



HAL
open science

Two remarks on elementary theories of groups obtained by free constructions

Eric Jaligot

► **To cite this version:**

Eric Jaligot. Two remarks on elementary theories of groups obtained by free constructions. 2012.
hal-00666967v2

HAL Id: hal-00666967

<https://hal.science/hal-00666967v2>

Preprint submitted on 24 Feb 2012 (v2), last revised 30 May 2012 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

TWO REMARKS ON ELEMENTARY THEORIES OF GROUPS OBTAINED BY FREE CONSTRUCTIONS

ERIC JALIGOT

ABSTRACT. We give two slight generalizations of results of Poizat about elementary theories of groups obtained by free constructions. The first-one concerns the non-superstability of such groups in many cases, and the second-one concerns the connectedness of most free products of groups.

Recently, first-order theories of free products of groups have been investigated in [JS10] and [Sel10], with to some extent some transfers of arguments from free groups to free products of groups. It is expected that some of this work transfers further to more general classes of groups obtained by free constructions. In this modest and short note we will make slight generalizations of early arguments of Poizat on first-order theories of free products which, so far, did not seem to have been noticed before. Since these generalizations concern the basic model-theory of groups obtained by free constructions, it seems relevant to have them recorded.

In a first series of results we prove that many groups obtained by free constructions do not have a superstable theory. We refer to [OH08] for an approach of the model theory of such groups via actions on trees, but with seemingly weaker results (only the failure of ω -stability). Here, our proofs are mere adaptations of arguments in [Poi83, §7] in the case of free products. We note that we also take the opportunity to make a very basic analysis of generic types in such groups, in the event that such groups are stable.

We recall that one of the main accomplishments of [Sel10] is a proof of the fact that the free product of two stable groups is still stable. But, conversely, we point out the following question as a possibly difficult one.

Question 1. *Can one have a free product of groups $G * H$ with a stable theory, but with the factor G unstable?*

We merely mention that our basic analysis of generic types in the stable case of groups obtained by free constructions will not assume the stability of the vertex groups.

In a second type of results, we prove that most free products of groups are connected, i.e., with no proper definable subgroups of finite index. Again

Date: February 24, 2012.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 03C45; 20A05; 03C60.

Key words and phrases. Free products of groups; Superstability; Connected groups.

Work partially supported by the ERC Grant 278722-GTMT.

this will be a mere adaptation of an argument contained in [Poi83, §7], about the free group on countably many generators, together with a deep elementary equivalence obtained in [Sel10] about free products.

Theorem 2. *Let G and H be two nontrivial groups. Then a group elementarily equivalent to $G * H$ is not connected if and only if $G \simeq H \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2$.*

All groups considered here are considered in the pure group language, but we will point out when our results remain valid in the case of expansions of groups, especially around non-superstability. We thank Bruno Poizat for his patient explanations of his argument for non-superstability in [Poi83, §7], and Chloé Perin for her vigilance on an erroneous previous version of this note.

1. NON-SUPERSTABILITY

We say that a free product of groups $G *_A H$ with amalgamated subgroup A is *non-trivial* when $A < G$ and $A < H$. As in stable group theory, we say that a subset X of a group is left-generic in the group when finitely many left-translates of X cover the ambient group.

Lemma 3. *Let $P = G *_A H$ be a non-trivial free product of groups with amalgamated subgroup A , and suppose $g^2 \notin A$ for some $g \in G \cup H$. For any integer $d > 1$ let $Y_d = (G \cup H)^P \cup \{x^d : x \in P\}$, and for any integer $n \geq 1$ let B_n denote the ball of elements of P of length at most n .*

- (1) *For any $n \geq 1$, there exists α_n in P such that, for every element x in B_n , $x\alpha_n$ is not in Y_d .*
- (2) *For any $n \geq 1$, $B_n Y_d$ is a proper subset of P . In particular Y_d is not left-generic in P .*

Proof. (1). By assumption, we find an element g in one of the factors but not in the amalgam, and an element h in the other factor and still not in the amalgam, with h^2 not in A .

