Branch: revision01 2024-09-18 09:55:51+02:00

Group actions on models

G. A. M. Polymath

ABSTRACT. A set is *strongly generic* if the intersection of any finitely many of its translation is generic. To demostrate the convenience of this notion I use it for a short proof of (a generalization of) Newelski's theorem on the diamter of the Lascar graph, see Theorem 13.

Theorem 15 shows that the condition *strongly generic* = *generic* is robust. It might be of some interest (it is reminiscent of *forking* = *dividing*). Is it worth investigating?

Section 5 is incomplete. I would like to recover in a natural way the classical theory of stable groups – but something does not add up.

The connections with topological dynamics are commented at the end of the notes.

1. The two perspectives on the invariance of types

This section I review well-known matter and set the terminology.

Below $\Delta \subseteq L_{x\,z}(\mathcal{U})$, $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^x$, and $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^z$ are some arbitrary nonempty sets (at some point we will require that $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ are type-definable). We write $L_{\Delta^{\pm}}(\mathcal{Z})$ for the set of formulas of the form $\varphi(x\,;b)$ or $\neg\varphi(x\,;b)$ for some $\varphi(x\,;z) \in \Delta$ and some $b \in \mathcal{Z}$. We write $B_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ for the set of Boolean combinations of formulas in $L_{\Delta^{\pm}}(\mathcal{Z})$. Such formulas a called Δ-formulas. A Δ-definable set is a set of the form $\vartheta(\mathcal{U}^x)$ for some Δ-formula $\vartheta(x) \in B_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$. Subsets of $B_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ are called Δ-types. We write $S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ for the set of complete Δ-types with parameters in $\mathcal{Z}$. Note that complete Δ-types are equivalent to subsets of $L_{\Delta^{\pm}}(\mathcal{Z})$.

1 Assumption Let G be a group that acts on $\mathcal{X}$ and on $\mathcal{Z}$ from the left. We require that for every $\varphi(x\,;z) \in \Delta$ the set $\varphi(\mathcal{X};\mathcal{Z})$ is invariant under the action of G.

Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^z$. We say that $\mathcal{D}$ is invariant under the action of G, or G-invariant, if $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{Z}$ is fixed setwise by G. Yet in other words, if

is1. $\quad a \in \mathcal{D} \;\leftrightarrow\; ga \in \mathcal{D} \qquad$ for every $a \in \mathcal{Z}$ and every $g \in G$.

A formula is invariant if the set it defines is invariant. We say that $p(x) \subseteq L(\mathcal{U})$ is invariant under the action of G, or G-invariant, if for every formula $\varphi(x\,;z) \in L$

it1. $\quad \varphi(x\,;a) \in p \;\Leftrightarrow\; \varphi(x\,;ga) \in p \qquad$ for every $a \in \mathcal{Z}$ and every $g \in G$.

It should be evident that invariant under the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}/A)$ coincides with invariant over A and that Lascar invariant over A coincides with invariant under the action of $\mathrm{Autf}(\mathcal{U}/A)$.

We have just defined invariance using the subsets of $\mathcal{Z}$ (externally) defined by p. Now we discuss invariance using the subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ that are in p.

An immediate consequence of Assumption 1 is that any G-translate of a Δ-definable set is again Δ-definable. In particular for every Δ-formula $\vartheta(x\,;\bar{b})$ and every $g \in G$

$$g[\vartheta(\mathcal{X}\,;\bar{b})] \;=\; \vartheta(\mathcal{X}\,;g\bar{b}).$$

Therefore $p(x) \subseteq L_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ is invariant if

$$p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{D} \;\Leftrightarrow\; p(x) \vdash x \in g\mathcal{D} \qquad \text{for every } \Delta\text{-definable } \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^x \text{ and } g \in G,$$

where by $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{D}$ we understand $\vartheta(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ for some $\vartheta(x)$ that is conjunction of formulas in $p(x)$.

