On the Order of Countable Graphs

Jaroslav Nešetřil*
Department of Applied Mathematics
and
Institute for Theoretical Computer Science (ITI)
Charles University
Malostranské nám.25, 11800 Praha 1
Czech Republic
Email: nesetril@kam.ms.mff.cuni.cz

Saharon Shelah
Hebrew University, Jerusalem†
Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem 91904, Israel
and Department of Mathematics
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08854, USA
Email: shelah@math.huji.ac.il

October 18, 2000

[1]

*Partially supported by the Project LN00A056 of the Czech Ministry of Education and by GAUK 158 grant.

†Research supported by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation. Publication xxx

[1]Math. Subj. Class.03C, 05C, 05E, and 06A. Keywords and phrases: Density, Posetss, Rigid graphs, Universal graphs. The authors wish to thank the Mittag-Leffler Institute, for its support and pleasant environement during September, 2000, when this paper was

Abstract

A set of graphs is said to be *independent* if there is no homomorphism between distinct graphs from the set. We consider the existence problems related to the independent sets of countable graphs. While the maximal size of an independent set of countable graphs is 2^ω the *On Line problem* of extending a given independent set to a larger independent set is much harder. We prove that singletons are extendandable ("partnership theorem"). While this is the best possible in general, we give structural conditions which guarantee independent extensions.

This is related to universal graphs, rigid graphs (where we solve a problem posed in [18]) and to the density problem for countable graphs.

1 Introduction and Statement of Results

Given graphs $G = (V, E), G' = (V', E')$ a homomorphism is any mapping $V \to V'$ which preserves all the edges of G:

$$\{x, y\} \in E \Longrightarrow \{f(x), f(y)\} \in E'$$

This is briefly denoted by $f : G \to G'$. The existence of a homomorphism we indicate by $G \to G'$ which is also denoted by $G \leq G'$. $\leq$ is obviously a quasiorder.

$\leq$ is a very rich quasiorder which have been studied in several context, see [15] for a survey of this area. For example it has been shown (and this also not difficult to see) that any poset may be represented by $\leq$; see [21, 13] for less easy results in this area. A particular case is an *independent set* of graphs which is can be defined as an indepentent set (or antichain) in this quasiorder. Here we are interested in a seemingly easy question:

Independence Problem (shortly IP):

Given a set $\{G_\iota; \iota \in I\}$ of graphs does there exist a graph G such that $\{G_\iota; \iota \in I\}$ together with G form an independent set of graphs.

This problem has been solved for finite sets of (finite or infinite) graphs in [12, 13]. The general case is much harder and it is relative consistent to assume the negative solution (this is related to Vopěnka Axiom, see [9, 13]).

written.

In this paper we disscuss IP for countable graphs.

We prove the following:

Theorem 1.1 *For every countable graph G the following two statements are equivalent:*

i. there exists a countable graph G' such that G and G' are independent.

ii. G is not bipartite and it does not contain an infinite complete subgraph.

The both conditions given in *ii.* are clearly necessary. The non-bipartiteness comes from the general (cardinality unrestricted) independence problem as the only finite exception and the absence of an infinite clique is due to the cardinality restriction.

This modestly looking result (which we could call *Partnership Theorem*: countable graphs without K_ω have independent partners) has a number of consequences and leads to several interesting problems. First, we want to mention that the above result (and the IP) is related to universal graphs.

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a class of graphs. We say that a graph $U \in \mathcal{K}$ is *hom-universal* (with respect to $\mathcal{K}$) if $G \leq U$ for every $G \in \mathcal{K}$, [18].

Note that a graph U may be hom-universal with respect to a class $\mathcal{K}$ without beeing universal (in the usual sense meaning that any graph from $\mathcal{K}$ is a subgraph of U; see [8, 7, 22, **?**, **?**] for an extensive literature about universal graphs).

Let GRA_ω denotes the class of all countable non-bipartite graphs without an infinite complete subgraph (which is denoted by K_ω). It is well known that the class GRA_ω does not have a universal graph. The same proof actually gives that GRA_ω has no hom-universal graph. (Here is a simple proof which we sketch for the completeness: Suppose that U is hom-universal for GRA_ω. Denote by $U \oplus x$ the graph which we obtain from U by addition of a new vertex x joined to all the vertices of U. Then there exists $f : U \oplus x \to U$. Define the vertices $x_0, x_1, \dots$ by induction: $x_0 = x, x_{i+1} = f(x_i)$ It is easy to see that all these vertices form a complete graph in U.)

Theorem 1.1 is a strenghtening of the non-hom-universality of GRA_ω. In fact Theorem 1.1 is best possible in the following sense:

Corollary 1.1 *For a positive integer t the following two statements are equivalent:*

i. For every finite set $\{G_0, \ldots, G_t\}$ of graphs from GRA_ω there exists a graph $G \in GRA_\omega$ such that all pairs G and G_i $(i = 0, \ldots, t)$ are independent.

ii. $t = 1$.

Proof. There are many examples proving $i. \Rightarrow ii.$. For example consider the complete graph K_n and let U_n be the universal countable K_n-free graph. Then the set $\{K_n, U_n\}$ cannot be extended to a larger independent set as every graph G either contains K_n or is homomorphic to U_n.

An example for $t > 2$ consists from an independent set of finite graphs $G_0, \ldots, G_{t-1}$ and an universal countable graph, $U \not\geq G_i, i = 0, \ldots, t-1$ which is universal for all graphs G satisfying $G \not\geq G_i, i = 0, \ldots, t-1$. Such universal graph exists by [14]. (Note also that an analogous result does not hold for infinite sets. To see this let $G_i = C_{2i+3}$ be the set of all cycles of odd length. Then there is no G which is independent of all graphs G_i.) ∎

Theorem 1.1 is in the finite (or cardinality unrestricted) case also known as (Sparse) Incomparability Lemma [18, **?**, 15]. We can formulate this as follows:

Theorem 1.2 *For any choice of graphs G, H, G non-bipartite, satisfying $G < H$, $H \not\leq G$ there exists a graph G' such that $G' < H$, $H \not\leq G'$ and such that G and G' are independent.*

If G has a finite chromatic number then G' may be chosen finite.

