

## Subgroups

Domenico Zambella

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a monster model. We confuse formulas  $\varphi(x) \in L(\mathcal{U})$  with the subset of  $\mathcal{U}^{|\mathcal{U}|}$  that they define  $\mathcal{D} = \varphi(\mathcal{U})$ . Unless stated otherwise, calligraphic capital letters denote definable sets (with parameters). If  $p \in S_x(\mathcal{U})$  we write  $p \in \mathcal{D}$  for  $p(x) \rightarrow x \in \mathcal{D}$ .

Write  $\kappa$  for the cardinality of  $\mathcal{U}$ . Let  $\mu$ , sometimes denoted by  $\mu(x)$ , be a filter on the boolean algebra of definable subsets of  $\mathcal{U}^{|\mathcal{U}|}$ . We write  $0_\mu$  for the ideal associated to  $\mu$ , that is  $0_\mu = \{\mathcal{D} : \neg \mathcal{D} \in \mu\}$ .

We say that  $\mu$  is  $\kappa$ -prime if for every sequence  $\langle \mathcal{D}_i : i < \kappa \rangle$  of definable sets such that  $\mathcal{D}_i \cup \mathcal{D}_j \in \mu$  for every  $i < j < \kappa$ , there is an  $i < \kappa$  such that  $\mathcal{D}_i \in \mu$ .

**Fact 1.** Assume there is a finitely additive probability measure on the definable subsets of and let  $\mu$  be the set of formulas of measure 1. Then  $\mu$  is  $\kappa$ -prime.

*Proof.* Assume for a contradiction that the sets  $\langle \mathcal{D}_i : i < \kappa \rangle$  have measure  $< 1$  but that  $\mathcal{D}_i \cup \mathcal{D}_j$  has measure 1 for any  $i < j < \kappa$ . We can assume that for some  $\varepsilon > 0$  all sets have measure  $< 1 - \varepsilon$ . Up to a set measure 0, the sets  $\neg \mathcal{D}_i$  are pairwise disjoint and  $\mathcal{D}_i$  contains  $\neg \mathcal{D}_j$  for every  $j \neq i$ . This is clearly a contradiction.  $\square$

**Fact 2.** For any  $A$ -invariant filter  $\mu$  the following are equivalent

1.  $\mu$  is  $\kappa$ -prime;
2. for every  $A$ -indiscernible sequence  $\langle \mathcal{D}_i : i < \omega \rangle$

$$\mathcal{D}_0 \cup \mathcal{D}_1 \in \mu \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_0 \in \mu.$$

**Example 3.** Let  $\mu = \{\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^{|\mathcal{U}|} : A^{|\mathcal{U}|} \subseteq \mathcal{X}\}$ . Then  $\mu$  is  $\kappa$ -prime.

*Proof.* Assume  $\mathcal{D}_0 \cup \mathcal{D}_1 \in \mu$ , where  $\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1$  start a sequence of  $A$ -indiscernibles. Then  $a \in \mathcal{D}_0 \cup \mathcal{D}_1$  for every  $a \in A^{|\mathcal{U}|}$ . By indiscernibility,  $a \in \mathcal{D}_0$  holds for every  $a \in A^{|\mathcal{U}|}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{D}_0 \in \mu$ .  $\square$

**Example 4.** Let  $\mu = \{\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^{|\mathcal{U}|} : p \in \mathcal{D} \text{ for every } A\text{-invariant } p \in S_x(\mathcal{U})\}$ . Then  $\mu$  is  $\kappa$ -prime.

*Proof.* Assume  $\mathcal{D}_0 \cup \mathcal{D}_1 \in \mu$ , where  $\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1$  are conjugate over  $A$ . By invariance  $p \in \mathcal{D}_0$  if and only if  $p \in \mathcal{D}_1$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{D}_0 \in \mu$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.** We say that  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $A$ -generic if finitely many  $A$ -translates of  $\mathcal{D}$  cover  $\mathcal{U}^{[x]}$ . Then the filter generated by the  $A$ -generic definable sets is the filter  $\mu$  in Example 4.

*Proof.* It is easy to see that if  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $A$ -generic then  $\mathcal{D} \in \mu$ . Vice versa, assume that there are no  $A$ -generic sets  $\mathcal{B}_i$  such that

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{B}_i \subseteq \mathcal{D}$$

By taking complements, for any  $\mathcal{C}_i$  such that

$$\neg \mathcal{D} \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}_i$$

there is at least one  $i$  such that the  $A$ -orbit of  $\mathcal{C}_i$  has the finite intersection property. By a standard argument we obtain that there is an  $A$ -invariant type  $p \in \mathcal{D}$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{D} \notin \mu$   $\square$

*Proof.* Let  $\langle \mathcal{D}_i : i < \kappa \rangle$  be a sequence of definable sets such that  $\mathcal{D}_i \cup \mathcal{D}_j \in \mu$  for every  $i < j < \kappa$ .  $\square$

**Definition 6.** Let  $p(x) \subseteq L(\mathcal{U})$ . If  $\mu(x) \cup p(x)$  is finitely consistent, then we say that  $p(x)$  is **wide**.

**Example 7.** If  $\mu$  is as in Example 3 then the following are equivalent

1.  $p(x)$  is wide;
2.  $p(x)$  is finitely satisfied in  $B$ .

*Proof.* (1 $\Rightarrow$ 2) If  $\varphi(x)$  is not finitely satisfiable in  $B$ , then  $\neg \varphi(x)$  is in  $\mu$  and  $p(x)$  is not consistent with  $\mu(x)$ . (2 $\Rightarrow$ 1) If  $p(x) \rightarrow \neg \varphi(x)$  for some  $\varphi(x) \in \mu$ , then  $p(x)$  is not finitely satisfied in  $B$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 8.** Let  $p(x; z), q(x; z) \subseteq L(A)$ . Let  $\mu$  be a  $k$ -prime and  $A$ -invariant. Then

$$R(a, b) \Leftrightarrow p(x; a) \cup q(x; b) \text{ is wide}$$

is a stable relation.

*Proof.* Let  $\langle a_i, b_i : i < \omega \rangle$  be a sequence of  $A$ -indiscernibles such that  $p(x; a_0) \cup q(x; b_1)$  is wide. By  $\kappa$ -primality, also  $[p(x; a_0) \cup q(x; b_1)] \cup [p(x; a_2) \cup q(x; b_3)]$  is wide. A fortiori  $p(x; a_2) \cup q(x; b_1)$  is wide and, by indiscernibility, so is  $p(x; a_1) \cup q(x; b_0)$ .  $\square$

**Definition 9.** The nonforking filter  $\nu$  is the filter generated by the sets  $\mathcal{D}$  such that some  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n$  that starts a sequence of indiscernibles cover  $\mathcal{U}$ .