

Coloring triangles and rectangles*

Jindřich Zapletal
 University of Florida
 Institute of Mathematics, Czech Academy of Sciences
 zapletal@ufl.edu

April 14, 2022

Abstract

It is consistent that ZF+DC holds, the hypergraph of rectangles on a given Euclidean space has countable chromatic number, while the hypergraph of equilateral triangles on \mathbb{R}^2 does not.

1 Introduction

This paper continues the study of algebraic hypergraphs on Euclidean spaces from the point of view of their chromatic numbers in the context of choiceless ZF+DC set theory. In the context of ZFC, such hypergraphs were completely classified by Schmerl regarding their countable chromatic number [7]. In the choiceless context, the study becomes much more difficult and informative; in particular, the arity and dimension of the hypergraphs concerned begin to play much larger role. In this paper, I compare chromatic numbers of equilateral triangles with that of rectangles.

Definition 1.1. Δ denotes the hypergraph of arity three consisting of equilateral triangles on \mathbb{R}^2 . Let $n \geq 2$ be a number. Γ_n denotes the hypergraph of arity four consisting of rectangles on \mathbb{R}^n .

In the base theory ZFC, these hypergraphs are well-understood. By an old result of [1], Δ has countable chromatic number. On the other hand, for every number $n \geq 2$ the chromatic number of Γ_n is countable if and only if the Continuum Hypothesis holds; this is a conjunction of [2] and [3, Theorem 2]. In the base theory ZF+DC, I present an independence result:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $n \geq 2$. It is consistent relative to an inaccessible cardinal that ZF+DC holds, the chromatic number of Γ_n is countable, yet every non-null subset of \mathbb{R}^2 contains all vertices of an equilateral triangle.*

*2020 AMS subject classification 03E35, 14P99, 05C15.

Note that the conclusion implies that the chromatic number of Δ is not countable: in a partition of \mathbb{R}^2 into countably many pieces, not all of them can be Lebesgue null. The consistency result can be achieved simultaneously for all $n \geq 2$. The proof seems to use the algebra and geometry of both rectangles and equilateral triangles in a way which does not allow an easy generalization.

The paper follows the set theoretic standard of [4]. The calculus of geometric set theory and balanced pairs in Suslin forcings is developed in [5, Section 5.2]. If $n > 0$ is a natural number, $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $F \subset \mathbb{R}$ are sets, the set A is *algebraic over F* if there is a polynomial $p(\bar{x})$ with n many variables and coefficients in F such that A is the set of all solutions to the equation $p(\bar{x}) = 0$. The set A is *semialgebraic over F* if there is a formula ϕ of real closed fields with parameters in F and n free variables such that $A = \{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R} \models \phi(\bar{x})\}$. If X, Y, C are sets and $C \subset X \times Y$ and $x \in X$ is an element, then C_x is the vertical section of C associated with x , $C_x = \{y \in Y : \langle x, y \rangle \in C\}$. Let X be a Polish space and μ a σ -finite Borel measure on it. If M is a transitive model of ZFC and $x \in X$ is a point, then x is *random over M* if it belongs to no μ -null Borel subset of X coded in M . By the Fubini theorem, for points $x_0, x_1 \in X$ the following are equivalent: (a) x_0 is random over M and x_1 is random over $M[x_0]$, (b) x_1 is random over M and x_0 is random over $M[x_1]$, and (c) the pair $\langle x_0, x_1 \rangle$ is random over M for the product measure on $X \times X$. In each case, I will say that x_0, x_1 are mutually random over M . The only measure appearing in this paper is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^2 and the word null always pertains to it. DC denotes the axiom of dependent choice.

The author was partially supported by grant EXPRO 20-31529X of GA ĆR.

2 A preservation theorem

To prove Theorem 1.2, it is necessary to isolate a suitable preservation property of Suslin forcing. First, recall the main concepts of [8].

Definition 2.1. [8, Section 2] Let X, Y be Polish spaces.

1. A closed set $C \subset Y \times X$ is a *Noetherian subbasis* if there is no infinite sequence $\langle a_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ of finite subsets of Y such that the sets $D_n = \bigcap_{y \in a_n} C_y$ are strictly decreasing with respect to inclusion;
2. if M is a transitive model of set theory containing the code for C and $A \subset X$ is a set, let $C(M, A) = \bigcap \{C_y : y \in Y \cap M \text{ and } A \subset C_y\}$;
3. generic extensions $V[G_0]$ and $V[G_1]$ are *mutually Noetherian* if for all Polish spaces X, Y and Noetherian subbases $C \subset Y \times X$ coded in the ground model, if $A_0 \subset X$ is a set in $V[G_0]$ then $C(V[G_1], A_0) = C(V, A_0)$, and if $A_1 \subset X$ is a set in $V[G_1]$ then $C(V[G_0], A_1) = C(V, A_1)$.

For example, mutually generic extensions are mutually Noetherian [8, Corollary 2.10], and if x_0, x_1 are mutually random reals, then $V[x_0]$ and $V[x_1]$ are mutually Noetherian [8, Corollary 3.14]. Another easy and important observation is

that the Noetherian assumption on the subbasis C implies that the intersection defining the set $C(M, A)$ is always equal to the intersection of a finite subcollection; therefore, the set $C(M, A)$ is coded in M no matter whether $A \in M$ or not.

I will need the following strengthening of balance of Suslin forcings.

Definition 2.2. Let P be a Suslin forcing.