(The last part of Theorem 1.2 may be seen as follows (sketch): If $\chi(G) = k$ then take G'' with $\chi(G'') > k$ and without cycles $\leq l$ such that G contains an odd cycle of length $\leq l$. Then G and G'' are independent. If $\chi(G')$ is large then also graphs G and $G'' \times H$ are independent, see [12].)

We do not know whether Theorem 1.2 holds if all the graphs are supposed to be countable. Partial results are included in Section 5.

Another related concept is the notion of a rigid graph: A graph G is said to be *rigid* if its only homomorphism $G \to G$ is the identical mapping. We shall prove the following:

Theorem 1.3 *For any countable graph G not containing K_ω there exists a countable rigid graph G' containing G as an induced subgraph.*

The history of this result goes to [3] (the finite case), to [4] (the cardinality unrestricted case), and to [18] (the optimal chromatic number). Theorem 1.3 solves an open problem proposed in [18].

Finally, let us mention that Theorem 1.1 is related to the concept of density.

Given a class $\mathcal{K}$ of graphs and two graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{K}$, $G_1 < G_2$, we say that the pair (G_1, G_2) is a *gap* in $\mathcal{K}$ if there is no $G \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfying $G_1 < G < G_2$. The *density problem* for class $\mathcal{K}$ is the problem to characterize all gaps in $\mathcal{K}$. (If there are a "few" gaps then we have a tendency to say that class $\mathcal{K}$ is *dense*; see [19, 12, 13].)

Our theorem has the following corollary:

Corollary 1.2 *Any pair (G, K_ω) fails to be a gap in the class of all countable graphs.*

Proof. Let $G < K_\omega$, $G \in GRA_\omega$, be given. According to Theorem 1.1 there exists $G' \in GRA_\omega$ such that $G' \not\to G$. Then we have $G < G + G' < K_\omega$. ∎

Note that we used the easier part of Theorem 1.1. This is beeing disscussed below and some particular positive examples of the density of the class GRA_ω are stated. However the characterization of all gaps for the class GRA_ω remains an open problem. In the class GRA_ω there are infinitely many gaps. This is in a sharp contarst with finite graphs where the trivial gap (K_1, K_2) is the only gap, compare [19].

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we give some no-homomorphism conditions which will aid us in Section 3 in Proof of Theorem 1.1. In Section 4 we define high and low graphs and show their relationship to the independence problem. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 6 we give structural conditions which allow us to prove that certain graphs are high and thus generalize Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 to other graphs H than K_ω. We also modify the proof of Theorem 1.1 to this setting. This yields a more direct proof and allows us (at least in principle) to hunt for partners. We find classes of graphs where independent extension property holds. Section 7 contains some remarks and problems.

2 Necessary conditions for the existence of a homomorphism

Given two graphs G_1, G_2 it is usually not easy to prove that $G_1 \not\to G_2$. We shall use the following two basic facts:

Suppose $G_1 \to G_2$. Then

i. If G_1 contains an odd cycle of length $< l$ then also G_2 contains an odd cycle of length $< l$.

ii. $\chi(G_1) \leq \chi(G_2)$ (where χ denotes the chromatic number).

To this well known list (which cannot be much more expanded even in the finite case) we add the rank function which we are going to introduce as follows:

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. By K_n we denote the complete graph on $n = \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$. Consider the set $h(K_n, G)$ of all homomorphisms $K_n \to G$ and denote by T^G the union of all the sets $h(K_n, G), n = 1, 2, \ldots$. We think of T^G as a (relational) tree ordered by the relation $f \subseteq g$.

It is clear and well known that

i. T^G is a relational tree;

ii. T^G has no infinite branches.

iii. We can define ordinal $rk(T^G) < \omega_1$ the *ordinal rank function* of T^G.

(For a tree T without infinite branches is $rk(T)$ defined as $\sup\{rk(T_\iota)\}$ over all branches of T at the root.) Put $rk(G) = rk(T^G)$. We have the following (perhaps folkloristic):

Lemma 2.1 *If $G_1 \leq G_2$ then $rk(G_1) \leq rk(G_2)$.*

Proof. Let $f : G_1 \to G_2$ be a homomorphism. Then for every n we have a natural mapping $h(f) : h(K_n, G_1) \to h(K_n, G_2)$ defined by $h(f)(g) = f \circ g$. $h(f)$ is a level preserving mapping $T^{G_1} \to T^{G_2}$ and thus $rk(G_1) \leq rk(G_2)$. ∎

For every ordinal $\alpha < \omega_1$ and graph G on ω consider the following undirected graph $K_\omega^{<\alpha>}$:

the vertices of $K_\omega^{<\alpha>}$: all decreasing sequences of ordinals $< \alpha$; the edges of $K_\omega^{<\alpha>}$: all pairs $\{\nu,\mu\}$ satisfying $\nu \subseteq \mu$, by this symbol we mean the containment of sequences ν and μ (as initial segments).

One can say that $K_\omega^{<\alpha>}$ is a tree of cliques with the total height α.

The following holds for any $\alpha < \omega_1$:

i. $K_\omega^{<\alpha>} \in GRA_\omega$;

ii. $rk(K_\omega^{<\alpha>}) = \alpha$.

iii. $K_\omega^{<rk(G)+1>} \not\to G$.

(This gives yet another proof that there is no countable hom-universal K_ω-free graph.)

Put $G^0 = K_\omega^{<rk(G)+1>}$ and let us look at the statement of Theorem 1.1. We have $G^0 \not\to G$ and thus if also $G \not\to G^0$ then we are done. So we can assume the following situation: $G \to G^0$ and $G^0 \not\to G$. Now if G^1 is any graph satisfying $G^1 \not\to G^0$ then necessarily $G^1 \not\to G$ (as otherwise $G^1 \to G \to G^0$) and thus by the same token we can assume $G \to G^1$. This strategy of the proof will be followed in the next section.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We proceede by contradiction: Let $G \in GRA_\omega$ be a graph for which Theorem 1.1 does not hold. By Theorem 1.2 the chromatic number of G is infinite.

We shall construct graphs G^0, G^1, G^2, G_η such that $G^j \not\to G^i$ for $(j,i) \in \{(1,0),(2,1),(\eta,1)\}$ and thus also $G^i \to G$ for all $i = 0,1,2,\eta$. However for some η we prove $G_\eta \to G$ and this will lead to a contradiction.

