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Abstract. We combine tameness for 1-types with the existence of a good frame to obtain some amount of tameness for n-types, where n is a natural number. We use this to show how to use tameness to extend a good frame in one cardinality to a good frame in all cardinalities, improving a theorem of Boney [Bon].
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1. Introduction

We show:

Theorem 1.1. Assume $\mathfrak{s}$ is a good $\lambda$-frame with underlying AEC $K$. If $K$ has amalgamation and is $\lambda$-tame (for 1-types), then $\mathfrak{s}$ extends to a good ($\geq \lambda$)-frame.
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This improves on [Bon], which used tameness for 2-types to prove the symmetry property. Assuming $K$ has no maximal models, this was shown to be true in [Vas, Section 6]. The proof used a nonstructure result from [BGKV] which made it nonlocal: $\lambda$-tameness for types over arbitrarily large models was needed. Our proof does not need no maximal models and is completely local: it works equally well to prove for example:

**Theorem 1.2.** Assume $s$ is a good $\lambda$-frame with underlying AEC $K$. If $K$ has amalgamation and is $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$-tame (for 1-types), then $s$ extends to a good $[\lambda, \lambda^+]$-frame.

While we were writing up this paper, Adi Jarden independently proved Theorem 1.2 with an additional hypothesis he called the “$\lambda^+$-continuity of serial independence property” [Jar]. A biproduct of our proofs is that his property holds in any good frame.

In the process of proving Theorem 1.1, we introduce frames with types longer than one elements and prove many general facts. In particular, we show how to start from a regular frame $s$ for 1-types and extend it to a frame $s^{<\lambda^+}$ for types of length $< \lambda^+$. The idea is to take the basic types of $s^{<\lambda^+}$ to be independent sequences of elements in $s$. A similar construction was already described in [?].

Assuming $s$ is a good $\lambda$-frame, we show that $s^{<\omega}$ is a good frame and $\lambda$-tameness for 1-types implies $\lambda$-tameness for the basic types of $s^{<\omega}$. We also show that $s^{<\lambda^+}$ will be a good frame without symmetry, and prove that extending a frame to bigger models and extending a frame to longer type can be done in any order. That is, we have the equation $(s^{\geq \lambda})^{<\lambda^+} = (s^{<\lambda^+})^{\geq \lambda}$.

This paper was written while working on a Ph.D. thesis under the direction of Rami Grossberg at Carnegie Mellon University and we would like to thank Professor Grossberg for his guidance and assistance in our research in general and in this work specifically.

This paper is still in draft form and may change a lot in the future.

### 2. Notation and preliminaries

Type always means Galois type, and $\text{tp}$ always stands for $\text{gtp}$. We assume familiarity with Galois types. For an ordinal $\alpha$, we write $S^\alpha(M)$ for
\{tp(\bar{a}/M; N) \mid M \prec N, \bar{a} \in \alpha N\}

and similarly for $S^{<\alpha}(M)$. If $p \in S^\alpha(M)$ (say $p = tp(\bar{a}/M; N)$) and $\beta < \alpha$, we write $p^\beta := tp(\bar{a}_\beta/M; N)$, where $\bar{a}_\beta = (a_i)_{i<\beta}$.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $K$ be an AEC, and let $F_1, F_2$ be families of types in $K$. Let $\lambda$ be a cardinal.

We say $K$ is $\lambda$-tame for $(F_1, F_2)$-types if for any $p \in F_1$ and any $q \in F_2$, if $p, q \in S(M)$, and $p \neq q$, then there is $M_0 \prec M$ of size $\leq \lambda$ so that $p \restriction M_0 \neq q \restriction M_0$.

$\lambda$-tame for $F_1$-types means $\lambda$-tame for $(F_1, F_1)$-types.

$\lambda$-tame for $\alpha$-types when $\alpha$ is an ordinal means $\lambda$-tame for $\bigcup\{S^I(M) \mid M \in K\}$-types. Similarly for $< \alpha$-types. $\lambda$-tame means $\lambda$-tame for 1-types.

3. Good frames

Good frames were first defined in [She09a]. The idea is to provide a localized (i.e. only for base models of a given size $\lambda$) axiomatization of a forking-like notion for (a “nice enough” set of) 1-types. Jarden and Shelah (in [JS13]) later gave a slightly more general definition, not assuming the existence of a superlimit model and dropping some of the redundant clauses. We will use a slight variation here: we assume the models come from $K_F$, for $\mathcal{F}$ an interval of cardinals, instead of just $K_\lambda$. We also assume that the types could be longer than just types of singletons\footnote{SV: Probably this needs to be adapted to better match the notation in [She09b] (e.g. our frame should really be a pre-frame in Shelah’s language), but can wait}.

**Definition 3.1 (Frame).** Let $\alpha$ be an ordinal and let $\mathcal{F}$ be an interval of the form $[\lambda, \mu)$, where $\lambda$ is a cardinal, and $\mu > \lambda$ is either a cardinal or $\infty$.

A \(< \alpha, \mathcal{F})\text{-frame}\ is a triples $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \downarrow, S^{bs})$, where:

1. $K$ is an abstract elementary class with $\lambda \geq LS(K)$ and $K_\mathcal{F}$ has amalgamation.
2. $S^{bs}$ is a function with domain $K_\mathcal{F}$ and if $M \in K_\mathcal{F}$, then:

$$S^{bs}(M) \subseteq S^{<\alpha}(M)$$
(3) \( \perp \) is a relation on quadruples of the form \((M_0, M_1, \bar{a}, N)\), where \(M_0 \prec M_1 \prec N, \bar{a} \in \prec^\alpha N\), and \(M_0, M_1, N\) are all in \(K_F\). We write \( \perp(M_0, M_1, \bar{a}, N) \) or \( \bar{a} \perp M_1 \) instead of \((M_0, M_1, \bar{a}, N) \in \perp\). We require \( \perp \) has the following properties:

(a) Invariance: If \( f : N \cong N' \) and \( \bar{a} \perp^N_{M_0} M_1 \), then \( f(\bar{a}) \perp^N_{f[M_0]} f[M_1] \).

(b) Monotonicity: If \( \bar{a} \perp M_0 M_1 \), \( \bar{a}' \) is a subtuple of \( \bar{a} \), and \( M_0 \prec M_0' \prec M_1 \prec N' \prec N \prec N'' \) with \( \bar{a}' \in N' \) and \( N'' \in K_F \), then \( \bar{a}' \perp^N_{M_0'} M_1' \) and \( \bar{a}' \perp^N_{M_0'} M_1' \).

(c) Existence: \( \text{tp}(\bar{a}/M_1; N) \in S_{bs}(M) \) if and only if \( \bar{a} \perp^N_{M} M_1 \).

A \((\leq \alpha, F)\)-frame is a \((\leq (\alpha + 1), F)\)-frame. An \(F\)-frame is a \((\leq 1, F)\)-frame. We write \( \lambda\)-frame instead of \(\{\lambda\}\)-frame, \((\geq \lambda)\)-frame instead of \([\lambda, \infty)\)-frame.

When the parameters are clear from context, or irrelevant, we just say “frame” instead of “\((< \alpha, F)\)-frame”.

**Notation 3.2.** Is \( s \) is a \((< \alpha, F)\)-frame, then \( \alpha_s = \alpha \) and \( F_s = F \).

**Notation 3.3.** If \( s = (K, \perp, S_{bs}) \) is a frame, we sometimes say “\( \text{tp}(\bar{a}/M_1; N) \) does not fork over \( M_0 \)” for \( \bar{a} \perp M_1 \). This makes sense by the monotonicity and invariance axioms.

**Notation 3.4.** If \( s = (K, \perp, S_{bs}) \) is a frame and \( \beta \) is an ordinal, we write \( S^{\beta, bs}(M) \) for \( S_{bs}(M) \cap S^{\beta}(M) \), and similarly for \( S^{<\beta, bs}(M) \).

The following example gives the simplest possible frame:

**Example 3.5.** Let \( \alpha \) be an ordinal. Let \( K \) be an AEC with amalgamation and let \( F \) be an interval of cardinals as above. Then \((K, \perp, S_{bs})\) is a \((< \alpha, F)\)-frame, where:

- For \( M \in K_F, S_{bs}(M) := S^{<\alpha}(M) \) \([S_{bs}(M) := \emptyset \) would also work].
- For \( M_0 \prec M_1 \prec N \) in \( K_F \) and \( \bar{a} \in \prec^\alpha N \), say \( \bar{a} \perp^N_{M_0} M_1 \) if and only if \( \text{tp}(\bar{a}/M_1; N) \in S_{bs}(M_1) \).

