

TOWARD CLASSIFICATION THEORY OF GOOD
 λ -FRAMES AND ABSTRACT ELEMENTARY CLASSES

SAHARON SHELAH

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Einstein Institute of Mathematics
Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram
Jerusalem 91904, Israel

Department of Mathematics
Hill Center-Busch Campus
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
110 Frelinghuysen Road
Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing
This research was supported by The Israel Science Foundation. Publication 705.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ - $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{X}$

§0 INTRODUCTION

Now λ -good frame is for us a parallel of the class of models of a superstable theory. Our main line is to start with λ -good⁺ frame \mathfrak{s} , categorical in λ , n -successful for n large enough and try to have parallel of stability theory for $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+\ell)}$ for $\ell < n$ not too large. Characteristically from time to time we have to increase n relative to ℓ to get our desirable properties; we do not critically mind the exact n , so you can think of an ω -successful \mathfrak{s} . Usually each claim or definition is for a fixed \mathfrak{s} , assumed to be successful enough. So using assumptions on λ^{+2} rather than λ^{++} is not so crucial now.

But a postriori we are interested in the model theory of such classes $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ per-se, and see as a test for this theory, that in the ω -successful case we can understand also the model in higher cardinals, e.g., prove that $\mathfrak{K}_{\mu}^{\mathfrak{s}} \neq \emptyset$ for every $\mu \geq \lambda$. Recall there are reasonable λ -frames which are not n -excellent but still we can say alot on models in $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+\ell)}$ for $\ell < n$.

Moving from λ to λ^+ we would have preferred not to restrict ourselves to saturated models but at present we do not know it. However, in the ω -excellent case we can understand the class of $\lambda^{+\omega}$ -saturated models in $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$, i.e., $\mathfrak{K}^{\mathfrak{s}(+\omega)}$. This fits well the thesis that it is reasonable to first analyze the quite saturated case.

Why are we interested in $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ (0.2(1))? we can “blow it up” by II§1 but for good frames this is not so.

Concerning the framework note that the unidimensional (or just non multi-dimensional) case is easier. In the characteristic unidimensional case, each $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ is minimal and any $p, q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ are not orthogonal. In the characteristic non multi-dimensional case for any $M \in K_{\lambda}$, $\mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ contains up to nonorthogonality every $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N)$, $M \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N \in K_{\lambda}$.

Generally the unidimensional case is easiest and is enough to continue [Sh 576], and to deal with categoricity.

A drawback in II§5 is that we need to assume that the normal ideal $\text{WdId}(\lambda^+)$ is not λ^{++} -saturated. This will be improved in [Sh:F603]; it is easier to do it when we have the theory developed here.

0.1 Notation: Let \mathfrak{s} denote a good frame (usually) or just a pre-frame, that is

0.2 Definition. 1) We say \mathfrak{s} is a pre-frame (or pre λ -frame) if $\mathfrak{s} = (\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}, \bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}})$

with $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}} = \mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{s})$ a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -a.e.c., $\mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}[\mathfrak{s}] = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}$, $\bigcup[\mathfrak{s}] = \bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} = \leq_{\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}}$ and satisfying axioms (A), (C), (D)(a), (E)(a)(b). We say \mathfrak{s} is a frame if it satisfies axioms (A), (B), (C), (D)(a),(b), (E)(a),(b) from II§2. Recall that \mathfrak{s} is a good frame if it satisfies all the axioms there.

2) For a frame \mathfrak{s} let $\mathfrak{K}^{\mathfrak{s}} = \mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]$ be the a.e.c. derived from $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\mathfrak{K}_{\mu}^{\mathfrak{s}} = (\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}])_{\mu}$ so

$\mathfrak{K}_s = \mathfrak{K}_{\lambda(s)}^s$. Recall that if \mathfrak{K} is a λ -a.c.e., then the a.e.c.-derived from it, \mathfrak{K}^{up} is the unique a.e.c. \mathfrak{K}' with $\tau(\mathfrak{K}') = \tau(\mathfrak{K})$, $\text{LS}(\mathfrak{K}') = \lambda$, $\mathfrak{K}'_\lambda = \mathfrak{K}_s$, see II§1.

3) For a frame \mathfrak{s} let $\leq^s = \leq_{\mathfrak{K}}^s$ be $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}^s}$.

0.3 Convention: For simplicity we assume \mathfrak{K} is such that if $\bar{a} \in \omega^> M$, $M \in K$ then \bar{a} can be considered an element of M .

0.4 Definition. Let \mathfrak{s} be a good frame and $\mu \geq \lambda_s$.

1) Let $\mathfrak{s}(\mu) = (\mathfrak{K}_\mu^s, \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}, \mu}^{\text{bs}}, \bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}, \mu})$ with $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}, \mu}^{\text{bs}}, \bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}, \mu}$ as defined in II§2; also $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}, < \mu}^{\text{bs}}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}, < \infty}^{\text{bs}}, \bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}, < \mu}$ and $\bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}, < \infty}$ are from there.

2) Let $\mathfrak{s}(\mu) =: (\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(\mu)}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}, \mu}^{\text{bs}}, \bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}(\mu)})$ where $K_{\mathfrak{s}(\mu)} =: \{M \in K_\mu^s : M \text{ is superlimit in } \mathfrak{K}_\mu^s\}$, $\leq_{K_{\mathfrak{s}(\mu)}} = \leq_{\mathfrak{K}}^s \upharpoonright K_{\mathfrak{s}(\mu)}$, and of course $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\mu)}^{\text{bs}} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}, \mu}^{\text{bs}} \upharpoonright K_{\mathfrak{s}(\mu)}$, $\bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}(\mu)} = \bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}, \mu} \upharpoonright K_\mu^{s, s}$.

3) Let $\mathfrak{s}(\mu) = (\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}[\mu]}, \bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}(mu)})$ where $K_{\mathfrak{s}[\mu]} = \{M \in K_\mu^s : \text{if } N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M, N \in K_s \text{ and } p \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N) \text{ then we can find } \mathbf{I} \subseteq M \setminus N \text{ such that, if } N \leq_s N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M \text{ then } N_1 \cap \mathbf{I} \text{ is independent in } (N, N_1)\}$.

4) If \mathfrak{s} is ω -successful let $\mathfrak{s}^{+\omega} = \mathfrak{s}(+\omega)$ is $\mathfrak{s}[\omega]$.

0.5 Remark. 1) In §12, $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}[\mu]}$ under strong assumptions is proved to be good (and categorical in μ).

Note, if \mathfrak{K}_μ have the JEP then we can show that any two superlimit models $M \in K_\mu^s$ are isomorphic but a priori not in general. However, here there is a canonical way to proceed: if \mathfrak{K} has superlimit model M_0 in λ we can try to choose by induction on $\ell < \omega$ a superlimit model M_ℓ in $K_{\lambda+\ell}$ such that $M_{\ell+1}$ is a model in $\mathfrak{K}_{[M_\ell]}$ which has cardinality $\lambda^{+\ell+1}$ and is saturated in $\mathfrak{K}_{[M_\ell]}$. It is not clear a priori if $M_{\ell+1}$ exists but at least it is unique (we can continue in $\lambda^{+\alpha}$ for ordinals with more case).

3) Let $<_s^+$ be the following two place relation on K_s : $M <_s^+ N$ iff $M \leq_s N$ and N is \mathfrak{K}_s -universal over M .

4) Note that $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}[\mu]}$ includes $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}[\mu]}$ and $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}[\mu]}$ but it is not clear how to compare $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}[\mu]}, \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}[\mu]}$.

0.6 Claim. *If \mathfrak{s} is ω -successful then $\mathfrak{s}^{+\omega}$ is a good $\lambda^{+\omega}$ -frame categorical in $(\lambda^{+\omega})$.*

§1 GOOD⁺ FRAMES; BASICS

In II.?(4) there was what may look like a minor drawback: moving from λ to λ^+ the derived class not only have fewer models of cardinality $\geq \lambda^+$ but also the notion of being a submodel changes; this is fine there, and surely unavoidable in some circumstances. More specifically, for proving the main theorem, it was enough to move from \mathfrak{s} to a good frame \mathfrak{t} satisfying $\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}} = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} < \mu < \lambda^{+\omega} \Rightarrow I(\lambda, K^{\mathfrak{t}}) \leq I(\lambda, K^{\mathfrak{s}})$ and forget \mathfrak{s} . But for us now this is undesirable (as arriving to $\lambda^{+\omega}$ we have forgotten everything) and toward this we consider a (quite mild) strengthening of λ^+ -good.

1.1 Hypothesis. $\mathfrak{s} = (\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda}, \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}, \bigcup_{\lambda})$ is a good λ - frame.

1.2 Definition. 1) We say \mathfrak{s} is successful if the conclusions under “no nonstructure assumptions in λ^{++} ” hold, that is:

- (*) (a) $K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$ is dense; i.e. for every $M \in K_{\lambda}$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ there is $(M, N, a) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$ such that $\text{tp}(a, M, N) = p$
- (b) if $\langle N_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\lambda^+}^*$ $[\mathfrak{s}]$ -increasing continuous in $K_{\lambda^+}^{\text{nice}}[\mathfrak{s}]$ and $i < \delta \Rightarrow N_i \leq_{\lambda^+}^* N \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\text{nice}}$ then $N_{\delta} \leq_{\lambda^+}^* N$ (see II.?(1)).

2) We say (the λ -good frame) \mathfrak{s} is weakly successful if clause (a) of (*) above holds.

Usually at least “ \mathfrak{s} is weakly successful” is used, but sometimes less suffice (and is helpful though not crucial).

1.3 Definition. 1) Let $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{puq}}$ be the class of $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bs}}$ such that: if $(M, N, a) \leq_{\text{bs}} (M_1, N_1, a)$ and $b \in \mathbf{I}_{M, N_1}$ then $\text{tp}(b, N, N_1)$ does not fork over M . We may say (M, N, a) has pseudo uniqueness.

2) We say that \mathfrak{s} has weakly pseudo uniqueness if $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{puq}}$ is dense in $(K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bs}}, \leq_{\text{bs}})$.

3) We say that \mathfrak{s} has semi-pseudo uniqueness if $\alpha < \lambda^+$, $\langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, $(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bs}}$ then for some $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous $\langle N_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ we have $(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \leq_{\text{bs}} (N_i, N_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{puq}}$.

Remark. For successful \mathfrak{s} we can define a successor, $\mathfrak{s}^+ = \mathfrak{s}(+)$, a λ^+ -good frame (see 1.8 below), but not with the most desirable $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}}$, for rectifying this we consider below good⁺ frames. Together with locality of types for models in $\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$

this seems to be in the right direction. Less crucial, still worthwhile, is that $\mathfrak{s}' = \mathfrak{s}^+$ has a strong property we call saturative, which can be used in several cases as an alternative of another version which says \mathfrak{s}' has the form \mathfrak{s}^+ with \mathfrak{s} a successful good^+ frame.

1.4 Definition. 1) We say that $\mathfrak{s} = (\mathfrak{K}_\lambda, \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}, \amalg_\lambda) = (K_\lambda, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}_\lambda}, \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}, \amalg_\lambda)$ is a good^+ λ -frame or good^1 λ -frame if:

- (a) \mathfrak{s} is a good λ -frame
- (b) the following is impossible
 - (*) $\langle M_i : i < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous in K_λ and $\langle N_i : i < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous in K_λ and $M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_i, p^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ and for each $i < \lambda^+$ we have:
 $a_{i+1} \in M_{i+2} \setminus M_{i+1}$, $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_{i+1}, M_{i+1}, M_{i+2})$ is a nonforking extension of p^* but $\text{tp}(a_{i+1}, N_0, N_{i+1})$ is not.
 We then say $\langle M_i, N_i, a_i : i < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is a counterexample (ignoring a_i being defined only for successor i ; we could demand this for every i by monotonicity of nonforking).

2) We say a good λ -frame \mathfrak{s} is saturative if:

- (a) every $M \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed (for $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$), equivalently: is superlimit
- (b) if $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$ and M_1 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 then M_2 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 .

The “ \mathfrak{s} is saturative” is a relative of “non-multidimensional”, but be careful, see 1.5(3) below.

Well, do we lose much by adopting the good^+ version? First, are the old cases covered? Yes, by the following claim

1.5 Claim. 1) In II§3 all the cases where we prove “good λ -frame” we actually get “ good^+ λ -frames”.

2) In fact those frames are also saturative.

3) If T is a complete superstable first order theory stable in λ and $\kappa \leq \lambda$ or $\kappa = \aleph_\varepsilon$ (in an abuse of notation) or $\kappa = 0, \lambda \geq |T|$ and $[\kappa > 0 \Rightarrow T \text{ stable in } \lambda]$ and $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_{T, \lambda}^{\kappa}$ (so $K_{\mathfrak{s}} = (\{M : M \models T, \|M\| \geq \lambda \text{ and } M \text{ is } \kappa\text{-brimmed}\}, <)$), that is \mathfrak{s} is defined in II.?, then

- (i) \mathfrak{s} is a good^+ λ -frame

- (ii) assume $0 < \kappa < \lambda$, then: \mathfrak{s} is saturative iff T is non-multidimensional (see 2.2(5))
- (iii) if $\mathfrak{s}' = \mathfrak{s}_{T,\lambda}^\kappa[M]$ where $M \in \mathfrak{K}_\lambda$ is the superlimit model (i.e., the saturated one), then \mathfrak{s}' is saturative
- (iv) if $\kappa = \lambda$, \mathfrak{s} is saturative.

Proof. 1), 2).

Case 1: Concerning Claim II.?

So $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$, \mathfrak{K} is an abstract elementary class categorical in λ, λ^+ and $1 \leq I(\lambda^{++}, K) < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$, with $\text{LS}(\mathfrak{K}) \leq \lambda$, $\text{WDMId}(\lambda^+)$ is not λ^+ -brimmed (or just a model theoretic consequence). We let $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \lambda^+$, $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}} = \mathfrak{K}_{\lambda^+}$ and for $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we let $\mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M) = \{p \in \mathcal{S}(M) : p \text{ is not algebraic and for some } M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M, M_0 \in K_\lambda \text{ and } p \upharpoonright M_0 \text{ is minimal}\}$ and $\amalg(M_0, M_1, a, M_3)$ iff $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_2$ are in $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $a \in M_3 \setminus M_1$ and for some $M'_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_0$ from $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ the type $\text{tp}(a, M_0, M_3) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ is minimal.

So let $\langle (M_i, N_i, a_i) : i < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+ \rangle$ be as in (*) of clause (b) of Definition 1.4. So for success $i < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$, $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M_0, N_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ so is minimal while $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, N_0, N_{i+1})$ is not its nonforking extension, hence necessarily $i < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+ \Rightarrow a_{i+1} \in N_0 \setminus M_0$, so $\langle a_{i+1} : i < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+ \rangle$ is a sequence with no repetitions of members from $N_0 \setminus M_0$ while $N_0 \in K_{\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}}$ so $\|N_0\| = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$, contradiction. Also saturativity should be clear.

Case 2: Claim II.?; actually from [88r].

So let $\langle (M_i, N_i, a_i) : i < \omega_1 \rangle$ be as in clause (b) of 1.4. So there is a finite $A_0 \subseteq M_0$ such that $\text{tp}(a_{i+1}, M_{i+1}, M_{i+2})$ is definable over A_0 (see I.?), but $\text{tp}(a_{i+1}, N_0, N_{i+2})$ does not have the same definition hence it splits over A_0 . By I.? for a club of E of ω_1 we have

$$\boxtimes \delta \in E \ \& \ \delta < \alpha < \omega_1 \ \& \ \bar{a} \in N_\delta \Rightarrow \text{tp}(\bar{a}, M_\alpha, N_\alpha) \text{ is definable over some finite } B_{\bar{a}} \subseteq M_\delta.$$

We get a contradiction to the symmetry (i.e., (E)(f) proved in the proof of II.? that is by I.?). Also saturativity should be clear.

Case 3: Claim II.?; actually from [Sh 48].

Similar to case 2.

3) First we prove clause (b) of 1.4(1), i.e. we prove \mathfrak{s} is a good⁺ frame; so assume toward contradiction that $\langle M_i : i < \lambda^+ \rangle, \langle N_i : i < \lambda^+ \rangle, p^*$ and a_{i+1} for $i < \lambda^+$ are as in (*) of 1.4(2) clause (b). Let $M = \cup\{M_i : i < \lambda^+\}$ and $N = \cup\{N_i : i < \lambda^+\}$.

Now for every finite sequence \bar{c} from N_0 , there is $i_c < \lambda^+$ such that $\text{tp}(\bar{c}, M, N)$ does not fork over M_{i_c} , and let $i^* = \sup\{i_{\bar{c}} : \bar{c} \in {}^{\omega>}(N_0)\}$ so $i^* < \lambda^+$ and easily $i \in [i^*, \lambda^+)$ & $\bar{c} \in {}^{\omega>}(N_0) \Rightarrow \text{tp}(\bar{c}, M_{i+2}, N)$ does not fork over M_{i+1} , hence by symmetry and local character ([Sh:c, III,§0]) we have $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_{i+1}, M_{i+1} \cup N_0, N)$ does not fork over M_i hence (transitivity) over M_0 , contradiction. So clause (i) holds.

As for saturativeness in clauses (iii), (iv) in 1.4(2), to show that the model $(M_2, c)_{c \in M_0}$ is saturated it is enough to show that for every $A \subseteq M_2, |A| < \aleph_0$ and regular $p \in \mathcal{S}^1(A \cup M_0)$, we have $\dim(p, M_2) = \lambda$. Why this holds? If $p \perp M_0$ then we can find a regular $q \in \mathcal{S}(M_0), q \perp p$ and as M_1 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 , $\dim(q, M_2) \geq \dim(q, M_1) = \lambda$ and easily $\dim(p, M_2) = \dim(q, M_2)$. If $p \perp M_0$ see [Sh 225]. The proof of clause (ii) is easy too (for the case $\kappa = 0$ when for some $M, Th(M, c)_{c \in M}$ is categorical in λ^+ , see [Sh:c] and properties as in [ShHM 158] and the analysis of Laskowski of model of T in $\lambda = |T|$ when T is categorical in λ^+).

□_{1.5}

Also in the main result of Chapter II we get good^+

1.6 Claim. *If \mathfrak{s} is a successful λ -good frame, then $\mathfrak{s}(+)$ is a λ^+ -good⁺ frame and is saturative.*

Proof. Like Case 1 of the proof of Claim 1.5(1).

1.7 Goodness Plus Claim. *Assume that $\mathfrak{s} = (\mathfrak{K}_\lambda, \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}, \bigcup_\lambda)$ is a good⁺ λ -frame.*

Then:

- (a) *if $M_1^* \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_2^*$ are from $K_{\lambda^+}^{\text{nice}}$ and $M_1^* \not\leq_{\lambda^+}^* M_2^*$ then $(**)_{M_1^*, M_2^*}$ from II.?
holds*
- (b) *if \boxtimes from II.?
(which holds if $I(\lambda^{++}, K) < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$) then*
 - (α) $\leq_{\lambda^+}^*, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ agree on $K_{\lambda^+}^{\text{nice}}$
 - (β) $(K_{\lambda^+}^{\text{nice}}, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}_\lambda}, \mathcal{S}_{\lambda^+}^{\text{bs}}, \bigcup_{\lambda^+})$ (as defined there, called \mathfrak{s}^+ below) is a λ^+ -good⁺ frame.

Recall in Chapter II we get a weak version of (α) of (b): $\leq_\lambda^, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}}^\otimes$ agree on $K_{\lambda^+}^{\text{nice}}$.*

Before proving 1.7 we see a conclusion

1.8 Definition. 1) For a good λ -frame $\mathfrak{s} = (\mathfrak{K}, \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}, \bigcup_{\lambda})$ define $\mathfrak{s}^+ = \mathfrak{s}(+)$, a λ^+ -frame, as follows (so $\lambda[\mathfrak{s}^+] = \lambda^+$):

- (a) $K_{\lambda^+}[\mathfrak{s}^+] =$ the class of λ^+ -saturated models from $K[\mathfrak{s}]$
- (b) $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}^+]} = \leq_{\lambda^+}^* \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}[\mathfrak{s}^+]$
- (c) $\mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}[\mathfrak{s}^+] = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}} = \{\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a, M_1, M_2) : M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_2 \text{ are from } K_{\lambda^+}[\mathfrak{s}^+], a \in M_2 \setminus M_1 \text{ and there is } N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1, N_1 \in K_{\lambda}, \text{ such that } N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_1 \ \& \ N \in K_{\mathfrak{s}} \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, N, M_2) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N) \text{ does not fork over } N_1 \text{ (in } \mathfrak{s}\text{'s sense)}\}$
- (d) $\bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} = \{(M_0, M_1, a, M_2) : M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_2 \text{ are of cardinality } \lambda^+, a \in M_2 \setminus M_1 \text{ and } \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a, M_1, M_2) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_1) \text{ has a witness } N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_0\}$.

2) If a, M_1, M_2, N_1 are as in clause (c) then we call N_1 or $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, N_1, M_2)$, a witness for $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a, M, N)$; we may abuse our notation and say that $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a, M_1, M_2)$ does not fork over N_1 . Similarly for stationarization (= nonforking extension).

1.9 Conclusion. 1) If \mathfrak{s} is a good $^+$ λ -frame and is successful (see Definition 1.2), then $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} = \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \upharpoonright K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ and \mathfrak{s}^+ is a λ^+ -good $^+$ frame.

2) For $M_1, M_2 \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\text{nice}}[\mathfrak{s}]$ we have $M_1 \leq_{\lambda^+}^+ M_2$ for \mathfrak{s} (see Definition II.?(3)) iff M_2 is $(\lambda^+, *)$ -brimmed over M_1 for \mathfrak{s}^+ .

Proof. 1) By II§7 particularly the proof of II.? and 1.7.

2) By the proof of II.?(2). □_{1.9}

We shall use this conclusion freely.

Proof of 1.7.

Clause (a):

Assume that $(**)_{M_1^*, M_2^*}$ fails, then by the assumptions of clause (a), from the clauses of $(**)_{M_1^*, M_2^*}$ only clause (iv) there may fail. So we can find $N_1^* \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_2^*$ from $K_{\lambda}, N_{\ell}^* \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_{\ell}^*$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N_2^*)$ which does not fork over N_1^* such that no $a \in M_1^*$ realizes p in M_2^* . Let $\langle M_{\alpha}^{\ell} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_{ℓ}^* for $\ell = 1, 2$. Without loss of generality $N_1^* \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_0^2$ and $M_{\alpha}^2 \cap M_1^* = M_{\alpha}^1$ and as $M_1^* \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\text{nice}}$ also $M_{\alpha+1}^1$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_{α}^1 for $\alpha < \lambda^+$. For each $\alpha < \lambda^+$ the type $p \upharpoonright N_1^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N_1^*)$ has a nonforking extension $p_{\alpha} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_{\alpha}^1)$. As $M_{\alpha+1}^1$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_{α}^1 clearly for every $\alpha < \lambda^+$ there is $a_{\alpha} \in M_{\alpha+1}^1 \setminus M_{\alpha}^1$ realizing p_{α} .

Let $M_\alpha =: M_\alpha^1, N_\alpha =: M_\alpha^2, p^* = p_0$; note that $N_1^* \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_0, N_2^* \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_0$, so all the demands in (*) of clause (b) of Definition 1.4(1) holds, in particular $a_{i+1} \in M_{i+2} \setminus M_{i+1}$, $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_{i+1}, M_{i+1}, M_{i+2}) = p_{i+1} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_{i+1})$ is a nonforking extension of $p \upharpoonright N_1^*$ hence of $p^* =: p_0$ but if $\text{tp}(a_{i+1}, N_0, N_{i+1})$ does not fork over M_0 then it is also a non forking extension of p (recall $N_2^* \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_0$). So this contradicts “ \mathfrak{s} is λ -good $^+$ ”, i.e., clause (b) of Definition 1.4, in other words, some a_i realizes p so actually clause (iv) of (**) of II.? holds.

Clause (b): Subclause (α).

Straight by clause (a) and II.?

Clause (b): Subclause (β).

Recalling II.?, the only new point is the + of the good $^+$ (for \mathfrak{s}^+) and the forking extension of p in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(t)}^{\text{bs}}(M_{i+1})$.

So assume $\langle (M_i, N_i, a_i) : i < \lambda^{++} \rangle$ be a counterexample to the “ \mathfrak{s}^+ is a good $^+$ λ^+ -frame”. So in particular $M_i, N_i \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(t)}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ and $p_i = \text{tp}(a_i, M_{i+1}, M_{i+2})$ the type for $\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda^+}^{\text{nice}}$ of course, which by clause (a) is $(K_{\lambda^+}^{\text{nice}}, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}}^* \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}^{\text{nice}})$. As $p =: p_i \upharpoonright M_0 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ there are $M' \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_0, M' \in K_{\lambda}$ and $q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M')$ which witness $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ (see 1.8). Let $\langle N'_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a sequence which $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -represents N_0 . For each $i < \lambda^{++}$, as $p'_i = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_{i+1}, N_0, N_{i+2})$ is not a nonforking extension of p necessarily there is $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_i < \lambda^+$ such that $M' \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N'_\varepsilon$ and $p'_i \upharpoonright N'_\varepsilon = \text{tp}(a_{i+1}, N'_\varepsilon, N_{i+2})$ is not a nonforking extension of q . So for some $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$ the set $B_\varepsilon = \{i < \lambda^{++} : \varepsilon_i = \varepsilon\}$ is unbounded in λ^{++} . We now choose by induction on $\zeta < \lambda^+$ a triple $(i_\zeta, M_\zeta^*, N_\zeta^*)$ such that:

- (a) $i_\zeta < \lambda^{++}$ is increasing continuous
- (b) $\zeta = \xi + 1 \Rightarrow i_\zeta \in B_\varepsilon$
- (c) $M_\zeta^* \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_{i_\zeta}$
- (d) $M_\zeta^* \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (e) $N_\zeta^* \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N_{i_\zeta}$
- (f) $N_\zeta^* \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (g) $M_\zeta^* = N_\zeta^* \cap M_{i_\zeta}$
- (h) $\zeta = \xi + 1 \Rightarrow a_{i_\xi} \in M_{\zeta+1}^*$
- (i) $M_0^* = M'$ and $N_0^* = N'_\varepsilon$ and $i_0 = \text{Min}(B_\varepsilon)$.

There is no problem to do this and letting $a_\zeta^* = a_{i_\zeta}$ clearly $\langle (M_\zeta^*, N_\zeta^*, a_\zeta^*) : \zeta < \lambda^+ \rangle$ contradict “ \mathfrak{s} is λ -good $^+$ ”. □_{1.7}

The following claim sums up the “localness” of the basic types for $\mathfrak{s}(+)$, i.e., how to translate their properties to ones in \mathfrak{s} .

1.10 Claim. [\mathfrak{s} is a successful good λ -frame].

Assume $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$.

- 1) If $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ then $p_1 = p_2 \Leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{\alpha < \lambda^+} p_1 \upharpoonright M_\alpha = p_2 \upharpoonright M_\alpha \Leftrightarrow (\exists \lambda^+ \alpha)(p_1 \upharpoonright M_2 = p_2 \upharpoonright M_\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (\exists \beta < \lambda^+)[p_1 \upharpoonright M_\beta = p_2 \upharpoonright M_\beta \ \& \ (\forall \alpha)(\beta \leq \alpha < \lambda^+ \rightarrow p \upharpoonright M_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\alpha)) \text{ does not fork over } M_\beta]$.
- 2) If $S \subseteq \lambda^+ = \sup(S)$, $\alpha_* \leq \min(S)$ and for $\alpha \in S$, $p_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\alpha)$ does not fork over M_{α_*} and $p_\alpha \upharpoonright M_{\alpha_*} = p_*$, then

(a) there is $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ satisfying $\alpha \in S \Rightarrow p \upharpoonright M_\alpha = p_\alpha$

(b) there is no $p' \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M) \setminus \{p\}$ satisfying this, i.e., p is unique

- 3) If $p = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a, M, N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(M)$ so $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} N$ and $a \in N$, then $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M) \Leftrightarrow$ [for every $\alpha < \lambda^+$ large enough, $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_\alpha, N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\alpha)] \Leftrightarrow$ [for stationarily many $\alpha < \lambda^+$, $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_\alpha, N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\alpha)$].
- 4) Assume $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_3$ and $\langle M_\alpha^\ell : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_ℓ and assume $a \in M_3$. Then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a, M_2, M_3) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_2)$ does not fork over M_1 (for \mathfrak{s}^+) iff for some club E of λ^+ , for every $\alpha < \beta$ from E , $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_\beta^2, M_\beta^3) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\beta^2)$ does not fork over M_α^1 (for \mathfrak{s}) iff for some stationary subset $S \subseteq \lambda^+$ for every δ from S , $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_\delta^2, M_\delta^3) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta^2)$ does not fork over M_δ^1 .

Proof. 1) Among the four statements which we have to prove equivalent, the first implies the second, trivially, the second implies the third trivially, the third implies the second easily and it implies the fourth by our assumption “ $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ ” and the definition of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M)$. To finish we shall prove that the fourth implies the first, so assume toward contradiction that this fails.

Let $M^0 = M$, $M_\alpha^0 = M_\alpha$, let M^ℓ, a_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$ be such that $M^0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M^\ell$, $a_\ell \in M^\ell$ and $\text{tp}(a_\ell, M^0, M^\ell) = p_\ell$ and let $\langle M_\alpha^\ell : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$. Without loss of generality $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_\alpha^0, M_\alpha^\ell, M_\beta^0, M_\beta^\ell), M_{\alpha+1}^\ell$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_{\alpha+1}^0 \cup M_\alpha^\ell$ and $a_\ell \in M_0^\ell$. Clearly $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_1, M_0^0, M_0^1) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_2, M_0^0, M_0^2)$ and we can build an isomorphism f from M_i^1 onto M_2 over M_0 mapping a_1 to a_2 by choosing $f \upharpoonright M_\alpha^1 : M_\alpha^1 \xrightarrow{\text{onto}} M_\alpha^2$ by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^+$.

2) Also easy.

3), 4) By the definition of \mathfrak{s}^+ and properties of NF. □_{1.10}

We may like in 1.10 to replace basic types by any types (later this is needed and more is done):

1.11 Claim. [\mathfrak{s} is a successful good λ -frame]. (λ^+ -locality)

Assume $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -representation of $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$.

1) For any $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(M)$, then $p_1 = p_2 \Leftrightarrow (\forall \alpha)(p_1 \upharpoonright M_\alpha = p_2 \upharpoonright M_\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (\exists \lambda^+ \alpha)(p_1 \upharpoonright M_\alpha = p_2 \upharpoonright M_\alpha)$.

Proof. See Chapter II on raising automorphisms: i.e., the proof of II.?(2).

□_{1.11}

Recall

1.12 Claim. If $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $(M_0, M_2, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bs}}$ then $\text{tp}(a, M_1, M_3) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ does not fork over M_0 .

Proof. See II.?

1.13 Definition. 1) We define by induction on n :

- (a) \mathfrak{s} is n -successful
- (b) $\mathfrak{s}^{+m} = \mathfrak{s}(+m)$ for $m \leq n$.

For $n = 0$: We say \mathfrak{s} is 0-successful if it is $\lambda(\mathfrak{s})$ -good.

Let $\mathfrak{s}^{+0} = \mathfrak{s}$.

For $n = 1$: We say \mathfrak{s} is 1-successful if it is $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -good and successful; let $\mathfrak{s}^{+1} = \mathfrak{s}^+$.

For $n = m + 1$: We say \mathfrak{s} is n -successful if \mathfrak{s}^{+m} is 1-successful.

We let $\mathfrak{s}^{+(n+1)} = (\mathfrak{s}^{+m})^+$.

2) We say \mathfrak{s} is $(n + \frac{1}{2})$ -successful or say is weakly $(n+1)$ -successful if it is n -successful and \mathfrak{s}^{+n} satisfies clause (a) of 1.2.

3) We say \mathfrak{s} is ω -successful if it is n -successful for every n .

4) If \mathfrak{s}^{+n} is well defined let $\mathfrak{B}_n = \mathfrak{B}_n^{\mathfrak{s}} = \mathfrak{B}_n^{\mathfrak{s}(+n)} = \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{s}^{+n})$ be a superlimit model in $\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}]$; it is defined only up to isomorphism.

1.14 Claim. Assume \mathfrak{s} is an n -successful good frame.

1) $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}(+n)} = \text{NF}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}]$ is well defined if \mathfrak{s} is $(n + \frac{1}{2})$ -successful.

2) There is $\mathfrak{B}_n^{\mathfrak{s}} \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}$, that is a $\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}]$ -superlimit is well defined.

3) $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+n)} = \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}[\mathfrak{B}_n^{\mathfrak{s}}]$.

4) If $k + m = n$ then \mathfrak{s}^{+k} is m -successful good frame and $((\mathfrak{s}^{+k})^{+m}) = \mathfrak{s}^{+m}$.

5) \mathfrak{s}^{+k} is m -successful iff \mathfrak{s} is $(k + n)$ -successful; and if this holds then $(\mathfrak{s}^{+k})^{+m} = \mathfrak{s}^{+(k+m)}$.

Remark. If \mathfrak{s} is also a good⁺ λ -frame then $\mathfrak{B}_n^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is almost superlimit also in $\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda+n}^{\mathfrak{s}}$: the universality is not clear.

Proof. Easy, by induction on n (and for (5) on $k + m$). □_{1.14}

1.15 Conclusion. In the main lemma II.?, if we strengthen the assumption to “ $\mathfrak{s} = (\mathfrak{K}_\lambda, \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}, \amalg_\lambda)$ is a λ -good⁺ frame”, then we can strengthen the conclusion to

- (α) $\mathfrak{s}_\ell = (\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}_\ell}^\ell, \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}_\ell}^{\text{bs}}, \amalg_{\mathfrak{s}_\ell})$ is $\lambda^{+\ell}$ -good
- (β) $\mathfrak{s}_\ell = \mathfrak{s}(\lambda^{+\ell})$, hence for some $M_\ell^* \in K_{\lambda^{+\ell}}$ we have:
 - (i) M_ℓ^* is superlimit (in $\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda^{+\ell}}^{\mathfrak{s}}$)
 - (ii) $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ell)}$ is $\mathfrak{K}^{[M_\ell^*]}$, so $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda^{+\ell}}^\ell} = \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^{+\ell}}^\ell$ (new “ $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ ” is the new point)
 - (iii) $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}_\ell}^{\text{bs}}, \amalg_{\mathfrak{s}_\ell}$ are defined as in II§1 but restricted to $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ell)}$ of course.

Proof. Should be clear (or combine II.? with 1.7). □_{1.15}

1.16 Claim. *Assume \mathfrak{s} is a weakly successful good λ -frame. Let $\delta < \lambda^+$, be a limit ordinal and $\langle M_i : i \leq \delta + 1 \rangle$ be $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous.*

1) If $b \in M_{\delta+1}$ satisfies $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M_i, M_{\delta+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_i)$ for arbitrarily large $i < \delta$, then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M_\delta, M_{\delta+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta)$ hence does not fork over M_i for every $i < \delta$ large enough.

Proof. 1) Let $\langle N_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ be as in Claim 1.17 below, so in particular N_δ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_δ hence $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -universal over N_δ , so without loss of generality $M_{\delta+1} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_\delta$. So for some $i < \delta$ we have $b \in N_i$, so without loss of generality $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M_i, M_{\delta+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_i)$, now as $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i, M_\delta, N_i, N_\delta)$ by 1.12 we have $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M_\delta, N_\delta) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M_\delta, M_{\delta+1})$ is a nonforking extension of $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M_i, N_i)$, and so we are done. □_{1.16}

1.17 Claim. *1) If $\langle M_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, then we can find $\langle N_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ such that $M_i \leq N_i, i < \delta \Rightarrow \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(N_i, M_i, N_{i+1}, M_{i+1})$ and N_{i+1} is universal over $N_i \cup M_{i+1}$.*

*2) If $\langle M_i, N_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ are as in part (1), then N_δ is $i \leq j \leq \delta \Rightarrow \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i, N_i, M_j, N_j)$ and N_δ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_δ .*

Proof. By II.?. □

1.18 Claim. *If $(M_0, N_0, a) \leq_{\text{bs}} (M_j, N_1, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bs}}$ and $(M_0, N_0, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ then $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, N_0, M_1, N_1)$.*

Proof. By II.?

1.19 Claim. *[\mathfrak{s} is a weakly successful good frame.] Assume $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$, $a \in M_2$ and $\text{tp}(a, M_1, M_2)$ does not fork over M_0 and $b \in M_1$, $\text{tp}(b, M_0, M_1) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$. Then there are M_1^*, M_2^* such that $M_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2^*$, $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1^* \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2^*$, $(M_0, M_1^*, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $\text{tp}(b, M_1^*, M_2^*)$ does not fork over M_0^* .*

Proof. By NF calculus (and the symmetry axiom).

□_{1.19}

1.20 Claim. *Assume \mathfrak{s} is successful good⁺ frame. Then $\mathfrak{s}^+ = \mathfrak{s}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+)$ where on $\mathfrak{s}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+)$ see Definition 0.4(1).*

Proof. Easy.

§2 UNIDIMENSIONALITY AND NONSPLITTING

We may wonder how to define “unidimensional” and whether: \mathfrak{s} is categorical in λ and is unidimensional and \mathfrak{s} is n -successful (see 1.13), then $K_{\lambda+n}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is categorical. By 2.8 below the answer is yes.

We may consider a more restricted framework closed to categoricity. Note that “saturative” is closed to non multi-dimensional.

2.1 Hypothesis. \mathfrak{s} is a λ -good frame.

2.2 Definition. 1) We say \mathfrak{s} is semi^{bs} unidimensional when for any model $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$, if $M <_{\mathfrak{s}} N_k \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ for $k = 1, 2$ then some $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ is realized in N_1 and in N_2 . Let “ \mathfrak{s} is semi^{na} unidimensional” be defined similarly but we allow $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{na}}(M)$ and “ \mathfrak{s} is semi¹ unidimensional” be called “ \mathfrak{s} is semi unidimensional”. Instead of na,bs we may write 0, 1 respectively.

2) We say \mathfrak{s} is almost unidimensional if for any model $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$, there is an unavoidable $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ (see below).

3) For $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we say $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M)$ is (\mathfrak{s})-unavoidable, if for every $N, M <_{\mathfrak{s}} N \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$, some $a \in N$ realizes p .

4) We say \mathfrak{s} is explicitly unidimensional if every $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ where $M \in K_{\lambda}$, is unavoidable.

5) We call \mathfrak{s} non-multi-dimensional if for every $M_0 \in K_{\lambda}$ whenever $M_0 <_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 <_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$, there is $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ which does not fork over M_0 and is realized in M_2 .

6) We say \mathfrak{s} is weakly unidimensional if for every $M <_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, there is $c \in M_2 \setminus M$ such that $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M, M_2)$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ and has more than one extension in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{all}}(M_1)$.

On meaning in the first order case see 2.5(5) below.

We naturally first look at the natural implications. Note that being “semi¹/almost explicitly/weakly unidimensional” is influenced by the choice of the basic types (compare 2.5(1) with 2.5(2)) as well as non-multi-dimensional but not so semi⁰-unidimensional.

- 2.3 Claim.** 1) *If \mathfrak{s} is explicitly unidimensional, then \mathfrak{s} is almost unidimensional.*
 2) *If \mathfrak{s} is almost unidimensional, then \mathfrak{s} is semi ^{ℓ} -unidimensional for $\ell = 0, 1$; if \mathfrak{s} is semi¹-unidimensional then \mathfrak{s} is semi⁰-unidimensional.*
 3) *If \mathfrak{s} is semi⁰-unidimensional, then $K^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is categorical in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$.*
 4) *If \mathfrak{s} is weakly unidimensional, then $K^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is categorical in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$.*
 5) *If \mathfrak{s} is semi-unidimensional, then \mathfrak{s} is weakly unidimensional.*

Remark. 1) Concerning non multi-dimensionality, does it follow from weak unidimensionality under reasonable assumptions? Yes, see 3.6.
 2) See more in 2.7.

Proof. 1) By Ax(D)(c) of λ -good frames (density of basic types).

2) Check the definitions.

3) Let $M_0, M_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ and we shall prove that they are isomorphic. Let $\langle M_\alpha^\ell : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_ℓ such that $\alpha < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow M_\alpha^\ell \neq M_{\alpha+1}^\ell$ for $\ell = 0, 1$. Let $\langle a_i^\ell : i < \lambda^+ \rangle$ list the elements of M_ℓ . We choose by induction on $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$ a tuple $(N_\varepsilon, \alpha_\varepsilon^1, f_\varepsilon^1, \alpha_\varepsilon^2, f_\varepsilon^2)$ such that:

- (a) $N_\varepsilon \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (b) $_\ell$ $\alpha_\varepsilon^\ell < \lambda^+$ is increasing continuous
- (c) $_\ell$ f_ε^ℓ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of $M_{\alpha_\varepsilon^\ell}^\ell$ into N_ε
- (d) $_\ell$ f_ε^ℓ is increasing continuous
- (e) $_\ell$ if $\varepsilon = 4\zeta + \ell, \ell \in \{0, 1\}$ and $j_\varepsilon = \text{Min}\{i : f_{4\zeta}^\ell(\text{tp}(a_i^\ell, M_{\alpha_\varepsilon^\ell}^\ell, M_\ell))$ is realized by some $d \in N_{4\zeta} \setminus \text{Rang}(f_\varepsilon^\ell)\}$ is well defined then $a_{j_\varepsilon}^\ell \in \text{Dom}(f_{\varepsilon+1}^\ell)$ and $f_{\varepsilon+1}^\ell(a_{j_\varepsilon}^\ell) \in N_{4\zeta}$ and $f_{\varepsilon+1}^{1-\ell} = f_\varepsilon^{1-\ell}$
- (f) $_\ell$ if $\varepsilon = 4\zeta + 2 + \ell, \ell \in \{0, 1\}$ then $\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}^\ell > \alpha_\varepsilon^\ell$.

If we succeed, then for some club E of λ^+ we have $\alpha_\alpha^\ell \in M_\delta^\ell \Leftrightarrow \alpha < \delta$ and $\delta \in E \Rightarrow N_\delta \cap \bigcup_{\varepsilon < \lambda^+} \text{Rang}(f_\varepsilon^\ell) = \text{Rang}(f_\delta^\ell)$. If $\delta \in E$ and $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$ but $\text{Rang}(f_\delta^\ell) \neq$

N_δ then by the assumption (“ \mathfrak{s} is semi⁰-unidimensional”) see Definition 2.2(1), for some $c \in M_{\alpha_\delta^\ell+1}^\ell \setminus M_{\alpha_\delta^\ell}^\ell$ and $d \in N_\delta \setminus \text{Rang}(f_\delta^\ell)$ we have $\text{tp}(d, \text{Rang}(f_\delta^\ell), N_\delta) = f_\delta^\ell(\text{tp}(c, M_{\alpha_\delta^\ell}^\ell, M_\ell))$ so by clause (e) $_\ell$ (as $f_{\delta+\ell}^\ell = f_\delta^\ell$) we have $\text{Rang}(f_{\delta+2}^\ell) \cap N_\delta \setminus \text{Rang}(f_\delta^\ell) \neq \emptyset$ contradiction. So $\delta \in E \wedge \ell \in \{0, 1\} \Rightarrow \text{Rang}(f_\delta^\ell) = N_\delta$ hence $f_\ell =: \bigcup_{\delta \in E} f_\delta^\ell$ is an

isomorphism from M_ℓ onto $N =: \bigcup_{\delta \in E} N_\delta$, so $M_1 \cong N \cong M_2$ and we are done.

So we have just to carry the induction, which is straight as $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -a.e.c. with amalgamation and the hypothesis¹.

4) The proof is similar to that of part (3) but we replace clause (e) $_\ell$ by

- (e) $_\ell^*$ if $\varepsilon = 4\zeta + \ell$ and for some $c \in N_{4\zeta} \setminus \text{Rang}(f_\varepsilon^\ell)$ we have $\text{tp}(c, f_\varepsilon^\ell(M_{\alpha_\varepsilon^\ell}^\ell), N_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(f_\varepsilon^\ell(M_{\alpha_\varepsilon^\ell}^\ell))$ and $(f_\varepsilon^\ell)^{-1}(\text{tp}(c, f_\varepsilon^\ell(M_{\alpha_\varepsilon^\ell}^\ell), N_\varepsilon))$ has at least two extensions

¹actually the “semi⁰-unidimensional” can be weakened - in Definition 2.2(1) we may ask $N_1 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}, \lambda^+}$

in $\mathcal{S}^{\text{all}}(M_\beta^\ell)$ for some $\beta \in (\alpha_\varepsilon^\ell, \lambda^+)$ then $\text{tp}(c, f_{\varepsilon+1}^\ell(M_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}^\ell}^\ell), N_{\varepsilon+1})$ is not the nonforking extension of $\text{tp}(c, f_\varepsilon^\ell(M_{\alpha_\varepsilon^\ell}^\ell), N_\varepsilon)$ in $\mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(f_{\varepsilon+1}^\ell(M_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}^\ell}^\ell))$.

Again there is no problem to carry the definition. So it is enough to prove that $\cup\{\text{Rang}(f_\varepsilon^\ell) : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\} = N_{\lambda^+}$, and for this it suffices to prove that $S_\ell = \{\delta < \lambda^+ : N_\delta \neq \text{Rang}(f_\delta^\ell)\}$ is not stationary. For every $\delta \in S_\ell$ by the assumption “ \mathfrak{s} is weakly unidimensional” we know that the assumption of $(e)_\ell^*$ holds hence there is $c = c_\delta^\ell$ as there. By Fodor lemma for some c_ℓ the set $S'_\ell = \{\delta \in S_\ell : c_\delta^\ell = c_\ell\}$ is stationary. Choose $\delta^* \in S'_\ell$, $\delta^* = \sup(\delta^* \cap S'_\ell)$ and use “ \mathfrak{s} is good”.

5) Easy. □_{2.3}

A conclusion is (see Definition 0.4(r)):

2.4 Conclusion: [\mathfrak{s} is successful good⁺ λ -frame.]

- 1) If \mathfrak{s} is semi⁰-unidimensional then $\mathfrak{s}(\lambda^+) = \mathfrak{s}^+$ so $\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda^+}^\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$.
- 2) Similarly if $K^\mathfrak{s}$ is categorical in $\lambda_\mathfrak{s}^+$.
- 3) If \mathfrak{s} is non-multi-dimensional, then so is \mathfrak{s}^+ .

Proof. 1) Clearly $K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} \subseteq K_{\lambda^+}^\mathfrak{s}$ and by 1.9 we know $\leq_{K^\mathfrak{s}} \upharpoonright K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} = \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$. But by 2.3(3), $K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ is categorical in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} = \lambda^+$. Hence $K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} = K_{\lambda^+}^\mathfrak{s}$ and even $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} = \mathfrak{K}_{\lambda^+}^\mathfrak{s}$ and check similarly above \cup and \mathcal{S}^{bs} .

2) So again $K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} = K_{\lambda^+}^\mathfrak{s}$ and just check.

3) By 1.10. □_{2.4}

Remark. But we may need “non-multi-dimensional” (defined below), does it follow?

We also note that the cases we have dealt with categoricity hypothesis, give not just good frames but even unidimensional ones.

2.5 Claim. 1) In II.? (= 1.5(1) Case 1 above) we can add: the \mathfrak{s} obtained there is explicitly unidimensional.

2) In II.?, if \mathfrak{K} is categorical in \aleph_1 (see above 1.5(1), Case 2) then we get almost unidimensionality for the \mathfrak{s} obtained there.

3) In II.?, if ψ is categorical in \aleph_1 (see above 1.5(1), Case 3) then we get almost unidimensionality for the \mathfrak{s} obtained there and is unidimensional.

4) In II.?(3), if $\mathfrak{s} = (\mathfrak{K}_\lambda, \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}, \cup_\lambda)$ is almost unidimensional (see above 1.5(3)), then

we get that also the λ^+ -good frame system \mathfrak{s}^+ obtained there is almost unidimensional.

5) If T is complete superstable first order and $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_{T,\lambda}^\kappa$ (see 1.5(3)) and $\lambda \geq |T| + \kappa^+$ ($\kappa > 0 \Rightarrow T$ stable in λ) then:

- (i) \mathfrak{s} is saturative iff T is non-multidimensional (see [Sh:c]; this is (ii) of 1.5(3))
 (ii) \mathfrak{s} is categorical in λ^+ iff T is unidimensional iff \mathfrak{s} is almost unidimensional.

Proof. Easy. (in (2) we have to use a minimal type see I.?, we get more on (5) follows from the claims below).

Now we consider those properties and how they are related in \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{s}^+ .

2.6 Claim. [$K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ categorical in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$]. If $K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is categorical in λ^+ then \mathfrak{s} is weakly unidimensional.

Proof. Assume toward contradiction that \mathfrak{s} is not weakly unidimensional, hence we can find $M_0 <_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ such that: if $c \in M_2 \setminus M_0$, $\text{tp}(c, M_0, M_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ then it has a unique extension in $\mathcal{S}(M_1)$. By Axiom (D)(d) of λ -good frames (existence) we can choose $c \in M_2 \setminus M_0$ such that $p = \text{tp}(c, M_0, M_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$. Now we choose by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^+$ a model $N_{\alpha} \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$, $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, $N_{\alpha} \neq N_{\alpha+1}$, $N_0 = M_0$ and p has a unique extension in $\mathcal{S}(N_{\alpha})$, call it p_{β} and by Axiom (E)(g) (extension) we know that $p_{\alpha} \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N_{\alpha})$ does not fork over N_0 . For $\alpha = 0$ this is trivial, for $\alpha = \beta + 1$ by 2.11 below (noting that every $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is isomorphic to M_0 and is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed as $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is categorical in λ) there is an isomorphism f_{β} from $N_0 = M_0$ onto N_{β} such that $f_{\beta}(p_0) = p_{\beta}$, so we can find $N_{\alpha} = N_{\beta+1}$ and isomorphism g_{β} from M_1 onto N_{α} extending f_{β} . Hence $f(p) = p_{\beta}$ and so p_{β} has a unique extension in $\mathcal{S}(g_{\beta}(M_1)) = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(N_{\alpha})$ as required. For β limit use Axiom (E)(h), continuity.

Now $N =: \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} N_{\alpha} \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ (recall $N_{\alpha} \neq N_{\alpha+1}$), and p_{β} is not realized in N_{β} for $\beta < \lambda^+$ hence $p = p_0$ is not realized in N , so $N \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is not saturated contradicting categoricity in λ^+ . □_{2.6}

2.7 Claim. Assume \mathfrak{s} is a successful λ -good frame.

- 1) If \mathfrak{s} is semi ^{x} -unidimensional where $x \in \{\text{na}, \text{bs}\}$ then \mathfrak{s}^+ is semi ^{ℓ} dimensional.
- 2) If \mathfrak{s} is weakly unidimensional, then \mathfrak{s}^+ is weakly unidimensional.
- 3) If \mathfrak{s} is almost unidimensional, then \mathfrak{s}^+ is almost unidimensional.
- 4) If \mathfrak{s} is explicitly unidimensional, then \mathfrak{s}^+ is explicitly unidimensional.

Proof. 1) First let $x = \text{na}$. Assume toward contradiction, that \mathfrak{s}^+ is not semi ^{ℓ} -unidimensional, so we can find $M_0 <_{\mathfrak{s}(+) } M_{\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ such that $c_1 \in M_1 \setminus M_0$ &

$c_2 \in M_2 \setminus M_0 \Rightarrow \text{tp}(c_1, M_0, M_1) \neq \text{tp}(c_2, M_0, M_2)$. Let $\langle M_\alpha^\ell : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_ℓ for $\ell < 3$, hence for some club E of λ^+ the following holds:

- (*) for $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\alpha < \beta$ in E , we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_\alpha^0, M_\alpha^\ell, M_\beta^0, M_\beta^\ell)$ (hence $M_\alpha^\ell \cap M_0 = M_\alpha^0$) and $M_\alpha^0 \neq M_\alpha^\ell$ and $c_1 \in M_\alpha^1 \setminus M_\alpha^0$ & $c_2 \in M_\alpha^2 \setminus M_\alpha^0$ & $(\exists \gamma < \lambda^+)(\text{tp}(c_1, M_\gamma^0, M_\gamma^1) \neq \text{tp}(c_2, M_\gamma^0, M_\gamma^2)) \Rightarrow \text{tp}(c_1, M_\alpha^0, M_\alpha^1) \neq \text{tp}(c_2, M_\alpha^0, M_\alpha^2)$.

Let $\delta = \text{Min}(E)$ and apply the assumption so there are $c_1 \in M_\delta^1 \setminus M_\delta^0, c_2 \in M_\delta^2 \setminus M_\delta^0$ satisfying $\text{tp}(c_1, M_\delta^0, M_\delta^1) = \text{tp}(c_2, M_\delta^0, M_\delta^2)$. By the choice of E we have $\beta < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow \text{tp}(c_1, M_\beta^0, M_1) = \text{tp}(c_2, M_\beta^0, M_2)$ and use 1.11(1).

If $x = \text{bs}$ the proof is similar using basic types (and 1.10(3)) or use 2.3(2), second clause.

2) So toward contradiction assume $M_0 <_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ are such that: if $c \in M_1 \setminus M_0$ and $p = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(c, M_0, M_1) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$, then p has a unique extension in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_2)$. Let $\langle M_\alpha^\ell : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_ℓ and E a thin enough club of λ^+ .

For each $\delta \in E$ we have $M_\delta^0 <_{\mathfrak{s}} M_\delta^\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ but \mathfrak{s} is weakly unidimensional hence for some $c_\delta \in M_\delta^1 \setminus M_\delta^0$ the type $p_\delta = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c_\delta, M_\delta^0, M_\delta^1)$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta^0)$ and has more than one extension in $\mathcal{S}(M_\delta^2)$. Clearly there is $\alpha_\delta < \delta$ such that p_δ does not fork for \mathfrak{s} over $M_{\alpha_\delta}^0$ and trivially $p_\delta \upharpoonright M_{\alpha_\delta}^0 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_{\alpha_\delta}^0)$ which has cardinality $\leq \lambda$. By Fodor lemma for some stationary $S \subseteq \lambda^+$ we have $\delta \in S \Rightarrow c_\delta = c_*$ & $\alpha_\delta = \alpha_*$ & $p_\delta \upharpoonright M_{\alpha_*}^0 = p_*$. By 1.11 the type $q =: \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(c_*, M_0, M_1)$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ hence by the choice of M_0, M_1, M_2 (“toward contradiction”) q has at least two distinct extensions $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(M_2)$. Now by the choice of S and as for each $\delta \in S$ there is $q'_\delta \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta^2)$ which is a non-forking extension of p_* clearly

- (**) if $\delta \in S$ & $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ then $q_\ell \upharpoonright M_\delta^2$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta^2)$ and does not fork over M_δ^0 and extends $p_* = p_\delta \upharpoonright M_{\alpha_*}^0$ hence does not fork over $M_{\alpha_*}^0$.

By 1.10 we get a contradiction.

3) As for $M_0, \langle M_\alpha^0 : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ as above there is $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ such that $\{\delta < \lambda^+ : p \upharpoonright M_\alpha^0 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\alpha^0) \text{ is unavoidable}\}$ is stationary.

4) Straightforward. □_{2.7}

Together we can “close the circle” to continuing “up” we shall get more (see more in 3.12).

2.8 Conclusion: Assume \mathfrak{s} is a λ -good frame categorical in λ .

1) Then \mathfrak{s} is weakly-unidimensional iff $K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is categorical in λ^+ .

2) If \mathfrak{s} is successful we can add: iff \mathfrak{s}^+ is weakly unidimensional and $\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}} = \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$.

Proof. 1) The second condition implies the first by 2.6, the first condition implies the second by 2.3(4).

2) The first implies the third as by 2.7(2) we have \mathfrak{s}^+ is weakly unidimensional and $\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}} = \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ by 0.4(1) and the third condition implies the second as $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ is categorical in λ^+ by the definition of $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$. $\square_{2.8}$

Earlier (say in [Sh 576]) minimal type were central, so let us mention them:

2.9 Definition. 1) We say \mathfrak{s} is (a λ -good frame) of minimals when the following holds: if $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$, $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_1$, $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_1$, $a \in M_1$, $p = \text{tp}(a, M_0, M_1)$ and $a \notin N_0$ then $\text{tp}(a, N_0, N_1)$ is a nonforking extension of p . So the triple (M, N, a) is called \mathfrak{s} -minimal.
2) For an λ -a.e.c. \mathfrak{K} , $p \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is minimal if for every $N, M \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N \in K_{\lambda}$, p has one and only one extension in $\mathcal{S}(N)$.

2.10 Claim. 1) In II.? (= above in 1.5(1)) we can add: \mathfrak{s} is a λ -good frame of minimals.

2) Similarly in 2.5(2),(3).

3) In 1.9, if \mathfrak{s} is a frame of minimals then so is \mathfrak{s}^+ .

4) If (M_0, M_1, a) is \mathfrak{s} -minimal (i.e., as in Definition 2.9(1)) then:

- (i) $p = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}}(a, M_0, M_1)$ is minimal,
- (ii) if $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1$ and $q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_1)$ extends p is not algebraic then q does not fork over M_0 ; hence, in particular, $q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$
- (iii) if $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1$ and $q = \text{tp}(b, M_0, M_1)$ satisfies clauses (i) and (ii) then q is minimal.

* * *

We could have mentioned in Chapter II:

2.11 Claim. [\mathfrak{s} is a λ -good frame].

Assume $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$ are superlimit in $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $p_i \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_2)$ does not fork over M_1 for $i < \alpha < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. Then there is an isomorphism f from M_1 onto M_2 such that $i < \alpha \Rightarrow f(p_i \upharpoonright M_1) = p_i$.

Proof. First assume that M_2 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_1 . Clearly we can find a regular cardinal θ such that $\alpha < \theta \leq \lambda$. Now we can find a sequence $\langle N_{\beta} : \beta < \theta \rangle$ which is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, $N_{\beta+1}$ being $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over N_{β} (of course,

we are using II§4). Clearly $\bigcup_{\beta < \theta} N_\beta \in K_s$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over N_0 , so without loss of generality is equal to M_1 .

So for each $i < \alpha$ for some $\beta(i) < \theta$ the type $p_i \upharpoonright M_1$ which $\in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ does not fork over $N_{\beta(i)}$, so $\beta = \sup\{\beta(i) : i < \alpha\} < \theta$, hence by transitivity and monotonicity of nonforking $i < \alpha \Rightarrow p_i$ does not fork over N_β . Clearly also M_2 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over N_β and by the choice of $\langle N_\gamma : \gamma < \theta \rangle$ also M_1 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over N_β hence there is an isomorphism f from M_2 onto M_1 over N_β . Now for $i < \alpha$ the types $p_i \upharpoonright M_1$ and $f(p_i)$ are members of $\mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ which does not fork over N_β and has the same restriction to N_β hence are equal. So f^{-1} is as required.