The graph $G^0 = K_\omega^{<rk(G)+1>}$ was constructed in the previous section.

Definition of G^1:

The vertices of G^1: $\omega \times 2$. The edges of G^1: all pairs of the form $\{(n,i),(m,i)\}$ where $\lfloor\sqrt{n}\rfloor = \lfloor\sqrt{m}\rfloor$, $i = 0,1$ and of the form $\{(n,0),(m,1)\}$ where $n < m$.

Thus G^1 is a "half graph" where the vertices are "blown up" by complete graphs of increasing sizes.

Claim 1: $G^1 \not\to G^0$

Proof. (*of Claim 1*)

Assume contrary: Let $f : G^1 \to G^0$ be a homomorphism. As f restricted to each of the complete graphs in each of the sets $\omega \times \{0\}, \omega \times \{1\}$ is monotone we can find an infinite set $X \subset \omega$ such that the mapping f restricted to the set $X \times \{0\}$ is injective. The set $Y = \{f(x); x \in X\}$ is the infinite set in the tree $T_{\alpha_0}, \alpha_0 = rk(G)$ which defines the graph G^0 and thus by either König Lemma or Ramsey Theorem the set Y either contains a chain (i.e. a complete graph in G^0) which is impossible, or Y contains an independent set in T_{α_0} and thus also in G^0.

So Y are the vertices of a star in T_{α_0} with centre y. y is in fact a function $y : K_n \to G$. Choose $n_\star \in \omega$ such that the set $X \cap (n_\star \times \{0\})$ has at least $n+1$ elements.

Now the function f restricted to the set $\{n_\star^2, n_\star^2+1, \ldots, n_\star^2+n_\star+1\} \times \{1\}$ is injective and if $(i,1)$ is any vertex of this set then $f(i,1)$ is connected to all vertices $f(m,0)$ for $m \in X \cap [0, n_\star]$. This implies that $f(m,0) \subset y$ for every $m \in X \cap [0, n_\star]$. But this is a contradiction. ∎

Construction of G^2:

The vertices of $V(G^2) = A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2$ where $A_0 = \{r\}$, and A_1 and A_2 are infinite sets (all three mutually disjoint). The set A_1 is disjoint union of finite complete graphs denoted by K_i^1 (isomorphic to K_i), $i \in \omega$. The set A_2 is disjoint union of finite complete graphs denoted by $K_{x,j}^2$ (isomorphic to K_j), $j \in \omega$. The edges of G^2 are the edges of all indicated complete graphs together with all edges of the form $\{r, x\}, x \in A_1$ and all pairs of the form $\{x, y\}, x \in A_1, y \in \cup_{j \in \omega} V(K_{x,j}^1)$.

So the graph G^2 is a tree of depth 2 with infinite branching with all its vertices "blown up" by complete graphs of increasing sizes.

Claim 2: $G^2 \not\to G^1$

Proof.

The proof is easy using the main property of the half graph: all the vertices of one of its "parts" (i.e. of the set $\omega \times \{1\}$) have finite degree.

Assume to the contrary that $f : G^2 \to G^1$ is a homomorphism (for G^1 we preserve all the above notation). We shall consider two cases according to the value of $f(r)$.

Case 1. $f(r) = (n, 1)$ for some $n \in \omega$.

But then the subgraph of G^1 induced by the neighborhood $N(n,1)$ of the vertex $(n,1)$ has a finite chromatic number (as $(n,1)$ has finite deghree in G^1) whereas the neighborhood of r in the graph G^2 has the infinite chromatic number (as this neighborhood is the disjoint union of complete graphs $K_i^1, i \in \omega$).

Case 2. $f(r) = (n,0)$ for some $n \in \omega$.

By the same argument as in the Case 1 we see that not all vertices $f(x), x \in A_1$ can be mapped to the vertices of the set $\omega \times \{0\}$ (as by the connectivity of the subgraph of G^2 formed by $A_0 \cup A_1$ this graph would be mapped to a finite complete graph of size $\lfloor \leq \sqrt{n} \rfloor$). Thus let $f(x_1) = (m,1)$ for an $x \in A_1$. But then the neighborhood $N(m,1)$ of $(m,1)$ in the graph G^2 has a finite chromatic number whereas x_1 has infinite chromatic number (in G^1). ∎

Thus we see that $G^2 \not\to G^1$ and consequently $G \to G^2$.

Construction of G^2:

The vertices of $V(G^2) = A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2$ where $A_0 = \{r\}$, and A_1 and A_2 are infinite sets (all three mutually disjoint). The set A_1 is disjoint union of finite complete graphs denoted by K_i^1 (isomorphic to K_i), $i \in \omega$. The set A_2 is disjoint union of finite complete graphs denoted by $K_{x,j}^2$ (isomorphic to K_j), $j \in \omega$. The edges of G^2 are the edges of all indicated complete graphs together with all edges of the form $\{r,x\}, x \in A_1$ and all pairs of the form $\{x,y\}, x \in A_1, y \in \cup_{j\in\omega} V(K_{v,j}^1)$.

So the graph G^2 is a tree of depth 2 with infinite branching with all its vertices "blown up" by complete graphs of increasing sizes.

Claim 3: $G^2 \not\to G^1$

Proof.

The proof is easy using the main property of the half graph: all the vertices of one of its "parts" (i.e. of the set $\omega \times \{1\}$ have finite degree.

Assume to the contrary that $f : G^2 \to G^1$ is a homomorphism (for G^1 we preserve all the above notation). We shall consider two cases according to the value of $f(r)$.

Case 1. $f(r) = (n,1)$ for some $n \in \omega$.

But then the subgraph of G^1 induced by the neighborhood $N(n,1)$ of the vertex $(n,1)$ has a finite chromatic number (as $(n,1)$ has finite deghree in G^1) whereas the neighborhood of r in the graph G^2 has the infinite chromatic number (as this neighborhood is the disjoint union of complete graphs $K_i^1, i \in \omega$).

Case 2. $f(r) = (n, 0)$ for some $n \in \omega$.