**Definition 3.6 (Good frame).** Let \( \alpha, F \) be as above.
A good \((< \alpha, \mathcal{F})\)-frame is an \((< \alpha, \mathcal{F})\)-frame \((K, \bot, S^{bs})\) satisfying in addition:

1. \(K_\mathcal{F}\) has joint embedding and no maximal model.
2. Disjointness: If \(\vec{a} \in \mathcal{F} N\) for \(\beta < \alpha\) and \(tp(\vec{a}/M; N) \in S^{bs}(M)\), then \(a_j \notin M\) for all \(j < \beta\).
3. \(bs\)-Stability: \(|S^{1,bs}(M)| \leq ||M||\) for all \(M \in K_\mathcal{F}\).
4. Density of basic types: If \(M \not\preceq N\) and \(M, N \in \mathcal{F}\), then there is \(a \in N\) such that \(tp(a/M; N) \in S^{bs}(M)\).
5. Extension: If \(p \in S^{bs}(M), N \in K_\mathcal{F}\), then there is some \(q \in S^{bs}(N)\) that does not fork over \(M\) and extends \(p\).
6. Uniqueness: If \(p, q \in S^{<\alpha}(M_1)\) do not fork over \(M_0\) and \(p \upharpoonright M_0 = q \upharpoonright M_0\), then \(p = q\).
7. Symmetry: If \(\vec{a}_1 \concat M_{0, \vec{a}_2} \in ^{<\alpha}M_2,\) and \(tp(\vec{a}_2/M_0; N) \in S^{bs}(M_0)\), then there is \(M_1\) containing \(\vec{a}_1\) and \(N' \succ N\) such that \(\vec{a}_2 \downarrow M_1\).
8. Local character: If \(\delta\) is a limit ordinal, \((M_i)_{\delta \leq i < \delta + 1}\) is an increasing continuous chain in \(K_\mathcal{F}\), and \(p := tp(\vec{a}/M_\delta; M_{\delta + 1}) \in S^{bs}(M_\delta)\) such that \(cf(\delta) \geq \ell(p)\), then there exists \(i < \delta\) such that \(p\) does not fork over \(M_i\).
9. Continuity: If \(\delta\) is a limit ordinal, \((M_i \in K_\mathcal{F} : i \leq \delta)\) and \((\alpha_i < \alpha : i \leq \delta)\) are increasing and continuous, and \(p_i \in S^{\alpha_i,bs}(M_i)\) for \(i < \delta\) such that, if \(j < i < \delta\), then \(p_j = p_i^{\alpha_j} \upharpoonright M_j\), then there is a \(p \in S^{\alpha,bs}(M_\delta)\) such that, for all \(i < \delta\), \(p_i = p^{\alpha_i} \upharpoonright M_i\) and this is the unique type in \(S^{\alpha,bs}(M_\delta)\) extending each \(p_i\). Moreover, if each \(p_i\) does not fork over \(M_0\), then neither does \(p\).
10. Transitivity\footnote{This actually follows from uniqueness and extension, see [She09a, Claim 2.18].} If \(M_0 \prec M_1 \prec M_2, p \in S^{<\alpha}(M_2)\) does not fork over \(M_1\) and \(p \upharpoonright M_1\) does not fork over \(M_0\), then \(p\) does not fork over \(M_0\).

When we talk of a good \((< \alpha, \mathcal{F})\)-frame without a given property \(P\), we mean that the frame is not required to satisfy \(P\): it may or may not have it. For example, a good \((< \alpha, \mathcal{F})\)-frame without stability is a good \((< \alpha, \mathcal{F})\)-frame which does not necessarily satisfy condition \([3]\); see [JS13].

**Remark 3.7.** The obvious monotonicity properties hold: If \(s\) is a [good] \((< \alpha, \mathcal{F})\)-frame and \(\beta < \alpha\), \(\mathcal{F}'\) is a subinterval of \(\mathcal{F}\) then the restricted frame \(s'\) defined in the natural way will be a [good] \((< \beta, \mathcal{F}')\)-frame.
We now show how to go the reverse way and extend frames. For simplicity\footnote{SV: I think we won’t write much more if we actually do it for intervals, and this is useful to demonstrate locality of our methods as opposed to e.g. nonstructure arguments based on the order property.}, we focus on going from a $\lambda$-frame to a $(<\alpha,\lambda)$-frame and from a $(<\alpha,\lambda)$-frame to a $(<\alpha,\geq\lambda)$-frame.

Let’s first see how to go up. This is first done in [She09a, Section 2].

**Definition 3.8 (Going up).** Let $s := (K, \downarrow, S^{bs})$ be a $(<\alpha,\lambda)$-frame. Define $s_{\geq\lambda} := (K, \downarrow, S^{bs}_{\geq\lambda})$ as follows:

- For $M_0 \prec M_1 \prec N$ in $K_{\geq\lambda}$ and $\bar{a} \in ^{<\alpha}N$, $\downarrow(M_0, M_1, \bar{a}, N)$ if and only if there exists $M'_0 \prec M_0$ in $K_{\lambda}$ such that for all $M'_0 \prec M'_1 \prec N' \prec N$ with $\bar{a} \in N'$, and $M'_1, N'$ in $K_{\lambda}$, we have $\bar{a} \downarrow M'_1$.

- For $M \in K_{\geq\lambda}$ and $p \in S^{<\alpha}(M)$, $p \in S^{bs}_{\geq\lambda}(M)$ if and only if there exists $N \succ M$ and $\bar{a} \in N$ such that $p = \text{tp}(\bar{a}/M; N)$ and $\downarrow(M, M, \bar{a}, N)_{\geq\lambda}$.

**Proposition 3.9.** Let $s$ be a $(<\alpha,\lambda)$-frame. If $K_{\geq\lambda}$ has amalgamation, then $s_{\geq\lambda}$ is a $(<\alpha,\geq\lambda)$-frame.

*Proof.* Straightforward. \qed

Shelah also observed that part of the properties of a good frame transferred:

**Fact 3.10.** Let $s$ be a good $(<\omega,\lambda)$-frame without symmetry. Then $s_{\geq\lambda}$ is a good $(<\omega,\geq\lambda)$-frame without bs-stability, extension, uniqueness, and symmetry.

*Proof.* See [She09a, Section 2]. \qed

Later it was shown in [Bon] that all the properties transferred given enough tameness:

**Fact 3.11.** Assume $K$ is $\lambda$-tame.

Let $n < \omega$, and let $s$ be a good $(n,\lambda)$-frame without symmetry, and assume $K_{\geq\lambda}$ has amalgamation and no maximal models. Then $s_{\geq\lambda}$ is a good $(n,\geq\lambda)$-frame without symmetry.
If in addition $K$ is $\lambda$-tame for $2n$-types and $s$ is a good frame, then $s_{\geq \lambda}$ is a good frame. In this case, the no maximal models hypothesis is not needed.

**Proof.** See [Bon, Theorem 8.1].

Note that the above facts were proven for good $\lambda$-frames (i.e. basic types were of length 1), but the proofs generalize to good $(< \omega, \lambda)$-frames.

Now let’s see how to make a frame longer (allowing larger tuples). This similar to what is done in [She09b, Section 5] and [JS12].

**Definition 3.12** (Independent sequence). Let $\alpha$ be an ordinal.

Let $s$ be an $\mathcal{F}$-frame.

1. $\langle a_i : i < \alpha \rangle, \langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is said to be independent over $M$ when:
   - (a) $(M_i)_{i \leq \alpha}$ is increasing continuous in $K_{\mathcal{F}}$.
   - (b) $M \prec M_i$ for all $i \leq \alpha$, and $M \in K_{\mathcal{F}}$.
   - (c) For every $i < \alpha$, $a_i \downarrow_{s_{\alpha}} M_i$.

2. $\bar{a} := (a_i)_{i < \alpha}$ is said to be independent in $(M, M_0, N)$ when $M \prec M_0 \prec N$, $\bar{a} \in N$, and for some $(M_i)_{i \leq \alpha}$ and a model $N^+$ such that $M_\alpha \prec N^+$, $N \prec N^+$, and $\langle a_i : i < \alpha \rangle, \langle M_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is independent over $M$.

3. A set $I$ is said to be independent in $(M, M_0, N)$ if for some enumeration $\bar{a}$ of $I$, $\bar{a}$ is independent in $(M, M_0, N)$.

**Remark 3.13.** If $\alpha = 1$, then $\bar{a} := (a_0)$ is independent in $(M, M', N)$ if and only if $\text{tp}(a_0/M'; N)$ does not fork over $M$.

