathscr{A}}$ be the class of structures M such that (pedantically, $K_{\mathscr{A}}$ depend also on the sequence $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(*)\rangle$:

$\boxplus_1$ (a) $M = (|M|, F^M_\varepsilon, P^M_\eta)_{\varepsilon<\kappa,\eta\in\mathscr{A}}$
(b) $\langle P^M_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{A}\rangle$ is a partition of $|M|$, so for $a \in M$ let $\eta_a = \eta^M_a$ be the unique $\eta \in \mathscr{A}$ such that $a \in P^M_\eta$
(c) if $a_\ell \in P^M_{\eta_\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $F^M_\varepsilon(a_2) = a_1$ then $\eta_1(\varepsilon) = \eta_2(\varepsilon)$ and $\eta_1 <_{\mathscr{A}} \eta_2$.

Let $K^*_{\mathscr{A}}$ be the class of M such that

$\boxplus_2$ (a) $M \in K_{\mathscr{A}}$
(b) $\|M\| = \lambda^\kappa$
(c) if $\eta \in \mathscr{A}, u \subseteq \kappa$ and $\eta_\varepsilon <_{\mathscr{A}} \eta, \eta_\varepsilon(\varepsilon) = \eta(\varepsilon)$ and $a_\varepsilon \in P^M_{\eta_\varepsilon}$ for $\varepsilon \in u$ <u>then</u> for some $a \in P^M_\eta$ we have $\varepsilon \in u \Rightarrow F^M_\varepsilon(a) = a_\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \in \kappa \backslash u \Rightarrow F^M_\varepsilon(a)$ not defined.

Clearly

$\boxplus_3$ there is $M \in K^*_{\mathscr{A}}$

$\boxplus_4$ for $M \in K_{\mathscr{A}}$ let G_M be the graph with:

- set of nodes $|M|$
- set of edges $\{\{a, F^M_\varepsilon(a)\} : a \in |M|, \varepsilon < \kappa$ when $F^M_\varepsilon(a)$ is defined$\}$.

Now

$\boxplus_5$ if $u \subseteq \alpha(*), \mathscr{B} = \{\eta_\alpha : \alpha \in u\} \subseteq \mathscr{A}$ and $\bar\eta \restriction u$ is free, and $M \in K_{\mathscr{A}}$ <u>then</u> $G_{M,\mathscr{B}} := G_M \restriction (\cup\{P^M_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{B}_u\})$ has chromatic number $\leq \kappa$.

[Why? Let $h : u \to \kappa$ witness that $\bar\eta \restriction u$ is free and for $\varepsilon < \kappa$ let $\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon := \{\eta_\alpha : \alpha \in u$ and $h(\alpha) = \varepsilon\}$, so $u = \cup\{u_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\}$, hence it is enough to prove for each $\varepsilon < \kappa$ that $G_{\mu,\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon}$ has chromatic number $\leq \kappa$. To prove this by induction on $\alpha \leq \alpha(*)$ we choose $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha$ such that:

$\boxplus_{5.1}$ (a) $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha$ is a function

(b) $\langle \mathbf{c}_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha \rangle$ is increasing continuous

(c) $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha) = B^\varepsilon_\alpha := \cup\{P^M_{\eta_\beta} : \beta < \alpha$ and $\eta_\beta \in \mathscr{B}_\varepsilon\}$

(d) $\mathrm{Rang}(\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha) \subseteq \kappa$

(e) if $a, b, \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathbf{c}_\alpha)$ and $\{a, b\} \in \mathrm{edge}(G_M)$ then $\mathbf{c}_\alpha(a) \neq \mathbf{c}_\alpha(b)$.

Clearly this suffices. Why is this possible?

If $\alpha = 0$ let $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha$ be empty, if α is a limit ordinal let $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha = \cup\{\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ and if $\alpha = \beta + 1 \wedge \alpha(\beta) \neq G$ let $\mathbf{c}_\alpha = \mathbf{c}_\beta$.

Lastly, if $\alpha = \beta + 1 \wedge h(\beta) = \varepsilon$ we define $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha$ as follows for $a \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha), c^\varepsilon_\alpha(a)$ is:

<u>Case 1</u>: $a \in B^\varepsilon_\beta$.

Then $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha(a) = \mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\beta(a)$.

<u>Case 2</u>: $a \in B^\varepsilon_\alpha \backslash B^\varepsilon_\beta$.

Then $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha(a) = \min(\kappa \backslash \{c^\varepsilon_\beta(F^M_\zeta(a)) : \zeta < \varepsilon$ and $F^M_\zeta(a) \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\beta)\})$.