1. A pair $\langle Q, \sigma \rangle$ is *3, 2-Noetherian balanced* if $Q \Vdash \sigma \in P$ and for every collection $\langle V[G_i] : i \in 3 \rangle$ of pairwise mutually Noetherian extensions of V , every collection $\langle H_i : i \in 3 \rangle$ of filters on Q -generic over V in the respective models $V[G_i]$, every tuple $\langle p_i : i \in 3 \rangle$ of conditions in P stronger than σ/H_i in the respective models $V[G_i]$ has a common lower bound;
2. P is *3, 2-Noetherian balanced* if for every condition $p \in P$ there is a 3, 2-Noetherian balanced pair $\langle Q, \sigma \rangle$ such that $Q \Vdash \sigma \leq \check{p}$.

The following theorem is stated using the parlance of [5, Convention 1.7.18].

Theorem 2.3. *In every forcing extension of the choiceless Solovay model by a cofinally 3, 2-Noetherian balanced Suslin forcing, every non-null subset of \mathbb{R}^2 contains all vertices of an equilateral triangle.*

Proof. Let κ be an inaccessible cardinal. Let P be a Suslin forcing which is 3, 2-Noetherian balanced cofinally in κ . Let W be a choiceless Solovay model derived from κ . Work in W . Suppose that τ is a P -name and $p \in P$ is a condition which forces τ to be a non-null subset of \mathbb{R}^2 . I must find an equilateral triangle $\{x_0, x_1, x_2\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and a condition in P stronger than p which forces $\check{x}_0, \check{x}_1, \check{x}_2 \in \tau$.

To do that, note that both p, τ are definable from a ground model parameter and an additional parameter $z \in 2^\omega$. Let $V[K]$ be an intermediate extension obtained by a poset of cardinality smaller than κ such that $z \in V[K]$ and P is 3, 2-Noetherian balanced in $V_\kappa[K]$. Work in $V[K]$. Let $\langle Q, \sigma \rangle$ be a 3, 2-Noetherian balanced pair for the poset P such that $|Q| < \kappa$ and $Q \Vdash \sigma \leq \check{p}$. Let R be the usual random poset of non-null closed subsets of \mathbb{R}^2 ordered by inclusion, adding an element $\dot{x}_{gen} \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Claim 2.4. *There is a poset S of cardinality smaller than κ , a $Q \times R \times S$ -name η for a condition in P stronger than σ , and conditions $q \in Q, r \in R, s \in S$ such that*

$$\langle q, r, s \rangle \Vdash_{Q \times R \times S} \text{Coll}(\omega, < \kappa) \Vdash \eta \Vdash_P \dot{x}_{gen} \in \tau.$$

Proof. Suppose towards a contradiction that this fails. In the model W , let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the set of all points random over the model $V[K]$; thus, the complement of B is null. Choose a filter $H_0 \subset Q$ generic over $V[K]$ and consider the condition $\sigma/H_0 \leq p$ in the poset P . I will show that $\sigma/H_0 \Vdash_P \tau \cap B = 0$, in contradiction to the initial assumptions of the condition $p \in P$.

To show this, let $x \in B$ be a point and $p_0 \leq \sigma/H_0$ be a condition; it will be enough to find a condition $p_1 \in P$ compatible with p_0 which forces $\check{x} \notin \tau$. Let $H_1 \subset Q$ be a filter generic over the model $V[K][H_0, x, p_0]$. The contradictory assumption shows that $p_1 = \sigma/H_1 \Vdash_P \check{x} \notin \tau$. At the same time, $V[K][H_0, x, p_0]$ and $V[K][H_1]$ are mutually generic extensions of the model $V[K]$. By the balance assumption on the pair $\langle Q, \sigma \rangle$, the conditions p_0 and p_1 are compatible in P . This concludes the proof. \square

Pick S, η and $q \in Q, r \in R, s \in S$ as in the claim and move to the model W . Let $x_0 \in r$ be a point random over $V[K]$. Since x_0 is a point of density of the set r , there must be a real number $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, writing $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ for the closed disc centered at x_0 of radius ε , the relative measure of r in D is greater than $1/2$. Consider the measure-preserving self-homeomorphism h of \mathbb{R}^2 rotating the whole plane around the point x_0 by angle $\pi/3$ counterclockwise. The disc D is invariant under h ; by the choice of D , $r \cap h^{-1}r \cap D$ is a closed set of positive measure. Let $x_1 \in r \cap h^{-1}r \cap D$ be a point random over $V[K][x_0]$, and let $x_2 = h(x_1)$. Clearly, the points $x_0, x_1, x_2 \in r$ form an equilateral triangle.

Claim 2.5. *The points $x_0, x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are pairwise random over $V[K]$.*

Proof. The point x_1 is chosen to be random over $V[K][x_0]$, therefore the points x_0, x_1 are mutually random over $V[K]$. The point x_2 is the image of x_1 under a measure-preserving self-homeomorphism in $V[K][x_0]$. Therefore, x_2 is random over $V[K][x_0]$, and x_0, x_2 are mutually random over $V[K]$. Finally, the point x_2 is the image of x_0 under the measure-preserving rotation around x_1 by angle $\pi/3$. Since x_0 is random over $V[K][x_1]$, so is x_2 , and the points x_1, x_2 are mutually random over $V[K]$ as well. \square