**Definition 3.14.** Let $\alpha$ be an ordinal. Let $s := (K, \perp, S_{bs})$ be an $\mathcal{F}$-frame. Define $s^{< \alpha} := (K, \perp, S^{< \alpha, bs})$ as follows:

- For $M_0 \prec M_1 \prec N$ in $K_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\bar{a} := (a_i)_{i < \beta}$ in $N$ with $\beta < \alpha$, $s^{< \alpha}(M_0, \bar{a}, M_1, N)$ if and only if $\bar{a}$ is independent in $(M_0, M_1, N)$.
- For $M \in K_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $p \in S^{< \alpha}(M)$, $p \in S^{< \alpha, bs}(M)$ if and only if there exists $N \succ M$ and $\bar{a} \in N$ such that $p = \text{tp}(\bar{a}/M; N)$ and $s^{< \alpha}(M, \bar{a}, M, N)$.

**Proposition 3.15.** Let $\alpha$ be an ordinal. Let $s$ be an $\mathcal{F}$-frame. Then $s^{< \alpha}$ is a $(< \alpha, \mathcal{F})$-frame.
Proof. Use amalgamation to see that if \( \bar{a} \) is independent in \((M_0, M_1, N)\) and \( N' \succ N \), then \( \bar{a} \) is independent in \((M_0, M_1, N')\). The rest is straightforward. \( \square \)

Note that when dealing with types rather than sequences, the \( N^+ \) in the definition can be avoided. That is, given \( p \in S^{\beta, bs}(N) \) that does not fork over \( M \), there is some \( \langle a_i : i < \beta \rangle, \langle N^i : i \leq \beta \rangle \) such that \( p = tp(\langle a_i : i < \beta \rangle/N; N^\beta) \) that witnesses that \( \langle a_i : i < \beta \rangle \) is independent in \((M, N, N^\beta)\).

We will shortly investigate what properties are preserved by the operation \( s \mapsto s^{<\alpha} \), but first we show how it interacts with the going up construction:

**Proposition 3.16.** Let \( \alpha \leq \lambda^+ \).

Let \( s := (K, \bot, S^{bs}) \) be a \( \lambda \)-frame. Assume \( K_{\geq \lambda} \) has amalgamation. Then:

\[
(s_{\geq \lambda})^{<\alpha} \subseteq (s^{<\alpha})_{\geq \lambda}
\]

Where \( \subseteq \) is taken componentwise.

**Proof.** Let \((s_{\geq \lambda})^{<\alpha} := (K, \bot, S^{bs}_1), (s^{<\alpha})_{\geq \lambda} := (K, \bot, S^{bs}_2)\). It is enough to show \( \bot \subseteq \bot \); Existence then implies that \( S^{bs}_1 \subseteq S^{bs}_2 \). Assume \( \bot(M, M^+, \bar{a}, N) \). Say \( \bar{a} = (a_i)_{i < \beta} \), where \( \beta < \alpha \). By definition, this means that \( \bar{a} \) is independent (with respect to \( \bot \)) in \((M, M^+, N)\). Fix \( (M_i)_{i \leq \alpha} \) and \( N^+ \) witnessing the independence.

In particular, we have that for every \( i < \alpha \), \( \bot(M, M_i, a_i, M_j) \). By definition again, this implies in particular that we have \( M' \prec M \) in \( K_{\lambda} \) so that \( \bot(M'_{i,j}, M_i, a_i, M_j) \). By the L"owenheim-Skolem axiom and monotonicity, since \( |\beta| \leq \lambda \), we can choose \( M' \prec M \) in \( K_{\lambda} \) such that for all \( i < \beta \), \( M_{i,j} \prec M' \) and \( \bot(M', M_i, a_i, M_j) \). In particular, \( \bar{a} \) is independent (with respect to \( \bot \)) in \((M', M^+, N)\).

Now fix any \( (M^+)' \), \( N' \in K_{\lambda} \) such that \( \bar{a} \in N \), \( M' \prec (M^+)' \prec M^+ \), and \( (M^+)' \prec N' \prec N \). We claim that \( \bar{a} \) is independent (with respect to \( \bot \)) in \((M', (M^+)', N') \), i.e. \( \bot(M', \bar{a}, (M^+)', N') \): construct \((M'_i \in K_{\lambda})_{i \leq \alpha} \) by induction such that
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- $M' \prec M'_i \prec M_i$; and
- $\bigcup_{j<i} M'_j \subset M'_i$.

Then pick $(N^+) \in K_{\lambda}$ such that $M'_i, N^+ \prec (N^+) \prec N^+$. Then $(M'_i)_{i \leq \alpha}$ and $N^+$ witness the claim.

Since $(M^+) \prec$ was arbitrary between $M'$ and $M^+$, this shows that $(2) \mathcal{I} (M, \bar{a}, M^+, N)$, as needed. □

We investigate the converse in Section 6.

The following lemmas follow from the definition of good frames and are helpful later, especially in the proof of Theorem 4.1. The first is a strengthening of to uniqueness over sets, instead of just models.

**Lemma 3.17.** Suppose $tp(a/M; N^*) = tp(b/M; N^*)$, $a \perp_{M^*} N_1$, and $b \perp_{M^*} N_2$. Then $tp(a/N_1 \cap N_2; N^*) = tp(b/N_1 \cap N_2; N^*)$.

**Proof.** Find $N^+$ such that $N_1, N_2 \prec N^+ \prec N^*$; this might just be $N^*$. Let $p' = tp(a'/N^+; N_1^+)$ and $q' = tp(b'/N^+; N_2^+)$ be nonforking extensions of $tp(a/N_1; N^*)$ and $tp(b/N_2; N^*)$, respectively, to $N^+$. Then $p' = q'$. Thus, we can use the various type equalities to fill out the following commutative diagram such that $g_1 \circ f_1(a) = g_2 \circ f_2(b)$.

The second is an equivalent way of formulating extension that is easier to work with.

---

4When we write an object in square brackets in a commutative diagram, we mean that the object is a member of the model the arrow points to.
Lemma 3.18. The following is equivalent to extension given in a frame:

if we have $tp(a/M; M') \in S^{bs}(M)$ and $f : M \to N$, then there is $N' \in K_s, g : M' \to N'$, and $b \in N'$ so that $f \subseteq g$, $g(a) = b$, and $b \downarrow_{f(M)} N'$.

Proof. It is easy to see that this statement implies extension: use it with $f = id$ and set $q = tp(b/N; N')$. For the other direction, let $tp(a/M; M') \in S^{bs}(M)$ and $f : M \to N$. First, extend $f$ to $\hat{f}$ so that all of $N$ is in the range of $\hat{f}$. By extension, there is some $q \in S^{bs}(\hat{f}^{-1}(N))$ that does not fork over $M$ so $q \upharpoonright M = tp(a/M; M')$. Let $q = tp(c/f^{-1}(N); N^+)$. Since $tp(c/M; N^+) = tp(a/M; M')$, there is some $N^{++}$ extending $N^+$ and $g' : M' \to M \ N^{++}$. Then, since $\hat{f} : \hat{f}^{-1}(N) \equiv N$ and $N^{++}$ extends $\hat{f}^{-1}(N)$, we can copy this over; that is, find $N'$ extending $N$ and $\hat{g} : N^{++} \equiv N'$ so that $\hat{f} \subseteq \hat{g}$. Then we are done by taking $b = \hat{g}(c)$ and $g = \hat{g} \circ g'$.

Lemma 3.19 (amalgamation of independent sequences). Let $s$ be a good $\lambda$-frame without stability or symmetry, and $\beta < \lambda^+_s$. Suppose that $p, q \in S^{bs}(N)$ does not fork over $M$, that $p \upharpoonright M = q \upharpoonright M$, and that there are witnessing sequences $\bar{a}_\ell = \langle a^i_\ell : i < \beta \rangle$, $\langle N^i_\ell : i \leq \beta \rangle$ independent in $(M, N, N^\beta)$ for $\ell = 0, 1$ with $\bar{a}_0 \models p$ and $\bar{a}_1 \models q$. Then, there are coherent, continuous, increasing $(N_i, f_{i,j})_{j<\beta}$ and $g^i_\ell : N^i_\ell \to N_i$ such that, for all $i < j < \beta$,

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
N^i_0 & \longrightarrow & N^i_1 \\
\downarrow g^i_0 & & \downarrow g^i_1 \\
N^i_j & \longrightarrow & N^i_{j+1} \\
\downarrow f_{j,i} & & \downarrow f_{j,i+1} \\
N^i_0 & \longrightarrow & N^i_0 \\
\end{array}
\]

commutes, $g^{i+1}_0(a^i_0) = g^{i+1}_j(a^i_1)$, and $g^{i+1}_0(a^i_0) \downarrow_{g^i_0(M)} f_{i,i+1}(N_i)$.