This is O.K. as:

$\boxplus_{5.2}$ (a) $B^\varepsilon_\alpha = B^\varepsilon_\beta \cup P^M_{\eta_\beta}$

(b) if $a \in B^\varepsilon_\beta$ then $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\beta(a)$ is well defined (so case 1 is O.K.)

(c) if $\{a, b\} \in \mathrm{edge}(G_M), a \in P^M_{\eta_\beta}$ and $b \in B^\varepsilon_\alpha$ <u>then</u> $b \in B^\varepsilon_\beta$ and $b \in \{F^M_\zeta(a) : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$

(d) $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha(a)$ is well defined in Case 2, too

(e) $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha$ is a function from B^ε_α to κ

(f) $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha$ is a colouring.

[Why? Clause (a) by $\boxplus_{5.1}(b)$, clause (b) by the induction hypothesis and clause (c) by $\boxplus_2(c) + \boxplus_4$. Next, clause (d) holds as $\{c^\varepsilon_\beta(F^M_\zeta(a)) : \zeta < \varepsilon$ and $F^M_z eta(a) \in B^\varepsilon_\beta = \mathrm{Dom}(\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\beta)\}$ is a set of cardinality $\leq |\varepsilon| < \kappa$. Clause (e) holds by the choices of the $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha(a)$'s. Lastly, clause (f) holds by the induction hypothesis of $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\beta$, clause (c) and the choice of $\mathbf{c}^\varepsilon_\alpha$.]

So indeed $\boxplus_5$ holds.]

$\boxplus_6$ $\mathrm{chr}(G_M) > \kappa$ if $M \in K^*_{\mathscr{A}}$.

Why? Toward contradiction assume $\mathbf{c} : G_M \to \kappa$ is a colouring. For each $\eta \in \mathscr{A}$ and $\varepsilon < \kappa$ let $\Lambda_{\eta,\varepsilon} = \{\nu : \nu \in \mathscr{A}, \nu <_{\mathscr{A}} \eta, \nu(\varepsilon) = \eta(\varepsilon)$ and for some $a \in P^M_\nu$ we have $\mathbf{c}(a) = \varepsilon\}$.

Let $\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon = \{\eta \in \mathscr{A} : |\Lambda_{\eta,\varepsilon}| < \kappa\}$. Now if $\mathscr{A} \neq \cup\{\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\}$ then pick any $\eta \in \mathscr{A} \backslash \cup \{\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\}$ and by induction on $\varepsilon < \kappa$ choose $\nu_\varepsilon \in \Lambda_{\eta,\varepsilon} \backslash \{\nu_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$, possible as $\eta \notin \mathscr{B}_\varepsilon$ by the definition of $\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon$. By the definition of $\Lambda_{\eta,\varepsilon}$ there is $a_\varepsilon \in P^M_{\nu_\varepsilon}$ such that $\mathbf{c}(\nu_\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$. So as $M \in K^*_{\mathscr{A}}$ there is $a \in P^M_\eta$ such that $\varepsilon < \kappa \Rightarrow F^M_\varepsilon(a) = a_\varepsilon$, but $\{a, a_\varepsilon\} \in \mathrm{edge}(G_M)$ hence $\mathbf{c}(a) \neq \mathbf{c}(a_\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$ for every $\varepsilon < \kappa$, contradiction. So $\mathscr{A} = \cup\{\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\}$.

For each $\varepsilon < \kappa$ we choose $\zeta_\eta < \kappa$ for $\eta \in \mathscr{B}_\varepsilon$ by induction on $<_{\mathscr{A}}$ such that $\zeta_\eta \notin \{\zeta_\nu : \nu \in \Lambda_{\eta,\varepsilon} \cap \mathscr{B}_\varepsilon\}$. Let $\mathscr{B}_{\varepsilon,\zeta} = \{\eta \in \mathscr{B}_\varepsilon : \zeta_\eta = \zeta\}$ for $\varepsilon, \zeta < \kappa$ so $\mathscr{A} = \cup\{\mathscr{B}_{\varepsilon,\zeta} : \varepsilon, \zeta < \kappa\}$ and clearly $\eta \mapsto \eta(\varepsilon)$ is a one-to-one function with domain $\mathscr{B}_{\varepsilon,\zeta}$, contradiction to "$\bar\eta = \bar\eta \restriction u_\lambda$ is not weakly free". $\square_{2.2}$

Observation 2.3. *1) If $\mathscr{A} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ and $\eta \neq \nu \in \mathscr{A} \Rightarrow (\forall^\infty \varepsilon < \kappa)(\eta(\varepsilon) \neq \nu(\varepsilon))$ then $\mathscr{A}$ is free iff $\mathscr{A}$ is weakly free.*
2) The assumptions of 2.2(2) hold <u>when</u>: $\mu \geq \lambda > \kappa$ are regular, $S \subseteq S^\mu_\kappa$ stationary, $\bar\eta = \langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle, \eta_\delta$ an increasing sequence of ordinals of length κ with limit δ such that $u \subseteq [\lambda]^{<\lambda} \Rightarrow \langle \mathrm{Rang}(\eta_\delta) : \eta \in u\rangle$ has a one-to-one choice function.