By the same argument as in the Case 1 we see that not all vertices $f(x), x \in A_1$ can be mapped to the vertices of the set $\omega \times \{0\}$ (as by the connectivity of the subgraph of G^2 formed by $A_0 \cup A_1$ this graph would be mapped to a finite complete graph of size $\lfloor \leq \sqrt{n} \rfloor$). Thus let $f(x_1) = (m, 1)$ for an $x \in A_1$. But then the neighborhood $N(m, 1)$ of $(m, 1)$ in the graph G^2 has a finite chromatic number whereas x_1 has infinite chromatic number (in G^1). ∎

Thus we see that $G^2 \not\to G^1$ and consequently $G \to G^2$. The last example which we shall construct will be a family of graphs G_η. This has to be treated in a more general framework and we do it in a separate subsection.

3.1 Tree like graphs

We consider the following generalization of the above construction of G^2:

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an infinite set of finite graphs of the form $G_{j,i}$ which satisfies:

i. $\chi(G_{j,i}) \geq i$;

ii. $G_{j,i}$ do not contain odd cycles of length $\leq j$.

iii. All the graphs are vertex disjoint.

Let $T = (V, E)$ be a graph tree (i.e. we consider just the successor relation) defined as follows: $V = A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2$ where $A_0 = \{r\}$, $A_1 = \omega$ and $A_2 = \omega \times \omega$. The edges of T are all edges of the form $\{(r, i)\}, i \in \omega$ and all pairs of the form $\{i, (i, j)\}, i, j \in \omega$.

Let $\eta : V \to \omega \times \omega$ be any function.

Define the graph G_η as follows: The set of vertices of G_η is the union of all graphs $G_{\eta(x)}, x \in V$. The edges of G_η are edges of all graphs $G_{\eta(x)}, x \in \omega$ together with all edges of the form $\{a, b\}$ where $a \in G_{\eta(x)}$, $b \in G_{\eta(y)}$ and $\{x, y\} \in E$.

Then we have analogously as in the Claim 2:

Claim 4: Let $\eta : V \to \omega$ be any function which is unbounded on ω and each of the sets $\{i\} \times \omega$, $i \in \omega$. Then $G_\eta \not\leq G^1$.

Now, consider the graph G again. As $\chi(G)$ is infinite denote by K the minimal number of vertices of of a subgraph G' of G with chromatic number 5 (by compactness it is $K \in \omega$). Let $\eta : V \to \omega$ be any function which is unbounded on ω and each of the sets $\{i\} \times \omega$, $i \in \omega$ and moreover which satisfies $\eta(i) \geq K$ for every $i \in \omega$.

It is $G_\eta \leq G^1$ by Claim 3. Thus $G \leq G_\eta$. In this situation we prove the following (and this will conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Claim 5: $G \not\leq G_\eta$.

Proof. Assume contrary: let $f : G \to G_\eta$. Then the vertices of the subgraph G' are mapped into a set $\cup_{i \in I} G_{\eta(i)}$ where I is a finite subset of V. Denote by G'' the image of G' in G. Due to the tree structure of G_η we have that $\chi(G'') \leq 2\mathrm{max}_{i \in I}\chi(G'' \cap G_{\eta(i)})$.

It is $\eta(i) \geq K$ and thus all graphs $G'' \cap G_{\eta(i)}$ are bipartite. This implies $\chi(G'' \cap G_{\eta(i)}) \leq 2$ and finally we get $\chi(G') \leq \chi(G'') \leq 4$, a contradiction. ∎

4 Independent Families

In a certain sense Theorem 1.1 captures the difficulty of independent extension property. The pair K_3, U_3 (see Proof following Theorem 1.1 in the Section 1) cannot be extended to a large independent set *because* U_3 is a rich graph. This can be made precise. Towards this end we first modify the ordinal rank function for graphs below a given graph H. We return to these results in Section 6.

Let G, H be infinite graphs. Assume that the vertices of H are ordered in a sequence of type ω. We can thus assume that H is a graph on ω. Denote by H_n the subgraph of H induced on the set $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$.

Consider the set $h(H_n, G)$ of all homomorphisms $H_n \to G$ and denote by T_H^G the union of all the sets $h(H_n, G), n = 1, 2, \ldots$. We think of T_H^G as a (relational) tree ordered by the relation $f \subseteq g$. T_H^G is called *H-valued tree of* G (with respect of a given ω-ordering of H).

It is clear that

i. T_H^G is a (relational) tree;

ii. T_H^G has no infinite branches;

Thus we can define ordinal $rk(T_H^G) < \omega_1$ the *ordinal rank function* of T_H^G.

Put $rk_H(G) = rk(T_H^G)$ (*the ordinal H-rank* of G). We have then the following:

Lemma 4.1 *Let G_1, G_2 be graphs with $H \not\leq G_1$ and $H \not\leq G_1$. Then $G_1 \leq G_2$ implies $rk_H(G_1) \leq rk_H(G_2)$.*

Proof. Let $f : G_1 \to G_2$ be a homomorphism. Then for every n we have a natural mapping $h(f) : h(H_n, G_1) \to h(H_n, G_2)$ defined by $h(f)(g) = f \circ g$. The mapping $h(f)$ is level preserving mapping $T_H^{G_1} \to T_H^{G_2}$ and thus $rk_H(G_1) \leq rk_H(G_2)$. ∎

For a countable graph G on ω and every ordinal $\alpha < \omega_1$ define the following graph $G^{<\alpha>}$:

The vertices of $G^{<\alpha>}$ are all decreasing sequences of ordinals $< \alpha$; the edges of $G^{<\alpha>}$ are all pairs $\{\nu, \mu\}$ satisfying $\nu \subseteq \mu$ and $\{\ell(\nu), \ell(\mu)\} \in E(G)$. (Recall that $\ell(\nu)$ is length of the sequence ν.)

One can say that $G^{<\alpha>}$ is a tree of copies of G_n (G_n is the graph induced by G on the set $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ with the total height α. (This notation also explains the rather cumbersome notation $K_\omega^{<\alpha>}$.)