A set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is generic under the action of G, or G-generic for short, if finitely many G-translates of $\mathcal{D}$ cover $\mathcal{X}$; we say n-G-generic if $\leq n$ translates suffices. Dually, we say that $\mathcal{D}$ is persistent under the action of G, or G-persistent for short, if the intersection of any finitely many G-translates of $\mathcal{D}$ is nonempty; we say n-G-persistent when the request is limited to $\leq n$ translates. We will drop reference to G when it is clear from the context.

The same properties may be attributed to formulas (as these are identified with the set they define). When these properties are attributed to a type $p(x)$, we understand that they hold for every conjunction of formulas in $p(x)$.

The terminology is mine. In **[?]** the authors write *quasi-non-dividing* for *persistent* when $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}/A)$.

2 Example If $p(x) \subseteq L(\mathcal{U})$ is finitely satisfiable in A then $p(x)$ is persistent (in any $\mathcal{X} \supseteq A^x$) under the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}/A)$. In fact, the same $a \in A^x$ that satisfies $\varphi(x)$ also satisfies every $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}/A)$-translate of $\varphi(x)$.

Notation: for $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^x$ and $H \subseteq G$ we write $H\,\mathcal{D}$ for $\{h\mathcal{D} : h \in H\}$.

In this notes many proofs require some juggling with negations.

3 Fact (Assume 1) The following are equivalent

1. $\mathcal{D}$ is not generic
2. $\neg\mathcal{D}$ is persistent.

Proof. Immediate by spelling out the definitions

1. there are no finite $H \subseteq G$ such that $\mathcal{X} \;\subseteq\; \cup H\,\mathcal{D}$.
2. $\varnothing \;\neq\; \mathcal{X} \cap \big(\cap\, H\neg\mathcal{D}\big)$ for every finite $H \subseteq G$. □

4 Theorem (Assume 1) Let $p(x) \in S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ be finitely satisfiable in $\mathcal{X}$. Then the following are equivalent

1. $p(x)$ is invariant
2. $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{D}$ for every generic Δ-definable set $\mathcal{D}$
3. $p(x)$ is persistent.

Proof. 1⇒2. Let $H \subseteq G$ be finite such that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \cup H\,\mathcal{D}$. Then $p(x) \vdash x \in \cup H\,\mathcal{D}$. By completeness, $p(x) \vdash x \in h\mathcal{D}$ for some $h \in H$. Finally, by invariance, $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{D}$.

2⇒3. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be defined by a conjunction of formulas in $p(x)$. If $\mathcal{D}$ is not persistent then, by Fact 3, $\neg\mathcal{D}$ is generic. By 2, $p(x) \vdash x \notin \mathcal{D}$, a contradiction.

3⇒1. If $p(x)$ is not invariant then, by completeness, $p(x) \vdash \varphi(x\,;b) \wedge \neg\varphi(x\,;gb)$ for some $g \in G$. Clearly $\varphi(x\,;b) \wedge \neg\varphi(x\,;gb)$ is not persistent as it is inconsistent with its g-translate. □

5 Remark In the theorem above, 2 and 3 can be replaced by

2′. $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{D}$ for every 2-generic Δ-definable set $\mathcal{D}$

3′. $p(x)$ is 2-persistent.

The theorem yields an immediate necessary condition for the existence of an invariant global Δ-type.

6 Corollary (Assume 1) If there exists an invariant global Δ-type then for every Δ-definable set $\mathcal{D}$

1. $\mathcal{D}$ and $\neg\mathcal{D}$ cannot be both generic
2. if $\mathcal{D}$ is generic then it is persistent
3. the type $\gamma_G(x) = \{\vartheta(x) \in B_\Delta(\mathcal{Z}) : \vartheta(x) \text{ generic }\}$ is finitely satisfiable in $\mathcal{X}$.

Proof. The three claims are equivalent; 1 is an immediate consequenc of 2 of Theorem 4. □

The following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of global invariant Δ-type. Ideally, we would like to prove that every persistent Δ-type extends to a global persitent type. Unfortunately this is not true – we need a stronger property. A Δ-definable set $\mathcal{D}$ is hereditarely persistent if every finite cover of $\mathcal{D}$ by Δ-definable sets contains a persistent set. A type is hereditarely persistent if every conjunction of formulas in the type is hereditarely persistent.

The terminology is provisional. In [?] a related property is called *quasi-non-forking*.