For every $n \geq 1$ consider, more or less as in [Poi83, §7], the element $\alpha_n = (gh)^{n+4}(ghgh^{-1})^{3n+3}$. Recall from [LS77, p. 187] that in a free product with amalgamation every element has a *unique* normal form, once is chosen a set of representatives of the amalgamated subgroup in each of the factors. Since h and h^{-1} cannot be in a same (left or right) coset of A in our situation, we may choose h and h^{-1} in the fixed sets of representatives of cosets of A . One sees that for every element $x \in B_n$, the element $x\alpha_n$ has a normal form of the form $\gamma(gh)^4(ghgh^{-1})^{3n+3}$ where γ is an element of length at most $3n$. Then one sees from the non-symmetries of this normal form that $x\alpha_n$ is not conjugated in one of the factors G or H , and that $x\alpha_n$ is not a square, and actually not a d -th power (see [LS77, p. 187]).

(2). The first claim shows that, for every element x of length at most n , $x\alpha_n$ is in $G \setminus Y_d$. In particular, α_n is in $x^{-1}(G \setminus Y_d)$, and α_n is not in $x^{-1}Y_d$. Since x and x^{-1} have the same length, this shows that α_n is not in $B_n Y_d$, and thus $B_n Y_d$ is a proper subset of P .

As the length of finitely many elements of P is uniformly bounded, it follows in particular that P cannot be covered by finitely many left-translates of Y_d , and thus Y_d not left-generic in P . \square

Recall from [Jal06] that a subset X of a group G is *left-generic* when X^G is left-generic in G . We obtain in particular the following corollary of Lemma 3 (with a proof more general and more direct than the one given in [Pil08, Lemma 2.12]).

Corollary 4. *Let $P = G *_A H$ be a non-trivial free product of groups with amalgamated subgroup A , and suppose $g^2 \notin A$ for some $g \in G \cup H$. Then $(G \cup H)$ is not left-generic in P .*

It is not clear whether our assumption in Corollary 4 is minimal. The failure of the left-genericity of $(G \cup H)$ in P occurs in groups of the form $A \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2 *_A A \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ where the two involutions of the \mathbb{Z}_2 both centralize A (or both invert A): in each case the group has a presentation of the form $A \rtimes D$ where D is a dihedral group generated by the two involutions (and A commutes with the maximal normal cyclic subgroup of D).

Of course, Lemma 3 and Corollary 4 could be proved similarly with the obvious notions of right-genericity, instead of left-genericity. When P is stable in Lemma 3 we get the following.

Corollary 5. *Assume P has a stable theory in Lemma 3. If g is generic over P , then, for every integer $d > 1$, g is not a d -th power.*

Proof. $P \setminus Y_d$ is contained in the definable subset Z_d of elements of P which are not a d -th power. Hence $G \setminus Z_d \subseteq Y_d$ and Lemma 3 implies that $G \setminus Z_d$ is not left-generic. Assuming the stability of P , we get then that, for every $d > 1$, the formula defining Z_d is in all generic types. \square

Theorem 6. *Let $P = G *_A H$ be a non-trivial free product of groups with amalgamated subgroup A , and suppose $g^2 \notin A$ for some $g \in G \cup H$. Suppose also there exist integers $d > 1$ and $s \geq 1$ such that g^d has at most s d -th roots for every g in $P \setminus ((G \cup H)^P \cup \{x^d : x \in P\})$. Then P is not superstable.*

Proof. With the same notation as in Lemma 3, we have under our assumption and as in Corollary 4 that $P \setminus Y_d$ is contained in the definable subset Z'_d of elements g of P which are not a d -th power and such that g^d has at most s d -th roots. Since $P \setminus Z'_d \subseteq Y_d$, Lemma 3 shows that $P \setminus Z'_d$ is not left-generic. Hence the formula defining Z'_d is in all generic type: if g is generic over P , then it is not a d -th power and g^d has at most s d -roots.