Conclusion 2.4. *Assume for every graph G, if $H \subseteq G \wedge |H| < \lambda \Rightarrow \mathrm{chr}(H) \leq \kappa$ then $\mathrm{chr}(G) \leq \kappa$.*
<u>Then</u>:

- *(A) if $\mu > \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\mu)$ and $\mu \geq \lambda$ then $\mathrm{pp}(\mu) = \mu^+$*
- *(B) if $\mu > \mathrm{cf}(\mu) \geq \kappa$ and $\mu \geq \lambda$ then $\mathrm{pp}(\mu) = \mu^+$, i.e. the strong hypothesis*
- *(C) if $\kappa = \aleph_0$ then above λ the SCH holds.*

Proof. <u>Clause (A)</u>: By 2.2 and [Sh:g, Ch.II], [Sh:g, Ch.IX,§1].

<u>Clause (B)</u>: Follows from (A) by [Sh:g, Ch.VIII,§1].

<u>Clause (C)</u>: Follows from (B) by [Sh:g, Ch.IX,§1]. $\square_{2.4}$

Discussion 2.5. Do we have $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathrm{chr}}(\lambda, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_0)$ for some λ? Assume not.
1) If $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_0}$, then necessarily $\mathrm{pp}(\mu) = \mu^+$ hence $2^\mu = \mu^+$.
2) Let $\mu = \sum\limits_n \lambda_n, \lambda_n = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda_n) < \lambda_{n+1}, \bar f = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \mu^+\rangle$ witness $\mu^+ = \mathrm{tcf}(\prod \lambda_n, <_{J^{\mathrm{bd}}_{\aleph_0}})$.

If $S_* = \mathrm{bad}_{\leq \aleph_\omega}(\bar f) = \mathrm{bad}(\bar f \cap S^{\mu^+}_{<\aleph_\omega})$ non-stationary, we are done. Otherwise for some $\ell \in \{1,2,3\}$ there is $S \subseteq S^{\mu^+}_{\aleph_\ell}$ stationary not reflecting in any $\delta \in S^{\mu^+}_{<\aleph_\omega}$, so we have $\diamondsuit_S$.
3) Recall for every $n, \mathrm{IC}_{\mathrm{chr}}(\beth^+_n(\kappa), \beth^+_n(\kappa), \kappa)$; so we can assume $\bigwedge\limits_n \beth_n < \aleph_\omega$, so $\beth_\omega = \aleph_\omega$.
4) Still we can prove: for some $\ell \in \{0,1,2,3\}, (\forall\lambda), \mathrm{IC}_{\mathrm{chr}}(\lambda, \aleph_\omega, \aleph_\ell)$. Can we use $X \subseteq [\mu]^n$. Use [Sh:620]?
5) Can we use an example of part (3) on some $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) < \beth_u$ and use...
6) Can we take stationary $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\theta$ not reflecting $S \notin \check I_\theta[\lambda]$, but on a partial square of it.

References

[EH74] Paul Erdős and Andras Hajnal, *Solved and Unsolved Problems in set theory*, Proc. of the Symp. in honor of Tarksi's seventieth birthday in Berkeley 1971 (Leon Henkin, ed.), Proc. Symp in Pure Math., vol. XXV, 1974, pp. 269–287.

[Sh:g] Saharon Shelah, *Cardinal Arithmetic*, Oxford Logic Guides, vol. 29, Oxford University Press, 1994.

[Sh:309] ______, *Black Boxes*, , 0812.0656. 0812.0656. 0812.0656.

[Sh:347] ______, *Incompactness for chromatic numbers of graphs*, A tribute to Paul Erdős, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990, pp. 361–371.

[Sh:620] ______, *Special Subsets of* ${}^{\mathrm{cf}(\mu)}\mu$*, Boolean Algebras and Maharam measure Algebras*, Topology and its Applications **99** (1999), 135–235, 8th Prague Topological Symposium on General Topology and its Relations to Modern Analysis and Algebra, Part II (1996). math.LO/9804156.

Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 91904, Israel, and, Department of Mathematics, Hill Center - Busch Campus, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

E-mail address: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

URL: `http://shelah.logic.at`