Second without the assumption “ M_2 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_1 ” we can find $M_3 \in K_s$ which is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_2 hence also over M_1 and let $q_i \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_3)$ be a nonforking extension of p_i .

Applying what we have already proved to the pair (M_1, M_3) there is an isomorphism f_1 from M_1 onto M_3 mapping $p_i \upharpoonright M_1 = q_i \upharpoonright M_1$ to q_i for $i < \alpha$. Applying what we have already proved to the pair (M_2, M_3) , there is an isomorphism f_2 from M_2 onto M_3 mapping p_i to q_i for $i < \alpha$. Now $f_2^{-1} \circ f_1$ is as required. $\square_{2.11}$

Recalling Definition 0.4(3) note:

2.12 Claim. 1) Assume $\bar{M} = \langle M_i : i \leq \delta + 1 \rangle$ is $<_s$ -increasing continuous. If $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{\delta+1})$, $|\Gamma| < \text{cf}(\delta)$ and $M_\delta \leq_s N$ and $p \in \Gamma \Rightarrow p$ does not fork over M_δ . Then for every large enough $i < \delta$ there is an isomorphism f from N onto $M_{\delta+1}$ over M_i such that $p \in \Gamma \Rightarrow f(p) = p \upharpoonright M_\delta$ provided that $i < \delta \Rightarrow M_\delta, N$ are $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_i .

2) Instead $|\Gamma| < \text{cf}(\delta)$ it is enough to demand: $|\Gamma| < \lambda_s$ and $p \in \Gamma \Rightarrow p$ does not fork over M_i .

Proof. 1) For $p \in \Gamma$, choose $i(p) < \delta$ such that $p \in \Gamma \Rightarrow p \upharpoonright M_\delta$ does not fork over $M_{i(p)}$ and let $i(*) = \sup\{i(p) : p \in \Gamma\}$ it is $< \delta$ or $|\Gamma| < \text{cf}(\delta)$.

2) Similar. $\square_{2.12}$

* * *

2.13 Definition. Let \mathfrak{K} be a λ -a.e.c. (so $\mathfrak{K} = \mathfrak{K}_\lambda$)(normally with amalgamation (in λ)).

1) We say that $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{K}}(M_1)$ α -splits or (α, \mathfrak{K}) -split over $A \subseteq M_1$ iff there are $\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2 \in {}^\alpha(M_1)$ such that:

(α) \bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2 realize the same type over A inside M_1 that is,

(*) for some M_2, f we have:

$$M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_2$$

f is an automorphism of M_2 over A mapping \bar{a}_1 to \bar{a}_2

(β) if $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_2$ and $c \in M_2$ realizes p inside M_2 then \bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2 do not realize the same type over $A \cup \{c\}$ inside M_2 , that is for no M_3, f do we have $M_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_3$ and f is an automorphism of M_3 over M mapping $\bar{a}_1 \hat{\langle} c \rangle$ to $\bar{a}_2 \hat{\langle} c \rangle$.

3) We may write \bar{a} instead of $A = \text{Rang}(\bar{a})$ and M_0 instead of $A = |M_0|$. If we omit α (and write split or \mathfrak{K} -split) we mean “for some α ”.

4) We say \mathfrak{K} has χ -nonsplitting if for every $M \in K_\lambda$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{K}\lambda}(M)$ there is $A \subseteq M, |A| \leq \chi$ such that p does not split over A (in \mathfrak{K}).

5) We say \mathfrak{s} has χ -nonsplitting if $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ has basically χ -nonsplitting which means that this holds for $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$.

6) In part (1), (2), (3) though not (4) writing \mathfrak{s} instead of \mathfrak{K} means $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

2.14 Claim. 1) If $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $\bar{c} \subseteq M_2$ then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{c}, M_1, M_3)$ does not split over M_0 .

2) Similarly for $\bar{c} \in \alpha(M_2)$.

Proof. Straightforward (by uniqueness of NF).

We could have noted earlier:

2.15 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $\delta < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ is a limit ordinal
- (b) $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (c) $M_{\alpha+1}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_α
- (d) $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_\delta)$.

Then for some $i < \delta$ the type p does not λ -split over M_i for $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

Proof. We can find a $<_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous sequence $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ such that $M_\alpha \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_\alpha$ and $N_{\alpha+1}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_{\alpha+1} \cup N_\alpha$ and $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_\alpha, N_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1}, N_{\alpha+1})$. We know (II§6) that N_δ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_δ , hence some $c \in N_\delta$ realizes p , so for some $i < \delta, c \in N_i$ and this α is as required. $\square_{2.15}$

We define rank as in [Sh 394].

2.16 Definition. $\text{rk} = \text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}$, e.g. is defined as follows:

$\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p)$ is defined if $p \in \mathcal{S}_\mathfrak{s}(M)$ for some $M \in K_\mathfrak{s}$

it is an ordinal or ∞

$\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p) \geq \alpha$ iff for every $\beta < \alpha$ we can find (M_1, p_1) such that

$M \leq_\mathfrak{s} M_1, p_1 \in \mathcal{S}_\mathfrak{s}(M_1)$ is an extension of p which splits over M and $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p_1) \geq \beta$.

Lastly, $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p) = \alpha$ iff $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p) \geq \alpha$ and $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p) \not\geq \alpha + 1$.

Basic properties of $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}$ are

2.17 Claim. *Assume \mathfrak{s} is weakly successful good. If $M \in K_\mathfrak{s}$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_\mathfrak{s}(M)$, then $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p) < \infty$.*

Remark. So this applies in 9.14 to \mathfrak{s}^* but $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} = \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(*)}$ so it applies to \mathfrak{s}^+ , too.

Proof. Assume $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p) = \infty$ we can choose by induction on n a triple (M_n, N_n, a) , $M_n \leq_\mathfrak{s} N_n$, $a \in N_n$, $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(\text{tp}(a, M_n, N_n)) = \infty$ and $M_n \leq_\mathfrak{s} M_{n+1}$, $N_n \leq_\mathfrak{s} N_{n+1}$ and $\text{tp}(a, M_{n+1}, N_{n+1})$ does λ -split over M_n (in the induction step we use amalgamation and having $\leq 2^{\lambda_\mathfrak{s}}$ possible isomorphism types for (M_{n+1}, N_{n+1}, a) over M_n). Clearly we can find $\langle N_n^+ : n < \omega \rangle$ such that $M_n \leq_\mathfrak{s} N_n^+$ and $\text{NF}_\mathfrak{s}(M_n, M_{n+1}, N_n^+, N_n^+), N_{n+1}^+$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_{n+1} \cup N_n$. By 1.17 we know that $N_\omega^+ = \cup\{N_n^+ : n < \omega\}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_\omega = \cup\{M_n : n < \omega\}$, hence we can embed $N_\omega = \cup\{N_n : n < \omega\}$ into N_ω^+ over M_n so without loss of generality $n < \omega \Rightarrow N_n \leq_\mathfrak{s} N_\omega^+$. So for some $n < \omega$ we have $a \in N_n^+$, and by long transitivity for NF we have $\text{NF}_\mathfrak{s}(M, N_n^+, M_\omega, N_\omega^+)$. We get easy contradiction to $\text{tp}(a, M_{n+1}, N_{n+1}^+) = \text{tp}_\mathfrak{s}(a, M_{n+1}, N_\omega^+) = \text{tp}(a, M_{n+1}, N_{n+1})$ does λ -split over M_n . $\square_{2.17}$

2.18 Remark. An important point is that for any $\langle M_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ which is $\leq_\mathfrak{s}$ -increasing continuous and $p_i \in \mathcal{S}_\mathfrak{s}(M_i)$ for $i < \delta$ such that $i < j \Rightarrow p_i = p_j \upharpoonright M_i$ in general there is no $p \in \mathcal{S}_\mathfrak{s}(\cup\{M_i : i < \delta\})$ such that $i < \delta \Rightarrow p_i = p \upharpoonright M_i$, but for $\delta = \omega$ there is.

2.19 Claim. 1) $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p)$ is a well defined ordinal ($< \infty$) if $p \in \mathcal{S}_\mathfrak{s}(M)$, $M \in K_\mathfrak{s}$.
 2) If $M <_\mathfrak{s} N$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_\mathfrak{s}(N)$ splits over M and $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p) < \infty$, then $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p) < \text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(p \upharpoonright M)$.
 3) If $\text{NF}_\mathfrak{s}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $a \in M_4$, then $\text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(\text{tp}_\mathfrak{s}(a, M_0, M_3)) = \text{rk}_\mathfrak{s}(\text{tp}_\mathfrak{s}(a, M_1, M_3))$.

4) If $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N)$ does not fork over M then p does not split over M and $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p) = \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p \upharpoonright M)$.

Proof. 1) Immediate by 2.15.

2) - 4) Easy. □_{2.19}

We may like to translate ranks between \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{s}^+ .

2.20 Claim. [\mathfrak{s} is a successful good⁺-frame]

Assume $N_1 <_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_1, N_1 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}, M_1 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}, p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(M_1)$.

1) If p does not λ -split over N_1 for \mathfrak{s} , then $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(p) = \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p \upharpoonright N_1)$.

2) Also the inverse holds.

3) If $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ and N_1 witnesses it then p does not λ -split over N_1 and moreover does not split over N_1 .

4) If $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(M_1)$ then for some $N_0 <_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_1$ of cardinality λ , p does not split over N_0 and even does not split over N_0 ; we call such N_0 a witness for p .

5) If $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ then N_1 is a witness for $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ iff p does not λ -split over N_1 .

2.21 Remark. No real harm in assuming “ \mathfrak{s} is type full” (see Definition 9.4).

2.22 Conclusion If $M_0 <_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_1$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ does $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$ -fork over M_0 then $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(p) < \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(p \upharpoonright M_0)$.

Proof of 2.20. 3),4),5) should be clear.

1) We prove by induction α that

$$\circledast_{\alpha} \text{ for any such } (N_1, M_1, p) \text{ we have} \\ \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(p) \geq \alpha \Leftrightarrow \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p \upharpoonright N_1) \geq \alpha$$

This clearly suffices.

For $\alpha = 0$ and α limit there are no problems. So assume $\alpha = \beta + 1$. First assume $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(p) \geq \alpha$ hence by the definition of $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ we can find p, M_2 such that $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_2, q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(M_2), q \upharpoonright M_1 = p$ and q does λ^+ -split over M_1 and $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(q) \geq \beta$. Hence q is not witnessed by N_1 hence q does λ -split over N_1 hence for some $N_2 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we have $N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_2$ and $q \upharpoonright N_2$ does λ -split over N_1 for $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and without loss of generality N_2 is a witness for q . So by the induction hypothesis $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(q) \geq \beta \Leftrightarrow \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(q \upharpoonright N_2) \geq \beta$.

But by the choice of q , $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(q) \geq \beta$ hence $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(q \upharpoonright N_2) \geq \beta$. By the definition of $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}$, as $q \upharpoonright N_2$ does λ -split over N_1 for \mathfrak{s} , we get $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p \upharpoonright N_1) > \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(q \upharpoonright N_2) \geq \beta$ so $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p \upharpoonright N_1) \geq \beta + 1 = \alpha$ as required.

Second assume $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p \upharpoonright N_1) \geq \alpha$ so we can find N_2, N_3, a such that $N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_3, a \in N_3, q = \text{tp}(a, N_2, N_3)$ is a λ -splitting (for \mathfrak{s}) extension of $p^- = p \upharpoonright N_1$. We use NF amalgamation to lift this to M_2, p .

2) It is enough to prove $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(p) < \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p \upharpoonright N_1)$ assuming the p does λ -split over N_1 . Now we can find $N_2 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ such that $N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_2 \leq \mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}] - M_1$ and p does not λ -split over N_2 but $p \upharpoonright N_2$ does λ -split over N_1 . So by part (1) we have $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(p) = \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p \upharpoonright N_2)$, and by the definition of $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we know that $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p \upharpoonright N_2) \leq \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p \upharpoonright N_1)$. Together we are done.

3),4) Left to the reader.

□_{2.20}

§3 PRIMES TRIPLES

3.1 *Hypothesis.* \mathfrak{s} is a good λ -frame.

3.2 Definition. 1) Assume $\mathfrak{s} = (\mathfrak{K}, \amalg, \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}})$ is a good λ -frame. Let $K_\lambda^{3,\text{pr}} = K_\mathfrak{s}^{3,\text{pr}}$

be the family (pr stands for prime) of triples $(M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{bs}} = K_\mathfrak{s}^{3,\text{bs}}$ such that: if $(M, N', a') \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{bs}}$ and $\text{tp}(a, M, N) = \text{tp}(a', M, N')$ then there is a $\leq_\mathfrak{s}$ -embedding $f : N \rightarrow N'$ over M satisfying $f(a) = a'$. So such triples are called prime.

2) We say that $\mathfrak{s} = (\mathfrak{K}, \amalg, \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}})$ is λ -good² or that \mathfrak{s} has primes if \mathfrak{s} is λ -good and

(a) if $M \in K_\lambda, p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ then for some N, a we have $(M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{pr}}$ and $p = \text{tp}(a, M, N)$.

3) (M, N, a) is model-minimal if it belongs to $K_\lambda^{3,\text{bs}}$ and there is no N' such that $M <_\mathfrak{s} N' <_\mathfrak{s} N$ and $a \in N'$ (this notion is close to “ $\text{tp}(a, M, N)$ is of depth zero, N prime over $M \cup \{a\}$ ” in the context of [Sh:c]).

4) We say \mathfrak{s} has [model]-minimality if for every $M \in K_\mathfrak{s}, p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ there is $(M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{bs}}$ in which a realizes p and (M, N, a) is [model]-minimal (see Definition 2.9).

3.3 Definition. 1) We say $\langle M_i, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ is a pr-decomposition of N over M or of (M, N) if: M_i is $\leq_\mathfrak{s}$ -increasing continuous, $(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_\mathfrak{s}^{3,\text{pr}}, M_0 = M$ and $M_\alpha = N$; we may allow $N \in K_{\lambda+}^\mathfrak{s}$ but $i < \alpha \Rightarrow M_i \in K_\mathfrak{s}$. If we demand just $M_\alpha \leq_\mathfrak{s} N$ we say “inside N ” instead of “of N ”. If we also allow $M \leq_\mathfrak{s} M_0, M_\alpha \leq_\mathfrak{s} N$ we say in (M, N) . Instead “over M ” we can say M -based. We call α the length of the decomposition.

2) Similarly for uq ($K_\lambda^{3,\text{uq}}$ is from II.?) and we define uq-decomposition. We may write just decomposition (or \mathfrak{s} -decomposition) instead pr-decomposition.

3.4 Claim. 1) If $(M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{pr}}$ and $M \cup \{a\} \subseteq N' \leq_\mathfrak{s} N$ then $(M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{pr}}$.

2) Similarly for $K_\lambda^{3,\text{uq}}$.

3) If $(M, N_1, a_1) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{bs}}$ is model-minimal and $(M, N_2, a_2) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{pr}}$ and $p = \text{tp}(a_1, M, N_1) = \text{tp}(a_2, M, N_2)$ then there is an isomorphism from N_1 onto N_2 over M , mapping a_1 to a_2 (so both triples are model-minimal and prime and so if (M, N', a') is prime or is model minimal with $\text{tp}(a', M, N') = \text{tp}(a_\ell, M, N_\ell)$ then for $\ell = 1, 2$ there is an isomorphism f_ℓ from N' onto N_ℓ mapping a' to a_ℓ and being

the identity on M).

- 4) Assume \mathfrak{s} is weakly successful. If $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and (M_0, M_1, a) belong to $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $\text{tp}(a, M_2, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0 (e.g. $\text{tp}(a, M_0, M_1)$ has unique extension in $\mathcal{S}(M_2)$) then $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$.
- 5) If $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$, $a_\ell \in M_{\ell+1}$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_\ell, M_\ell, M_{\ell+1}) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_\ell)$ does not fork over M_0 for $\ell = 0, 1$ then $(M_0, M_2, a_0) \notin K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$.

Proof. Easy (e.g. (3) is 1.18 and (4) is by the definition of $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and the existence of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -amalgamation). □_{3.4}

- 3.5 Claim.** 1) Assume that \mathfrak{s} has primes; if $(M, N, a) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$ then for some $N', M \cup \{a\} \subseteq N' \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ and $(M, N', a) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{pr}} \cap K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$.
- 2) If $(M, N, a) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and $K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$ is dense (e.g. if \mathfrak{s} is weakly successful) then $(M, N, a) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$.

Proof. Immediate: part (1) by the definition and monotonicity of $K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$, part (2) by the proof of part (1). □_{3.5}

3.6 Claim. If \mathfrak{s} is non-multi-dimensional weakly successful and has primes then \mathfrak{s} has model-minimality and all $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ are model minimal.

Proof. Let $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$. We know (by Definition 3.2(2)(a)) that there is $(M, N_2, a) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{bs}}$ which is prime and $p = \text{tp}(a, M, N_2)$. If (M, N_2, a) is model-minimal we are done, otherwise there is N_1 satisfying $M \cup \{a\} \subseteq N_1 <_{\mathfrak{s}} N_2$. As (M, N_2, a) is prime there is an $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding f of N_2 into N_1 over $M \cup \{a\}$, let $N_0 = f(N_2)$ hence $M \cup \{a\} \subseteq N_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_1$. So $M \cup \{a\} \subseteq N_0 <_{\mathfrak{s}} N_2$, so by non-multi-dimensionality there is $b \in N_2 \setminus N_0$ such that $\text{tp}(b, N_0, N_2) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N_0)$ does not fork over M hence by 3.4(5) we have $(M, N_2, a) \notin K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$ (the M, N_0, N_2, a, b here correspond to M_0, M_1, M_2, a_0, a_1). This easily contradicts “ $(M, N_2, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}} \subseteq K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ ” which holds by 3.5(2). □_{3.6}

3.7 Claim. [\mathfrak{s} is a good, weakly successful λ -frame].

- 1) Assume $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3$, $a_\ell \in M_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $(M_0, M_\ell, a_\ell) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

Then $\text{tp}(a_2, M_1, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0 iff $\text{tp}(a_1, M_2, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0 .

2) Assume $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3$ and $a_\ell \in M_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $(M_0, M_1, a_1) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $\text{tp}(a_2, M_0, M_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$. If $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_1, M_2, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0 then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_2, M_1, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0 .

Proof. 1) By the symmetry in the claim it is enough to prove the if part, so assume that $\text{tp}(a_1, M_2, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0 (see II§5 on \leq_{bs}). As $(M_0, M_1, a_1) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ by 3.4(4) it follows that $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$, hence by symmetry of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ (see II.?) we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_2, M_1, M_2)$ which implies that $\text{tp}(a_2, M_1, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0 by 1.12.

2) The proof is included in proof of part (1). $\square_{3.7}$

3.8 Claim. *Assume \mathfrak{s} has primes.*

- (1) *If $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ then there is a decomposition of N over M (see Definition 3.3(1),(2)). Moreover, if $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bs}}$ then without loss of generality $a_0 = a$.*
- (2) *If $M \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} N, M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}, N \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$, then there is a decomposition of N over M*
- (3) *If $N \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ the length of the decomposition is λ^+*
- (4) *In part (1) there is a decomposition of N over M of length $\leq \lambda$*
- (5) *In part (1) if N is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M , then there is a decomposition of N over M of length exactly λ .*

Proof. 1) By the definition of λ -good frame there is $a \in N$ such that $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M, N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$, so it is enough to prove the second sentence, so without loss of generality a is well defined. Choose a_i, M_i by induction $i < \lambda^+$. Arriving to i , if $i = 0, M_i = M, a_i = a$. If i is limit let $M_i = \cup\{M_j : j < i\}$: if $M_i = N$ we are done, if not then for some $a_i \in N \setminus M_i$ we have $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M_i, N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_i)$. If $i = j + 1$ then M_j, a_j are well defined and we know (as \mathfrak{s} has primes) that there is $M_{j+1} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ such that $(M_j, M_{j+1}, a_j) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$; again if $M_i = N$ we are done and otherwise we can choose $a_i \in N \setminus M_i$ such that $\text{tp}(a_i, M_i, N) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_i)$. So by cardinality consideration at some point we are stuck, i.e., $M_i = N$.

2) Let $\langle b_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ list the elements of N . Repeating the proof of part (1), now in choosing a_i when $i > 0$ we can choose any $a \in \mathbf{I}_i = \{a \in N \setminus M_i : \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_i, N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_i)\}$ so we can demand that $a_i = b_{\varepsilon_1}$ & $b_{\varepsilon_2} \in \mathbf{I}_i \Rightarrow \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2$. It suffice to show that $M_{\lambda^+} = \cup\{M_i : i < \lambda^+\}$ is not equal to N , obviously $M_{\lambda^+} \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} N$. Otherwise we can find $a \in N \setminus M_{\lambda^+}$ such that $S = \{i : \text{tp}(a, M_i, N) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_i)\}$ is stationary and without loss of generality $i \in S \Rightarrow \text{tp}(a, M_i, N)$ does not fork

over $M_{i(*)}$, $i(*) = \text{Min}(S)$ so without loss of generality $S = [i(*), \lambda^+)$. The type $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_{\lambda^+}, N)$ does not fork over $M_{i(*)}$, so $i \in [1 + i(*), \lambda^+) \Rightarrow a \in \mathbf{I}_i$, so if $a = b_{\varepsilon(*)}$ then $i \in [1 + i(*), \lambda^+) \Rightarrow a_i \in \{b_{\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)\}$, so we have a 1-to-1 function from $[1 + i(*), \lambda)$ into $[0, \varepsilon(*))$, contradiction.

3)-5) Left to the reader. $\square_{3.8}$

3.9 Claim. *1) $[\mathfrak{s}$ is a (good) weakly successful λ -frame with primes].*

If $\mathfrak{C} \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is λ^+ -saturated (over λ of course), $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$, $M \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} \mathfrak{C}$ and $a_1, a_2 \in \mathfrak{C}$ satisfy $\text{tp}(a_{\ell}, M, \mathfrak{C}) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, then the following are equivalent:

- (a) *there are M_1, M_2 from $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ such that $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M, M_1, M_2, \mathfrak{C})$ and $a_1 \in M_1, a_2 \in M_2$ (the meaning of NF above is for some $M_3 \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} \mathfrak{C}$ from $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M, M_1, M_2, M_3)$)*
- (b) $_{\ell}$ *there is $M_{\ell} \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} \mathfrak{C}$ from $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ satisfying $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{\ell} \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} \mathfrak{C}$ such that $a_{\ell} \in M_{\ell}$ and $\text{tp}(a_{3-\ell}, M_{\ell}, \mathfrak{C})$ does not fork over M*
- (c) $_{\ell}$ *if $(M, M_{\ell}, a_{\ell}) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $M_{\ell} \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} \mathfrak{C}$ then $\text{tp}(a_{3-\ell}, M_{\ell}, \mathfrak{C})$ does not fork over M*
- (d) $_{\ell}$ *if $(M, M_{\ell}, a_{\ell}) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and $M_{\ell} \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} \mathfrak{C}$ then $\text{tp}(a_{3-\ell}, M_{\ell}, \mathfrak{C})$ does not fork over M .*

2) $[\mathfrak{s}$ is a (good) weakly successful λ -frame.] Above (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) $_{\ell} \Leftrightarrow$ (c) $_{\ell} \Rightarrow$ (d) $_{\ell}$.

Proof. 1)

(a) \Rightarrow (b) $_{\ell}$ by 1.12 (and the symmetry of NF).

(b) $_{\ell} \Rightarrow$ (a) + (c) $_{3-\ell}$. To prove (c) $_{3-\ell}$ assume $(M, M_{3-\ell}, a_{3-\ell}) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$. As we assume (b) $_{\ell}$ for some $M_{\ell} \leq_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathfrak{C}$ in K_{λ} , we have $\text{tp}(a_{3-\ell}, M_{\ell}, \mathfrak{C})$ does not fork over M and $a_{\ell} \in M_{\ell}$, so as $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{\ell}$ and $\text{tp}(a_{\ell}, M, M_{\ell}) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ clearly $(M, M_{\ell}, a_{\ell}) \in K^{3, \text{bs}}$. By 3.4(4) we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M, M_{\ell}, M_{3-\ell}, \mathfrak{C})$ hence by 1.12 the desired conclusion of (c) $_{3-\ell}$ holds. This proves also clause (a) if we note, as \mathfrak{s} is weakly successful for some $(M, N, b) \in K^{3, \text{uq}}$, $\text{tp}(b, M, N) = \text{tp}(a_{3-\ell}, M, \mathfrak{C})$, so as \mathfrak{C} is λ^+ -saturated?? without loss of generality $a_{3-\ell} = b, N \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} \mathfrak{C}$.

(c) $_{3-\ell} \Rightarrow$ (d) $_{3-\ell}$: to prove (d) $_{3-\ell}$ assume $(M, M_{\ell}, a_{\ell}) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and $M_{\ell} \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} \mathfrak{C}$; now “ \mathfrak{s} is weakly successful” and 3.5(2) implies $(M, M_{\ell}, a_{\ell}) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$, and we can apply clause (c) $_{3-\ell}$ to get the desired conclusion of (d) $_{3-\ell}$.

(d) $_{3-\ell} \Rightarrow$ (b) $_{3-\ell}$: as \mathfrak{s} has primes there is $M_{3-\ell}$ such that $(M, M_{3-\ell}, a_{3-\ell}) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and use 3.5(2).

Clearly those implications are enough.

2) The proof is included in the proof of part (1) except $(c)_\ell \Rightarrow (b)_\ell$ like $(d)_{3-\ell} \Rightarrow (b)_{3-\ell}$ using “weakly successful”. $\square_{3.9}$

3.10 Claim. *Assume \mathfrak{s} is good⁺ and n -successful and $n > 0$.*

1) \mathfrak{s}^{+n} is a λ^{+n} -good⁺ frame.

2) $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}[+n]}^{\text{bs}} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s} < \lambda^{+n}}^{\text{bs}} \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{\mathfrak{s}^{+n}}$ (see 0.4, the $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}$ is from II§2 and is $\{p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M, \mathfrak{s}) : M \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{\mathfrak{s}^{+n}}\}$).

3) If $M \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{\mathfrak{s}^{+n}}$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}[+n]}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ then for some $(M, N, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{pr}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}]$ we have $\text{tp}(a, M, N) = p$.

4) If $(M, N, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{pr}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}]$ then $(M, N, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{uq}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}]$.

5) If $M \leq_{\mathfrak{R}} N^1 \leq_{\mathfrak{R}} N^2$ are in $K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{\mathfrak{s}^{+n}}$ and $a \in N^1$ then $(M, N^2, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{uq}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}] \Rightarrow (M, N^1, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{uq}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}]$ and $(M, N^2, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{pr}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}] \Rightarrow (M, N^1, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{pr}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}] \Rightarrow (M, N^1, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{uq}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}]$.

6) Assume $n = m + 1$, and $(M_0, M_1, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{bs}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}]$ and $\bar{M}_\ell = \langle M_{\ell, \alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^{+n} \rangle$ a $\leq_{\mathfrak{R}}$ -representation of M_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$. Then:

(*) $(M_0, M_1, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{pr}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}]$ iff for some club E of λ^+ we have: for $\alpha < \beta$ in E , $(M_{0, \alpha}, M_{1, \alpha}, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{uq}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+m}]$ and $(M_{0, \alpha}, M_{1, \alpha}, a) <_{\text{bs}}^{*, \mathfrak{s}^{+m}} (M_{0, \beta}, M_{1, \beta}, a)$, see 4.2.

Proof. Straight; all by induction on n ; part (3), (6) by 4.9 + 4.3 below, part (4) by 3.5, part (5) by 3.4(1), 3.4(2). $\square_{3.10}$

3.11 Remark. 1) If we assume \mathfrak{s}_0 is unidimensional (see §2), life is easier: $(M, N, a) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ implies model-minimality, see §3, 3.6. On categoricity see 3.12.

2) For 3.10(6), note that M_1 is saturated (in $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{s}^{+(n-1)}}$ above λ^{+n-1}) if $(M, M_2, b) \in K_{\lambda^{+n}}^{3, \text{bs}}[\mathfrak{s}^{+n}]$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}[+n]}(b, M_0, M_2) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}[+n]}(a, M_0, M_1)$ then we can choose an $\leq_{K[\mathfrak{s}]}$ -embedding f_α of $M_{1, \alpha}$ into $M_{2, \alpha}$, increasing continuous with α , mapping a to b . For $\alpha = 0$ use the saturation, for $\alpha = \beta + 1$ use $(M_{1, \alpha}, M_{2, \alpha}, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}[n-1]}^{3, \text{uq}} +$ saturation.

3.12 Claim. *If \mathfrak{s} is an n -successful good⁺ λ -frame and weakly unidimensional and categorical in λ , then*

(i) $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{s}^{+(n)}} = \mathfrak{R}_{\geq \lambda^{+n}}^{\mathfrak{s}}$

(ii) $\mathfrak{s}^{+(n)}$ is weakly unidimensional, and categorical in λ^{+n} .

Proof. By 3.10 and 2.7. $\square_{3.12}$

§4 PRIME EXISTENCE

We give some easy properties of primes for \mathfrak{s}^+ . A major point is 4.9: existence of primes. We also note how various properties reflect from $K_{\mathfrak{s}^+}$ to $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

4.1 Hypothesis. 1) $\mathfrak{s} = (\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}, \amalg, \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}})$ is a successful good⁺ λ -frame, $\mathfrak{K} = \mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]$ as usual.

Recall

4.2 Definition. 1) We let $\leq_{\text{bs}} = \leq_{\text{bs}}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ be the following relation (really quasi order) on $K_{\lambda}^{3,\text{bs}}$: $(M, N, a) \leq_{\text{bs}} (M', N', a)$ if both are in $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bs}}$, $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M'$, $N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N'$ and $\text{tp}(a, M', N')$ does not fork over M .

2) $\leq_{\text{bs}}^* = \leq_{\text{bs}}^{*,\mathfrak{s}}$ is the following quasi order on $K_{\lambda}^{3,\text{bs}}$: $(M, N, a) \leq_{\text{bs}}^* (M', N', a)$ if (they are in $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bs}}$ and) $(M, N, a) \leq_{\text{bs}} (M', N', a)$ and if they are not equal then M', N' is universal over M, N respectively (and $<_{\text{bs}}^*$ has the obvious meaning).

4.3 Claim. *Assume $M_0 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$. Then we can find $a, \bar{M}_0, M_1, \bar{M}_1$ such that:*

- (i) $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$
- (ii) $M_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is saturated, for \mathfrak{s} , equivalently $M_1 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$
- (iii) $a \in M_1$ and $p = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a, M_0, M_1)$
- (iv) $\bar{M}_{\ell} = \langle M_{\ell,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}$ -representation of M_{ℓ} for $\ell = 0, 1$
- (v) $a \in M_{1,0}$
- (vi) $(M_{0,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha}, a) \in K_{\lambda}^{3,\text{uq}}$ for every $\alpha < \lambda^+$
- (vii) $M_{\ell,i+1}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_{\ell,i}$ for $i < \lambda^+, \ell < 2$
- (viii) $(M_{0,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha}, a)$ is $<_{\text{bs}}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing

4.4 Definition. If we say (M_0, M_1, a) is canonically \mathfrak{s}^+ -prime if there are \bar{M}^0, \bar{M}^1 are as in claim 4.3 above (see 4.9 below, formally this depends on \mathfrak{s} , but our \mathfrak{s} is constant).

Proof. Let $M_{0,0} \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_0, M_{0,0} \in K_{\lambda}$ be such that $M_{0,0}$ is a witness for p and $\langle b_{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ list $|M_0|$

We choose by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^+$, a pair $(M_{0,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha})$ such that:

- (a) $(M_{0,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha}, a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{bs}}$
- (b) $(M_{0,\beta}, M_{1,\beta}, a) \leq_{\text{bs}} (M_{0,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha}, a)$ for $\beta < \alpha$
- (c) if α is a limit ordinal then $M_{\ell,\alpha} = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} M_{\ell,\beta}$ for $\ell = 0, 1$
- (d) for every even α , if $(M_{0,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha}, a) \notin K_\lambda^{3,\text{uq}}$ then
 $\neg \text{NF}_\mathfrak{s}(M_{0,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha}, M_{0,\alpha+1}, M_{1,\alpha+1})$
- (e) for odd α , $M_{\ell,\alpha+1}$ is brimmed over $M_{\ell,\alpha}$ for \mathfrak{s} , for $\ell = 1, 2$.

There is no problem to carry the definition (concerning clause (d), it follows by 4.5 below).

Before we continue note

- 4.5 Claim.** 1) If $(M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{bs}}$ then $(M, N, a) \notin K_\lambda^{3,\text{uq}}$ iff for some $(M', N', a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{bs}}$ we have $(M, N, a) \leq_{\text{bs}} (M', N', a)$ and $\neg \text{NF}_\mathfrak{s}(M, N, M', N')$.
 2) If $(M_\ell, N_\ell, a) <_{\text{bs}}^* (M_{\ell+1}, N_{\ell+1}, a)$ for $\ell = 0, 1$ then (M_2, N_2, a) is universal over (M_0, N_0, a) for \leq_{bs} .

Proof. By the definition of $K_\lambda^{3,\text{uq}}$ and the uniqueness and existence of NF-amalgamation by II§6 (i.e., any two NF ones are compatible), the conclusion follows. $\square_{4.5}$

Continuation of the proof of 4.3

By clause (e), necessarily $M'_\ell =: \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} M_{\ell,\alpha} \in K_{\lambda^+}^\mathfrak{s}$ are saturated for $\ell = 0, 1$.

Also $M'_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}[\mathfrak{s}]} M'_1$ and by clause (b) we have $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a, M'_0, M'_1) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M'_0)$ is a stationarization of $p \upharpoonright M_{0,0}$, i.e., is witnessed by it. So without loss of generality $M'_0 = M_0$ and $\text{tp}(a, M'_0, M'_1) = p$ and by 1.7, clause (b) we have $M_0 \leq_{\lambda^+}^* M_1$, so by its definition (see II.?) for some club E of λ^+ we have $\alpha \in E$ & $\alpha < \beta \in E \Rightarrow \text{NF}_\mathfrak{s}(M_{0,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha}, M_{0,\beta}, M_{1,\beta})$, hence by monotonicity of $\text{NF}_\mathfrak{s}$ and clause (d) of the construction we have $\alpha \in E \Rightarrow (M_{0,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha}, a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{uq}}$. By renaming we get the conclusion. $\square_{4.3}$

4.6 Claim. 1) Assume $\beta < \lambda^+$, $\langle M_i : i \leq \beta \rangle$ is $\leq_\mathfrak{s}$ -increasing continuous and $(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_\mathfrak{s}^{3,\text{bs}}$ for $i < \beta$ and $M_0 \leq_\mathfrak{s} M^+$. Then we can find $\langle N_i : i \leq \beta \rangle$ such that:

- (i) $M_i \leq_\mathfrak{s} N_i$
- (ii) N_i is $\leq_\mathfrak{s}$ -increasing continuous

- (iii) $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, N_i, N_{i+1})$ does not fork over M_i
- (iv) $(N_i, N_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$
- (v) M^+ can be $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedded into N_0 over M_0
- (vi) N_i is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_i for $i \leq \beta$

2) Assume further $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M^+, M_{\beta}, M^*)$, e.g. $M^+ = M_0, M_{\beta} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M^*$, then we can replace (v) by

- (v)⁺ $M^+ \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_0$ and $M^* \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_{\beta}$.

Proof. 1) We try to choose by induction on $\zeta < \lambda^+$ a sequence $\bar{M}^{\zeta} = \langle M_i^{\zeta} : i \leq \beta \rangle$ such that

- (a) \bar{M}^{ζ} is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (b) $\bar{M}^0 = \langle M_i : i \leq \beta \rangle$
- (c) for each $i < \beta$ the sequence $\langle M_i^{\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \zeta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (d) $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M_i^{\zeta}, M_{i+1}^{\zeta})$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_i^{\zeta})$ and does not fork over M_i^0
- (e) if $\zeta = 1$ then M^+ can be $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedded into M_0^{ζ} over $M_0 = M_0^0$
- (f) if $\zeta = \varepsilon + 1$ and ε limit, then for some $i < \beta$ we have $\neg \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i^{\varepsilon}, M_{i+1}^{\varepsilon}, M_i^{\zeta}, M_{i+1}^{\zeta})$
- (g) if $\zeta = \varepsilon + 2$ then M_i^{ζ} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_i^{\varepsilon+1}$.

There is no problem to define for $\zeta = 0, \zeta = 1$ and ζ limit. For $\zeta = \varepsilon + 1, \varepsilon$ not limit straightforward as in Chapter II, so assume ε is limit, if we cannot proceed then ε is a limit ordinal and we are done: let $\langle N_i : i \leq \beta \rangle = \langle M_i^{\zeta} : i \leq \beta \rangle$. If we succeed to carry the induction for all $\zeta < \lambda^+$. Now we have \mathfrak{s} is successful (we use the second demand (b) of ?(3)), for each $i < \beta$ for some club E_i of λ^+ , for every $\varepsilon < \zeta$ from E we have

\rightarrow $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i^{\varepsilon}, M_{i+1}^{\varepsilon}, M_i^{\zeta}, M_{i+1}^{\zeta})$. Let $\varepsilon < \zeta$ be successive members of $E = \cap \{E_i : i < \beta\}$, so by monotonicity of non-forking we have $i < \beta \Rightarrow \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i^{\varepsilon}, N_{i+1}^{\varepsilon}, M_i^{\varepsilon+1}, M_{i+1}^{\varepsilon+1})$, contradiction to the construction.

2) Similarly with the following changes: we let $M_{\beta+1}^0 = M_{\beta}^0$, in the demand above we have $\bar{M}^{\zeta} = \langle M_i^{\zeta} : i \leq \beta + 1 \rangle$ and

- (e)' if $\zeta = 1$ then $M^+ \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_0^{\zeta}, M^* \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{\beta+1}^{\zeta}$
- (h) if $\zeta = \varepsilon + 2$ and $M_{\beta}^{\varepsilon} \neq M_{\beta+1}^{\varepsilon}$ then for some $b \in M_{\beta+1}^{\varepsilon} \setminus M_{\beta}^{\varepsilon}$ the type $\text{tp}(b, M_{\beta}^{\varepsilon+1}, M_{\beta+1}^{\varepsilon+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_{\beta}^{\varepsilon+1})$ forks M_{β}^{ε} .

Alternatively for every $\zeta \geq 1$, $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0^0, M_0^\zeta, M_\beta^0, M_\beta^\zeta)$ hence $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0^0, M_0^1, M_\beta^0, M_\beta^\zeta)$ over $M_0^1 \cup B_\beta^0$ (using uniqueness of NF).

As $\cup\{M_\beta^\zeta : \zeta < \lambda^+\}$ is saturated we can embed M^* into this union hence into $M_\beta^{\zeta(1)}$ for some $\zeta(1)$. In the end of the proof of (1) demand $\zeta > \zeta(1)$. $\square_{4.6}$

4.7 Claim. Assume $(*)_{\bar{M}}$ holds (see below) and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ then we can find \bar{N} and a such that $(*)_{\bar{N}, \bar{M}}$ holds, where:

- $(*)_{\bar{N}, \bar{M}}$ $\ell g(\bar{N}) = \ell g(\bar{M})$, $M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_i$ are from $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$, \bar{N} is $<_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing, $a \in N_0$, $\text{tp}(a, M_i, N_i)$ is a nonforking extension of p and $(M_i, N_i, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ for every $i < \ell g(\bar{M})$ and N_{i+1} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over N_i and N_0 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed
- $(*)_{\bar{M}}$ $\bar{M} = \langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, $\alpha \leq \lambda^+$, M_0 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed and M_{i+1} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_i for i such that $i + 1 < \alpha$ (hence $[i < j < \alpha \Rightarrow M_j$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_i]$) and if α is limit, then $[i < \alpha \Rightarrow \cup\{M_j : j < \alpha\}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_i]$.

Proof. By the proof of 4.3 (let $\langle \alpha_\zeta : \zeta \in [1, \delta] \rangle$ be increasing continuous with $\alpha_\zeta \in E$, $\alpha_1 > \text{Min}(E)$, let $\alpha_0 = 0$, let $N_\zeta = M_{1, \alpha_\zeta}$, for $\zeta > 0$ and lastly find $N_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{1, \text{Min}(E)}$. $\square_{4.7}$

4.8 Conclusion: 1) $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ is \leq_{bs}^* -dense in $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bs}}$, also $<_{\text{bs}}^* \subseteq \leq_{\text{bs}}$ (both by their definitions).

2) If $(M_1, N_1, a) <_{\text{bs}}^* (M_2, N_2, a) \leq_{\text{bs}} (M_3, N_3, a)$ then $(M_1, N_1, a) <_{\text{bs}}^* (M_3, N_3, a)$.

3) If $(M_1, N_1, a) \leq_{\text{bs}} (M_2, N_2, a) <_{\text{bs}}^* (M_3, N_3, a)$ then $(M_1, N_1, a) <_{\text{bs}}^* (M_3, N_3, a)$ and $(M_1, N_1, a) \leq_{\text{bs}} (M_3, N_3, a)$.

4) If $\delta < \lambda^+$ is a limit ordinal, $(M_i, N_i, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bs}}$ for $i < \delta$ is $<_{\text{bs}}^*$ -increasing then $(M_i, N_i, a) <_{\text{bs}}^* (\bigcup_{j < \delta} M_j, \bigcup_{j < \delta} N_j, a) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{bs}}$.

4.9 Claim. (Prime Existence) 1) If $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$, $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M)$, then there are $N \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ and an element a satisfying $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{3, \text{pr}}$. This means that if $M \leq_{\mathfrak{R}} M' \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$, $a' \in N'$ realizes p then there is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{R}}$ -embedding f of N into M such that $f \upharpoonright M = \text{id}_M$, $f(a) = a'$.

2) In fact if (M, N, a) is like (M_0, M_1, a) of 4.3 then this holds, i.e., (M, N, a) is canonical \mathfrak{s}^+ -primes are primes for \mathfrak{s}^+ .

Proof of 4.9. Let $M_0 = M$ and let $\bar{M}_0, M_1, \bar{M}_1, a$ be as in 4.3 and let $N = M_1$ and we shall prove that N, a are as required. So let $M \leq_{\bar{\kappa}} M' \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}, a' \in M', \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a', M, M') = p$. We define by induction on α a $\leq_{\bar{\kappa}}$ -embedding f_α of $M_{1,\alpha}$ into M' , such that $f_\alpha(a) = a', f_\alpha$ is increasing continuous and $f_\alpha \upharpoonright M_{0,\alpha} \equiv \text{id}_{M_{0,\alpha}}$. For $\alpha = 0$, as M' is saturated in $\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ (over λ) and a' realizes in M' the type $p \upharpoonright M_{0,0}$ this should be clear. For α limit take the unions. For $\alpha = \beta + 1$, there is a model $N_\alpha \leq_{\bar{\kappa}} M'$ from K_λ which includes $f_\alpha(M_{1,\beta}) \cup M_{0,\beta+1}$ and is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed for \mathfrak{s} over this set, there is such N as M' is saturated over λ . So as $(M_{0,\beta}, M_{1,\beta}, a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{uq}}$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_{0,\beta+1}, M')$ does not fork over $M_{0,\beta}$, we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_{0,\beta}, f_\beta(M_{1,\beta}), M_{0,\beta+1}, N_\alpha)$ hence by the definition of $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{uq}}$ we can extend $f_\beta \cup \text{id}_{M_{0,\alpha}}$ to a $\leq_{\bar{\kappa}}$ -embedding f_α of $M_{1,\alpha}$ into N_α .

So having carried the induction, $f = \cup\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$ is a $\leq_{\bar{\kappa}}$ -embedding of $M_1 = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} M_{1,\alpha}$ into M' over $M = M_0$ mapping a to a' , so we are done. $\square_{4.9}$

4.10 Claim. $(K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{uq}}, \leq_{\text{bs}}^{\mathfrak{s}})$ is λ^+ -strategically closed. Moreover, if $\delta < \lambda^+$ is a limit ordinal, $\langle (N_{0,i}, N_{1,i}, a) : i < \delta \rangle$ is \leq_{bs} -increasing continuous in $K_\lambda^{3,\text{uq}}$ and $N_{0,i+1}, N_{1,i+1}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $N_{0,i}, N_{1,i}$ respectively for each $i < \delta$ (equivalently, the sequence is \leq_{bs}^* -increasing continuous), then $(\bigcup_{i < \delta} N_{0,i} \bigcup_{i < \delta} N_{1,i}, a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{uq}}$.

Recalling

4.11 Definition. A partial order I is δ -strategically closed if in the following game the COM player has a winning strategy. A play last δ -moves, for $\alpha < \delta$ the INC player chooses $s_\alpha \in I$ such that $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow t_\beta \leq_I s_\alpha$ and then the player COM chooses $t_{\alpha,s}$ such that $s_\alpha \leq_I t_\alpha$. The player INC wins the play if or some $\alpha < \delta$ he has no legal move; otherwise, the player COM wins the play.

Proof. It suffices to prove the second sentence by 4.7 or 4.8. Let $\langle (M_{0,i}, M_{1,i}, a) : i < \lambda^+ \rangle$ and E be as constructed in 4.3 be such that $i = 0 \Rightarrow (M_{0,i}, M_{1,i}, a) = (N_{0,i}, N_{1,i}, a)$.

We now by induction on i choose f_i, α_i such that:

- (a) f_i is an $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of $N_{1,i}$ into M_{1,α_i}
- (b) f_i increasing continuous in i
- (c) f_i maps $N_{0,i}$ into M_{0,α_i}
- (d) α_i is increasing continuous, $i > 0 \Rightarrow \alpha_i \in E$

- (e) $\alpha_0 = 0$ and f_0 is the identity
- (f) $f_i(N_{1,i}) \cap \bigcup_{\gamma < \lambda^+} M_{0,\gamma} = f_i(N_{0,i})$
- (g) $N_{0,\alpha_i} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} f_i(M_{0,i+1})$.

Note that clause (f) follows automatically as $(N_{0,i}, N_{1,i}, a) \in K_\lambda^{3,\text{uq}}$ and non-forking amalgamation is disjoint. Also for limit i , clearly $f_i(N_{0,i}) = M_{0,\alpha_i}$ (check) and $\{a\} \cup M_{0,\alpha_i} \subseteq f_i(N_{1,i}) \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{1,\alpha_i}$.

Lastly f_i maps $(\bigcup_{i < \delta} N_{0,i}, \bigcup_{i < \delta} N_{1,\delta}, a)$ isomorphically into $(M_{0,\alpha_\delta}, M_{1,\alpha_\delta}, a)$ and maps $\bigcup_{i < \delta} N_{0,i}$ onto M_{0,α_δ} (see clause (g), i.e., the previous paragraph). The latter belongs to $K_\lambda^{3,\text{uq}}$, so (by 3.4(2) monotonicity for $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{uq}}$) we are done. $\square_{4.10}$

In 4.12(2) below we show how relevant situations in \mathfrak{s}^+ reflect to \mathfrak{s} .

4.12 Claim. 1) If $(M_0, M_1, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{3,\text{pr}}$ and $\bar{M}^\ell = \langle M_\alpha^\ell : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then for some club E of λ^+ we have

(*) if $\alpha \in E$ then $(M_\alpha^0, M_\alpha^1, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{uq}}$.

2) Assume $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_3$ and $a_\ell \in M_\ell$ and $p_\ell = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a_\ell, M_0, M_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. Then for a club E of λ^+ for every $\delta \in E$ we have

- (i) if $p_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ then $p_{\ell,\delta} = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_\ell, M_{0,\delta}, M_{\ell,\delta}) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{0,\delta})$ and $M_{\ell,\delta}$ (and $p_{\ell,\delta}$) are witnesses for p_ℓ
- (ii) if $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a_\ell, M_{3-\ell}, M_3)$ is an \mathfrak{s}^+ -nonforking extension of p_ℓ then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_\ell, M_{3-\ell,\delta}, M_{3,\delta})$ is an \mathfrak{s} -nonforking extension of $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_\ell, M_{0,\delta}, M_{\ell,\delta})$ (hence of $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_\ell, M_{0,\min(E)}, M_{\ell,\min(E)})$)
- (iii) if $\alpha \in \delta \cap E$ then $M_{\alpha+1}^\ell$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_α^ℓ for $\ell < 4$
- (iv) if $(M_0, M_\ell, a_\ell) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}+1}^{3,\text{uq}}$ then $(M_\delta^0, M_\delta^\ell, a_\ell) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{uq}}$.

Proof. 1) We can find M_2, a_2 such that $(M_0, M_2, a_2) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{3,\text{pr}}$ and this triple is canonically \mathfrak{s}^+ -prime, i.e., is as in 4.3 (with M_0, M_2, a_2 here standing for M_0, M_1, a there, of course) and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a_2, M_0, M_2) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a, M_0, M_1)$. There is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ -embedding of M_1 into M_2 over M_0 mapping a to a_2 so without loss of generality $a_2 = a$ & $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$. Let \bar{M}^ℓ be a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_ℓ for $\ell < 3$ and E a thin enough club of λ^+ . As $M_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_{\ell+1}$ for any $\alpha < \beta$ from E we have

$\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_{\alpha}^{\ell}, M_{\alpha}^{\ell+1}, M_{\beta}^{\ell}, M_{\beta}^{\ell+1})$ for $\ell = 0, 1$ and by the choice of M_2 for any $\alpha < \beta$ from E we have $(M_{\alpha}^0, M_{\alpha}^2, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$. By monotonicity of $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$, i.e., 3.4(2) as $M_{\alpha}^0 \cup \{a\} \subseteq M_{\alpha}^1 \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_{\alpha}^2$ we get $(M_{\alpha}^0, M_{\alpha}^1, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ as required.

2) Straightforward (for (iii) recall that $M_{\ell} \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is saturated (above λ) for \mathfrak{s}).

□_{4.12}

4.13 Claim. 1) $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{3, \text{pr}}$, then it is canonically \mathfrak{s}^+ -prime.

2) Uniqueness: if $(M, N_{\ell}, a_{\ell}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a_1, M, N_1) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(a_1, M, N_2)$ then there is an isomorphism f from N_1 onto N_2 over M satisfying $f(a_1) = a_2$.

Proof. 1) By 3.4(2) and 4.12.

2) By part (1), we know that (M, N_{ℓ}, a_{ℓ}) is canonically \mathfrak{s}^+ -prime. Now we build the isomorphism by hence and forth as in the proof of 4.9. □_{4.1}

It is good to know that also $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ reflect down (when we have it).

4.14 Claim. Assume that also \mathfrak{s}^+ is weakly successful so $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ is well defined. If $M_{\ell} \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $\bar{M}_{\ell} = \langle M_{\ell, \alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ does $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -represent M_{ℓ} for $\ell < 4$, then for a club of $\delta < \lambda^+$ we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_{0, \delta}, M_{1, \delta}, M_{2, \delta}, M_{3, \delta})$.

Proof. Without loss of generality M_{ℓ} is $(\lambda^+, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 for \mathfrak{s}^+ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and M_3 is $(\lambda^+, *)$ -brimmed over $M_1 \cup M_2$ (by density of $(\lambda^+, *)$ -brimmed recalling \mathfrak{s}^+ is a weakly successful λ^+ -good frame, and the existence property of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ and the monotonicity of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ and $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$).

Let $\langle N_{\ell, \alpha}, a_{\alpha}^{\ell} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be as in 3.8 applied to $\mathfrak{s}(+)$ for (M_0, M_{ℓ}) for $\ell = 1, 2$ (the length being λ^+ is somewhat more transparent and is allowed as M_{ℓ} is $(\lambda^+, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 for \mathfrak{s}^+ by 3.8(6)). As M_3 is $(\lambda^+, *)$ -brimmed over $M_1 \cup M_2$, without loss of generality we have $\langle N_{3, \alpha} : \alpha \leq \lambda^+ \rangle$ which is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ -increasing continuous, $N_{3, 0} = M_2, N_{3, \lambda^+} = M_3, N_{3, \alpha} \cap M_1 = N_{1, \alpha}$ and $(N_{1, \alpha}, N_{1, \alpha+1}, a_{\alpha}^1) \leq_{\text{bs}}^{\mathfrak{s}(+)} (N_{3, \alpha}, N_{3, \alpha+1}, a_{\alpha}^1)$; see II§6. For each $\alpha < \lambda^+, \ell \leq 2, 3$ let $\langle N_{\ell, \alpha, i} : i < \lambda^+ \rangle \leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -represent $N_{\ell, \alpha}$. Let $E_{1, \alpha}$ be a club of α such that $i \in E_{1, \alpha}$ implies $(N_{1, \alpha, i}, N_{1, \alpha+1, i}, a_{\alpha}^1) \in K_{\lambda^+}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_{\alpha}, N_{1, \alpha, i}, N_{1, \alpha+1, i})$ does not fork over $N_{1, \text{Min}(E_{1, \alpha})}$ hence $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_{\alpha}^1, N_{3, \alpha, i}, N_{3, \alpha+1, i})$ does not fork over $N_{1, \text{Min}(E_{1, \alpha+1})}$; note that $E_{1, \alpha}$ exists by 4.12. Let $E = \{\delta < \lambda^+ : \delta \text{ limit}, \delta \in \bigcap_{\alpha < \delta} E_{1, \alpha} \text{ and } M_{\ell, \delta} \cap M_m = M_{\ell, \delta} \text{ for } \ell < m \leq 3, (\ell, m) \neq (1, 2), M_{1, \delta} = N_{1, \delta}, M_{3, \delta} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} N_{3, \alpha, \delta} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} N_{3, \alpha, \alpha}, M_{0, \delta} = N_{1, 0, \delta} \text{ and } M_{2, \delta} = N_{3, 0, \delta}\}$. Now check. □_{4.14}

* * *

Discussion: By the above in the cases we construct good λ -frames \mathfrak{s} in II.?, \mathfrak{s} is essentially \mathfrak{t}^+ , \mathfrak{t} is almost good and we need that \mathfrak{s} is successful to get \mathfrak{s}^+ has primes; but \mathfrak{t} is close enough to being good and successful so that \mathfrak{s} itself has primes. In the other two cases of 1.5(1) there are primes for different reason: \aleph_0 is easier. As for the case we use [Sh 576] this is not clear.

4.15 Claim. 1) *If \mathfrak{s} is as in II.?, then \mathfrak{s} has primes.*
 2) *If \mathfrak{s} is as in II.?, II.?, i.e. Cases 2,3 of 1.5(1), then \mathfrak{s} has primes.*

Proof. 1) Like the proof of 4.9.

2) Using stability in \aleph_0 we can construct primes directly.

□_{4.15}

§5 INDEPENDENCE

Here we make a real step forward: independence (of set of elements realizing basic types) can be defined and proved to be as required. In an earlier version we have used existence of primes but eventually eliminate it.

5.1 Hypothesis. \mathfrak{s} is a good weakly successful λ -frame.

Remark. E.g. $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^+$, \mathfrak{t} is λ^+ -good and 1.5-successful, $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

5.2 Definition. Let $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ (hence from $K_{\mathfrak{s}} = K_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{s}}$).

1) Let $\mathbf{I}_{M,N} = \{a \in N : \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M, N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)\}$.

2) We say that \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, A, N) if $(*)$ below holds; when: $A = N'$ we may write N' instead of A ; if N is understood from the context we may write “over (M, A) ”; if $A = M$ and we may omit it and then we say “in (M, N) ” or “for (M, N) ”; where:

- $(*)$ $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}$, $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$, $M \subseteq A \subseteq N$ and we can find a witness $\langle M_i, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ and N^+ which means:
 - (a) $\langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -increasing continuous²
 - (b) $M \cup A \subseteq M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$, (usually $M \subseteq A$) and $N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$
 - (c) $a_i \in M_{i+1} \setminus M_i$, (if we forget to mention M_{α} we may stipulate $M_{\alpha} = N^+$)
 - (d) $\text{tp}(a_i, M_i, M_{i+1})$ does not fork over M ,
 - (e) $\mathbf{J} = \{a_i : i < \alpha\}$.

The name independent indicates we expect various properties, like finite character, so we start to prove them.

5.3 Claim. *Assume that $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$. Then \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_2) iff \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_1, M_3) .*

Proof. The if implication is trivial. The only if implication is easy by chasing arrows and using $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -uniqueness (and existence and 1.12). □_{6.14}

²note that omitting “continuous” makes no difference

5.4 Theorem. *Assume $M \leq_s N$ so are from K_s and $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}$.*

1) *The following are equivalent:*

(*)₀ *every finite $\mathbf{J}' \subseteq \mathbf{J}$ is independent in (M, N)*

(*)₁ *\mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N)*

(*)₂ *like (*) of Definition 5.4 adding*

(f) *M_{i+1} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_i \cup \{a_i\}$ for $i < \alpha$*

(*)₃ *for every ordinal $\beta, |\beta| = |\mathbf{J}|$ and list $\langle a_i : i < \beta \rangle$ with no repetitions of \mathbf{J} there are M_i (for $i \leq \beta$) such that $\langle M_j, a_i : j \leq \beta, i < \beta \rangle$ and N^+ which satisfy:*

(a) *M_i is \leq_s -increasing continuous, $M_0 = M$*

(b) *$M \leq_s M_i \leq_s N^+$ and $N \leq_s N^+$*

(c) *$a_i \in M_{i+1} \setminus M_i$*

(d) *$\text{tp}_s(a_i, M_i, M_{i+1})$ does not fork over M*

(e) *$\mathbf{J} = \{a_i : i < \beta\}$*

(f)₃ *M_{i+1} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed³ over $M_i \cup \{a_i\}$*

(*)₄ *like (*)₃ replacing (f)₃ by*

(f)₄ *$(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$*

(*)₅ *like (*)₄ adding*

(g) *if there is $M'_{i+1} \leq_s M_{i+1}$ such that $(M_i, M'_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$ then $(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$*

(*)₆ *like (*)₅ adding*

(h) *if $(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$ for each $i < \beta$ (holds e.g. if s has primes) then $M_\alpha \leq_s N$.*

(so in (*)₆ $\langle (M_i, a_i : i < \beta) \rangle$ is a witness for “ \mathbf{J} independent for (M, N) and it is an M -based uq-decomposition inside (M, N) see Definition 3.3).