7 Theorem (Assume 1) Let $q(x) \subseteq L(\mathcal{U})$. Then the following are equivalent

1. $q(x)$ extends to an invariant type $p(x) \in S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ finitely satisfiable in $\mathcal{X}$
2. $q(x)$ is hereditarely persistent.

Proof. 1⇒2. Let $\vartheta(x)$ be a conjunction of formulas in $q(x)$. Suppose $\mathcal{C}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{C}_n$ cover $\vartheta(\mathcal{U}^x)$ and pick $p(x)$ as in 1. By completeness, $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{C}_i$ for some i. Then, by Theorem 4, $\neg\mathcal{C}_i$ is not generic. Therefore, by Fact 3, $\mathcal{C}_i$ is persistent.

2⇒1. Let $p(x)$ be maximal among the Δ-types that contain $q(x)$ and are such that $\vartheta(\mathcal{U}^x)$ is hereditarely persistent for every $\vartheta(x)$ that is conjunction of formulas in $p(x)$. We claim that p is a complete Δ-type. Suppose for a contradiction that $\vartheta(x), \neg\vartheta(x) \notin p$. By maximality there is some formula $\psi(x)$, a conjunction of formulas in $p(x)$ and some $\mathcal{C}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{C}_n$ that cover both $\psi(\mathcal{U}^x) \cap \vartheta(\mathcal{U}^x)$ and $\psi(\mathcal{U}^x) \smallsetminus \vartheta(\mathcal{U}^x)$ and such that no $\mathcal{C}_i$ is persistent. As $\mathcal{C}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{C}_n$ cover $\psi(\mathcal{U}^x)$ this is a contradiction. It is only left to show that $p(x)$ is finitely satisfiable in $\mathcal{X}$ and invariant. Finite satisfiability follows from persistency. From completeness and Theorem 4 we obtain invariance. □

We concude with a fact that reminds of Lemma 2.10 in [**?**].

8 Fact (Assume 1) Let $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ be Δ-definable sets. The relation on G defined by

$$R(h\,;k) \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad h\,\mathcal{D}\cap k\,\mathcal{C} \text{ is persistent}$$

is stable.

Proof. Let $\langle h_i\,;k_i : i < 3\rangle$ be a sequence of elements of G^2. Assume $h_0\mathcal{D}\cap k_1\mathcal{C}$ is persistent. Note that if a set $\mathcal{B}$ is persistent then $\mathcal{B}\cap g\mathcal{B}$ is also persistent for any $g\in G$. Therefore $h_0\mathcal{D}\cap k_1\mathcal{C}\cap h_2\mathcal{D}\cap h_2h_0^{-1}k_1\mathcal{C}$ is persistent. A fortiori $h_2\mathcal{D}\cap k_1\mathcal{C}$ is peristent. Therefore $R(h_i\,;k_j)\Leftrightarrow i<j$ fails for some i,j. □

2. Strong genericity

Unfortunatelly, genericity is not preserved under intersection. To obtain closure under intersection, we need to push the concept to a higher level of complexity.

A set $\mathcal{D}\subseteq\mathcal{U}^x$ is strongly generic if for every finite $H\subseteq G$ the set $\cap\,H\,\mathcal{D}$ is generic. Dually, we say that $\mathcal{D}$ is weakly persistent if for some finite $H\subseteq G$ the set $\cup\,H\,\mathcal{D}$ is persistent. Again, the same properties may be attributed to formulas and types.

9 Lemma (Assume 1) The intersection of strongly generic sets is strongly generic.

Proof. We may assume that all sets mentioned below are subsets of $\mathcal{X}$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ be strongly generic and let $K\subseteq G$ be an arbitrary finite set. It suffices to prove that $\mathcal{B}=\cap\,K\,(\mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{D})$ is generic. Clearly $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{C}'\cap\mathcal{D}'$, where $\mathcal{C}'=\cap\,K\,\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}'=\cap\,K\,\mathcal{D}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}'$ and $\mathcal{D}'$ are both strongly generic. In particular $\mathcal{X}=\cup\,H\,\mathcal{D}'$ for some finite $H\subseteq G$. Now, from

$$
\begin{aligned}
\cup\,H\,\mathcal{B} &= \cup\,H\Big[\mathcal{C}'\;\cap\;\mathcal{D}'\Big]\\
\cup\,H\,\mathcal{B} &\supseteq \cup\,H\Big[(\cap\,H\,\mathcal{C}')\;\cap\;\mathcal{D}'\Big]\\
&= (\cap\,H\,\mathcal{C}')\;\cap\;(\cup\,H\,\mathcal{D}')\\
&= \cap\,H\,\mathcal{C}'
\end{aligned}
$$