Consider now such an element g generic over P . We get in particular that g is algebraic over g^d . Assuming superstability, we then get, by weak regularity as in [Poi83, §7 and p.346], that g^d is also generic over P . Since generic elements over P cannot be d -th powers, this is a contradiction. \square

In the event that a free product P as in Theorem 6 is stable, the basic analysis of generic types of Corollary 5 is expanded by what has been seen

in the proof of Theorem 6: generic elements over P are not d -th powers, and their d -th powers have at most s d -th roots.

Here are examples of free products P satisfying the second assumption in Theorem 6 (always assuming the first assumption):

- A is malnormal in G (or H): centralizers of hyperbolic elements are then cyclic and of hyperbolic type, and we may even take any $d > 1$ and $s = 1$.
- More generally, groups such that $C_G(a) \leq A$ (or $C_H(a) \leq A$) for every non-trivial element $a \in A$: same reason as above, and again with any d and $s = 1$.
- A is finite: see the analysis of centralizers in free products with amalgamation in [KS77, Theorem 1(i)].

It is unclear to us how the algebraic assumptions in Theorem 6 are far from a full algebraic characterization of free products with amalgamation which are not superstable. If we take $A = \mathbb{Z}$ in the two examples considered after Corollary 4, then we get two non-trivial free products with amalgamation which are superstable (because they are definable in \mathbb{Z}). In these two groups, it is the first assumption in Theorem 6 which tend to fail rather than the second one.

We now pass to HNN -extensions. We say that an HNN -extension $G^* = \langle G, t \mid A^t = B \rangle$ is of *automorphism type* when $A = B = G$.

Lemma 7. *Let $G^* = \langle G, t \mid A^t = B \rangle$ be an HNN -extension, and suppose G^* not of automorphism type. For any integer $d > 1$ let $Y_d = G^{G^*} \cup \{x^d : x \in G^*\}$, and for every integer $n \geq 1$ let B_n denote the ball of elements of G^* of length at most n .*

- (1) *For every integer $n \geq 1$, there exists α_n in G^* such that, for every element x in B_n , $x\alpha_n$ is not in Y_d .*
- (2) *For every integer $n \geq 1$, $B_n Y_d$ is a proper subset of G^* . In particular Y_d is not left-generic in G^* .*

Proof. Since G^* is not of automorphism type we can, interchanging A and B if necessary, assume that $B < G^*$. Let now g be any element of $G \setminus B$. Since we are using the convention $g^h = h^{-1}gh$ for conjugates, we get that tgt^{-1} is not in the preimage A of B by the underlying automorphism from A to B . Hence there are no cancellations in the word $(gt)^{n+4}(tgt^{-1})^{3n+3}$. Now one can argue as in Lemma 3, with g playing the same role as g there, and with $t = h$ in the proof of Lemma 3. Notice that $t \neq t^{-1}$ here, and see [LS77, Chap IV 2.1-2.5] for normal forms in the case of HNN -extensions. \square

With Lemma 7 we get analogs of Corollaries 4 and 5 in the same way.

Corollary 8. *Let $G^* = \langle G, t \mid A^t = B \rangle$ be an HNN -extension, and suppose it is not of automorphism type. Then G is not left-generous in G^* .*

Corollary 9. *Assume G^* has a stable theory in Lemma 7. If g is generic over G^* , then, for every integer $d > 1$, g is not a d -th power.*

Theorem 10. *Let $G^* = \langle G, t \mid A^t = B \rangle$ be an HNN -extension, and suppose it is not of automorphism type. Suppose also there exist integers $d > 1$ and $s \geq 1$ such that g^d has at most s d -th roots for every g in $G^* \setminus (G^{G^*} \cup \{x^d : x \in G^*\})$. Then G^* is not superstable.*

Proof. With Corollary 9 we may argue exactly as in the proof of Theorem 6. Notice that under the assumptions of Theorem 10, a generic elements over G^* is a d -th power and is such that its d -th power has at most s d -roots. \square

Here, examples of HNN -extensions satisfying the assumption in Theorem 10 include any HNN -extension $\langle G, t \mid A^t = B \rangle$ not of automorphism type and such that $C_G(t)$ is finite: see [KS77, Theorem 1(ii)].