2) *If $M \cup \mathbf{J} \subseteq N^- \leq_s N$ and $N \leq_s N^+ \in K_s$, then: \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N^+) iff \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N) iff \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N^-) .*

3) *If \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N) and $a_i \in \mathbf{J}$ for $i < \beta$ are with no repetitions,*

³omitting $\{a_i\}$ give an equivalent condition

$M_0 = M$ and $\langle M_i : i \leq \beta \rangle, \langle a_i : i < \beta \rangle$ are as in $(*)_4$ clauses (a)-(e), $(f)_4$ from part (1) and $M_\beta \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$, then $\mathbf{J} \setminus \{a_i : i < \beta\}$ is independent in (M, M_β, N) .

4) If $M^- \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M, M^- \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}, \mathbf{J}$ is independent in (M, N) and $\mathbf{J}' \subseteq \mathbf{J}$ and $[a \in \mathbf{J}' \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M, N)$ does not fork over $M^-]$, then \mathbf{J}' is independent in (M^-, N) ; moreover if $M^- \subseteq A \subseteq M$ then \mathbf{J}' is independent in (M^-, A, N) .

Proof. First note that part (2) is immediate by the amalgamation property, and also part (4) is straightforward so it is enough to prove part (1) + (3). Clearly

$$\boxtimes_0 (*_4 \Rightarrow (*_3)$$

[Why? We choose (f_i, M'_i) by induction on $i \leq \alpha$ such that M'_i is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, f_i is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of M_i into M'_i , f_i is increasing continuous, $f_0 = \text{id}_{M_0}$, $\text{tp}(f_{i+1}(a_i), M'_i, M'_{i+1})$ does not fork over M, M'_{i+1} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M'_i \cup \{f_{i+1}(a_i)\}$. By amalgamation without loss of generality there are (g, N') such that $M'_\alpha \leq N', g$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of N^+ into N' extending f_α . Renaming $g = \text{id}_{N^+}$ so clearly we are done.]

$$\boxtimes_1 (*_6 \Rightarrow (*_5 \Rightarrow (*_4 \Rightarrow (*_3 \Rightarrow (*_2 \Rightarrow (*_1 \Rightarrow (*_0)$$

[Why? The implication $(*)_4 \Rightarrow (*_3$ by $\boxtimes_0, (*_5 \Rightarrow (*_4$ as $K^{3, \text{pr}} \subseteq K^{3, \text{uq}}$ by 3.5(2) (as we assume 5.1, i.e., \mathfrak{s} is weakly successful). For the others, just read them.]

$$\boxtimes_2 \text{ if } \langle M'_i : i \leq \alpha' \rangle, \langle a_i : i < \alpha' \rangle \text{ and } N^+ \text{ are as in } (*_2 \text{ witnessing " } \mathbf{J} \text{ is independent in } (M, N) \text{"} \text{ then we can find } M''_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M'_i \text{ for } i \leq \alpha' \text{ such that } \langle M''_i : i \leq \alpha' \rangle, N^+ \text{ is as required in } (*_4 \text{ clauses (a)-(e), (f)}_4 \text{ of part (1)}$$

[why? choose $M''_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M'_i$ by induction on i such that M''_i is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, $(M''_i, M''_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $i \leq \alpha \Rightarrow M''_i \leq_{\mathfrak{R}} M'_i$, using the hypothesis " \mathfrak{s} is weakly successful" and " M'_{i+1} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M'_i ".]

Hence

$$\boxtimes_3 (*_3 \Rightarrow (*_4)$$

and similarly (recalling $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}} \subseteq K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$)

$$\boxtimes_4 (*_4 \Rightarrow (*_5).$$

Also if $\langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle, N^+, \langle a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ are as in $(*)_1$, i.e., satisfy clauses (a)-(e) of $(*)_3$ with α instead of β then we can choose (M_i^+, f_i) by induction on $i \leq \alpha$ such that M_i^+ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, f_i is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of M_i into M_i^+, f_i is increasing continuous, $\text{NF}(f_i(M_i), M_i^+, f_{i+1}(M_i), M_{i+1}^+)$ and M_i^+ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_i^+ \cup \{a_i\}$. Without loss of generality $f_i = \text{id}_{M_i}$ for $i \leq \alpha$. By renaming without loss of generality $f_i = \text{id}_{M_i}$ and by amalgamation without loss of generality $M_i^+ \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$. So

$$\boxtimes_5 (*_1 \Rightarrow (*_2).$$

We prove part (1) + (3) by induction on $|\mathbf{J}|$.

Case 1: $|\mathbf{J}| \leq 1$.

Trivial.

Case 2: $n = |\mathbf{J}|$ finite > 1 .

As \mathbf{J} is finite (and monotonicity of independence) clearly

$$\otimes_1 (*)_0 \Leftrightarrow (*)_1.$$

We first show

$$\otimes_2 (*)_2 \Rightarrow (*)_3.$$

As the permutations exchanging $m, m+1$ generate all permutations of $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$, above it is enough to show

$$\otimes_3 \text{ if } \langle M_k, a_\ell : k \leq n, \ell < n \rangle \text{ and } N^+ \text{ are as in } (*)_2 \text{ and } m < n - 1 \text{ and } a'_\ell \text{ is } a_\ell \text{ if } \ell < n \ \& \ \ell \neq m \ \& \ \ell \neq m + 1, \text{ is } a_{m+1} \text{ if } \ell = m \text{ and is } a_m \text{ if } \ell = m + 1, \text{ then for some } M'_\ell \text{ for } \ell < n \text{ we have } \langle M'_k, a'_\ell : k \leq n, \ell < n \rangle \text{ and } N^+ \text{ are as in } (*)_3.$$

Why does \otimes_3 hold? Let M'_ℓ be M_ℓ if $\ell \leq m \vee \ell \geq m + 2$.

As \mathfrak{s} is a good frame and $\text{tp}(a_{m+1}, M_{m+1}, M_{m+2}) \in \mathcal{S}_\mathfrak{s}^{\text{bs}}(M_{m+1})$ does not fork over M and $M \leq_\mathfrak{s} M_m \leq_\mathfrak{s} M_{m+1}$ clearly $\text{tp}_\mathfrak{s}(a_{m+1}, M_{m+1}, M_{m+2}) \in \mathcal{S}_\mathfrak{s}^{\text{bs}}(M_{m+1})$ does not fork over M_m and similarly $\text{tp}(a_m, M_m, M_{m+1}) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_m)$. Hence there are by symmetry M', M'' such that $M_{m+2} \leq_\mathfrak{s} M'', M_m \leq_\mathfrak{s} M' \leq_\mathfrak{s} M'', a_{m+1} \in M'$ and $\text{tp}_\mathfrak{s}(a_m, M', M'')$ does not fork over M_m and without loss of generality M' is $(\lambda, *)$ -saturated?? over $M_m \cup \{a_{m+1}\}$. As M_{m+2} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_{m+1} \cup \{a_{m+1}\}$ which include $M_m \cup \{a_m\}$, without loss of generality $M'' \leq_\mathfrak{s} M_{m+2}$ and, moreover, without loss of generality M_{m+2} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M'' hence over $M' \cup \{a_m\} = M' \cup \{a'_{m+1}\}$ (equivalently over M'); just think on the definitions. Let $M'_{m+1} = M'$ so \otimes_1 holds.

So (in the present case) we have

$$\otimes_4 (*)_0 \Leftrightarrow (*)_1 \Leftrightarrow (*)_2 \Leftrightarrow (*)_3 \Leftrightarrow (*)_4 \Leftrightarrow (*)_5.$$

Next

$$\otimes_5 \text{ part (3) holds.}$$

Why? By the induction hypothesis, it is enough to deal with the case $\beta = 1$, i.e., to prove that $\mathbf{J} \setminus \{a_0\}$ is independent in (M_1, N) assuming $(M, M_1, a_0) \in K_\mathfrak{s}^{3, \text{uq}}, a_0 \in \mathbf{J}$, also without loss of generality $\mathbf{J} \setminus \{a_0\} \neq \emptyset$ (otherwise the conclusion is trivial) hence

$n \geq 2$. Choose b_0, \dots, b_{n-2} such that they list $\mathbf{J} \setminus \{a_0\}$ and we can let $b_{n-1} = a_0$ and possibly increasing N let $\langle M'_\ell : \ell \leq n \rangle$ be such that $\langle b_\ell : \ell < n \rangle, \langle M'_\ell : \ell \leq n \rangle$ are as in $(*)_4$ clauses (a)-(e),(f) $_4$, they exist as we have already proved most of part (1) in \otimes_4 above in the present case. So $\text{tp}_s(a_0, M'_{n-1}, M'_n) = \text{tp}_s(b_{n-1}, M'_{n-1}, N)$ does not fork over $M'_0 = M$ so as $(M, M_1, a_0) \in K_\lambda^{3, \text{uq}}$ we can deduce that $\text{NF}_s(M, M'_{n-1}, M_1, N)$ by [600, §6], II.?. Hence (or see 5.5(2)) easily by the NF calculus for some $N^+, N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N^+ \in K_s$ we can find M_2, \dots, M_n such that $M_1 \leq_s M_2 \leq_s \dots \leq_s M_n \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N^+, \ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\} \Rightarrow \text{NF}_s(M'_\ell, M_{\ell+1}, M'_{\ell+1}, M_{\ell+2})$. By 1.12 $\text{tp}_s(b_\ell, M_{\ell+1}, M_{\ell+2})$ does not fork over M'_ℓ hence by transitivity of non-forking for $\ell < n-1$ the type $\text{tp}_s(b_\ell, M_{\ell+1}, M_{\ell+2})$ does not fork over M . So $\langle M_{1+\ell} : \ell \leq n-2 \rangle$ witness that $\langle b_0, \dots, b_{n-2} \rangle$ is independent in (M_1, N^+) . So by part (2), i.e., for $n-1$, clearly $\langle b_0, \dots, b_{n-2} \rangle$ is independent in (M_1, N) , so by part (4) we have shown part (3), i.e., \otimes_3 .

To complete the proof in the present case we need

$$\otimes_6 (*)_5 \Rightarrow (*)_6.$$

We do more: we prove this in the general case provided that part (3) has been proved.

So let $\langle a_i : i < \beta \rangle$ list \mathbf{J} with no repetitions and let $N^+, \langle M_i : i \leq \beta \rangle$ be as in $(*)_5$. The only nontrivial case is when $i < \beta \Rightarrow (M_i, M_{i+1}, a_\beta) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$. We now choose by induction on $i \leq \beta$ a \leq_s -embedding f_i of M_i into N such that $f_0 = \text{id}_{M_0}$ and $f_{i+1}(a_i) = a_i$.

Now f_0 is defined, if f_i is defined, then by part (3) which we have already proved for this case we know that $\mathbf{J} \setminus \{a_j : j < i\}$ is independent in $(M, f(M_i), N^+)$ so $\text{tp}_s(a_i, f(M_i), N^+)$ does not fork over M hence $f_i(\text{tp}(a_i, M_i, M_{i+1})) = \text{tp}_s(a_i, f(M_i), N^+)$. Hence f_{i+1} exists as $(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_\ell) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$ and the definition of $K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$. Lastly $\langle f_\ell(M_\ell) : \ell \leq n \rangle$ witnesses that $(*)_6$ holds.

Case 3: $|\mathbf{J}| = \mu \geq \aleph_0$.

Now we first prove what we now call $(3)^-$, a weaker variant of part (3), which is: replacing in the conclusion “independent” by “every finite subset is independent”, this will be subsequently used to prove the other parts, so by (1) we shall get part (3) itself; we prove $(3)^-$ by induction on the ordinal β (for all possibilities) and for a fixed β by induction on $|\mathbf{J} \setminus \{a_i : i < \beta\}|$ which without loss of generality is finite.

First, for $\beta = 0$ it is trivial.

Second, assume $\beta = \gamma + 1$ and let $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbf{J} \setminus \{a_i : i < \beta\}$ be pairwise distinct, and we should prove that $\{b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}\}$ is independent in (M, M_β, N) . Now by the induction hypothesis on β applied to $\langle M_j, a_i : j \leq \gamma, i < \gamma \rangle$ and $\{b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}, a_\gamma\}$ we deduce that $\{b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}, a_\gamma\}$ is independent in (M, M_γ, N) . Now the desired conclusion follows from the case with \mathbf{J} finite.

Lastly, assume β is a limit ordinal and let $n < \omega, b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbf{J}' =: \mathbf{J} \setminus \{a_i : i < \beta\}$ be pairwise distinct. We should prove that $\{b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}\}$ is independent in (M, M_β, N) . By the induction hypothesis on β we have $\varepsilon < \beta$ implies $\text{tp}(b_0, M_\varepsilon, N)$ does not fork over M , hence $\text{tp}(b_0, M_\beta, N)$ does not fork over M . By Claim 5.5(2) below we can find $\langle M'_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \beta \rangle$, \leq_s -increasing continuous and N^+ satisfying $N \leq_s N^+ \in K_s$ and $\text{NF}_s(M_\varepsilon, M_\zeta, M'_{1+\varepsilon}, M'_{1+\zeta})$ for $\varepsilon < \zeta \leq \beta, M'_\beta \leq_s N^+, M_0 \leq_s M'_0$ and $\text{tp}_s(a_\varepsilon, M'_{1+\varepsilon}, M'_{1+\varepsilon+1})$ does not fork over M such that letting $a'_0 = b'_0, a'_{1+\varepsilon} = a_\varepsilon, \bar{M}' = \langle M'_\varepsilon, a'_\zeta : \varepsilon \leq 1 + \beta, \zeta < \beta \rangle$ we have $(M'_\varepsilon, M'_{\varepsilon+1}, a'_\varepsilon) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $M_\varepsilon \leq_s M'_{1+\varepsilon}$ for $\varepsilon < \beta$; note that $1 + \beta = \beta$ as β is a limit ordinal.

Now

$\otimes_7 \{M'_\varepsilon, a'_\zeta : \varepsilon \leq \beta, \zeta < \beta\}$ is as in $(*)_4$ for (M'_0, N^+) .

[Why? As $\text{NF}_s(M_0, M'_0, N, N^+)$ by 5.3.]

Hence by the induction hypothesis on $n, \{b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}\}$ is independent in (M'_0, M'_β, N^+) so by part (4) also in $(M, M'_{1+\beta}, N^+)$ and recall $\text{tp}(b_0, M_\beta, N^+)$ does not fork over M while $b_0 \in M'_\beta, M \leq_s M_\beta \leq_s M'_{1+\beta}$, so easily $\{b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}\}$ is independent in (M, M_β, N^+) , i.e. by 5.6(1) below hence by the induction hypothesis (using parts (2) + (4) for the cases of finite \mathbf{J}) the set $\{b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}\}$ is independent in (M, M_β, N) as required so we have proved $(3)^-$

Next we prove $(*)_0 \Rightarrow (*)_4$ in part (1).

For proving $(*)_4$ let $\langle a_i : i < \beta \rangle$ be a given list of \mathbf{J} and we will find $N^+, \langle M_i : i \leq \beta \rangle$ as required; we do it by induction on β , i.e. we prove $(*)_4, \beta$. We now choose by induction on i a pair of models $M_i \leq_s N_i$ such that

- \square N_i is \leq_s -increasing continuous, $N_0 = N, M_i$ is \leq_s -increasing continuous, $M_0 = M$ and $i = j + 1$ implies $(M_j, M_i, a_j) \in K_\lambda^{3, \text{uq}}$ and every finite subset of $\mathbf{J} \setminus \{a_j : j < i\}$ is independent in (M, M_i, N_i) and $N_0 = N$ and N_i is \leq_s -increasing continuous.

Subcase a: For $i = 0$ there is no problem.

Subcase b: For i limit let $M_i = \bigcup_{j < i} M_j$, the least trivial part is the clause in \square on

independence. As for $i = \beta$ this clause is trivial, in fact $(*)_4, \beta$ is already proved. We can assume $i < \beta$ and let $\{a_{i_0}, \dots, a_{i_{n-1}}\} \subseteq \mathbf{J} \setminus \{a_j : j < i\}$ be with no repetitions. Now if $i < \mu$ then by renaming without loss of generality $\max[\{i_\ell : \ell < n\} \cup \{i\}] < \mu$ so we can use our induction hypothesis on μ . So we can assume $\beta > \mu \vee (i = \beta = \mu)$ and the case $i = \beta = \mu$ is trivial and can be forgotten, so as we are inducting on all listings of \mathbf{J} of a given length we have actually proved $(*)_0 \Rightarrow (*)_4, \beta$ for $\beta = \mu$,

so \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N) (as witnessed by some list of length $\mu!$). So we can apply $(3)^-$ and get that $\{a_{i_0}, \dots, a_{i_{n-1}}\}$ is independent in (M, M_i, N_i) as required.

Subcase c: For $i = j + 1$, as in \mathfrak{s} we know that $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ is dense (as \mathfrak{s} is weakly successful and good) we can find N_i, M_i as required and the induction assumption on i holds as we have proved the claims for finite \mathbf{J} .

So we have finished the induction on i , thus proving $(*)_0 \Rightarrow (*)_4$ for \mathbf{J} of cardinality $\leq \mu$. Hence we have part (1) for μ by $\boxtimes_1 + \boxtimes_4 + \boxtimes_5$ from the beginning, as $(*)_0 \Rightarrow (*)_4$ was just proved and $(*)_5 \Rightarrow (*)_6$ was proved inside the proof of the finite case. Hence we have proved part (1). Now part (3) for μ follows from (1) + $(3)^-$. So we have finished the induction step for μ also in the infinite case (case 3) so we have finished the proof. $\square_{5.4}$

Still to finish the proof of 5.4 we have to show 5.5(2), 5.6(1) below.

5.5 Claim. 1) [Assume \mathfrak{s} has primes.] If $\langle N_i, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ is a M -based pr-decomposition for \mathfrak{s} inside N (so $N_\alpha \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$, see Definition 3.3), $b \in N$, $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, N_\alpha, N)$ is a nonforking extension of $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N_0)$, then we can find $\langle N'_i, a'_j : i \leq 1 + \alpha, j < 1 + \alpha \rangle$ an M -based pr-decomposition for \mathfrak{s} inside N^+ , such that $N_i \leq N'_{1+i}, N_0 = N'_0, b = a'_0, a_i = a'_{1+i}, \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, N'_{1+i}, N'_{1+i})$ does not fork over $N_i, N'_\alpha \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+, N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$.

2) Similarly for uq-decomposition only $N_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N'_0$ (instead equality).

Proof. 1) Chasing arrows: first ignore $b = a'_0$, demand just $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a'_0, N_0, N'_1) = \text{tp}(b, N_0, N)$ and ignore $N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$. After proving this we can use equality of types.

In details, we choose by induction on $i \leq \alpha$ a pair (N_i^*, f_i) and b^*, a_i^* (if $i < \alpha$) such that:

- (a) f_i is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of N_i into N_i^*
- (b) N_i^* is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (c) N_0^* satisfies $(N_0, N_0^*, b^*) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b^*, N_0, N_0^*) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, N_0, N)$
- (d) $f_0 = \text{id}_{N_0}$
- (e) if $i = j + 1$ then $(N_j^*, N_i^*, a_j^*) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and $f_i(a_j) = a_j^*$
- (f) $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b^*, f_i(N_i), N_i^*)$ does not fork over N_0 .

For $i = 0$ just use “ \mathfrak{s} has primes”.

For $i = j + 1$ first choose $p_j \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N_j^*)$, a nonforking extension of $p_j^- = f_j(\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_j, N_j, N_{j+1}))$ and second choose N_i^*, a_j^* such that $(N_j^*, N_i^*, a_j^*) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_j^*, N_j^*, N_i^*) = p_j$ (using “ \mathfrak{s} has primes”), lastly choose $f_i \supseteq f_j$ mapping a_j to a_j^* using the assumption $(N_j, N_i, a_j) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and a_j^* 's realizing p_j .

For i limit take union.

Having finished the induction without loss of generality each f_i is the identity on N_i so $j < \alpha \Rightarrow a_j^* = a_j$. So $N_\alpha \leq_s N_\alpha^*$ and $N_\alpha \leq_s N$ and $\text{tp}(b^*, N_\alpha, N_\alpha^*)$ does not fork over N_0 (by clause (f)) and extend $\text{tp}_s(b, N_0, N)$; also $\text{tp}(b, N_\alpha, N)$ satisfies this so as K_s has amalgamation without loss of generality $b = b^*$ and for some $N^+ \in K_s$ we have $N \leq_s N^+ \ \& \ N_\alpha^* \leq_s N^+$.

Letting $N'_0 = N', N'_{1+i} = N_i^*$ we are done.

2) As in II§6.

□_{5.5}

Some trivial properties are:

5.6 Claim. 1) If $\langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is \leq_s -increasing continuous, and \mathbf{J}_i is independent in (M_0, M_i, M_{i+1}) then $\cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \alpha\}$ is independent in (M_0, M_α) .

2) If $\text{NF}_s(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_1) then \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_2, M_3) . If $\text{NF}_s(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3), M_0 \leq_s M_1^- \leq_s M_1, \mathbf{J}_1$ independent in (M_1^-, M_1) and \mathbf{J}_2 independent in (M_0, M_2) then $\mathbf{J}_1 \cup \mathbf{J}_2$ is independent in (M_1^-, M_3) .

3) [Monotonicity] If \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, A, N) and $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathbf{J}$, then \mathbf{I} is independent in (M, A, N) .

4) If \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_1, M_3, N) and $M_0 \leq_s M_\ell \leq_s M_3$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $c \in \mathbf{J} \Rightarrow \text{tp}_s(c, M_1, N)$ does not fork over M_0 , then \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_2, N) .

5) [s has primes]. Assume that $\text{NF}_s(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $\langle M_{0,i}, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ is a decomposition of M_2 over M_0 . Then we can find M_3^+ satisfying $M_3 \leq_s M_3^+$ and $\langle M_{1,i} : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ such that $M_{1,\alpha} \leq_s M_3^+, \langle M_{1,\alpha}, a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is a decomposition of $M_{1,\alpha}$ over M_1 and $\text{tp}(a_i, M_{1,i}, M_3^+)$ does not fork over $M_{0,i}$.

6) Similarly for uq-decompositions except that $M_1 \leq_s M_{1,0}$ (not necessarily equal).

7) The set $\{a\}$ is s -independent in (M, N) iff $(M, N, a) \in K_s^{3,bs}$.

Proof. 1) Should be clear (e.g., without loss of generality M_{i+1} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_i \cup \mathbf{J}_i$).

2) The first phrase is 5.2(2). The second phrase by chasing arrows.

3) Trivial.

4) Easy by the nonforking calculus.

5) As in the proof of the previous claim there is a sequence $\langle M_{1,i} : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ and a \leq_s -embedding f_α of $M_2 = M_{0,\alpha}$ into $M_{1,\alpha}$ such that $M_{1,0} = M_1, f \upharpoonright M_0 = \text{id}_{M_0}$ and $f_i(M_{0,i}) \leq_s M_{1,i}$ and $\text{tp}_s(f(a_i), M_{1,i}, M_{1,i+1})$ does not fork over $f(M_{0,i})$ and $(M_{1,i}, M_{1,i+1}, f_{i+1}(a_i)) \in K_s^{3,pr}$ (e.g., just choose $M_{1,i}, f_i = f \upharpoonright M_{0,i}$ by induction on $i \leq \alpha$). As $(M_{0,i}, M_{0,i+1}, a_i) \in K_s^{3,pr}$ also $(f(M_{0,i}), f(M_{0,i}), a_i)$ belongs to $K_s^{3,pr}$ hence to $K_s^{3,uq}$ hence $\text{NF}_s(f(M_{0,i}), f(M_{0,i+1}), M_{1,i}, M_{1,i+1})$ hence by long transitivity $\text{NF}(f(M_{0,0}), f(M_{0,\alpha}), M_{1,0}, M_{1,i})$. By the uniqueness of NF ,

without loss of generality f the identity and for some M_3^+ we have $M_{1,\alpha} \leq_s M_3^+$ and $M_3 \leq_s M_3^+$.

6) As in II§6.

7) Trivial by the definitions. □_{5.6}

* * *

5.7 Definition. 1) We say N is prime over $M \cup \mathbf{J}$ (for \mathfrak{s}), or $(N, M, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}}$ if:

(a) $M \leq_s N$ in K_λ

(b) $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}$

(c) if $M \leq_s N'$, $\mathbf{J}' \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N'}$ and \mathbf{J}' is independent in (M, N') and h is a one to one mapping from \mathbf{J} onto \mathbf{J}' such that $\text{tp}(a, M, N) = \text{tp}(h(a), M, N')$ for every $a \in \mathbf{J}$, then there is a \leq_s -embedding of N into N' over M extending h .

2) Let $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bs}}$ means that $M \leq_s N$ and \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N) , (see 5.2).

Some basic properties are

5.8 Claim. 1) [Assume \mathfrak{s} has primes.] If $M \leq_s N$ (in K_λ) and $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}$ is independent in (M, N) , then there is $N' \leq_s N$ which is prime over $M \cup \mathbf{J}$.

2) If \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N) and $\langle M_i, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ is an M -based predecomposition for \mathbf{J} of (M_0, N) (see Definition 5.7(2)), then M_α is prime over $M_0 \cup \mathbf{J}$.

3) $(M, N, \{a\}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}}$ iff $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{pr}}$.

4) If $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}}$ and $M \cup \mathbf{J} \subseteq N^- \leq_s N$ then $(M, N^-, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}}$.

Proof. 1) By 5.4(1), $(*)_1 \Leftrightarrow (*)_6$, letting $\langle a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ list \mathbf{J} we can find $M_i \leq_s N$ for $i < \alpha$ such that $\langle M_i, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ as in $(*)_6$ of 5.4. Now we can use part (2).

2) Let $M_0 \leq_s N^*$ and a one-to-one function $h : \mathbf{J} \rightarrow \mathbf{J}' \subseteq N^*$ satisfying $c \in \mathbf{J} \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(h(c), M_0, N^*) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_0, M_\alpha)$ and \mathbf{J}' independent in (M_0, N^*) be given. Let $h(a_j) = c_j$. We now define by induction on $i \leq \alpha$ a \leq_s -embedding f_i of M_i into N^* , increasing continuous with i and mapping a_j to c_j . For $i = 0$ this is given, for i limit take union. For $i = j + 1$, we know that $\text{tp}(c_j, f_j(M_j), N^*)$ does not fork over $N_0 = f_0(M_0)$ by 5.4(3) (because $(M_j, M_{j+1}, a_j) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{uq}}$ by 3.5(2)) and so as $\text{tp}(a_j, M_j, N_1)$ does not fork over M_0 and $f_0[\text{tp}(a_j, M_0, M_1)] = \text{tp}(c_j, N_0, N_1)$ clearly $f_j[\text{tp}(a_j, M_j, M_\alpha)] = \text{tp}(c_j, f_j(M_j), N^*)$. But $(M_j, M_{j+1}, a_j) \in K_{\lambda}^{3,\text{pr}}$ so we can find $f_i \supseteq f_j$ as required. So f_α is as required in Definition 5.7.

3) By the definition.

4) Easy, like in 3.4(1).

□_{5.8}

* * *

5.9 Claim. 1) If $(M_0, M_1, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{qr}}$ hence \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_1) and $N_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_1$, f_0 is an isomorphism from M_0 onto N_0 and $\{c_a : a \in \mathbf{J}\}$ is an independent set in (N_0, N_1) satisfying $\text{tp}(c_a, N_0, N_1) = f_0[\text{tp}(a, M_0, M_1)]$ for $a \in \mathbf{J}$ and of course $\langle c_a : a \in \mathbf{J} \rangle$ is with no repetitions then there is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding f of M_1 into N_1 extending f_0 and mapping each $b \in \mathbf{J}$ to c_b .

2) [Assume \mathfrak{s} has primes]. Assume $(M_0, M_1, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{qr}}$ and $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3, M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3$ and \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_2, M_3) . Then $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$.

Proof. 1) This just rephrases Definition 5.7.

2) We are allowed to increase M_1, M_3 , i.e. if $M_3 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M'_3, M'_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M'_3, M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M'_1$ and $(M_0, M'_1, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{qr}}$ then we can replace M_1, M_3 by M'_1, M'_3 . So by 5.8(2) amalgamation in $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and the definition of primes without loss of generality we can find $\langle M_i^0, a_j : i \leq \alpha, i < \alpha \rangle$ such that $M_0^0 = M_0, M_1^0 = M_1, M_i^0$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, $(M_i^0, M_{i+1}^0, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}} \subseteq K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ for $i < \alpha$ and $\langle a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ list \mathbf{J} with no repetitions. We now choose by induction on $i \leq \alpha, M_i^2, M_i^3$ such that:

- (α) M_i^2 is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (β) M_i^3 is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (γ) $M_0^2 = M_2, M_0^3 = M_3$
- (δ) $M_i^0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_i^2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_i^3$
- (ε) $(M_i^2, M_{i+1}^2, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$
- (ζ) $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M_i^2, M_i^3)$ does not fork over M_i^0
- (η) $M_i^0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_i^3$.

Why is this enough? For each i we have $(M_i^0, M_{i+1}^0, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ (by the choice of M_i^0, M_{i+1}^0, a_i we have $(M_i^0, M_{i+1}^0, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and use claim 3.5(2)). By this, [600, §6], II.? and clauses (δ), (ε), (ζ) and the definition of $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i^0, M_{i+1}^0, M_i^2, M_{i+1}^2)$. By the symmetry property of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i^0, M_i^2, M_{i+1}^0, M_{i+1}^2)$. As this holds for every $i < \alpha$ and clauses (α) + (β) by the long transitivity property of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ (see [600, §6], II.?(1)) we get $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0^0, M_0^2, M_{\alpha}^0, M_{\alpha}^2)$, which means $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_2, M_1, M_{\alpha}^2)$. Now by monotonicity we can replace M_{α}^2 first by M_{α}^3 then by M_3 so we got $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_2, M_1, M_3)$ as required.

Why is it possible to carry the induction? Having arrive to i the type $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M_i^2, M_i^3)$

does not fork over M by 5.4(3) and then we can find a $M_{i+1}^2 \leq_s M_{i+1}^3$ such that $M_i^3 \leq_s M_{i+1}^3$ and $(M_i^2, M_{i+1}^2, a_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$. Now by the definition of prime, there is a \leq_s -embedding f_i of M_{i+1}^0 into M_{i+1}^3 over M_i^0 satisfying $f_i(a_i) = a_i$. Chasing arrows without loss of generality $M_{i+1}^0 \leq_s M_i^2$. $\square_{5.9}$

5.10 Claim. *Assume $\langle M_i : i \leq \delta + 1 \rangle$ is \leq_s -increasing continuous and $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_\delta, M_{\delta+1}}$.*

- 1) *If $|\mathbf{J}| < \text{cf}(\delta)$ and \mathbf{J} is independent in $(M_\delta, M_{\delta+1})$ then for every $i < \delta$ large enough, \mathbf{J} is independent in $(M_i, M_\delta, M_{\delta+1})$.*
- 2) *If $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_\delta, M_{\delta+1}}$ is independent in $(M_i, M_{\delta+1})$ for every $i < \delta$, then \mathbf{J} is independent in $(M_\delta, M_{\delta+1})$.*

Discussion: At this point, if $\langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is \leq_s -increasing continuous $M_\alpha \leq N$, $a \in N$, $\text{tp}(a, M_\alpha, N) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_\alpha)$ does not fork over M_0 we do not know if there is $\langle N_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ which is \leq_s -increasing continuous $a \in N_0$, $M_i \leq_s N_i$ and $(M_i, N_i, a) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$. So we go around this. This claim is used in 6.14.

Proof. 1) For each $c \in \mathbf{J}$ for some $i_c \in \delta$, $\text{tp}_s(c, M_\delta, M_{\delta+1})$ does not fork over M_{i_c} let $i(*) = \sup\{i_c : c \in \mathbf{J}\}$ and use 5.4(4).

2) By 5.4(1) it suffices to deal with finite \mathbf{J} , say $\mathbf{J} = \{b_\ell : \ell < n\}$ with no repetitions. By the NF_s -calculus there is a \leq_s -increasing continuous sequence $\langle M_i^+ : i \leq \delta + 1 \rangle$ such that $\text{NF}_s(M_i, M_i^+, M_j, M_j^+)$ for any $i < j \leq \delta + 1$ and M_{i+1}^+ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_{i+1} \cup M_i^+$ for $i \leq \delta$ hence M_δ^+ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_δ see 1.17. Hence there is a \leq_s -embedding h of $M_{\delta+1}$ into M_δ^+ over M_δ , so without loss of generality $M_{\delta+1} \leq_s M_\delta^+$. As \mathbf{J} is finite and M_δ^+ is the union of the \leq_s -increasing sequence $\langle M_i^+ : i < \delta \rangle$ clearly for some $i < \delta$ we have $\mathbf{J} \subseteq M_i^+$ hence “ \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_i, M_i^+) ”. But $\text{NF}(M_i, M_i^+, M_\delta, M_\delta^+)$ hence by Claim 5.3 we deduce “ \mathbf{J} is independent in $(M_i, M_\delta, M_\delta^+)$ ” hence in $(M_i, M_\delta, M_{\delta+1})$ as required. $\square_{5.10}$

5.11 Claim. *Assume $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^+$, \mathfrak{t} a successful $\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}$ -good⁺ frame, $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}^+$.*

Assume further $M_\ell \in K_s$ and $\langle M_\alpha^\ell : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{t}]}$ -representation of M_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

If $M_0 \leq_s M_1$ and $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_0, M_1}$ then: \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_1) iff for a club of $\delta < \lambda$ the set $\mathbf{J} \cap M_{1, \delta}$ is independent in $(M_{0, \delta}, M_{1, \delta})$ (for \mathfrak{t}) iff for stationarily many $\delta < \lambda$, $\mathbf{J} \cap M_{1, \delta}$ is independent in $(M_{0, \delta}, M_{1, \delta})$ (for \mathfrak{t}).

Proof. By 5.4(1), applied to \mathfrak{s} and to \mathfrak{t} without loss of generality \mathbf{J} is finite.

Using (*) of Definition 5.2, the first clause implies the second clause (by the definition and 1.10) and trivially second implies third. So it suffices to assume the failure of the first and show the failure of the third. Let $\mathbf{J} = \{a_\ell : \ell < n\}$ without repetitions. We can try to choose by induction on ℓ a model $M'_\ell \leq_s M_1$ such that $M'_0 = M_0, (M'_\ell, M'_{\ell+1}, a_\ell) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$, moreover is as constructed in 4.9(1) + 4.3 and $\text{tp}_s(a_\ell, M'_\ell, M_1) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M'_\ell)$ does not fork over M_0 . We cannot succeed so for some $m < n$ we have M'_0, \dots, M'_m as above but $\text{tp}(a_m, M_m, N)$ forks over M_0 . Rename M_1 as M'_{m+1} and let $\langle M'_{\ell, \alpha} : \alpha \leq \lambda \rangle$ be a \leq_t -representation of M'_ℓ for $\ell \leq m+1$ and $M'_{0, \alpha} = M_\alpha^0, M'_{m+1} = M_\alpha^1$. Now by 4.13(1) for some club E of λ , if δ is from E and $\ell < m$ then $(M'_{\ell, \delta}, M'_{\ell+1, \delta}, a_\ell) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $a_m \in M'_{m+1, \delta}$ and $\text{tp}_s(a_m, M_{m, \delta}, M_{m+1, \delta})$ forks over $M_{0, \delta}$ while $M_{m, \delta} \leq_t M_{m+1, \delta}$. By 5.4(3) for \mathbf{t} we get $\{a_\ell : \ell \leq m\} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_{0, \delta}, M_{m, \delta}}$ is not independent. So we have gotten the failure of the third clause. $\square_{5.11}$

We can deal with dimension as in [Sh:c, Ch.III].

5.12 Definition. 1) Assume that $M \leq_s N$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$, then we let

$\dim(p, N) = \text{Min}\{|\mathbf{J}| : \mathbf{J} \text{ satisfies}$

- (i) \mathbf{J} is a subset of $\{c \in N : \text{tp}(c, M, N) \text{ is equal to } p\}$,
- (ii) the triple (M, N, \mathbf{J}) belongs to $K_s^{3, \text{bs}}$ and
- (iii) \mathbf{J} is maximal under those restrictions}.

We shall say more on \dim after we understand regular types but for now ??

5.13 Claim. Assume $M \in K_s$ and \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N^*) .

1) If $\text{tp}(a, M, N^*) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$, then for some finite $\mathbf{J}' \subseteq \mathbf{J}$ the set $(\mathbf{J} \setminus \mathbf{J}') \cup \{a\}$ is independent in (M, N^*) .

2) If $a \in N^*$ then for some finite $\mathbf{J}' \subseteq \mathbf{J}$ and M' we have: $M \cup \{a\} \subseteq M' \leq_s N$ and $\mathbf{J} \setminus \mathbf{J}'$ is independent over (M, M') in N^* .

Proof. 1) Let $\mathbf{J} = \{a_i : i < \alpha\}$, we prove the statement by induction on α . For $\alpha = 0, \alpha$ successor this is trivial. For α limit $< \lambda^+$ by the definition there is a \leq_s -increasing continuous sequence $\langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ such that $M_0 = M, M_i \leq_s N^+, N^* \leq_s N^+$ and $\text{tp}(a_i, M_i, M_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_i)$ does not fork over M_i . As in the proof of 5.10(2) without loss of generality $M_\alpha = N^*$.

Now for some $\beta < \alpha$, $a \in M_\beta$ and by the induction hypothesis on α for some finite $u \subseteq \beta$ we have $\{a_i : i \in \beta \setminus u\} \cup \{a\}$ is independent in (M, M_β) . Clearly by the Definition 5.2 the set $\{a_i : i \in \alpha \setminus \beta\}$ is independent in (M, M_α, M_β) . By 5.6(1) and the last two sentences $(\{a_i : i \in \beta \setminus u\} \cup \{a\}) \cup (\{a_i : i \in \alpha \setminus \beta\})$ is independent in (M, M_α) hence in (M, N^+) hence in (M, N^*) by 5.4(2). But the set is $\{a_i : i \in \alpha \setminus u\} \cup \{a\}$ so we are done.

2) Similar.

□_{5.13}

5.14 Claim. *Assume that $M \leq_s N$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$. Then any two sets \mathbf{J} satisfying the demands (i) + (ii) from 5.15(2) have the same cardinality or are both finite.*

Proof. By 5.13.

5.15 Definition. Let $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ means:

- (a) $M \leq_s N$
- (b) \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N)
- (c) if $N \leq_s M_3, M \leq_s M_2 \leq_s M_3$ and \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_2, M_3) then $\text{NF}_s(M, M_1, N, M_3)$.

So by 5.9(2)

5.16 Claim. 1) *If $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{qr}}$ then $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$.*

2) *If $(M_i, N_i, \mathbf{J}_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{qr}}$ for $i < \delta$, δ a limit ordinal $< \lambda_s^+$, M_i is \leq_s -increasing, N_i is \leq_s -increasing, \mathbf{J}_i is \subseteq -increasing then*

- (a) $(M_\delta, N_\delta, \mathbf{J}_\delta) \in K_s^{3, \text{qr}}$ when we let $M_\delta = \cup\{M_i : i < \delta\}$, $N_\delta = \cup\{N_i : i < \delta\}$, $\mathbf{J}_\delta = \cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \delta\}$
- (b) for $k < j \leq \delta$, $\text{NF}_s(M_i, N_i, M_j, N_j)$
- (c) $\alpha \leq j \leq \delta$ is a limit ordinal then $\text{NF}_s(\bigcup_{i < \alpha} M_i, \bigcup_{i < \delta} M_i, M_j, N_j)$.

Proof. 1),2) Clauses (b),(c) hold by 5.9(2).

5.17 Claim. [$\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^+, \mathfrak{t}$ a successful good $\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}$ -frame, so $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}^+$ and \mathfrak{t} satisfies Hypothesis 4.1].

Assume

- (a) $\langle M_{\alpha}^{\ell} : \alpha < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation $M_{\ell} \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (b) $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$
- (c) $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_1, M_2}$ is independent in (M_1, M_2) and let $\mathbf{J}_{\alpha} = \mathbf{J} \cap M_{\alpha}^2$.

Then $(M_1, M_2, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{qr}}$ iff for a club of $\delta < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ the triple $(M_{\alpha}^1, M_{\alpha}^2, \mathbf{J}_{\alpha}) \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}^{3, \text{vq}}$ iff for stationarily many $\delta < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ the triple $(M_{\alpha}^1, M_{\alpha}^2, \mathbf{J}_{\alpha})$ belongs to $K_{\mathfrak{t}}^{3, \text{vq}}$.

Proof. Like 4.9 we can prove “second implies first”. The second implies the third trivially, the third implies the second by 5.16(2), clause (a). If the third fails, without loss of generality the failure is for every $\alpha < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ in particular, $\mathbf{J}_{\alpha} \neq \emptyset$ and without loss of generality $M_{\alpha+1}^{\ell}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_{α}^{ℓ} for $\alpha < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+, \ell = 1, 2$.

By the definition of “ $(M_0^1, M_0^2, \mathbf{J}_0) \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}^{3, \text{vq}}$ ” we can find N_1, N_2 such that:

- (*)₁ (a) $M_0^1 \leq_{\mathfrak{t}} N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{t}} N_2$
- (b) $M_0^2 \leq_{\mathfrak{t}} N_2$
- (c) \mathbf{J}_0 is independent in (M_0^1, N_1, N_2)
- (d) $\neg \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{t}}(M_0^1, M_0^2, N_1, N_2)$.

Without loss of generality

- (*)₂ N_1 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0^1 in \mathfrak{t} .

Hence we can find $\langle N_i^{\ell} : i \leq \lambda \rangle$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\langle a_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ such that

- (*)₃ (a) $\langle N_i^{\ell} : i \leq \lambda \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{t}}$ -increasing continuous
- (b) $N_0^{\ell} = M_0^{\ell}, N_{\lambda}^{\ell} = N_{\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (c) $N_i^1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_i^2$
- (d) $(N_i^1, N_i^2, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}^{3, \text{uq}}$
(why? see II.?).

Now by induction on $i \leq \lambda$ we choose $(M_{1,i}, M_{2,i}, f_i)$ and if i is a successor also b_{i-1} such that

- (*)₄ (a) $\langle M_{\ell,i} : i \leq \lambda \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (b) $M_{1,i} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{2,i}$
- (c) $M_{\ell,0} = M_{\ell}$ or $\ell = 1, 2$

- (d) $(M_{\ell i}, M_{\ell, i+1}, b_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$ for $\ell = 1$
- (e) $\text{tp}_s(b_i, M_{2i}, M_{2, i+1})$ does not fork over $M_{1, i}$
- (f) f_i is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}[t]}$ -embedding of N_i^2 into $M_{2, i}$
- (g) f_i maps N_i^1 into $M_{1, i}$ and maps a_j to b_j for $j < i$
- (h) if $j < i$ then $f_i(\text{tp}_t(a_j, N_j^1, N_{j+1}^1))$ is a witness for $\text{tp}_s(b_j, M_{1, j}, m_{1, j+1})$.

For $i = 0$ this is trivial, for i limit take union. For $i = j + 1$, $q_j = f_j(\text{tp}_t, N_j^1, N_i^1) \in \mathcal{S}_t^{\text{bs}}(f_j(1_j))$ is well defined and so there is $p_j \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_{1, i})$ such that q_j witnesses it. Now use the existence of primes (?) for s to choose $b_i, M_{1, i}$ and as there we can choose f_i . The rest should be clear.

5.18 Claim. 1) If $M_0 \leq_s M_1 \leq_s N$ and \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, N) and $(M_0, M_1, M_1 \cap \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$, then $\mathbf{J} \setminus (M_1 \cap \mathbf{J})$ is independent in (M_0, M_1, N) .
 2) [s is successful.] If \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, N_0) , then we can find (M_1, N_1) such that:

- (a) $M_0 \leq_s M_1 \leq_s N_1, M_0 \leq_s N_0 \leq_s N_1$
- (b) M_1 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0
- (c) N_1 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over N_0
- (d) $(M_1, N_1, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$
- (e) $\text{tp}(c, M_1, N_1)$ does not fork over M_0 for every $c \in \mathbf{J}$ so \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_1, N_1) .

[Similarly for towers?]

Proof. 1) Let $\mathbf{J}_1 = M_1 \cap \mathbf{J}$ and let it be $\{a_i : i < \alpha\}$. As \mathbf{J}_1 is independent in (M_0, M_1) (by monotonicity 5.6(3)) by Theorem 5.4 we can find a \leq_s -increasing continuous sequence $\langle M_{1, i} : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ such that $M_0 \leq_s M_{1, 0}, M_1 \leq_s M_{1, \alpha}$ and $(M_{1, i}, M_{1, \alpha}, a_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $\text{tp}(a_i, M_{1, i}, M_{1, i+1})$ does not fork over M_0 .

By the existence of NF-amalgamation without loss of generality for some N^+ we have $\text{NF}_s(M_1, M_{1, \alpha}, N, N^+)$.

Now $\langle M_{1, i} : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ witness then $\mathbf{J}_1 = \{a_i : i < \alpha\}$ is independent in $(M_0, M_{1, 0}, M_{1, \alpha})$ so as $(M_0, M_1, \mathbf{J}_1) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ by the assumption of the claim definition we have $\text{NF}_s(M_0, M_{1, 0}, M_1, M_{1, \alpha})$. By the transitivity of NF we get $\text{NF}_s(M_0, M_{1, 0}, N, N^+)$. So as \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, N) by Claim 5.3 we get that \mathbf{J} is independent in $(M_0, M_{1, \alpha}, N^+)$.

By 5.4(3) and the properties of $\langle M_{1, i}, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ we can deduce that $\mathbf{J} \setminus \{a_j : j < \alpha\} = \mathbf{J} \setminus \mathbf{J}_1 = \mathbf{J} \setminus (M_1 \cap \mathbf{J})$ is independent in $(M_0, M_{1, \alpha}, N^+)$ hence by

monotonicity in (M_0, N) as required.

2) We try to choose by induction on $\zeta < \lambda_s^+$, a pair (M'_ζ, N'_ζ) such that:

- (*)₁ $(M'_0, N'_0) = (M_0, N_0)$
- (*)₂ M'_ζ is \leq_s -increasing continuous,
- (*)₃ N'_ζ is \leq_s -increasing continuous
- (*)₄ $M'_\zeta \leq_s N'_\zeta$, \mathbf{J} is independent in $(M_0, M'_\zeta, N'_\zeta)$
- (*)₅ $\neg \text{NF}_s(M'_\zeta, N'_\zeta, M'_{\zeta+1}, N'_{\zeta+1})$ for ζ even
- (*)₆ $M'_{\zeta+1}$ is saturated over M'_ζ and $N'_{\zeta+1}$ is saturated over N'_ζ if ζ is odd.

There are no problems in successor stages and for limit stages use 5.10(2).

We necessarily (by §1) get stuck for some ζ and (M'_ζ, N'_ζ) can serve as (M_1, N_1) .

□_{5.18}

§6 ORTHOGONALITY

Note that presently the case “orthogonality = weak orthogonality” is the main one for us. In the latter part of the section “ \mathfrak{s} has primes” is usually used and we shall later weaken this, but this is not a serious flaw here.

6.1 Hypothesis. 1) \mathfrak{s} is a λ -good⁺ frame, weakly successful.

6.2 Definition. 1) For $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ we say that they are weakly orthogonal, $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q$ when: if $(M, N, b) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $\text{tp}(b, M, N) = q$ then p has a unique extension in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(N)$ equivalently, every extension of p in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(N)$ does not fork over M ; note: the order of p, q is seemingly important. (In the first order case the symmetry is essentially by the definition and here it will be proved).

2) For $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ we say that they are strongly orthogonal, $p \perp_{\text{st}} q$ or $p \perp q$ iff p_1, q_1 are weakly orthogonal whenever $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1$ and $p_1, q_1 \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ is a nonforking extension of p, q respectively.

3) If $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M), q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N), M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ orthogonality of p and q means p', q are orthogonal where $p' \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N)$ is the unique nonforking extension of p . Similarly, if $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N), q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$.

Naturally we now show that the definition is equivalent to some variants (e.g. for some such pair (N, a) rather than all such (N, a)).

6.3 Claim. *Assume that $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ and $(M, N, b) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $q = \text{tp}(b, M, N)$. Then $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q$ iff p has a unique extension in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(N)$.*

Proof. The implication \Rightarrow holds by the “every” in the definition. So assume p has a unique extension in $\mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N)$ and we shall prove $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q$.

So assume $(M, N_2, b_2) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b_2, M, N_2) = q$ and let $p_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(N_2)$ extend p . So there is $N^+ \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $a \in N^+$ such that $N_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$ and a realizes p_2 in N^+ . As \mathfrak{s} is weakly successful, possibly replacing N^+ by a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -extension, there is $N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$ such that $(M, N_1, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and without loss of generality $b_2 = b$ (as N, N^+ are $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -extensions of M and $b \in N, b_2 \in N_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$ realizes the same type so we can amalgamate) also without loss of generality $N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$.

Now as a realizes p_2 in N^+ it also realizes $p_2 \upharpoonright M$ which is p so $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, N, N^+)$ is an extension of p in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(N)$ hence by our present assumption it does not fork over M . We can conclude by Claim 1.18 that $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M, N, N_1, N^+)$, but $b \in N, \text{tp}(b, M, N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ hence by 1.12 $\text{tp}(b, N_1, N^+)$ does not fork over M . But

we have $(N, N_2, b) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ hence $\text{NF}_s(M, N_2, N_1, N^+)$ from which (as $a \in N_1$, $\text{tp}(a, M, N^+) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$) we deduce $\text{tp}(a, N_2, N^+)$ does not fork over M , but this last type is p_2 so we are done. $\square_{6.3}$

6.4 Claim. 1) Assume $(M, N, b) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$ or just $(M, N, b) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $q = \text{tp}(b, M, N)$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$.

1) If p is realized in N , then p, q are not orthogonal and even not weakly orthogonal.

2) Let $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$. Then $p \underset{\text{wk}}{\perp} q$ iff for some a, N' we have $N \leq_s N'$, $a \in N'$ realizes p and $\{a, b\}$ is not independent in (M, N') .

Proof. 1) The type p has at least two extensions in $\mathcal{S}_s(N)$: one algebraic, is $\text{tp}_s(a, N, N)$ where $a \in N$ realizes p and the second is in $\mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N)$, hence nonalgebraic, in fact a nonforking extension of p . So by 6.3 we have $p \underset{\text{wk}}{\perp} q$.

2) Let $(M, N, a) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$, $q = \text{tp}(a, M, N)$. If $p \underset{\text{wk}}{\perp} q$ then by 6.3 there is $p_1 \in \mathcal{S}_s(N)$ extending p forking over M , and let a, N' be such that $N \leq_s N'$, and $p_1 = \text{tp}(a, N, N')$; now by 5.4(3) we get $\{a, b\}$ is not independent in (M, N') ; so first phrase implies the second. If $p \perp q$ then $\{a, b\}$ is independent over M inside N' by the Definition 5.2. $\square_{6.4}$

6.5 Definition. Fixing $\mathfrak{C} \in K^s$, if $p_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_\ell)$ and $M_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[s]} \mathfrak{C}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, then let $p_1 \parallel p_2$, in words p_1, p_2 are parallel inside \mathfrak{C} , mean that for some M, p we have $M_1 \cup M_2 \subseteq M <_{\mathfrak{R}[s]} \mathfrak{C}$ and $M_2 \in K_s, p \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ does not fork over M_ℓ and extend p_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

Remark. If $M_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[s]} \mathfrak{C}$ and $p_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ we can define when $p_1 \perp p_2$ and prove the natural properties. Similarly for $p \perp M$ defined in 6.9 below.

Obvious properties of parallelism are

6.6 Claim. 1) Parallelism inside $\mathfrak{C} \in K^s$ is an equivalence relation.

2) If $M \in K_s$, then on $\mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$, parallelism is equality.

Proof. Easy.

6.7 Claim. 1) If $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ and f as an isomorphism from M onto N then $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q \Leftrightarrow f(p) \perp_{\text{wk}} f(q)$. Similarly for \perp .

2) If $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ then $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q \Leftrightarrow q \perp_{\text{wk}} p$. Similarly for \perp .

3) Assume that $M, N \in K_s$ are brimmed (e.g. K_s categorical). If $M \leq_s N$, and $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N)$ do not fork over M , then $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q \Leftrightarrow (p \upharpoonright M) \perp_{\text{wk}} (q \upharpoonright M)$.

4) Assume $M, N \in K_s$ are brimmed. If $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ and $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N)$ and $M \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[s]} \mathfrak{C}, N \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[s]} \mathfrak{C}$ and $p_1 \parallel q_1, p_2 \parallel q_2$ inside \mathfrak{C} then $p_1 \perp_{\text{wk}} p_2 \Leftrightarrow q_1 \perp_{\text{wk}} q_2$.

Hence $p_1 \perp p_2 \Leftrightarrow q_1 \perp q_2 \Leftrightarrow p_1 \perp_{\text{wk}} p_2$.

5) If $\langle M_i, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ is an M_0 -based pr-decomposition or just uq-decomposition of (M_0, M_α) and $p \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ is weakly orthogonal to $\text{tp}_s(a_j, M_j, M_{j+1})$ for every $j < \alpha$ then p has a unique extension in $\mathcal{S}_s(M_\alpha)$.

6) Assume $M_0 \leq_s M_1$ and $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ does not fork over M_0 . If $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q$ then $(p \upharpoonright M_0) \perp_{\text{wk}} (q \upharpoonright M_0)$.

7) If $M <_s N, N$ is universal over $M, p, q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N)$ does not fork over M and $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q$ then $p \perp q$ (hence $(p \upharpoonright M) \perp q$).

8) If $\langle M_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is \leq_s -increasing continuous; $\delta < \lambda_s^+$ and $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta)$ then $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q$ iff for every large enough $i < \delta, (p \upharpoonright M_i) \perp_{\text{wk}} (p \upharpoonright M_j)$.

Proof. 1) Immediate.

2) By 3.7 (alternatively follows from 6.4(2) + 5.4).

3) By 2.11 there is an isomorphism f from M onto N such that $f(p \upharpoonright M) = p, f(q \upharpoonright M) = q$ so the results holds by part (1).

4) The first phrase follows by (3) and the definitions (using a third model $(\leq_{\mathfrak{R}[s]}, \mathfrak{C})$ extending M and N). The second phrase follows by the first and Definition 6.2(2).

5) Let $M_\alpha \leq_s N$ and $c \in N$ realizes p . We prove by induction on $\beta \leq \alpha$ then $\text{tp}(c, M_\beta, N) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_\beta)$ does not fork over M_0 .

6) Assume toward contradiction $(p \upharpoonright M_0) \not\perp_{\text{wk}} (q \upharpoonright M_0)$. So there are $M_0 \leq_s N_1 \leq_s$

$N_2, b \in N_1$ realizes $q \upharpoonright M_0, (M_0, N_1, b) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $a \in N_2$ realizes $p \upharpoonright M_0$ but $\text{tp}(a, N_1, N_2)$ forks over N_0 . By our knowledge on NF without loss of generality for some N_3 we have $\text{NF}_s(M_0, M_1, N_2, N_3)$ hence a, b realizes p, q in N_3 respectively (see 1.12). By 5.6(4), if $\{a, b\}$ is independent in (M_1, N_3) then $\{a, b\}$ is independent in (M_0, N_3) . So N_1^+, N_3, a, b witness $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q$ by 6.4(2).

7) Follows by part (6).

8) Easy. □_{6.7}

- 6.8 Claim.** 1) If $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ does not fork over M_0 where $M_0 \leq_s M_1$ then $(p \perp q) \Leftrightarrow (p \upharpoonright M_0) \perp (q \upharpoonright M_0)$.
- 2) If $p \perp q$ then $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q$.
- 3) Assume that $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ is \leq_s -increasing continuous, $\delta < \lambda^+$ limit ordinal and $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta)$. Then $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q$ iff for every $\alpha < \delta$ large enough $(p \upharpoonright M_\alpha) \perp_{\text{wk}} (q \upharpoonright M_\alpha)$.
Similarly \perp .
- 4) If $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ and $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N)$ and $M \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[s]} \mathfrak{C}, N \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[s]} \mathfrak{C}$ and $p_1 \parallel q_1, p_2 \parallel q_2$ inside \mathfrak{C} then $p_1 \perp p_2 \Leftrightarrow q_1 \perp q_2$.
- 5) If K_s is categorical then \perp, \perp_{wk} are equal.
- 6) If $M \in K_s$ is brimmed and $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ then $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q \Leftrightarrow p \perp q$.

Proof. 1) The implication \Leftarrow is by the definition. For the other direction assume $p \perp q$ and $M_0 \leq_s M_2$ and $p_2, q_2 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_2)$ are nonforking extensions of $p \upharpoonright M_0, q \upharpoonright M_0$ respectively. Without loss of generality for some M_3 we have $M_2 \leq_s M_3, M_1 \leq_s M_3$ and let $p_3, q_3 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_3)$ be nonforking extensions of p_2, q_2 respectively hence of $p \upharpoonright M_0, q \upharpoonright M_0$ respectively. As $p \perp q$ we have $p_3 \perp_{\text{wk}} q_3$ and by 6.7(6) also $p_3 \upharpoonright M_2 \perp_{\text{wk}} (q_3 \upharpoonright M_2)$ which means $p_2 \perp_{\text{wk}} q_2$, as required.

2) Read the definitions.

3) By 6.3 and 5.10. For the last phrase use the proof of part (1).

4) By part (1).

5) By (6).

6) First assume $\neg(p \perp_{\text{wk}} q)$ then by the definitions $\neg(p \perp q)$, the counterexample is M itself.

Second, assume $p \perp_{\text{wk}} q$ and let N_1 be such that $M \leq_s N_1$ and $p_1, q_1 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N_1)$ be nonforking extensions of p, q respectively; we shall prove $p_1 \perp_{\text{wk}} q_1$, this suffices for $p \perp q$ hence finish the proof. Now there are N_2, p_2, q_2 such that $N_1 \leq_s N_2, N_2$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed and $p_2, q_2 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N_2)$ are nonforking extensions of p, q respectively hence $p_2 \upharpoonright N_1 = p_1, q_2 \upharpoonright N_1 = q_1$. By 6.7(4) we have $(p \perp_{\text{wk}} q) \equiv (p_2 \perp_{\text{wk}} q_2)$ so by our present assumption $p_2 \perp_{\text{wk}} q_2$ hence by 6.7(6) we have $p_1 \perp_{\text{wk}} q_1$ so we are done. $\square_{6.8}$

6.9 Definition. Assuming $M \leq_s N$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N)$, we let $p \perp M$ (p orthogonal to M) mean that: for any q , if $q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N)$ does not fork over M then $p \perp q$ (but see 6.10(1) below). Similarly for \perp_{wk} .

6.10 Claim. 0) Automorphism of any $\mathfrak{C} \in K_{\geq \lambda}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ preserves $p \parallel q, p \perp_x q, p \perp_x M$ for $x \in \{\text{wk}, \text{st}\}$.

