

# A short proof of a theorem of Brodskii

James Howie

August 3, 2000

## Abstract

A short proof, using graphs and groupoids, is given of Brodskii's Theorem that torsion-free one-relator groups are locally indicable

## 1 Introduction

In 1980, Sergei Brodskii announced [2] the result, previously conjectured by Gilbert Baumslag [1], that every torsion-free one-relator group is *locally indicable*, that is, every nontrivial, finitely generated subgroup has an infinite cyclic homomorphic image. His algebraic proof was published in full in 1984 [3]. Around the same time, I independently obtained Brodskii's theorem, and published a slightly more general version in [7], with a topological proof: a one-relator quotient of a free product of locally indicable groups is locally indicable, provided the relator is neither a proper power nor conjugate to an element of one of the free factors. A further version of the theorem was later proved by John Hempel [5]: the quotient of a surface group by a single relator that is not a proper power is locally indicable.

This paper arose as a response to requests from colleagues - notably Warren Dicks - for a proof of Brodskii's theorem more accessible than those in [3, 7]. In particular the topology used in [7] seemed to cause some difficulty. Here I present a straightforward proof of the theorem, using groupoids. It is essentially my proof from [7], restricted to the original case of a torsion-free one-relator group, with as much of the topology as possible translated into algebra. The only remaining topology is the notion of an infinite cyclic cover of a graph or groupoid. For more detailed background material on graphs and groupoids, the best reference is [6], but for completeness I have included some elementary definitions in §2 below, and a description of the construction of infinite cyclic covers in §3.

**Acknowledgements.** I first presented a version of this proof in a seminar to mark the retirement of my PhD supervisor, Philip Higgins. I am grateful to him for his support. I am also grateful to Warren Dicks for encouraging me to publish this material, and for pointing out Corollary 3.2.

## 2 Preliminaries

A *graph*  $\Gamma$  consists of a set  $V = V(\Gamma)$  of *vertices* and a set  $E = E(\Gamma)$  of *edges*, together with a map  $i : E \rightarrow V$  (the *initial vertex map*), and a fixed-point-free involution  $e \mapsto e^{-1} : E \rightarrow E$ . The *terminal vertex map*  $t : E \rightarrow V$  is defined by  $t(e) = i(e^{-1})$ . A *path* in  $\Gamma$  from the vertex  $u$  to the vertex  $v$  is a sequence  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  of edges, with  $i(e_1) = u$ ,  $i(e_j) = t(e_{j-1})$  for  $2 \leq j \leq n$ , and  $t(e_n) = v$ . (We also call  $u$  the *initial vertex*, and  $v$  the *terminal vertex* of  $P$ .) The path  $P$  is *reduced* if  $e_j \neq e_{j-1}^{-1}$  for all  $2 \leq j \leq n$ , and *closed* if  $u = v$ . A reduced closed path is *cyclically reduced* if, in addition,  $e_n \neq e_1^{-1}$ . A closed path is a *proper power* if it is obtained by repeating a closed path two or more times. A graph is *connected* if any two vertices are joined by a path. The set of all reduced paths forms a groupoid  $F(\Gamma)$  under juxtaposition (followed by cancellation of any resulting inverse pairs of consecutive edges), called the *free groupoid* on  $\Gamma$  (see [6] for details). The set of all reduced closed paths at a vertex  $v$  forms a group  $\pi(\Gamma, v)$ , called the *path group*, or *fundamental group*, of  $\Gamma$  (based at  $v$ ). It is equal to the vertex group at  $v$  of the groupoid  $F(\Gamma)$ . It is a free group, and every free group arises in this way.

A presentation  $\langle \Gamma \mid R \rangle$  of a groupoid  $G$  consists of:

1. a graph  $\Gamma$ ; and
2. a set  $R$  of cyclically reduced closed paths in  $\Gamma$ ,

such that  $G = F(\Gamma)/N(R)$ , where  $N(R)$  denotes the smallest normal subgroupoid containing  $R$ . The presentation is *staggered* if there are linear orderings on the sets  $R$  and  $E = E(\Gamma)$  which are *compatible* in the sense that, if  $\alpha, \beta \in R$  with  $\alpha < \beta$ , then  $\max(\alpha) < \max(\beta)$  and  $\min(\alpha) < \min(\beta)$ , where  $\max$  and  $\min$  denote the greatest and least edges occurring in a path (under the given linear ordering on  $E$ ).

A group  $G$  is *indicible* if it admits an infinite cyclic homomorphic image. It is *locally indicible* if every non-trivial, finitely generated subgroup is indicible.