We note that Lemma 3 and its two corollaries, as well as their analogs for HNN -extensions, do not depend on the fact of considering pure group structures: they remain true if the groups considered are expanded by some extra structure definable in some extra language. Similarly, the proofs of non-superstability in Theorems 6 and 10 are not sensitive to structure expanding the group structure. Hence we actually get the following.

Theorem 11. *Let G be any expansion of a non-trivial free product with amalgamation as in Theorem 6, or of an HNN -extension as in Theorem 10. Then G is not superstable. Furthermore, if g is generic over the considered group, then it is not a d -th power, and its d -th power has at most s d -th roots.*

Conversely, of course, there might be expansions of the dihedral group which are not superstable. The question of the superstability of HNN -extensions of automorphism type may depend on the pair consisting of a group with an automorphism considered. For instance, the HNN -extension $\langle \mathbb{Z}, t \mid [t, \mathbb{Z}] \rangle \simeq \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ is definable in \mathbb{Z} and has a superstable theory.

2. CONNECTEDNESS

In this section we consider the connectedness of free products of groups without amalgamation. The following argument stems directly from [Poi83, Lemme 6] (see also [Poi93] for related arguments).

Proposition 12. *Let A be a group, $F_\omega = \langle e_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ the free group on countably many generators e_i , and $G = A * F_\omega$ the free product without amalgamation of A and F_ω .*

- (1) *If X is a left-generic definable subset of G , then X contains a cofinite subset of the set $\{e_i \mid i < \omega\}$.*
- (2) *G is connected, i.e., with no proper definable subgroup of finite index.*
- (3) *If G is stable, the sequence $(e_i)_{i < \omega}$ is a Morley sequence of the unique generic type p_0 of G over \emptyset .*

Proof. (1). Suppose $G = g_1X \cup \dots \cup g_kX$ for finitely many elements g_s in G . Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_r\}$ consists of the set of all the generators of F_ω involved in the parameters needed to define X , together with all the generators of

F_ω such that $g_s \in A * \langle e_1, \dots, e_r \mid \rangle$ for each s . It suffices to show that e_i is in X for each $i > r$. Since e_i is in $g_s X$ for some s , $g_s^{-1}e_i$ is in X . But since $g_s^{-1}e_i$ is free over $A * \langle e_1, \dots, e_r \mid \rangle$, there is an automorphism of $A * \langle e_1, \dots, e_r \mid \rangle * \langle e_i \rangle$ fixing $A * \langle e_1, \dots, e_r \mid \rangle$ pointwise and sending $g_s^{-1}e_i$ to e_i . This automorphism extends to an automorphism of $A * F_\omega$ and must stabilize X setwise. In particular we get that e_i is in X .

(2). By the preceding, two left-generic definable subsets necessarily have a non-empty intersection, and in particular G cannot have a proper definable subgroup of finite index.

(3). As in [Pil08, Corollary 2.7]. \square

With one of the results of [Sel10] we get the following

Proof of Theorem 2: Since elementary equivalence preserves connectedness, we may consider directly $G * H$.

If G and H are cyclic of order 2, then $G * H$ is dihedral and in particular not connected. If $G * H$ is not dihedral, then it is elementarily equivalent to $G * H * F_\omega$ by [Sel10, Theorem 7.2], which is connected by Proposition 12(2); since elementary equivalence preserves connectedness, $G * H$ is connected. \square

We note that in the proof of Theorem 2 we only used the elementary equivalence $G * H \equiv G * H * F_\omega$ when $G * H$ is not of dihedral type. It is actually expected that a reworking of [Sel10] “over parameters” would imply the elementary embedding $G * H \preceq G * H * F_1$ in this case (and thus elementary embeddings $G * H \preceq G * H * F_\kappa \preceq G * H * F_{\kappa'}$ for all cardinals $\kappa \leq \kappa'$). In [OH11, Proposition 8.8] an elementary embedding of this type is used in a proof of the connectedness of non-cyclic torsion-free hyperbolic groups, but one could argue without such an elementary embedding as is done here.