Proof: We will build

1. models $\{N_i, M^i_j : i \leq \beta, j = 0, 1\}$;
2. embeddings $\{h^i_\ell : N^i_\ell \to M^i_\ell, r^i_\ell : M^i_\ell \to N_{i+1} : i \leq \beta, j = 0, 1\}$; and
(3) coherent \( \{ f_{j,i} : N_j \to N_i, \hat{r}_{j,i}^\ell : M_j^\ell \to M_i^\ell : i \leq \beta, \ell = 0, 1 \} \)

such that

1. \[
\begin{array}{c}
M_0 \xrightarrow{r_0} N_{i+1} \\
\downarrow r_0 \quad \downarrow r_1 \\
N_i \xrightarrow{r_i} M_i^\ell
\end{array}
\]

commutes;

2. \[
\begin{array}{c}
N_i^{i+1} \xrightarrow{h_i^{i+1}} M_i^{i+1} \\
\downarrow h_i^{i+1} \\
N_i \xrightarrow{h_i} M_i^\ell \xrightarrow{r_i^\ell} N_{i+1}
\end{array}
\]

commutes;

3. \( M_0^0 = M_1^0 = N_1, r_i^0 = \text{id}, \) and

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N_0^0 \xrightarrow{h_0^0} N_1 \\
\downarrow h_0^0 \\
N \xrightarrow{h_i} N_1^0
\end{array}
\]

commutes;

4. \( h_i^{i+1}(a_i^j) \xrightarrow{M_i^{i+1}} N_{i+1} \)

5. \( r_0^{i+1} \circ h_0^{i+1}(a_0^j) = r_1^{i+1} \circ h_1^{i+1}(a_1^j); \) and

6. \( (N_i, f_{j,i})_{j < i \leq \beta} \) and \( (M_i^\ell, \hat{r}_{j,i}^\ell)_{j < i \leq \beta} \) are continuous, coherent systems generated by \( \hat{r}_i^{i+1} = r_i^\ell \) and \( f_{i,i+1} = r_0^\ell \mid N_i = r_1^i \mid N_i. \)

At stage \( i, \) we will construct \( h_i^\ell, r_i^\ell, M_i^\ell, \) and \( N_{i+1} \) for \( \ell = 0, 1. \) Also, at each stage, we implicitly extend the coherent system by the rule given above (at successor steps) or by taking direct limits (at limit steps). \( i = 0: \) Amalgamate \( N_0^0, N_1^0 \) over \( N \) to get \( N_1. \)

---

5Note that \( h_i^{i+1}(N_i^j) = r_i^\ell \circ h_i^\ell(N_i^j) \)

6SV: In the second equality, \( r_0^\ell \mid N_i \) and \( r_1^i \mid N_i \) were \( r_0^{i+1} \) and \( r_1^{i+1}. \) I assumed that was a typo.
We take the direct limits to get the following for \( j < i \):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N_i \quad r_i^0 \quad r_i^1 \\
M_i^0 \quad M_i^1 \\
N_j \quad p^0_i \quad p^1_i \\
M_j^0 \quad M_j^1 \\
N_i \quad h_i^0 \quad h_i^1
\end{array}
\]

Set \( N_{i+1} = N_i \).

\( i = j + 1 \): Use the above Lemma—replace \((M_0, M_1, a, f, N_0)\) there with \((N_\ell^0, N_\ell^1, a_\ell, r_\ell \circ g_\ell, N_i)\) here to get \((h_\ell^{i+1}, M_\ell^{i+1})\) here, written as \((g, N_1)\) there. From the hypothesis, we have \( a_\ell \perp N_i \). Applying \( h_\ell^{i+1} \) and stretching the ambient model from \( h_\ell^{i+1} (N_\ell^{i+1}) \) to \( M_\ell^{i+1} \), we get \( h_\ell^{i+1} (a_\ell) \perp_{M_\ell^{i+1}} h_\ell^{i+1} (N_\ell^{i+1}) \).

Using Transitivity for \( s \), this gives

\[
h_\ell^{i+1} (a_\ell) \perp_{M_\ell^{i+1}(M)} N_{i+1}
\]

By the commutative diagrams, \( h_0^{i+1} \upharpoonright M = h_1^{i+1} \upharpoonright M \), so, since \( a_0^i \) and \( a_1^i \) have the same type over \( M \), we have that

\[
\text{tp}(h_0^{i+1}(a_0^i)/h_0^{i+1}(M); M_0^{i+1}) = \text{tp}(h_1^{i+1}(a_1^i)/h_1^{i+1}(M); M_1^{i+1}).
\]

By uniqueness for \( s \), these imply that

\[
\text{tp}(h_0^{i+1}(a_0^i)/N_{i+1}; M_0^{i+1}) = \text{tp}(h_1^{i+1}(a_1^i)/N_{i+1}; M_1^{i+1}).
\]

We can witness this with \( r_\ell^{i+1} : M_\ell^{i+1} \to N_{i+1} \) for \( \ell = 0, 1 \); that is, \( r_0^{i+1} \upharpoonright N_{i+1} = r_1^{i+1} \upharpoonright N_{i+1} \) and \( r_0^{i+1} \circ h_0^{i+1}(a_0^i) = r_1^{i+1} \circ h_1^{i+1}(a_1^i) \).

This construction completes the proof. \( \dagger \)
Corollary 3.20. Suppose $M_0 \prec M \prec N$ and $\alpha \leq \beta$ such that there are $p \in S^{\alpha,bs}(M)$ and $q \in S^{\beta,bs}(N)$ such that $q^e \upharpoonright M = p$ and $p, q$ do not fork over $M_0$. If $\bar{a}_p = \langle a_p^i : i < \alpha \rangle$, $\langle N^i_p : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is independent in $(M_0, M, N^\alpha)$ such that $\bar{a}_p \vDash p$ and $\bar{a}_q = \langle a_q^i : i < \beta \rangle$, $\langle N^i_q : i \leq \beta \rangle$ is independent in $(M_0, N, N^\beta_q)$ such that $\bar{a}_q \vDash q$, then there is $\langle M^i_q : i \leq \beta \rangle$ and $h_i : N^i_q \to M^i_q$ for $i \leq \alpha$ such that

1. $\bar{a}_q$, $\langle M^i_q : i \leq \beta \rangle$ is independent in $(M_0, N, M^\beta_q)$;
2. $N^i_q \prec M^i_q$ for all $i \leq \beta$; and
3. $h_{i+1}(a^i_p) = a^i_q$ and $\id_{M} \subseteq h_i \subseteq h_{i+1}$.

Proof: First, extend the $p$-sequence to $\langle a^i_p : i < \beta \rangle$, $\langle N^i_q : i \leq \beta \rangle$ independent in $(M_0, M, N^\beta_q)$. Then, we can amalgamate there sequences over $M$ using Lemma 3.19 there is $(N_i, f_{j,i})_{j<i<\beta}$ and $g^i_x : N^i_x \to N_i$ for $x = p, q$ and $i \leq \beta$ as above. Since we have $g^\beta_q : N^\beta_q \cong g^\beta_q(N^\beta_q) \prec N_{\beta}$, we can extend $g^\beta_q$ to an $L(K)$-isomorphism $h$ with $N_{\beta}$ in its range. Set $M^i_q := h^{-1}N_i$ for $i \leq \beta$. Note that $h_i := h^{-1} \circ g^i_q : N^i_q \to M^i_q$ is the identity.

Lemma 3.21. Suppose we have $M \prec M_0 \prec M_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ such that $a \in M_1$ and $a \perp M_0$. Then there is $N \prec M_1$ and $f : M_2 \to M_0$ such that $a \perp_{M} f(M_2)$.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
M_1 & \longrightarrow & N \\
| & | & \downarrow f \\
| & | & \downarrow \\
M_0 & \longrightarrow & M_2 \\
& M & \\
\end{array}
\]

Proof: By extension, there is some $q \in S^{bs}(M_2)$ that extends $tp(a/M_0; M_1)$ such that $q$ does not fork over $M_0$. Realize $q$ as $tp(b/M_2; N^-)$. Since $tp(a/M_0; M_1) = tp(b/M_0; N^+)$, there is some $N \succ M_1$ and a mapping $f : N^- \to N$ such that $f(b) = a$. Since $q$ does not fork over $M_0$, we can just rewrite this as $b \perp M_2$. Applying $f$ to this, and applying
invariance and monotonicity, we get that $a \dot{\frown} f(M_2)$. From the hypothesis, we have $a \dot{\frown} M_0$ and we can combine these with transitivity to get $a \dot{\frown} f(M_2)$, as desired. 