We have the following:

Lemma 4.2 *i. $G^{<\alpha>} \leq G$;*

ii. If $\alpha \leq \beta$ then also $G^{<\alpha>} \leq G^{<\beta>}$;

iii. $G \leq H$ if and only if $G^{<\alpha>} \leq H$ for every $\alpha < \omega_1$

Proof. This is easy statement. The existing homomorphisms are canonical level-preserving homomorphisms. Let us mention just *iii.*:

If $f : G \to H$ then $G^{<\alpha>} \to H$ by composition of f with the map guaranteed by *i.*. Thus assume $G \not\leq H$ and $G^{<\alpha>} \leq H$ for any $\alpha < \omega_1$. In this case the ordinal G-rank of H is defined and $rk_G(H) = \alpha < \omega_1$. As $rk_G(G^{<\alpha+1>}) = \alpha + 1 > \alpha rk_G(H)$ we get a contradiction. ∎

We say that G is *$\alpha-$low* if $G \leq G^{<\alpha>}$. A *low graph* is a graph which is low for some α, a graph is *high* if it is not low.

We have the following

Theorem 4.1 *Let $G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_t$ be countable connected graphs such that for some $s < t$ holds: $G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{s-1}$ are low while $G_s, \ldots, G_t$ are high (the case $s = 0$ corresponds to the set of of all high graphs). Then there exists a graph G such that $G, G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_t$ is an independent set.*

Corollary 4.1 *Any finite set of high graphs can be extended to a larger independent set.*

Proof. Choose $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that for any $m \in \{s, \ldots, t\}$ and $n \in \{1, \ldots, s-1\}$ the graph $G_n^{<\alpha>}$ has no homomorphism to G_m. This is possible as by the high-low assumption for every m, n as above there is no homomorphism $G_m \to G_n$ and thus for some $\alpha(m,n) < \omega_1$ we have $G_n^{<\alpha(m,n)>} \not\longrightarrow G_m$. (This also covers the case $s = 0$.) Put $\alpha' = \max \alpha(m,n)$ and $\alpha = \max rk_{G_n^{<\alpha(m,n)>}} G_m$.

We define

$$G = \sum_{i=0}^{t-s} G_{s+i}^{<\alpha>}$$

and prove that G is the desired graph. Fix $n \in \{0, \ldots, s-1\}$ and choose $m \in \{s, \ldots, t\}$ arbitrarily. Then $G_m^{<\alpha>} \not\to G_n$ and thus $G \not\to G_n$ as claimed.

In the opposite direction for every $m, n \in \{s, \ldots, t\}$ we have $G_m \not\to G_m^{<\alpha>}$ by G_m high and $G_m \not\to G_n^{<\alpha>}$ by the choice of α (i.e. as α is large enough). As G_m is a connected graph G_m mapps to G if and only if it maps to one of the component. Thus $G_m \not\to G$ and we are done. ∎

Remark.

Theorem 4.1 shows that we have an extension property providing we “play” with high graphs. This is in aggreement with the “random building blocks” used in the proofs of universality, see [13].

5 Rigid Graphs

We prove Theorem 1.3

Let G be a countable graph not containing K_ω, we can assume that G is infinite. In fact we can assume without loss of generality that every edge of

G belongs to a triangle and that G is connected (we simply consider a graph containg G).

Let $G_1 \in GRA_\omega$ form independent pair with G (G_1 exists by Theorem 1.1). We can assume without loss of generality that also every edge of G_1 belongs to a triangle. For that it is enough to attach to every edge of G_1 a pendant triangle; (as every edge of G belongs to a triangle) these triangles do not influence the non-existence of homomorphisms between G and G_1. G_1 can be also assumed to be connected.

Let G_0 be a countable rigid graph without triangles. The existence of G_0 follows from the existence of a countable infinite rigid relation (take one way infinite path on ω together with arc $(0, 3)$) by replacing every edge by a finite triangle free rigid graph; see e.g. [21, 18, 15].

Let $\mu : V(G) \to V(G_0)$ and $\nu : V(G_0) \to V(G_1)$ be bijections. Define the graph G' as the disjoint union of graphs G, G_0, G_1 together with the matchings $\{\{x, \mu(x)\}; x \in V(G)\}$ and $\{\{x, \nu(x)\}; x \in V(G_0)\}$.

We prove that G' is rigid (G' obviously contains G as an induced subgraph).

Let $f : G' \to G'$ be a homomorphism. As the matching edges and the edges of G_0 do not lie in a triangle we have either $f(V(G)) \subseteq V(G)$ or $f(V(G)) \subseteq V(G_1)$. However the last possibility fails as G and G_1 are independent. Similarly, we have either $f(V(G_1)) \subseteq V(G_1)$ or $f(V(G)) \subseteq V(G)$ and the last possibility again fails.

Thus we have $f(V(G)) \subseteq V(G)$ and $f(V(G_1)) \subseteq V(G_1)$. As the vertices of G_0 are the only vertices joined both to $V(G)$ and $V(G')$ we have also $f(V(G_0)) \subseteq V(G_0)$. However G_0 is rigid and thus $f(x) = x$ for every $x \in V(G_0)$. Finally as G and G_0, G_0 and G_1 are joined by a matching we have that $f(x) = x$ for all $x \in V(G')$.

Remark.

This "sandwich construction" may be the easiest proof of a statement of this type (compare [21, 3, 4, 18]. This proves also the analogous statement for every infinite κ (also for the finite case) providing that we use the fact that on every set there exists a rigid relation. This has been proved in [24], and e.g. [16] for a recent easy proof.

6 Gaps below H

We say that a gap $G < H$ is a *gap below* H. In the introduction we derived from Theorem 1.1 that there are no gaps below K_ω. It is well known that finite undirected graphs have no non-trivial gap (except $K_1 < K_2$), see [23, 19]. Also infinite graphs (with unrestricted cardinalities) have no non-trivial gaps ([12]). However note that classes of graphs with bounded cardinality (such as GRA_ω) may have many non-trivial gaps. For example if $H = K_n$ then let U_n be the hom-universal K_n-free universal graph. Consider the graph $G_n = U_n \times K_n$ (the product here is the categorical product defined by projection - homomorphisms). Then $G_n < K_n$ and it is easy to see that G_n is also K_n-free hom-universal graph. Now if $G < K_n$ then also $G \leq G_n$ and thus (G_n, K_n) is a gap (below K_n). In fact this holds for every finite graph, see [14]. It seems to be difficult to find gaps formed by infinite graphs only. Here we give soem explanation of this difficulty. We use the ordinal H-rank function for graphs bellow H which was introduced in Section 4.

