# Avoidable words and lattice universal <br> semigroup varieties 

by
Pavel Goralcik

The "purely speculative field" opened to mathematical research by Axel Thue $[7,8]$ about 80 years ago - combinatorics of words - has found many applications since. The original problem of avoidance of squares in arbitrarily long words on a small (ternary) alphabet continues to be a source of inspiration. The notion was recently generalized by Bean, Ehrenfeucht, and McNulty [1] to the problem of avoidance of an arbitrary word. In this form the problem perfectly fits into the framework of universal algebra. The idea goes back to the application of square-free words to semigroup varieties by Burris, Nelson [3], and Jezek [5] .

It is well known, since the work of $G$. Birkhoff, that the classes of semigroups closed under the passage to homomorphic images, subsemigroups, and direct products - the so called varieties stand in one-one correspondence with the sets of equations satisfied by them. Recall that by an equation is meant any pair (u,v) of words over a countably infinite standard alphabet $X$; such an equation is satisfied by a class $K$ of semigroups if $f(u)=f(v)$ for every homomorphism $f: X^{+} \rightarrow S$ with $S$ in $K$. The set of all equations satisfied by $\mathbb{K}$ is called the equational theory of $K$ and can be described as

$$
\operatorname{Th}(\mathbb{K})=\left\{\operatorname{Ker} f ; f \in \operatorname{Hom}\left(X^{+}, S\right), S \in \mathbb{K}\right\}
$$

Algebraically, $\mathrm{Th}(\mathrm{K})$ is a ful/y fnvariant congruence in the free semigroup $X^{+}$, i.e. a congruence closed to endomorphisms:

$$
(u, v) \in \operatorname{Th}(K) \quad \operatorname{implies}(f(u), f(v)) \in \operatorname{Th}(K) \text { for all } f \in \text { End } X^{+} \text {. }
$$

The one-one correspondence between the semigroup varieties $\nabla$ on the one hand and their equational theories $\operatorname{Th}(V)$ on the other hand is known to be a dual lattice isomorphism.

The variety $\operatorname{Var}(\mathbb{K})$ generated by a class $K$ of semigroups can be considered as an adequate expression of the "amount of algebraic structure contained in $K^{\prime \prime}$. We can say that a class $\mathbb{R}$ has at most as much semigroup structure as another class $K$, provided $\operatorname{Var}(\mathbb{K}) \subseteq \operatorname{Var}\left(\mathbb{K}^{\prime}\right)$. In particular, any class $K$ or a single semigroup $S$ which generates the variety Sem of all semigroups is endowed, in this sense, with a maximum possible amount of semigroup structure. In terms of equations, no non-trivial equation $(u, v), u \neq v$, is satisfied by such a $K$ or $S$.

The structural hierarchy of classes of semigroups is thus expressed by the lattice $L$ sem of semigroup varieties. Each variety $V$ has its own hierarchy in the form of the lattice $L_{V}$ of subvarieties of $\mathbf{V}$.

Now, applying the same structural approach to the lattice $L_{V}$ we come to a fairly sophisticated way of comparing semigroup varieties $V$ by the amount of lattice structure contained in $L \mathbb{V}$. Naturally distinguished then become those varieties $V$ whose lattice $L_{V}$ does not satisfy any non-trivial lattice equations. Let us call such varieties $V$ lattice universal.

How to prove that a given lattice $L$ does not satisfy any non-trivial equation? One feasible way is to embed into $L$ the
partition lattice $T_{\infty}$ over a countably infinite set since this lattice has been proved by sachs [6] not to satisfy any nontrivial lattice equations.

The lattice $L_{V}$ of subvarieties of a semigroup variety $V$ is dually isomorphic to the interval of equational theories between $T h(V)$ and the total congruence $T h(\mathbb{T})$, the equational theory of the variety $T$ of trivial semigroups. Therefore we have

Statement 1. If a semigroup variety $V$ is such that the partition lattice on a countably infinite set $\prod_{\infty}$ can be embedded into the interval [Th(V), Th(T)] of equational theories, then $V$ is lattice universal.

All told, let us now look more closely at congruences in $X^{+}$. Among the simplest ones are the so called Rees congruences, defined by ideals $I$ in $X^{+}$as the congruence generated by $I \times I$. The corresponding partition of $X^{+}$has $I$ for the only non-singleton class. When a Rees congruence is a theory? Obviously, if and only if the ideal $I$ defining it is invariant under the endomorphisms of $X^{+}, f(I) \subseteq I$ for all $f \in E n d X^{+}$.