1) If $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_\ell (\leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} \mathfrak{C}), p_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $p_1 \parallel p_2$ then $p_1 \perp M \Leftrightarrow p_2 \perp M$ (so we can write $p \perp N$ if for some $p' \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N')$ parallel to $p, M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N' \ \& \ p' \perp_x N$).

2) If $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N)$ where $N \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} \mathfrak{C}, M_\delta \leq \mathfrak{C}$ (so $N \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$) and $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow p \perp M_\alpha$ then $p \perp M_\delta$.

3) If $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ and $p_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M, N_1, N_2, N)$ and $p_2 \perp M$ then $p_2 \perp p_1$ (hence $p_2 \perp N_1$).

4) If $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_3), M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3$ for $\ell = 1, 2, p$ does not fork over M_2 and $p \perp_x M_1$ then $p \upharpoonright M_2 \perp_x M_0$ when $x \in \{\text{st}, \text{wk}\}$.

Proof. 0) Trivial.

1) Just note that if $q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M), q_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N_\ell)$ is a nonforking extension of q for $\ell = 1, 2$ then by 6.8(4) because by $q_1 \parallel q_2$ we have $p_1 \perp q_1 \Leftrightarrow p_2 \perp q_2$ and we are done.

2) Easy by the local character (i.e., Axiom (E)(c) of good frames) and 6.8(3).

3) By part (1) without loss of generality

(*) N_2 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M and M is brimmed.

Also we can find $\langle M_n, N_{2,n} : n < \omega \rangle$ such that: $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_n, N_{2,n}, M_{n+1}, N_{2,n+1}), M_{n+1}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_n, N_{2,n+1}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_{n+1} \cup N_{2,n}$ (by NF calculus). So (II.?) $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_{2,n}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $\bigcup_{n < \omega} M_n$ so by (*) above without

loss of generality $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_{2,n} = N_2$ and $\bigcup_{n < \omega} M_n = M$. So for some $k < \omega$ the type

p_2 does not fork over $N_{2,k}$. By the $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ calculus we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_k, N_{2,k}, N_1, N)$.

Recall \mathfrak{C} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over N , so we can find an automorphism f of \mathfrak{C} such that $f \upharpoonright N_{2,k} = \text{id}_{N_{2,k}}, f(N_1) \subseteq M_{k+1} \subseteq M$. Let $p'_1 = f(p_1) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(f_1(N_1))$ and let $p''_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ be a nonforking extension of p'_1 as $f_1(N_1) \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M$. Now $p''_1 \perp_x p_2$ as $p_2 \perp M$, hence $p'_1 \perp (p_2 \upharpoonright M_k)$ by 6.8(4). By part (0) we have $p_1 \perp (p_2 \upharpoonright M_k)$ and lastly $p_1 \perp p_2$ by 6.8(4).

4) Easy. □_{6.10}

Naturally, we would like to reduce orthogonality for $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^+$, to orthogonality for \mathfrak{t} .

6.11 Claim. Assume $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^+, \mathfrak{t}$ a successful $\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}$ -good⁺ frame, so $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}^+$.

Assume further $M_\ell \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\langle M_\alpha^\ell : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{t}}$ -representation of M and for simplicity each M_α^ℓ is brimmed (for \mathfrak{t}) and $M_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} \mathfrak{C}_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

0) For \mathfrak{s} we have $\perp = \perp_{\text{wk}} = \perp_{\text{st}}$.

- 1) If $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ then:⁴
 $p_1 \perp_s p_2$ iff for unboundedly many $\alpha < \lambda$ we have $(p_1 \upharpoonright M_\alpha^0) \perp_{\text{wk}} \mathfrak{t}(p_2 \upharpoonright M_\alpha^0)$ iff for every large enough $\alpha < \lambda$, we have $(p_1 \upharpoonright M_\alpha^0) \perp_{\mathfrak{t}}(p_2 \upharpoonright M_\alpha^0)$.
- 2) If $M_0 \leq_s M_1 \leq_s M_2$ and $a \in M_2 \setminus M_1$, then: $\text{tp}_s(a, M_1, M_2) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ and is orthogonal (for \mathfrak{s}) to M_0 iff for a club of ordinals $\delta < \lambda$ we have $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{t}}(a, M_\delta^1, M_\delta^2) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{t}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta^1)$ and is orthogonal (for \mathfrak{t}) to M_δ^0 iff for a stationary set of ordinals $\delta < \lambda$ we have $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{t}_0}(a, M_\delta^1, M_\delta^2) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{t}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta^1)$ and is $\perp_{\mathfrak{t}} M_\delta^0$.
- 3) In part (2), “for all but boundedly many $\delta < \lambda$ ”, “for unboundedly many $\delta < \lambda$ ” can replace “club of $\delta < \lambda$ ”, “stationarily many $\delta < \lambda$ ” respectively.

Proof. 0) By 6.8(5) and the definition of \mathfrak{t}^+ .

1) Without loss of generality for every $\alpha < \lambda, \ell < 2$ we have M_α^0 is \mathfrak{t} -brimmed and $p_\ell \upharpoonright M_\alpha^0 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{t}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\alpha^0)$ does not fork over M_0^0 (and so $p_\ell \upharpoonright M_\alpha^0$ is a witness for p_ℓ) hence by 6.8(4) for every $\alpha < \lambda$ we have $(p_1 \upharpoonright M_\alpha^0) \perp_{\mathfrak{t}}(p_2 \upharpoonright M_\alpha^0) \Leftrightarrow (p_1 \upharpoonright M_0^0) \perp_{\mathfrak{t}}(p_2 \upharpoonright M_0^0)$ and by 6.8(6) + transitivity of equivalence $(p_1 \upharpoonright M_\alpha^0) \perp_{\text{wk}} \mathfrak{t}(p_2 \upharpoonright M_\beta^0) \Leftrightarrow (p_1 \upharpoonright M_0^0) \perp_{\mathfrak{t}}(p_2 \upharpoonright M_\beta^0)$ for $\alpha, \beta < \lambda$.

Case 1: Assume that $(p_1 \upharpoonright M_0^0) \perp_{\mathfrak{t}}(p_2 \upharpoonright M_0^0)$.

As \mathfrak{s} has primes (by 4.9), we can assume that $M_0 \leq_s M_1 \leq_s M_2, a_1 \in M_1 \setminus M_0, p_1 = \text{tp}_s(a_1, M_0, M_1)$ and $(M_0, M_1, a_1) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$ and $a_2 \in M_2, p_2 = \text{tp}_s(a_2, M_0, M_2)$ and it suffices to prove that $\text{tp}_s(a_2, M_1, M_2)$ is a nonforking extension of p_2 . By 6.3 without loss of generality (M_0, M_1, a) is as in 4.9(1), 4.3 i.e., is canonically prime. So for a club E of λ , for every $\delta \in E$ we have:

- (*) $(M_\delta^0, M_\delta^1, a_1) \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $M_\delta^1 \leq_{\mathfrak{t}} M_\delta^2, a_2 \in M_\delta^2, \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{t}}(a_2, M_\delta^0, M_\delta^2)$ is a nonforking extension of $p_2 \upharpoonright M_0^0$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{t}}(a_1, M_\delta^0, M_\delta^1)$ is a nonforking extension of $p_1 \upharpoonright M_0^0$.

As we are assuming $(p_1 \upharpoonright M_0^0) \perp_{\mathfrak{t}}(p_2 \upharpoonright M_0^0)$ hence $(p_1 \upharpoonright M_\delta^0) \perp_{\mathfrak{t}}(p_2 \upharpoonright M_\delta^0)$ so we get by (*) and the definition of orthogonality that $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{t}}(a_2, M_\delta^1, M_\delta^2)$ is a nonforking extension of $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{t}}(a_2, M_\delta^0, M_\delta^2)$ hence it does not fork over M_0^0 . As this holds for every $\delta \in E$ clearly M_0^0 witness that $\text{tp}_s(a_2, M_1, M_2)$ does not fork over M_0 as required in this case.

Case 2: Assume that $(p_1 \upharpoonright M_0^0) \pm_{\mathfrak{t}}(p_2 \upharpoonright M_0^0)$.

We shall prove that $p_1 \pm p_2$. Let $M_0 <_s M_1, a_1 \in M_1, (M_0, M_1, a_1) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$ (recall that \mathfrak{s} has primes being \mathfrak{t}^+) and $p_1 = \text{tp}_s(a_1, M_0, M_1)$ and so as \mathfrak{t} is successful,

⁴here we use “ $K_\lambda^{3, \text{uq}}$ is dense” in definition of \perp

without loss of generality $\alpha < \beta < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_\alpha^0, M_\alpha^1, M_\beta^0, M_{1,\beta})$. By easy manipulation there is $q_2 \in \mathcal{S}_t(M_0^1)$ extending $p_2 \upharpoonright M_0^0$ which fork over M_0^0 . We can choose M_0^2, a_2 such that $M_0^1 \leq_t M_0^2, a_2 \in M_0^2$ and $q_2 = \text{tp}_t(a_2, M_0^1, M_0^2)$. Now we can choose inductively f_α, M_α^2 such that M_α^2 is \leq_t -increasing continuous, f_α is a \leq_t -embedding of M_α^1 into M_α^2 , increasing continuous with $\alpha, f_0 = \text{id}_{M_{2,0}}$ and $\alpha = \beta + 1 \Rightarrow \text{NF}_t(M_\beta^1, M_\beta^2, M_\alpha^1, M_\alpha^2)$. No problem to do it and at the end without loss of generality $\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} f_\alpha = \text{id}_{M_1}$ and let $M_2 = \cup\{M_\alpha^2 : \alpha < \lambda\}$. Easily

M_1, a_1, M_2, a_2 exemplifies $p_1 \pm p_2$; that is by 1.12 for every α , $\text{tp}_t(a_2, M_\alpha^0, M_\alpha^2)$ is a nonforking extension of $\text{tp}_t(a_2, M_0^0, M_0^2) = p_2 \upharpoonright M_0^0$, hence $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_2, M_0, M_2) = p_2$. We conclude $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_2, M_1, M_2)$ extends p_2 but is not its nonforking extension in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_1)$ as required for proving $p_1 \pm_{\mathfrak{s}} p_2$.

2) Without loss of generality $a \in M_0^2$ and for $\ell < 2, \alpha < \beta < \lambda$ we have

$\text{NF}_t(M_\alpha^\ell, M_\alpha^{\ell+1}, M_\beta^\ell, M_\beta^{\ell+1})$ hence M_0^0 is a witness for p . Clearly $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_1, M_2) \perp_{\mathfrak{s}} M_0$ iff for every $q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ we have $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_1, M_2) \perp_{\mathfrak{s}} q$ iff for each $\alpha < \lambda$ for every $q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ which does not fork over M_α^0 we have $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_1, M_2) \perp_{\mathfrak{s}} q$ iff for each $\alpha < \lambda$ for every $q \in \mathcal{S}_t^{\text{bs}}(M_\alpha^0)$, for every $\beta \in [\alpha, \lambda)$, the types $p \upharpoonright M_\beta^1$ is t -orthogonal to the nonforking extension of q in $\mathcal{S}_t^{\text{bs}}(M_\beta^0)$ iff for each $\gamma < \lambda$ we have $(p \upharpoonright \mathcal{S}_t^{\text{bs}}(M_\gamma^1)) \perp_t M_\gamma^0$. Thus we finish.

3) By monotonicity and 1.16. □_{6.11}

6.12 Claim. 1) Assume $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$.

If $M \cup \{a\} \subseteq N' <_{\mathfrak{s}} N, b \in N \setminus N'$ and $q = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, N', N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N')$ then q is weakly orthogonal to M .

2) [\mathfrak{s} has primes.] Assume $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bs}}$. We can find $\langle M_i, a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ for some $\alpha < \lambda^+$, which is a pr-decomposition of N over M with $a_0 = a$, i.e., such that:

- (a) $a_0 = a$
- (b) $M_0 = M$.
- (c) $M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (d) $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M_i, N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_i)$
- (e) stipulating $M_\alpha = N$ we have:
 $(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ for $i < \alpha$.

3) [\mathfrak{s} has primes]. In part (2) if also $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $\langle M_i, a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is as there then we can add

- (f) if $i > 0$ then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M_i, N)$ is weakly orthogonal to M .

4) If $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $M \cup \mathbf{J} \subseteq N' \leq_s N$ and $b \in N \setminus N'$ and $q = \text{tp}_s(b, N', N) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N')$ then q is weakly orthogonal to M .

Proof. (1) If $q \perp^{\text{wk}} M$ then for some c, N_1^+, r we have $N \leq_s N^+, c \in N_1^+, r = \text{tp}_s(c, N', N_1^+) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N')$ does not fork over M but $\{b, c\}$ is not independent in (N', N^+) (or $b = c$). Possibly \leq_s -increasing N^+ as $\text{tp}(c, N', N^+)$ does not fork over $M \leq_s N'$, clearly there is M' such that $M \cup \{c\} \subseteq M'$ and $\text{NF}_s(M, M', N', N^+)$. As $a \in N'$ and $\text{tp}(a, N') \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ this implies that $\text{tp}(a, M', N^+) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M')$ does not fork over M . As $(M, N, a) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ it follows that $\text{NF}_s(M, N, M', N^+)$, and this implies that $\{b, c\}$ is independent in (N', N^+) , by 5.6(2), contradicting the choice of c .

2) This is 3.8(1).

3) Follows by (part (2) and) part (1).

4) Like part (1). □_{6.12}

6.13 Claim. 1) [s has primes]. Assume $(M, N, a) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$. Then we can find $\langle M_i, a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ such that:

(a) – (d) as in 6.12(2)

(f) as in 6.12(3)

(g) $\alpha \leq \lambda$.

2) If in addition $s = \mathfrak{t}^+, \mathfrak{t}$ is a successful $\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}$ -good⁺ frame (so $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}^+$) then we can add

(h) for each $i < \alpha$, for any $\langle M_{\varepsilon}^i : \varepsilon < \lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}^+ \rangle, \langle M_{\varepsilon}^{i+1} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ of M^i, M^{i+1} respectively, for a club of ordinals $\delta < \lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}^+$ we have $(M_{\delta}^i, M_{\delta}^{i+1}, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}^{3, \text{uq}}$.

Proof. 1) Exactly as in 3.8(5), i.e., in the proof of 3.8(1) use a bookkeeping in order to get clause (g).

2) By 4.13(1). □_{6.13}

6.14 Claim. [s with primes.] Assume

(a) $\text{NF}_s(M_0, M_0^+, M_1, M_3)$

(b) \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_1, M_3)

(c) $\text{tp}_s(c, M_1, M_3)$ is orthogonal to M_0 for every $c \in \mathbf{J}$.

Then we can find M_1^+, M_3^+ such that:

- (α) $M_3 \leq_s M_3^+$
- (β) $M_1 \cup M_0^+ \subseteq M_1^+ \leq_s M_3^+$
- (γ) $\text{tp}_s(c, M_1^+, M_3^+)$ does not fork over M_1 for $c \in \mathbf{J}$
- (δ) \mathbf{J} is independent⁵ in (M_1^+, M_3^+) .

Before we prove 6.14 note that:

6.15 *Conclusion.* [\mathfrak{s} with primes.] If to the assumptions of 6.14 we add

- (d) $(M_1, M_2, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{qr}}$ or just $(M_1, M_2, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ and $M_2 \leq_s M_3$,

then we can add to the conclusion (in fact follows from it):

- (ε) $\text{NF}_s(M_1, M_2, M_1^+, M_3^+)$.

Proof. By 6.14 and 5.9(2) or by the definition.

Proof of 6.14. We can find $\langle M_i^0, a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ which is a decomposition of M_0^+ over M_0 and stipulate $M_\alpha^0 = M_0^+$. We can now choose by induction on i , (M_i^1, f_i) such that $M_i^1 \in K_s$ is \leq_s -increasing continuous, $M_0^1 = M_1, f_0 = \text{id}_{M_0}, f_i$ is an \leq_s -embedding of M_i^0 into M_i^1 , increasing continuous with i and $(M_i^1, M_{i+1}^1, f_{i+1}(a_i)) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$ and $\text{tp}_s(f_{i+1}(a_i), M_i^1, M_{i+1}^1)$ does not fork over $f_i(M_i^0)$. There is no problem to do this, (as in stage $i = j + 1$ first choose $p_i = f_i(\text{tp}_s(a_i, M_i^0, M_{i+1}^0))$ and then M_{i+1}^1 such that some $b_i \in M_{i+1}$ realizes p_i and as $(M_i^0, M_{i+1}^0, a_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$ we can choose a $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embedding of M_{i+1}^0 into M_{i+1}^1 extending f_i and mapping a_i to b_i). As $K_s^{3, \text{pr}} \subseteq K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ and the definition of $K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ easily $\text{NF}_s(f_i(M_i^0), f_{i+1}(M_{i+1}^0), M_i^1, M_{i+1}^1)$ hence by NF_s -symmetry $\text{NF}_s(f_i(M_i^0), M_i^1, f_{i+1}(M_{i+1}^0), M_{i+1}^1)$ for every i hence by long transitivity $\text{NF}_s(f_0(M_0), M_0^1, f_\alpha(M_\alpha^0), M_\alpha^1)$, and recalling $f_0 = \text{id}_{M_0}, M_0^0 = M_0, M_0^1 = M_1, M_\alpha^0 = M_0^+$ this means $\text{NF}_s(M_0, M_1, f_\alpha(M_0^+), M_\alpha^1)$. But also we assume $\text{NF}_s(M_0, M_1, M_0^+, M_3)$, hence by NF_s uniqueness without loss of generality for some $M_3^+, M_3 \leq_s M_3^+, f_i = \text{id}_{M_i^0}$ and $M_\alpha^1 \leq_s M_3^+$.

For $i < \alpha$ for each $c \in \mathbf{J}$, note that $\text{tp}_s(c, M_1, M_3)$ is orthogonal to M_0 (by a hypothesis). We prove by induction on $i \leq \alpha$ that \mathbf{J} is independent over (M_1, M_i^1) inside M_3^+ and for every $c \in \mathbf{J}$, $\text{tp}_s(c, M_i^1, M_3^+)$ (does not fork over $M_0^+ = M_1$ and) is orthogonal to M_i^0 . For $i = 0$ this is trivial for does not fork given for

⁵so (γ) + (δ) says that \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_1, M_1^+, M_3^+)

orthogonal. For i limit easy. For $i + 1$, as $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M_i^1, M_3^+)$ does not fork over M_i^0 , it is orthogonal to $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_i^1, M_3^+)$ for $c \in \mathbf{J}$ hence $\mathbf{J} \cup \{a_i\}$ is independent over M_i^1 . As $(M_i^1, M_{i+1}^1, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ we get $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_{i+1}^1, M_3^+)$ does not fork over M_i^1 hence over M_1 . Let M_1^+ be chosen as M_{α}^1 .

By 6.17 below we are done. $\square_{6.14}$

6.16 Remark. We can phrase the proof of $(\alpha) + (\beta)$ as a subclaim.

6.17 Claim. [\mathfrak{s} has primes.] Assume

- (a) $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{\ell} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (b) $\langle M_{0,i}, a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is a decomposition of M_2 over M_0
- (c) \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_1)
- (d) $\text{tp}(c, M_0, M_1) \perp \text{tp}(a_i, M_{0,i}, M_2)$ for $i < \alpha$ and $c \in \mathbf{J}$.

Then \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_2, M_3) moreovr in (M_0, M_2, M_3) .

Proof. We prove this by induction on $|\mathbf{J}|$.

By 5.4 without loss of generality \mathbf{J} is finite and let \mathbf{J} be $\{b_{\ell} : \ell < n\}$ where $n = |\mathbf{J}|$. If $n = 0$ this is trivial and let $\langle M_{\ell,0} : \ell \leq n \rangle$ be such that $M_{0,0} = M_0, M_{\ell,0} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1$ and $(M_{\ell,0}, M_{\ell+1}, b_{\ell}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$, so $\text{tp}(b_{\ell}, M_{0,\ell}, M_{0,\ell+1})$ does not fork over M_0 hence is orthogonal to $\text{tp}(a_i, M_{0,i}, M_{0,i+1})$ for $i < \alpha$.

We choose by induction on $\ell \leq n$, a sequence $\bar{M}_{\ell} = \langle M_{\ell,i} : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ and N_{ℓ}^* such that:

$$N_0^* = M_3$$

\bar{M}_{ℓ} is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous

$M_{\ell,0}$ as above

$M_{0,i}$ as above hence $M_{0,\alpha} = M_2$

$$(M_{\ell,i}, M_{\ell,i+1}, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$$

$\text{tp}(a_i, M_{\ell,i}, M_{\ell,i+1})$ does not fork over $M_{0,i}$

For $\ell = 0$ this is clear. For $\ell + 1$, $\text{tp}(b_{\ell}, M_{\ell,0}, M_{\ell+1,0}) = \text{tp}(b_{\ell}, M_{\ell,0}, N_{\ell}^*)$ is orthogonal to each $\text{tp}(a_i, M_{0,i}, M_{0,i+1}) = \text{tp}(a_i, M_{0,i}, N_{\ell}^*)$ hence to $\text{tp}(a_i, M_{\ell,i}, N_{\ell}^*)$ so by 6.7(5) we deduce that $\text{tp}(b_{\ell}, M_{\ell,\alpha}, N_{\ell}^*)$ does not fork over $M_{\ell,0}$ hence $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_{0,\ell}, M_{0,\ell+1}, M_{\ell,\alpha}, N_{\ell}^*)$ so by 5.6(5) we can choose $\bar{M}_{\ell+1}, N_{\ell+1}^*$. $\square_{6.17}$

Below the restriction $\gamma \leq \omega$ may seem quite undesirable but it will be used as a stepping stone for better things. Note that in the proof of 6.18(1), clause (c) in the induction hypothesis on $\langle M_i^n : i \leq \alpha \rangle$, primeness, is not proved to hold for $\langle M_i^{\omega} : i \leq \alpha \rangle$, though enough is proved to finish the proof, this is why the proof does not naturally work for $\gamma > \omega$.

6.18 Claim. *[\mathfrak{s} has primes.]*1) *Assume*

- (a) $\langle M_\beta : \beta \leq \gamma \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous with $\gamma \leq \omega$
- (b) $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_0^+ \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3^*$ and $M_\gamma \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3^*$
- (c) $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_0^+, M_3^*)$
- (d) if $0 < \beta < \gamma$ then $(M_\beta, M_{\beta+1}, \mathbf{J}_\beta) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{qr}}$ (so \mathbf{J}_β is independent in $(M_\beta, M_{\beta+1})$)
- (e) for every $\beta \in (0, \gamma)$ and $a \in \mathbf{J}_\beta$ the type $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_\beta, M_{\beta+1})$ is orthogonal to M_0 .

Then $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_\gamma, M_0^+, M_3^*)$.2) If $\langle M_\beta : \beta \leq \gamma \rangle, \langle \mathbf{J}_\beta : 0 < \beta < \gamma \rangle$ satisfy clauses (a), (d), (e) above and $(M_0, M_1, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$ then $(M_0, M_\gamma, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$.

Proof. 1) We choose $\langle M_i^0, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$, a decomposition of M_0^+ over M_0 (as in the proof of 6.14). Now by induction on $n \leq \gamma, n < \omega$ we choose $N_n^3, \bar{M}^n = \langle M_i^n : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $N_0^3 = M_3^*$ and $\bar{M}^0 = \langle M_i^0 : i \leq \alpha \rangle$
- (b) $N_n^3 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_{n+1}^3$
- (c) $\langle M_i^n, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ is a decomposition inside N_n^3 over M_n i.e., $M_0^n = M_n$
- (d) $M_i^n \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_i^{n+1}$
- (e) $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_j, M_i^n, N_n^3)$ does not fork over M_i^0 .

For $n = 0$ this is done. The step from n to $n + 1$ is by the first paragraph of the proof of 6.14 or 5.6(5), but for this we need to know that $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_n, M_{n+1}, M_\alpha^n, N_n^*)$. First if $n = 0$ this holds by clause (c) of the assumption as $M_\alpha^0 = M_0^+$. Second if $n > 0$ then holds by clause (ε) of 6.15 using 6.10(1). If $\gamma < \omega$ we are done.

So assume $\gamma = \omega$, and let for $i < \alpha, M_i^\omega =: \bigcup_{n < \omega} M_i^n$. Now for each $i < \alpha$, and $n < \omega$ we have (see the proof of 6.14), $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i^n, M_{i+1}^n, M_i^{n+1}, M_{i+1}^{n+1})$, hence by long transitivity of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ (see II.?) we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i^0, M_{i+1}^0, M_i^\omega, M_{i+1}^\omega)$. By symmetry we get $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i^0, M_i^\omega, M_{i+1}^0, M_{i+1}^\omega)$ for $i < \omega$. As $\langle M_i^0 : i \leq \alpha \rangle, \langle M_i^\omega : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ are $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, by long transitivity of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we get $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0^0, M_0^\omega, M_\alpha^0, M_\alpha^\omega)$ which means $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_\omega, M_0^+, M_\alpha^\omega)$ so by using monotonicity twice we get $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_\omega, M_0^+, M_3^*)$ as required.

2) By definition 5.15, Claim 5.9(2) and the first part of the claim. □_{6.18}

We could have noted earlier

6.19 Claim. *Assume $p_i = \text{tp}(a_i, M, N) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ for $i < \alpha$ are pairwise orthogonal. Then $\{a_i : i < \alpha\}$ is independent in (M, N) .*

Proof. By 5.4 and renaming it is enough to deal with finite α , (not really used). We now choose a pair (M_ℓ, N_ℓ) by induction on $\ell \leq \alpha$ such that

- ⊛(i) $M_\ell \leq_s N_\ell$
- (ii) $M_0 = M, N_0 = N$
- (iii) if $m < \ell$ then $M_m \leq_s M_\ell$ and $N_m \leq_s N_\ell$
- (iv) if $\ell = m + 1$ then $(M_m, M_\ell, a_m) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$
- (v) $\text{tp}(a_m, M_m, M_{m+1})$ does not fork over M_0 .

For $\ell = 0$ this is trivial. For $\ell = m + 1$, first we prove by induction on $k \leq m$ that $p_m^k = \text{tp}(a_m, M_k, N_m)$ is the nonforking extension of p_m in $\mathcal{S}(M_k)$, now for $k = 0$ this is trivial by the choice of p_m and for $k + 1 \leq m$ we use the assumption $p_k \perp p_m$ and $(M_k, M_{k+1}, a_k) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ noting that by the induction hypothesis on k , $\text{tp}(a_m, M_k, N_m)$ is a non-forking extension of p_n and by clause (v) for k , $\text{tp}_s(a_k, M_k, M_n)$ is a non-forking extension of p_k .

Second, as s is weakly successful there are b_m, M_ℓ^* such that $(M_m, M_\ell^*, b_m) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $\text{tp}_s(b_m, M_m, M_\ell^*) = p_m$. By the definition of types and as K_s has amalgamation by renaming there is N_ℓ such that $M_\ell \leq_s N_\ell, N_m \leq_s N_\ell$ and $b_m = a_m$. So we can define (M_ℓ, N_ℓ) for $\ell \leq n$ as in ⊛. By the definition of independents we are done.

□_{6.19}

6.20 Claim. *If $p_i \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ for $i < \alpha$ are pairwise orthogonal and $q \pm p_i$ for $i < \alpha$ then $\alpha < \omega$.*

Proof. By 5.13 and 6.19. That is assume $\alpha \geq \omega$, let $q = \text{tp}_s(b, M, N_0)$ and we can find $N_n (n < \omega) \leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -increasing and $a_{n+1} \in N_{n+1}$ realizing p_n such that $\{b, a_n\}$ is not independent. By 6.19, $\{a_n : n < \omega\}$ is independent in $N_\omega = \cup\{N_n : n < \omega\}$ and so by 5.13, we get a contradiction. □_{6.20}

6.21 Claim. [s has primes]. *Assume that $(M_0, M_1, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ and $(M_1, M_2, a) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$ or just $\in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $\text{tp}(a, M_1, M_2)$ is orthogonal to M_0 . Then $(M_0, M_2, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$.*

Proof. Assume $M_0 \leq_s N_0 \leq_s N_2, M_2 \leq_s N_2$ such that \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, N_0, N_2) and we should prove that $\text{NF}_s(M_0, N_0, M_2, N_2)$, this suffices.

We can find a decomposition $\langle M_{0,i}, a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ of (M_0, N_0) . By 6.17 we can find N_2^+ and an \leq_s -increasing continuous $\langle M_{1,i} : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ such that $N_2 \leq_s N_2^+, M_{0,i} \leq_s M_{1,i}$ stipulating $M_{0,\alpha} = N_0$ and $M_{1,0} = M_1$, $\text{tp}(a_i, M_{1,i}, N^+)$ does not fork over $M_{0,i}$ and $(M_{1,i}, M_{1,i+1}, a_i) \in K_s^{3,\text{pr}}$. Now we prove by induction on $i \leq \alpha$ that $\text{tp}(b, N_{1,i}, N_2^+)$ does not fork over $M_1 = M_{1,0}$. As usual $\text{NF}(M_0, M_1, M_{0,i}, M_{1,i})$ for $i \leq \alpha$. For $i = 0$ trivial for i limit by Axiom (E)(h) and for $i = j + 1$ just note that by 6.10 $\text{tp}(b, M_{1,0}, N_2^+) = \text{tp}(b, M_1, M_2)$ is orthogonal to $M_{0,i}$ hence $\text{tp}(a_i, M_{0,i}, M_{0,i+1})$ hence to $\text{tp}(a_i, M_{1,i}, M_{1,i+1})$. So $\text{tp}(b, M_{1,\alpha}, N_2^+)$ does not fork over $M_1 = M_{0,\alpha}$ and $(M_1, M_2, a) \in K_s^{3,\text{uq}}$ so $\text{NF}_s(M_1, M_{1,\alpha}, M_2, N_2^+)$. By transitivity of NF we have $\text{NF}_s(M_0, N_0, M_2, N_3^+)$ hence $\text{NF}_s(M_0, N_0, M_2, N_3)$ is as required.

□_{6.21}

§7 UNDERSTANDING $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{vq}}$

We would like to show that $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{vq}} = K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}}$ and $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{pr}} = K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{uq}}$ and more remembering that every $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is saturated.

The hypothesis below holds if \mathfrak{t} is successful, $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^6$ is successful.

7.1 Hypothesis.

- (a) \mathfrak{s} is a λ -good frame
- (b) \mathfrak{s} is successful
- (c) \mathfrak{s} has primes
- (d) $\perp = \underset{\text{wk}}{\perp}$.

In the definition below note that our aim is to analyze (M, N, \mathbf{J}_0) so \mathbf{J}_0 has a special role.

7.2 Definition. 1) $\mathscr{W}_\alpha = \{(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) : \bar{M} = \langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle \text{ is } \leq_{\mathfrak{s}}\text{-increasing continuous, } M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N \text{ and } \bar{\mathbf{J}} = \langle \mathbf{J}_i : i < \alpha \rangle \text{ and } \mathbf{J}_i \text{ is independent in } (M_i, M_{i+1}) \text{ stipulating } M_\alpha = N \text{ and we let}$

$$\mathscr{W} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} \mathscr{W}_\alpha$$

2) $\leq_{\mathscr{W}} = \leq_{\mathscr{W}[\mathfrak{s}]}$ is the following two place relation on \mathscr{W} :

$(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1) \leq_{\mathscr{W}} (N^2, \bar{M}^2, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2)$ iff (a) + (b) where

- (a) $N^1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^2, \ell g(\bar{M}^1) \leq \ell g(\bar{M}^2), i < \ell g(\bar{M}^1) \Rightarrow M_i^1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_i^2 \ \& \ \mathbf{J}_i^1 \subseteq \mathbf{J}_i^2$ and
- (b) $a \in \mathbf{J}_i^1 \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_i^2, M_{i+1}^2)$ does not fork over M_i^1

3) $\leq_{\mathscr{W}}^{\text{fx}}$ is defined like $\leq_{\mathscr{W}}$ but also $\bar{\mathbf{J}}^1 = \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2$ (so $\ell g(\bar{M}^1) = \ell g(\bar{M}^2)$ in particular).

⁶where do we use successful rather than weakly successful? E.g. in 7.3(3). This can be somewhat weakened: replacing a club of $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ a member of a normal filter on $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$

7.3 Claim. 1) $\leq_{\mathscr{W}}$ is a partial order.

2) If $\delta < \lambda_s^+$ is a limit ordinal and $\langle (N^\alpha, \bar{M}^\alpha, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^\alpha) : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathscr{W}}$ -increasing, then this sequence has a $\leq_{\mathscr{W}}$ -lub $(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$, with $lg(\bar{M}) = \sup\{lg(\bar{M}^\alpha) : \alpha < \delta\}$, $N = \cup\{N^\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$, $M_i = \cup\{M_i^\alpha : \alpha \text{ satisfies that } i < lg(\bar{M}^\alpha) \text{ and } \alpha < \delta\}$, $\mathbf{J}_i^* = \cup\{\mathbf{J}_i^\alpha : \alpha \text{ satisfies that } i < lg(\bar{M}^\alpha) \text{ and } \alpha < \delta\}$.

3) If $(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1) \in \mathscr{W}_\alpha$ then for some $(N^2, \bar{M}^2, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2)$ we have

- (α) $(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1) \leq_{\mathscr{W}}^{\text{fx}} (N^2, \bar{M}^2, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2)$
- (β) $(M_i^2, M_{i+1}^2, \mathbf{J}_i^2) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ for each $i < lg(\bar{M})$
- (γ) $N^2 = \cup\{M_i^2 : i < lg(\bar{M}^2)\}$.

Proof. Straight: part (1) is trivial, part (2) holds by 5.10(2), and part (3) is proved repeating in the proof of 5.18(2) but using part (2) here. $\square_{7.3}$

We are interested in “nice” such sequences; we define several variants.

7.4 Definition. 1) $K_s^{\text{or}} = \{(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in \mathscr{W}_\omega : \text{if } a \in \mathbf{J}_{n+1} \text{ then } \text{tp}_s(a, M_{n+1}, M_{n+2}) \text{ is orthogonal to } M_0\}$, if we omit N we mean $N = \cup\{M_n : n < \omega\}$.

2) $K_s^{\text{ar}} = \{(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in \mathscr{W}_\omega : \text{if } a \in \mathbf{J}_{n+1} \text{ then } \text{tp}_s(a, M_{n+1}, M_{n+2}) \text{ is orthogonal to } M_n\}$.

3) $K_s^{\text{br}} = \{(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in K_s^{\text{or}} : \text{if } b \in \mathbf{J}_{n+1} \text{ then for some } m = m(b) \leq n \text{ we have } \text{tp}(b, M_{n+1}, M_{n+2}) \text{ does not fork over } M_{m+1} \text{ and is orthogonal to } M_m\}$.

4) We say that $(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$ is K_s^{or} -full if it belongs to K_s^{or} and⁷ $p \perp_{\text{wk}} M_0$ & $p \in \mathscr{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{n+1}) \Rightarrow \lambda_s = |\{c \in \mathbf{J}_{n+1} : p = \text{tp}_s(c, M_{n+1}, M_{n+2})\}|$ and $N = \cup\{M_n : n < \omega\}$.

5) We say that $(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$ is K_s^{ar} -full if it $\in K_s^{\text{ar}}$ and $p \in \mathscr{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{n+1})$ & $p \perp_{\text{wk}} M_n \Rightarrow \lambda_s = |\{c \in \mathbf{J}_{n+1} : p = \text{tp}_s(c, M_{n+1}, M_{n+2})\}|$ and $N = \cup\{M_n : n < \omega\}$.

6) We say that $(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$ is K_s^{br} -full if it $\in K_s^{\text{br}}$ and $p \in \mathscr{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{n+1})$ & p does not fork over M_{m+1} & $p \perp_{\text{wk}} M_m \Rightarrow \lambda_s = |\{c \in \mathbf{J}_{n+1} : c \text{ realizes } p\}|$ and $N = \cup\{M_n : n < \omega\}$.

7) $\leq_{\text{or}} = \leq_{\text{or}}^s$ is the following two place relation over K_s^{or} :

$$(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1) \leq_{\text{or}} (N^2, \bar{M}^2, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2) \text{ iff } (N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1) \leq_{\mathscr{W}} (N^2, \bar{M}^2, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2) \text{ and } \mathbf{J}_0^1 = \mathbf{J}_0^2.$$

8) We say that $(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in \mathscr{W}$ is prime if $(M_n, M_{n+1}, \mathbf{J}_n) \in K_s^{3, \text{qr}}$ for $n < lg(\bar{M})$.

⁷Note that on \mathbf{J}_0 there are no demands

7.5 Definition. We say \mathfrak{s} has enough regulars when: for any $\bar{M} = \langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta+1 \rangle$ which is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, $M_{\delta+1} \neq M_\delta$, there are $\alpha < \delta$ and $c \in M_{\delta+1}$ such that $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_\delta, M_{\delta+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta)$ does not fork over M_α and $\alpha = 0$ or $\alpha = \beta+1$ & $p \perp M_\beta$ for some β .

Remark. If we are dealing with $\mathfrak{s}_{T,\lambda}^{\kappa}$, see 1.5(3), then using regular types this property holds.

7.6 Claim. 1) $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{ar}} \subseteq K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{br}} \subseteq K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{or}}$.

2) \leq_{or} is a partial order on $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{or}}$; for an \leq_{or} -increasing sequence of length $< \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$, it has a \leq_{or} -lub which is a $\leq_{\mathcal{W}}$ -lub.

3) If $(N^\alpha, \bar{M}^\alpha, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^\alpha) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{or}}$ for $\alpha < \delta < \lambda^+$ is \leq_{or} -increasing, then its $\leq_{\mathcal{W}}$ -lub (see 7.2) is its \leq_{or} -lub (so it belongs to $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{or}}$).

4) In part (2) if $(N^\alpha, \bar{M}^\alpha, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^\alpha) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{ar}}$ for $\alpha < \delta$ is \leq_{or} -increasing then the \leq_{or} -lub belongs to $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{ar}}$.

5) In part (2) if $(N^\alpha, \bar{M}^\alpha, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^\alpha) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{br}}$ for $\alpha < \delta$ is \leq_{or} -increasing, then the \leq_{or} -lub (of this sequence) belongs to $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{br}}$.

6) If $(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{or}}$ then there is a $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{or}}$ -full $(N^2, \bar{M}^2, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2)$ such that $(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1) \leq_{\text{or}} (N^2, \bar{M}^2, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2)$.

7) If $(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{ar}}$ then there is a $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{ar}}$ -full $(N^2, \bar{M}^2, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2)$ such that $(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1) \leq_{\text{or}} (N^2, \bar{M}^2, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2)$.

8) If $(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{br}}$ then there is a $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{br}}$ -full $(N^2, \bar{M}^2, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2)$ such that $(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1) \leq_{\text{or}} (N^2, \bar{M}^2, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^2)$.

9) Like parts (3), (4), (5) for $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{or}}$ -full, $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{ar}}$ -full, $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{br}}$ -full triples.

Proof. Straight (for (9) use the local character of non-forking).

7.7 Claim. 1) Assume that $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{vq}}$ or at least $(*)_{(M,N,\mathbf{J})}$ below. Then we can find $(\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$ such that $(**)_{(M,N,a),\bar{M},\bar{\mathbf{J}}}$ below holds, where

$(*)_{(M,N,\mathbf{J})}$ $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bs}}$ and for no N', b do we have $\mathbf{J} \subseteq N', M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N' \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$,
 $b \in N \setminus N'$ and $\text{tp}(b, N', N) \underset{wk}{\perp} M$

$(**)_{(M,N,\mathbf{J}),\bar{M},\bar{\mathbf{J}}}$

- (a) $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bs}}$
- (b) $\bar{M} = \langle M_n : n < \omega \rangle, M_n \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{n+1}$
- (c) $M_0 = M$ and $\cup \{M_n : n < \omega\} = N$
- (d) $(\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{or}}$
- (e) $(M_n, M_{n+1}, \mathbf{J}_n) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}}$

- (f) $\mathbf{J}_0 = \mathbf{J}$
 (g) if $n < \omega$ and $b \in \mathbf{J}_{n+1}$ then $\text{tp}(b, M_n, M_{n+1}) \perp_{\text{wk}} M_0$ (follows by clause (d)).

2) If $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ we can find $\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}$ such that (a)-(e),(g) above holds.

Proof. 1) By 6.12(4), we know that $(*)_{(M,N,\mathbf{J})}$ holds in both cases.

We shall choose M_n, \mathbf{J}_n by induction on n satisfying the relevant clauses in $(**)$. Let $M_0 = M$, let $\mathbf{J}_0 = \mathbf{J}$ and let $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ be such that $(M_0, M_1, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}}$, exists by 5.8(1). If $M_n \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ is well defined, $n \geq 1$ let \mathbf{J}_n be a maximal subset of $\mathbf{I}_{M_n, N}$ independent in (M_n, N) such that $b \in \mathbf{J}_n \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M_n, N) \perp M_0$.

Lastly, let $M_{n+1} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ be such that $(M_n, M_{n+1}, \mathbf{J}_n) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}}$, exists by 5.8(1). To finish we need to prove that $M_{\omega} =: \bigcup_{n < \omega} M_n$ is equal to N . Clearly $M_{\omega} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$,

if $M_{\omega} \neq N$ then for some $b \in N \setminus M_{\omega}$ we have $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M_{\omega}, N) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{\omega})$, by $(*)_{(M,N,\mathbf{J})}$ clearly $\text{tp}(b, M_{\omega}, N) \perp M_0$ and clearly for some $n < \omega$, $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M_{\omega}, N)$ does not fork over M_n (and necessarily $n \geq 1$), and similarly we have $\text{tp}(b, M_n, N) \perp_{\text{wk}} M_0$ so b contradicts the choice of \mathbf{J}_n (as maximal such that ...). So we are done.

2) Should be clear. □_{7.7}

7.8 Claim. [\mathfrak{s} has enough regulars].

1) In 7.7 we can get

$$(**)_{(M,N,\mathbf{J}),\bar{M},\bar{\mathbf{J}}}^+ \quad (a)-(f) \text{ as in 7.7} \\
 (g)^+ (\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{ar}} \text{ (i.e. we strengthen clause (d)).}$$

2) In 7.9 below we can add

$$(B)^+ \text{ like (B) adding } (N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{ar}}.$$

Proof. 1) Similar to 7.7 using the definition of “ \mathfrak{s} has enough regulars”.

2) In 7.9 note that $(C) \Rightarrow (B)^+$ by 7.8(1) and $(B)^+ \Rightarrow (B)$ trivially. □_{7.8}

Now we arrive to “understanding $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{vq}}$ ”.

7.9 Conclusion. For every triple (M, N, \mathbf{J}) , the following are equivalent:

$$(A) (M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{vq}}$$

- (B) We can find $\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}$ such that $(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{or}}, \mathbf{J}_0 = \mathbf{J}, M_0 = M, N = \bigcup_{n < \omega} M_n$
 and $(M_n, M_{n+1}, \mathbf{J}_n) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{qr}}$ (we then say $(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$ is prime), note that necessarily $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M_{n+1}, M_{n+2})$ is orthogonal to M_0 for every $n < \omega, b \in \mathbf{J}_{n+1}$
- (C) (a) $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$
 (b) \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N)
 (c) if $M \cup \mathbf{J} \subseteq N' \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ and $b \in N \setminus N'$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, N', N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N')$
then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, N', N) \perp M$
- (D) (a), (b) as above
 (c) if $N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+, b \in N^+ \setminus M \setminus \mathbf{J}$ and $\mathbf{J} \cup \{b\}$ is independent in (M, N^+)
then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, N, N^+) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N)$ does not fork over M
- (E) there is a uq-decomposition $\langle M_i, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ of (M_0, N) such that $(M, M_0, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}, M_{\alpha} = N$ and each $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_j, M_j, M_{j+1})$ is orthogonal to M .

From this we shall deduce (after the proof of 7.9):

7.10 Conclusion. [$\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^+, \mathfrak{t}$ is a good⁺ and successful frame.]

- 1) $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}} = K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$; so together with 4.13(2) we get uniqueness.
- 2) $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{qr}}$ iff $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$; so together with 5.10(k) we get uniqueness.

7.11 Claim. If $\delta < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ and $\langle M_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, and $\langle \mathbf{J}_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is increasing continuous and (M, M_i, \mathbf{J}_i) belongs to $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$ for $i < \delta$, then $(M, M_{\delta}, \mathbf{J}_{\delta})$ belongs to $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$.

Question: Can we assume less than $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^+$?

Proof of 7.9. The following implications clearly suffice.

(A) \Rightarrow (E): Let $\alpha = 0, M_0 = N$.

(E) \Rightarrow (D): Clauses (a), (b) are obvious, so let us turn to (c). Assume b, N^+ are as in clause (c) of (D), so by Claim 5.18(1) we know that $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M_0, N^+)$ does not fork over M ; now we prove by induction on $i \leq \alpha$ that $\text{tp}(b, M_i, N^+)$ does not fork over M , for $i = 0$ see above, for i limit use Axiom (E)(h), for i successor by the definition of orthogonality. For $i = \alpha, M_{\alpha} = N$. So we are done.

(C) \Rightarrow (B): by 7.7

(B) \Rightarrow (A): by 6.18(2)

(A) \Rightarrow (D): Clauses (a), (b) are obvious. For clause (c), as $\text{tp}_s(b, M, N^+) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$, there is $M' \leq_s N^+$ such that $(M, M', b) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$ (recalling s has primes). By 5.4 we know \mathbf{J} is independent over (M, M', N^+) hence by Definition 5.15, we have $\text{NF}_s(M, M', N, N^+)$ hence 1.12) we get that $\text{tp}_s(b, N, N^+) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N)$ does not fork over M as required. (Actually not used).

(D) \Rightarrow (C):

Again the problem is to prove clause (c) of (C) so toward contradiction assume that $M \cup \mathbf{J} \subseteq N' <_s N$ and $b \in N \setminus N'$ and $p = \text{tp}_s(b', N', N) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N')$ is not orthogonal to M hence by Hypothesis 6.18(d) is not weakly orthogonal to M . So for some $q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ we have $p \pm q$, and let $q_1 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N')$ be a nonforking extension of q . We can find N_2 such that $N' \cup \{b\} \subseteq N_2 \leq_s N$ and $(N', N_2, b) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$. So (see 6.3) q_1 has some extension $q_2 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(N_2)$ which is not a nonforking extension of q , and so we can find N_4 and c such that $N \leq_s N_4$ and $q_2 = \text{tp}_s(c, N_2, N_4)$. Now as c realizes q_1 clearly $\text{tp}_s(c, N', N)$ does not fork over M hence $\mathbf{J} \cup \{c\}$ is independent in (M, N_4) ; but as c realizes q_2 clearly $\text{tp}_s(c, N_2, N_4)$ does not fork over M , hence as $N_2 \leq_s N \leq_s N$ also $\text{tp}_s(c, N, N_4)$ forks over M . So we have gotten a contradiction to clause (c) of (D). $\square_{7.9}$

Proof of 7.10. 1) This is a special case of (2).

2) The “only” if implication we already proved in 3.5(2), more exactly 5.16. For the other direction assume $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ and by 7.7(1) applied to (M, N, \mathbf{J}) we get $(\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$ satisfying $(**)_{(M, N, \mathbf{J}), \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}}$ of 7.7(1) hence it is as in clause (B) of 7.9 in particular $\mathbf{J}_0 = \mathbf{J}$. Let $\langle M_i^\beta : i < \lambda_s \rangle$ be \leq_t -representations of M_β for $\beta \leq \omega$. Now by 5.17 there is a club E of $\lambda_s = \lambda_t^+$ such that for $\delta \in E$, $(\langle M_\delta^\beta : \beta \leq \omega \rangle, \langle \mathbf{J}_n \cap M_\delta^{n+1} : n < \omega \rangle)$ are as in 7.9 clause (B) for t , hence clause (A) so $(M_\delta^0, M_\delta^\omega, \mathbf{J} \cap M_\delta^\omega) \in K_t^{3, \text{vq}}$, hence (see 4.9 as $M_0, M_\omega \in K_s$, more exactly by 4.12(1) if \mathbf{J} is a singleton, by 5.17 in general) the triple $(M_0, M_\omega, \mathbf{J})$ belongs to $K_s^{3, \text{qr}}$, as required. $\square_{7.10}$

Proof of 7.11. It is enough to check clause (D) of 7.9, now clause (a) is trivial, clause (b) holds by 5.4(3). For proving clause (c) we assume $M_\delta \leq_s N^+$, $c \in N^+ \setminus \mathbf{J} \setminus M$ and $\mathbf{J} \cup \{b\}$ is independent in (M, N^+) , and we should prove that “ $\text{tp}_s(c, M_\delta, N)$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta)$ and does not fork over M ”. Now clearly for each $i < \delta$ the set $\mathbf{J}_i \cup \{b\}$ is independent in (M, N^+) by monotonicity of independence. Hence by 7.9 (A) \Rightarrow (D) as we are assuming $(M, M_i, \mathbf{J}_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ we can conclude that $\text{tp}_s(c, M_i, N) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_i)$ does not fork over M ; so this holds for every $i < \delta$. Now

$\text{tp}_s(c, M_\delta, N^+)$ does not fork over M by Axiom (E)(h).

□_{7.11}

* * *

We now try to show that there is a parallel to universal homogeneous or saturated among $\{(M, N, a) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}} : \text{tp}_s(a, M, N) = p\}$

7.12 Definition. 1) If $M \in K_s, p \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ let $K_{s,p}^{3, \text{uq}} = \{(M^*, N^*, a^*) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}} : M = M^* \text{ and } p = \text{tp}_s(a, M, N)\}$, we identify (M, N, a) with $(M, N, \{a\})$ and recall $M^* = \text{Dom}(p^*)$.

2) We say $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ is full or is $K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ -full if there is a full $(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in K_s^{3, \text{or}}$ satisfying $M_0 = M, \cup\{M_n : n < \omega\} = N_0$. If $\mathbf{J} = \{a\}$ we may write a instead of \mathbf{J} and say (M, N, \mathbf{J}) is $K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ -full and if $p = \text{tp}(a, M, N)$ we say (M, N, \mathbf{J}) is $K_{s,p}^{3, \text{uq}}$ -full.

7.13 Claim. 1) If $(M, N, a) \in K_{s,p^*}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$ is K_s^{or} -full, $\mathbf{J}_0 = \{a^*\}$,

$(M_0^1, M_1^1, a^*) \in K_{s,p^*}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $M = M_0^1$ then there is a \leq_s -embedding f of N into $N^1 = \cup\{M_n^1 : n < \omega\}$ over M mapping a to a^* .

2) If $(N^\ell, \bar{M}^\ell, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^\ell)$ is a K_s^{or} -full and prime (see 7.9, clause (B)), $\mathbf{J}_0^\ell = \{a_\ell\}$, $\text{tp}_s(a_\ell, M_0^\ell, M_1^\ell) = p$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ (so $M_0^\ell = \text{Dom}(p)$ does not depend on ℓ) then there is an isomorphism f from N^1 onto N^2 over $\text{Dom}(p)$ which maps a_1 to a_2 .

3) Similar to (2) with $\mathbf{J}_0^\ell = \mathbf{J}, M_0^\ell = M_0$ and $\text{tp}_s(c, M_0^1, M_1^1) = \text{tp}_s(c, M_0^2, M_1^2)$ for $c \in \mathbf{J}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

4) If $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ and $(N^1, \bar{M}^1, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^1)$ is K_s^{or} -full and $\mathcal{J} = \mathbf{J}_0^1$ and $c \in \mathbf{J} \Rightarrow \text{tp}_s(c, M, N) = \text{tp}_s(c, M_0^1, N^1)$ then there is an embedding of N into $\cup\{M_n^1 : n < \omega\}$ which is the identity on $M \cup \mathbf{J}$.

7.14 Remark. In 7.13 we can allow stronger demands on f . In part (1) if $M \cup \{a\} \subseteq N' \leq_s N, f'$ a $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embedding of N' into $M_n^1, f' \subseteq \text{id}_M, f'(a) = a^*$, then we can require $f' \subseteq f$.

In part (2) of 7.13, if $M_0^\ell \cup \{a_\ell\} \subseteq M'_\ell \leq M_n^\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2, f'$ an isomorphism from M'_1 onto M'_2 extending $\text{id}_{\text{Dom}(p)} \cup \{\langle a_2, a_2 \rangle\}$ then we can require $f' \subseteq f$.

Proof. 1) By 7.9 (A) \Rightarrow (B), we can find $(N, \bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in K_s^{\text{or}}$ with $M_0 = M, \mathbf{J}_0 = \{a\}$, as in 7.9, clause (B). Now we choose by induction on $n < \omega$ a \leq_s -embedding f_n of M_n into M_n^1 increasing with $n, f_0 = \text{id}_{M_0}, f_1(a) = a^*$. For $n = 0$ this is trivial, for $n = 1$ note that $\text{tp}_s(a, M, M_1) = \text{tp}_s(a^*, M, M_1^*)$ and recall the definition of

$(M, M_1, a) \in K_s^{3, \text{pr}}$. For $n = m + 1 > 1$, by the definition of “full” in 7.4(4) we can find a one-to-one mapping h_m from \mathbf{J}_m into \mathbf{J}_m^* such that

- (i) $b \in \mathbf{J}_m \Rightarrow \text{tp}_s(h_m(b), M_m^*, M_{m+1}^*)$ does not fork over $\text{Rang}(f_m)$
- (ii) $b \in \mathbf{J}_m \Rightarrow f_m(\text{tp}_s(b, M_m, M_{m+1})) = \text{tp}_s(h_m(b), \text{Rang}(f_m), M_{m+1}^*)$.

Then choose $f_n \supseteq f_m$, $f_n(c) = h_m(c)$ for $c \in \mathbf{J}_m$ by the definition of $(M_m, M_{m+1}, \mathbf{J}_m) \in K_s^{3, \text{qr}}$.

2) We choose by induction on n a tuple $(N_n^1, N_n^2, f_n, \mathbf{I}_n^1)$ such that (with $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$):

- (a) $N_n^\ell \leq_s M_n^\ell$
- (b) f_n is an isomorphism from N_n^1 onto N_n^2
- (c) $N_n^\ell \leq_s N_{n+1}^\ell$ and $f_n \subseteq f_{n+1}$
- (d) $N_n^\ell = M_0^\ell$ and f_0 is the identity
- (e) $(N_0^1, N_1^1, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{qr}}$ and $f_1(a_1) = a_2$
- (f) if $n = \ell \pmod 2$ (where $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$) then
 - (α) \mathbf{I}_n is a maximal subset of $\{b \in \mathbf{I}_{N_n^\ell, M_n^\ell} : \text{tp}(b, N_n^\ell, M_n^\ell) \perp M_0\}$
 - (β) $(N_n^\ell, N_{n+1}^\ell, \mathbf{J}_n) \in K_s^{3, \text{qr}}$
 - (γ)₁ if $\ell = 1$, $f_{n+1} \upharpoonright \mathbf{I}_n$ is a one-to-one mapping from \mathbf{I}_n into \mathbf{J}_{n+1}^2
 - (γ)₂ if $\ell = 2$, $f_{n+1}^{-1} \upharpoonright \mathbf{I}_n$ is a one-to-one mapping from \mathbf{I}_n into \mathbf{J}_{n+1}^1 .

There is no problem to carry the induction and $f = \bigcup_{n < \omega} f_n$ is as required as in the proof of 7.7.

3), 4) Similarly. □_{7.13}

7.15 Claim. 1) If $(M, N_\ell, a) \in K_{s,p}^{3, \text{uq}}$ is full for $\ell = 1, 2$ then N_1, N_2 are isomorphic over $M \cup \{a\}$.

2) Similarly for $K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$.

3) If $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{bs}}$ then for some $N' \leq_s N''$ we have $J \subseteq N'$ and $N \leq_s N''$ and (M, N', \mathbf{J}) is $K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ -full.

Proof. By the proof of 7.13(2) (note that under somewhat stronger assumption in 7.10 we get uniqueness even without assuming fullness). □_{7.15}

7.16 Claim. 1) Assume $(M_i, N_i, \mathbf{J}_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ for $i < \delta$ where $\delta < \lambda_s^+$ and $i < j < \delta$ & $c \in \mathbf{J}_i \Rightarrow \text{tp}_s(c, M_j, N_j)$ does not fork over M_i . Assume further that $\langle M_i : i < \delta \rangle$ is \leq_s -increasing continuous, $\langle N_i : i < \delta \rangle$ is \subseteq -increasing continuous and $\langle \mathbf{J}_i : i < \delta \rangle$ is \subseteq_s -increasing. Let $M_\delta = \cup\{M_i : i < \delta\}$, $N_\delta = \cup\{N_i : i < \delta\}$ and $\mathbf{J}_\delta = \cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \delta\}$. Then $(M_\delta, N_\delta, \mathbf{J}_\delta) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$.

Proof. Note that \mathbf{J}_δ is independent in (M_δ, N_δ) .

[Why? For each $i < j < \delta$ as \mathbf{J}_j is independent in (M_j, N_j) , but $\mathbf{J}_i \subseteq \mathbf{J}_j$ hence also \mathbf{J}_i is independent in (M_j, N_j) . However, $c \in \mathbf{J}_i \Rightarrow \text{tp}_s(c, M_j, N_j)$ does not fork over M_i , hence \mathbf{J}_i is independent in (M_i, M_j, N_j) , so as $N_j \leq_s N_\delta$, clearly \mathbf{J}_i is independent in (M_i, M_j, N_δ) . As fixing $i < \delta$ this holds for every $j \in (i, \delta)$ and as $\langle M_j : j \in (i, \delta) \rangle$ is increasing by 5.10 as get that \mathbf{J}_i is independent in $(M_i, \bigcup_{j \in (i, \delta)} M_j, N_\delta)$ which means that it is independent in $(M_i, M_\delta, N_\delta)$. So \mathbf{J}_i is independent in (M_δ, N_δ) . As \mathbf{J}_i is increasing with $i < \delta$ by 5.4(3), $\mathbf{J}_\delta = \cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \delta\}$ is independent in (M_δ, N_δ) as required.]