It is not necessarily true that $H^{<\alpha>} \in GRA_H$. We defined above H to be an *α-low graph* if $H^{<\alpha>} \in GRA_H$. Here are sufficient conditions for low and high:

For a graph F we say that an infinite subset X of $V(F)$ is *separated by a subset* C if for any two distinct vertices x, y of X there is no path $x = x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_t = y$ in F such that all the vertices $x_1, \ldots, x_{t-1}$ do not belong C (thus possibly $x, y \in C$).

Recall, that graphs G and G' are said to be *hom-equivalent* if $G \leq G' \leq G$. This is denoted by $G \simeq G'$.

We say that graph F is *H-connected* if no infinite subset X of $V(F)$ is separated by a subset C such that $C \simeq H'$ for a finite subgraph H' of H. H is said to have *finite core* if H is equivalent to its finite subgraph. Any graph with infinite chromatic number has no finite (and this is far from beeing necessary). The following then holds:

iv. If H is H-connected without a finite core then $H^{<\alpha>} \in GRA_H$.

Proof. H is infinite. Let $f : H \to H^{\alpha>}$ be a homomorphism. As H is not equivalent to any its finite subgraph there exists an infinite set $X \subset V(H)$ such that f restricted to the set X is injective. Then the set $f(X)$ is infinite subset of $H^{\alpha>}$ and applying the König's Lemma to the tree structure of $H^{\alpha>}$ we get that either there is an infinite chain (which is impossible as $H^{\alpha>}$ is

H-free) or there is an infinite star. Its vertices form an independent set which is separated by the finite graph corresponding to the stem of the star. ∎

We have the following:

Theorem 6.1 *Let H be a H-connected graph without finite core. Then the following holds:*

i. There is no gap below H;

ii. GRA_H has no hom-universal graph;

iii. For every $G < H$ there exists $G' < H$ such that G and G' are independent ("partners under H").

Proof.I.

i. is easier. Let $G < H$. Then $rk_H(G) = \alpha < \omega_1$. It is $H^{<\alpha+1>} < H$ and thus $H^{<\alpha+1>} \not\to G$. Put $G^0 = H^{<\alpha+1>}$ and thus we have $G < G + G^0 < H$ as needed. The same proof gives *ii.*.

However by Lemma 4.2 we also know that there exists $\beta > \alpha$ such that $G \not\leq H^{<\beta>}$. This proves *iii.* ∎

We give another proof of Theorem 6.1*iii.* which is an extension of the proof given in Sections 3 a,d 4. This proof is more direct and gives us more tools for hunting of partners.

Proof. Let $G < H$ be fixed. We proceede in a complete analogy to the above proof of Theorem 1.1 and we outline the main steps and stress only the differences. Thus let G be a counterexample. We have $G^0 \not\leq G$ and $G^0 < H$ and thus we have $G < G^0$. As G^0 has the tree structure we can find G^1 in a similar way such that $G^1 \not\leq G^0$ and $G^1 < H$. Given G^1 we then define graphs G^2 and G_μ with $G \leq G^2$ and $G \leq G_\mu$. However we have to (as possibly $\chi(H) \leq 4$) continue and define also graph G^4 with $G \leq G^4$. This will finally lead to a contradiction.

The details of this process are involved an we need several technical definitions.

An *H-partite graph* (G, c) is a graph together with a fixed homomorphism $c : G \to H$. The sets $c^{-1}(x)$ are color classes of (G, c). Given two H-partite graphs (G, c) and (G', c') the *H-join* $(G, c) \bowtie (G', c')$ is the disjoint union of (G, c) and (G', c') together with all edges $\{x, x'\}$ where $x \in V(G)$, $x' \in V(G')$

and $\{c(x), c(x')\} \in E(H)$. The graph $(G, c) \bowtie (G', c')$ is again H-partite (with the coloring denoted again by c).

Recall, that H_n is the graph H restricted to the set $\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. Let H_n^0 and H_n^1 be copies of H_n so that all the graphs H_n^0 and H_n^1, $n \in \omega$ are mutually disjoint. Without loss of generality the vertices of $H_n^i \subset \omega \times \{i\}, i = 0, 1$. The graphs H_n, H_n^0, H_n^1 are considered as H-partite graphs with the inclusion H-coloring.

Definition of G^1:

The vertices of G^1 form the set $\omega \times 2$. The edges of G^1 are all pairs of the form $\{(x, i), (y, i)\}$ where $\{x, y\} \in H_n^i$ for some $n \in \omega$ together with all the edges of the graphs $H_m^0 \bowtie H_n^1$ where $m \leq n$.

G^1 is an H-partite graph with $c : G^1 \to H$ defined as the limit of all the inclusions $H_n \subset H$. We can still think of G^1 as a suitable blowing of a half graph. What is important that the key property holds for G^1: all the vertices in the class $\omega \times \{1\}$ have finite degree.

Claim 1: $G^1 \not\to G^0$

(Recall that $G^0 = T_{\alpha,H}$.) Assume contrary, let $f : G^1 \to G^0$.

As H does not have a finite retract we get (by compactness) that for every m there exists n such that $H_n \not\leq H_n$. It follows that there exists an infinite set $X \subset \omega$ such that the mapping f restricted to the set $X \times \{0\}$ is injective. The set $Y = \{f(x); x \in X\}$ is then an infinite subset of the tree $H^{<\alpha>}, \alpha = rk_H(G)$ which defines the graph G^0 and thus by either König Lemma (or Ramsey Theorem) the set Y either forms a chain (i.e. a complete graph in G^0) which is impossible, or Y forms an independent set in $H^{<\alpha>}$ and thus also in G^0. So Y are the vertices of an infinite star in $T_{\alpha,H}$ with centre y. y is in fact an injective homomorphism $y : H_n \to H$. Define the set C by $C = f^{-1}(\{0, \ldots, n-1\})$. Then C separates X while $C \leq H_n$. But this is a contradiction.