## 3 The main result

**Theorem 3.1** *Let  $G$  be a groupoid given by a staggered presentation  $\langle \Gamma \mid R \rangle$  in which no element of  $R$  is a proper power. Then every vertex group of  $G$  is locally indicible.*

Brodskiĭ's theorem is the special case of Theorem 3.1 in which  $V(\Gamma)$  and  $R$  are singleton sets (and  $E(\Gamma)$  has an arbitrary ordering).

**Corollary 3.2** *Any torsion-free subgroup of a one-relator group is locally indicible.*

*Proof.* Let  $G = \langle X \mid r^m \rangle$  be a one-relator group, where  $m \geq 2$  and  $r$  is not a proper power. Let  $\tilde{G} = \langle X \mid r \rangle$  be the corresponding torsion-free one-relator group. Then there is a short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow F \rightarrow G \rightarrow \tilde{G} \rightarrow 1$$

in which  $F$  is a free product of cyclic groups [4]. If  $H$  is a torsion-free subgroup of  $G$ , then  $H \cap F$  is free, so locally indicable. Hence  $H$  is an extension of a locally indicable group by a locally indicable group, so is locally indicable.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Suppose the theorem were false. Then for some  $G = \langle \Gamma \mid R \rangle$  as in the theorem, and some vertex  $v \in V(\Gamma)$ , there would be a finitely generated, non-indicable subgroup  $H \neq \{1\}$  of the vertex group  $G_v$  of  $G$  at  $v$ . Suppose  $H$  is generated by reduced closed paths  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$  at  $v$ . Since  $H$  is non-indicable, it has finite abelianisation, and so there are  $n$  words  $W_1, \dots, W_n$  in the free group on  $n$  generators  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , such that:

1. the abstract group  $\langle x_1, \dots, x_n \mid W_1, \dots, W_n \rangle$  has finite abelianisation; and
2. each path  $W_j(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$  ( $1 \leq j \leq n$ ) belongs to  $N(R)$ .

Because of 2. there is an identity:

$$W_j(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n) = (\delta_{j,1} \alpha_{j,1} \delta_{j,1}^{-1}) \cdots (\delta_{j,m(j)} \alpha_{j,m(j)} \delta_{j,m(j)}^{-1}) \quad (1)$$

for each  $j$ , where each  $\alpha_{j,k}$  is an element of  $R$  or its inverse, and each  $\delta_{j,k}$  is a path in  $\Gamma$  from  $v$  to the initial (and terminal) vertex of  $\alpha_{j,k}$ . We will refer to the collection of paths  $\gamma_j$ , words  $W_j$  and identities (1) as a *datum*,  $\Delta$  say. There is nothing in the definition of a datum which enforces the nontriviality of the subgroup  $H$  generated by the  $\gamma_j$ , so data exist for the trivial subgroup also. In fact, we will prove the theorem by showing that, for any datum as above, the corresponding subgroup  $H$  vanishes. We will do this by induction on  $L(\Delta) - M(\Delta)$ , where  $L(\Delta)$  is the sum of the lengths of all the paths  $\delta_{j,k}$  and  $\alpha_{j,k}$ , and  $M(\Delta)$  is the number of *distinct* vertices visited by these paths. Clearly  $M(\Delta) \leq L(\Delta)$ , so induction on  $L(\Delta) - M(\Delta)$  makes sense.

The first step is to replace  $\Gamma$  by the smallest subgraph  $\Gamma_0$  containing all the paths  $\delta_{j,k}$  and  $\alpha_{j,k}$  (and hence all the  $\gamma_j$ ), and  $R$  by the subset  $R_0 = \{\alpha_{j,k} \mid 1 \leq j \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq m(j)\}$ . Note that  $\Gamma_0$  is a finite graph, and  $R_0$  is a finite set. This gives a new (finite) presentation  $\langle \Gamma_0 \mid R_0 \rangle$  of a groupoid  $G_0$ ; the paths  $\gamma_j$  generate a subgroup  $H_0$  of  $G_0$ ; the inclusion of  $\Gamma_0$  in  $\Gamma$  induces a natural homomorphism  $G_0 \rightarrow G$  which maps  $H_0$  onto  $H$ ; and the presentation of  $G_0$  is staggered under the restriction of the orders on  $E(\Gamma)$  and  $R$  to  $E(\Gamma_0)$  and  $R_0$  respectively. In particular, if we prove that  $H_0 = \{1\}$ , then it follows that  $H = \{1\}$ , as desired.