Lemma 3.22. Suppose we have $M \prec M_0 \prec M_1$ and $f : M_0 \to M_2$ such that $a \in M_1$ and $a \dot{\frown} M_0$. Then, there is $N \succ M_2$ and $g : M_1 \to N$ extending $f$ such that $g(a) \dot{\frown} f(M)$.

\[
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (N) at (2,2) {$N$};
  \node (M1) at (-2,0) {$M_1$};
  \node (M0) at (-2,-2) {$M_0$};
  \node (M2) at (2,-2) {$M_2$};
  \node (M) at (0,-2) {$M$};
  \draw[->] (M1) -- (N) node[midway,above] {$g$};
  \draw[->] (M0) -- (M1) node[midway,left] {$a$};
  \draw[->] (M) -- (M0) node[midway,above] {$f$};
  \draw[->] (M0) -- (M2) node[midway,right] {$f(M)$};
  \draw[->] (M) -- (M2) node[midway,below] {$f$};
\end{tikzpicture}
\]

Proof: Extend $f$ to an $L(K)$-isomorphism $\hat{f}$ with range $M_2$. By extension, there is some $q \in S^{bs}(\hat{f}^{-1}(M_2))$ that extends $tp(a/M_0; M_1)$ and does not fork over $M_0$. Write $q$ as $tp(b/\hat{f}^{-1}(M_2); N^+)$. Since $tp(a/M_0; M_1) = tp(b/M_0; N^+)$, there is $N^{++} \succ N^+$ and $h : M_1 \to M_0$ $N^{++}$ such that $h(a) = b$. Then, since $N^{++}$ extends $\hat{f}^{-1}(M_2)$, we can find an $L(K)$-isomorphism $\hat{f}^+$ that extends $\hat{f}$ such that $N^{++}$ is the domain of $\hat{f}^+$. Set $N := \hat{f}^+(N^{++})$ and $g = \hat{f}^+ \circ g$. Some nonforking calculus shows that this works. 

\[\dagger\]
Lemma 3.23. Given $\bar{a} = \langle a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ independent in $(M, M_0, M_1)$ and $M_2 \succ M_0$ containing $\bar{b}$ such that $tp(\bar{a}/M_0; M_1) = tp(\bar{b}/M_0; M_2)$, we have that $\bar{b}$ is independent in $(M, M_0, M_2)$.

Proof: Let $\langle N_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ and $N^+$ witness the independence of $\bar{a}$. First, use the type equality to find $M^* \succ M_2$ and $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_0 M^*$ such that $f(a_i) = b_i$. Then, we use amalgamation to find $N^*$ and $g$ such that $N^* \succ M^*$ and $g : N^+ \rightarrow N^*$ extends $f$.

Set $N'_i := g(N_i)$ and $N_+ := N^*$. We claim that this witnesses $\bar{b}$ is independent in $(M, M_0, M_2)$.

- $\langle N'_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is increasing and continuous because $\langle N_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is.
- $M_0 \prec N'_i \prec N_+$ because $M_0 \prec N_i \prec N^+$; $g$ fixes $M_0$; and $g(N^+) \prec N_+$.
- $M_2 \prec N_+$ by the amalgamation construction.
- $b_i \not\downarrow M N'_i$ because we know that $a_i \not\downarrow M N_i$ and we can apply $g$ to this.

The following easy consequence of invariance is often useful.

Proposition 3.24. Let $s$ be a $(< \alpha, \mathcal{F})$-frame with amalgamation and extension. Assume $p := tp(\bar{a}/M; N) \in S^{<\alpha}(M)$ does not fork over $M_0 \prec M$. Let $M \prec M' \prec N$. Then there exists $M'' \equiv_M M'$ and $N' \succ N$ such that $tp(\bar{a}/M''; N')$ does not fork over $M_0$.

Proof. Let $q \in S^{<\alpha}(M')$ be an extension of $p$ that does not fork over $M_0$. Extending $N$ if necessary, we can assume without loss of generality $q := tp(\bar{a}'/M'; N)$. In particular, $p = tp(\bar{a}'/M; N)$. Therefore there
is $N' > N$ and $f : N \to N'$ fixing $M$ such that $f(\bar{a}') = \bar{a}$. Let $M'' := f[M']$. By invariance, $f(q) = \text{tp}(\bar{a}/M'', N')$ does not fork over $M_0$. □

**Proposition 3.25.** Let $s$ be a $(<\alpha, F)$-frame with amalgamation and extension. Let $M_0 < M_1 < N$, $\ell = 1, 2$, be models in $K_F$. Let $\bar{a} \in <^\alpha N$ be given so that $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/M_\ell; N)$ does not fork over $M_0$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

Then there exists $N_3 > N$, $M_3 > M_1$ in $K_F$ and $f : M_2 \to M_3$ fixing $M_0$ such that $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/M_3; N_3)$ does not fork over $M_0$.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
M_1 \xrightarrow{f} M_3 \\
\downarrow \\
M_0 \xrightarrow{f} M_2
\end{array}
\]

**Proof.** By amalgamation, there is $N'_3 > N$, $M_1 < M'_3 < N'_3$, and $g : M_2 \to M_3$ an embedding fixing $M_0$. By Proposition 3.24 there is $N_3 > N'_3$ and $h : M_3 \cong_{M_1} M'_3$ such that $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/M_3; N_3)$ does not fork over $M_0$. Take $f := h^{-1} \circ g$. □

An interesting fact is that when $\alpha$ is finite, the ordering does not matter:

**Fact 3.26.** Let $s$ be a good $\lambda$-frame without stability (but with symmetry). If $\bar{a}$ is a finite tuple independent in $(M, M', N)$, then any permutation of $\bar{a}$ is independent in $(M, M', N)$.

**Proof.** See [JS12, Theorem 4.2.(a)]. □

We can also concatenate two sequences together. This is reproven later (Theorem 5.1) without the symmetry assumption.

**Fact 3.27.** Let $s$ be a good $\lambda$-frame without stability. Let $M < M_0 < M_1 < M_2$ such that $\bar{a} = \langle a_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is independent in $(M, M_0, M_1)$ and $\bar{b} = \langle b_i : i < \beta \rangle$ is independent in $(M, M_1, M_2)$. Then $\bar{a}\bar{b}$ is independent in $(M, M_0, M_2)$.

**Proof.** This follows from the definition of frames if the sequences are of length 1 and is [JS12, Proposition 4.1] for longer sequences. Note that this relies on [JS12, Proposition 2.6], which is proved as [JS13, Proposition 3.1.8] and uses Symmetry in an essential way. □
4. Transferring various properties

We get that many properties transfer from the frame to its “elongation” immediately. This is claimed (for finite tuples) by Shelah in [She09b, Exercise 9.4.1] but a proof has never appeared anywhere. Here we show that all the properties transfer to the elongation to types of size $< \lambda^+$, except symmetry which we can only manage to transfer to $s^{< \omega}$. Jarden and Sitton [JS12] have essentially shown that symmetry also transfers to $s^{< \lambda^+}$ assuming some strong continuity properties.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $s := (K, \sqcup, S^{bs})$ be a good $\lambda$-frame without stability or symmetry.

1. $s^{< \lambda^+}$ has local character.
2. $s^{< \lambda^+}$ has uniqueness.
3. $s^{< \lambda^+}$ has extension.
4. $s^{< \lambda^+}$ has continuity.
5. If $s$ has symmetry, then $s^{< \omega}$ has symmetry.

In particular, $s^{< \lambda^+}$ is a good frame without stability or symmetry and if $s$ has symmetry then $s^{< \omega}$ is a good frame without stability.

Note that this result can be improved: if $s$ is a good $\mathcal{F}$-frame without stability or symmetry, then (1) − (4) above hold in $s^{< \mu}$, where $\mu = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{F}} (\lambda^+)$. The same is true of Lemma 3.19 and other results.

**Proof.**

1. Let $p \in S^{< \lambda^+, bs}(N)$ and $N = \bigcup_{i < \delta} N_i$ with $\ell(p) < \delta = cf \delta < \lambda^+$. Thus, there is some $a = \langle a_i : i < \beta \rangle$ and increasing, continuous $\langle N^i : i \leq \beta \rangle$ such that $\beta < \delta$, $p = tp(a/N; N^\beta)$, and, for all $i < \beta$, $a_i \perp_{N^i} N_i$. By $(M)$ for $s$, $tp(a_i/N; N^{i+1}) \in S_s^{bs}(N)$.