As $\mathcal{C}'$ is strongly generic, $\cap\,H\,\mathcal{C}'$ is generic. Therefore $\cup\,H\,\mathcal{B}$ is also generic. The genericity of $\mathcal{B}$ follows. □

10 Corollary (Assume 1) Define

$$^{\mathrm{s}}\gamma_G(x) \quad=\quad \big\{\vartheta(x)\in B_\Delta(\mathcal{Z}) \,:\, \vartheta(x) \text{ strongly generic}\big\}.$$

Then $^{\mathrm{s}}\gamma_G(x)$ is finitely satisfiable in $\mathcal{X}$, strongly generic, and invariant.

Proof. Strong genericity is an immediate consequence of Lemma 9. Finite satisfiability follows easily from genericity. As for invariance, note that any translate of a strongly generic formula is also strongly generic. □

11 Corollary (Assume 1) Let ${}^{s}\gamma_G(x)$ be as in Corollary 10. Let $p(x) \subseteq B_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ be such that $p(x) \cup {}^{s}\gamma_G(x)$ is finitely satisfied in $\mathcal{X}$. Then $p(x)$ is weakly persistent.

Proof. Let $\vartheta(x) \in p$. As ${}^{s}\gamma_G(x)$ is finitely satisfiable in $\vartheta(\mathcal{U}^x)$, we cannot have that $\neg\vartheta(x)$ is strongly generic. From Fact 3, we obtain that $\neg\vartheta(\mathcal{U}^x)$ non strongly generic is equivalent to $\vartheta(x)$ weakly persistent. □

3. The diameter of a Lascar type

Recall that $\mathcal{L}(a/A)$, the Lascar strong type of $a \in \mathcal{U}^x$, is the union of a chain of type-definable sets of the form $\{x \ : \ d_A(a,x) \leq n\}$. In this section we prove that $\mathcal{L}(a/A)$ is type-definable (if and) only this chain is finite. In other words, only if the connected component of a in the Lascar graph has finite diameter. It is convenient to address the problem in more general terms.

Assume $G \trianglelefteq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U})$. Let $K \subseteq G$ be a set of generators that is

1. symmetric i.e. it contains the unit and is closed under inverse
2. conjugancy invariant i.e. $g\,Kg^{-1} = K$ for every $g \in G$

Assume G acts transitively on $\mathcal{X}$ i.e. $G\,a = \mathcal{X}$ for every $a \in \mathcal{X}$. We define a discrete metric on $\mathcal{X}$. For $a, b \in \mathcal{X}$ let $d(a,b)$ be the minimal n such that $a \in K^n b$. This defines a metric which is G-invariant by 2. The diameter of a set $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is the supremum of $d(a,b)$ for $a, b \in \mathcal{C}$.

We are interested in sufficient conditions for $\mathcal{X}$ to have finite diameter. The notions introduced in Section 2 offer some hint.

12 Proposition If $\mathcal{X}$ has a weakly persistent subset of finite diameter, then $\mathcal{X}$ itself has finite diamenter.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a weakly persistent set of diameter n. Let $H \subseteq G$ be finite such that $\cup H\,\mathcal{C}$ is persistent. We claim that also $\cup H\,\mathcal{C}$ has finite diameter. Let $a \in \mathcal{C}$ be arbitrary. Let m be larger than $d(ha, ka)$ for all $h, k, \in H$. Now, let hb and kc, for some $h, k, \in H$ and $b, c \in \mathcal{C}$, be two arbitrary elements of $\cup H\,\mathcal{C}$. As $h\mathcal{C}$ and $k\mathcal{C}$ have the same diameter of $\mathcal{C}$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(hb,\ kc) \ &\leq\ d(hb,\ ha)\ +\ d(ha,\ ka)\ +\ d(ka,\ kc) \\ &\leq\ n + m + n. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $\cup H\,\mathcal{C}$ has finite diameter. Therefore, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathcal{C}$ itself is persistent.