Construction of G^2:

The vertices of $V(G^2) = A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2$ where $A_0 = \{r\}$, and A_1 and A_2 are infinite sets (all three mutually disjoint). The set A_1 is disjoint union of graphs H_i denoted by H_i^1 (isomorphic to H_i), $i \in \omega$. The set A_2 is disjoint union of graphs denoted by $H_{x,j}^2$ (isomorphic to H_j), $x \in A_1, j \in \omega$. The edges of G^2 are the edges of all indicated graphs H_i^1 and $H_{x,j}^2$ together with all edges of the form $\{r, x\}, x \in A_1$ and all pairs of the form $\{x, y\}, x \in A_1, y \in$

$\cup_{j\in\omega} V(H^1_{x,j}), \{c(x), c(y)\} \in E(H))$.

So the graph G^2 is a tree of depth 2 with infinite branching with all its vertices "blown up" by graphs H_n of increasing sizes, the graph induced by vertices $V(H^1_i) \cup V(H^2_{x,j}$ is isomorphic to $H^1_i \bowtie H^2_{x,j}$.

Claim 2: $G^2 \not\to G^1$

Proof.

Assume to the contrary that $f : G^2 \to G^1$ is a homomorphism (for G^1 we preserve all the above notation). We shall consider two cases according to the value of $f(r)$.

Case 1. $f(r) = (n, 1)$ for some $n \in \omega$.

(We proceede similarly as in Case 1 of the proof of Theorem 1.1.) But then the subgraph of G^1 induced by the neighborhood $N(n, 1)$ of the vertex $(n, 1)$ can be mapped to a finite subgraph of H (as $(n, 1)$ has finite deghree in G^1) whereas the neighborhood of r in the graph G^2 cannot be mapped to finite subset of H (as this neighborhood is the disjoint union of graphs $H^1_i, i \in \omega$).

Case 2. $f(r) = (n, 0)$ for some $n \in \omega$.

This is similar adaptation of the Case 2 of the proof of Theorem 1.1.

∎

Next we shall define graphs G_η. We consider the following generalization of the above construction of G^2:

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an infinite set of finite graphs of the form $G_{j,i}$ which satisfies:

i. $G_{j,i} \not\to H_i$;

ii. $G_{j,i}$ do not contain odd cycles of length $\leq j$.

iii. $G_{j,i} \to H$ (this homomorphism will be denoted again by c).

iv. All the graphs are vertex disjoint.

By now it is easy to get such examples, see e.g. [18, 15].

Let $T = (V, E)$ be a graph tree (i.e. we consider just the successor relation) defined as follows: $V = A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2$ where $A_0 = \{r\}$, $A_1 = \omega$ and $A_2 = \omega \times \omega$. The edges of T are all edges of the form $\{(r, i)\}, i \in \omega$ and all pairs of the form $\{i, (i, j)\}, i, j \in \omega$.

Let $\eta : V \to \omega \times \omega$ be any function.

Define the graph G_η as follows: The set of vertices of G_η is the union of all graphs $G_{\eta(x)}, x \in V$. The edges of G_η are edges of all graphs $G_{\eta(x)}, x \in \omega$ together with all edges of the form $\{a, b\}$ where $a \in G_{\eta(x)}$, $b \in G_{\eta(y)}$, $\{x, y\} \in E$ and $\{c(A), c(b)\} \in E(H)$.

We have analogously as in Claim 2:

Claim 3 Let $\eta : V \to \omega$ be any function which is unbounded on ω and each of the sets $\{i\} \times \omega$, $i \in \omega$. Then $G_\eta \not\leq G^1$.

Now, consider the graph G again. We have to distinguish two cases:

Case 1: $\chi(H) \geq 5$

In this case we proceede completely analogously as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 with the only change that we denote by K the minimal number of vertices of a subgraph G' of G such that $G' \not\to H_i$ and $\chi(H_i) \leq 4$ (by compactness it is $K \in \omega$). In this case we derive a contradiction as above. Leaving this at that we have to consider:

Case 2: $\chi(H) < 5$

In this case we have to continue and we introduce one more contruction of the graph G^4.

Let T be an infinite binary tree. Explicitely, $V(T)$ denotes the set of all binary sequences ordered by the initial segment containment. For a sequence $\sigma = (\sigma(0), \sigma(1), \ldots, \sigma(p))$ we put $i(\sigma) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} 2^{\sigma(i)}$ ($i(\sigma)$ is a level-preserving enumeration of vertices of T) and $\ell(\sigma) = \max\{i; \sigma(i) \neq 0\}$ ($\ell(\sigma)$ is the level of σ in T).

Assume that the graphs H_n satisfy $H_m < H_n$ and $|V(H_m)| < |V(H_n)|$ for all $m < n$. This can be assumed without loss of generality as we can consider subset of ω with this property.

Let F_σ, $\sigma \in V(T)$ be a set of disjoint graphs with the following properties:

i. $F_\sigma \leq H_{i(\sigma)}$.

ii. $F_\sigma > H_{i(\sigma)-1}$, moreover for every homomorphism $f : F_\sigma \to H$ satisfying $|f(V(F_\sigma))| < |V(F_\sigma)|$ there exist homomorphisms $g : F_\sigma \to H_{i(\sigma)}$ and $h : H_{i(\sigma)} \to H$ such that $f = h \circ g$ (in the other words each f with a small image factorizes through $H_{i(\sigma)}$).

iii. F_σ does not contain odd cycles of length $\leq k_1$ where k_1 denotes the shortest length of an odd cycle in G.

iv. In each F_σ are given two distinct vertices x_σ and $y = y_\sigma$ such that $\{c(x_\sigma), c(y_\sigma)\} \in E(H)$.

(See [18, 15]; it suffices to put $F_\sigma = H_{i(\sigma)} \times K$ where K is a graphs without short odd cycles with sufficiently large chromatic number.)

Denote by G^4 the disjoint union of graphs F_σ with added edges of the form $\{x, y\}$ where $x = x_\sigma$ and $y = y'_\sigma$ and $\{\sigma, \sigma'\}$ form an edge of T.

This concludes the definition of G^4. For G^4 we define $G^3 = G_\eta$ for the follwing function $\eta : A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2 \to \omega$ (see the above definition of the graph G_η for general η):

$\eta(r) = 1, \eta(i) = (i, \sum(|V(F_\sigma)|; \ell(\sigma) < i)), \eta(i,j) = (j, \sum(|V(F_\sigma)|; \ell(\sigma) < j))$.

This only means we consider graphs with rapidly progressing odd girth.

We know that $G^3 \not\to G^2$ (for any η unbounded on the stars of the corresponding tree).