By local character for $s$, for all $i < \beta$, there is some $j_i < \delta$ such that $a_i \perp_{N_{j_i}^i} N$. By $(T)$ for $s$, $a_i \perp_{N_{j_i}} N^i$. Set $j_* := \sup_{i < \beta} j_i$; since $cf \delta > \beta$, we have that $j_* < \beta$. By $(M)$ for $s$, $a_i \perp_{N_{j_*}} N^i$ for all $i < \beta$. This is exactly what we need to conclude that $a$ is independent in $(N_{j_*}, N, N^\beta)$. Thus, $p = tp(a/N; N^\beta)$ does not fork over $N_{j_*}$.

---

WB: I added this remark.
(2) This follows directly from Lemma 3.19.

(3) We prove two extension results separately: extending the domain and extending the length. Combining these gives that $s^\prec\lambda^+_\delta$ has extension.

For extending the domain, let $p \in S^{<\lambda^+_\delta,bs}(M)$ and $N \supset M$. By definition of this frame, there is some $\vec{a} = \langle a_i : i < \beta \rangle$ and increasing, continuous $\langle N^i : i \leq \beta \rangle$ such that $a_i \nsubseteq N^i$ for all $i < \beta$. We wish to construct increasing and continuous $\langle M^i : i \leq \beta \rangle$ and $\langle f_i : N^i \to M^i : i \leq \beta \rangle$ such that

(a) $f_0 \upharpoonright N = \text{id}$; and

(b) $f_i(a_i) \nsubseteq M^i$.

This is done by induction by taking unions at limits and by using Lemma 3.18 at all successor steps. Since $\beta < \lambda^+_\delta$, $M^i$ is of size $\lambda_\delta$ at all steps and the induction can continue. Then $tp(\vec{a}/M; N^\beta) = tp(f(\vec{a})/M; M^\beta)$ as witnessed by $f$ and $f(\vec{a})$ is independent in $(M, N, M^\beta)$. Thus, $q = tp(f(\vec{a})/N, M^\beta)$ is as desired.

(4) For all $i < \delta$, there is some $\vec{a}_i = \langle a^k_i : k < \alpha_i \rangle$, $\langle N^k_i : k \leq \alpha_i \rangle$ independent in $(M_i, M_i, N^\alpha_i)$ such that $p_i = tp(\vec{a}_i/M_i; N^\alpha_i)$. To show uniqueness, if we already have $q \in S^{\alpha_\delta}(M_\delta)$ that extends each $p_i$, then we can do this so $a^k_i = a^k_j = a^k$ for all $i, j < \delta$ with $k < \alpha_i, \alpha_j$ such that $\langle a^k : k < \alpha_\delta \rangle$ realizes $q$. For the moreover clause, if each $p_i$ does not fork over $M_0$, we can pick the independent sequences to witness this. Then change the rest of the proof so $M_0$ is always the model that types and tuples do not fork over.
We will construct \( \langle M_i^k : i < \delta, k \leq \alpha_i \rangle \) and \( \{ f_{i,j}^k : M_j^k \rightarrow M_i^k : k \leq \alpha_j, j < i < \alpha \} \) such that

(a) \( N_i^k < M_i^k \) and \( \bar{a}, \langle M_i^k : k < \alpha_i \rangle \) is independent in \( (M_i, M_i, M_i^{\alpha_i}) \);

(b) for each \( k \leq \alpha_j \), \( (M_i^k, f_{i,j}^k)_{j \leq i < \alpha} \) is a coherent, direct system such that

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
M_{i_2} & \longrightarrow & M_{i_2}^{k_0} \\
\downarrow f_{i_1,i_2}^{k_0} & & \downarrow f_{i_1,i_2}^{k_1} \\
M_{i_1} & \longrightarrow & M_{i_1}^{k_0} \\
\downarrow f_{i_0,i_1}^{k_0} & & \downarrow f_{i_0,i_1}^{k_1} \\
M_{i_0} & \longrightarrow & M_{i_0}^{k_0} \\
\end{array}
\]

commutes; and

(c) \( f_{i,j}^k(a_i^k) = a_i^k \).

This is enough. For each \( k < \alpha \), set \( (M_i^k, f_{i,j}^k)_{i < \delta, k \leq \alpha_i} = \lim (M_i^k, f_{i,j}^k) \). Then \( \langle M_i^k : k < \alpha \rangle \) is increasing and continuous because each \( \langle M_i^k : k < \alpha_i \rangle \) is. Set \( M_\alpha := \bigcup_{k < \alpha_i} M_i^k \). For \( k < \alpha_i \), \( a_i \), we have that \( f_{i,j}^{k+1}(a_i^k) = f_{j,i}^{k+1}(a_i^k) \). Thus, there is no confusion in setting \( a_i^k = f_{i,j}^{k+1}(a_i^k) \) for some/any \( k < \alpha_i \). Set \( p = \text{tp}(\bar{a}/M_i, M_i^{\alpha_i}) \).

Note that \( M_\delta < M_0^0 \); indeed \( f_{i,j}^k \upharpoonright M_i \) is the identity for all \( k \leq \alpha_i \). Thus, we have that

\[
p_i = \text{tp}(\bar{a}/M_i; M_i^{\alpha_i}) = \text{tp}(\langle a_i^k : k < \alpha_i \rangle/M_i; M_i^{\alpha_i}) = p^{\alpha_i} \upharpoonright M_i
\]

If we are showing uniqueness as well, then we have that \( f_{i,j}^{k+1} \) sends \( a_i^k \) to itself, so \( a_\delta = \langle a_i^k : k < \alpha \rangle \) realizes \( q \). Thus, \( p = q \).

Claim: For all \( k < \alpha_\delta \), \( a_\delta^k \downharpoonright M_\delta^{k+1} \).

Proof of Claim: Given \( i < \delta \) and \( k < \alpha_i \), we have by construction that \( a_i^k \downharpoonright M_i^k \). Applying \( f_{i,j}^k \) to this, we get

\[
a_\delta^k \downharpoonright M_i^k \quad f_{i,j}^k(M_i^k)
\]

By construction,

\[
M_\delta^k = \bigcup_{i < \delta} f_{i,j}^k(M_i^k) \quad and \quad M_\delta^{k+1} = \bigcup_{i < \delta} f_{i,j}^{k+1}(M_i^{k+1})
\]

\[\text{Recall that, in the moreover clause, this is } a_\delta^k \downharpoonight M_\delta^k\]
Thus, by Continuity for $s$, we have, for all $i < \delta$, $a^k_{\delta} \downarrow M^k_{\delta}$.

By Monotonicity for $s$, we get $a^k_{\delta} \downarrow M^k_{\delta}$.

Thus, $\bar{a}_\delta, \langle M^k_{\delta} : k \leq \alpha_\delta \rangle$ is independent in $(M_\delta, M_\delta, M^\alpha_{\delta})$. So $p \in S^{a_{\delta}, b_s}(M_\delta)$ and extends each $p_i$ as desired.

**Construction:** Repeated applications of Corollary 3.20.

(5) Assume $\bar{a}_1 \downarrow M_2$, $\bar{a}_2 \in {<}^\omega M_2$, and $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_2/M_0; N) \in S^{b_s}(M_0)$.

By existence, $\bar{a}_2 \downarrow M_0$. By concatenation (Fact 3.27), $\bar{a}_1 \bar{a}_2 \downarrow M_0$.

By Fact 3.26, $\bar{a}_2 \bar{a}_1 \downarrow M_0$. By definition of being independent, this means that there exists $M_1$ containing $\bar{a}_1$ and $N' > N$ such that $\bar{a}_2 \downarrow M_1$, as needed.

\[\square\]

Note that the continuity above proves Jarden’s $\lambda^+$-continuity of serial independence (see [Jar, Definition 4.0.20]). This allows Jarden’s proof of symmetry ([Jar, Theorem 4.0.22]) to go through without any extra hypotheses.

Also, continuity and the independence of order for finite tuples (see Fact 3.26) is enough to prove the finite continuity property (see [JS12, Definition 8.2]) from just the assumption of a good $\lambda$-frame without stability. This improves [JS12, Proposition 8.4], which proves this with the additional assumptions that $s$ satisfies the conjugation property and that $K^{3,uq}$ is dense with respect to $<_{bs}$.

## 5. Concatenation without Symmetry

A key property in the proof that symmetry transfers (Theorem 4.1.(5)) was the ability to concatenate two independent sequences. This has already been stated in Fact 3.27, but the existing proof of Jarden and Sitton uses symmetry. Here, we improve this to just requiring that $s$ is a frame that also satisfies extension and uniqueness (and, thus, transitivity). We avoid any use of symmetry or nonforking amalgamation.
This is not crucial for our main result, but shows that the situation is somewhat similar to the first-order context, where concatenation holds in any theory (See e.g. [GIL02, Lemma 1.6]).