By the transitivity of the action, any two elements of $\mathcal{X}$ are of the form ha, ka for some $h, k \in G$ and some $a \in \mathcal{C}$. By percistency, there are $c \in \mathcal{C} \cap h\mathcal{C}$ and $d \in \mathcal{C} \cap k\mathcal{C}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d(ha,\ ka) \ &\leq\ d(ha,\ c)\ +\ d(c,\ d)\ +\ d(d,\ ka) \\ &\leq\ n + n + n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the diameter of $\mathcal{X}$ does not exceed $3n$. □

13 Theorem Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ and the sets $\mathcal{X}_n = K^n a$, for some $a \in \mathcal{X}$, are type-definable. Then $\mathcal{X}$ has finite diameter.

Proof. By Proposition 12, it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{X}_n$ is weakly persistent. Let ${}^{s}\gamma_G(x)$ be as in Corollary 10, with $L_{x,z}$ for Δ. It suffices to prove that for some n the type ${}^{s}\gamma_G(x)$ is finitely satisfied in $\mathcal{X}_n$. Suppose not. Let $\psi_n(x) \in q$ be a formula that is not satisfied in $\mathcal{X}_n$. The type $p(x) = \{\psi_n(x) : n \in \omega\}$ is finitely satisfied in $\mathcal{X}$. Then $p(x)$ has a realization in $\mathcal{X}$. As this realization belongs to some $\mathcal{X}_n$ we contradict the definition of $\psi_n(x)$. □

14 Example Let $K \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}/A)$ be the set of automorphisms that fix a model containing A. Then the group G generated by K is $\mathrm{Autf}(\mathcal{U}/A)$ and $G\,a = \mathcal{X}$ is $\mathcal{L}(a/A)$. Then $d(a,b)$ concides with the dinstance in the Lascar graph. It is not difficult to see that the sets $K^n\,a$ are type definable. Then from Theorem 13 it follows that $\mathcal{L}(a/A)$ is type definable (if and) only if it has a finite diameter.

4. A simplified landscape

Under suitable assumptions – e.g. the sability of $\varphi(x\,;z)$ – some of the notions introduced above coalesce and we are left with cleaner theory. We prove the following theorem.

15 Theorem (Assume 1) The following are equivalent

1. persistent Δ-definable sets are hereditarely persistent
2. generic Δ-definable sets are strongly generic
3. generic Δ-definable sets are closed under intersection
4. weakly persistent Δ-definable sets are persistent.

Proof. 1⇒2. It suffices to prove that generic sets are closed under intersection. Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be generic Δ-definable sets. Suppose for a contradiction that $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}$ is not generic. By 1 and Theorem 7 there is an invariant global Δ-type $p(x)$ containing $x \in \neg\mathcal{C} \cup \neg\mathcal{D}$. By completeness either $p(x) \vdash x \notin \mathcal{C}$ or $p(x) \vdash x \notin \mathcal{D}$. This is a contradiction because, by Theorem 4, $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{C}$ and $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{D}$.

2⇔3⇔4. Clear.

4⇒1. Let ${}^{s}\gamma_G(x)$ be as in Corollary 11. Any completion of ${}^{s}\gamma_G(x)$ is, by 4, persistent. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a persistent Δ-definable set. By Theorems 4 and 7 it suffices to show that $\mathcal{D}$ is consistent with ${}^{s}\gamma_G(x)$. Suppose not, then ${}^{s}\gamma_G(x) \vdash x \notin \mathcal{D}$. Therefore $\neg\mathcal{D}$ is generic. This is a contradiction by Fact 3. □

16 Assumption For G, $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Z}$ and Δ as in Assumption 1 we also require that the equivalent conditions in Theorem 15 hold.