From now on, we assume that  $G = G_0$ , etc.

**Case 1.** Assume that the vertex group  $G_v$  of  $G$  at  $v$  is indicable.

Choose an epimorphism  $G_v \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  of groups and extend it to an epimorphism  $\theta : G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  of groupoids. Corresponding to  $\theta$  we construct *infinite cyclic coverings*  $\Gamma'$  of  $\Gamma$  and  $G'$  of  $G$  as follows. Firstly we define  $V(\Gamma') := V(\Gamma) \times \mathbb{Z}$ ;  $E(\Gamma') := E(\Gamma) \times \mathbb{Z}$ ;  $i(e, n) := (i(e), n)$  and  $(e, n)^{-1} := (e^{-1}, n + \theta(e))$  to get a graph  $G'$ . The projections onto the first coordinates determine a graph homomorphism  $\pi : \Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma$ , called a *covering projection*. This satisfies the (easily verified) *path lifting property*: given any path  $P$  in  $\Gamma$ , beginning at a vertex  $v$ , say, and any integer  $n$ , there is a unique path  $P_n$  in  $\Gamma'$ , beginning at  $(v, n)$ , with  $\pi(P_n) = P$ . (We call  $P_n$  the *lift* of  $P$  beginning at  $(v, n)$ .) If  $P$  ends at a vertex  $u$ , then  $P_n$  ends at  $(u, n + \theta(P))$ . In

particular, for each  $r \in R$ , each  $r_n$  is a closed path, since  $r$  is closed and  $\theta(r) = 0$ . Let  $R'$  be the set  $\{r_n \mid r \in R, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  of closed paths in  $\Gamma'$ , and define  $G'$  to be the groupoid  $\langle \Gamma' \mid R' \rangle$ .

Since  $H$  is non-indicable, we must have  $\theta(H) = 0$ . Hence each path  $\gamma_j$  lifts to a closed path  $\gamma'_j$  at  $v' := (v, 0)$ . If  $\delta'_{j,k}$  is the lift of  $\delta_{j,k}$  that begins at  $v'$ , and  $\alpha'_{j,k}$  is the lift of  $\alpha_{j,k}$  that begins at the terminal vertex of  $\delta_{j,k}$ , then we have identities

$$W_j(\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_n) = (\delta'_{j,1} \alpha'_{j,1} (\delta'_{j,1})^{-1}) \cdots (\delta'_{j,m(j)} \alpha'_{j,m(j)} (\delta'_{j,m(j)})^{-1}) \quad (2)$$

for each  $1 \leq j \leq n$ .

We introduce linear identities on  $E(\Gamma')$  and  $R'$  by:

$$(e, n) < (f, m) \text{ if } e < f \text{ or if } e = f \text{ and } n < m;$$

$$r_n < s_m \text{ if } r < s \text{ or if } r = s \text{ and } n < m.$$

It is clear that these are compatible, and hence that  $\langle \Gamma' \mid R' \rangle$  is a staggered presentation.

Let  $H'$  be the subgroup of  $G'$  generated by the paths  $\gamma'_j$  ( $1 \leq j \leq n$ ), and let  $\Delta'$  be the datum consisting of the  $\gamma'_j$ ,  $W_j$  and identities (2). Then  $H'$  is non-indicable, by the identities (2), and  $H'$  is mapped onto  $H$  by  $\pi$ . We show that the inductive hypothesis applies to  $H'$ . It follows that  $H'$ , and hence  $H$ , vanishes.

Clearly  $L(\Delta') = L(\Delta)$ . Let  $\Gamma_1$  be the smallest subgraph of  $\Gamma'$  containing all the paths  $\delta'_{j,k}$  and  $\alpha'_{j,k}$ . Then  $M(\Delta') = |V(\Gamma_1)|$  and  $M(\Delta) = |V(\Gamma)|$ . Moreover,  $\Gamma_1$  is mapped surjectively onto  $\Gamma$  by  $\pi$ , and it suffices to show that this surjection is proper on vertices. If not, then by construction the restriction of  $\pi$  to  $\Gamma_1$  must be bijective both on edges and on vertices, so a graph isomorphism  $\Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Gamma$ . But there is at least one closed path  $\beta$  in  $\Gamma$  at  $v$  with  $\theta(\beta) = 1$ . Under the graph isomorphism  $\pi^{-1} : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_1$ ,  $\beta$  is mapped onto the unique path  $\beta'$  beginning at  $v' = (v, 0)$  such that  $\pi(\beta') = \beta$ . But by definition  $\beta'$  ends at  $(v, \theta(\beta)) = (v, 1) \neq (v, 0)$ . Hence  $(v, 0), (v, 1) \in V(\Gamma_1)$  with  $\pi(v, 0) = \pi(v, 1) = v$ , contradicting the assumption that  $\pi : V(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$  is injective.