Now, for each $i \in 3$ let $H_i \subset Q$ and $G_i \subset S$ for $i \in 3$ be filters mutually generic over the model $V[K][x_j : j \in 3]$, containing the conditions q, s respectively. The models $V[K][x_i]$ for $i \in 3$ are pairwise mutually Noetherian extensions of $V[K]$ by [8, Corollary 3.14]. The models $V[K][x_i][G_i][H_i]$ for $i \in 3$ are then pairwise mutually Noetherian extensions of $V[K]$ as well by [8, Proposition 2.9]. For each $i \in 3$ let $p_i = \eta/H_i, x_i, G_i \in P$. By the balance assumption on the pair $\langle Q, \sigma \rangle$, the conditions p_i for $i \in 3$ have a common lower bound in the poset P . By the forcing theorem applied in the respective models $V[K][x_i][G_i][H_i]$, this common lower bound forces $\{x_i : i \in 3\} \subset \tau$ as desired. \square

3 The coloring poset

Let $n \geq 2$ be a number, and write Γ_n for the hypergraph of rectangles in \mathbb{R}^n . To prove Theorem 1.2, I must produce a 3, 2-Noetherian balanced Suslin poset adding a total Γ_n -coloring. The definition of the poset uses, as a technical parameter, a Borel ideal I on ω which contains all singletons and which is not generated by countably many sets. Further properties of the ideal I seem to be irrelevant; the summable ideal will do.

Definition 3.1. Let $n \geq 2$ be a number. The poset P_n consists of partial functions $p: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \omega$ such that there is a countable real closed subfield $\text{supp}(p) \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\text{dom}(p) = \text{supp}(p)^n$, and p is a Γ_n -coloring. The ordering is defined by $p_1 \leq p_0$ if

1. $p_0 \subset p_1$;
2. for every hypersphere $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ algebraic over $\text{supp}(p_0)$ and any two points $x, y \in \text{dom}(p_1 \setminus p_0)$, if x, y are opposite points on S then $p_1(x) \neq p_1(y)$;
3. for any two parallel hyperplanes $P, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ visible in $\text{supp}(p_0)$ and any two points $x, y \in \text{dom}(p_1 \setminus p_0)$, if x, y are opposite points on the respective hyperplanes P, Q then $p_1(x) \neq p_1(y)$;
4. if $a \subset \text{supp}(p_1)$ is a finite set, then $p_1''\delta(p_0, p_1, a) \in I$ where $\delta(p_0, p_1, a) = \{x \in \text{dom}(p_1 \setminus p_0) : x \text{ is algebraic over } \text{supp}(p_0) \cup a\}$.

Proposition 3.2. \leq is a σ -closed transitive relation.

Proof. For the transitivity, suppose that $r \leq q \leq p$ are conditions in the poset P_n ; I must show that $r \leq p$. Checking the items of Definition 3.1, (1) is obvious. For (2), suppose that S is a hypersphere algebraic over p and x, y are opposite points on it in $\text{dom}(r \setminus p)$. By the closure properties of $\text{dom}(q)$, either both x, y belong to $\text{dom}(q)$ or both do not. In the former case (2) is confirmed by an application of (2) of $q \leq p$, in the latter case (2) is confirmed by an application of (2) of $r \leq q$. (3) is verified in a similar way. For (4), suppose that $a \subset \text{supp}(r)$ is a finite set. Let $b \subset \text{supp}(q)$ be an inclusion maximal set of points algebraic over $\text{supp}(p) \cup a$ which is algebraically independent. Since finite algebraically independent sets over $\text{supp}(p)$ form a matroid, it must be the case that $|b| \leq |a|$ holds. Note that $\delta(p, r, a) \subseteq \delta(p, q, b) \cup \delta(q, r, a)$ and $r''\delta(p, r, a) \subseteq q''\delta(p, q, b) \cup r''\delta(q, r, a)$. Thus, the set $r''\delta(p, r, a)$ belongs to I , since it is covered by two sets which are in I by an application of (4) of $q \leq p$ and $r \leq q$.

For the σ -closure, let $\langle p_i : i \in \omega \rangle$ be a descending sequence of conditions in P_n , and let $q = \bigcup_i p_i$; I will show that q is a common lower bound of the sequence. Let $i \in \omega$ be arbitrary and work to show $q \leq p_i$. For brevity, I deal only with item (4) of Definition 3.1. Let $a \subset \text{supp}(q)$ be a finite set. There must be $j \in \omega$ greater than i such that $a \subset \text{supp}(p_j)$. By the closure properties of $\text{dom}(p_j)$, it follows that $\delta(p_i, q, a) = \delta(p_i, p_j, a)$. Thus, $q''\delta(p_i, q, a) = p_j''\delta(p_i, p_j, a)$ and the latter set belongs to I by an application of (4) of $p_j \leq p_i$. \square

Further analysis of the poset P_n depends on a characterization of compatibility of conditions.

Proposition 3.3. Let $p_0, p_1 \in P_n$ be conditions. The following are equivalent:

1. p_0, p_1 are compatible;

2. for every point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there is a common lower bound of p_0, p_1 containing x_0 in its domain;
3. the conjunction of the following:
 - (a) $p_0 \cup p_1$ is a function and a Γ_n -coloring;
 - (b) whenever S is a hypersphere visible from $\text{supp}(p_0)$ and $x, y \in \text{dom}(p_1 \setminus p_0)$ are opposite points on S , then $p_1(x) \neq p_1(y)$;
 - (c) whenever P, Q are parallel hyperplanes visible from $\text{supp}(p_0)$ and $x, y \in \text{dom}(p_1 \setminus p_0)$ are opposite points on them, then $p_1(x) \neq p_1(y)$;
 - (d) for every finite set $a \subset \text{supp}(p_1)$, $p_1''\delta(p_0, p_1, a) \in I$;
 - (e) items above with subscripts 0, 1 interchanged.