We shall use Claim 7.9, our desired conclusion is clause (A) for $(M_\delta, N_\delta, \mathbf{J}_\delta)$ so it is enough to check clause (D). So let $M_\delta \leq_s N_\delta^+$, $b \in M^+ \setminus \mathbf{J}_\delta \setminus M_\delta$ and assume that $\mathbf{J}_\delta \cup \{b\}$ is independent in (M_δ, N_δ^+) . So $\text{tp}(b, M_\delta, N_\delta^+) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{bs}$ hence for some $i(*) < \delta$ the type $\text{tp}(b, M_\delta, N_\delta^+)$ does not fork over $M_{i(*)}$. It is enough to prove that for every $i \in [i(*), \delta)$, the type $\text{tp}(b, N_i, N_\delta^+) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{bs}(N_i)$ does not fork over M_i (as then the nonforking extension $q \in \mathcal{S}_s^{bs}(N_\delta)$ of $\text{tp}(b, M_\delta, N_\delta^+)$ satisfies $i \in [i(*), \delta) \Rightarrow q \upharpoonright N_i = \text{tp}(b, N_i, N_\delta^+)$). As $\mathbf{J}_i \cup \{b\} \subseteq \mathbf{J}_\delta \cup \{b\}$ and $c \in \mathbf{J}_i \cup \{b\} \Rightarrow \text{tp}(c, M_\delta, N_\delta^+)$ does not fork over N_i it follows that $\mathbf{J}_i \cup \{b\}$ is independent in (M_i, M_δ, N_i) . As $(M_i, N_i, \mathbf{J}_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ and 7.9 clearly $\text{tp}(b, N_i, N_\delta^+)$ does not fork over M_i , and as said earlier this suffices.

□_{7.16}

7.17 Claim. Assume $\langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is \leq_s -increasing continuous and $(M_i, M_{i+1}, \mathbf{J}_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ and \mathbf{J}_i is independent in (M_0, M_i, M_{i+1}) . Then $(M_0, M_\alpha, \cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \alpha\}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$.

Proof. We prove the statement by induction on α . Let $\mathbf{J} = \cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \alpha\}$. First note that \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_α) by 5.16[?]. To prove that $(M_0, M_\alpha, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ by 7.11 it suffices to prove clause (D) there, so assume $M_\alpha \leq_s N$ and $b \in N \setminus \mathbf{J} \setminus M_0$ and $\mathbf{J} \cup \{b\}$ is independent in (M_0, N) . If $\alpha = 0$ this is trivial. For α limit it is enough to show for every $i < \alpha$ that $\text{tp}(b, M_i, N)$. But each $i < \alpha$, clearly $\{\mathbf{J}_j : j < i\} \cup \{b\}$ is independent in (M_0, N^+) hence by the induction hypothesis

and 7.9 we know that $\text{tp}(b, M_i, N)$ does not fork over M_i ; as this holds for every $i < \alpha$, we can deduce that $\text{tp}(b, M_\alpha, N)$ does not fork over M_0 as required.

So we are left with the case $\alpha = \beta + 1$. So $\mathbf{J} \cup \{b\}$ is independent in (M_0, N) and clearly $(\mathbf{J} \cup \{b\}) \cap M_\beta = \cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \beta\}$, so by part 5.18(1) we know that $\mathbf{J} \cup \{b\} \setminus M_\beta = \mathbf{J}_\beta \cup \{b\}$ is independent in (M_0, M_β, N) . As $(M_\beta, M_\alpha, \mathbf{J}_\beta) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$ by 5.18(1), $\text{tp}(b, M_\alpha, N)$ does not fork over M_β hence over M_0 . $\square_{5.18}$

§8 TRIES TO DECOMPOSE AND INDEPENDENCE OF SEQUENCES OF MODELS

We try to find smooth or otherwise good decompositions; at present only 8.3 works. We shall get really what we want after using fullness + regular types. This assumption having \mathcal{S}^{na} equal to \mathcal{S}^{bs} , i.e., fullness is “soft”, see §9.

8.1 Hypothesis.

- (a) \mathfrak{s} is a successful good⁺ frame,
- (b) \mathfrak{s} has primes,
- (c) $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{uq}} = K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{pr}}$, moreover $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{vq}} = K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{qr}}$ and
- (d) $\perp = \underset{\text{wk}}{\perp}$.

The last hypothesis is reasonable by the last section and also by 8.5? below, but in some examples it holds without going to a successor, so we use it as an hypothesis.

8.2 Definition. We say that $\langle M_i, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ is a smooth decomposition inside N over M if:

- (a) it is a decomposition inside N over M (see Definition 3.3), which mean
 - $\langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
 - $M_{\alpha} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$
 - $M = M_0$
 - $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M_i, M_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_i)$
 - $(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{pr}}$
- (b) for every $i < \beta$ there is nonlimit $j \leq i$ such that $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M_i, M_{i+1})$ does not fork over M_j and is orthogonal to M_{j-1} if $j > 0$.

8.3 Claim. [No need of 8.1(b).] If $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ then we can find $\bar{M} = \langle M_i, a_j : i \leq \alpha, j < \alpha \rangle$ such that

- ⊠ _{M, N, \bar{M}} , \bar{a} (a) $M_0 = M$ and $N \leq_{\bar{\mathfrak{R}}} M_{\alpha}$
- (b) M_i is $\leq_{\bar{\mathfrak{R}}}$ -increasing continuous
- (c) $(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{uq}}$ and $\in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{pr}}$ if \mathfrak{s} has primes
- (d) for each $j < \alpha$ either $\text{tp}(a_j, M_j, M_{j+1})$ does not fork over M_0 or it is weakly orthogonal to M_0 .

Proof. We try to choose by induction on i a pair (M_i, N_i) and if $i = j+1$ also a_j such that: $M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_i$, M_i is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, N_i is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, and the M_i, a_j satisfy the relevant cases of clauses (b), (c), (d) and $M_0 = M, N_0 = N$ and $i = j + 1 \Rightarrow \neg \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_j, N_j, M_i, N_i)$. We cannot succeed (as \mathfrak{s} is good⁺ and successful, see §1) and we can define for $i = 0$ and i limit. Hence for some i we have (M_i, N_i) but cannot choose M_{i+1}, N_{i+1}, a_i . If $M_i \neq N_i$ there is $b_i \in N_i$ such that $\text{tp}(b, M_i, N_i) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_i)$, and one of the following cases occurs.

Case 1: $\text{tp}(b_i, M_i, N_i)$ is orthogonal to M_0 .

Then we let $N_{i+1} = N_i, a_i = b_i$ and we can find $M_{i+1} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_{i+1}$ such that $N_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_{i+1}$ and $(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and if \mathfrak{s} has primes even $\in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$. All the induction demands hold and $\neg \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i, N_i, M_{i+1}, N_i)$ as NF implies disjointness (by the definition of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ see Chapter II).

Case 2: $\text{tp}(b_i, M_i, N_i)$ is not orthogonal to M_0 .

So there is $p_i \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_i)$ which does not fork over M_0 such that $p_i, \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b_i, M_i, N_i)$ are not weakly orthogonal. Hence we can find $N_{i+1} \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ such that $N_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_{i+1}$ and some $a_i \in N_{i+1}$ realizing p_i in N_{i+1} and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, N_i, N_{i+1})$ is not the nonforking extension of p_i in $\mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N_i)$. As we can increase N_{i+1} without loss of generality there is $M_{i+1} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_{i+1}$ such that (M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) is in $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ if possible but always in $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$, so clearly $\neg \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i, N_i, M_{i+1}, N_{i+1})$. So all the demands hold.

So if $M_i \neq N_i$ then we can continue the induction, contradiction, hence $M_i = N_i$ and so $\alpha = i, \langle M_j : j \leq \alpha \rangle, \langle a_j : j < \alpha \rangle$ are as required. $\square_{8.3}$

8.4 Claim. *If $\langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{\alpha})$ does not fork over M_0 , then we can find an $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous sequence $\langle N_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ and a such that $M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_i, a \in N_0, a \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_{\alpha}, N_{\alpha}) = p$ and (M_i, N_i, a) is \mathfrak{s} -prime for $i \leq \alpha$.*

Proof. We choose by induction on $i \leq \alpha$ a pair (N_i, f_i) a a such that N_i is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing, f_i is an $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of M_i into N_i, f_i is increasing continuous, $f_0 = \text{id}_{M_0}, \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M_0, N_0) = p \upharpoonright M_0, (f_i(M_i), N_i, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}, \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, f_i(M_i), N_i)$ does not fork over $f_0(M_0) = M_0$. For $i = 0$ use existence of primes.

For i limit use 7.16 and the hypothesis (c) of 8.1, and for $i = j + 1$ use the definition of prime chasing arrows. In the end, renaming without loss of generality $f_i = \text{id}_{M_i}$ for $i \leq \alpha$. $\square_{8.4}$

8.5 Claim. [No use of 8.1(b),(c),(d).] If $\boxtimes_{M,N,\bar{M},\bar{a}}$ from Claim 8.3 holds and $\mathbf{J} = \{a_i : \text{tp}(a_i, M_i, M_{i+1}) \text{ does not fork over } M = M_0\}$ then (M, N, \mathbf{J}) belongs to $K_s^{3,\text{vq}}$.

Proof. We shall use Claim 7.9, now the desired conclusion is clause (A) there, so it suffices to prove clause (D) there. Now subclauses (a), (b) are obvious so let us prove subclause (c). For this we prove by induction on $\beta \leq \alpha = \ell g(\bar{a})$ that letting $\mathbf{J}_\beta = \{a_i : i < \beta \text{ and } \text{tp}(a_i, M_i, M_{i+1}) \text{ does not fork over } M_0\}$, we have:

\otimes_β if $M_\beta \leq_s N^+$, $n < \omega$ and $b_\ell \in N^+$ for $\ell < n$ and $\mathbf{J}_\beta \cup \{b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}\}$ is independent in (M_0, N^+) (and $b_\ell \notin \mathbf{J}_\beta, \ell \neq k \Rightarrow b_\ell \neq b_k$ of course), then $\{b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}\}$ is independent in (M, M_β, N^+) .

For $\beta = 0$ this is trivial. For β limit this holds by 5.10(2) as $(M_0, M_\gamma, \{b_\ell : \ell < n\})$ is independent by the induction hypothesis for each $\gamma < \beta$. Lastly, let $\beta = \gamma + 1$; then by 7.9, as we have proved \otimes_γ , we have $(M_0, M_\gamma, \mathbf{J}_\gamma) \in K_s^{3,\text{uq}}$. First assume $a_\gamma \in \mathbf{J}_\beta$. So

(*) we are given n, b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} we let $b_n = a_\gamma$ and we are assuming $\mathbf{J}_\beta \cup \{b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}\}$ is independent.
Hence $\mathbf{J}_\gamma \cup \{b_0, \dots, b_n\}$ is independent.

Hence apply $(*)_\gamma$ for $n+1, b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}, b_n$, so $\{b_0, \dots, b_n\}$ is independent in (M, M_γ, N^+) as $(M_\gamma, M_\beta, a_{\gamma+1}) \in K_s^{3,\text{pr}}$ by 5.4 we deduce that $\{b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}\}$ is independent in (M_0, M_β, N^+) , which gives the desired conclusion.

Second, assume $a_\gamma \notin \mathbf{J}_\beta$ and n, b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} are given as in (*). By the induction hypothesis $\{b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}\}$ is independent in (M, M_γ, N^+) . But $\text{tp}(a_\gamma, M_\gamma, M_\beta) = \text{tp}(a_\gamma, M_\gamma, N^+)$ is orthogonal to M_0 , $\text{tp}(b_\ell, M_\gamma, N^+)$ does not fork over M, M_0 and $(M_\gamma, M_\beta, a_\gamma) \in K_s^{3,\text{pr}}$ so by 6.15 necessarily $\text{tp}(b, M_\beta, N^+)$ does not fork over M_0 , as required.

Having carried the induction we got \otimes_α which for $n = 1$ is the statement (D) of 7.9 hence gives the desired conclusion. $\square_{8.5}$

Now we can show that any type in a sense is below a nonforking combination of basic ones. (Compare with 8.6).

8.6 Claim. If $p \in \mathcal{S}_s(M)$ then for some $n, M_\ell (\ell \leq n), a_k (k < n)$ and b we have:

- (a) $M_0 = M$
- (b) $(M_\ell, M_{\ell+1}, a_\ell) \in K_s^{3,\text{pr}}$
- (c) $\text{tp}_s(a_\ell, M_\ell, M_{\ell+1})$ does not fork over M_0 , so

- (d) $\{a_\ell : \ell < n\}$ is independent in (M_0, M_n) and $(M_0, M_n, \{a_\ell : \ell < n\}) \in K_s^{3,qr}$
(e) $b \in M_n$ and $p = \text{tp}(b, M, M_n)$.

Proof. We can find N_0, b such that $M \leq_s N_0$ and $b \in N_0$ and $\text{tp}_s(b, M, N_0) = p$. By 8.3, without loss of generality, possibly increasing N , we have $\boxtimes_{M, N, \bar{M}, \bar{a}}$ for some \bar{M}, \bar{a} as there. By 8.5 we have $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, vq}$ for some \mathbf{J} . Among all such pairs (N, \mathbf{J}) choose one (N^*, \mathbf{J}^*) with the cardinality of \mathbf{J}^* being minimal. Let $\mathbf{J}^* = \{a_i : i < \theta\}$; by hypothesis 8.1(c) we know $(M, N^*, \mathbf{J}^*) \in K_s^{3, qr}$ so we can find an M -based pr-decomposition $\langle M_i, b_j : i \leq \theta, j < \theta \rangle$ over M , i.e. $M_0 = M$ such that $\text{tp}_s(b_j, M, M_{j+1}) = \text{tp}_s(a_i, M, N^*)$ and $\text{tp}_s(b_j, M_j, M_{j+1})$ does not fork over M , of course. So by the section hypothesis 8.1 there is a \leq_s -embedding of N^* into M_θ over M so without loss of generality $N^* \leq_s M_\theta$. Now if $\theta < \aleph_0$ we have gotten the desired conclusion, otherwise $b \in N^* \subseteq M_\theta = \bigcup_{i < \theta} M_i$ so for some $\beta < \theta$ we have $b \in N_\beta$ and has clearly $(M_0, M_\beta, \{a_i : i < \beta\}) \in K_s^{3, qr}$ by 8.1 so we have gotten a contradiction to the choice of (N^*, \mathbf{J}^*) . $\square_{8.6}$

8.7 Definition. 1) We say that $\langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N if $M \leq_s M_i \leq_s N$ and we can find a \leq_s -increasing sequence $\langle N_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ such that $N_0 = M, N \leq_s N_\alpha$ and $\text{NF}_s(M, N_i, M_i, N_{i+1})$. We call $\langle N_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ a witness.
2) For $\alpha = \lambda^+$ we define similarly.

8.8 Weak Uniqueness Claim. *Assume*

- (a) for $\ell = 1, 2, \langle M_i^\ell : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M_ℓ inside N_ℓ as witnessed by $\langle N_i^\ell : i \leq \alpha \rangle$
(b) f is an isomorphism from M_1 onto M_2
(c) for $i < \alpha, f_i$ is an isomorphism from M_i^1 onto M_i^2 extending f .

Then there is N_3 such that $N_2 \leq_s N_3$ and a \leq_s -embedding f^* of N_1 into N_3 extending every f_i .

Proof. Without loss of generality $M_1 = M_2$ call it M and f_0 is the identity on M , so $N_0^\ell = M$.

We choose by induction on $i \leq \alpha$ the tuple (N_i^3, g_i^1, g_i^2) such that

- (α) $N_0^3 = M, g_0^\ell = \text{id}_M$
(β) N_i^3 is \leq_s -increasing continuous

- (γ) g_i^ℓ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of N_i^ℓ into N_i^3 for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (δ) g_i^ℓ is increasing continuous for i
- (ε) $(\forall a \in M_i^1)(g_{i+1}^2(f_i(a)) = g_{i+1}^1(a))$.

For $i = 0, i$ limit this is obvious. For $i = j + 1$ use the uniqueness of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -amalgamation. Having carried the induction, by renaming we get the conclusion.

□_{8.8}

Proof. Straightforward.

8.9 Claim. 1) Assume that $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ for $i < \alpha, \alpha < \lambda^+$. Then we can find $N^+, \langle M_i^+ : i < \alpha \rangle$ such that $\langle N_i^+ : i \leq \alpha \rangle$

- (a) $M = N_0^+, N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+ = N_\alpha^+$
- (b) $\langle N_i^+ : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (c) $M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_i^+ \leq N_{i+1}$
- (d) $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_i, N_i^+, M_i^+, N_{i+1}^+)$
- (e) M_i^+ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_i hence over N .

2) In part (1) it follows that

- (f) there is \mathbf{J}_i such that $(M, M_i^+, \mathbf{J}_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$
- (g) if $u \subseteq \alpha$ and $\{M_i : i \in u\}$ is independent over M inside N then $\{M_i^+ : i \in u\}$ is independent over N inside N^+ .

3) If $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M'_i$ for $i < \alpha$ then we can find N and $\bar{M} = \langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ such that \bar{M} is independent inside (M, N) and M_i, M'_i are isomorphic over M for $i < \alpha$.

Proof. Easy.

8.10 Claim. Assume that $\langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M , inside N with $\bar{N} = \langle N_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$, a witness.

- 1) If $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M'_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_i$ for $i < \alpha$, then $\langle M'_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N .
- 2) In part (1), \bar{N} is also a witness for $\langle M'_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ being \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N .
- 3) If $M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_i^+$ then we can find $N^+, \langle N_i^+ : i \leq \alpha \rangle, \langle f_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $N_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_i^+$ and $N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$

- (b) $\langle N_i^+ : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
 - (c) f_i is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of M_i^+ into N_{i+1} over M_i
 - (d) $\langle N_i^+ : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ witness $\langle f_i(M_i^+) : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N_1^+ .
- 4) There are $\langle M_i^* : i < \alpha \rangle, \langle N_i^+ : i \leq \alpha \rangle, N^+, \langle \mathbf{J}_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ such that:
- (a) $M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_i^*, N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$ and $N_i \leq N_i^+$ for $i < \alpha$
 - (b) $\langle N_i^+ : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ witness that $\langle M_i^* : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N^+
 - (c) $(M, M_i^*, \mathbf{J}_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$.
- 5) If $N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N^+$ then $\langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N^+ .

Proof. 1), 2) Straightforward.

3) By 8.9(2) and then use part (1).

4) By 8.9(2).

5) Trivial.

8.11 Claim. Assume $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ for $i < \alpha$.

1) For any $\bar{M}' = \langle M'_i : i < \alpha' \rangle$, a permutation of $\bar{M} = \langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ (that is for some one to one function π from α onto α' , $M_i = M'_{\pi(i)}$) we have: \bar{M} is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N iff \bar{M}' is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N .

2) $\bar{M} = \langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N iff every finite subsequence \bar{M}' of \bar{M} is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N .

3) Assume $(M, M_i, \mathbf{J}_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$. Then: $\langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N iff $\cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \alpha\}$ is independent in (M, N) and, of course, the \mathbf{J}_i are pairwise disjoint.

Proof. 1) By the symmetry assume $\langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N . By 8.9(2) + 8.10(1) without loss of generality, for each $i < \alpha$ for some \mathbf{J}_i we have $(M, M_i, \mathbf{J}_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$. Now using (3), part (1) is translated to parts of 5.4.

2) Similarly (note 8.9(2), clause (g)).

3) First assume that $\langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N , let $\langle N_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ witness this; of course, $i \neq j \Rightarrow \mathbf{J}_i \cap \mathbf{J}_j = 0, i < j \Rightarrow M_i \cap M_j = M$ (by properties of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$). For $\beta = \alpha$ we get that $\cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \alpha\}$ is independent in (M, N) as required.

We prove by induction on $\beta \leq \alpha$ that $\cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \beta\}$ is independent in $(M, N_{\beta}) = (N_0, N_{\beta})$; of course, we can increase N_{β} (see 5.4(2)). For $\beta = 0$ this is trivial, for β limit use 5.4(1), for $\beta = \gamma + 1$, by 5.6(2) we have \mathbf{J}_{γ} is independent in $(M, N_{\gamma}, N_{\beta})$ and so by 5.6(1) we have $(\cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \gamma\}) \cup \mathbf{J}_{\gamma} = \cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \beta\}$ is independent in (M, N_{β}) .

Second assume that the \mathbf{J}_i -s are pairwise disjoint and $\cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \alpha\}$ is independent in (M, N) . Let $\mathbf{J}_{<\beta} = \cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \beta\}$, so $\langle \mathbf{J}_{<\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha \rangle$ is \subseteq -increasing continuous.

We now choose by induction on $\beta \leq \alpha$, the tuple⁸ $(M_\beta^*, N_\beta^*, \mathbf{J}_\beta^*)$ such that:

- (a) M_β^* is \leq_s -increasing continuous
- (b) N_β^* is \leq_s -increasing continuous
- (c) $M_0^* = M, N_0^* = N$
- (d) $M_\beta^* \leq_s N_\beta^*$
- (e) $M_i \leq_s M_\beta^*$ for $i < \beta$
- (f) $\mathbf{J}_\beta^* \subseteq N_\beta^* \setminus M \setminus \mathbf{J}_{<\beta}$
- (g) \mathbf{J}_β^* is \subseteq -increasing continuous
- (h) $(M, M_\beta^*, \mathbf{J}_\beta^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\beta})$ belongs to $K_s^{3,vq}$
- (i) $\mathbf{J}_\beta^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\alpha}$ is independent in (M, N_β^*)
- (j) $\text{NF}_s(M, M_\gamma^*, M_\gamma, N_\gamma^*)$.

Note that by clauses (a),(e),(j) this is enough to prove $(M_\beta^* : \beta \leq \alpha)$ witness that $\langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is independent in (M, N) , (see Definition 8.7) as required.

For $\beta = 0$ let $M_\beta^* = M, N_\beta^* = N$ and $\mathbf{J}_\beta^* = \emptyset$; easy to check.

For β a limit ordinal let $M_\beta^* = \cup\{M_\gamma^* : \gamma < \beta\}, N_\beta^* = \cup\{N_\gamma^* : \gamma < \beta\}$ and $\mathbf{J}_\beta^* = \cup\{\mathbf{J}_\gamma^* : \gamma < \beta\}$ the least obvious point is clause (h) which holds by 7.16 and clause (i) which holds by 5.4.

Lastly, for $\beta = \gamma + 1$ as $(M, M_\gamma^*, \mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma}) \in K_s^{3,vq}$ by clause (h), and $\mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma} \subseteq \mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\beta}$ is independent in (M, N_γ^*) by clause (i), by 5.18(1) we deduce that $\mathbf{J}_\gamma = \mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\beta} \setminus \mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma}$ is independent in $(M, M_\gamma^*, N_\gamma^*)$. So as $(M, M_\gamma, \mathbf{J}_\gamma) \in K_s^{3,vq}$, by the definition of $K_s^{3,vq}$ (see Definition 5.15) we get $\text{NF}_s(M, M_\gamma^*, M_\gamma, N_\gamma^*)$ hence \mathbf{J}_γ is independent in $(M, M_\gamma^*, N_\gamma^*)$ by 5.6(2). By 5.18(2) we can find (M'_γ, N'_γ) such that: $M_\gamma^* \leq_s M'_\gamma \leq_s N'_\gamma, N_\gamma^* \leq_s N'_\gamma, M'_\gamma$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_γ^*, N'_γ is $(\lambda, *)$ -saturated over N'_γ and $(M'_\gamma, N'_\gamma, \mathbf{J}_\gamma) \in K_s^{3,vq}$ and \mathbf{J}_γ is independent in $(M, M'_\gamma, N'_\gamma)$. By Definition 5.15 (of $K_s^{3,vq}$) this implies $\text{NF}_s(M, M_\gamma, M'_\gamma, N'_\gamma)$. There are also (f_β, N''_γ) such that $N'_\gamma \leq_s N''_\gamma, f_\beta$ is a \leq_s -embedding of M'_γ into N''_γ over M_γ^* and $\text{NF}_s(M_\gamma^*, N_\gamma^*, f_\beta(M'_\gamma), N''_\gamma)$, simply by the existence of NF_s -amalgamation.

As we also have $\text{NF}_s(M, M_\gamma, M_\gamma^*, N_\gamma^*)$ (see above), by transitivity for NF_s we have $\text{NF}_s(M, M_\gamma, f_\beta(M'_\gamma), N''_\gamma)$. As we have $\text{NF}_s(M, M_\gamma, M'_\gamma, N'_\gamma)$ by the uniqueness of NF_s -amalgamation, possibly increasing N''_β , we can extend f_β to f'_β , a \leq_s -embedding of N'_γ into N''_γ such that $\text{id}_{M_\gamma} \subseteq f'_\beta$. Let $N_\beta^* = N''_\gamma, M_\beta^* = f'_\beta(N'_\gamma)$,

⁸the sequence $\langle M_\beta^* : \beta \leq \alpha \rangle$ will witness that $\langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is independent in (M, N)

note that $f'_\beta(M'_\gamma)$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $f'_\beta(M_\gamma^*) = M_\gamma^*$ and $\mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma}$ is independent in $(M, f'_\beta(M'_\gamma))$ and $\mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma} \subseteq f'_\beta(M_\gamma^*) = M_\gamma^*$, hence we can find $\mathbf{J}'_\gamma \subseteq M_\beta^* \setminus (\mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma}) \setminus M$ such that: $\mathbf{J}'_\gamma \cup \mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma}$ is independent in $(M, f'_\beta(M'_\gamma))$ and $(M, f'_\beta(M'_\gamma), \mathbf{J}'_\gamma \cup \mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ by ?. As $M \leq_s f'_\beta(M'_\gamma) \leq_s f'_\beta(N'_\gamma) = M_\beta^*$

→ scite{705-xxX} undefined

and $(M, f'_\beta(M'_\gamma), \mathbf{J}'_\gamma \cup \mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ and $(f'_\beta(M'_\gamma), f'_\beta(N'_\gamma), \mathbf{J}_\gamma) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ we get by 5.18(3) that $(M, f'_\beta(N'_\gamma), \mathbf{J}'_\gamma \cup \mathbf{J}_\gamma^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma} \cup \mathbf{J}_\gamma) = (M, M_\beta^*, (\mathbf{J}'_\gamma \cup \mathbf{J}_\gamma^*) \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\beta}) \in K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$.

Let $\mathbf{J}_\beta^* = \mathbf{J}'_\gamma \cup \mathbf{J}_\gamma^*$, so we have almost finished proving the induction step, we still need: \mathbf{J}_β^* disjoint to $\mathbf{J}_{<\alpha}$ and $\mathbf{J}_\beta^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\alpha}$ is independent in (M, N_β^*) ; for this we know that $\mathbf{J}_\beta^* \cup \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma}$ is independent in $(M, f'_\beta(M'_\gamma))$ and $M \leq_s f'_\beta(M'_\gamma) <_s N_\beta^*$ and $(\mathbf{J}_\beta^* \cap \mathbf{J}_{<\alpha}) \setminus f'_\beta(M'_\gamma) = (\mathbf{J}_{<\alpha} \setminus \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma})$ hence it suffices to prove that $\mathbf{J}_{<\alpha} \setminus \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma}$ is independent in $(M, f'_\beta(M'_\gamma), N_\beta^*)$. But $\text{NF}_s(M_\gamma^*, f'_\beta(M'_\gamma), N_\gamma^*, N_\gamma'')$ and $\mathbf{J}_{<\alpha} \setminus \mathbf{J}_{<\gamma} \subseteq N_\gamma^*$ is independent in $(M, M_\gamma^*, N_\gamma^*)$ as stated above, so by 5.6(2) we are done.

□_{8.11}

8.12 Conclusion. 1) If $\langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N , f_i is an isomorphism from M_0 onto M_i over M for $i < \alpha$ and π is a permutation of α and N^+ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over N , then for some automorphism f of N^+ over M we have $\pi(i) = j \Rightarrow f_j \circ f_i^{-1} \subseteq f$.

2) Assume that $\langle M_i^\ell : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -indiscernible over M_ℓ inside N_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $f_i \supseteq f$ is an isomorphism from M_i^1 onto M_i^2 for $i < \delta$, f an isomorphism from M_1 onto M_2 and N_ℓ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $\cup\{M_i^\ell : i < \alpha\}$. Then there is an isomorphism from N_1 onto N_2 extending $\cup\{f_i : i < \alpha\}$.

Proof. 1) By (2).

2) By 8.10(3) and uniqueness of the $(\lambda, *)$ -saturated model over a model in K_s . □_{8.12}

8.13 Definition. 1) We say that $\langle f_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is $(< \theta)$ -indiscernible over M if: for some sequence $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = \langle a_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta \rangle$ (possibly infinite), $\text{Dom}(f_i) = \{a_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$ for every $i < \alpha$ and for every partial one to one function π such that $\text{Dom}(\pi) \cup \text{Rang}(\pi) \subseteq \alpha$ and $|\text{Dom}(\pi)| < \theta$ there are N^+, g such that $N \leq_s N^+, g$ is an automorphism for N^+ over M and for every $i \in \text{Dom}(\pi)$ we have: g maps $f_i(\bar{\mathbf{a}})$ to $f_{\pi(i)}(\bar{\mathbf{a}})$.

8.14 Claim. Assume $\langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathfrak{s} -independent over M inside N , $f_i (i < \alpha)$ is an isomorphism from M_0 onto M_i over M , and $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$. The following are equivalent:

(A) $p \perp M$

(B) $p \perp f_1(p)$

(C) for some $i < j < \alpha$ we have $f_i(p) \perp f_j(p)$

Proof. By 8.9(3) [NO!: ad proof] it is easy to show that without loss of generality M is $(\lambda, *)$ -saturated and by ? without loss of generality α is infinite.

→ scite{705-xxX} undefined

(B) \Leftrightarrow (C): by the indiscernibility (8.12(1)).

$\neg(C) \Rightarrow \neg(A)$: By the indiscernibility we have $i < j < \alpha \Rightarrow f_i(p) \pm f_j(p)$.

First we can find $\langle M_n^* : n < \omega \rangle, \leq_s$ -increasing, M_{n+1}^* is $(\lambda, *)$ -saturated over M_n^* such that $\cup\{M_n^* : n < \omega\} = M$. Second, we can also find $\langle M_{0,n}^* : n < \omega \rangle \leq_s$ -increasing such that $\text{NF}_s(M_n^*, M_{0,n}^*, M_{n+1}^*, M_{0,n+1}^*)$ and $M_0 \leq_s \cup M_{0,n}^*$ by ?. Third,

→ scite{705-yyY} undefined

without loss of generality $\cup\{M_{0,n}^* : n < \omega\} = M_0$. Fourth, for some n, p does not fork over $M_{0,n}^*$ so without loss of generality $n = 0$. Hence we can consider $M_0^*, \langle f_i(M_{0,0}^*) : i < \alpha \rangle, \langle f'_i = f_i \upharpoonright M_{0,0}^* : i < \alpha \rangle, \langle p'_i = f_i(p \upharpoonright M_{0,0}^*) : i < \alpha \rangle$ and can choose $f'_\alpha, f'_\alpha(M_{0,0}^*) \leq_s M_0$ such that $\langle f'_i \upharpoonright M_{0,0}^* : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is indiscernible over M_0^* . By the indiscernibility clearly $p'_0 \pm p'_\alpha$ but $p'_0 \parallel p_0$ and there is $q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M), q \parallel p'_\alpha$, so we are done. [This is similar to 6.10].

(C) \Rightarrow (A):

Assume $q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M), q \pm p$, so $q \pm p_i$ for $i < \alpha$ where $p_i = f_i(p)$. Let N^+, b be such that $N \leq_s N^+, b \in N^+$ and $\text{tp}(b, N, N^+)$ is a nonforking extension of q . So by 6.4(2), possibly increasing N^+ , for each $i < \alpha$ there is $a_i \in N^+$ such that $\text{tp}(a_i, N, N^+)$ is a nonforking extension of p_i and $\{b, a_i\}$ is not independent in (N, N^+) . But by 6.19(1) $\{a_i : i < \alpha\}$ is independent in (N, N^+) , contradicting 5.13(1) as α is infinite. $\square_{8.14}$

The following will be used in §9[?].

8.15 Claim. *Assume:*

- (a) $\langle N_\alpha^\ell : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ is \leq_s -increasing continuous for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\lambda \mid \delta$
- (b) $M_i^\ell \leq_s N_0^\ell$ for $i < i^*$
- (c) if $N_0^\ell \leq_s M \leq_s N_\delta^\ell, c \in N_\delta^\ell \setminus M$ and $p = \text{tp}_s(c, M, N_\lambda^\ell) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ then $p \pm M_i^\ell$ for some $i < i^*$
- (d) if $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N_\alpha^\ell), \alpha < \delta, \ell \in \{1, 2\}$ and $p \pm M_i^\ell$ for some $i < i^*$ and p is regular, then for λ ordinals $\beta \in (\alpha, \delta)$ there is $c \in M_{\beta+1}^\ell$ such that $\text{tp}_s(c, N_\beta^\ell, N_{\beta+1}^\ell)$ is a nonforking extension of p
- (e) f_0 is an isomorphism from N_0^1 onto N_0^2 mapping M_i^1 onto M_i^2 .

Then there is an isomorphism from N_δ^1 onto N_δ^2 extending f_0 .

Proof. Hence and forth, as usual.

8.16 Claim. 1) If $\langle M_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is independent over M and $a_i \in M_i$, $\text{tp}_s(a_i, M, M_i) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ then $\{a_i : i < \alpha\}$ is independent over M .
 2) If above $(M, M_i, \mathbf{J}_i) \in K_s^{3, \text{bs}}$, $i < \alpha \Rightarrow M_i \leq_s N$ then $\cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < \alpha\}$ is independent in (M, N) .

§9 BETWEEN CARDINALS, NONSPLITTING AND GETTING FULLNESS

Our aim is to get full λ -good⁺-systems. Fullness seems naturally desirable (being closed to superstability) and help in proving the existence of enough regular types.

9.1 Hypothesis. 1) \mathfrak{s} is a successful λ -good⁺ system.

9.2 Definition. 1) For $\lambda < \mu$ we define \mathfrak{s} is a $[\lambda, \mu)$ -frame as in Chapter II, except that $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is a $[\lambda, \mu)$ -a.e.c., i.e., $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}} = K_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{s}'} \upharpoonright \cup \{K_{\kappa}^{\mathfrak{s}'} : \kappa \in [\lambda, \mu)\}$. Let $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}, \mu_{\mathfrak{s}}$ be λ, μ , respectively.

2) We define “a good $[\lambda, \mu)$ -frame”, $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,bs}, K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,pr}, K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,uq}, K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,qr}, K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,vq}$ similarly.

3) For a λ -frame \mathfrak{s} and $\mu > \lambda$ we define $\mathfrak{s}[\lambda, \mu)$ naturally; so $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}[\lambda, \mu)} = K^{\mathfrak{s}} \upharpoonright \cup \{K_{\kappa}^{\mathfrak{s}} : \kappa \in [\lambda, \mu)\}$.

9.3 Claim. *The claims on good λ -frames hold for $[\lambda, \mu)$ -frames with some obvious changes.*

* * *

Not central but we may note

9.4 Definition. 1) We say that \mathfrak{s} is type-full if $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{bs} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{na}$.

2) Let $a \underset{M}{\underset{N}{\cup}} b$ means that $\text{tp}(a, M, N), \text{tp}(b, M, N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{bs}(N)$ and for some $M_{\ell} (\ell < 3)$ we have $M_0 = M, N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2, M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2, a \in M_1$ and $\text{tp}(b, M_1, M_2)$ does not fork over M_0 .

3) We may allow not to distinguish types of elements and of finite tuples, so we use $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M) = \cup \{\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^m(M) : m < \omega\}$ we call such \mathfrak{s} of $(< \omega)$ -type, then let ab be the concatenation (this makes no real difference).

4) We say that \mathfrak{s} is type-closed if \mathfrak{s} is of $(< \omega)$ -types and $\text{tp}(a_{\ell}, M, N) \in \mathcal{S}^{bs}(M)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $a_1 \underset{M}{\underset{N}{\cup}} a_2$ implies $\text{tp}(a_1 a_2, M, N) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{bs}(M)$. [See Claim x].

9.5 Definition. For a λ -good frame \mathfrak{s} (not necessarily satisfying Hypothesis 5.1??) we define a frame $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{s}^{tc}$:

$$\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}} = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}, \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{t}} = \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$$

$\mathcal{S}_t^{\text{bs}} = \{ \text{tp}(a_0 \dots a_{n-1}, M, N) : M \leq_s N, a_\ell \in N \setminus M \text{ for } \ell < n$
 and $\bigcup_M^N \{a_\ell : \ell < n\}$, i.e. we can find M_ℓ satisfying
 $M = M_0 \leq_s M_1 \leq_s \dots \leq_s M_n = N$ and
 $a_\ell \in M_{\ell+1}, \text{tp}(a_\ell, M_\ell, M_{\ell+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_\ell)$
 does not fork over M_0 for $\ell < n\}$

$\bigcup = \{ (M_0, M_1, \bar{a}, M_3) : \text{for some } n \text{ and } \langle M_\ell^* : \ell \leq n \rangle \text{ we have}$

$a = a_0 \dots a_{n-1}, M_3 \leq_s M_n^*, M_1 = M_0^* \leq_s M_1^* \leq_s \dots \leq_s M_n^*$
 and $\text{tp}(a_\ell, M_\ell^*, M_{\ell+1}^*) \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_\ell)$
 does not fork over $M_0\}$.

9.6 Claim. 1) If \mathfrak{s} is a good λ -frame as in Hypothesis 5.1[?], then \mathfrak{s}^{tc} is a good λ -frame as in Hypothesis 5.1 and deal with $(< \omega)$ -type.
 2) If \mathfrak{s} is a good⁺ λ -frame, then \mathfrak{s}^{tc} is a λ -good⁺ frame.
 3) Primes, $K_s^{3, \text{vq}}$ dense, etc., are lifted [FILL!].

Proof. Saharon: We may wonder (see answer later).

* * *

9.7 Definition. 1) We say \mathfrak{K}^1 is situated above \mathfrak{K}^0 if for some $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda_1$ we have: \mathfrak{K}^1 is a λ_1 -a.e.c., with amalgamation, \mathfrak{K}^0 is an λ_0 -a.e.c. with amalgamation and letting $\mathfrak{K}^{0, \text{up}}$ be the lifting (from II§1) we have $K_{\lambda_1}^1 \subseteq K^{0, \text{up}}, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^1} = \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^{0, \text{up}}} \upharpoonright K_{\lambda_1}^1$. We may write $\lambda_\ell = \lambda(\mathfrak{K}^\ell)$. We may treat $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}^1}(a, M, N)$ as $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}^0}(a, M, N)$ when no confusion arises, e.g. $p \upharpoonright N, N \in K_t$.

2) We say \mathfrak{K}_λ^1 is weakly \mathfrak{K}^0 -local (or weakly local above \mathfrak{K}^0) if:

(a) \mathfrak{K}_λ^1 is situated above \mathfrak{K}^0

(b) if $M \in \mathfrak{K}_{\lambda_1}^1$ and $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{K}_\lambda^1}(M)$, then

$\boxtimes p = q \Leftrightarrow (\forall N)[N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^{0, \text{up}}} M \ \& \ N \in K_{\lambda(\mathfrak{K}^0)} \rightarrow p \upharpoonright N = q \upharpoonright N (\in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{K}^0}(N))]$ which means if $p = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}_\lambda^1}(a, M, M_1)$ and $q = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}^1}(b, M, M_2)$

then: $p = q$ iff for every $N \in \mathfrak{K}^0$ satisfying $N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^0, \text{up}} M$ we have $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}^0, \text{up}}(a, N, M_1) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}^0, \text{up}}(b, N, M_2)$ recalling that this means that $N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^0, \text{up}} N_\ell \leq M_\ell, a \in N_1, b \in N_2 \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}^0}(a, N, N_1) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}^0}(b, N, N_1)$.

2A) \mathfrak{K}_λ^1 is basically weak \mathfrak{K}^0 -local if (a),(b) above but in (b), $p, q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$.

3) We say \mathfrak{K}^1 is \mathfrak{K}^0 -local (or local above \mathfrak{K}^0) if

(α) \mathfrak{K}^1 is situated above \mathfrak{K}^0

(β) \mathfrak{K}^1 is weakly \mathfrak{K}^0 -local

(γ) if $M \in \mathfrak{K}^1$ and $p = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}^1}(a, M, M_1) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{K}^1}(M)$, then for some $A \subseteq M, |A| \leq \lambda(\mathfrak{K}^0)$ the type p does not split over A which means that: if $A \subseteq N \in \mathfrak{K}^0, N_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^0, \text{up}} M$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and f is an isomorphism from N_1 onto N_2 over A , then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}^0}(a, N_2, M_1) = f(\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}^0}(a, N_1, M_1))$ (by Definition 2.13 this is equivalent to: if $A \subseteq N \in \mathfrak{K}^0, N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^0, \text{up}} M$ then $(\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}^0, \text{up}}(a, N, M_1))$ does not split over A).

4) We say \mathfrak{s} is situated above \mathfrak{t} if:

(a) $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}$ are good frames

(b) $\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}} \leq \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$

(c) $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is situated above $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}$

(d) if $M \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}(M)$, then: $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ iff for every large enough $N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{t}]} M$ of cardinality $\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}$ we have $p \upharpoonright N \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N)$

(e) similarly “ $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ does not fork over $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1$ ” iff there are $N_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}} N_1$ (so $N_\ell \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}$) such that $N_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{t}]} M_\ell$:

(*) if $N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}} N_1^+ \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{t}]} M_1$ then $p \upharpoonright N_1^+ \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{t}}^{\text{bs}}(N_1^+)$ does not fork over N_0 .

5) We say \mathfrak{s} is weakly \mathfrak{t} -local (or local above \mathfrak{t})

(α) \mathfrak{s} is situated above \mathfrak{t}

(β) $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is weakly $\mathfrak{K}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ -local, i.e., clause (b) of (2) (which deals with not necessarily basic types); but even for basic types this (b) of (2) is not implied by “ \mathfrak{s} situated above \mathfrak{t} ”.

5A) We say \mathfrak{s} is \mathfrak{t} -local (or local above \mathfrak{t}) if

(α) \mathfrak{s} is situated above \mathfrak{t}

(β) $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is $\mathfrak{K}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ -local (see (3)).

6) In (5) we add basically if in (b) of (c) we demand this.

6A) In (5A) we add the adjective “basically” if we weaken clauses $(\beta), (\gamma)$ of part (3) to $(\beta)^{\text{bs}} + (\gamma)^{\text{bs}}$ respectively; that is \mathfrak{s} is basically \mathfrak{t} -local if:

- (α) \mathfrak{s} is situated
- (β)^{bs} if $M \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$, then $p = q \Leftrightarrow (\forall N)[N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{t}]} M \ \& \ N \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{t}} \rightarrow p \upharpoonright N = q \upharpoonright N (\in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{t}}(N))]$
- (γ)^{bs} if $M \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}, p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$, then for some $A \subseteq M$ we have $|A| \leq \lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}$ and p does not split over A .

7) We say \mathfrak{s} is a strongly \mathfrak{t} -local if:

- (α) \mathfrak{s} is basically \mathfrak{t} -local
- (β) $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}$ are weakly successful
- (γ) if $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$, then for almost every $X \in [N]^{\leq \lambda[\mathfrak{t}]}$ the type $\text{tp}_{K[\mathfrak{t}]}(X, M, N)$ does not split over $X \cap N$, see Definition xxx
- (δ) for $M_{\ell} \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ for $\ell < 4$, we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ iff for almost all $Y \in [M_0 \cup M_1 \cup M_2 \cup M_3]^{\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}}$, $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{t}}(M_0 \upharpoonright Y, M_1 \upharpoonright Y, M_2 \upharpoonright Y, M_3 \upharpoonright Y)$
- (δ)' NF have⁹ reflection from \mathfrak{s} to \mathfrak{t} and lifting from \mathfrak{t} to \mathfrak{s} and x.x.

8) We say \mathfrak{s} is super \mathfrak{t} -local if:

- (α) $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}$ are weakly successful frames
- (β) $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}$ have primes¹⁰ and $\perp = \perp_{\text{wk}}$ (for both)
- (γ) \mathfrak{s} is strongly \mathfrak{t} -local
- (δ) if $(M_0, M_1, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ then for almost all $Y \in [M_1]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$ we have $(M_0 \upharpoonright Y, M_1 \upharpoonright Y, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}^{3, \text{pr}}$.

8A) We say that \mathfrak{s} is super- \mathfrak{t} -local if:

- (α) $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}$ are weakly successful frames
- (β) \mathfrak{s} is strongly \mathfrak{t} -local
- (γ) if $M_0 \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}, p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ then there are M_1, a such that
 - (i) $(M_0, M_1, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$
 - (ii) $\text{tp}(a, M_0, M_1) = p$
 - (iii) for almost all $Y \in [M_1]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$ we have $(M_0 \upharpoonright Y, M_1 \upharpoonright Y, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}^{3, \text{uq}}$.

⁹is it reasonable to demand this instead for $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$? Then for NF it follows.

¹⁰To demand every $(M_0, M_1, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ is reflected incomparable. To demand for a dense family is enough and weak.

9) In any of the above we add “fully” if $\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda_1}^1 = \mathfrak{K}_{\lambda_1}^{0, \text{up}}$ (for a.e.c.) or $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}} = (K[\mathfrak{t}])_{\lambda(\mathfrak{s})}$ (for frames).

9.8 Claim. *Assume $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^+$ is weakly successful and \mathfrak{t} is $\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}$ -good⁺ and successful.*

1) *If $M \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M)$, then p does not split over some $A \subseteq M$ of cardinality $\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}$ [even in a stronger sense: for $N_{\ell} \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{t}]} M$, N_{ℓ} in any cardinality].*

2) *\mathfrak{s} is strongly \mathfrak{t} -local.*

3) *[??] If $M \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$, $A \subseteq M$, $|A| < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M)$, then*

p does not split over A iff $(\forall N \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{t}})$

$[N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^{\mathfrak{t}}} M \ \& \ A \subseteq N \rightarrow p \upharpoonright N \text{ does not } \lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}\text{-split over } A]$

4) *\mathfrak{s} is super \mathfrak{t} -local.*

Proof. Essentially from II.?

Some of the obvious properties are

9.9 Claim. 1) *If \mathfrak{s}_2 is \mathfrak{s}_1 -local and \mathfrak{s}_1 is \mathfrak{s}_0 -local, then \mathfrak{s}_2 is \mathfrak{s}_0 -local.*

2) *If \mathfrak{s}_2 is strongly \mathfrak{s}_1 -local, \mathfrak{s}_1 has χ -nonsplitting, then \mathfrak{s}_2 has χ -nonsplitting.*

3) *If \mathfrak{s}_2 is strongly \mathfrak{s}_1 -local and \mathfrak{s}_1 is strongly \mathfrak{s}_0 -local, then \mathfrak{s}_2 is strongly \mathfrak{s}_0 -local.*

4) *Similar results for the “basic” version.*

5) *Similar results for “ \mathfrak{K}^{ℓ} a λ_{ℓ} -a.e.c.”.*

6) *Similar results of “ \mathfrak{s} is super \mathfrak{t} -local”.*

Proof. Easy.

We now investigate the reflection of the following properties and their negation: independent, orthogonal $K^{3, \text{qr}}$, $K^{3, \text{vq}}$.

9.10 Claim. 1) *Assume \mathfrak{K}^2 is situated above \mathfrak{K}^1 . If $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^2} M_2$ then for almost all $Y \in [M_2]^{\lambda[\mathfrak{t}]}$ we have $M_1 \upharpoonright Y \leq_{\mathfrak{t}} M_2$; similarly for $M_1 \not\leq_{\mathfrak{K}^2} M_2$ & $\{M_1, M_2\} \in \mathfrak{K}^2$.*

2) *[\mathfrak{s} is situated above \mathfrak{t}]*

(a) *$p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ does not fork over $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1$ iff for almost every $Y \in [M_1]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$ we have: $p \upharpoonright Y \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{t}}^{\text{bs}}(M_1 \upharpoonright Y)$*

- (b) if $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$ and $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_1, M_2}$ is independent in (M_0, M_1, M_2) for \mathfrak{s} , then for almost all $Y \in [M_2]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$ we have: $\mathbf{J} \cap Y \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_1 \upharpoonright Y, M_2 \upharpoonright Y}$ is independent in $(M_0 \upharpoonright Y, M_1 \upharpoonright Y, M_2 \upharpoonright Y)$ for \mathfrak{t} ,
- (c) if $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$, then for almost all $Y \in [M]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$ we have $p \underset{\text{wk}_{\mathfrak{s}}}{\perp} q \Rightarrow p \upharpoonright (M \upharpoonright Y) \underset{\text{wk}_{\mathfrak{t}}}{\perp} q \upharpoonright (M \upharpoonright Y)$
- (d) if $M_{\ell} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M, p_{\ell} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_{\ell})$ then $p_1 \parallel p_2$ iff for almost every $Y \in [M]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$, $M_{\ell} \upharpoonright Y \leq_{\mathfrak{t}} M$ and $p_1 \upharpoonright (M_1 \upharpoonright Y) \parallel p_2 \upharpoonright (M_2 \upharpoonright Y)$.

9.11 Claim. Assume \mathfrak{s} is super \mathfrak{t} -local.

- 1) If $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$ and $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_1, M_2}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ then \mathbf{J} is independent in (M_0, M_1, M_2) iff for almost every $Y \in [M_2]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$ the set $\mathbf{J} \cap Y$ is independent in $(M_0 \upharpoonright Y, M_1 \upharpoonright Y, M_2 \upharpoonright Y)$.
- 2) If $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ then $p \underset{\text{wk}_{\mathfrak{s}}}{\perp} q$ iff for almost every $Y \in [M]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$, $p \upharpoonright (M \upharpoonright Y) \underset{\text{wk}_{\mathfrak{t}}}{\perp} q \upharpoonright (M \upharpoonright Y)$.
- 3) If $(M_0, M_1, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{qr}}$ then for almost all $Y \in [M_0]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$ we have $(M_0 \upharpoonright Y, M_1 \upharpoonright Y, \mathbf{J} \cap Y) \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}^{3, \text{qr}}$, similarly for $\notin K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{qr}}$.
- 4) Like (3) for $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$.
- 5) If $M_{\ell} \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ for $\ell < 4$ then: $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ iff for almost all $Y \in [\bigcup_{\ell < 4} M_{\ell}]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$ we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{t}}(M_0 \upharpoonright Y, M_1 \upharpoonright Y, M_2 \upharpoonright Y, M_3 \upharpoonright Y)$; similarly for the negation.
- 6) If $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{t}]} M_2 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}, M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{t}} M_1, M_1 \cap M_2 = M_0$ then we can find M_3 such that: $M_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3, M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{t}]} M_3$ and for almost all $Y \in [M_3]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$ we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{t}}(M_0 \upharpoonright Y, M_1 \upharpoonright Y, M_2 \upharpoonright Y, M_3 \upharpoonright Y)$. We express this as $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$. Similar we define “ $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_2)$ does not fork over M_0 for $(\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{s})$ ”.
- 7) If $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$ and $\bar{\mathbf{a}} \in {}^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}(M_2)$, then for some $A \in [M_1]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$ we have $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, M_1, M_2)$ does not $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -split over A .
- 8) The parallel of 8.14 (fill).

Proof. Fill (particularly (7)).

For some club $\mathcal{C}_{\ell} \subseteq [M_{\ell}]^{\lambda(\mathfrak{t})}$ we have $Y \in \mathcal{C}_{\ell} \Rightarrow M_{\ell} \upharpoonright Y \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{t}]} M_{\ell}$.

Now without loss of generality $Y \in \mathcal{C}_2 \Rightarrow Y \cap M_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1$ so now for every $Y \in \mathcal{C}_2$ we have $M_1 \upharpoonright Y = M_1 \upharpoonright (Y \cap M_1) \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{t}]} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{t}]} M_2$ and $M_2 \upharpoonright Y \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{t}]} M_2$ and $M_1 \upharpoonright Y \subseteq M_2 \upharpoonright Y$ hence by axiom V of a.e.c. we have $M_1 \upharpoonright Y \leq_{[\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{t}]]} M_2 \upharpoonright Y$ which means that $M_1 \upharpoonright Y \leq_{\mathfrak{t}} M_2 \upharpoonright Y$. □_{9.11}

9.12 Claim. 1) We say $\bar{\mathfrak{s}} = \langle \mathfrak{s}_\theta : \lambda_0 \leq \theta \leq \lambda_1 \rangle$ is a super local sequence if:

- (a) each \mathfrak{s}_θ is a weakly successful good θ -frame
- (b) if $\lambda_0 \leq \theta_0 < \theta_1 < \lambda$ then \mathfrak{s}_{θ_1} is fully super \mathfrak{s}_{θ_1} -local.

2) For such $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$ let: $\mathfrak{K}_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}} = (\mathfrak{K}[\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_{\lambda_0}])_{[\lambda_0, \lambda_1^+]}$ and we write $\leq_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$ for $\leq_{K_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}}$. Let $\text{NF}_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ iff $M_0 \leq_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}} M_\ell \leq_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}} M_3$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and for almost every $Y \in [M_3]^{\lambda_0}$ we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda_0}}(M_0 \upharpoonright Y, M_1 \upharpoonright Y, M_2 \upharpoonright Y, M_3 \upharpoonright Y)$.

9.13 Claim. 1) If $\bar{\mathfrak{s}} = \langle \mathfrak{s}_\theta : \theta \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1] \rangle$ is a super local sequence and λ_1 is a limit cardinal then for one and only one \mathfrak{s}_{λ_1} the sequence $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}' = \langle \mathfrak{s}_\theta : \theta \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1^+] \rangle$ is a super local sequence.

2) If $\bar{\mathfrak{s}} = \langle \mathfrak{s}_\theta : \theta \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1^+] \rangle$ is a super local sequence and \mathfrak{s}_{λ_1} is successful, and we define $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda_1^+} = \mathfrak{s}_{\lambda_1}^+$ then the sequence $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}' = \langle \mathfrak{s}_\theta : \theta \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1^{++}] \rangle$ is a super local sequence (but not necessarily full!).

Proof. FILL!

□_{9.13}

Now we return to trying to deal with all types in $\mathcal{S}(M)$, i.e. fullness.

9.14 Definition. [\mathfrak{s} is a λ -frame]

1) For $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ let $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{na}}(M) = \{\text{tp}(b, M, N) : M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N \text{ and } b \in N \setminus M\}$.

2) The λ -frame \mathfrak{s} is type-full if $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M) = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{na}}(M)$.

3) [\mathfrak{s} is a weakly successful good λ -frame]

Let $\mathfrak{s}^{\text{nf}} = \mathfrak{s}(\text{nf})$ be the following frame (see below)

- (a) $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(\text{nf})} = \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$
- (b) $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\text{nf})}^{\text{bs}}(M) = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{na}}(M)$
- (c) $\bigcup (M_0, M_1, a, M_3)$ holds iff $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3$ and $a \in M_3 \setminus M_1$ and there $\mathfrak{s}(\text{nf})$ are M'_3, M_2 such that $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M'_3, M_3 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M'_3$ and $a \in M_2$ and $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M'_3)$.

4) [\mathfrak{s} as in (3)]

Let $\mathfrak{s}^{+\text{nsp}}$ be the $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ -frame which we also denote by $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$ or $\mathfrak{s}(+\text{nsp})$, defined by

- (a) $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} = \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+\text{nsp})}$
- (b) $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{bs}}(M) = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+\text{nsp})}^{\text{nsp}}(M) =: \{p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{na}}(M) : \text{for some } M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M \text{ from } K_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{s}}, p \text{ does not } \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}\text{-split over } M_0 \text{ (see Definition 2.13(1) in our case as } M \text{ is}$

$K^\mathfrak{r}$ -saturated over λ , this means that every automorphism g of M over M_1 maps p to itself), if \mathfrak{s} is successful this is $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{na}}(M)$

- (c) $\bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} (M_0, M_1, a, M_3)$ if $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3, a \in M_3 \setminus M_1$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a, M_1, M_3)$ does not $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -split over some $N_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_0, N_0 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

9.15 Claim. *Assume \mathfrak{s} is a successful good^+ -frame. If $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ and $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M)$ and $N \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} M$ & $N \in K_{\mathfrak{s}} \Rightarrow (p \upharpoonright N) = (q \upharpoonright N)$ then $p = q$.*

Proof. Similar to 2.15.

9.16 Lemma. *Assume that \mathfrak{s} is a successful good^+ frame. Then the frame $\mathfrak{s}(+\text{nsp}) = \mathfrak{s}(\ast)$ is a good^+ $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ -frame and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{bs}}(M) = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(M)$, $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$ has primes and weak orthogonality and is equivalent to orthogonality for it and $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}$ is categorical.*

Proof. We have to check the axioms there.

Axioms: (A),(B),(C).

As $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} = \mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ this follows from 1.9(1).

Axiom: (D),(a),(b) by the Definition of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{bs}}$.

Axiom (D)(c): Any $a \in N \setminus M$ is O.K. by [\aleph_{600} , §6],II.? (2) (use representation, remember that every model $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}$ is saturated in $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ above $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ of cardinality $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+ = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}$). Hence we get also $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{bs}}(M) = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{na}}(M)$.

Axiom (D)(d): This holds as $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ is stable in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ by 1.9(2) + [\aleph_{600} , §4],II.? but $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} = \mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$, alternately use [\aleph_{600} , §6],II.?(1)(?).

Axiom (E)(a): By the definitions.

Axiom (E)(b): [monotonicity].

So Assume $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M'_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M'_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_3 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M'_3$ and $\bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} (M_0, M_1, a, M_3)$

so it is witnessed by some $N_0 \leq_{K[\mathfrak{s}]} M_0$ with $N_0 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

Now the same N_0 witness $\bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} (M'_0, M'_1, a, M_3)$. The other statement $(\bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} (M_0, M_1, a, M_3) \Leftrightarrow$

$\bigcup_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} (M_0, M_1, a, M'_3))$ is immediate by $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a, M'_1, M'_3) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a, M_1, M_3)$.

Axiom (E)(c): (local character).

So assume that $\langle M_i : i \leq \delta + 1 \rangle$ is $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$ -increasing continuous, $\delta < (\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)})^+ = \lambda^{++}$, $c \in M_{\delta+1} \setminus M_{\delta}$, and assume toward contradiction that $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(c, M_{\delta}, M_{\delta+1}) \in$

$\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(*)}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta)$ is a counterexample. Without loss of generality $\delta = \text{cf}(\delta)$, so $\delta \leq \lambda^+$. Let $\bar{M}^i = \langle M_\alpha^i : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_i , E a thin enough club of λ^+ , so e.g.

$$\alpha \in E \Rightarrow c \in M_\alpha^{\delta+1}$$

and

$$\alpha \in E \ \& \ \alpha < \beta \in E \ \& \ i \leq \delta \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_\beta^i, M_\alpha^{\delta+1}) \text{ does not } \lambda\text{-split over } M_\alpha^i$$

and

$$\alpha < \beta \in E \ \& \ i < \delta \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_\beta^\delta, M_\beta^{\delta+1}) \text{ does } \lambda\text{-split over } M_\alpha^i.$$

Choose $\varepsilon_i \in E$ for $i \leq \delta$, increasing continuous, so $\langle M_{\varepsilon_i}^i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is $<_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, each $M_{\varepsilon_i}^i$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed for \mathfrak{s} and $i < j \leq \delta \Rightarrow M_{\varepsilon_j}^j$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_{\varepsilon_i}^i$ for \mathfrak{s} . If $\delta < \lambda^+$, by Subclaim 2.15, for some $i < \delta$, $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_{\varepsilon_\delta}^\delta, M_{\varepsilon_{\delta+1}}^{\delta+1})$ does not λ -split over $M_{\varepsilon_i}^i$ for $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$, contradiction to the choice of E above (and obvious monotonicity of nonsplitting). If $\delta = \lambda^+$, use Fodor's lemma.