This contradiction completes the proof in Case 1.

**Case 2.** Now assume that  $G_v$  is not indicable.

Note that the argument in Case 1 shows that this must include the initial case of the induction.

The proof in this case is a second induction, this time on the number of elements in the relation set  $R$ . If  $R = \emptyset$ , then  $G = F(\Gamma)$  is a free groupoid, so  $G_v$  is a free group. But  $G_v$  is also non-indicable, so  $G_v = \{1\}$  and hence  $H = \{1\}$ .

If  $R = \{r\}$  is a singleton set, then  $G_v$  is a one-relator group. Since  $G_v$  is non-indicable, it must be finite cyclic, and so  $\pi(\Gamma, v)$  is cyclic. In other words,  $\Gamma$  has first Betti number 1, and so contains a single nontrivial cycle. Since  $r$  is cyclically reduced and not a proper power,  $r$  is this cycle (traversed in one of the two possible directions), so again  $H = G_v = \{1\}$ . Moreover, note that each edge in  $r$  occurs precisely once in  $r$ .

For the general case, we take the slightly stronger property noted above to be the inductive hypothesis: namely that  $G_v = \{1\}$  and every edge occurring in any relation  $r \in R$  occurs precisely once in  $r$ .

Now suppose that  $r_{max}$  is the greatest relation in  $R$  (with respect to the given linear ordering). let  $e = \max(r_{max})$ . Suppose first that  $\Gamma'' = \Gamma \setminus \{e\}$  is connected. Then  $G'' = \langle \Gamma'' \mid R \setminus \{r_{max}\} \rangle$  cannot have indicable vertex groups, for then so would  $G$ . By induction each vertex group of  $G''$  is trivial, and each edge occurring in each relator occurs precisely once in that relator. In particular  $f = \min(r_{min})$  occurs precisely once in  $r_{min}$ , where  $r_{min}$  is the least relator in  $R \setminus \{r_{max}\}$  (and hence in  $R$ ). Thus  $G_2 = \langle \Gamma \setminus \{f\} \mid R \setminus \{r_{min}\} \rangle$  is isomorphic to  $G$ , so has nonindicable vertex groups. By inductive hypothesis the vertex groups of  $G_2$  are trivial, and each edge occurring in any of its relators occurs precisely once in that relator. Hence the same is true for  $G$ , and we are done.

A similar argument works if we suppose that  $G''$  has two components  $\Gamma_3$  and  $\Gamma_4$ , say. For each relator other than  $r_{max}$  must be a path in one of  $\Gamma_3, \Gamma_4$ , so  $R \setminus \{r_{max}\}$  splits as a disjoint union  $R_3 \cup R_4$ , and we have two groupoids  $G_3 = \langle \Gamma_3 \mid R_3 \rangle$  and  $G_4 = \langle \Gamma_4 \mid R_4 \rangle$ . Since  $G$  has nonindicable vertex groups, so does at least one of  $G_3, G_4$  (say  $G_3$ ). Now  $R_3$  cannot be empty, for then  $\Gamma_3$  would be a tree, and no cyclically reduced closed path could contain  $e = \max(r_{max})$ , a contradiction. Now apply the same argument as above, taking  $r_{min}$  to be the least relator in  $R_3$ .

This completes the proof. □

## References

- [1] G. Baumslag, Some problems on one-relator groups, *Lect. Notes in Math.* **372** (1974) 75-81.
- [2] S. D. Brodskii, Equations over groups and groups with a single defining relator, *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* **35**, no. 4 (1980) 183. (*Russian Math. Surveys* **35**, no. 4 (1980) 165.)
- [3] S. D. Brodskii, Equations over groups and groups with a single defining relator, *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.* **25**, no. 2 (1984) 84-103. (*Siberian Math. J.* **25**, no. 2 (1984) 235-251)
- [4] J. Fischer, A. Karrass and D. Solitar, On one-relator groups having elements of finite order, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **33** (1972) 297-301.
- [5] J. Hempel, One-relator surface groups, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **108** (1990) 467-474.
- [6] P. J. Higgins, *Notes on Categories and Groupoids*, van Nostrand Reinhold Mathematical Studies **32**, London 1971.
- [7] J. Howie, On locally indicable groups, *Math. Z.* **180** (1982) 445-461.