Proof. (2) implies (1), which in turn implies (3) by Definition 3.1. The hard implication is the remaining one: (3) implies (2). Suppose that all items in (3) obtain and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a point. To find a common lower bound of p_0, p_1 which contains x_0 in its domain, let $F \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a countable real closed field containing x_0 as an element and $\text{supp}(p_0), \text{supp}(p_1)$ as subsets. The common lower bound q will be constructed in such a way that $\text{dom}(q) = F^n$. Write $d = F^n \setminus (\text{dom}(p_0) \cup \text{dom}(p_1))$. For every point $x \in d$ and every $i \in 2$, let $\alpha(x, i) = \{y \in \text{dom}(p_i) \setminus \text{dom}(p_{1-i}) : y \text{ and } x \text{ are mutually algebraic over } \text{supp}(p_{1-i})\}$.

Claim 3.4. For each $x \in d$ and $i \in 2$, the set $p_i''\alpha(x, i)$ belongs to the ideal I .

Proof. For definiteness set $i = 1$. The set $\alpha(x, 1)$ is a subset of $\delta(p_0, p_1, a)$ where a is the set of coordinates of any point in $\alpha(x, 1)$. The claim then follows from assumption (3)(d). \square

Now, use the claim to find a set $b \subset \omega$ in the ideal I which cannot be covered by finitely many elements of the form $p_i''\alpha(x, i)$ for $x \in d$ and $i \in 2$ and finitely many singletons. Let $q: F^n \rightarrow \omega$ be a function extending $p_0 \cup p_1$ such that $q \upharpoonright d$ is an injection and for every $x \in d$, $q(x) \in b \setminus (p_0''\alpha(x, 0) \cup p_1''\alpha(x, 1))$. Such a function exists by the choice of the set b . I will show that $q \in P_n$ and q is a lower bound of p_0, p_1 .

To see that $q \in P_n$, let $R \subset \text{dom}(q)$ be a rectangle and work to show that R is not monochromatic. The treatment splits into cases.

Case 1. $R \subset \text{dom}(p_0) \cup \text{dom}(p_1)$. By the closure properties of the sets $\text{dom}(p_0)$ and $\text{dom}(p_1)$, there are two subcases.

Case 1.1. R is entirely contained in one of the two conditions. Then R is not monochromatic as both p_0, p_1 are Γ_n -colorings.

Case 1.2. There are exactly two vertices of R in $\text{dom}(p_0 \setminus p_1)$ and exactly two vertices of R in $\text{dom}(p_1 \setminus p_0)$. There are again two subcases.

Case 1.2.1 If the two vertices in $\text{dom}(p_0 \setminus p_1)$ are opposite on the rectangle R , then they determine a hypersphere visible from $\text{supp}(p_0)$ on which the other two vertices are opposite as well. Then the other two vertices receive distinct p_1 -colors by assumption (3)(b).

Case 1.2.2. If the two vertices in $\text{dom}(p_0 \setminus p_1)$ are next to each other on the rectangle R , then they determine parallel hyperplanes visible from $\text{supp}(p_0)$ on which the other two vertices are opposite as well. Then the other two vertices receive distinct p_1 -colors by assumption (3)(c).

Case 2. R contains exactly one vertex in the set d ; call it x . By the closure properties of the sets $\text{dom}(p_0)$ and $\text{dom}(p_1)$, the remaining three vertices of R cannot all belong to the same condition. Thus, there must be two vertices contained in (say) $\text{dom}(p_0)$ and one vertex, call it y , in $\text{dom}(p_1 \setminus p_0)$. Then y, x are mutually algebraic over $\text{dom}(p_0)$. Thus $y \in \alpha(x, 1)$ and $q(x) \neq q(y)$ by the initial assumptions on the function q . In conclusion, the rectangle R is not monochromatic.

Case 3. R contains more than one vertex in the set d . Then R is not monochromatic as $q \upharpoonright d$ is an injection.

This shows that $q \in P_n$ holds. I must show that $q \leq p_1$; the proof of $q \leq p_0$ is symmetric. To verify Definition 3.1 (2), suppose that S is a hypersphere algebraic over $\text{dom}(p_0)$ and $x, y \in \text{dom}(q \setminus p_0)$ are opposite points on S . If $x, y \in \text{dom}(p_1)$ then item (3)(b) shows that $q(x) \neq q(y)$. If $x \in d$ and $y \in \text{dom}(p_0)$ (or vice versa) then $y \in \alpha(x, 0)$ and $q(x) \neq q(y)$ by the choice of the color $q(x)$. Finally, if $x, y \in d$ then $q(x) \neq q(y)$ as $q \upharpoonright d$ is an injection.

Definition 3.1 (3) is verified in the same way. For item (4) of Definition 3.1, let $a \subset F$ be a finite set. Let $a' \subset \text{supp}(p_0)$ be a maximal set in $\text{supp}(p_0)$ which is algebraically free over $\text{supp}(p_1)$. Since algebraically free sets over $\text{supp}(p_0)$ form a matroid, $|a'| \leq |a|$ holds, in particular a' is finite. Now, $\delta(q, p_1, a) \subset \delta(p_1, p_0, a') \cup b$, the first set on the right belongs to I by assumption (3)(d), so the whole union belongs to I as required. \square

Corollary 3.5. P_n is a Suslin poset.