The invariant ideals in $X^{+}$form a closure system $y$ easily described as follows. For a word $w$ in $X^{+}$, denote by $[w]$ the set of all endomorphic images ("substitution instances") of w,

$$
[w]=\left\{f(w) ; f \in \text { End } X^{+}\right\}
$$

Then we have

$$
y(w)=x^{*}[w] x^{*}, \quad y(w)=\bigcup\{\mathscr{H}(w) ; w \in W\}
$$

for any $W \subseteq X^{+}$.

Combinatorially speaking, $y(w)$ consists of the words on $x$ containing as a factor a substitution instance of the word w. The complement of $\quad y(w)$ in $X^{+}$consists of the words $u$ having no substitution instance of $w$ as a factor; such a word $u$ is said to avoid the word w. We have come to the basic concept in [1].

Definition 1. A word $w i n \mathrm{X}^{+}$is avoidable on a finite alphabet $A \subseteq X$ if there is an infinite collection of words on $A$ avoiding $w ;$ the word $w$ is avoidable if it is avoidable on some finite alphabet A.

This definition is a direct generalization of the avoidance of squares: the word aa is avoidable on the ternary alphabet $\{a, b, c\}$. Our previous considerations lead us to considerably strengthen the notion of avoidance.

Definition 2. An infinite set of words $J X^{+}$is a Jezek set if
(1) all $w$ in $J$ have the same set $A$ of letters,
(2) $J$ is $\mathscr{Y}$-independent, in the sense that $u \notin \mathcal{Y}(v)$ for any pair of distinct $u, v \in J$.

A word $\mathrm{w}^{+}$is strong/y avoidable if there is a Jezek set $J \subseteq X^{+}$of words avoiding w.

Statement 2. If the word $w \in X^{+}$is strongly avoidable then the variety $W$ determined by the Rees theory associated with the ideal $\mathscr{y}(w)$ is lattice universal. The theory $T h(w)$ is generated by the equations $w x=x w=w$ (saying that $w / T h(W)$ is a zero in $X^{+} / \operatorname{Th}(W)$ ).

A sketch of proof runs as follows. Let $J$ be a Jezek set avoiding w, let $A$ be the set of letters occurring in the words of $J$. Let $K$ denote the fully invariant ideal

$$
X^{*}([w] \cup[J]) X^{*} \backslash\left\{f(u) ; u \in J, f \in \operatorname{Aut} X^{+}\right\}
$$

Assign to each equivalence $E$ on $J$ the equational theory generated by $E U(K \times K)$. This assignment is an embedding of the lattice of equivalences on $J$ (isomorphic to $\Pi_{\infty}$ ) onto an interval of the lattice of equational theories.

Jezek [5] is the first one to have constructed a Jezek set of square-free words on the ternary alphabet $\{a, b, c\}$. His construction enabled Goralcik and Vanicek [4] to produce, via encodings of the original Jezek set $J$, to every binary word $w$ on $A=\{a, b\}$ avoidable on $A$ a Jezek set $J_{w}$ avoiding $w$.

Theorem. Let $A=\{a, b\}$. $A$ word $w \in A^{+}$is avoidable on $A$ if and only if $w \in A^{*}[T] A^{*}$, where
$T=\{a a a, a b a b a, a b a a b, a b b a b, a a b b a, ~ a b b a a, ~ a a b a b b\}$.
The complement $A^{+} \backslash A^{*}[T] A^{*}$ consists of 28 words each of which is unavoidable on $A$.

Every word $w \in A^{+}$which is avoidable on $A$ is strongly avoidable on $A$.

To prove the first assertion, we only need to construct a Jezek set $J_{w}$ for $w$ from the set of five words
aaa, ababa, aabba, aababb, abaab
(because the remaining two in $T$ are isomorphic to the reversals
of abbba and abaab). The required Jezek sets are obtained by encoding a fixed Jezek set $J$ of square-free words on $\{a, b, c\}$ by the following codes:

For aaa: abbababbabaabaabb
abbabaababbabaabb
abbaababbababbaabb

For ababa: ababbaabbb
abbaababbb
aababbabbb

For aabba: abbaaabaabababaaaabaabbbabbbb abbaaabaaaabaaababbbb abbaaabaaabaabababaaaabbbabbbb

For aababb: abbaaaaabaaaaabaaaaabaaaaabbb abbaaaabaaaabaaaabaaaabbb
abbaaabaaabaaabaaabaaabbb

For abaab: aaaababababaaaababbbb
abababaaaababababbbb
abaaaababababaaabbbb

The verification that it works is tedious.

One curious consequence of the above encoding is that for each $w$ in $T$ the rate of growth of the number of words avoiding $w$ on $A=\{a, b\}$ (as a function of length) is the same as the growth of the number of square-free ternary words, which is exponential by Brandenburg [2].
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