Axiom (E)(d): [transitivity]

Assume

$$(\alpha) \ M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(*)} M_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(*)} M_3 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(*)} M_4$$

$$(\beta) \ a \in M_4 \setminus M_3$$

$$(\gamma) \ \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(*)}(a, M_2, M_4), \mathfrak{s}(*)\text{-does not fork over } M_1 \text{ and}$$

$$(\delta) \ \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(*)}(a, M_3, M_4), \mathfrak{s}(*)\text{-does not fork over } M_2.$$

Let $\bar{M}^\ell = \langle M_\zeta^\ell : \zeta < \lambda^+ \rangle$, for $\ell = 1, 2, 3, 4$ be a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_ℓ such that $a \in M_0^4$ and without loss of generality $\alpha < \beta < \lambda^+ \ \& \ 1 \leq \ell < m \leq 4 \Rightarrow \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_\alpha^\ell, M_\alpha^m, M_\beta^\ell, M_\beta^m)$ and for $\ell = 1, 2$

$$\boxtimes_\ell \ M_0^\ell \text{ witness } \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(*)}(a, M_{\ell+1}, M_4), \mathfrak{s}(*)\text{-does not fork over } M_\ell.$$

Let $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_\ell$ list M_0^ℓ so $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_\ell \in {}^\lambda(M_\ell)$. Now assume $\bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}} \in {}^\lambda(M_3)$ are such that

$$(\varepsilon) \ \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\bar{\mathbf{b}}, M_1^0, M_4) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}, M_1^0, M_4).$$

As M_2 is $\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]$ -brimmed above $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we can find $\bar{\mathbf{b}}' \in {}^\lambda(M_2)$ such that

$$(\zeta) \ \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\bar{\mathbf{b}}', M_2^0, M_4) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\bar{\mathbf{b}}, M_2^0, M_4)$$

similarly we can find $\bar{c}' \in {}^\lambda(M_2)$ such that

$$(\eta) \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\bar{c}', M_2^0, M_4) = \text{tp}(\bar{c}, M_2^0, M_4).$$

Chasing equalities $(\varepsilon) + (\zeta) + (\eta)$, as $M_1^0 \subseteq M_2^0$, clearly $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\bar{b}', M_1^0, M_4) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\bar{c}', M_1^0, M_4)$, hence by clause (γ) more exactly by \boxtimes_1 we have

$$(\theta) \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\langle a \rangle^{\wedge} \bar{b}', M_1^0, M_4) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\langle a \rangle^{\wedge} \bar{c}', M_1^0, M_4).$$

By clause (δ) , i.e., by \boxtimes_2 and the statement (η) we have

$$(\iota) \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\langle a \rangle^{\wedge} \bar{c}, M_2^0, M_4) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\langle a \rangle^{\wedge} \bar{c}', M_2^0, M_4)$$

and similarly by \boxtimes_2 and (ζ)

$$(\kappa) \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\langle a \rangle^{\wedge} \bar{b}, M_2^0, M_4) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\langle a \rangle^{\wedge} \bar{b}', M_2^0, M_4).$$

By chasing the equalities $(\theta) + (\iota) + (\kappa)$ we get $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\langle a \rangle^{\wedge} \bar{b}, M_0^0, M_4) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}(\langle a \rangle^{\wedge} \bar{c}, M_0^0, M_4)$ as required.

Axiom (E)(e): [Unique nonforking extension].

So let $M_0 <_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_1$ and $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ does not fork over M_0 and $p \upharpoonright M_0 = q \upharpoonright M_0$. Let $M_1 <_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_2$ and $a_1, a_2 \in M_2$ be such that $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_1, M_1, M_2) = p$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_2, M_1, M_2) = q$. Let $\langle M_{\ell, \zeta} : \zeta < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_ℓ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ with $a_1, a_2 \in M_{2,0}$. By the assumption and the definition of $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$ for a club E of λ^+ we have, for $\zeta \in E, p \upharpoonright M_{0, \zeta} = q \upharpoonright M_{0, \zeta} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_{0, \zeta})$ call it r_ζ and $p \upharpoonright M_{1, \zeta}, q \upharpoonright M_{1, \zeta}$ belong to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_{1, \zeta})$ and does not λ -split over $M_{0,0}$ and they extend r_ζ ; also for $\zeta < \xi$ in E and $\ell < 2$ we have $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_{\ell, \zeta}, M_{\ell+1, \zeta}, M_{\ell, \xi}, M_{\ell+1, \xi})$ and for $\ell < \xi, M_{\ell, \xi}$ is (λ, \ast) -brimmed over $M_{\ell, \zeta}$ for \mathfrak{s} . Now for $\zeta < \xi$ from E , let g be an isomorphism from $M_{1, \xi}$ onto $M_{2, \xi}$ over $M_{1, \zeta}$, (clearly exists). Let \bar{a} list $M_{1, \xi}$, and $\bar{b} = g(\bar{a})$, so as for $\ell = 1, 2$, $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\bar{a}_\ell, M_{1, \xi}, M_{2, \xi})$ does not λ -split over $M_{0,0} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{1, \zeta}$ (by the hypothesis) there is an extension g_ℓ of g to an automorphism of M_2 such that $g_\ell(a_\ell) = a_\ell$, so clearly $p \upharpoonright M_{1, \xi} = q \upharpoonright M_{1, \xi}$. By 9.8(2) we get $p = q$ (recall that $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} = \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}$).

Axiom (E)(f): [Symmetry].

The proof relies on (E)(g) proved below.

We use freely $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} = \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$.

By the symmetry (in the axiom) assume clause (b) there and we shall prove clause (a). So there are M_4, M_5 such that $M_3 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_5$ and $M_0 \cup \{a_2\} \subseteq M_4 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_5$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_1, M_4, M_5)$ does not fork over M_0 for $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$. By (E)(g) we can find $M_6, M_7 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}$ such that $M_4 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_6 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_7, M_5 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_7$ and M_6 is $(\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+, \ast)$ -brimmed over M_5 for \mathfrak{s}^+ (equivalently for $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$) and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}}(a_1, M_6, M_7)$ does not fork over M_4 for $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$.

By transitivity (i.e. clause (E)(d)) we know that $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_1, M_6, M_7)$ does not fork over M_0 for $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$. By 8.6 applied to \mathfrak{s}^+ we can find M_2, \mathbf{J}_2 such that $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_6, \mathbf{J}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_0, M_2}^{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}$ is finite and $(M_0, M_2, \mathbf{J}_2) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{3, \text{qr}}$ and $a_2 \in M_2$. Also by 8.6 for \mathfrak{s}^+ without loss of generality we can find M_1^*, a_1^* such that $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_1^* \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_7$ and $a_1^* \in M_1^*$ such that $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_1^*, M_0, M_1^*) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_1, M_0, M_3)$ (equivalently, for $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}$) and $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(M_0, M_1^*, M_6, M_7)$ and M_1^* is (λ^+, \ast) -brimmed over M_0 for \mathfrak{s}^+ . We also can find M_1 such that $M_0 \cup \{a_1^*\} \subseteq M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_1^*, \mathbf{J}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_0, M_1}^{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}$ is finite and $(M_0, M_1, \mathbf{J}_1) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{3, \text{qr}}$.

Now

- ⊗₁ $\mathbf{J}_1 \cup \mathbf{J}_2$ is independent in (M_0, M_7) for \mathfrak{s}^+
[why? see 8.11(3)]
- ⊗₂ $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_1^*, M_6, M_7)$ does not fork over M_0 for $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$
- ⊗₃ $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_1^*, M_6, M_7) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_1, M_6, M_7)$
[why? as both are $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$ -nonforking extensions of $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_1, M_0, M_3)$.]

We are done by subclaim ? below.

→ scite{705-x.X} undefined

Axiom(E)(g): [extension existence]

So let $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)} M_1$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ so for some $N_0 \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}, N_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_0$ and N_0 is a witness for p . So M_0, M_1 are saturated models in λ^+ for $\mathfrak{K}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ hence there is an isomorphism f from M_0 onto M_1 over N_0 and $f(p) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ is witnessed by N_0 and extend $p \upharpoonright N_0$ hence p . [Saharon: say more]

Axiom (E)(h): By claim 9.17(1) below.

Axiom (E)(i): By [600 , §2],II.? it follows.

Lastly

$\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$ is good⁺:

So assume $\bar{M}^\ell = \langle M_\alpha^\ell : \alpha < \lambda^{++} \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}$ -increasing continuous, $M_\alpha^0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_\alpha^1, a_\alpha \in M_{\alpha+1}^0, \text{tp}(a_{\alpha+1}, M_{\alpha+1}^0, M_{\alpha+2}^0) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{bs}}(M_{\alpha+1}^0)$ is an $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$ -nonforking extension of $p^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta^0)$ but $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_{\alpha+1}, M_0^1, M_{\alpha+2}^1)$ does $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$ -fork over M_0^0 and we shall get a contradiction.

As $p^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}^{\text{bs}}(M_0^0)$ clearly for some $N^* \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we have $N^* \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_0^0$ and p^* does not λ -split over N^* hence (by 9.17(2) below) also $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_{\alpha+2}, M_{\alpha+1}^0, M_{\alpha+2}^0)$ does not λ -split over N^* . let $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -representation of M_0^1 , and without loss of generality $N^* \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_0$.

Now for each $\alpha < \lambda^{++}$ the type $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a_{\alpha+1}, M_0^1, M_{\alpha+2}^1)$ does $\mathfrak{s}(\ast)$ -fork over M_0^1 hence it does λ -split over N^* , but clearly for some $\zeta_\alpha < \lambda^+$ it does not λ -split over

$N_{\zeta(\alpha)}$. So for some $\zeta^* < \lambda^+$ the set $W = \{\alpha < \lambda^{++} : \zeta_\alpha = \zeta^*\}$ is unbounded in λ^{++} . Now choose by induction on $\varepsilon < \lambda$ a triple $(\alpha_\varepsilon, M_{0,\varepsilon}, M_{1,\varepsilon})$ such that:

- (a) $\alpha_\varepsilon \in S$ is increasing
- (b) $M_{0,\varepsilon} \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_{\alpha_\varepsilon}^0$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (c) $M_{1,\varepsilon} \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_{\alpha_\varepsilon}^1$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (d) $M_{0,\varepsilon} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{1,\varepsilon}$
- (e) $a_{\varepsilon(\alpha)} \in M_{0,\varepsilon+1}$
- (f) $N^* \subseteq M_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{\zeta^*} \subseteq M_{1,\varepsilon}$.

There is no problem to carry the definition and $\langle (M_{0,\varepsilon}, M_{1,\varepsilon}; a_\varepsilon) : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ provide a counterexample to “ \mathfrak{s} is good $^+$ ”.

□_{9.16}

9.17 Claim. 1) Assume the pre- λ -frame \mathfrak{r} (see 0.2) satisfies axiom (E)(c),(d) (of good frames of II.?) and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{bs}} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{K}\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{na}}$.

Then it satisfies (E)(h), too. [have appeared?]

2) In clause (c) of Definition 9.14(4), an equivalent condition is

- (*) if $N_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_0, N_0 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a, M_0, M_3)$ does not λ -split over N_0 then also $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}(\ast)}(a, M_1, M_3)$ does not λ -split over it.

Proof. So assume $\langle M_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ be $\leq_{\mathfrak{r}}$ -increasing continuous, $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta)$ and $p \upharpoonright M_i$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{bs}}(M_i)$, does not \mathfrak{r} -fork over M_0 for $i < \delta$. As $p \upharpoonright M_i$ is not realized in M_i for $i < \delta$ this holds for $i = \delta$, too. Let $(M_\delta, M_{\delta+1}, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{r}}^{3,\text{bs}}$ be such that $p = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{r}}(a, M_\delta, M_{\delta+1})$; now by an assumption p belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{bs}}(M_\delta)$ hence by (E)(c) for some $i < \delta$ the type $p = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{r}}(a, M_\delta, M_{\delta+1})$, does not \mathfrak{r} -fork over M_i . But we assume that $p \upharpoonright M_i$ does not \mathfrak{r} -fork over M_0 . So by Axiom (E)(d) together we get p does not \mathfrak{r} -fork over M_0 . □_{9.17}

Of course

9.18 Claim. If \mathfrak{s} is a successful type full λ -good $^+$ -frame, then \mathfrak{s}^+ is a full λ^+ -good frame and $\mathfrak{s}^* = \mathfrak{s}^+$.

Proof. Easy.

9.19 Claim. [\mathfrak{s} is successful and type-full λ -good frame].

If $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$ and $(M_\ell, M_{\ell+1}, a_\ell) \in K_\lambda^{3, \text{pr}}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, then $(M_0, M_1, a_0 a_1) \in K_\lambda^{3, \text{pr}}$.

Proof. Use 5.8(2).

[But \oplus -closed suffices.]

9.20 Question: Add on \mathfrak{s}^{nf} for \mathfrak{s} saturative. Saharon!

* * *

9.21 Claim. [*Here?*] Assume \mathfrak{s} is super \mathfrak{t} -local, both full.

If $M_0 \leq_{K[\mathfrak{t}]} M_1$, $M_0 \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}$, $M_1 \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$, $p_1 \in \mathcal{S}(M_1)$ does not fork over M_0 , $p_0 = p \upharpoonright M_0 < \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{t}}(M_0)$, then $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p_1) = \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{t}}(p_0)$.

§10 REGULAR TYPES

10.1 Hypothesis. \mathfrak{s} is a λ -good weakly successful frame with primes such that \mathfrak{s} is type-full.

10.2 Definition. 1) We say that $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ is regular if there are M_0, M_1, a, M_2 such that:

- (a) M_ℓ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (b) $M_0, M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2, a \in M_2$
- (c) $p' = \text{tp}(a, M_1, M_2)$ is parallel to p
- (d) p' does not fork over M_0
- (e) if $c \in M_2 \setminus M_1$ realizes $p' \upharpoonright M_0$ then c realizes p' .

2) We say that $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ is regular⁺ if there are M_1, M_2, a such that clauses (a)-(d) above holds and (see §2)

- (e)' if $c \in M_2 \setminus M_1$, then $\text{rk}(\text{tp}(c, M, M_2)) \geq \text{rk}(p)$.

3) We add “directly”, if

- (g) $M_1 = M$.

Remark. Note that regular \neq regular⁺, e.g. T is the first order theory of $M = (\omega \times \omega \cup \omega, P^M, Q^M, F^M)$ when $P^M = \omega \times \omega, Q^M = \omega, F^M((n, m)) = n, F^M(n) = n$.

By and for our purposes every regular type is “equivalent to a regular⁺ type so those suffice.

10.3 Claim. 1)

- (a) If $p_1 \parallel p_2$ then p_1 is regular iff p_2 is regular
- (b) if M is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed (trivially holds if $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is categorical) and $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$, then p is regular iff it is directly regular.

2) If $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ is regular, M is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 , p does not fork over M_0 and $(M, M_2, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$, $\text{tp}(a, M, M_2) = p$ and we let $M_1 = M$. Then p is regular iff clause (e) of 10.2 holds. So trivially (a), (b), (c), (d) of 10.2 hold, i.e., holds for M_0, M_1, M_2, a .

3) The parallel of parts (1),(2) holds for regular⁺.

- 4) If $(M, N, a) \in K_s^{3, \text{Pr}}$ and $p = \text{tp}_s(a, M, N)$ is regular⁺, M is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed, then $c \in N \setminus M \Rightarrow \text{rk}(\text{tp}(c, M, N)) \geq \text{rk}(p)$.
- 5) If p is regular⁺ then p is regular.

Proof. 1a) So assume that $M' \leq_s M$ and $M'' \leq_s M$ and $p' \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M')$, $p'' \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M'')$ are parallel, that is some $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ does not fork over M' and over M'' and $p \upharpoonright M' = p'$, $p \upharpoonright M'' = p''$ and we should prove that p' is regular iff p'' is regular. By the symmetry it suffices to show that p' is regular iff p is regular. Now the “if” direction is trivial (the same witnesses M_0, M_1, M_2, a works). For the “only if” direction, let (M'_0, M'_1, M'_2, a) witness p' is regular and without loss of generality M'_2 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M'_1 .

As \mathfrak{K}_s has amalgamation and $M' \leq_s M$, $M' \leq_s M'_2$ without loss of generality for some M_1 we have $M'_1 \leq_s M_1$ and $M \leq_s M_1$ and without loss of generality M_1 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M'_1 \cup M$. There is an isomorphism f from M'_1 onto M_1 over M'_0 as both are $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over it, and we can find f^+, M_2, a^* such that $M_1 \leq_s M_2$, $f^* \supseteq f$, f^* an isomorphism from M'_2 onto M_2 and $f^*(a) = a^*$.

Now $f^*(M'_0), M_1 = f^*(M'_1), M_2 = f^*(M'_2)$ and a^* witnesses the regularity of p .

1b) The if direction is obvious (same witnesses).

For the other direction assume that M_0, M_1, M_2, a witness that $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ is regular. There is M'_0 such that $M_0 \leq_s M'_0 \leq_s M_1$ such that M'_0 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 and M_1 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M'_0 . Clearly there is an isomorphism f from M'_0 onto M and it can be extended to an isomorphism f^+ from M_1 onto M_1 . Without loss of generality $f^+(\text{tp}(a, M_1, M_2)) = \text{tp}(a, M_1, M_2)$ (as both types does not fork over M_0 and M'_0, M_1 are isomorphic over M_0 hence there is $g \in \text{Aut}(M'_0)$ over M_0 such that $g(\text{tp}(a, M'_0, M_2)) = f^{-1}(p)$). Hence replacing f by $f \circ g$ we are “done”. Using f^+ we can find f^*, M'_2, a' such that $f^* \supseteq f^+$ is an isomorphism from M_2 onto M'_2 , $f^*(a) = a'$ and $(f^*(M_0), M_1, M'_2, a')$ is a witness to p directly regular.

2), 3), 4) Similar.

5) Because if M_1 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 and $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ and $q \in \mathcal{S}(M_1)$, $q \neq p$, $q \upharpoonright M_0 = p \upharpoonright M_0$ then $\text{rk}(p) = \text{rk}(p \upharpoonright M_0) > \text{rk}(q)$, see 2.19(4) + 2.22. $\square_{10.3}$

10.4 Claim. 1) If $M <_s N$ and M is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed, then for some $c \in N \setminus M$ the type $\text{tp}(c, M, N)$ is regular⁺ (hence regular).

2) If $M_0 <_s M <_s N$, M is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed and $p \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ is realized by some member of $N \setminus M$ and M is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 , then for some $c_1 \in N \setminus M$ realizing p we have $\text{tp}_s(c_1, M, N)$ is regular.

Proof. 1) Choose $c \in N \setminus M$ such that $\text{rk}_s(\text{tp}_s(c, M, N))$ is minimal. Then choose $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed $M_0 <_s M$ such that M is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 and $\text{tp}(c, M, N)$

does not fork over M_0 .

2) Choose $c \in N \setminus M$ realizing p with $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M, N))$ minimal. Let $a_1 \in M_0^1$ realize $p \upharpoonright M_1$, let f be an isomorphism from M_1 onto M (exists as there is $M^- <_{\mathfrak{s}} M$ such that M is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M^- and p does not fork over M^-). $\square_{10.4}$

10.5 Claim. $[\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^+, \mathfrak{t}$ is λ -good⁺ successful with primes or just \mathfrak{s} is super \mathfrak{t} -local \mathfrak{t} with primes [Saharon]].

Assume $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bs}}, p = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M, N)$ and $q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ and $M_0 \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}, M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{t}]} M$ (so M is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed [if $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^+$]).

1) If p does not fork over M_0 then

(a) p is regular (for \mathfrak{s}) iff $p \upharpoonright M_0$ is regular (for \mathfrak{t})

(b) Similarly for regular⁺

(c) if $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and $c \in N \setminus M$ realizes $p \upharpoonright M_0$ then c realizes p .

2) There is a regular⁺ type $p_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ not orthogonal to p , and realized in N such that $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p_1) \leq \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p)$ and $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(r) < \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p_1) \Rightarrow r \perp p$ for $r \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M)$ or just $r \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M'), M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M'$. Question: Is \mathfrak{s} not \mathfrak{t} ?

3) If p, q are regular⁺ not orthogonal, then q is realized in N and $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(q) = \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p)$.

4) If $M^* \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M, p \upharpoonright M^* = q \upharpoonright M^*, p \neq q, p$ does not fork over M^* and p is regular then $p \perp q$.

5) If p is regular⁺ and $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(q) < \text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p)$ then $p \perp q$.

6) Let $p_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ be not orthogonal to p with minimal rank. Then

(α) p_1 is realized in N and is regular⁺

(β) if p is regular and $(M, N^1, a^1) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}, p_1}^{3, \text{pr}}$ then p is realized in N^1 .

7) If $a_1 \in N \setminus M$ and $p \perp q$ and $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_1, M, N) \perp q$ and $M' <_{\mathfrak{s}} M$ & $p \perp M' \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_1, M, N) \perp M'$.

8) If p, q are regular not orthogonal then q is realized in N .

Proof. For the case $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^+$ let $\langle M_{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle, \langle N_{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be $\leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{t}]}$ -representation of M, N respectively. Without loss of generality $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and $\alpha < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow (M_{\alpha}, N_{\alpha}, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{t}}(M_{\alpha}, N_{\alpha}, M_{\beta}, N_{\beta})$ hence $(M_{\alpha}, N_{\alpha}, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{t}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ [used?] and $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow N_{\beta}, M_{\beta}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ - \mathfrak{t} -brimmed over N_{α}, M_{α} respectively.

1) Easy. (see 2.20 which deals with rk , but the proof works).

2) Choose $p_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ realized by some $c_1 \in N \setminus M$ with $\text{rk}_{\mathfrak{s}}(p_1)$ minimal and let $N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ be such that $(M, N_1, c_1) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$. Now p_1 is regular⁺ by 10.3(2),(3) it is realized in N as exemplified by c_1 . Also $\text{rk}(p_1) \leq \text{rk}(p)$ by the minimality of $\text{rk}(p_1)$.

Lastly, assume $r \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M'), r \perp p, M \leq_s M'$; without loss of generality $M = M'$ (see 8.14 and its proof). Without loss of generality p, p_1, r do not fork over M_0 , so as N is λ_t^+ -saturated (for K^t) there is $c_2 \in N$ realizing $r \upharpoonright M_0$ such that $\{a, c_2\}$ is not independent over M_0 inside N . Now this implies $c_2 \notin M$ hence $\text{rk}_s(\text{tp}_s(c_2, M, N)) \geq \text{rk}_s(p_1)$ so necessarily using 2.20? $\text{rk}_s(r) = \text{rk}_t(r \upharpoonright M_0) = \text{rk}_t(\text{tp}_t(c_2, M_0, N)) \geq \text{rk}_s(\text{tp}_s(c_2, M, N)) \geq \text{rk}_s(p_1)$ as required.

3) First assume $\text{rk}(q) \leq \text{rk}(p)$.

Without loss of generality p, q does not fork over M_0 , so $p \upharpoonright M_0, q \upharpoonright M_0$ are regular⁺ not orthogonal (by part (1) and by 6.11 respectively). As $a \in N$ realizes $p \upharpoonright M_0$ and N is λ_t^+ -saturated there is $c \in N$ realizing $q \upharpoonright M_0$ such that $\{a, c\}$ is not independent over M_0 inside N for t . Hence $c \notin M$, hence $\text{rk}_s(\text{tp}_s(c, M, N)) \leq \text{rk}_t(\text{tp}_t(c, M_0, N)) = \text{rk}_s(q) \leq \text{rk}_s(p)$ so $\text{rk}_s(\text{tp}_s(c, M, N)) = \text{rk}(p)$.

As p is regular⁺ and $(M, N, a) \in K_{s,p}^{3,\text{pr}}$ this implies that $\text{rk}_s(\text{tp}_s(c, M, N))$ is equal to $\text{rk}_s(p)$, hence to $\text{rk}_s(q)$, so necessarily $\text{tp}_s(c, M, N) = q$ and $\text{rk}_s(p) = \text{rk}_s(q)$. We are left with the case $\text{rk}_s(p) < \text{rk}_s(q)$. But then interchanging p and q (and replacing N, a by others) we get a contradiction.

4) Without loss of generality $M_0^* =: M^* \cap M_0 <_t M_1$ and p does not fork over it.

Without loss of generality and p and q does not fork over (are witnessed by) M_0 and $p \upharpoonright M_1$ and $p \perp q \Leftrightarrow (p \upharpoonright M_0 \perp q \upharpoonright M_0)$. Assume toward contradiction that $p \perp q$ hence for some $c \in N$ realizing $q \upharpoonright M_0, \{a, c\}$ is not independent over M_0 inside N , hence $c \in N \setminus M$. So choose $c' \in N \setminus M$ realizing $q \upharpoonright M_0$ with $\text{rk}_s(\text{tp}_s(c', M, N))$ minimal, and choose $\alpha < \lambda_t^+$ such that $M_\alpha \leq_t N' \leq_t N_\alpha$ and $\text{tp}(c', M, N)$ does not fork over M_α and $c' \in N'_\alpha$ and (M_α, N', a) belongs to $K_t^{3,\text{uq}}$ hence to $K_t^{3,\text{pr}}$, and N' is $(\lambda, *) - t$ -saturated over M_0 .

So $M_0, M_\alpha, N', a, p \upharpoonright M_\alpha, c'$ contradict “ $p \upharpoonright M_1$ is t -regular (check Definition 10.2(1)).

5) Proof similar to (3).

6) Clause (α) : as in the proof of part (2).

Proof of Clause (β) :

By clause (α) we know that p_1 is realized in N , so without loss of generality $N^1 \leq_s N$ hence $a^1 \in N$. Without loss of generality both p and p_1 does not fork over M_0 and so as in earlier cases there is $c \in N^1$ realizing $p \upharpoonright M_0$ such that $\{c, a^1\}$ is not independent in N over M_0 . This implies $c \in N^1 \setminus M$ hence by clause (c) of part (1) we know that c realizes p , as required.

7) Easy.

8) Let $p_1 \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ be not orthogonal to p of minimal rank, and let $q_1 \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M)$ be not orthogonal to q of minimal rank. By part (6), clause (α) p_1, q_1 are regular⁺. By part (6) clause (α) , p_1 is realized in N say by a_1 . Now $p_1 \perp q_1$ (apply twice part (6)(β)+(7) to get $(p_1 \perp q_1 \Rightarrow p \perp q)$), hence by part (3) some $b_1 \in N$ realizes q_1 hence by part (6) clause (β) (applied to q, q_1) some $b \in N$ realizes q , as required.

□_{10.5}

10.6 Conclusion. 1) Non-orthogonality among regular types is an equivalence relation.

2) For regular $p, q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ and $r \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ we have $p \pm q, q \pm r \Rightarrow p \pm r$.

3) For $p, q, r \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$, q regular, $p \pm q, q \pm r$ we have $p \pm r$.

4) For nonorthogonal $p, q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N)$ and $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$, we have $p \perp M \Leftrightarrow q \perp M$.

[Saharon: with categoricity use $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})$, \mathfrak{s} saturated over \mathfrak{t} .

10.7 Claim. [\mathfrak{s} categorical in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$].

1) If $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N)$ is not orthogonal to M then there is $q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N)$ not orthogonal to p , conjugate to p (i.e., $f(p) = q$ for some $f \in \text{Aut}(M)$) and q does not fork over M .

2) If $\langle M_i : i \leq \delta + 1 \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous and $M_{\delta} \neq M_{\delta+1}$, then for some $c \in M_{\delta+1} \setminus M_{\delta}$ and nonlimit $i < \delta$, we have $\text{tp}(c, M_{\delta}, M_{\delta+1})$ does not fork over M_i , and is orthogonal to M_{i-1} if $i > 0$ so \mathfrak{s} has enough regulars (see Definition x.x).

3) If in part (2), $q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{\delta})$ is regular realized by some member of $M_{\delta+1}$, then we can demand $\text{tp}(c, M_i, M_{\delta+1})$ is conjugate to q .

4) In part (1), if for some M_0 is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_0 , then we can get q conjugate to p over M_0 .

Proof. 1) Let $r \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ be not orthogonal to p . Let $\langle M_{\alpha} : \alpha \leq \omega \rangle, \langle N_{\alpha} : \alpha \leq \omega \rangle$ be as in the proof of 8.14, i.e., $M = M_{\omega} = \cup \{M_n : n < \omega\}, N = N_{\omega} = \cup \{N_n : n < \omega\}$, $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_n, N_n, M_{n+1}, M_{n+1}, N_{n+1})$ and M_{n+1}, N_{n+1} is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_n, N_n respectively; without loss of generality p does not fork over N_0 and r does not fork over M_0 . We can find $\langle f_i : i < \lambda^+ \rangle$ such that f_{1+i} is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of N_0 into M over M_0 , $f_0 = \text{id}_{N_0}$, such that $\langle f_i(N_0) : i < \omega \rangle$ is independent over M_0 (see 8.14) and clearly $f_i(p \upharpoonright N_0) \pm q \upharpoonright M_0$, hence $f_i(p \upharpoonright N_0) \pm M_0$. By 8.14 clearly $p \upharpoonright N_0 \pm f_1(p \upharpoonright N_0)$ and let $q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N)$ be a nonforking extension of $f_1(p \upharpoonright N_0)$.

2) By 10.4(1) for some $d \in M_{\delta+1} \setminus M_{\delta}$, the type $\text{tp}(d, M_{\delta}, M_{\delta+1})$ is regular, and apply part (3).

3) Let $j = \text{Min}\{i \leq \delta : q \pm M_i\}$, as $q \pm M_{\delta}$ clearly j is well defined. By 6.10(2), j is a nonlimit ordinal and by part (1) there is $r \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{\delta})$ not forking over M_j not orthogonal to q and conjugate to q hence r is regular and by 10.6(4)a is orthogonal to M_{j_1} for $j_1 < j$ but not orthogonal to p .

By 10.5(8) some $c \in M_{\delta+1} \setminus M_{\delta}$ realizes r .

4) Easy. □_{10.7}

10.8 Claim. If $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_3)$ is regular and $p \pm M_1, p \pm M_2$ then $p \pm M_0$.

Proof. FILL (used in 12.9).

10.9 Claim. 1) Assume

- (a) \mathfrak{s} is super \mathfrak{t} -local
- (b) \mathfrak{t} is weakly successful with primes, categorical in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{t}}$.

Then the conclusion of 10.7 holds.

2) If \mathfrak{s} satisfies 10.7(1) then it satisfies 10.7(2), (3), (4).

Proof. 1) By part (2) it suffices to prove 10.7(1), it holds by the same proof using 9.10(8) instead of 8.14.

2) Same proof. □_{10.9}

10.10 Definition. We call $(\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in \mathscr{W}$ regular if $c \in \mathbf{J}_i \Rightarrow \text{tp}(c, M_i, M_{i+1})$ is regular; we say “regular except \mathbf{J} ” if $c \in \mathbf{J}$ are excluded.

10.11 Claim. [\mathfrak{s} categorical in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ or just the conclusions of 10.7.]

1) Assume $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ and $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}$ is independent in (M, N) . Then we can find a prime $(\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{ar}}$ with $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{J}_0, M_0 = M, N = \cup\{M_n : n < \omega\}$ and $(\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$ is regular except (possibly) \mathbf{J} .

2) If $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{uq}}$ then we can find prime regular $(\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{ar}}$ with $\mathbf{J}_0 = \{a\}, M_0 = M, N = \cup\{M_n : n < \omega\}$.

3) If $N_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N_2, c \in N_2 \setminus N_1, \text{tp}(c, N_1, N_2) \pm N_0$ then for some $b \in N_2 \setminus N_1$ the type $\text{tp}(b, N_1, N_2)$ does not fork over N_0 and is regular.

Proof. 1) Like the proof of 3.8 using 10.7(2).

2) Follows.

3) Apply part (1) with (N_1, N_2, \emptyset) here standing for (M, N, \mathbf{J}) there and get $(\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$ as there. If for some $c \in \mathbf{J}_0, \text{tp}(c, M_0, M_1) \pm N_0$, then by 10.7(3) we get the desired conclusion. Otherwise, we get contradiction by claim 10.12 below. □_{10.11}

10.12 Claim. If $(\bar{M}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{ar}}$ is prime, $N <_{\mathfrak{s}} M_0$ and $c \in \mathbf{J}_0 \Rightarrow \text{tp}(c, M_0, M_1) \perp N$ then $M_0 <_N^{\mathfrak{s}} \bigcup_n M_n$ (see Definition 5.7(2)), i.e., every $q \in \mathscr{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ not forking over N has a unique extension in $\mathscr{S}^{\text{bs}}(\bigcup_{n < \omega} M_n)$.

Proof. Easy (put in §5?).

10.13 Definition. 1) For $M \leq_s N$ let $\mathbf{I}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}} = \{c \in N : \text{tp}(c, M, N) \text{ is regular}\}$.
 2) For $M <_s N$, we define on $\mathbf{I}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}}$ a dependence relation called the (M, N) -dependence relation by:

- (a) $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}}$ is (M, N) -independent if it is independent
- (b) $c \in \mathbf{J}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}}$ is (M, N) -dependent on $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{J}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}}$ iff there is an independent $\mathbf{J}' \subseteq \mathbf{J}$ such that $c \in \mathbf{J}'$ or $\mathbf{J} \cup \{c\}$ is not independent.

We omit (M, N) if clear.

Remark. We can use only regular⁺ types; somewhat simplify.

10.14 Claim. Assume $M \leq_s N$.

- 1) The relations in 10.13 and their negations are preserved iff we replace N by a \leq_s -extension.
- 2) If $\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}}$ are (M, N) -independent, every $b \in \mathbf{J}_2$ does (M, N) -depend on \mathbf{J}_1 and $c \in \mathbf{I}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}}$ depend on \mathbf{J}_2 , then $c \in (M, N)$ -depend on \mathbf{J}_1 .
- 3) The (M, N) -dependence relation satisfies the axioms of dependence relation, such that dimension is well defined.
- 4) $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}}$ is a maximal (M, N) -independent subset of $\mathbf{I}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}}$ iff $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{uq}}$ iff $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_s^{3, \text{qr}}$.
- 5) If $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \{p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M) : p \text{ regular}\}$ is a maximal set of pairwise orthogonal types and $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}}$, Then we can find \mathbf{J}', f such that:

- (a) $\mathbf{J}' \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}}$ is (M, N) -independent
- (b) h is a function from \mathbf{J} onto \mathbf{J}' such that $h(c), (M, N)$ -depend on $\{c\}$
- (c) $c \in \mathbf{J}' \Rightarrow \text{tp}_s(c, M, N) \in \mathcal{P}$.

Proof. Straight. [Details???

10.15 Claim. 1) Assume $\mathbf{J}_i \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}$ for $i < i^*$ and $i \neq j$ & $a \in \mathbf{J}_i$ & $b \in \mathbf{J}_j \Rightarrow \text{tp}_s(a, M, N) \perp \text{tp}(b, M, N)$.

Then

- (α) $i \neq j \Rightarrow \mathbf{J}_i \cap \mathbf{J}_j = \emptyset$
- (β) $\cup\{\mathbf{J}_i : i < i^*\}$ is independent in (M, N) iff for each i, \mathbf{J}_i is independent in (M, N) .

2) Assume $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M,N}^{\text{reg}}$ and \mathcal{E} is the following equivalence relation on $\mathbf{I}_{M,N} : aEb \Leftrightarrow \text{tp}(a, M, N) \pm \text{tp}(b, M, N)$. Then \mathbf{J} is independent in (M, N) iff $\mathbf{J}/(a/\mathcal{E})$ is independent in (M, N) .

Proof. Easy.

10.16 Remark.: 1) Say on weight and simple; so 8.3 and $(M, N, c) \in K^{3,\text{pr}}$; here?
 2) Where [\mathfrak{s} saturative] if $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$, $\text{tp}(c, M_1, M_2) \perp M_0$ and $(M_0, M_1, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{vq}}$ then $(M_0, M_2, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{vq}}$?
 For more on groups see [Sh:F569].

10.17 Claim. Assume

- (a) $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ are superlimit
- (b) if $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ is regular then for some regular $q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{br}}(M)$ we have $\dim(q, N) = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $p \pm q$, (see Definition 5.12, ? .

\rightarrow scite{705-5.1A} undefined

Then N is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M .
 [Used in 12.34. (is 6.orth.x)]

Proof. FILL!

10.18 Claim. If $NF_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3), p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_3)$ is regular and $p \pm M_1, p \pm M_2$ then $p \pm M_0$.

§11 DOP

Note that this is meaningful for non-excellent frame.

Question: Change the framework to super local $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$? or \mathfrak{s} super \mathfrak{t} -local?

On weight: see 11.5, 11.6, 11.7. Main gap for describing $M_a \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ where $<_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -extend a fixed N .

11.1 Hypothesis. \mathfrak{s} is λ -good⁺ frame which is successful, with prime models (see below), such that $K_{\lambda}^{3,\text{uq}} = K_{\lambda}^{3,\text{pr}}$. [check]

Let $\mathfrak{C} \in K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ be saturated over λ .

11.2 Definition. 1) We say \mathfrak{s} has DOP if: we can find M_{ℓ} (for $\ell < 4$) and a_{ℓ} (for $\ell = 1, 2$) and q which exemplifies it, which means

- (a) $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$
- (b) $(M_0, M_{\ell}, a_{\ell}) \in K_{\lambda}^{3,\text{uq}}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (c) $(M_1, M_3, a_2) \in K_{\lambda}^{3,\text{uq}}$
- (d) $q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_3)$ is orthogonal to M_1 and to M_2 .

2) Above we also say that (p_1, p_2) has the DOP if there are M_{ℓ} ($\ell < 4$), a_{ℓ} ($\ell = 1, 2$) exemplifying it which means exemplifying DOP and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_{\ell}, M_0, M_{\ell}) \parallel p_{\ell}$; we say (p_1, p_2) has the explicit DOP if $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_{\ell}, M_0, M_i) = p_{\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

3) We say \mathfrak{s} has NDOP if it fails to have DOP.

11.3 Claim. 1) *If M_{ℓ} ($\ell < 3$), a_{ℓ} ($\ell = 1, 2$) satisfies clauses (a), (b), (c) of Definition 11.2 and $(p_1, p_2) = (\text{tp}(a_1, M_0, M_1), \text{tp}(a_2, M_0, M_2))$ has the explicit DOP, then replacing M_3 by some M'_3 , $M_1 \cup M_2 \subseteq M'_3 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3$ clauses (c), (d) hold.*

Proof. 1) Let M'_{ℓ} ($\ell < 4$), a'_{ℓ} ($\ell = 1, 2$), q' exemplifies (p_1, p_2) has explicit DOP, so $M'_0 = M$, $\text{tp}(a'_{\ell}, M'_0, M'_{\ell}) = p_{\ell}$. By uniqueness of primes we are done.

[Saharon: need!]

[Or first find M_3 such that $(M_1, M_3, a_2) \in K_{\lambda}^{3,\text{uq}}$ then as $(M_0, M_2, a_2) \in K_{\lambda}^{3,\text{pr}}$ there is $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embedding f of M_2 into M_3 over $M_0 \cup \{a_2\}$, let $g \in \text{AUT}(\mathfrak{C})$ extend $f \cup \text{id}_{M_1}$ (exists as $\text{NF}(M, M_1, M_3, \mathfrak{C})$ and $\text{NF}(M, M_1, f(M_2), \mathfrak{C})$), so $g^{-1}(M_3)$ is as required.] □_{11.3}

11.4 Claim. 1) [\mathfrak{s} has NDOP see Definition 11.2.] Assume

- (a) $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$
- (b) $(M_0, M_\ell, a_\ell) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (c) $(M_1, M_3, a_2) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$.

Then

- (d) $(M_2, M_3, a_1) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$.

2) If $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $(M_0, M_\ell, a_\ell) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then the following are equivalent:

- (α) M_3 is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -minimal over $M_1 \cup M_2$
- (β) $(M_1, M_3, a_2) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$
- (γ) $(M_2, M_3, a_1) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$.

Proof. 1) If this fails, then by 7.9 we can find $M'_3 <_{\mathfrak{s}} M_3$, $(M_2, M'_3, a_1) \in K_{\lambda}^{3, \text{uq}}$ and $b \in M_3 \setminus M'_3$ such that $\text{tp}(b_1, M'_3, M_3)$ is not orthogonal to M_0 . Hence by the Definition of “a type is orthogonal to a model” there is $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ such that $\text{tp}(c, M'_3, \mathfrak{C}) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M'_3)$ does not fork over M_0 and $c \uplus_{M'_3} b$. By the choice of

$c, c \amalg_{M_0} M'_3$ but $a_1 \amalg_{M_0} a_2$ hence $\{a_1, a_2, c\}$ is independent over M_0 hence $\{c, a_2\}$ is independent over (M_0, M_1) . Also c is independent over (M_1, M_2) hence c is independent over (M_0, M_3) , i.e., $\text{tp}(c, M_3, \mathfrak{C})$ does not fork over M_0 hence by monotonicity $\text{tp}(c, M_3, \mathfrak{C})$ does not fork over M'_3 . By the choice of b this contradicts $c \uplus_{M'_3} b$.

2) Similar.

[Question: can move to §5, ignoring regularity?]

□_{11.4}

11.5 Definition. Assume $M_1, M_2 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$, $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}[M_1] =: \cup\{\mathcal{S}(N) : N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_1, N \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}\}$. Then $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathcal{P}} M_2$ means that $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_2$ and if $p \in \mathcal{P}$, p_ℓ the nonforking extension of p in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, then p_2 is the unique extension of p_1 in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_2)$.

11.6 Claim. Let $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}, \mathcal{P}$ as in 11.5.

1) $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathcal{P}}$ is a partial order on $\{M' : M \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M' \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}\}$.

2) If $\langle M_i : i < \delta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}, \mathcal{P}}$ -increasing continuous, $\delta < \lambda^+$ and $M_\delta = \bigcup_{i < \delta} M_i$ then

$i < \delta \Rightarrow M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathcal{P}} M_\delta$.

3) If $r \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ is orthogonal to every $p \in \mathcal{P}$ and $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{3, \text{uq}}$,

$\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a, M, N) = r$ then $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathcal{P}} N$.

4) $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathcal{P}} N$ iff there is a pr-decomposition $\langle M_i, a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ of N over M (so letting $M_\alpha =: N, M_i$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous, $M_0 = M_1(M_i, M_{i+1}, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ and) $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M_i, N) \perp \mathcal{P}$ for every $i < \alpha$.

Proof. Straight.

11.7 Claim. 1) Assume $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M)$ and

(*) \mathcal{P} is a type base for M which means:

(a) $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}[M] = \cup \{\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(N) : N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M, \text{ (so } N \in K_{\mathfrak{s}})\}$

(b) for every $q \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ there is $r \in \mathcal{P}$ not orthogonal to it.

Then we can find a decomposition $\langle M_i : i \leq n \rangle, \langle a_\ell : \ell < n \rangle$ such that

(i) $M_0 = M$,

(ii) p is realized in M_n , and

(iii) for each $\ell < n$, either $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_\ell, M_\ell, M_{\ell+1})$ is a nonforking extension of some $q \in \mathcal{P}$ or $\text{tp}(a_\ell, M_\ell, M_{\ell+1})$ is orthogonal to M (can be waived if $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}} = K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$).

2) Assume that \mathfrak{s} has NDOP and $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $(M_0, M_\ell, a_\ell) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $(M_1, M_3, a_2) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$. Then $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_1) \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_2)$ is a type base for M_3 .

3) [??] If $(\langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle, \langle a_i : i < \alpha \rangle)$ is a decomposition of M_α over M_0 , so $(M_i, M_i, a_i) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}, N_i \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_{i+1}$ then $\{p : \text{for some } i < \alpha, p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_{i+1}) \text{ and } p \perp M_i\} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_0)$ is a type base for M_α .

Proof. Easy.

11.8 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $\langle M_\ell^* : \ell < 4 \rangle, \langle a_\ell : \ell = 1, 2 \rangle, q$ are as in 11.2
- (b) $a_\ell^k \in \mathfrak{C}$ realizes $\text{tp}(a_\ell, M_0, M_\ell)$ and $\langle a_\ell^k : \ell = 1, 2 \text{ and } k = 1, 2 \rangle$ is independent over M_0
- (c) $M_\ell^k \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \mathfrak{C}$, f_ℓ^k is an isomorphism from M_ℓ onto M_ℓ^k over M_0 for $\ell = 1, 2$, $k = 1, 2$ and $f_\ell^k(a_\ell) = a_\ell^k$
- (d) $(M_1^{k_1}, M^{k_1, k_2}, a_2^{k_2}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{Pr}}$
- (e) f^{k_1, k_2} is an isomorphism from M_3 onto $M^{k_1, k_2} \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \mathfrak{C}$ extending $f_1^{k_1} \cup f_2^{k_2}$
- (f) $q^{k_1, k_2} = f^{k_1, k_2}(q)$.

Then the types $q^{1,1}, q^{1,2}, q^{2,1}, q^{2,2}$ are pairwise orthogonal and each of them orthogonal in M_ℓ^k for $\ell = 1, 2, k = 1, 2$.

Proof. Straightforward.

11.9 Claim. \mathfrak{s} has DOP iff \mathfrak{s}^+ has DOP.

Proof. FILL! Straight. Decide!

Our aim is to get strong nonstructure in λ^{++} when \mathfrak{s} has DOP. [Why in λ^{++} ? We have quite strong independence but it speaks on λ -tuples, hence it is hard to get many models in λ^+ , and if we deal with $K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$, why not ask λ^+ -saturation. Using [Sh:F569] we hope to deal with $K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}}$, too.]

11.10 Definition. 1) We call \mathfrak{a} an approximation or an \mathfrak{s} -approximation (in symbols $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{A}$) if \mathfrak{a} consists of the following objects, satisfying the following demands

- (a) $I_1^{\mathfrak{a}}, I_2^{\mathfrak{a}}$ disjoint index sets of cardinality $\leq \lambda^+$
- (b) $R_{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq I_1^{\mathfrak{a}} \times I_2^{\mathfrak{a}}$, we write $sR_{\mathfrak{a}}t$ for $(s, t) \in R_{\mathfrak{a}}$, $\neg sR_{\mathfrak{a}}t$ for $s \in I_1^{\mathfrak{a}}$, $t \in I_2^{\mathfrak{a}}, (s, t) \notin R_{\mathfrak{a}}$
- (c) $M_\ell^{\mathfrak{a}}$ for $\ell < 4$, $a_\ell^{\mathfrak{a}}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $q_{\mathfrak{a}}$ exemplifying DOP
- (d) $M^{\mathfrak{a}} \in K_{\lambda^+}$ saturated (so $\in K_{\lambda^+}[\mathfrak{s}^+]$) such that $M_0^{\mathfrak{a}} \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M^{\mathfrak{a}}$
- (e) $f_{\ell,t}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ an $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embedding of $M_\ell^{\mathfrak{a}}$ into $M^{\mathfrak{a}}$ for $\ell = 1, 2, t \in I_\ell^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and we let $M_{\ell,t}^{\mathfrak{a}} = f_{\ell,t}^{\mathfrak{a}}(M_\ell^{\mathfrak{a}})$, $a_{\ell,t}^{\mathfrak{a}} = f_{\ell,t}^{\mathfrak{a}}(a_\ell^{\mathfrak{a}})$
- (f) $\{a_{\ell,t}^{\mathfrak{a}} : \ell = 1, 2 \text{ and } t \in I_\ell^{\mathfrak{a}}\} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_0^{\mathfrak{a}}}$, $M^{\mathfrak{a}}$ is independent over $M_0^{\mathfrak{a}}$; hence $\langle M_{\ell,t}^{\mathfrak{a}} : \ell = 1, 2, t \in I_\ell^{\mathfrak{a}} \rangle$ is independent
- (g) if $sR_{\mathfrak{a}}t$ then $f_{s,t}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embedding of $M_3^{\mathfrak{a}}$ into $M^{\mathfrak{a}}$ extending $f_{1,s}^{\mathfrak{a}} \cup f_{2,t}^{\mathfrak{a}}$; we let $M_{s,t}^{\mathfrak{a}} = f_{s,t}^{\mathfrak{a}}(M_3^{\mathfrak{a}})$, $q_{s,t}^{\mathfrak{a}} = f_{s,t}^{\mathfrak{a}}(q^{\mathfrak{a}})$.

- 2) For an approximation \mathfrak{a} let $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{a}^+ = \{q_{s,t}^\mathfrak{a} : sR_\mathfrak{a}t \text{ hence } s \in I_1^\mathfrak{a} \text{ and } t \in I_2^\mathfrak{a}\}$
 $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{a}^- = \{f(q_\mathfrak{a}) : \text{for some } f \text{ and } (s,t) \in I_1^\mathfrak{a} \times I_2^\mathfrak{a} \text{ such that } \neg sR_\mathfrak{a}t, f \text{ is a } \leq_{\mathfrak{R}}\text{-embedding of } M_3^\mathfrak{a} \text{ into } M \text{ extending } f_{1,s}^\mathfrak{a} \cup f_{2,t}^\mathfrak{a}\}$.
- 3) Let $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_\mathfrak{s}$ be the class of \mathfrak{s} -approximations.
- 4) We call \mathfrak{a}^* a DOP witness if it consists of $M_\ell^{\mathfrak{a}^-}$ ($\ell < 4$), $a_\ell^{\mathfrak{a}^-}$ ($\ell = 1, 2$), $q^{\mathfrak{a}^-}$ which are as above. If \mathfrak{b} is an approximation let \mathfrak{b}^- be defined naturally.

11.11 Definition. 1) If $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ are approximations let $\mathfrak{a} \leq \mathfrak{b}$ means:

- (α) $M_\ell^\mathfrak{a} = M_\ell^\mathfrak{b}$ for $\ell < 4$, $a_\ell^\mathfrak{a} = a_\ell^\mathfrak{b}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, $q^\mathfrak{a} = q^\mathfrak{b}$
- (β) $I_\ell^\mathfrak{a} \subseteq I_\ell^\mathfrak{b}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $R_\mathfrak{a} = R_\mathfrak{b} \cap (I_1^\mathfrak{a} \times I_2^\mathfrak{a})$
- (γ) for $\ell = 1, 2, t \in I_1^\mathfrak{a}$ we have $f_{\ell,t}^\mathfrak{a} = f_{\ell,t}^\mathfrak{b}$
- (δ) for $(s,t) \in R^\mathfrak{a}$ we have $f_{s,t}^\mathfrak{a} = f_{s,t}^\mathfrak{b}$
- (ε) $M^\mathfrak{a} \leq_{\mathfrak{R}} M^\mathfrak{b}$, moreover $M^\mathfrak{a} \leq_{\mathfrak{R}, \mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{a}^-} M^\mathfrak{b}$.

- 2) If $\langle \mathfrak{a}_\zeta : \zeta < \delta \rangle$ is \leq -increasing in \mathfrak{A} and $\delta < \lambda^{++}$ let their union $\mathfrak{a} = \bigcup_{\zeta < \delta} \mathfrak{a}_\zeta$ be defined by $I_\ell^\mathfrak{a} = \bigcup_{\zeta < \delta} I_\ell^{\mathfrak{a}_\zeta}$, $R_\mathfrak{a} = \bigcup_{\zeta < \delta} R_{\mathfrak{a}_\zeta}$, $f_{\ell,t}^\mathfrak{a} = f_{\ell,t}^{\mathfrak{a}_\zeta}$ for $\zeta < \delta$ large enough, $f_{s,t}^\mathfrak{a} = f_{s,t}^{\mathfrak{a}_\zeta}$ for $\zeta < \delta$ large enough when $sR_\mathfrak{a}t$ and $M^\mathfrak{a} = \cup\{M^{\mathfrak{a}_\zeta} : \zeta < \delta\}$.

Below we restrict ourselves to $K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ for the application we have in mind but K_{λ^+} would be also O.K.

11.12 Claim. 1) (\mathfrak{s}, \leq) is a partial order.

- 2) If $\langle \mathfrak{a}_\zeta : \zeta < \delta \rangle$ is increasing in \mathfrak{A} , $\delta < \lambda^{++}$ then $\mathfrak{a} = \bigcup_{\zeta < \delta} \mathfrak{a}_\zeta$ belong to $\mathfrak{A}_\mathfrak{s}$ is the lub of the sequence.

Proof. Straight.

11.13 Claim. 1) If $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{A}_\mathfrak{s}$, $p \in \mathcal{S}_\mathfrak{s}^{\text{bs}}(M^\mathfrak{a})$ is orthogonal to every $q \in \mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{a}^-$ and $(M^\mathfrak{a}, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{3, \text{uq}}$ then for some $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{A}_\mathfrak{s}$ we have $\mathfrak{a} \leq \mathfrak{b}$ and $M^\mathfrak{b} = N$.

- 2) Assume $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{A}$, $\ell(*) \in \{1, 2\}$, $Y \subseteq I_{3-\ell(*)}^\mathfrak{a}$, $t^* \notin I_{\ell(*)}^\mathfrak{a}$ and $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is a representation of $M^\mathfrak{a}$ such that $M_0 = M_0^\mathfrak{a}$ (and of course $M_{\alpha+1}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over M_α in \mathfrak{K}_λ). Then we can find $\mathfrak{b}, a, \langle N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ such that:

- (A)(a) N_α is $\leq_{\mathfrak{R}}$ -increasing continuous in K_λ , $N_{\alpha+1}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over N_α

- (b) $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_\alpha, N_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1}, N_{\alpha+1})$
 - (c) $(M_\alpha, N_\alpha, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{uq}}$
 - (d) N_0 is isomorphic to $M_{\ell(*)}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ over $M_0^{\mathfrak{a}}$
 - (e) $(\bigcup_{\alpha} M_\alpha, \bigcup_{\alpha} N_\alpha, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{3, \text{pr}}$
- (B)(a) $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{a} \leq \mathfrak{b}$
- (b) $I_{\ell(*)}^{\mathfrak{b}} = I_{\ell(*)}^{\mathfrak{a}} \cup \{t^*\}, I_{3-\ell(*)}^{\mathfrak{b}} = I_{3-\ell(*)}^{\mathfrak{a}}$
 - (c) $R^{\mathfrak{b}}$ is $R^{\mathfrak{a}} \cup \{\langle t^*, s \rangle : s \in Y\}$ if $\ell(*) = 1$ and is $R^{\mathfrak{a}} \cup \{\langle s, t^* \rangle : s \in y\}$ if $\ell(*) = 2$
 - (d) $f_{\ell(*)}^{\mathfrak{a}, t^*}$ is an isomorphism from $M_{\ell(*)}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ onto N_0 mapping $a_{\ell(*)}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ to a .

Proof. 1) Easy.

2) First choose a, N_α to satisfy (A). Then the choice of \mathfrak{b} is actually described in (B); the orthogonality hold by 11.6. $\square_{11.13}$

11.14 Claim. *Let \mathfrak{a} be a DOP witness and $R \subseteq \lambda^{++} \times \lambda^{++}$ be given. For $\alpha < \lambda^{++}$ let $I_1^\alpha = \{i : 3i + 1 \leq \alpha\}, I_2^\alpha = \{i : 3i + 2 \leq \alpha\}, R_\alpha^* = R \cap (I_1^\alpha \times I_2^\alpha)$. We can find $\langle \mathfrak{a}^\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^{++} \rangle$ such that*

- (a) $\mathfrak{a}_\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is increasing continuous and $\mathfrak{a}_\alpha^- = \mathfrak{b}$
- (b) $(I_1^{\mathfrak{a}^\alpha}, I_2^{\mathfrak{a}^\alpha}, R_{\mathfrak{a}^\alpha}) = (I_1^\alpha, I_2^\alpha, R_\alpha)$,
- (c) for $(s, t) \in R_\alpha$ for arbitrarily large $\beta \in (\alpha, \lambda^{++})$ (by some bookkeeping), some $b \in M^{\mathfrak{a}^{3\beta+3}} \setminus M^{\mathfrak{a}^{3\beta+2}}$ the type $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(b, M^{\mathfrak{a}^{3\beta+2}}, M^{\mathfrak{a}^{3\beta+3}})$ is a nonforking extension of $q_{s,t}^{\mathfrak{a}^\alpha}$
- (d) \mathfrak{a}_α depends just on $(I_1^\alpha, I_2^\alpha, R_\alpha)$
- (e) the universe of $M^{\mathfrak{a}^\alpha}$ is $\gamma_\alpha < \lambda^{++}$ (really $\gamma_\alpha = \lambda^* \times (1 + \alpha)$) is O.K. for nontrivial cases.

Proof. We choose \mathfrak{a}^α by induction on α . For $\alpha = 0$ this is trivial, for α limit by 11.12(2), for $\alpha = 3\beta + 1$ by 11.13(2) for $\ell(*) = 1$, for $\alpha = 3\beta + 2$ by 11.13(2) for $\ell(*) = 2$ for $\alpha = 3\beta + 3$ bookkeeping gives as a pair (s_α, t_α) and we use 11.13(1). $\square_{11.14}$

11.15 Claim. *In 11.14 we can add: letting $M^* = \bigcup_{\alpha} \{M^{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^{++}\}$*

- (*) *for $(s, t) \in \lambda^{++} \times \lambda^{++}$, the following are equivalent*
- (α) $(s, t) \in R$
 - (β) $\dim(q_{s,t}^{\alpha}, M^*) = \lambda^{++}$ *when $\alpha = \text{Max}\{3s + 1, 3t + 2\}$ that is, there is a sequence $\langle b_{\gamma} : \gamma < \lambda^{++} \rangle$ independent in (M^{α}, M^*) of elements realizing $q_{s,t}^{\alpha}$ for any $\alpha > 3s + 1, 3t + 2$*
(check the existence of formal definition, §5 defines dimension)
 - (γ) *there is a $\leq_{\bar{\kappa}}$ -embedding f of M_3^{α} into M^* , extending $f_{1,s}^{\alpha} \cup f_{2,t}^{\alpha}$ such that $\dim(f(q^{\alpha}), M^*) = \lambda^{++}$ for $\alpha = \text{Max}\{3s + 1, 3t + 2\}$*
 - (δ) *for no $\alpha < \lambda^{++}$ and f as in (γ), we have: $q^* \in \mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M^{\alpha})$, the nonforking extension of $f(q_b)$ in $\mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M^{\alpha})$ satisfies: for every $\beta \in (\alpha, \lambda^{++})$, q^* has a unique extension in $\mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M^{\alpha\beta})$*
(Saharon - check in the reflections].