Proof. It is clear from Definition 3.1 that the underlying set and the ordering of the poset P_n are Borel. Proposition 3.3 shows that the (in)compatibility relation is Borel as well. \square

Corollary 3.6. P_n forces the union of the generic filter to be a total Γ_n -coloring.

Proof. By a genericity argument, it is enough to show that for every condition $p \in P_n$ and every point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there is a stronger condition containing x_0 in its domain. This follows from Proposition 3.3 with $p = p_0 = p_1$. \square

It is time for the balance proof. It uses the following general fact.

Proposition 3.7. Let $V[G_0], V[G_1]$ be mutually Noetherian extensions.

1. Let $n_0 \in \omega$ be a number and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ be a set algebraic over $V[G_1]$. Suppose that $\bar{x}_0 \in V[G_0] \cap \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ is a point in A . Then there is a set $B \subseteq A$ algebraic over V such that $\bar{x}_0 \in B$;
2. same as (1) except for semialgebraic sets;

3. if $a \subset \mathbb{R} \cap V[G_1]$ is a finite set and $r \in \mathbb{R} \cap V[G_1]$ is a real algebraic over $(\mathbb{R} \cap V[G_0]) \cup a$, then r is algebraic over $(\mathbb{R} \cap V) \cup a$;
4. $\mathbb{R} \cap V[G_0] \cap V[G_1] = \mathbb{R} \cap V$.

Proof. For (1), let $n_1 \in \omega$ be a number and $\phi(\bar{v}_0, \bar{v}_1)$ be a polynomial with integer coefficients and $n_0 + n_1$ many free variables, and let $\bar{x}_1 \in V[G_1]$ be an n_1 -tuple of real numbers such that $A = \{\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0} : \phi(\bar{y}, \bar{x}_1) = 0\}$. Let $C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ be the set of all pairs $\langle \bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_0 \rangle$ such that $\phi(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1) = 0$. This is a Noetherian subbasis by the Hilbert Basis Theorem. Since $C(V[G_1], \{\bar{x}_0\}) \subseteq A = C_{\bar{x}_1}$ holds by the definitions and $C(V[G_1], \{\bar{x}_0\}) = C(V, \{\bar{x}_0\})$ holds by the initial assumption on the generic extensions, (1) is witnessed by $B = C(V, \{\bar{x}_0\})$.

For (2), let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ be a set semialgebraic over $V[G_1]$. By the elimination of quantifiers for real closed fields [6, Section 3.3], A is defined by a quantifier free formula θ with parameters in $V[G_1]$. The formula can be rearranged so that its atomic subformulas compare a value of a polynomial with zero. Let $\{\phi_i : i \in m\}$ be a list of all polynomials mentioned in θ . Let $\bar{x}_0 \in V[G_0] \cap \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ be a point in A . Let $a \subset m$ be the set of all i such that $\phi_i(\bar{x}_0) = 0$. Let $O \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ be a rational open box around \bar{x}_0 in which the polynomials ϕ_i for $i \notin a$ do not change sign. Use (1) to find a set C algebraic over V such that $\bar{x}_0 \in C$ and for all $\bar{y} \in C$ and all $i \in a$, $\phi_i(\bar{y}) = 0$. It is clear that the set $B = C \cap O \subseteq A$ works as required in (2).

For (3), let $\phi(\bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_1, v)$ be a nonzero polynomial with parameters \bar{x}_0 in $V[G_0]$ and $\bar{x}_1 \in a$ and a free variable v such that $\phi(\bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_1, r) = 0$ holds. There is an open neighborhood O of \bar{x}_0 such that for every $\bar{x}'_0 \in O$, the polynomial $\phi(\bar{x}'_0, \bar{x}_1, v)$ remains non-zero. Let $A = \{\bar{y}_0 : \phi(\bar{y}_0, \bar{x}_1, r) = 0\}$, use (1) to find a set $B \subseteq A$ algebraic over V such that $\bar{x}_0 \in B$, and use a Mostowski absoluteness argument to find a tuple $\bar{x}'_0 \in O \cap B$ in the ground model. (3) is then witnessed by the tuple \bar{x}'_0 . Finally, (4) immediately follows from (1). \square

Theorem 3.8. *Let $n \geq 2$ be a number. In the poset P_n ,*

1. *for every total Γ_n -coloring $c: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \omega$, the pair $\langle \text{Coll}(\omega, \mathbb{R}), \check{c} \rangle$ is 3,2-Noetherian balanced;*
2. *if the Continuum Hypothesis holds then the poset P_n is 3,2-Noetherian balanced.*

The fine details of this proof are the reason behind the rather mysterious Definition 3.1.

Proof. For item (1), let $c: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \omega$ be a total Γ_n -coloring. Let $V[G_i]$ for $i \in 3$ be pairwise mutually Noetherian extensions of V . Suppose that $p_i \leq c$ is a condition in P_n in the model $V[G_i]$ for each $i \in 3$; I must find a common lower bound of all p_i for $i \in 3$.