**Theorem 5.1** (Concatenation). Let \( \mathfrak{a} \) be a frame with extension, transitivity\(^9\), and continuity. Let \( M \prec M_0 \prec M_1 \prec M_2 \) such that \( \bar{a} = \langle a_i : i < \alpha \rangle \) is independent in \((M, M_0, M_1)\) and \( \bar{b} = \langle b_i : i < \beta \rangle \) is independent in \((M, M_1, M_2)\). Then \( \bar{a} \bar{b} \) is independent in \((M, M_0, M_2)\).

A\(^{10}\) diagram of the proof is included at the end.

**Proof:** From the independence of \( \bar{a} \), there is continuous, increasing \( \langle M^i_0 : i \leq \alpha \rangle \) and \( N^+_0 \) such that

- \( M_0 \prec M^i_0 \prec N^+_0 \);
- \( M_1 \prec N^+_0 \); and
- \( a_i \mathrel{\downarrow} M^i_0 \).

From the independence of \( \bar{b} \), there is continuous, increasing \( \langle M^i_1 : i \leq \beta \rangle \) and \( N^+_1 \) such that

- \( M_1 \prec M^i_1 \prec N^+_1 \);
- \( M_2 \prec N^+_1 \); and
- \( b_i \mathrel{\downarrow} M^i_1 \).

**Step I:** There is a coherent, continuous \( \langle N_i, f_{j,i} : N_j \rightarrow N_i : j < i \leq \alpha \rangle \) and \( f : M^0_0 \rightarrow M_0 \ N_0 \) such that

- \( M^i_0 \prec N_i \) and \( f_{i+1} \) fixes \( M^i_0 \); and
- \( a_0^i \mathrel{\downarrow} f_{i+1}(N_i) \).

We proceed by induction using Lemma\(^{3,21}\). At limit stages, we will take direct limits and this will be enough. For the base case, we simply amalgamate \( M^0_0 \) and \( M^0_0 \) over \( M_0 \); this gives \( N_0 \succ N^+_0 \) and \( f_0 : M^0_1 \rightarrow M_0 \ N_0 \). For successor steps (moving from \( i \) to \( i + 1 \)), we apply the above

\(^9\)WB: I agree that this is all that the proof seems to need, but worth triple checking

\(^{10}\)WB: very much in need of better drawing
claim to

\[
\begin{array}{c}
M_0^{i+1} \overset{\cdots}{\longrightarrow} N_{i+1} \\
\uparrow^{a_i} \quad \uparrow^{a_i} \quad \uparrow^{f_{i+1}} \\
M_i \quad \overset{\cdots}{\longrightarrow} \quad N_i \\
\end{array}
\]

and generate the rest of the direct system from that.

**Step II:** There is increasing continuous \( \langle N_1^j : j \leq \beta \rangle \) and increasing continuous \( \langle g_j : M_i^j \rightarrow N_1^j : j \leq \beta \rangle \) such that

- \( N_1^0 = N_\alpha \) and \( g_0 = f_{0,\alpha} \circ f \); and
- \( g_{j+1}(b_j) \perp_M N_1^j \).

We proceed by induction using Lemma 3.22. At limit stages, we take unions and this will be enough. The base case is set. At successor steps (moving from \( j \) to \( j + 1 \)), we apply the above claim to

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N_1^{[g_{j+1}(a_j^i)]} \overset{\cdots}{\longrightarrow} N_1^{j+1} \\
\uparrow^{g_i} \quad \uparrow^{g_{j+1}} \\
M_i^j \quad \overset{\cdots}{\longrightarrow} \quad M_i^{j+1} \\
\end{array}
\]

Set \( g := \bigcup_{i \leq \beta} g_i \). Now we amalgamate \( N_1^+ \) and \( N_1^{\beta} \) (via \( g \)) over \( M_1^{\beta} \) to get \( N^+ \succ N_1^\beta \) and \( h : N_1^+ \rightarrow N^+ \) extending \( g \).

Define the sequence \( \langle N_i : i \leq \alpha + \beta \rangle \) by

\[
N^i := \begin{cases} 
M_0^i & \text{if } i \leq \alpha \\
N_1^i & \text{if } i = \alpha + j \in (\alpha, \beta] 
\end{cases}
\]

**Claim:** This sequences witnesses that \( \bar{c} := \bar{a} \sim g(\bar{b}) \) is independent in \((M, M_0, N^+)\).

**Proof of Claim:** It is easy to see that this sequence is of the proper type, ie, it is increasing and continuous and \( M_0 \prec N^i \prec N^+ \).
If $i < \alpha$, then we need to show that $c_i \downarrow_{M_i}^N N^i$, which is the same as $a_i \downarrow_{M_0}^i M_0^i$. This just follows from the definition of the independent sequence for $\tilde{a}$.

If $i = \alpha$, then we need to show that $c_\alpha \downarrow_{M_0}^N N^\alpha$, which is the same as $g_1(b_0) \downarrow_{M_0}^N N_1^\alpha$. We know that $g_1(b_0) \downarrow_{M_0}^N N_1^0$ holds from the construction in Step II and we know that $M \prec M_0^\alpha \prec N_1^1$. Thus, by Monotonicity, we have the desired nonforking.

If $i = \alpha + j > \alpha$, then we need to show that $c_i \downarrow_{M_i}^N N^i$, which is the same as $g_{j+1}(b_j) \downarrow_{M}^N N_j^j$. This holds directly by the construction in Step II.

Notice that the map $h$, which extends the map $g$, shows that $tp(\tilde{a}(g(\tilde{b})/M_0; N_1^\beta)) = tp(\tilde{a}\tilde{b}/M_0; M_2)$. Thus, by Lemma 3.23, we have that $\tilde{a}\tilde{b}$ is independent in $(M, M_0, M_2)$.
6. “Up” and “Long” Commute

**Theorem 6.1.** Let \( s \) be a good \( \lambda \)-frame without stability or symmetry and assume that \( s_{\geq \lambda} \) is also a good \( \lambda \)-frame without stability or symmetry. Then:

\[
(s_{\geq \lambda})^{<\lambda^+} = (s^{<\lambda^+})_{\geq \lambda}
\]

**Proof.** Let \( s_{\geq \lambda} := (K, \sqsubseteq, S^{bs}) \). Write \( (s_{\geq \lambda})^{<\lambda^+} := (K, \sqsubseteq^{(1)}, S^{bs}_1), (s^{<\lambda^+})_{\geq \lambda} := (K, \sqsubseteq^{(2)}, S^{bs}_2) \). By Proposition 3.16 and existence, it is enough to show \( \sqsubseteq^{(2)} \subseteq \sqsubseteq^{(1)} \). Assume \( \sqsubseteq^{(2)}(M, \bar{a}, N, \hat{N}) \). By definition of \( \sqsubseteq \) and monotonicity, we can assume without loss of generality that \( M \in K^\lambda \). We know that for all \( N' \leq N \) and \( \hat{N}' \leq \hat{N} \) of size \( \lambda \), \( \bar{a} \) is independent (with respect to \( \sqsubseteq \)) in \((M, N', \hat{N}')\). We want to see that \( \bar{a} \) is independent (with respect to \( \sqsubseteq \)) in \((M, N, \hat{N})\).

Say \( N, \hat{N} \in K_\mu, \mu \geq \lambda \). Work by induction on \( \mu \). We already have what we want if \( \mu = \lambda \), so assume \( \mu > \lambda \). Let \( (N_i)_{i \leq \mu} \) be an increasing continuous resolution of \( N \) such that \( N_\mu = N, N_0 = M, \|N_i\| = \lambda + |i| \).

By the induction hypothesis, \( \bar{a} \) is independent (with respect to \( \sqsubseteq \)) in \((M, N_i, \hat{N})\) for all \( i < \mu \). In other words, for any \( i < \mu \), \( \text{tp}(\bar{a}/N_i; \hat{N}) \) does not fork (in the sense of \((s_{\geq \lambda})^{<\lambda^+}\)) over \( M \). By Theorem 4.1 (and the remark in the statement), we know that \((s_{\geq \lambda})^{<\lambda^+}\) has the continuity property. Thus \( \text{tp}(\bar{a}/N; \hat{N}) \) also does not fork (in the sense of \((s_{\geq \lambda})^{<\lambda^+}\)) over \( M \). This is exactly what we needed to prove. \( \square \)

7. Extending Frames Revisited

**Lemma 7.1.** Let \( s := (K, \sqsubseteq, S^{bs}) \) be a \((< \alpha, \geq \lambda)\)-frame such that if \( \bar{a} \downarrow M_1 \), then there is \( M_0' < M_0 \) in \( K_\lambda \) with \( \bar{a} \downarrow M_1 \). Assume \( s \) has uniqueness.