17 Remark (Assume 16) Note that the types $\gamma_G(x)$ and ${}^{s}\gamma_G(x)$ defined in corollary 6 and 11 coincide. Then the following are equivalent for every $p(x) \in S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$

1. $p(x)$ is persistent (equivalently, invariant)
2. $p(x)$ extends $\gamma_G(x)$.

Note also that, as $\gamma_G(x)$ is finitely consistent on $\mathcal{X}$, invariant global types exist.

It is also worth mentioning that if $\mathcal{D}$ is generic then every positive Bolean combination of G-translates of $\mathcal{D}$ is generic.

5. Definable groups

In this section we work as always under Assumption 1 but we further specify G and Δ. We set $G = \mathcal{Z}$ and require that $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ are type-definable over A. We assume that the group operations and the group action are definable over A. We use the symbol $\cdot$ for both the group multiplication and the group action. Clearly, $\mathcal{Z}$ also acts on itself by left multiplication.

In this section we deal with the actions of two groups: $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}/A)$. Generic and persistent only refer to the action of $\mathcal{Z}$. We will be explicit about invariance.

Let $\psi(x\,;y) \in L(A)$. We write $\varphi(x\,;z\,;y)$ for the formula $\psi(z^{-1}\cdot x\,;y)$. In this section Δ contains the formulas $\varphi(x\,;z\,;a)$ where a ranges over some given $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^y$ that is invariant over A. Note that $\varphi(\mathcal{X}\,;\mathcal{Z}\,;a)$ is invariant for every a.

Let 1 be the identity of $\mathcal{Z}$ which, for simplicity, we think as a constant of L. Clearly, $\varphi(\mathcal{X}\,;g\,;a) = g\cdot\varphi(\mathcal{X}\,;1\,;a)$.

18 Assumption Let G, $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Z}$ and Δ be as described above. Note that these are compatible with Assumption 1.

19 Fact (Assume 18) Let $\vartheta(x\,;\bar{z}\,;\bar{y})$ be a Bolean combination of $\varphi(x\,;z_i\,;y_i)$, where $i = 1,\dots,n$. Then there is a formulas $\psi(\bar{z}\,;\bar{y}) \in L(A)$ such that, for every $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ and every $\bar{g} \in \mathcal{Z}^n$

$$\psi(\bar{g}\,;\bar{a}) \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \vartheta(x\,;\bar{g}\,;\bar{a}) \text{ is generic.}$$

In other words, the type $\gamma_G(x)$ is definable.

Proof. By compactness, there is an m such that for every $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ and every $\bar{g} \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ if $\vartheta(x\,;\bar{g}\,;\bar{a})$ is generic then it is also m-generic. Then

$$\psi(\bar{z}\,;\bar{y}) \quad=\quad \exists u_1,\dots,u_m\,\forall x \bigvee_{i=1}^{m} \vartheta(x\,;\,u_i\cdot\bar{z}\,;\,\bar{y}) \qquad \square$$

An immediate consequence of this fact is that the automorphisms in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}/A)$ map generic/persistent Δ-definable sets to generic/persistent sets of the same form.

20 Fact Let $p(x) \in S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ be persistent – equivalently, G-invariant. Then $p(x)$ is invariant over A.

Proof. We may assume that $p(x)$ only contain the formulas $\varphi(x\,;b)$ for $\varphi(x\,;z) \in \Delta$ or negations thereof. As $p(x)$ is invariant, $\varphi(x\,;g\,;a) \in p \Leftrightarrow \varphi(x\,;1\,;a) \in p$. Then, as $\varphi(x\,;1\,;a) \leftrightarrow \varphi(x\,;1\,;fa)$ for every $f \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}/A)$, invariance over A follows. □

21 Assumption For G, $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Z}$ and Δ as in Assumption 18 we also require that the equivalent conditions in Theorem 15 hold.

6. Notes and references

Connnections with topological dynamics are mentioned everywhere but I ignored them until the very last. I just realized that *persistent* = *thick* and that *weakly persistent* = *piecewise syndetic*. Of course, *generic* = *syndetic*. The notion of *hereditarely persistent* may also have an analogon in topological dynamics, but could not find it yet.