Work in the model $V[G_i : i \in 3]$. Let $F \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a countable real closed field containing $\text{supp}(p_i)$ for $i \in 3$. I will construct a lower bound q such that $F = \text{supp}(q)$. Write $d = F^n \setminus \bigcup_i \text{dom}(p_i)$. For each point $x \in d$ and for each pair

$i, j \in 3$ of distinct indices, define sets $\alpha(x, i, j), \beta(x, i, j)$ and $\gamma(x, i, j) \subset \text{dom}(p_i)$ as follows:

- $\alpha(x, i, j) = \{y \in \text{dom}(p_i \setminus c) : \text{there is a hypersphere } S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \text{ algebraic over } \text{supp}(p_j) \text{ such that } x, y \text{ are opposite points on } S\}$;
- $\beta(x, i, j) = \{y \in \text{dom}(p_i \setminus c) : \text{there are parallel hyperplanes } P, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n \text{ algebraic over } \text{supp}(p_j) \text{ such that } x, y \text{ are opposite points on } P, Q \text{ respectively}\}$;
- $\gamma(x, i, j) = \{y \in \text{dom}(p_i \setminus c) : \text{there are points } x_j \in \text{dom}(p_j \setminus c) \text{ and } x_k \in \text{dom}(p_k \setminus c) \text{ such that } x, y, x_j, x_k \text{ are four vertices of a rectangle listed in a clockwise or counterclockwise order}\}$. Here $k \in 3$ is the index distinct from i and j .

Claim 3.9. *There is a finite set $a \subset \text{supp}(p_i)$ such that $\alpha(x, i, j)$ consists of points algebraic over $(\mathbb{R} \cap V) \cup a$.*

Proof. This is clear if $\alpha(x, i, j) = 0$. Otherwise, let $y \in \alpha(x, i, j)$ be any point and argue that all other points in $\alpha(x, i, j)$ are algebraic over $(\mathbb{R} \cap V) \cup y$. To see this, suppose that $z \in \alpha(x, i, j)$ is any other point. Let S_y, S_z be hyperspheres algebraic in $\text{supp}(p_j)$ such that x is opposite of y on S_y and opposite of z on S_z . It follows that z is algebraic over $\text{supp}(p_j) \cup y$: one first derives x from y and then z from x . By Fact 3.7 z is algebraic over $(\mathbb{R} \cap V) \cup y$ as desired. \square

Claim 3.10. *There is a finite set $a \subset \text{supp}(p_i)$ such that $\beta(x, i, j)$ consists of points algebraic over $(\mathbb{R} \cap V) \cup a$.*

Proof. This is parallel to the previous argument. \square

Claim 3.11. *There is a finite set $a \subset \text{supp}(p_i)$ such that $\gamma(x, i, j)$ consists of points algebraic over $(\mathbb{R} \cap V) \cup a$.*

Proof. This is the heart of the whole construction and the reason why item (4) appears in Definition 3.1. For each point $y \in \gamma(x, i, j)$ choose points $x_j(y) \in \text{dom}(p_k \setminus c)$ and $x_k \in \text{dom}(p_k \setminus c)$ witnessing the membership relation. Let $H(y) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the hyperplane passing through y and perpendicular to the vector $y - x_j(y)$; thus, $x \in H(y)$. Write $H = \bigcap_{y \in \gamma(x, i, j)} H(y)$. Let $a \subset \gamma(x, i, j)$ be a set of minimum cardinality such that $H = \bigcap_{y \in a} H(y)$; the set a is finite. I will show that every point $y \in \gamma(x, i, j)$ is algebraic over $(\mathbb{R} \cap V) \cup a$. This will prove the claim.

Let $y \in \gamma(x, i, j)$ be an arbitrary point. Consider the set $A = \{u \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{m+1} : \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^n (\forall l \in m (x_j(a(l)) - u(l)) \cdot (z - u(l)) = 0) \rightarrow (x_j(y) - u(m)) \cdot (z - u(l)) = 0\}$. The set A is semialgebraic in parameters from $\text{supp}(p_j)$ and contains the tuple $a \hat{\ } y$. By Fact 3.7(2) and the Noetherian assumption between $V[G_i]$ and $V[G_j]$, there is a set $B \subset A$ semialgebraic over $\mathbb{R} \cap V$ such that $a \hat{\ } y \in B$. Note that B_a is a subset of the hypersphere of which the segment between $x_j(y)$ and x , and also the segment between $x_k(y)$ and y , is a diameter.

Let $C = \{u \in B: u(m) \text{ is the farthest point of } B_{u \upharpoonright m} \text{ from } x_i(y)\}$. This is a semialgebraic set in parameters from $\text{supp}(p_k)$. By Fact 3.7(2) and the Noetherian assumption on $V[G_i]$ and $V[G_k]$, there is a set $D \subseteq C$ semialgebraic over $\mathbb{R} \cap V$ such that $a \hat{\ } y \in D$. Clearly, $D_a = \{y\}$. It follows that y is algebraic over $(\mathbb{R} \cap V) \cup a$ as desired. \square

Now, define the set $f(x) \subset \omega$ of forbidden colors by setting it to the union of $p_i''(\alpha(x, i, j) \cup \beta(x, i, j) \cup \gamma(x, i, j))$ for all choices of distinct indices $i, j \in 3$. By the claims and Definition 3.1(4) applied to $p_i \leq c$, $f(x) \in I$. Let $b \subset \omega$ be a set in the ideal I which cannot be covered by finitely many sets of the form $f(x)$ for $x \in d$, and finitely many singletons. Let $q: F^n \rightarrow \omega$ be any map extending $\bigcup_i p_i$ and such that $q \upharpoonright d$ is an injection such that $q(x) \in b \setminus f(x)$ holds for every $x \in d$. I claim that q is the requested common lower bound of the conditions p_i for $i \in 3$.

Claim 3.12. *q is a Γ_n -coloring.*

Proof. Let $R \subset F^n$ be a rectangle; I must show that q is not constant on it. The proof breaks into numerous cases and subcases.