Thus assume that $f : G^4 \to G^3$. Due to the tree structure of the graph G^3 we see that for each $\sigma \in V(T)$ the image $f(F_\sigma)$ intersects a finite set of graphs $G_x, x \in I \subset A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2$ and due to the tree structure of the graph G^3 we see easily that there is a homomorphism $f' : F_\sigma \to H_{i(I)}$ where $i(I)$ is the maximal index appearing among all $i \in I$ and $(j, i) \in I$ and we arrived to a contradiction.

Thus $G^4 \not\leq G^3$ and consequently also $G \leq G^4$.

As G^4 contains odd cycles only in copies of graphs H_σ and as all these cycles have lengths $> k_0$ we conclude that $G \not\leq G^4$. ∎

7 Concluding Remarks

1. The problem to characterize gaps below H is not as isolated as it perhaps seems at the first glance. Put $GRA_H = \{G; G < H\}$. We have the following easy theorem:

Theorem 7.1 *For a countable graphs H the following statements are equivalent:*

i. There is no gap below H;

ii. For every $G \in GRA_H$ there is $G' \in GRA_H$ such that $G' \not\leq G$;

iii. For every $H' \in GRA_H$ the class GRA'_H has no hom-universal graph;

Motivated by Theorem 1.3 one is tempted to include here also the following condition:

iv. For every $G \in GRA_H$ there exists $G' \in GRA_H$ such that $G < G'$ and G' is rigid.

However *iv.* is false as shown by the following example:

Let $H = K_3$ and let G be the disjoint union of all odd cycles of length > 3. Then any rigid graph G', $G' < H$ which contains G as a subgraph is necessarily a disconnected graph. Let $\{G'_i; i \in \omega\}$ be all the components of G'. Then $\chi(G_i) = 3$ for every $i \in \omega$ and thus let G_i contains an odd cycle $C_{\ell(i)}$ of length $\ell(i)$. Let G_j be the component which mapps to $C_{\ell(i)}$ (as a component of G). Clearly $i \neq j$ and thus $G_j \to G_i$, a contradiction.

Note also that the above Theorem 7.1 is true for any fixed infinite cardinality.

2. We say that a set G of countable graphs is *maximal* (or *unextendable*) if there is no graph $G \notin \mathcal{G}$ such that G is independent to all $G' \in \mathcal{G}$.

$\{K_\omega\}$ is maximal but there are other maximal families. For example $\{K_k\} \cup \{G; G$ finite and $\chi(G) > k$ is a maximal set and more generally for every finite graph H the following is a maximal set:

$$\{H\} \cup \{G; G \text{ finite and } G > H\}$$

Corollary 1.1 implies existence of finite maximal sets.

The characterization of maximal sets seems to be difficult problem related to *duality theorems*, see [20]. However no maximal set is known which consists from infinite graphs only.

References

[1] G. Cherlin, S. Shelah, N. Shi: Universal Graphs with forbidden subgraphs and algebraic closure, Advances in Appl. Math. 22 (1999), 454-491.

[2] G. Cherlin, N. Shi: Graphs ommitting a finite set of cycles, J. Graph Th. 21 (1996), 351-355.

[3] V. Chvátal, P. Hell, L. Kučera, J. Nešetřil: Every finite graph is a full subgraph of a rigid graph, J. Comb. Th., 11, 3 (1971), 184-286

[4] L. Babai, J. Nešetřil: High chromatic rigid graphs II., Annals of Discrete Math. 15 (1982), 55-61.

[5] Z. Füredi, P. Komjáth: On the existence of countable universal graph, J. Graph. Th. 25 (1997), 53-58

[6] Z. Füredi, P. Komjáth: Nonexistence of universal graphs without some trees, Combinatorica 17 (1997), 163-171.

[7] B. Jónsson: Universal Relational Systems, Math. Scand. 4 (1956), 193-208.

[8] J. B. Johnston: Universal infinite partially orderd sets, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 7 (1956), 507-514.

[9] A. Kanamori: The higher infinite. Large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings, Perspectives in Math. Logic, Springer Verlag, Berlin 1994

[10] P. Komjáth, A. Mekler, J. Pach: Some Universal Graphs, Israel J. Math. 64 (1998), 158-168.

[11] P. Komjáth, J. Pach: Universal graphs without large bipartite subgraphs, Mathematika 31 (1984), 282-290.

[12] J. Nešetřil: The Homomorphism Structure of Classes of Graphs, Combinatorics, Probab. and Comp. 8 (1999), 177-184

[13] J. Nešetřil: The Coloring Poset and its On - Line Universality, KAM Series 2000-458 (submitted)

[14] J. Nešetřil: Universality and Homomorphism Order (to appear)

[15] J. Nešetřil: Aspects of Structural Combinatorics (Graph Homomorphisms and their Use), Taiwanese J. Math.3, 4 (1999), 381-424.

[16] J. Nešetřil: A rigid graph for every set, KAM-DIMATIA Series 2000-456 (to appear)

[17] J. Nešetřil, A. Pultr: On Classes of Relations and Graphs determined by Subobjects and Factorobjects, Discrete Math. 22 (1978), 237-300.

[18] J. Nešetřil, V. Rödl: Chromatically Optimal Rigid Graphs, J. Comb. Th. B, 46 (1989), 133-141.

[19] J. Nešetřil, C. Tardif: Density. In: Contemporary Trends in Discrete Mathematics (R.L.Graham, J. Kratochvíl, J. Nešetřil, F.S. Roberts, eds.), AMS, 1999, pp. 229-237

[20] J. Nešetřil, C. Tardif: Duality Theorems for Finite Structures (characterizing gaps and good characterizatios). KAM-DIMATIA Series, 98-407, to appear J. Comb. Th. B

[21] A. Pultr, V. Trnková: Combinatorial, Algebraic and Topological Representations of Groups, Semigroups and Categories, North Holland, 1980.

[22] R. Rado: Universal Graphs and Universal Functions, Acta Arith. 9 (1964), 331-340.

[23] E. Welzl: Color families are dense, J. Theoret. Comp. Sci. 17 (1982), 29-41.

[24] P. Vopěnka, A. Pultr, Z.Hedrlín: A rigid relation exists on any set, Comm. Math. Univ. Carol. 6(1965), 149-155