Proof. Easy.

11.16 Claim. $[2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{++}}]$. *If \mathfrak{s} has DOP then $I(\lambda^{++}, K^{\mathfrak{s}(+)}) = 2^{\lambda^{++}}$.*

11.17 Remark. 1) It is a strong nonstructure (i.e., neither like for deepness, no even like unsuperstable.

2) We can in 11.14, 11.15 restrict more the types realized.

3) We may use here [Sh:e, III]. FILL!

Proof. We use the construction above in the framework of [Sh 576, §3].

§12 BRIMMED SYSTEMS

Saharon: $\mathfrak{s}[\mu]$ the canonical lifting!!!

This section generalizes [Sh 87b], [Sh:c, XII,§4,§5]. Here every system is in the context of some good frame \mathfrak{s} and usually we look at models of cardinality $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ (in this section), but we vary \mathfrak{s} .

The adoption of “ $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ categorical in λ ” (in 12.2) is very helpful here but there is a price: when we shall work on “all $\lambda^{+\omega}$ -models in $K^{\mathfrak{s}}$ ” we cannot just quote the results. Note that this restriction fits well the thesis that the main road is first to understand the quite saturated models.

- 12.1 Convention: 1) Without loss of generality always $I \cap \mathcal{P}(\text{Dom}(I)) = \emptyset!!$
 2) In the cases we assume categoricity of $K^{\mathfrak{s}}$ in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we add $*$ (e.g., 12.3(2)).

12.2 Hypothesis.

- (a) \mathfrak{s} is a good λ -frame
 - (b) $\perp = \underset{\text{wk}}{\perp}$ is well defined
 - (c) \mathfrak{s} has primes (in the sense of $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}}$) and they are unique
 - (d) \mathfrak{s} is full or at least satisfies the conclusion of it “has enough regulars” (see Definition and Claim ?)
- scite{705-xxX} undefined
- (e)* $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is categorical in $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$

- Recall (by ?)
- scite{705-xxX} undefined

12.3 Claim. 1) The following¹¹ condition on (M, N, \mathbf{J}) are equivalent

- ⊗₁ $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bu}}$ which means that $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bs}}$, and \mathbf{J} is maximal (used in ?)
- scite{705-xxX} undefined
- ⊗₂ $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bs}}$ and if $M + \mathbf{J} \subseteq N' \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N, b \in N \setminus N', \text{tp}(b, N', N) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N')$ then $\text{tp}(b, N', N) \perp M$,
 - ⊗₃ $(M, N, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{vq}}$.

¹¹we may be interested in the case we replace $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bu}}$ by $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}}$, but we have troubles enough

- 2) We have $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bu}} = K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}}$.
 3) $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}} \subseteq K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bg}}$.
 4) For every $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$, $i^* < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ and $p_i \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ for $i < i^*$ we can find N and a_i ($i < i^*$) such that: $(M, N, \{a_i : i < i^*\}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{qr}} \subseteq K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bu}}$ and $p_i = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(a_i, M, N)$ and, of course, $\langle a_i : i < i^* \rangle$ is without repetition.

12.4 Definition. Let u_* be a set (usually finite) and I a family of finite subsets of u_* (so for u_* finite this is automatic) satisfying $I \subseteq \mathcal{P}(u_*)$ is downward closed; I, J will denote such sets in this section; let $\text{Dom}(I) = \cup\{u : u \in I\}$.

- 1) We say \mathfrak{s} is an I -system or (I, \mathfrak{s}) -system or I -system for \mathfrak{s} if:
- (a) \mathfrak{s} consists of M_u (for $u \in I$), and $h_{v,u}$ (for $u \subseteq v \in I$) (mappings, with $h_{u,u} = \text{id}_{M_u}$ so we may ignore $\langle h_{u,u} : u \in I \rangle$ when defining \mathfrak{s})
 - (b) $M_u \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ for $u \in I$
 - (c) if $u \subseteq v \in I$ then $h_{v,u}$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of M_u into M_v , and the diagram of the $h_{u,v}$'s commute and we let $M_{v,u} =: h_{v,u}(M_u)$ and recall $h_{u,u} = \text{id}_{M_u}$; so if $u \subseteq v \subseteq w \in I$ we have $M_{w,u} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{w,v}$ and $M_{u,u} = M_u$.

2) We say \mathfrak{s} is a (μ, I) -system or (μ, I, \mathfrak{s}) -system if we replace (b) by

$$(b)^+ \quad M_u \in K_{\mu}^{\mathfrak{s}}.$$

Similarly for $(\geq \mu, I, \mathfrak{s})$, etc.

3) We shall write $u_*^{\mathfrak{s}}$ for $\text{Dom}(I)$ and $h_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{s}}, I^{\mathfrak{s}}, M_u^{\mathfrak{s}}$, for $h_{u,v}, I, M_u$, respectively. If $h_{v,u} = \text{id}_{M_u}$ for $u \subseteq v \in I^{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}} \cap M_v^{\mathfrak{s}} = M_{v \cap u}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ for $u, v \in I$ we call \mathfrak{s} normal.

4) We say \bar{g} is an isomorphism from the I -system \mathfrak{s}^1 onto the I -system \mathfrak{s}^2 if $\bar{g} = \langle g_u : u \in I \rangle$, g_u is an isomorphism from $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}^1}$ onto $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}^2}$ such that $u \subseteq v \in I \Rightarrow h_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{s}^2} \circ g_u = g_v \circ h_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{s}^1}$. If $\mathfrak{s}^1, \mathfrak{s}^2$ are normal we may say $g = \bigcup_u g_u$ is an isomorphism

from \mathfrak{s}^1 onto \mathfrak{s}^2 . Similarly \bar{g} is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of \mathfrak{s}^1 into \mathfrak{s}^2 if $g_u(M_u^{\mathfrak{s}^1}) \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_u^{\mathfrak{s}^2}$ or¹² $g_u(M_u^{\mathfrak{s}^1}) \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_u^{\mathfrak{s}^2}$ for $u \in I$ and $u \subset v \in I \Rightarrow h_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{s}^2} \circ g_u = g_v \circ h_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{s}^1}$. Let $\mathfrak{s}_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} \mathfrak{s}_2$ if $\langle \text{id}_{M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_1}} : u \in I \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_1}$ into $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_2}$ for $u \in I$, similarly $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}$.

5) We say \bar{f} is an embedding of an I -system \mathfrak{s} to a model M if $\bar{f} = \langle f_u : u \in I \rangle$, f_u is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of M_u into M and $u \subseteq v \in I \Rightarrow f_u = f_v \circ g_{v,u}$.

6) Similarly for $(\geq \mu, I)$ -systems, $(\geq \mu, I, \mathfrak{s})$ -systems, so we use $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]}$ -embeddings.

The important case here is:

¹²the difference is meaningful only if $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}^2} \in K^{\mathfrak{s}} \setminus K_{\mathfrak{s}}$

12.5 Definition. 1) We say that \mathbf{d} is an expanded stable (I, \mathfrak{s}) -system or I -system or (λ, I) -system or $(\lambda, I, \mathfrak{s})$ -system if it consists of \mathfrak{s} and $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}$ for $u \subseteq v \in I$ such that:

- (a) $\mathfrak{s} = \langle M_u, h_{v,u} : u \subseteq v \in I \rangle$ is an $(\lambda, I, \mathfrak{s})$ -system
- (b) $\mathbf{J}_{v,u} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{M_{v,u}, M_v} \setminus \cup \{M_{v,w} : w \subset v\}$ for $u \subseteq v \in I$ so $\mathbf{J}_{u,u} = \emptyset$.

such that

- (c) if $u_0 \subset u_1 \subset u_2 \in I$ and $c \in \mathbf{J}_{u_2, u_1}$ then $\text{tp}(c, M_{u_2, u_1}, M_{u_2})$ is orthogonal to M_{u_2, u_0} , recalling that $M_{u_2, u_1} = f_{u_2, u_1}(M_{u_1})$
- (d) $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}$ is a maximal subset of $\{c \in M_v : c \notin \cup \{\mathbf{J}_{v,w} : w \subset u\}$ and $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_{v,u}, M_u)$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M)$ and is orthogonal to $M_{v,w}$ for every $w \subset u\}$ such that $\mathbf{J}_{v,u} \cup \cup \{\mathbf{J}_{v,w} : w \subset u\}$ is independent in $(M_{v,u}, M_v)$.

1A) For $u_0 \subseteq u_1 \subseteq u_2 \in I$ we define (if $u_2 = u_1$ we may omit it, this catch the “main action”, so $\mathbf{J}_{u_1, u_1, u_0}^0 = \mathbf{J}_{u_1, u_0}^0 = \mathbf{J}_{u_1, u_0}$)

- (α) $\mathbf{J}_{u_2, u_1, u_0}^0 = \{h_{u_2, u_1}(c) : c \in \mathbf{J}_{u_1, u_0}\}$
- (β) $\mathbf{J}_{u_2, u_1, u_0}^1 = \cup \{\mathbf{J}_{u_2, u_1, u}^0 : u \subseteq u_0\}$
- (γ) $\mathbf{J}_{u_2, u_1, u_0}^2 = \cup \{\mathbf{J}_{u_2, w_1, w_0}^0 : w_0 \subseteq w_1 \subseteq u_1, w_0 \subseteq u_0 \text{ and } w_1 \subset u_0\}$

If we omit clause (d) we say “an expanded (I, \mathfrak{s}) -system”.

2) We say \mathbf{d} is normal if each $h_{v,u}$ is the identity (on M_u) and $M_u \cap M_v = M_{u \cap v}$, that is \mathfrak{s} is normal.

3) For an expanded stable (λ, I) -system \mathbf{d} and $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we say that \bar{f} is an embedding (or $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding) of \mathbf{d} into M when:

- (A) \bar{f} embeds $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}}$ into M , i.e.
 - (a) $\bar{f} = \langle f_u : u \in I \rangle$
 - (b) f_u is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of $M_u^{\mathbf{d}}$ into M
 - (c) if $u \subset v \in I$ then $f_u = f_v \circ h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$
 - (d) if $u \in I$ then $\cup \{f_u(\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{2, \mathbf{d}}) : v \text{ satisfies } u \subset v \in I\}$, is an independent set in $(f_u(M_u^{\mathbf{d}}), M)$ and, of course, $u \subseteq v_1 \in I \cap u \subseteq_2 \in I \cap v_1 \neq v_2 \Rightarrow f_u(\mathbf{J}_{v_1, u}^{2, \mathbf{d}}) \cap f_u(\mathbf{J}_{v_2, u}^{2, \mathbf{d}}) = \emptyset$

4) We say that a normal expanded stable (λ, I) -system \mathbf{d} is embedded into $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ if (\mathbf{d} is normal and) $\bar{f} = \langle f_u : u \in I \rangle$ is an embedding of \mathbf{d} into M when we choose $f_u = \text{id}_{M_u^{\mathbf{d}}}$.

5) We say \mathbf{d} an expanded stable I -system is explicit or strongly regular if:

- (a) if $u \subset v \in I$ and $c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}})$ is regular (see 12.7(2))
- (b) if $c_1 \neq c_2 \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ and $u \subset v \in I$ then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c_1, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}})$, $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c_2, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}})$ are equal or orthogonal.

12.6 Notation: Above we let $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{s}[\mathbf{d}]$, $M_u^{\mathbf{d}} = M_u^{\mathfrak{s}}$, $h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} = h_{v,v}^{\mathfrak{s}}$, $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{J}_{v,u}$, $\mathbf{J}_{u_2, u_1, u_0}^{\ell, \mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{J}_{u_2, u_1, u_0}^{\ell}$ but we do not write the superscript \mathbf{d} when clear from the context.

12.7 Definition. 1) We say \bar{f} is an isomorphism from the expanded stable I -system \mathbf{d}^1 onto the expanded stable system \mathbf{d}^2 if \bar{f} is an isomorphism from $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}^1}$ onto $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}^2}$ and f_v maps $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}^1}$ onto $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}^2}$ for $u \subseteq v \in I$.

1A) For expanded stable (λ, I) -systems $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2$, we say \bar{f} is an $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of \mathbf{d}_1 into \mathbf{d}_2 if

- (α) \bar{f} is an $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of \mathfrak{s}_1 into \mathfrak{s}_2
- (β) for $u \subset v \in I$, f_v maps $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ into $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_2}$
- (β)⁺ moreover, if $u \subset v \in I$ and $c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(f_v(c), M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_2}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}_2})$ does not fork over $f_v(M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1})$.

2) An expanded stable (λ, I) -system \mathbf{d} is called regular if

- (f) if $u \subseteq v \in I$, $c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ then $\text{tp}(c, M_{v,u}, M_v)$ is regular.

3) A system \mathfrak{s} is called stable if for some expanded stable system \mathbf{d} we have $\mathfrak{s} = \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}}$ (called an expansion of \mathfrak{s}), we call the $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$'s witnesses. Similarly for other properties.

4) A (λ, I) -system \mathfrak{s} (or an expanded stable system \mathbf{d} with $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}} = \mathfrak{s}$) is called very brimmed if:

- (g) for every $v \in I$, \mathfrak{s} is very brimmed at v which means
- (g)_v⁰ $M_v^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is brimmed
- (g)_v¹ $M_v^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is $(\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}, *)$ -brimmed over $\cup\{M_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{s}} : u \subset v\}$.

5) A stable I -system \mathfrak{s} (or an expanded stable system \mathbf{d} with $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}} = \mathfrak{s}$) is weakly brimmed if for every $v \in I$ it is weakly brimmed at v which means

- (h)_v⁻ $M_v^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is brimmed¹³.

¹³note that if $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is categorical (in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$) then this follows from the other demands

6) An expanded stable system \mathbf{d} is called brimmed if for every $v \in I_s$ it is brimmed at v which means

$(h)_v^0$ $M_v^{\mathbf{d}}$ is brimmed

$(h)_v^1$ if $u \subset v \in I$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{v,u})$ is orthogonal to $M_{v,w}$ for every $w \subset u$, then the set $\{c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u} : \text{tp}_{\bar{s}}(c, M_{v,u}, M_v) \pm p\}$ has cardinality $\|M_v\|$.

7) An I -system is [very][weakly] brimmed if there is a [very][weakly] brimmed expanded stable system \mathbf{d} expanding it (so the system is stable).

12.8 Definition. 1) We say \mathbf{s} is a $(I, \mathfrak{s})^\ell$ -system or a brimmed $^\ell$ I -system when it is a I -system and: if $\ell = 0$ no additional demands; if $\ell = 1$, it is stable; if $\ell = 2$ it is a stable system which is weakly brimmed, that is each $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is brimmed; if $\ell = 3$, it is stable and brimmed; if $\ell = 4$, it is a very brimmed stable (I, \mathfrak{s}) -system.

2) Similarly for \mathbf{d} , an expanded stable (I, \mathfrak{s}) -system (so $\ell = 0, \ell = 1$ become equivalent).

3) We say M is brimmed $^\ell$ if letting $I = \{\emptyset\}$, $M_\emptyset = M$, we get that $\langle M_t : t \in I \rangle$ is a brimmed $^\ell$ system.

4) For $\ell = 1, 2, 3, 4$ we say that an expanded stable I -system \mathbf{d} is brimmed $^\ell$ in $u \in I$ if the demand in Definition 12.7 holds for u (so for $\ell = 1$: no demand).

Notation: Let $\mathcal{P}^-(u_*) = \{v \subseteq u_* : v \neq u_*\}$.

12.9 Claim. *Let \mathbf{d} be an expanded stable I -system.*

0) If $u \subset v \in I$ then $(M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{2,\mathbf{d}})$ belongs to $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bu}}$; equivalently (see 12.3) it belongs to $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{vq}}$, recalling $\mathbf{J}_{v,v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{2,\mathbf{d}}$.

1) If $u_1 \subseteq u \in I, u_2 \subseteq u, u_0 = u_1 \cap u_2$, then $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_{u,u_0}, M_{u,u_1}, M_{u,u_2}, M_u)$.

1A) If $u_0, u_1, u_2 \subseteq v \in I, u_0 \subseteq u_1, c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u_1,u_0}^{\mathbf{d}}$ and $u_0 \not\subseteq u_2$ then $\text{tp}(c, M_{v,u_0}, M_{v,u_1})$ is orthogonal to M_{v,u_2} .

2) If $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{v,u})$ is regular, then there is a unique set $w \subseteq u$ such that p is not orthogonal to $M_{v,w}$ but p is orthogonal to $M_{v,w'}$ whenever $w' \subseteq u$ & $w \not\subseteq w'$ hence even when $w' \subseteq v$ & $w \not\subseteq w'$.

3) \mathbf{d} is isomorphic to some normal \mathbf{d}' (see Definition 12.4(3)).

4) If $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and the expanded stable I -system \mathbf{d} is brimmed $^{\ell+1}$ then it is brimmed $^\ell$. If the I -system \mathbf{s} is brimmed $^{\ell+1}$ and $\ell = 0, 1, 2, 3$ then \mathbf{s} is brimmed $^\ell$.

5) If $u_0 \subset u_2 \in I$ then $\mathbf{J}_{u_2,u_0}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is a maximal set \mathbf{J} such that

(α) $\mathbf{J} \subseteq M_{u_2}$ is disjoint to $\cup\{M_{u_2,w} : w \subset u_2\}$

(β) for each $c \in \mathbf{J}$ we have $\text{tp}(c, M_{u_2,u_0}, M_{u_2}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_{u_2,u_0})$ and it is orthogonal to $M_{u_2,w}$ whenever $w \subset u_0$

(γ) $\mathbf{J} \cup \bigcup \{\mathbf{J}_{u_2, w_1, w_0}^0 : w_1 \subseteq u_2, \neg(w_1 = u_2 \wedge w_0 = u_0) \text{ and } w_1 \not\subseteq u_0, w_0 \subseteq u_0 \cap w_1, w_0 \neq w_1\}$ is independent in (M_{u_2, u_0}, M_{u_2}) ; note that necessarily there are no repetitions in the union.

6) Assume that in addition to \mathbf{d} being an expanded stable I -system we have

- (a) for $u \subset v \in I$, $\mathbf{J}'_{v, u}$ is a maximal subset of $\{c \in \mathbf{I}_{M_{v, u}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}}} : \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_{v, u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}}) \perp M_w^{\mathbf{d}} \text{ for } w \subset u \text{ and } c \notin M_{v, w}^{\mathbf{d}} \text{ for } w \subset v\}$ such that the set $\mathbf{J}'_{v, u} \cup \bigcup \{\mathbf{J}_{v, w_1, w_0}^0 : w_1 \subseteq v, \neg(w_1 = v \ \& \ w_0 = u_0), w_1 \not\subseteq u_0, w_0 \subseteq w_1 \cap u_0, w_0 \neq w_1\}$ is independent in $(M_{v, u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}})$; for the last phrase alternatively: $\mathbf{J}'_{v, u} \cup \{h_{v, w_1}(\mathbf{J}'_{w_1, w_0}) : w_1 \subseteq v, \neg(w_1 = v \cap w_0 = u_0), w_1 \not\subseteq u_0, w_0 \subseteq u_0 \cap w_1, w_0 \neq w_1\}$ is independent in $(M_{v, u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}})$
- (b) \mathbf{d}' is defined by $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}'} = \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{J}_{v, u}^{\mathbf{d}'} = \mathbf{J}'_{v, u}$ for $u \subset v \in I$.

Then \mathbf{d}' is an expanded stable I -system.

7) If \mathbf{d} is a brimmed³ I -system and $u \in I$ then $M_u^{\mathbf{d}} \setminus \bigcup \{M_{u, w}^{\mathbf{d}} : w \subset u\}$ has cardinality λ ; moreover, for $w_1 \subset u$, \mathbf{J}_{u, w_1} is a subset of $M_u^{\mathbf{d}} \setminus \bigcup \{M_{u, w_2}^{\mathbf{d}} : w_2 \subset u\}$ of cardinality λ .

Proof. 0) By 12.3(1), clause (d) of Definition 12.5(1) (and the choice of $\mathbf{J}_{v, u}^{2, \mathbf{d}}$ in 12.5(1A)).

1) We have

- (i) $M_{u, u_1 \cap u_2} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_{u, u_\ell} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_u$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ when $u_1 \cup u_2 \subseteq u \in I$
[Why? Each case by a different instance of clause (c) of 12.4(1)]
- (ii) _{ℓ} $(M_{u, u_1 \cap u_2}, M_{u, u_\ell}, \mathbf{J}_{u, u_\ell, u_0}^2) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bu}}$ hence $\in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{vq}}$
[Why? Without loss of generality $u_1 \neq u_2$ so $u_1 \cap u_2 \subset u_1, u_1 \cap u_2 \subset u_2$. By part (0), we know that $(M_{u_\ell, u_1 \cap u_2}, M_{u_\ell}, \mathbf{J}_{u_\ell, u}^2) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bu}}$ and by the definition of $\mathbf{J}_{u, u_\ell, u}^2$ we know that h_{u, u_ℓ} maps this triple to the one mentioned in clause (ii) _{ℓ}]
- (iii) $\mathbf{J}_{u, u_1, u_1 \cap u_2}^2, \mathbf{J}_{u, u_2, u_1 \cap u_2}^2$ are disjoint
[Why? E.g., as on the one hand $\mathbf{J}_{u, u_1, u_1 \cap u_2}^2 \subseteq \mathbf{J}_{u, u_2}^2$ and \mathbf{J}_{u, u_2}^2 is disjoint to M_{u, u_2} and on the other hand $(M_{u, u_2}, M_{u, u_1 \cap u_2}, \mathbf{J}_{u, u_1, u_1 \cap u_2}^2) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bu}}$ hence $\mathbf{J}_{u, u_2, u_1 \cap u_2}^2 \subseteq M_{u, u_2}$]
- (iv) $\mathbf{J}_{u, u_1, u_1 \cap u_2}^2 \cup \mathbf{J}_{u, u_2, u_1 \cap u_2}^2 \subseteq \mathbf{J}_{u, u_1 \cap u_2}$
[Why? By their definitions]
- (v) $\mathbf{J}_{u, u_1, u_1 \cap u_2}^2 \cup \mathbf{J}_{u, u_2, u_1 \cap u_2}^2$ is independent in $(M_{u, u_1 \cap u_2}, M_u)$ hence in $(M_{u, u_1 \cap u_2}, M_{u, u_1 \cup u_2})$
[Why? By monotonicity properties.]

Now by 5.18(3) we are done.

1A) By Part (1) and 6.10.

2) As I is finite, there is $w \subset u$ such that p is not orthogonal to M_w but is orthogonal to $M_{v,w'}$ if $w' \subset w$. The “hence” follows by part (1) and 10.8 (or use part (1A)).

3) By renaming; possible as $M_{v,u_1} \cap M_{v,u_2} = M_{v,u_1 \cap u_2}$ whenever $u_1, u_2 \subseteq v$ by part (1) and properties of $\text{NF}_{\bar{s}}$.

4) The least easy part is $\ell = 3$. So we have to check clauses $(h)_v^0, (h)_v^1$ of 12.7(6). For the first, clearly every $M_u^{\mathbf{d}} (u \in I)$ is brimmed, see clause $(g)_v^0$ in 12.7(4) so only the second clause $(h)_v^1$ there may fail.

Assume toward contradiction that $u \subset v \in I, p \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}})$ and the set $\mathbf{J} =: \{c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} : \text{tp}(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}}) \pm p\}$ has cardinality $< \lambda_{\bar{s}}$. By Definition 12.5(1), $c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} \setminus \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} \Rightarrow \text{tp}(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}}) \perp p$ hence we have $\mathbf{J}^1 =: \{c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} : \text{tp}(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}}) \pm p\}$ is equal to \mathbf{J} so it still has cardinality $< \lambda_{\bar{s}}$.

By the assumption there is N such that $\cup\{M_{v,w}^{\mathbf{d}} : w \subset v\} \subseteq N \leq_s M_v^{\mathbf{d}}$ and $M_v^{\mathbf{d}}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over N . Hence there is \mathbf{I} of cardinality $\lambda_{\bar{s}}$ independent in $(M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, N, M_v^{\mathbf{d}})$ such that $\text{tp}(c, N, M_v^{\mathbf{d}})$ is a nonforking extension of $p \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}})$ for every $c \in \mathbf{I}$. By dimension calculus (see Claim 10.17 or 6.4, we get contradiction to $(M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}) \in K_{\bar{s}}^{3,\text{bu}}$.

5),6) Left to the reader using the dimension calculus (recalling (7)).

7) The first conclusion follows from the second which holds by parts (0) + (1) (and clause (d) of Definition 12.9(1)). $\square_{12.9}$

12.10 Conclusion. [Density of explicit expanded stable systems, see Definition 12.5(5)] Assume:

(a) \mathbf{s} is a stable I -system

(b) for each $u \in I^{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{P}_u \subseteq \{p \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_u) : p \text{ is regular orthogonal to } M_{u,w}^{\mathbf{d}} \text{ whenever } w \subset u\}$ is a maximal subset of pairwise orthogonal regular types.

Then there is an expanded stable I -system \mathbf{d}^* such that:

(α) $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}^*} = \mathbf{s}$

(β) \mathbf{d}^* is regular, moreover, \mathbf{d} obeys $\bar{\mathbf{P}} = \langle \mathbf{P}_u : u \in I^{\mathbf{d}} \rangle$ which means:

\boxtimes if $u \subset v \in I^{\mathbf{d}}$ and $c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ then for some $q \in \mathbf{P}_u$ we have $\text{tp}_{\bar{s}}(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}})$ is q

(γ) \mathbf{d}^* is explicit.

Proof. Note that (γ) follows from (β) . This holds by 12.9(6) and 10.14(5). $\square_{12.10}$

12.11 Claim. Assume $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and

- (a) \mathbf{d}_k is an expanded stable (λ, I) -system for $k = 1, 2$
- (b) $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}_1} = \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}_2}$.

Then \mathbf{d}_1 is brimmed $^\ell$ iff \mathbf{d}^2 is brimmed $^\ell$.

Proof. The least easy case is $\ell = 3$, see Definition 12.7(6), which is similar to 12.10. $\square_{12.11}$

12.12 Definition. 1) For expanded stable I -systems $\mathbf{d}_0, \mathbf{d}_1$ let $\mathbf{d}_0 \leq_s \mathbf{d}_1$ or $\mathbf{d}_0 \leq_s^I \mathbf{d}_1$ mean¹⁴ that:

- (a) $M_u^{\mathbf{d}_0} \leq_s M_u^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ for $u \in I$ and $h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0} \subseteq h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ for $u \subset v \in I$
- (b) $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0} \subseteq \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ for $u \subseteq v \in I$
- (c) if $c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}$ then $\text{tp}_s(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}_1})$ does not fork over $M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}$.

2) We say that J is a successor of I if for some $t^* \notin \text{Dom}(I)$ we have $J = I \cup \{u \cup \{t^*\} : u \in I\}$ and we call t^* the witness for J being a successor of I ; so $\text{Dom}(J) = \text{Dom}(I) \cup \{t^*\}$.

3) For stable I -system $\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{s}_1$ let¹⁵ $\mathbf{s}_0 \leq_s \mathbf{s}_1$ or $\mathbf{s}_0 \leq_s^I \mathbf{s}_1$ mean that for some expansions $\mathbf{d}_0, \mathbf{d}_1$ of $\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{s}_1$ respectively we have $\mathbf{d}_0 \leq_s^I \mathbf{d}_1$.

4) Assume that $\mathbf{d}_0 \leq_s^I \mathbf{d}_1$ and J is a successor of I with the witness t^* and

- (*) $[u \subset v \in I] \ \& \ c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1} \setminus \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0} \Rightarrow \text{tp}_s(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}_1})$ either does not fork over $M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}$ or is orthogonal to $M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}$.

Then we let $\mathbf{d} \approx \mathbf{d}_0 *_J \mathbf{d}_1$ mean that $\mathbf{d} = \langle M_u^{\mathbf{d}}, h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} : u \subseteq v \in I \rangle$ (but note that \mathbf{d} is not determined uniquely by $\mathbf{d}_0, \mathbf{d}_1, J$ as we have freedom concerning $\mathbf{J}_{u \cup \{t^*\}, u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ for $u \in I$, still we may use $\mathbf{d}_0 *_J \mathbf{d}_1$ for any such \mathbf{d}) where

- (a) $M_u^{\mathbf{d}}$ is $M_u^{\mathbf{d}_0}$ if $u \in I$
- (b) $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}$ if $u \subseteq v \in I$
- (c) $M_u^{\mathbf{d}}$ is $M_{u \setminus \{t^*\}}^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ if $u \in J \setminus I$

¹⁴in Definition 12.7's terms this means that $\langle \text{id}_{M_v^{\mathbf{d}_0}} : v \in I \rangle$ embeds \mathbf{d}_0 into \mathbf{d}_1

¹⁵this relation, \leq_s , is a two-place relation, we shall prove that it is a partial order.

- (d) $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} = \{c \in \mathbf{J}_{v \setminus \{t^*\},u}^{\mathbf{d}_1} : c \notin \mathbf{J}_{v \setminus \{t^*\},u}^{\mathbf{d}_0} \text{ and } \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}_1}) \text{ does not fork over } M_{v \setminus \{t^*\},u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}\}$ if $u \in I, v \in J \setminus I, u \subset v$
- (e) $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} = \{c \in \mathbf{J}_{v \setminus \{t^*\},u \setminus \{t^*\}}^{\mathbf{d}_1} : \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_{v \setminus \{t^*\},u \setminus \{t^*\}}^{\mathbf{d}_1}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}_1}) \text{ is orthogonal to } M_{v \setminus \{t^*\},u \setminus \{t^*\}}^{\mathbf{d}_0}\}$ if $u \subset v$ are both from $J \setminus I$
- (f) $h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is: $h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}$ if $u \subseteq v \in I$; $h_{v,v}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is $h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ if $t \in u \subseteq v \in I$ and $h_{v,v}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is $h_{v_1,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}$ if $v = v_1 \cup \{t^*\}, u \subseteq v_1 \in I$
- (g) $\mathbf{J}_{u \cup \{t^*\},u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is a maximal subset of $\{c \in M_u^{\mathbf{d}_1} : \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_u^{\mathbf{d}_0}, M_u^{\mathbf{d}_1}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_u^{\mathbf{d}_0}) \text{ is orthogonal to } M_w^{\mathbf{d}_0} \text{ for every } w \subset u\}$ which is independent in $(M_u^{\mathbf{d}_0}, M_u^{\mathbf{d}_1})$ for every $u \in I$.

4A) Similarly for $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_0 *_J \mathfrak{s}_1$ (but now \mathfrak{s} is uniquely determined).

5) If $\delta \leq \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ and $\langle \mathbf{d}_{\alpha} : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}^I$ -increasing sequence of expanded stable I -systems (see 12.13 below) then we let $\mathbf{d} = \bigcup_{\alpha} \mathbf{d}_{\alpha}$ be $\langle M_u^{\mathbf{d}}, h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} : u \subseteq v \in I \rangle$ where $M_u^{\mathbf{d}} = \cup \{M_u^{\mathbf{d}_{\alpha}} : \alpha < \delta\}$ and $h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} = \cup \{h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_{\alpha}} : \alpha < \delta\}$ and $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} = \cup \{\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_{\alpha}} : \alpha < \delta\}$. Similarly for $\langle \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha} : \alpha < \delta \rangle$.

- 12.13 Claim.** 1) $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}^I$ is a partial order on the family of expanded stable I -systems.
 2) If $\delta < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ and $\langle \mathbf{d}_{\alpha} : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}^I$ -increasing sequence (of expanded stable I -systems) then $\mathbf{d} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} \mathbf{d}_{\alpha}$ is an expanded stable I -system and $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow \mathbf{d}_{\alpha} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}}^I \mathbf{d}$.
 3) If $\mathbf{d}_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}}^I \mathbf{d}_1$ and $u \subset v \in I$ then $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}_0}, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}_1})$.
 4) If $\mathbf{d}_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}}^I \mathbf{d}_1$ and \mathbf{d}'_0 is an expanded stable I -system satisfying $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}'_0} = \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}_0}$ then we can find an expanded stable I -system \mathbf{d}'_1 such that $\mathbf{d}'_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}}^I \mathbf{d}'_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}'_1} = \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}_1}$.
 5) The relation $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}^I$ on the family of stable I -systems is a partial order.
 6) In Definition 12.12(4), always there is \mathbf{d} such that $\mathbf{d} \approx \mathbf{d}_0 *_J \mathbf{d}_1$ is an expanded stable (λ, J) -system; similarly without “expanded”.
 7) For I -system $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2$ we have $\mathfrak{s}_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} \mathfrak{s}_2$ iff $\mathfrak{s}_1 \leq \mathfrak{s}_2$ and $u \subset v \in I \Rightarrow \text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_1}, M_v^{\mathfrak{s}_1}, M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_2}, M_v^{\mathfrak{s}_2})$.

Proof. 1) Obvious. Check the definition.

2) First we prove this for stable expanded systems. The main point is why, for $u \subset v \in I$, the triple $(M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}})$ belong to $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bu}}$. This holds by 12.3.

Second, for stable systems, given $\langle \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha} : \alpha < \delta \rangle, \mathfrak{s}_{\delta} =: \mathfrak{s}$ we choose by induction on $\alpha \leq \delta$ an expanded stable I -system \mathbf{d}_{α} such that $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}_{\alpha}} = \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha}$ and $\langle \mathbf{d}_{\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha \rangle$ is increasing continuous. For $\alpha = 0$ this is by the definition, for $\alpha = \beta + 1$ by part (4) below (which does not rely on parts (2), (3)). Lastly, for α limit use what we have proved for stable expanded systems. For $\alpha = \delta, \mathbf{d}_{\delta}$ witnessed which we need.

- 3) As in the proof of 12.9(1).
 4) As in the proof of 12.9(6).
 5) Being partial order follows by (4) and (1). The union of increasing continuous sequences follows by (4) and (1). [Note that the cases of non-continuous chains are problematic, those are parallel of AxIII₂ of a.e.c.; compares with 12.15.] As for brimmed^ℓ for **d**'s version: if ℓ = 1 this is trivial; if ℓ = 2 this is as “the union of an increasing chain of brimmed model” (for **s**) of length < λ⁺ is brimmed. Lastly, for ℓ = 3, by the finite character of nonforking (= Ax(E)(x)) and the definition.
 6) Easy by §10.
 7) Think (that is let **d**_ℓ be an expanded *I*-system with **s**[**d**_ℓ] = **s**_ℓ for ℓ = 1, 2. Now we shall choose **J**'_{*v,u*} for *u* ⊂ *v* ∈ **I** such that **d**₁ ≤_{**s**}^{*I*} **d**'₂ where **s**[**d**'_{*v*}] = **s**₂, **J**_{*v,u*}^{**d**'₂} = **J**'_{*v,u*}. We do this by induction on (*v*), as in previous cases). □_{12.13}

12.14 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) **s**₁ is a stable *I*-system
- (b) **s**₀ is an *I*-system
- (c) $M_u^{\mathbf{s}_0} \leq_{\mathbf{s}} M_u^{\mathbf{s}_1}$ for $u \in I$ and $h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{s}_0} \subseteq h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{s}_1}$ for $u \subset v \in I$
- (d) if $u \subset v \in I$ then $\text{NF}_{\mathbf{s}}(M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{s}_0}, M_v^{\mathbf{s}_0}, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{s}_1}, M_v^{\mathbf{s}_1})$.

Then **s**₀ is a stable *I*-system and **s**₀ ≤_{**s**}^{*I*} **s**₁.

Proof. Let **d**₁ be an expanded stable *I*-system such that **s**^{**d**₁} = **s**₁. For each *u* ⊂ *v* ∈ *I* we choose **I**_{*v,u*} as a maximal set such that

- (i) **I**_{*v,u*} ⊆ $M_v^{\mathbf{s}_0} \setminus \cup \{M_{v,w}^{\mathbf{s}_0} : w \subset v\}$ and for any $c \in \mathbf{I}_{v,u}$ we have $\text{tp}_{\mathbf{s}}(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{s}_0}, M_v^{\mathbf{s}_0}) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_v^{\mathbf{s}_0})$ is orthogonal to $M_{v,w}^{\mathbf{s}_0}$ whenever $w \subset u$
- (ii) **I**_{*v,u*} ∪ {**J**^{2,**s**₁}_{*v,w₁,w₀*} : $w_0 \subseteq w_1 \subset v, w_0 \subseteq u$ } is independent in $(M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{s}_1}, M_v^{\mathbf{s}_1})$.

Let **J**'_{*v,u*} be maximal set such that

- (i) **J**'_{*v,u*} ⊆ $M_v^{\mathbf{s}_1} \cup \{M_{v,w}^{\mathbf{s}_1} : w \subset v\}$
- (ii) **J**'_{*v,u*} ∪ {**J**^{2,**s**₁}_{*v,w₁,w₀*} : $w_0 \subseteq w_1 \subset v, w_2 \subseteq u$ } is independent in $(M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{s}_1}, M_v^{\mathbf{s}_1})$
- (iii) **I**_{*v,u*} ⊆ **J**'_{*v,u*}.

So by 12.9(6), **d**'₁ =: $\langle M_u^{\mathbf{s}_1}, h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{s}_1}, \mathbf{J}'_{v,u} : u \subseteq v \in I \rangle$ is an expanded stable *I*-system. Also **d**₀ =: $\langle M_u^{\mathbf{s}_0}, h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{s}_0}; \mathbf{I}_{v,u} : u \subseteq v \in I \rangle$ is an expanded stable *I*-system. Now easily **s**_ℓ = **s**^{**d**_ℓ} and **d**₀ ≤_{**s**}^{*I*} **d**'₁.

So we are done. □_{12.14}

12.15 Claim. *Assume J is a successor of I with witness t^* .*

1) *Assume $\mathfrak{s}_0, \mathfrak{s}_1$ are stable I -systems satisfying $\mathfrak{s}_0 \leq_s^I \mathfrak{s}_1$. Then*

(a) *for one and only one $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_0 *_J \mathfrak{s}_1$*

(b) *\mathfrak{s} is a stable J -system.*

2) *Assume that $\delta < \lambda_s^+$ and $\langle \mathfrak{s}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is a $<_s^I$ -increasing continuous sequence of stable J -systems and \mathfrak{s}_α is brimmed $^\ell$ for $\alpha < \delta$ and $\ell \leq 3$ then \mathfrak{s}_δ is brimmed $^\ell$ and $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha \leq_s^I \mathfrak{s}_\delta$ for $\alpha < \delta$.*

3) *Assume that \mathfrak{s} is successful hence \mathfrak{s}^+ is as in 12.2 and $\ell = 3$. If $\langle \mathfrak{s}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_s^+ \rangle$ is a $<_s^I$ -increasing sequence of stable I -systems and $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha *_J \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha+1}$ is brimmed $^\ell$ for each $\alpha < \lambda^+$ then $\mathfrak{s} = \cup \{ \mathfrak{s}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_s^+ \}$ is a brimmed $^\ell$ $(\lambda^+, I, \mathfrak{s})$ -system.*

4) *In part (3), if $\delta = \lambda_s^+$ and $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $a \in I \Rightarrow M_u^{\mathfrak{s}} \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ then \mathfrak{s} is brimmed $^\ell$ (I, \mathfrak{s}^+) -system.*

Proof. 1) Clearly \mathfrak{s} is well defined.

Recall that $\mathfrak{d}_0 \leq_s^I \mathfrak{d}_1$ above does not imply that for some $\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{d}_0 * \mathfrak{d}_1$. By Definition 12.12(3) there are stable expanded I -system $\mathfrak{d}_1, \mathfrak{d}_2$ such that $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathfrak{d}_\ell} = \mathfrak{s}_\ell$ and $\mathfrak{d}_0 \leq_s \mathfrak{d}_1$. For each $u \in I$ let \mathbf{P}_u^0 be a maximal set of pairwise orthogonal regular types from $\mathcal{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_0})$ orthogonal to $M_{u,w}^{\mathfrak{s}_0}$ for every $w \subset u$. For each $u \in I$ let \mathbf{P}_u^1 be a maximal set of pairwise orthogonal regular types $p \in \mathbf{S}_s^{\text{bs}}(M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_1})$ orthogonal to $M_w^{\mathfrak{s}_v}$ for every $w \subset u$ such that either p is a nonforking extension of some $q \in \mathbf{P}_u^0$ or $p \perp M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_0}$. By Claims 12.9(6), 12.10 (and see 12.13(4)), without loss of generality $\{0, 1\}, w \subset u \subset v \in I, c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{d}_i} \Rightarrow \text{tp}_s(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{d}_{i\ell}}, M_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{d}_i}) \in \mathbf{P}_u^i$ and $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{d}_0} \subseteq \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{d}_1}$.

So $\mathfrak{d}_0, \mathfrak{d}_1$ are as in Definition 12.12(4) (as $J, t(*)$ are given) hence there is a stable expanded I -system $\mathfrak{d} \approx \mathfrak{d}_0 *_J \mathfrak{d}_1$. So $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}^{\mathfrak{d}}$ is as required.

2) For $\ell = 0$ this is just by properties of a.e.c.. For $\ell = 1$ we use Claim 12.13(1) (we can expand \mathfrak{s}_α to $\mathfrak{d}_\alpha, \mathfrak{d}_\alpha$ increasing continuous by Claim 12.13(4) and 12.13(5)). For $\ell = 2$ note that the union of an \leq_s -increasing continuous sequence of brimmed models in brimmed.

For $\ell = 3$ use the basic properties of orthogonality.

3) Easy, too.

4) Easy, too. □_{12.15}

12.16 Lemma. 1) *Let $\ell \in \{0, 2, 3\}$. Assume that \mathfrak{s} is successful (hence \mathfrak{s}^+ has the properties required in 12.2) and*

(a) *J a successor of I , in details $I \subseteq \mathcal{P}(u_*)$ is downward closed, u_* finite, $u_{**} = u_* \cup \{t^*\}, t^* \notin u_*, J = I \cup \{u \cup \{t^*\} : u \in I\}$*

- (b) \mathfrak{s} is a brimmed $^\ell$ $(\lambda^+, I, \mathfrak{s}^+)$ -system
- (c) $\langle M_{u,\alpha}^{\mathfrak{s}} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is a $\langle \mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]$ -representation of $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}}$
- (d) for $\alpha < \lambda^+$ we try to define $(\lambda, I, \mathfrak{s})$ -system \mathfrak{s}_α by $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha} = M_{u,\alpha}^{\mathfrak{s}}, h_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha} = h_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{s}} \upharpoonright M_{u,\alpha}^{\mathfrak{s}}$
- (e) for $\alpha < \beta < \lambda^+$ we try to define a $(\lambda, J, \mathfrak{s})$ -system $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta}$ by

$$M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta}} = M_{u,\alpha}^{\mathfrak{s}} \text{ for } u \in I$$

$$M_{u \cup \{t^*\}}^{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta}} = M_\beta^{\mathfrak{s}}$$

$$h_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta}} = h_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{s}} \upharpoonright M_{u \cup \{t^*\}}^{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta}} \text{ if } u \in I, u \subseteq v \in J$$

$$h_{v, u \cup \{t^*\}}^{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta}} = h_{v,u}^{\mathfrak{s}} \upharpoonright M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta}} \text{ if } u \in I, u \cup \{t^*\} \subseteq v \in I.$$

Then for some club E of λ^+ we have

- (α) for every $\alpha \in E$, \mathfrak{s}^α is an (I, \mathfrak{s}) -system which is brimmed $^\ell$
- (β) for every $\alpha < \beta$ from E , $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is a brimmed $^\ell$ (J, \mathfrak{s}) -system.

2) Assume that $\ell \in \{2, 3\}$ and (a),(c),(d),(e) of part (1) holds for $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}}$ and

- (b)' \mathbf{d} is an explicit brimmed $^\ell$ expanded stable $(\lambda^+, I, \mathfrak{s}^+)$ -system.

Then for some club E of λ^+ , we can define for $\alpha \in E$, \mathbf{d}^α as below and we can find $\mathbf{d}^{\alpha,\beta}$ for $\alpha < \beta$ from E as below such that

- (α) \mathbf{d}_α is an explicit expanded stable $(\lambda, I, \mathfrak{s})$ -system
- (β) $\mathbf{d}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is an explicit brimmed $^\ell$ expanded stable $(\lambda^+, J, \mathfrak{s}^+)$ -system
- (γ) $\mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{d}^{\alpha,\beta}] = \mathfrak{s}^{\alpha,\beta}$ from part (1) and $\mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{d}^\alpha] = \mathfrak{s}^\alpha$ from part (1)
- (δ) for $u \subset v \in I$, $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}^\alpha} = \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} \cap M_v^{\mathbf{d}^\alpha}$

Proof. 1) We leave the case $\ell = 0$ to the reader, so it is enough to prove part (2).

2) Choose for each $u \in I$ a maximal subset of \mathbf{P}_u of $\mathbf{P}_u^* = \{p \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}^{\text{bs}}(M_u^{\mathfrak{s}}) : p \text{ regular orthogonal to } M_{u,w}^{\mathfrak{s}} \text{ for every } w \subset u\}$ of pairwise orthogonal types.

Let \mathbf{d} be the stable expanded (λ, I) -system and let $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}} = \mathfrak{s}$. Now

- ⊗₁ if $p \in \mathbf{P}_u^*$ then for some $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(p) \leq \alpha_1 = \alpha_1(p) < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ we have:
 - (a) $M_{v,\alpha_1}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is a witness for p
 - (b) $p \upharpoonright M_{u,\alpha_1}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is orthogonal to $M_{u,\gamma}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ iff $\gamma < \alpha_0$.

For each $p \in \mathbf{P}_u$ let \mathbf{J}_p be a maximal subset of $\mathbf{I}_{M_{u,\alpha_1(p)}^s, M_u^s} = \cup \{\mathbf{I}_{M_{u,\alpha(p)}^s, M_{u,\beta}^s} : \beta \in [\alpha_1(p), \lambda_s^+]\}$ of elements realizing $p \upharpoonright M_{u,\alpha_1(p)}^s$ in M_u^s which is independent in $(M_{u,\alpha_1(p)}^s, M_u^s)$.

We can find a club E of λ_s^+ such that

⊗₂ if $\delta \in E$ then

- (a) for $u \subset v \in I$ we have $h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}(M_{u,\delta}^s) = M_{v,u}^s \cap M_{v,\delta}^s$
- (b) for $u \subset v$ and $c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$, if $c \in M_{v,\delta}^s$ then $\delta \geq \alpha_1(\text{tp}(c, M_{v,u}^s, M_v^s))$
- (c) $(M_{v,u}^s \cap M_{v,\delta}^s, M_{v,\delta}^s, \cup \{\mathbf{J}_{v,u_1,u_0}^{2,\mathbf{d}} \cap M_{v,\delta}^s : u_0 \subseteq u, u_1 \subseteq v, u_1 \not\subseteq u\})$ belongs to $K_s^{-3,\text{bu}}$
- (d) if $u \in I, p \in \mathbf{P}_u, \alpha_1(p) < \delta$ then $\mathbf{J}_p \cap M_{u,\delta}^s$ is a maximal subset of $\mathbf{I}_{M_{u,\alpha_1(p)}^s, M_{u,\delta}^s}$ of elements realizing $p \upharpoonright M_{u,\alpha_1(p)}^s$ which is independent in $(M_{u,\alpha_1(p)}^s, M_{u,\delta}^s)$
- (e) if $u \subset v \in I$ and $\delta_1 < \delta_2$ are from E then $\text{NF}_s(M_{u,\delta_1}^s, M_{v,\delta_1}^s, M_{u,\delta_2}^s, M_{v,\delta_2}^s)$
- (f) if $u \subset v \in I, c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^s$ and $p = \text{tp}_{s(+)}(c, M_{v,u}^s, M_v^s)$ and $\alpha_0(p) \leq \delta$ then $\alpha_1(p) \leq \delta$.

Let $\alpha < \beta$ be from E and let $\mathbf{s}^{\alpha,\beta}$ be as in part (1) of the claim. We define an expanded (λ, J) -system $\mathbf{d}^{\alpha,\beta}$ by (recalling \mathbf{d} is explicit)

- (a) $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{d}^{\alpha,\beta}} = \mathbf{s}^{\alpha,\beta}$ (defined in part (1))
- (b) if $u \subset v \in I$ then $\mathbf{J}_{u,v}^{\mathbf{d}^{\alpha,\beta}} = \mathbf{J}_{u,v}^{\mathbf{d}} \cap M_{v,\alpha}^s$
- (c) if $u \subset v \in J, u \in I, v = v_1 \cup \{t^*\}$ hence $u \subset v_1 \in I$ then $\mathbf{J}_{u,v}^{\mathbf{d}^{\alpha,\beta}} = \{c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} : c \in M_{v,\alpha}^s \text{ and } \alpha \geq \alpha_1(\text{tp}(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}}))\}$
- (d) if $u \subseteq v \in J, u = u_1 \cup \{t^*\}, v = v_1 \cup \{t^*\}, u \subset v \in I$ then $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}^{\alpha,\beta}} = \{c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} : c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}} \text{ and } \alpha < \alpha_1(\text{tp}(c, M_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M_v^{\mathbf{d}}))\}$
- (e) if $u \in I, v = u \cup \{t^*\}$ then $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}^{\alpha,\beta}} = \{c : \text{for some } p \in \mathbf{P}_u, \alpha_1(p) \leq \alpha \text{ and } c \in \mathbf{J}_p \cap M_{u,\beta}^s \setminus M_{u,\alpha}^s\}$.

Now check.

□_{12.16}

12.17 Definition. Let $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

1) We say that \mathfrak{s} satisfies (or has) the brimmed $^\ell$ weak (λ, n) -existence property if:

Case 1: $n = 0$.

There is a brimmed $^\ell$ model in $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ (so always holds).

Case 2: $n = 1$.

If M_\emptyset is brimmed $^\ell$, $p_i \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_\emptyset)$ for $i < i^* < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$ then we can find $c_i (i < i^*)$ and $M_{\{\emptyset\}}$ such that $p_i = \text{tp}(c_i, M_\emptyset, M_{\{\emptyset\}})$ and $(M_\emptyset, M_{\{\emptyset\}}, \{c_i : i < i^*\}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bs}}$, $i < j \Rightarrow c_i \neq c_j$.

Case 3: $n \geq 2$.

Every brimmed $^\ell$ expanded stable $\mathcal{P}^-(n)$ -system \mathbf{d} can be completed to an expanded stable $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system \mathbf{d}^+ , i.e. there is an expanded stable $\mathcal{P}(n)$ -system \mathbf{d}^+ such that $\mathbf{d}^+ \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathbf{d}$; recall $\mathcal{P}^-(n) = \{u : u \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}\} = \mathcal{P}(n) \setminus \{n\}$.

2) We say that \mathfrak{s} satisfies (or has) brimmed $^\ell$ weak (λ, n) -uniqueness property when:

Case 1: If $n = 0$, $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ has amalgamation.

Case 2: If $n = 1$. If $(M, N_\ell, \{a_i^k : i < i^*\}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bu}}$ for $k = 1, 2$ and $\text{tp}(a_i^1, M, N_\ell) = \text{tp}(a_i^2, M, N_\ell)$ there is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding f of N_1 into some N'_2 such that $N_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N'_2$ and $f(a_1^1) = a_1^2$.

Case 3: $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2$ are brimmed $^\ell$ expanded stable $\mathcal{P}(n)$ -systems and $\mathbf{d}^m = \mathbf{d}_m \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ and $\bar{f} = \langle f_u : u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) \rangle$ is an isomorphism from $\mathbf{s}[\mathbf{d}^1]$ onto $\mathbf{s}[\mathbf{d}^2]$, then we can find (f, N) such that:

- (a) $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_2} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$,
- (b) f is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ into N
- (c) for $u \subset n$ we have $f \circ h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1} = h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_2} \circ f_u$.

3) We say that \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ, n) -existence when:

Case 1: $n = 0$, just $K_{\mathfrak{s}} \neq \emptyset$.

Case 2: $n = 1$, as in part (1) but $(M_\emptyset, M_{\{\emptyset\}}, \{c_i : i < i^*\}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bu}}$.

Case 3: $n \geq 2$.

For every brimmed $^\ell$ expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}^-(n))$ -system \mathbf{d} we can find an expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system \mathbf{d}^+ such that $\mathbf{d}^+ \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathbf{d}$ and \mathbf{d}^+ is reduced in n which means $u \subset n \Rightarrow \mathbf{J}_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}^+} = \emptyset$.

4) We say that \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ, n) -uniqueness property when:

Case 1: If $n = 0$, $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ categorical in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

Case 2: If $n = 1$, uniqueness for $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3,\text{bu}}$ see 7.15.

Case 3: $n \geq 2$ and $\ell \in \{3, 4\}$.

In part (2) we add $N = M_n^{\mathbf{d}_2}$ and f is onto N .

Case 4: $n \geq 2$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$.

The conclusion of Case 1 holds¹⁶ if we assume (what is said in part (2) and) that $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2$ are regular (or just $c \in \mathbf{J}_{n,u} \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, h_{n,u}(M_u^{\mathbf{d}_k}), M_n^{\mathbf{d}_k})$ is regular):

- if $u \subset v \in \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1})$ then the cardinality of $\{c \in \mathbf{J}_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1} : \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}, M_{u_n}^{\mathbf{d}_1}) \pm p\}$ is equal to the cardinality of $\{c \in \mathbf{J}_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_2} : \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_2}, M_n^{\mathbf{d}_2}) \pm f(p)\}$ assuming for simplicity \mathbf{d}_1 is regular.

5) We say that \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed ^{ℓ} weak/strong (λ, n) -primeness property when $n = 0, 1$ or for any brimmed ^{ℓ} $\mathcal{P}^-(n)$ -system \mathbf{d}_0 and expanded stable $\mathcal{P}(n)$ -system \mathbf{d}_1 which is reduced in n which means $u = n \Rightarrow \mathbf{J}_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1} = \emptyset$ and \mathbf{d}_1 satisfy $\mathbf{d}_1 \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathbf{d}_0$ we have: \mathbf{d}_1 is weakly/strongly prime ^{ℓ} over \mathbf{d}_0 , see below.

5A) We say \mathbf{d}_1 is weakly/strongly prime ^{ℓ} over \mathbf{d}_0 (and also say that $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ is weakly/strongly prime ^{ℓ} over $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}_0}$) when for some n , \mathbf{d}_1 is a brimmed ^{ℓ} $\mathcal{P}(n)$ -system, $\mathbf{d}_0 = \mathbf{d}_1 \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ and:

- (*) if \mathbf{d}_2 is a brimmed ^{ℓ} $(\mathcal{P}(n), \mathfrak{s})$ -system satisfying $\mathbf{d}_2 \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathbf{d}_0 \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$, then there is an $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding f of $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ into $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_2}$ such that $u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) \Rightarrow f \circ h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1} = h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_2}$, and in the strong case, for every regular $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(f(M_n^{\mathbf{d}_1}))$ orthogonal to $M_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_2}$ for every $u \subset n$ we have $\dim(p, M_n^{\mathbf{d}_2}) = \lambda$.

6) In (1)-(5) we may restrict ourselves to one expanded stable $\mathcal{P}^-(n)$ -system or $\mathcal{P}(n)$ -system \mathbf{d} , i.e., consider the property as a property of \mathbf{d} ; so in this case the brimmed ^{ℓ} may refer to only $u = n$!

7) We say that \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed ^{ℓ} weak/strong (λ, n) -prime existence if for every brimmed ^{ℓ} expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}^-(n))$ -system \mathbf{d}_1 there is an expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system \mathbf{d}_2 which is weakly/strongly prime ^{ℓ} over \mathbf{d}_1 , (note: \mathbf{d}_2 is only brimmed¹ and is reduced in n).

8) Writing “...($< n$)... property” we mean “... m ... property” for every $m < n$.

Our main aim is to show that if \mathfrak{s} is excellent and $\langle 2^{\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^{+n}} : n < \omega \rangle$ increasing then every one of those properties is satisfied by \mathfrak{s}^{+m} for $m < \omega$ large enough.

¹⁶in the case central for this section the $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_m}$ are brimmed so the only freedom left are about dimensions of types from $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_m})$

- 12.18 Claim.** 1) For $n = 0, 1, 2$, the frame \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ weak (λ, n) -existence property for $\ell \leq 4$.
- 2) For $n = 0, 1, 2$, the frame \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ weak (λ, n) -uniqueness property for $\ell = 1, 2, 3, 4$.
- 3) For $n = 0, 1$ the frame \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ, n) -existence property for $\ell = 1, 2, 3, 4$.
- 4) For $n = 0, 1$, the frame \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell(\lambda, n)$ -primeness property for $\ell = 1, 2, 3, 4$.
- 5) For $n = 0, 1$ the frame \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell(\lambda, n)$ -primeness existence property for $\ell = 1, 2, 3, 4$.
- 6) If \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ, n) -existence property and the brimmed $^\ell$ weak/strong (λ, n) -primeness property, then it has the brimmed $^\ell$ weak/strong (λ, n) -primeness existence property 12.34.

Proof. 1) If $n = 0$, this is clear, for $n = 1$ this is the existence theorem for $K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bu}}$, see ?.

→ scite{705-xxX} undefined

Lastly, if $n = 2$ by ?; “the existence of stable amalgamation” we can find a sta-

→ scite{705-yyY} undefined

ble $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n)$ -system \mathfrak{s}^+ such that $\mathfrak{s}^+ \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}}$ and we can extend $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}^+}$ and choose $\mathbf{J}_{n,u}$ for $u \subset n$.

2) For $n = 2$, by the uniqueness of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -amalgamation, see ?.

→ scite{705-yyY} undefined

3), 4), 5) Easy, too.

6) Let \mathbf{d} be a brimmed $^\ell(\lambda, \mathcal{P}^-(n))$ -system. By the strong $(\lambda, n)^\ell$ -existence property there is an expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system \mathbf{d}^* , reduced in n such that $\mathbf{d}^* \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathbf{d}$. By the (λ, n) -primeness $^\ell$ property \mathbf{d}^* is prime $^\ell$ so we are done.

□_{12.18}

Remark. Assume $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is the class of (A, E) , $|A| = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$, E an equivalence relation. If $(M, N, a) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bu}}$, a/E^N disjoint to M , if a/E^N is too large then $(M, N, a) \notin K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{pr}}$.

12.19 Claim. The following properties of \mathbf{d} are actually properties of \mathfrak{s} , that is, their satisfaction depends just on $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbf{d}}$

- (A) “ \bar{f} being an embedding of \mathbf{d} into M ”
- (B) \mathbf{d} is brimmed $^\ell$ at u for $\ell = 1, 2, 3, 4$
- (C) \mathbf{d} has weak/strong uniqueness/existence property
- (D) \mathbf{d} has the weak/strong primeness existence property
- (E) \mathbf{d} has the weak/strong primeness property.