Case 1. R contains no elements of the set d . Let $a \subset 3$ be an inclusion minimal set such that $R \subset \bigcup_{i \in a} \text{dom}(p_i)$.

Case 1.1. $|a| = 1$. Here, R is not monochromatic because p_i is a Γ_n -coloring where i is the unique element of a .

Case 1.2. $|a| = 2$, containing indices $i, j \in 3$. The closure properties of the domains of p_i and p_j imply that each set $\text{dom}(p_i \setminus c)$ and $\text{dom}(p_j \setminus c)$ contains exactly two points of R .

Case 1.2.1. The two points in $\text{dom}(p_i \setminus C) \cap R$ are adjacent in R . Then the hyperplanes containing the two respective points and perpendicular to their connector are algebraic over both $V[G_i]$ and $V[G_j]$, so in V by Proposition 3.7(4). The two points are opposite on these planes and therefore they receive distinct p_i colors by Definition 3.1(3). Therefore, R is not monochromatic.

Case 1.2.2. The two points in $\text{dom}(p_i \setminus C) \cap R$ are opposite in R . Then both the center of the rectangle R and the real number which is half of the length of the rectangle diagonal belong to both $V[G_i]$ and $V[G_j]$, so to V by Proposition 3.7(4). The hypersphere S they determine is visible from V , and the two points of $\text{dom}(p_i \setminus C) \cap R$ are opposite on S . Applying Definition 3.1(2) to $p_i \leq c$, it is clear that the two points receive distinct p_i colors and R is not monochromatic.

Case 1.3. $|a| = 3$. Then there must be index $i \in 3$ such that $\text{dom}(p_i \setminus c)$ contains exactly two points of R and $\text{dom}(p_j \setminus c)$ contains exactly one point of R for each index $j \neq i$. I will show that this case cannot occur regardless of the colors on the rectangle R . For an index $j \neq i$, write x_j for the unique point in $R \cap \text{dom}(p_j \setminus c)$.

Case 1.3.1. The two points in $\text{dom}(p_i \setminus C) \cap R$ are adjacent in R . Consider the two hyperplanes Q_j, Q_k containing these two points respectively and perpendicular to their connecting segment, indexed by $j, k \neq i$. Reindexing if necessary, $x_j \in Q_j$ and $x_k \in Q_k$ holds. By Proposition 3.7(1), there must be algebraic sets

$Q'_j \subseteq Q_j$ and $Q'_k \subseteq Q_k$ visible from the ground model and still containing x_j and x_k . This means that x_k can be recovered in $V[G_j]$ as the closest point to x_j in Q'_k . This is impossible as $\mathbb{R} \cap V[G_j] \cap V[G_k] = \mathbb{R} \cap V$.

Case 1.3.2. The two points in $\text{dom}(p_i \setminus C) \cap R$ are opposite in R . Consider the hypersphere S in which these two points are opposite. S then contains x_j and x_k and these two points are opposite in S . By Fact 3.7, there must be algebraic sets $S_j \subseteq S$ and $S_k \subseteq S$ visible from the ground model and still containing x_j and x_k . This means that x_k can be recovered in $V[G_j]$ as the farthest point to x_j in S_k . This is impossible as $\mathbb{R} \cap V[G_j] \cap V[G_k] = \mathbb{R} \cap V$.

Case 2. R contains exactly one point in the set d ; call this unique point x . Let $a \subset 3$ be an inclusion minimal set such that $R \setminus \{x\} \subset \bigcup_{i \in a} \text{dom}(p_i)$.

Case 2.1. $|a| = 1$. This cannot occur since $\text{dom}(p_i)$ would contain x with the other three vertices of R , where $i \in 3$ is the only element of a .

Case 2.2. $|a| = 2$, containing indices $i, j \in 3$. Here, for one of the indices (say j) $\text{dom}(p_j)$ has to contain two elements of R while $\text{dom}(p_i \setminus c)$ contains just one; denote the latter point by x_i .

Case 2.2.1. The points x_i and x are opposite on the rectangle R . Then $x_i \in \alpha(x, i, j)$ as the hypersphere on which x_i, x are opposite points is the same as the one on which the other two points are opposite, and therefore is algebraic over $\text{supp}(p_j)$. The choice of the map q shows that $q(x) \neq p_i(x_i)$, so R is not monochromatic.

Case 2.2.1. The points x_i and x are opposite on the rectangle R . Then $x_i \in \beta(x, i, j)$ as x_i, x are opposite points on the hyperplanes passing through the other two points and perpendicular to their connecting segment, and these are algebraic over $\text{supp}(p_j)$. The choice of the map q shows that $q(x) \neq p_i(x_i)$, so R is not monochromatic.

Case 2.3. $|a| = 3$. For each index $i \in 3$ let $x_i \in R$ be the unique point in $\text{dom}(p_i \setminus c)$. Let $i, j, k \in 3$ be indices such that the sequence x, x_i, x_j, x_k goes around the rectangle R . Then $x_i \in \gamma(x, i, j)$ holds. The choice of the map q shows that $q(x) \neq p_i(x_i)$, so R is not monochromatic.

Case 3. R contains more than one point in the set d . Then R is not monochromatic as $d \upharpoonright d$ is an injection. \square

Finally, let $i \in 3$ be an index; I must prove that $q \leq p_i$ holds. It is clear that $p_i \subset q$ holds. The following claims verify the other items of Definition 3.1.