Since free products tend to have proper subgroups of finite index, it seems difficult to characterize which expansions of a free product not of dihedral type are still connected. In the pure group language, we can obtain some realizations of the unique generic type over a non-dihedral free product with the following.

Corollary 13. *Let A be a group, $F_\omega = \langle e_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$, and suppose that $G = A * F_\omega$ is stable. Then any primitive element of F_ω is a realization of the generic type of G over \emptyset .*

Proof. By Proposition 12. \square

In particular, for $G * H$ a non-trivial free product not of dihedral type, primitive elements of F_ω realize the generic type in the elementary equivalent group $G * H * F_\omega$. The full characterization of the set of realizations of the generic type, as in [Pil09] in the free group case, seems to depend on the nature of the factors; it is even unclear whether the generic type is realized in the standard model $G * H$. Most probably, one can prove that the generic type is not isolated, as in [Sk11] in the free group case.

Theorem 2 proves that all non-trivial free products of groups are connected, with the single exception of the dihedral case. We believe that such groups are actually definably simple, which would follow from the following more general conjecture.

Conjecture 14. *Let $G * H$ be a free product of two groups. Then any definable subgroup of $G * H$ is of one of the following type:*

- *the full group,*
- *conjugated in one of the factors G or H ,*
- *cyclique infinite and of hyperbolic type, or*
- *dihedral (just in case one of the factors contains an element of order 2).*

Most probably, one way to prove Conjecture 14 could be obtained by a direct generalization to free products of groups of the Bestvina-Feighn notion of a *negligeable set* in free groups, and by using the quantifier elimination for definable subsets of $G * H$ from [Sel10]. We refer to [KM11] for a proof in the free group case.

REFERENCES

- [Jal06] Eric Jaligot. Generix never gives up. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 71(2):599–610, 2006.
- [JS10] Eric Jaligot and Zlil Sela. Makanin-Razborov diagrams over free products. *Illinois J. Math.*, 54(1):19–68, 2010.
- [KM11] Olga Kharlampovich and Alexey Myasnikov. Definable subsets in a free group. Preprint, arXiv:1111.0577v1, 2011.
- [KS77] A. Karrass and D. Solitar. Subgroups with centre in HNN groups. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A*, 24(3):350–361, 1977.
- [LS77] R. C. Lyndon and P. E. Schupp. *Combinatorial group theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 89.
- [OH08] Abderezak Ould Houcine. Superstable groups acting on trees. Submitted, arXiv:0809.3441v1, 2008.
- [OH11] Abderezak Ould Houcine. Homogeneity and prime models in torsion-free hyperbolic groups. *Confluentes Math.*, 3(1):121–155, 2011.
- [Pil08] Anand Pillay. Forking in the free group. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 7(2):375–389, 2008.
- [Pil09] Anand Pillay. On genericity and weight in the free group. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 137(11):3911–3917, 2009.
- [Poi83] Bruno Poizat. Groupes stables, avec types génériques réguliers. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 48(2):339–355, 1983.
- [Poi93] Bruno Poizat. *Is the free group stable? (Le groupe libre est-il stable?)*. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität, Fachbereich Mathematik, 1993.
- [Sel10] Zlil Sela. Diophantine geometry over groups X: The elementary theory of free products of groups. preprint: <http://www.ma.huji.ac.il/~zlil/>, 2010.
- [Sk11] Rizos Sklinos. On the generic type of the free group. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 76(1):227–234, 2011.

INSTITUT FOURIER, UNIVERSITÉ DE GRENOBLE 1, 100 RUE DES MATHS, BP 74, 38402 ST MARTIN D'HÈRES CEDEX, FRANCE