Proof. The least easy case is that replacing $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ by similar $\mathbf{J}'_{v,u}$ does not make a difference which holds by ?.

□_{12.19}

→ scite{705-xxX} undefined

12.20 Discussion: Why do we define the “strong primeness”, “strong prime^ℓ” existence?

The problem arises in 12.34. Assume \mathbf{d}_0 is a brimmed³ expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system, \mathbf{d}_1 is an expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system, $\mathbf{d}_1 \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathbf{d}_0 \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$, \mathbf{d}_1 is reduced in n , $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_1} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_n^{\mathbf{d}_0}$ and $h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1} = h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}$ for $u \subset n$. Is $M^{\mathbf{d}_0}(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_1}$? If \mathfrak{s} has the NDOP (and $n \geq 2$) yes, but in general for $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_n^{\mathbf{d}_1})$ which is $\perp h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}(M_u^{\mathbf{d}_1})$ for every $u \subset n$, we do not know that $\dim(p, M_n^{\mathbf{d}_0}) = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. This motivates the definition of strong primeness.

12.21 Claim. 1) Assume $I_1 \subseteq I_2$ and \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ weak $(\lambda, |u|)$ -existence property whenever $u \in I_2 \setminus I_1$. Then for any brimmed^ℓ expanded stable $(\lambda, I_1, \mathfrak{s})$ -system \mathbf{d}_1 there is a brimmed^ℓ expanded stable $(\lambda, I_2, \mathfrak{s})$ -system \mathbf{d}_2 satisfying $\mathbf{d}_2 \upharpoonright I_1 = \mathbf{d}_1$.

2) Let $\ell \in \{3, 4\}$. Assume that for any $m < n$, \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ strong (λ, m) -uniqueness property. Then for any two brimmed^ℓ expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}^-(n))$ -systems $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2$, the systems $\mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{d}_1], \mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{d}_2]$ are isomorphic. Similarly for (λ, I) if $u \in I \Rightarrow |u| < n$.

3) In (2) if \mathbf{d}_k is a brimmed^ℓ expanded stable (I_2, \mathfrak{s}) -system, for $k = 1, 2$ and $I_1 \subseteq I_2$ and \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ strong $(\lambda, |u|)$ -uniqueness whenever $u \in I_2 \setminus I_1$ and $\bar{f} = \langle f_u : u \in I_1 \rangle$ is an isomorphism from $\mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{d}_1 \upharpoonright I_1]$ onto $\mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{d}_2 \upharpoonright I_1]$, then we can find \bar{f}' , an isomorphism from $\mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{d}_1]$ onto $\mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{d}_2]$ such that $\bar{f}' \upharpoonright I_1 = \bar{f}$.

Proof. Natural.

□_{12.21}

12.22 Conclusion. 1) Assume $\ell \in \{3, 4\}$ and

- (a) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ strong $(\lambda, < n)$ -uniqueness property
- (b) there is a brimmed^ℓ stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system.

Then \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ weak (λ, n) -existence property.

Proof. 1) We prove this by induction on n , so we can assume that \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ weak (λ, m) -existence property for $m < n$. The cases $n = 0, 1$ are trivial, see 12.18. Now by clause (b) there is a brimmed^ℓ expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system \mathbf{d}^* . To prove the brimmed^ℓ weak (λ, n) -existence property, let \mathbf{d} be a

brimmed^ℓ expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}^-(n))$ -system. By assumption (a) and 12.21(2) and the induction hypothesis, \mathbf{d} and $\mathbf{d}^* \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ are isomorphic hence, by renaming, without loss of generality they equal, so \mathbf{d}^* prove the existence. $\square_{12.22}$

12.23 Claim. 1) Let $\ell = 1, 2, 3, 4$. The brimmed^ℓ weak (λ, n) -existence property is equivalent to: for every brimmed^ℓ expanded stable $\mathcal{P}^-(n)$ -system \mathbf{d} there are $M \in \mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\bar{f} = \langle f_u : u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) \rangle$, such that

⊗ \bar{f} is an embedding of \mathbf{d} into M which means

- (a) f_u is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of $M_u^{\mathbf{d}}$ into M
- (b) if $u \subset v \in \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ then $f_u = f_v \circ f_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$
- (c) for any $u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n)$, the set $\cup \{f_v(\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}) : v \text{ satisfies } u \subseteq v \in \mathcal{P}^-(n)\}$ is independent in $(f_u(M_u^{\mathbf{d}}), M)$, as an indexed set¹⁷.

2)

- (a) If \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ strong (λ, n) -existence property then \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ weak (λ, n) -existence property
- (b) if \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ strong (λ, n) -uniqueness property then \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ weak (λ, n) -uniqueness property
- (c) if \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ strong (λ, n) -primeness existence property then \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ weak (λ, n) -primeness existence property
- (d) similarly for primeness.

3) If $\{(\ell(1), \ell(2))\} \in \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 4)\}$ and \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^{ℓ(1)} weak/strong (λ, n) -existence property then \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^{ℓ(2)} weak/strong (λ, n) -existence property.

4) Similarly to part (3) for weak (λ, n) -uniqueness.

4A) If $\{(\ell(1), \ell(2))\} \in \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 4)\}$ and \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^{ℓ(1)} strong uniqueness, then \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^{ℓ(2)} strong uniqueness.

5)*

- (a) every expanded stable $(\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}, I)$ -system for \mathfrak{s} is brimmed²
- (b) for each of the properties defined in Definition 12.17, the weak brimmed² version and the brimmed¹ one are equivalent.

¹⁷this just means that $\langle \{f_v(c) : c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}\} : u \subset v \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) \rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint sets

Proof of 12.23. 1) First assume that \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed ^{ℓ} weak (λ, n) -existence property and we shall prove the condition \circledast in 12.23(1). By the present assumption, we can find \mathbf{d}' as in the definition 12.17(1), and we let $M = M_n^{\mathbf{d}'}, f_u = f_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}'}$, clearly they are as required in \circledast .

Second assume that \mathfrak{s} satisfies the condition \circledast from 12.23(1). Let $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}_0$, a brimmed ^{ℓ} expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}^-(n))$ -system be given, so by our assumption there are $M, \langle f_u : u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) \rangle$ as there. Now we define an expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system \mathbf{d}_1 as follows: $\mathbf{d}_1 \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathbf{d}_0, M_n^{\mathbf{d}_1} = M, h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1} = f_u$ for $u \subset n$ let $\mathbf{J}_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ be a maximal subset \mathbf{J} of $M \setminus \cup \{f_v(M_v) : v \subset n\}$ such that $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1} = \cup \{f_v(J_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_0}) : v \text{ satisfies } u \subset v \subset n\}$ is independent. Clearly \mathbf{d}_1 is as required except that in the brimmed² case we are missing “ M is brimmed”, and in the brimmed³ case, we are missing the $\mathbf{J}_{n,u}$ and in the brimmed⁴ case the relevant condition. Choose M^* such that $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M^*$ and M^* is $(\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}, *)$ -brimmed over M letting $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_1} = M^*$ and lastly, for each $u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ let $\mathbf{J}_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ be a maximal \mathbf{J} such that:

- (α) $\mathbf{J} \subseteq M^* \setminus \cup \{f_u(\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}) : v \text{ satisfies } u \subset v \in \mathcal{P}^-(n)\}$
- (β) $c \in \mathbf{J} \Rightarrow \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, f_u(M_u^{\mathbf{d}_0}), M^*) \in \mathcal{S}^{bs}(f_u(M_u^{\mathbf{d}_0}) \text{ is orthogonal to } f_w(M_w^{\mathbf{d}_0})$
for every $w \subset u$
- (γ) $\mathbf{J} \cup \cup \{f_{w_1}(\mathbf{J}_{w_1,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}) : u \subset w_1 \in \mathcal{P}^-(n)\}$ is independent in $(f_u(M_u^{\mathbf{d}_1}), M^*)$
- (δ) \mathbf{J} is maximal under (α) + (β).

By 12.9(7) we are done.

2), 3), 4), 5) Left to the reader. □_{12.23}

The following claim will give a crucial “saving”.

12.24 Claim. *Assume that $(\ell = 3$ or just $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $n \geq 2$ and)*

- (a) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed ^{ℓ} weak (λ, n) -uniqueness
- (b) \mathbf{d} is an expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}^-(n))$ -system
- (c) $\mathbf{d} \upharpoonright [n]^{<n-1}$ is a brimmed ^{ℓ} system (but \mathbf{d} not necessarily).

Then \mathbf{d} has weak uniqueness, i.e.

- \circledast if $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2$ are expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system satisfying $\mathbf{d}_1 \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}_2 \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ then we can find (N, f) such that $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_2} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N, f$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_1}$ into N and $u \subset n \Rightarrow h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_2} = f \circ h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_1}$.

Proof. We prove this by induction on $k_{\mathbf{d}} = |\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{d}}|$ where $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{d}} = \{v \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) : \mathbf{d} \text{ is not brimmed}^{\ell} \text{ in } v \text{ (so } u \in [n]^{n-1})\}$.

Clearly $k_{\mathbf{d}} \leq \binom{n}{n-1} = n(\leq |\mathcal{P}^-(n)| < 2^n)$. If $k_{\mathbf{d}} = 0$ the conclusion follows from assumption (a).

So assume that $k_{\mathbf{d}} > 0$ and choose $v_* \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{d}}$. We can find M which is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed ^{ℓ} over $M_{v_*}^{\mathbf{d}}$. Next we define an expanded $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}^-(n))$ -system \mathbf{d}^+ :

- \otimes_1 (a) $\mathbf{d}^+ \upharpoonright (\mathcal{P}^-(n) \setminus \{v_*\}) = \mathbf{d} \upharpoonright (\mathcal{P}^-(n) \setminus \{v_*\})$
- (b) $h_{v_*,u}^{\mathbf{d}^+} = h_{v_*,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ if $u \subset v_*$
- (c) $M_{v_*}^{\mathbf{d}^+} = M$
- (d) $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}^+} = \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ if $u \subset v \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) \setminus \{v_*\}$
- (e) $\mathbf{J}_{v_*,u}^{\mathbf{d}^+}$, for $u \subset v_*$, is a maximal subset \mathbf{J} of $\{c \in M \setminus \cup \{M_{v_*,u}^{\mathbf{d}} : u \subset v_*\} : \text{tp}(c, M_{v_*,u}^{\mathbf{d}}, M) \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_{v,u})\}$ is orthogonal to $M_{v_*,w}$ when $w \subset u$ such that \mathbf{J} is independent in $(M_{v_*,u}, M_{v_*})$ and $\mathbf{J} \supseteq \mathbf{J}_{v_*,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$.

Now let $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2$ be as in the assumption of \otimes . Next for $k = 1, 2$ by the existence of stable amalgamation there are (N_k, f_k) such that $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_k} \leq_s N_k, f_k$ is a \leq_s -embedding of $M = M_{v_*}^{\mathbf{d}^+}$ into N_k extending $f_{n,v_*}^{\mathbf{d}_k}$ and $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_n^{\mathbf{d}_k}, M_n^{\mathbf{d}_k}, f_k(M), N_k)$ holds.

By renaming without loss of generality $f_1 = f_2 = \text{id}_M$. We now define an expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}^-(n))$ -system \mathbf{d}_k^+

- \otimes_k^2 (a) $\mathbf{d}_k^+ \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathbf{d}^+$
- (b) $M_n^{\mathbf{d}_k^+} = N_k$.
- (c) $h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_k^+} = h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_k}$ for $u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) \setminus \{v_*\}$
- (d) $h_{n,v_*}^{\mathbf{d}_k^+} = f_k$
- (e) $\mathbf{J}_{n,v}^{\mathbf{d}_k^+}$ for $v \subset n$ are defined as in previous cases.

Now we use the induction hypothesis (on $k_{\mathbf{d}}$)

□_{12.24}

12.25 Claim. 1) Assume that (a) + (b) and: (c)₁ or (c)₂ where;

- (a) \mathbf{s}^k is a stable (λ, I) -system for $k = 1, 2$
- (b) $\mathbf{s}^1 \upharpoonright J = \mathbf{s}^2 \upharpoonright J$ where $J =: \{u \in I : (\exists v \in I)(u \subset v)\}$
- (c)₁ if $u \in I \setminus J$ then $\mathbf{s}^{\ell} \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(u)$ has the weak uniqueness property
- (c)₂ if $v \in I \setminus J$ then $u \subset v \Rightarrow h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{s}^1} = h_{v,u}^{\mathbf{s}^2}$ and $M_v^{\mathbf{s}^{\ell}} \leq_s M_v^{\mathbf{s}^{2-\ell}}$ for some $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$.

Then

- (α) \mathbf{s}^1 has the weak existence property iff \mathbf{s}^2 has the weak existence property
- (β) \mathbf{s}^1 has the weak uniqueness property iff \mathbf{s}^2 has the weak uniqueness property.

Proof. Similar to 12.24. □_{12.25}

In 12.16 we have proved actually some things on \mathfrak{s}^+ concerning Definition 12.17. [Why do we ignore $\ell = 1$? As for \mathfrak{s}^+ , $\text{brimmed}^1 \Rightarrow \text{brimmed}^2$.]

12.26 Conclusion. Let $\ell \in \{0, 2, 3\}$ and assume that \mathfrak{s} is successful hence \mathfrak{s}^+ satisfies the demands in 12.2. If for \mathfrak{s}^+ there is a brimmed^ℓ stable $\mathcal{P}(n)$ -system, then for \mathfrak{s} there is a brimmed^ℓ stable $\mathcal{P}(n + 1)$ -system.

Remark. For $\ell = 0, 2$ we can find trivial examples.

Proof. By 12.16.

12.27 Claim. Assume that \mathbf{d}_k is an expanded stable (λ, I) -system for $k = 1, 2$ and \bar{f} is an embedding of \mathbf{d}_1 into \mathbf{d}_2 , see Definition 12.7(1A).

1) If $I = \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ and \mathbf{d}_2 has the weak existence property then \mathbf{d}_1 has the weak existence property.

2) If $I = \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ and $\bar{f} \upharpoonright [n]^{<n-1}$ is an isomorphism from $\mathbf{d}_1 \upharpoonright [n]^{<n-1}$ onto $\mathbf{d}_2 \upharpoonright [n]^{<n-1}$ and \mathbf{d}_2 has the weak uniqueness property then \mathbf{d}_1 has weak uniqueness property.

Proof. 1) Easy (and was used inside the proof of 12.24).

2) Very similar to the proof of 12.24 (and we can use part (1)). □_{12.27}

12.28 Lemma. 1) Let $\ell = 3, n \geq 2$. Assume $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+}$ and:

- (a) \mathfrak{s} is successful hence \mathfrak{s}^+ has the properties required in 12.2
- (b) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ weak $(\lambda, \leq n + 1)$ -existence property
- (c) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ strong $(\lambda, \leq n)$ -uniqueness property
- (d) \mathfrak{s} does not have the brimmed^ℓ weak $(\lambda, n + 1)$ -uniqueness property.

Then \mathfrak{s}^+ does not have the brimmed^ℓ strong (λ^+, n) -uniqueness property.

Remark. Of course, it would be better to have “strong” in clause (d) of the assumption and it would be better to have weak in the conclusion. Still we can prove a slightly stronger claim.

→ A variant of ? is [scite{705-12.b11}](#) undefined

12.29 Claim. 1) In 12.28 we can replace clause (c) by $(c)_1^- + (c)_2^-$ (which obviously follows from it) where

- $(c)_1^-$ \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ strong $(\lambda, < n)$ -uniqueness property
 $(c)_2^-$ \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed^ℓ weak (λ, n) -uniqueness property.

2) We can strengthen the conclusion to: \mathfrak{s}^+ fail the brimmed³ weak (λ^+, n) -uniqueness property.

Proof of 12.28. 1) We choose by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^+$, \mathfrak{s}_η for every $\eta \in {}^\alpha 2$ such that:

- ⊗ (α) \mathfrak{s}_η is a normal brimmed^ℓ stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system
- (β) the universe of $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}_\eta}$ is an ordinal $\gamma_{\ell g(\eta)} < \lambda^+$
- (γ) the sequence $\langle M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_\eta \upharpoonright \gamma} : \gamma \leq \alpha \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -increasing continuous
- (δ) if $\alpha = \beta + 1$ then $\mathfrak{s}_\eta^* =: \mathfrak{s}_{\eta \upharpoonright \beta} *_{\mathcal{P}(n+1)} \mathfrak{s}_\eta$ is a brimmed^ℓ stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n+1))$ -system
- (ε) if $\alpha = \beta + 1, \nu \in {}^\beta 2$, then:
 $\mathfrak{s}_{\nu^{\wedge} \langle 0 \rangle}^* \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n+1) = \mathfrak{s}_{\nu^{\wedge} \langle 1 \rangle}^* \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n+1)$
- (ζ) if $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and $\nu \in {}^\beta 2$ then for no f, N do we have:
 f is an $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of $M_{n+1}^{\mathfrak{s}_{\nu^{\wedge} \langle 0 \rangle}^*}$
into $N, M_{n+1}^{\mathfrak{s}_{\nu^{\wedge} \langle 1 \rangle}^*} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$
and f is the identity on $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_{\nu^{\wedge} \langle 0 \rangle}^*} = M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_{\nu^{\wedge} \langle 1 \rangle}^*}$ for $u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n+1)$
- (η) if $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in {}^\alpha 2$ then $\mathfrak{s}_{\nu_1} \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathfrak{s}_{\nu_2} \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$
(this strengthens clause (ε)).

Now

- (*)₁ we can carry the induction
[Why? For $\alpha = 0$ trivial. For $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and $\eta \in {}^\beta 2$ by clause (d) of the assumption there are brimmed^ℓ $\mathcal{P}(n+1)$ -system $\mathfrak{s}', \mathfrak{s}''$ with $\mathfrak{s}' \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n+1) = \mathfrak{s}'' \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n+1)$ as in clause (ζ), i.e., for no (N, f) do we have $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}''} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ and f is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}'}$ into N which is the identity on $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}'}$ for every $u \subset n+1$. Now for proving 12.28, by assumption (c) and claim 12.21(2) renaming we have $\mathfrak{s}_{\eta^{\wedge} \langle 0 \rangle}, \mathfrak{s}_{\eta^{\wedge} \langle 1 \rangle}$ as required in clause (ε) and (ζ) of ⊗ and by renaming we have (β); by the proof we can get clause (η), too. (For proving 12.29 this is done in its proof). For α limit $\mathfrak{s}_\eta =: \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \mathfrak{s}_{\eta \upharpoonright \beta}$ is a stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system by Claim 12.15(2); moreover is brimmed^ℓ.]

For $\eta \in \lambda^+ 2$ we define a normal $(\lambda^+, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system for \mathfrak{s}^+ called \mathfrak{s}_η by $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_\eta} = \cup\{M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_\eta \upharpoonright \alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$, clearly

- (*)₂ \mathfrak{s}_η is really a $(\lambda^+, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system for the frame \mathfrak{s}^+ (noting that $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_\eta} \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ as it belongs to $K^{\mathfrak{s}}$ and is saturated over $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ because by clause (δ) , $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_\eta \upharpoonright (\alpha+1)}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}_\eta \upharpoonright \alpha}$ for every $\alpha < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^+$)
- (*)₃ \mathfrak{s}_η is a brimmed stable $(\lambda^+, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system for $\mathfrak{s}(+)$
[why? by 12.15(3).]
- (*)₄ $\mathfrak{s}_\eta \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ is the same for all $\eta \in \lambda^+ 2$ call it \mathfrak{t}^* .
[Why? By Clause (η) of \otimes .]

Let $\rho \in \lambda^+ 2$. To finish the proof it is enough to find $\eta \in \lambda^+ 2$ such that $h_* = \cup\{\text{id}_{M_u^{\mathfrak{t}}} : u \subset n\}$ cannot be extended to an isomorphism from $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}_\rho}$ onto $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}_\eta}$; toward contradiction assume that f_η is such an isomorphism for every $\eta \in \lambda^+ 2$. By the weak diamond, (see I§0) for some $\eta_0, \eta_1 \in \lambda^+ 2$ and $\delta < \lambda^+$ we have $\nu = \eta_\ell \upharpoonright \delta, \nu \wedge \langle \ell \rangle \triangleleft \eta_\ell$ and $f_{\eta_1} \upharpoonright M_n^{\mathfrak{s}_\nu} = f_{\eta_2} \upharpoonright M_n^{\mathfrak{s}_\nu}$. Clearly we get contradiction to clause (ζ) in the construction. □_{12.28}

Proof of 12.29. In the proof of 12.28 there one point in which the proofs differ. We are given \mathfrak{s}_η for $\eta \in \beta 2$ and we know that there are normal brimmed^ℓ $\mathcal{P}(n+1)$ -system $\mathfrak{s}', \mathfrak{s}''$ such that $\mathfrak{s}' \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n+1) = \mathfrak{s}'' \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n+1)$ but there is no $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -embedding of $M_{n+2}^{\mathfrak{s}'}$ into any $N, M_{n+1}^{\mathfrak{s}''} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} N$ over $\bigcup_{u \subset n^+} M_u^{\mathfrak{s}'}$. By the amount of uniqueness we have, i.e. by assumption $(c)_1^-$ without loss of generality $\mathfrak{s}' \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathfrak{s}_\eta \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ (for every $\eta \in \beta 2$, hence also $\mathfrak{s}'' \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathfrak{s}_\eta$). Without loss of generality the universe of $M_{n+1}^{\mathfrak{s}'}$ and of $M_{n+1}^{\mathfrak{s}''}$ is $\gamma_\beta + \lambda$ (recall 12.9(8)) and, of course, the universe of $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}'} = M_n^{\mathfrak{s}''}$ is γ_η .

Now we define \mathfrak{s}_η^* , a $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}^-(n+1))$ -system by $\mathfrak{s}_\eta^* \upharpoonright (\mathcal{P}(n+1) \setminus \{n, n+1\}) = \mathfrak{s}' \upharpoonright (\mathcal{P}^*(n+1) \setminus \{n, n+1\}) = \mathfrak{s}'' \upharpoonright (\mathcal{P}^-(n+1) \setminus \{n, n+1\})$ and $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}_\eta^*} = M_n^{\mathfrak{s}_\eta}$. Clearly \mathfrak{s}_η^* is stable and brimmed^ℓ.

Now by 12.25, the version with $(c)_1$ as $\mathfrak{s}' \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n+1)$ fails the brimmed³ weak uniqueness, also \mathfrak{s}_η^* fails it. Hence we can find a stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}^*(n+1))$ -systems $\mathfrak{s}'_\eta, \mathfrak{s}''_\eta$ witnessing it, to $\mathfrak{s}'_\eta \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n+1) = \mathfrak{s}_\eta^* = \mathfrak{s}''_\eta \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n+1)$. By renaming we take care of clause (β) of \otimes (we use freely 12.9).

2) We choose in addition to \mathfrak{s}_η also N_η such that

- \otimes $(\alpha), (\gamma) - (\eta)$ as in the proof
- (β) N_η is brimmed over $M_\eta^{\mathfrak{s}_\eta}$ the universe of N_η is an ordinal $\gamma_{\ell g(\eta)}$ (instead of (β))

(θ) if $\nu \triangleleft \eta$ then $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}}(M_n^{\mathfrak{s}\nu}, N_\nu, M_n^{\mathfrak{s}\eta}, N_\eta)$ and N_η is brimmed over $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}\eta} \cup N_\nu$.

In the end for $\eta \in \lambda^+ 2$ we define also $N_\eta = \cup\{N_\eta \upharpoonright \alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$ hence $M^{\mathfrak{s}\eta} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} N_\eta$ and N_η is $(\lambda^+, *)$ -brimmed over $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}\eta}$.

So if $\rho, \eta \in \lambda^+ 2$, $N_\eta \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} N$ and f is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ -embedding of $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}\rho}$ into N over $\cup\{M_u^{\mathfrak{s}\rho} : u \subset n\}$, then N can be $\leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ -embedded into N_η over $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}\eta}$ so without loss of generality $N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}(+)} M_n^{\mathfrak{s}\eta}$, N_η is $(\lambda^+, *)$ -brimmed over $M_n^{\mathfrak{s}\eta}$. The rest should be clear. $\square_{12.29}$

12.30 Claim. 1) Assume $\ell = 2, 3, n \geq 1$ and

- (a) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong $(\lambda, \leq n)$ -existence property
- (b) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ weak $(\lambda, \leq n)$ -primeness property

Then there is an expanded stable $\mathcal{P}(n+1)$ -system \mathbf{d} reduced at $n+1$ such that $\mathbf{d} \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ is brimmed 3 .

2) If in addition clause (c) below holds then \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong $(\lambda, n+1)$ -existence property where

- (c) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong $(\lambda, \leq n)$ -uniqueness property.

Proof. 1) Let $M_\emptyset \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ be brimmed $^\ell$. Let $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ be $(\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}, *)$ -brimmed over M_\emptyset . Let $\mathcal{P}_\emptyset \subseteq \{p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_\emptyset) : p \text{ regular}\}$ be a maximal family of pairwise orthogonal types. Let \mathbf{J}_\emptyset^2 be a maximal subset of $\{c \in M : c \text{ realizes some } p \in \mathcal{P}_\emptyset^2 \text{ in } M \text{ over } M_\emptyset\}$ which is independent in (M_\emptyset, M) so $|\mathbf{J}_\emptyset^2| = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and let $\{\mathbf{J}_{u,\emptyset}^2 : \emptyset \subset u \subset n+1\}$ be a partition of \mathbf{J}_\emptyset^2 to sets each of cardinality $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ such that for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_\emptyset^2$ and $u \subset n+1$ the set $\{c \in \mathbf{J}_u : \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{s}}(c, M_\emptyset, M) = p\}$ has cardinality $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. For $u \in I_1 \setminus I_0$ let $M_u \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M$ be such that $(M_\emptyset, M_u, \mathbf{j}_{u,\emptyset}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bu}}$.

Let $I_k = \{u \subseteq n+1 : |u| \leq k\}$ for $k \leq n+1$. We now choose by induction on $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, the objects \mathbf{d}_k and $\langle \mathcal{P}_u, \mathbf{J}_{v,u} : u \in I_k, u \subseteq v \subset n+1 \rangle, \langle N_u, \mathcal{P}_u^1 : u \in I_k, |u| > 1 \rangle, \langle \mathbf{J}_{u,v}^i : u \subseteq v \subset n+1 \text{ and } (u, v) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset) \text{ and } i = 1, 2 \rangle$ such that

- \otimes (a) \mathbf{d}_k is a normal brimmed $^\ell$ expanded stable (λ, I_k) -system embedded in M and $M_\emptyset^{\mathbf{d}_k} = M_\emptyset, M_u^{\mathbf{d}_k} = M_u$ for $u \in I_1 \setminus I_0, J_u^{\mathbf{d}_k} = \mathbf{J}_{u,\emptyset}$
- (b) $m < k \Rightarrow \mathbf{d}_m = \mathbf{d}_k \upharpoonright I_m$
- (c) for $u \in I_k \setminus I_1, N_u$ is such that $\cup\{M_w^{\mathbf{d}_k} : w \subset u\} \subseteq N_u \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M$ and \mathbf{d}_u^* is reduced in u where \mathbf{d}_u^* is the normal brimmed 1 $\mathcal{P}(u)$ -system $\mathbf{d}_u^* \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(u) = \mathbf{d}_k \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(u), M_u^{\mathbf{d}_u^*} = N_u, \mathbf{J}_{u,w}^* = \emptyset$ for $w \subset u$
- (d) for $u \in I_k \setminus I_1, \mathcal{P}_u^1$ is a maximal set of pairwise orthogonal types from $\subseteq \{p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N_u) : p \text{ regular orthogonal to } M_w^{\mathbf{d}_k} \text{ for } w \subset u \text{ (hence to } M_w^{\mathbf{d}_k} \text{ for } w \in I_k \text{ such that } u \not\subseteq w \text{ by 10.18)}\}$

- (e) for $u \in I_k \setminus I_1$, the set \mathbf{J}_u^1 is a maximal subset of $\{c \in M : \text{tp}_s(c, N_u, M) \in \mathcal{P}_u^1\}$ independent in (N_u, M)
- (f) if $u \in I_k \setminus I_1$, then $\langle \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^1 : u \subseteq v \subset n+1 \text{ but } (v, u) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset) \rangle$ is a partition of \mathbf{J}_u^1 to sets each of cardinality λ_s such that moreover, for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_u^1$ the set $\mathbf{J}_{v,u,p}^1 =: \{c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^1 : \text{tp}_s(c, N_u, M) = p\}$ has cardinality λ_s
- (g) $(N_u, M_u^{\mathbf{d}_k}, \bigcup_{w \subseteq u} \mathbf{J}_{u,w}^1 \cup \bigcup_{w \subset u} \mathbf{J}_{u,w}^2) \in K_s^{3,\text{bu}}$ for $u \in I_k \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ where we stipulate $\mathbf{J}_{u,w}^1 = \emptyset$ when $w \subseteq u, |w| \leq 1$
- (h) \mathcal{P}_u^2 is a maximal set of pairwise orthogonal types from $\{p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_u^{\mathbf{d}_k}) : p \text{ orthogonal to } N_u \text{ when } u \notin I_1 \text{ and to } M_\emptyset \text{ if } u \in I_1 \setminus I_0\}$ when $u \in I_k$ (if $u = \emptyset$ then \mathcal{P}_u^2 has already been chosen)
- (i) \mathbf{J}_u^2 is a maximal set of $\{c \in M : \text{tp}_s(c, M_u^{\mathbf{d}_k}, M) \in \mathcal{P}_u^2\}$ independent in $(M_u^{\mathbf{d}_k}, M)$ when $u \in I_k$, (if $u = \emptyset$, \mathbf{J}_u^2 has already been chosen), note that the $\mathbf{J}_{u,w}^2$ used is clause (g) has already been chosen)
- (j) $\langle \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^2 : u \subset v \in \mathcal{P}^-(n+1) \rangle$ is a partition of \mathbf{J}_u^2 such that for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_u^2$ and v such that $u \subset v \in \mathcal{P}^-(n+1)$ the set $\{c \in \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^2 : \text{tp}_s(c, M_u^{\mathbf{d}_k}, M) = p\}$ has cardinality λ when $u \in I_k$
- (k) $\mathbf{J}_{v,u}^{\mathbf{d}_k} = \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^1 \cup \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^2$ where $u \subset v \in I_k$

For $k = 1$, \mathbf{d}_k is defined by clause (a) and choose $\mathcal{P}_u^2, \mathbf{J}_u^2, \langle \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^2 : v \text{ satisfies } u \subseteq v \subset n+1 \rangle$ as above for $u \in I_k \setminus I_0$ (i.e., $u = \{m\}, m < n+1$).

For $k = m+1 > 1$ for each $u \in I_k \setminus I_m$ clearly $\mathbf{d}_m \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(u)$ is a normal brimmed^l expanded stable $\mathcal{P}^-(u)$ -system hence by assumption (a) we can find a normal brimmed¹ $\mathcal{P}(u)$ -system \mathbf{d}_u^* such that $\mathbf{d}_u^* \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(u) = \mathbf{d}_u \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(u)$, $M_u^{\mathbf{d}_u^*} = N_u$ which is reduced in u hence \mathbf{d}_u^* is prime over $\mathbf{d}_m \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(u)$, use (b).

Now $\mathbf{d}_u^* \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(u)$ is embedded in M (by clause (a) of \otimes) so by the definition of the primeness without loss of generality $N_u =: M_u^{\mathbf{d}_u^*} \leq_s M$. Now as $|u| > 1$ choose $\mathcal{P}_u^1, \mathbf{J}_u^1$ and $\langle \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^1 : v \text{ satisfies } u \subseteq v \subset n+1 \rangle$ as required. Now let $M_u^{\mathbf{d}_k} \leq_s M$ be¹⁸ such that $(N_u, M_u^{\mathbf{d}_k}, \cup\{\mathbf{J}_{u,w}^1 \cup \mathbf{J}_{u,w}^2 : w \subset u\}) \in K_s^{3,\text{bu}}$. We then choose $\mathcal{P}_u^2, \mathbf{J}_u^2, \mathbf{J}_{v,u}^2$ ($u \subset v \subset n+1$) as required.

Having carried the induction we define a normal $\mathcal{P}(n+1)$ -system \mathbf{d}_{n+1} by

$$\mathbf{d}_{n+1} \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n+1) = \mathbf{d}_n$$

$$M_{n+1}^{\mathbf{d}_{n+1}} = M$$

¹⁸exists as for every $w \subset u$, the set $\mathbf{J}_{u,w}$ is independent in (N_u, M) because $(M_w, N_u, \cup\{\mathbf{J}_{v_1, u_1} : v_1 \subset u, u_1 \subseteq w, u_1 \subset v_1\}) \in K_s^{3,\text{bu}}$

$$\mathbf{J}_{n+1,u}^{\mathbf{d}_{n+1}} = \emptyset \text{ for } u \subset n+1.$$

It is easy to check that \mathbf{d}_{n+1} is as required.

2) Easy, by 12.21(2). □_{12.30}

12.31 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) \mathbf{d} is an expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system
- (b) \mathbf{d} is reduced at n .

Then we can find \mathbf{d}' such that

- (α) \mathbf{d}' is an expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system reduced at n
- (β) $\mathbf{d}' \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathbf{d} \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$
- (γ) $h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}'} = h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ for $u \subset n$
- (δ) $M_n^{\mathbf{d}} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_n^{\mathbf{d}'}$
- (ε) if $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_n^{\mathbf{d}})$ is regular orthogonal to $M_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}}$ for every $u \subset n$ then
 $\dim(p, M_n^{\mathbf{d}'}) = \lambda$.

Proof. Let $M^+ \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ be $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_n^{\mathbf{d}}$, let $\mathbf{P} = \{p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_n^{\mathbf{d}}) : p \text{ regular } \perp M_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}} \text{ for every } u \subset n\}$. Let $\mathbf{J} = \{c_{p,\alpha} : p \in \mathbf{P}, \alpha < \lambda\}$ be such that

- (i) $c_{p,\alpha} \in M^+$ realizes p
- (ii) $p \in \mathbf{P} \wedge \alpha \neq \beta \Rightarrow c_{p,\alpha} \neq c_{p,\beta}$
- (iii) \mathbf{J} is independent in $(M_n^{\mathbf{d}}, M^+)$.

Now let $M \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M^+$ be such that $(M_n^{\mathbf{d}}, M, \mathbf{J}) \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}^{3, \text{bu}}$ and define \mathbf{d}' such that ((α), (β), (γ)) above holds and) $M_n^{\mathbf{d}'} = M$. It is easy to check that \mathbf{d}' is as required. □_{12.31}

12.32 Claim. 1) *Assume $\ell = 3$ and*

- (a) \mathfrak{s} is successful hence \mathfrak{s}^+ satisfies the hypothesis 12.2
- (b) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed ^{ℓ} weak $(\lambda, \leq n+1)$ -uniqueness property [actually only $n+1$ and n are used]
- (c) \mathfrak{s} is a brimmed ^{ℓ} stable $(\mathcal{P}^-(n), \mathfrak{s}^+)$ -system
- (d) \mathfrak{s}^* is a stable $(\mathcal{P}(n), \mathfrak{s}^+)$ -system reduced at n such that $\mathfrak{s}^* \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathfrak{s}$.

Then \mathfrak{s}^* is prime over \mathfrak{s} for \mathfrak{s}^+ .

2) Moreover, \mathfrak{s}^* is strongly prime^ℓ over \mathfrak{s} for \mathfrak{s}^+ .

Remark. This is similar to the proof of the existence of primes in \mathfrak{s}^+ .

Proof. 1) Without loss of generality \mathfrak{s} is normal. Let $\langle M_u^\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_\mathfrak{s}^+ \rangle$ be $\leq_\mathfrak{s}$ -increasing continuous with union $M_u^{\mathfrak{s}^*}$ and let E be a thin enough club of $\lambda_\mathfrak{s}^+$. By 12.16 for each $\alpha \in E$, $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha^* = \langle M_u^\alpha : u \in \mathcal{P}(n) \rangle$ is a normal stable $\mathcal{P}(n)$ -system reduced at n and letting $\mathcal{P} = \{u \subseteq n+1 : n \notin u\}$ for $\alpha < \beta$ from E , $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta}^* =: \mathfrak{s}_\alpha *_{\mathcal{P}(n+1)} \mathfrak{s}_\beta$ is a stable $(\mathcal{P}(n+1), \mathfrak{s})$ -system and $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta} \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}$ is a normal brimmed³ $(\mathcal{P}, \mathfrak{s})$ -system, see 12.16. Suppose that $M \in K_{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ and $\langle f_u : u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) \rangle$ an embedding of $\mathfrak{s} \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ into M (see Definition 12.5(3)).

As \mathfrak{s} is normal, we have $u \subseteq v \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) \Rightarrow f_u \subseteq f_v$. Let $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_\mathfrak{s}^+ \rangle$ be $\leq_\mathfrak{s}$ -increasing continuous with union M and without loss of generality E is a thin enough club for this too; by renaming $E = \lambda_\mathfrak{s}^+$. Let $f_u^\alpha = f_u \upharpoonright M_u^\alpha$, so $\bar{f}^\alpha = \langle f_u^\alpha : u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) \rangle$ is an embedding of \mathfrak{s}_α into $M_\alpha \leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]} M$. Now we choose f_n^α by induction on α such that

- ⊛(i) f_n^α is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{R}[\mathfrak{s}]}$ -embedding of M_n^α into M (hence into $M_{\beta(\alpha)}$ for some $\beta(\alpha) < \lambda_\mathfrak{s}^+$)
- (ii) f_n^α extend f_n^β for $\beta < \alpha$ and f_u^α for $u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n)$.

For $\alpha = 0$, f_n^0 exists as \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed³ weak (λ, n) -uniqueness property and M is λ^+ -saturated.

For α limit let $f_n^\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} f_n^\beta$.

For $\alpha = \beta + 1$ let $\gamma < \lambda_\mathfrak{s}^+$ be such that M_γ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $\text{Rang}(f_n^\beta) \cup \bigcup \{\text{Rang}(f_u^\alpha : u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n))\}$. We shall show that there is a $\leq_\mathfrak{s}$ -embedding of M_n^α into M and even into M_γ extending $f_\beta \cup \bigcup \{f_u^\alpha : u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n)\}$. For this we shall use “ \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed³ weak $(\lambda, n+1)$ -uniqueness property” defined in 12.17(2) for the $(\lambda_\mathfrak{s}, \mathcal{P}^-(n+1))$ -system $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta}^*$. The embedding are O.K. as M_n^α does not contribute (as \mathfrak{s} is reduced in n). But the assumption is not fully satisfied because $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\beta}^*$ the brimmed^ℓ demand does not (necessarily) holds for $u = n$, i.e., for $f_n^\alpha(M_n^\alpha)$; however, by Claim 12.24 this is overcome. We get that there is a pair (f, N) such that $M_{\beta(\alpha)} \leq_\mathfrak{s} N$ and f a $\leq_\mathfrak{s}$ -embedding M_n^α into N , but without loss of generality $N \leq M_\gamma$ so we are done.

Now $f_n = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda_\mathfrak{s}^+} f_n^\alpha$ is the required embedding.

2) By part (1) and 12.31.

□_{12.32}

12.33 *Conclusion.* Assume $\ell = 3$ and

- (a) \mathfrak{s} is successful hence \mathfrak{s}^+ satisfies 12.2
- (b) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ weak $(\lambda, \leq n + 1)$ -uniqueness property.

Then \mathfrak{s}^+ has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ^+, n) -primeness $^\ell$ property.

Proof. By 12.32.

12.34 Claim. 1) Let $\ell = 3$ and

- (a) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ, n) -existence property
- (b) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ, n) -primeness property.

Then \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ, n) -uniqueness property.

2) Let $\ell = 4$ and \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ weak (λ, n) -uniqueness property then \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ, n) -uniqueness property.

Proof. 1) Assume $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2$ are brimmed $^\ell$ stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system and $\bar{f} = \langle f_u : u \in \mathcal{P}^-(n) \rangle$ be an isomorphism from $\mathbf{d}_1 \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$ onto $\mathbf{d}_2 \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n)$. As \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ, n) -existence property, (i.e., assumption (a)), clearly for $k = 1, 2$ there is an expanded stable $(\lambda, \mathcal{P}(n))$ -system $\mathbf{d}^k, \mathbf{d}^k \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n) = \mathbf{d}_k \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n), \mathbf{d}^k$ reduced in n , i.e., such that $u \subset n \Rightarrow \mathbf{J}_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}^k} = \emptyset$.

Let $f'_u = f_u$ for $u \subset n$. Without loss of generality there is an isomorphism f'_n such that $\langle f'_u : u \in \mathcal{P}(n) \rangle$ is an isomorphism from \mathbf{d}^1 onto \mathbf{d}^2 .

By clause (b) of the assumption + (*) of Definition 12.17 without loss of generality $M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k}$; recall $u \subset n \Rightarrow h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}^k} = h_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}_k}$.

Now

$$(*) \quad M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k} \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k} \text{ and } p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k}) \Rightarrow \dim(p, M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k}) = \lambda \text{ (or just for a dense set of regular } p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k}).$$

[Why? Let $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k})$ be regular; without loss of generality such that for some $u(p) \subseteq n, p$ does not fork over $M_{n,u(p)}^{\mathbf{d}^k}$ and $u \subset u(p) \Rightarrow p$ orthogonal to $M_{n,u}^{\mathbf{d}^k}$. Now $\dim(p, M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k}) = \lambda$. Why? If $u(p) = n$ by (**) from Definition 12.17(5),(5A),(6) and if $u(p) \subset n$ as \mathbf{d}_k is brimmed $^\ell$ (i.e., the definition and basic properties of dimension and regular types).]

We know that if M is $(\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}, *)$ -brimmed $^\ell, N \leq_{\mathfrak{s}} M$ and $p \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(N) \Rightarrow \dim(p, N) = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ then M is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over N (see 10.17). But this demand by (*) holds with

$(M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k}, M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k})$ here standing for (M, N) , hence $M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k}$ is $(\lambda, *)$ -brimmed over $M_n^{\mathbf{d}^k}$. As f'_n is an isomorphism from $M_n^{\mathbf{d}^2}$ onto $M_n^{\mathbf{d}^2}$ there is an isomorphism f_u from $M_n^{\mathbf{d}^1}$ onto $M_n^{\mathbf{d}^2}$ which extends f'_n . So clearly $\langle f_u : u \subseteq n \rangle$ is an isomorphism from \mathbf{d}_1 onto \mathbf{d}_2 . $\square_{12.34}$

12.35 Theorem. $[2^{\lambda+n} < 2^{\lambda+n+1}$ for $n < \omega]$. Let $\ell = 3$. Assume \mathfrak{s} is ω -successful. Then for every $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq n - 2$, \mathfrak{s}^{+m} is n -excellent $^\ell$; (see definition below).

12.36 Definition. 1) We say that \mathfrak{s} is n -beautiful $^\ell$ if:

- (a) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong $(\lambda, \leq n)$ -existence property
- (b) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ weak $(\lambda, \leq n)$ -uniqueness property
- (c) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong $(\lambda, < n)$ -uniqueness property
- (d) \mathfrak{s} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong $(\lambda, < n)$ -primeness property.

2) We say that \mathfrak{s} is ω -beautiful $^\ell$ if \mathfrak{s} is n -beautiful $^\ell$ for every n .

Remark. In the Theorem we could restrict our demand to $n \leq n_*(< \omega)$ and get the appropriate conclusion, essentially \mathfrak{s}^{+m} is n -excellent 3 if \mathfrak{s} is $2n$ -successful (and $\langle 2^{\lambda+\ell} : \ell \leq 2n \rangle$ is increasing).

Proof of 12.35. We know that

$(*)_1$ \mathfrak{s}^{+m} satisfies the demand in 12.2 and is successful.

We now prove by induction on $n \geq 2$ that

\boxtimes_n \mathfrak{s}^{+m} is n -beautiful $^\ell$ if $m \geq n - 2$.

First we prove \boxtimes_2 .

By 12.18 for $n = 0, 1$ the demands in 12.36 holds. Now \mathfrak{s}^{+m} has the brimmed $^\ell$ weak $(\lambda, 2)$ -uniqueness as \mathfrak{s} is a good frame (i.e., the uniqueness of $\text{NF}_{\mathfrak{s}^{+(+m)}}$ -amalgamation. Lastly, the brimmed $^\ell$ strong $(\lambda, 2)$ -existence holds by 12.30.

So let $n \geq 2$ and we assume \boxtimes_n and we shall prove \boxtimes_{n+1} , this suffices

$(*)_2$ there is a brimmed $^\ell$ $(\mathcal{P}(n+1), \mathfrak{s}^{+m})$ -system for $m \geq n - 2$
 [Why? By 12.26.]

$(*)_3$ \mathfrak{s}^{+m} has the brimmed $^\ell$ weak $(\lambda, n+1)$ -existence property if $m \geq n - 2$.

[Why? By $(*)_2$ there is brimmed $^\ell(\mathcal{P}(n+1), \mathfrak{s}^{+m})$ -system call it \mathbf{d}^* . Let a $(\mathcal{P}^-(n+1), \mathfrak{s}^{+m})$ -system \mathbf{d} be given. By \boxtimes_n we know that \mathfrak{s} has the strong $(\lambda, < n)$ -uniqueness property hence by 12.21(2) without loss of generality $\mathbf{d}^* \upharpoonright [n+1]^{<n}$, $\mathbf{d} \upharpoonright [n+1]^{<n}$ are isomorphic so without loss of generality they are equal. Now we shall apply clause (a) of the conclusion of 12.25 to \mathbf{d} and $\mathbf{d}^* \upharpoonright \mathcal{P}^-(n+1)$, as the latter has the weak existence property (as \mathbf{d}^* exemplify) it suffices to check the assumptions of 12.25. So here $I = \mathcal{P}^-(n+1)$ and $J = [n+1]^{<n}$, clause (a) of 12.25 is obvious, clause (b) was assumed above and clause (c) $_1$ follows from “ \mathfrak{s}^{+m} has the weak n -uniqueness property, which holds as we assume \boxtimes_n .”]

- $(*)_4$ \mathfrak{s}^{+m} has the brimmed $^\ell$ weak $(\lambda, n+1)$ -uniqueness property if $m \geq n-1$.
 [Why? We try to apply 12.29(2) hence implicitly 12.28 + 12.29(1) to \mathfrak{s}^{+m} and n . Its conclusion fails by clause (b) of Definition 12.36, applied to $(\mathfrak{s}^{+m})^+ = \mathfrak{s}^{+m+1}$ for n which holds as we are assuming \boxtimes_n . Clause (a) from its assumptions holds by $(*)_1$, clause (b) holds by $(*)_3$ for $n+1$ and by clause (a) of Definition 12.36 and for $m \leq n$.
 Now clause (c) $_2^-$ holds by clause (c) of 12.36 by \boxtimes_n applied to \mathfrak{s}^{+m} and clause (c) $_1^-$ holds by clause (b) of Definition 12.36 by \boxtimes_n applied to \mathfrak{s}^{+m} . So in 12.29 only the fourth assumption (d), may fail, so as the conclusion fails, (d) there fails.
 Hence clause (d) from 12.28 has to fails which is the desired conclusion.]
- $(*)_5$ \mathfrak{s}^{+m} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ, n) -primeness property if $m \geq n-1$.
 [By 12.33 applied to $n' = n$ and $\mathfrak{s}' = \mathfrak{s}^{+(m-1)}$. It gives the desired conclusion. As for its assumption clause (a) there holds by $(*)_1$ and clause (b) there for $n+1$ by $(*)_4$ above and for $0, \dots, n$ by \boxtimes_n .]
- $(*)_6$ \mathfrak{s}^{+m} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong (λ, n) -uniqueness property if $m \geq n-1$.
 [Why? By 12.34, assumption (a) there holds by clause (a) of the definition 12.36 of excellent and clause (b) there holds by $(*)_5$ above.]
- $(*)_7$ \mathfrak{s}^{+m} has the brimmed $^\ell$ strong $(\lambda^{+m}, n+1)$ -existence property for $m \geq n-1$.
 [Why? By 12.30, its conclusion is what we need, assumption (a) there holds by \boxtimes_n . Assumption (b) there holds by $(*)_5$ and 12.23(2d) (which says that strong prime \Rightarrow weakly prime. Lastly, assumption (c) there holds by $(*)_6$ above so we are done.]

So \boxtimes_{n+1} holds.

$\square_{12.35}$

Recall that Chapter II has tried generalizing [Sh 87a], [Sh 87b] but through it give the parallel conclusions about each λ^{+n} , it does not say anything on $\mu \geq \lambda^{+\omega}$. In the claims (12.37), 12.38, 12.39, 12.40 below we derived the parallel of several of the further conclusions of [Sh 87a], [Sh 87b].

The aim of the following claim is to help proving for the case $\ell = 3$ that for non-unidimensional \mathfrak{s} , we can prove non-categoricity in higher cardinals (of course, we shall get better results when we prove excellency for $\ell = 1$).

12.37 Claim. *Assume that*

- (a) \mathfrak{s} is a good λ -frame
- (b) $M^* \in K_{\mathfrak{s}}, \langle c_i : i < \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} \rangle$ list the elements of M^* ,
 $\mathbf{P} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M^*)$ is a non-empty set of regular types such that there is $q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M^*)$ orthogonal to \mathbf{P} (so \mathfrak{s} is not weakly unidimensional)
- (c) $\tau^* = \tau \cup \{c_i : c \in M_*\}$
- (d) $K^* = \{M : M \text{ is a } \tau^*\text{-model and } M \upharpoonright \tau \in K^{\mathfrak{s}}, c_i \mapsto c_i^M \text{ is a } \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} \text{-embedding of } M^* \text{ into } M \upharpoonright \tau\}$ and if $q \in \mathcal{S}^{\text{bs}}(M^*)$ is regular realized in $M \upharpoonright \tau$ then it is orthogonal to \mathbf{P}
- (e) $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^*} M_2$ *iff* $(M_1, M_2 \in K^* \text{ and } M_1 \upharpoonright \tau \leq_{\mathfrak{K}[\mathfrak{s}]} M_2 \upharpoonright \tau)$
- (f) $\mathfrak{s}^* = (\mathfrak{K}^*, \mathcal{S}_*^{\text{bs}}, \bigcup_*)$ where
 - (i) $\mathcal{S}_*^{\text{bs}}(M_1)$ is essentially $\{\text{tp}(a, M_1, M_2) : M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^*} M_2 \text{ is of cardinality } \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}, \text{tp}(a, M_1 \upharpoonright \tau, M_2 \upharpoonright \tau) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{\text{bs}}(M_1 \upharpoonright \tau)\}$
 - (ii) \bigcup_* similarly, i.e., $\bigcup_*(M_0, M_1, a, M_3)$ *iff* $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^*} M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}^*} M_3, a \in M_3$ and $\bigcup_*(M_0, M_1, a, M_3)$.

Then

- (α) \mathfrak{s}^* is a good λ -frame
- (β) $K^{\mathfrak{s}^*} \subseteq K^{\mathfrak{s}}, K_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{s}^*} \neq \emptyset, K_{\lambda^+}^{\mathfrak{s}^*} \neq \emptyset$
- (γ) if $\mathbf{I}(\lambda^{+n+1}, K^{\mathfrak{s}^*}) < \mu_{\text{wd}}(\lambda^{+n+1}, 2^{\lambda^{+n}})$ for $n < \omega$, then \mathfrak{s}^* is ω -successful and is well defined for every $\mu > \lambda$.

Proof. Clause (α).

Check

Clause (β).

Trivial.

Clause (γ).

By 12.35 applied to \mathfrak{s}^* .

12.38 Major Conclusion. Assume that \mathfrak{s} satisfies the conclusion of 12.35 and let $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{s}^{+\omega}$ (see Definition 0.4(4)) then

- (a) $\mathfrak{s}^{+\omega} = \mathfrak{s}(+\omega)$ is a good $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^{+\omega}$ -frame (recall that $\mathfrak{K}_{\mathfrak{s}(+\omega)}$ is $\cap\{\mathfrak{K}_{\lambda^{+\omega}}^{\mathfrak{s}(+n)} : n < \omega\}$)
- (b) $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{s}^{+\omega}$ is ω -beautiful³
- (c) for $\mu \geq \lambda^{+\omega}$, $\mathfrak{t}[\mu] = \mathfrak{s}[\mu]$, see Definition ? is a good μ -frame, which is ω -scite{705-xxX} undefined beautiful³, categorical in μ for every $\mu \geq \lambda^{+\omega}$, so in particular $\mu \geq \lambda \Rightarrow K_{\mu}^{\mathfrak{s}} \neq \emptyset$ (on $\mathfrak{t}[\mu]$ see Definition 0.4)
- (d) if \mathfrak{s} is weakly unidimensional and $\mu \geq \lambda$ then $\mathfrak{s}[\mu] = \mathfrak{s}[\mu] = \mathfrak{s}[\mu]$; hence $K^{\mathfrak{s}(+)}$ is categorical in μ for every $\mu \geq \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}^{+}$ (if $K_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is categorical in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ then $K^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is categorical in μ for every $\mu \geq \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$)
- (e) if \mathfrak{s} is not weakly unidimensional then $\mathfrak{s}(\mu)$ is not weakly unidimensional
- (f) \mathfrak{s} has NDOP iff $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{s}^{+\omega}$ has NDOP iff $\mathfrak{s}(\mu)$ has NDOP (for any $\mu \geq \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$)
- (g) $K_{\mu}^{\mathfrak{s}} \neq \emptyset$ for $\mu \geq \lambda$, $\mathfrak{s}[\mu]$ well defined for $\mu \geq \lambda$ (on $\mathfrak{s}[\mu]$ see Definition 0.4(4)).

12.39 Conclusion. Assume $2^{\lambda^{+n}} < 2^{\lambda^{+n+1}}$ for $n < \omega$ and

- (a) \mathfrak{s} is a good λ -frame not weakly unidimensional
- (b) $I(\lambda^{+n+1}, K^{\mathfrak{s}}) < \mu_{\text{wd}}(\lambda^{+n}, 2^{\lambda^{+n}})$ for $n < \omega$.

Then $K^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is not categorical in μ , for every $\mu > \lambda$.

Proof. For each $\mu > \lambda$, there is $M_{\mu}^1 \in K_{\mathfrak{s}[\mu]}$ see 12.38. But we can define \mathfrak{t} as $\mathfrak{s}^{*}[+\omega]$, where \mathfrak{s}^{*} is as in 12.37 and apply it to 12.35, 12.38, and get $M_{\mu}^2 \in K_{\mathfrak{t}[\mu]}$. Looking at $\leq_{K[\mathfrak{s}]}$ -submodels of M_{μ}^1, M_{μ}^2 it is clear that $M_{\mu}^1 \approx M_{\mu}^2$ so we are done.

We can sum up

12.40 Conclusion. Assume $2^{\lambda^{+n}} < 2^{\lambda^{+n+1}}$ for $n < \omega$. If an a.e.c. \mathfrak{K} with $\text{LS}(\mathfrak{K}) \leq \lambda$, is categorical in $\lambda, \lambda^{+}, 1 \leq I(\lambda^{++}, K)$ and $I(\lambda^{+n+2}, K) < \mu_{\text{wd}}(\lambda^{+n+2}, 2^{\lambda^{+n+1}})$ for $n < \omega$ then \mathfrak{K} is categorical in every $\mu \geq \lambda$.

12.41 Remark. 1) This through light on [MaSh 285], [KlSh 362], [Sh 472], [Sh 394]. In those works we start with an appropriate a.e.c. \mathfrak{K} and assume that it is categorical in λ large enough then $\text{LS}(\mathfrak{K})$ and prove that for some $\alpha_{*}(2^{\text{LS}(\mathfrak{K})})^{+}$ that the class is categorical in every $\lambda' \in [\beth_{\alpha_{*}}, \lambda)$, but nothing is said about $\lambda' > \lambda$. However,

if for some $\mu, \mu^{+\omega} \in (\beth_{\alpha_*}, \lambda]$ then by 12.40 we are done. This weak set theoretic assumption will be eliminated in a sequel.

2) Moreover, we can eliminate the “ λ successor” assumption.

3) We can say much more: ω -successful frames are very much like superstable first order classes and more. We delay this.

REFERENCES.

- [KISh 362] Oren Kolman and Saharon Shelah. Categoricity of Theories in $L_{\kappa,\omega}$, when κ is a measurable cardinal. Part 1. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **151**:209–240, 1996. math.LO/9602216.
- [MaSh 285] Michael Makkai and Saharon Shelah. Categoricity of theories in $L_{\kappa\omega}$, with κ a compact cardinal. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **47**:41–97, 1990.
- [Sh:e] Saharon Shelah. *Non-structure theory*, accepted. Oxford University Press.
- [Sh 48] Saharon Shelah. Categoricity in \aleph_1 of sentences in $L_{\omega_1,\omega}(Q)$. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **20**:127–148, 1975.
- [Sh 87a] Saharon Shelah. Classification theory for nonelementary classes, I. The number of uncountable models of $\psi \in L_{\omega_1,\omega}$. Part A. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **46**:212–240, 1983.
- [Sh 87b] Saharon Shelah. Classification theory for nonelementary classes, I. The number of uncountable models of $\psi \in L_{\omega_1,\omega}$. Part B. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **46**:241–273, 1983.
- [Sh 225] Saharon Shelah. On the number of strongly \aleph_ϵ -saturated models of power λ . *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **36**:279–287, 1987. See also [Sh:225a].
- [Sh:c] Saharon Shelah. *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, volume 92 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, xxxiv+705 pp, 1990.
- [Sh 394] Saharon Shelah. Categoricity for abstract classes with amalgamation. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **98**:261–294, 1999. math.LO/9809197.
- [Sh 576] Saharon Shelah. Categoricity of an abstract elementary class in two successive cardinals. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **126**:29–128, 2001. math.LO/9805146.
- [Sh 472] Saharon Shelah. Categoricity of Theories in $L_{\kappa^*\omega}$, when κ^* is a measurable cardinal. Part II. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **170**:165–196, 2001. math.LO/9604241.
- [ShHM 158] Saharon Shelah, Leo Harrington, and Michael Makkai. A proof of Vaught’s conjecture for ω -stable theories. *Israel Journal of Mathe-*

matics, **49**:259–280, 1984. Proceedings of the 1980/1 Jerusalem Model Theory year.

- [Sh:F601] Shelah, Saharon. Good and semi good frames. moved to 849.
- [Sh:F569] Shelah, Saharon. More on Frames. moved to 839.
- [Sh:F603] Shelah, Saharon. Non-structure in λ^{++} . moved to 838.