Claim 3.13. *If $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a hypersphere algebraic over $\text{supp}(p_i)$ and $x, y \in \text{dom}(q \setminus p_i)$ are opposite points on it, then $q(x) \neq q(y)$.*

Proof. The argument splits into cases.

Case 1. If x, y both belong to the set d , then $q(x) \neq q(y)$ as $q \upharpoonright d$ is an injection.

Case 2. If $x \in d$ and $y \notin d$, let $j \in 3$ be an index distinct from i such that $y \in \text{dom}(p_j \setminus c)$. Then, $y \in \alpha(x, j, i)$ holds and therefore $q(x) \neq p_j(y)$ as $q(x) \notin p_j''\alpha(x, j, i)$.

Case 3. If neither of the points x, y belongs to d , then there are two subcases.

Case 3.1. There is $j \in 3$ such that both x, y belong to $\text{dom}(p_j) \setminus c$. In such a case, the hypersphere S is also algebraic over $\text{supp}(p_j)$. By the Noetherian

assumption on the models $V[G_i]$ and $V[G_j]$ and Proposition 3.7(4), the hypersphere S is algebraic over the ground model. It follows that $q(x) = p_j(x) \neq p_j(y) = q(y)$ by Definition 3.1 (2) applied to $p_j \leq c$.

Case 3.2. $x \in \text{dom}(p_j \setminus c)$ and $y \in \text{dom}(p_k \setminus c)$ for distinct indices j, k . By the Noetherian assumption on the models $V[G_i]$ and $V[G_j]$ and Proposition 3.7(1), there is a set $T \subseteq S$ algebraic over the ground model such that $x \in T$. Then x can be recovered in $V[G_k]$ as the point on T farthest away from y , contradicting the fact that $V[G_j] \cap V[G_k] = 0$. \square

Claim 3.14. *If $P, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are parallel hyperplanes algebraic over $\text{supp}(p_i)$ and $x, y \in \text{dom}(q \setminus p_i)$ are opposite points on them, then $q(x) \neq q(y)$.*

Proof. The argument is similar to that for Claim 3.13. \square

Claim 3.15. *If $a \subset F^n$ is a finite set, then $q''\delta(p_i, q, a) \in I$.*

Proof. For each index $j \in 3$ distinct from i , let $a_j \subset \delta(p_i, q, a) \cap \text{dom}(p_j)$ be an inclusion-maximal set which is algebraically free over $\text{supp}(p_i)$. Since sets algebraically free over $\text{supp}(p_i)$ form a matroid, $|a_j| \leq |a|$. By Proposition 3.7(3) $\delta(p_i, q, a) \cap \text{dom}(p_j) = \delta(c, p_j, a_j)$ holds. This means that $\delta(p_i, q, a) = \delta(c, p_j, a_j) \cup \delta(c, p_k, a_k) \cup d$ where $j, k \in 3$ are the two indices distinct from i . Now, $p_j''(c, p_j, a_j) \in I$ by Definition 3.1(4) applied to $p_j \leq c$, $p_k''(c, p_k, a_k) \in I$ by Definition 3.1(4) applied to $p_k \leq c$, and $q''b \in I$ as this set is a subset of b . As the ideal I is closed under unions and subsets, $q''\delta(p_i, q, a) \in I$ as desired. \square

This concludes the proof of item (1) of the theorem. For item (2), if CH holds and $p \in P_n$ is a condition, by (1) it is enough to produce a total Γ_n -coloring c such that $\text{Coll}(\omega, \mathbb{R}) \Vdash \check{c} \leq \check{p}$. To this end, choose an enumeration $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1 \rangle$ of \mathbb{R}^n and by recursion on $\alpha \in \omega_1$ build conditions $p_\alpha \in P_n$ so that

- $p = p_0 \geq p_1 \geq \dots$;
- $x_\alpha \in \text{dom}(p_{\alpha+1})$;
- $p_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta \in \alpha} p_\beta$ for limit ordinals α .

The successor step is possible by Corollary 3.6 and the limit step by Proposition 3.2. In the end, let $c = \bigcup_\alpha p_\alpha$ and observe that c is a total Γ_n -coloring and $c \leq p$. \square

Finally, I can complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $n \geq 2$ be a number. Let κ be an inaccessible cardinal. Let W be the choiceless Solovay model derived from κ . Let P_n be the Suslin poset of Definition 3.1, and let $G \subset P_n$ be a filter generic over W . $W[G]$ is a model of ZF+DC since it is a σ -closed extension of a model of ZF+DC. In $W[G]$, the chromatic number of Γ_n by Corollary 3.6. In $W[G]$, every non-null subset of the plane contains an equilateral triangle by the conjunction of Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 3.8. The proof is complete.

References

- [1] Jack Ceder. Finite subsets and countable decompositions of Euclidean spaces. *Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl.*, 14:1247–1251, 1969.
- [2] P. Erdős and S. Kakutani. On non-denumerable graphs. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 49:457–461, 1943.
- [3] Paul Erdős and Péter Komjáth. Countable decompositions of \mathbb{R}^2 and \mathbb{R}^3 . *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 5:325–331, 1990.
- [4] Thomas Jech. *Set Theory*. Springer Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [5] Paul Larson and Jindřich Zapletal. *Geometric set theory*. AMS Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2020.
- [6] David Marker. *Model theory: An introduction*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 217. Springer Verlag, 2002.
- [7] James H. Schmerl. Avoidable algebraic subsets of Euclidean space. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 352:2479–2489, 1999.
- [8] Jindřich Zapletal. Noetherian spaces in choiceless set theory. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 2022. arXiv:2101.03434.