Then \( K \) is \( \lambda \)-tame for basic \((< \alpha)\)-types, i.e. for any \( M \in K \) and \( p, q \in S^{bs}(M) \), if \( p \neq q \), then there is \( M_0 \prec M \) of size \( \leq \lambda \) such that \( p \upharpoonright M_0 \neq q \upharpoonright M_0 \).
Proof. Fix \( p, q \in S^{\text{bs}}(M) \) as above. By monotonicity, one can find \( M_0 \prec M \) such that both \( p \) and \( q \) do not fork over \( M_0 \). By uniqueness, \( M_0 \) is as desired. \( \square \)

Note that the “such that” in the hypothesis follows from local character if \( \alpha \leq \omega \).

Lemma 7.2. Let \( s \) be a good \( \lambda \)-frame without stability. Write \( (s^{<\omega})_{\geq \lambda} := (K, \perp, S^{\text{bs}}_{\lambda}) \). If \( \bar{a} \downarrow M_0 \), and \( \bar{a}' \) is a permutation of \( \bar{a} \), then \( \bar{a}' \downarrow M_0 \).

Proof. Fix \( M_0' \prec M_0 \) in \( K_{\lambda} \) such that for any \( M_0' \prec M_1' \prec M_1 \), \( M_1' \prec N' \prec N \) with \( \bar{a} \in N' \), \( M_1' \) and \( N' \) in \( K_{\lambda} \), we have \( \bar{a} \downarrow M_1' \). By Fact 3.26 this also means \( \bar{a}' \downarrow M_1' \). The result follows. \( \square \)

Theorem 7.3. Assume \( s \) is a good \( F \)-frame without stability and symmetry, where \( \lambda \) is an interval of the form \([\lambda, \mu)\), and \( \mu > \lambda \) is either a cardinal or \( \infty \). Then \( s \) has symmetry if and only if \( s \rhd \lambda \) has symmetry.

Proof. Let \( s \rhd \lambda := (K, \perp, S^{\text{bs}}_{\lambda}) \) and let \( s := (K, \perp, S^{\text{bs}}_{\geq \lambda}) \). If \( s \) has symmetry, then in particular \( s \rhd \lambda \) has symmetry. Now assume \( s \rhd \lambda \) has symmetry. By \[She09a, \text{Section 2}\], there is at most one good \( F \)-frame without symmetry extending \( s \rhd \lambda \). Now \( s \) is such a frame, and since \( s \) gives us some tameness, \[Bon\] proves that \( s_F \) is also a good frame without symmetry, so \( s = s_F \).

Recall that \[Bon, \text{Theorem 6.1}\] proves symmetry for \( s = s_F \) assuming \( \lambda \)-tameness for 2-types. We revisit this proof and use the same notation. Suppose \( \perp (M_0, M_2, a_1, M_3), a_2 \in M_2 \) with \( \text{tp}(a_2/M_0; M_3) \in S^{\text{bs}}_{\geq \lambda}(M_0) \).

Let \( M_0 \prec M_1 \prec M_3 \) be a model containing \( a_1 \). By extension, there is \( M'_3 \succ M_3 \) and \( a' \in M'_3 \) such that \( \perp (M_0, M_1, a', M'_3) \) and \( \text{tp}(a'/M_0; M'_3) = \text{tp}(a_2/M_0; M_3) \). Boney argues it is enough to see that \( p := \text{tp}(a_1a_2/M_0; M_3) = \text{tp}(a_1a'/M_0; M'_3) =: p' \), shows that this equality holds for all restrictions to models of size \( \lambda \), and then uses tameness for 2-types. Our hypotheses only include tameness for 1-types, but by Theorem 4.1 \( (s_{\geq \lambda})^{\leq 2} \) has uniqueness, so by Lemma 7.1 it is enough to see that \( p, p' \) are basic types of \( (s_{\geq \lambda})^{\leq 2} \).
First, let’s see that $a_1a_2$ is independent (with respect to $\lambda$) in $(M_0, M_0, M_3)$. The increasing chain $(M_0, M_2, M_3)$ witnesses that $a_2a_1$ is independent in $(M_0, M_0, M_3)$. Now from Theorem 6.1, $(s_{\geq \lambda})^{\leq 2} = (s^{\leq 2})^{\geq \lambda}$, so we can use Lemma 7.2 to see that $a_1a_2$ is independent in $(M_0, M_0, M_3)$. Similarly, $(M_0, M_1, M_3')$ witnesses that $a_1a'$ is independent in $(M_0, M_0, M_3')$. Thus $p$ and $p'$ are basic types of $(s_{\geq \lambda})^{\leq 2}$, as desired.

We can now prove the announced theorem.

**Corollary 7.4.** Assume there is a good $\lambda$-frame $s$, $K$ has amalgamation, and is $\lambda$-tame for 1-types. Then $s_{\geq \lambda}$ (and in fact even $s_{<\lambda}$) is a good $(\geq \lambda)$-frame. If $s$ is a good frame without stability, then $s_{\geq \lambda}$ is a good frame without stability.

*Proof.* Let $s := (K, \perp, S^{bs})$ and let $s_{\geq \lambda} := (K, \perp, S^{bs}_{\geq \lambda})$. By Fact 3.11, $s_{\geq \lambda}$ is a good frame without symmetry or no maximal models. Symmetry follows from the previous theorem, and [Bon, Theorem 7.1] now gives us no maximal models.

**Corollary 7.5.** Let $s := (K, \perp, S^{bs})$ be a good $\lambda$-frame. Assume $K$ is $\lambda$-tame for 1-types.

Then $K$ is $\lambda$-tame for the basic types of $(s_{\geq \lambda})^{<\lambda^+} = (s^{<\lambda^+})_{\geq \lambda}$.

*Proof.* Follows easily from Corollary 7.4, Theorem 6.1, and Lemma 7.1.

Note that for types of infinite length, we don’t have Theorem 6.1 to tell us that order doesn’t matter in extending the length and domain size.

We can improve Corollary 7.5 to types of even longer length. Suppose that $s$ is good $\lambda$-frame for 1-types. Define

$$s^\infty := (s_{\geq \lambda})^{<\infty} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{ON}} (s_{\geq \lambda})^{<\alpha}$$

Note that this order is the only one that makes sense: there are no independent sequences of length $\mu^+$ or longer in a $\mu$-frame. Since $s$ is a good $\lambda$-frame, extensions of Theorem 4.1 will transfer many of the frame properties to $s^\infty$, although not symmetry. However, we have enough for a tameness result.
Corollary 7.6. Let \( s \) be a good \( \lambda \)-frame. Assume \( K \) is \( \lambda \)-tame for 1-types. Then a basic type of \( p \) of \( s^\infty \) is determined by its restrictions to models of size \( \lambda + |\ell(p)| \).

Proof. Let \( p, q \in S^\infty_{s^\infty}(M) \) such that \( p \upharpoonright M^- = q \upharpoonright M^- \) for all \( M^- \in K_\mu \) such that \( M^- \prec M \) where \( \mu := \lambda + |\ell(p)| \). If \( \mu \geq |M| \), then this just gives \( p = q \). Otherwise, set \( t = s_{\geq \lambda} \upharpoonright \mu \); this is good \( \mu \)-frame without symmetry. Since, \( p, q \) are basic for \( s^\infty \), they are basic for \( (t^{<\mu^+})_{\geq \mu} \). By Theorem 6.1, this means they are basic for \( (t^{<\mu^+})_{<\mu} \). Then, we can find some \( M_0 \prec M \) of size \( \mu \) such that \( p \) and \( q \) do not fork over \( M_0 \). We know that \( p \upharpoonright M_0 = q \upharpoonright M_0 \) and that \( (t^{<\mu^+})_{<\mu} \) has uniqueness (see Theorem 4.1); thus \( p = q \). \( \Box \)

8. Symmetry in long frames

In this section, we give some partial results on when \( s^{<\lambda^+} \) has symmetry and what this implies.

Lemma 8.1. Assume \( s \) is a good \( \lambda \)-frame without stability. If \( K \) is \( \lambda \)-tame, then \( s^{<\lambda^+} \) has symmetry.

Proof. Since \( K \) is \( \lambda \)-tame, \( s_{\geq \lambda} \) is a good frame without stability (Theorem 7.4). An argument similar to \[BGKV\] Lemma 5.16 tells us that \( K \) is stable in unboundedly many cardinals, so does not have the order property. The proof of \[BGKV\] Theorem 5.14 now gives us symmetry. \( \Box \)

Remark 8.2. It is enough to require that \( K \) is \( (\lambda, \beth_{(2\lambda)^+}) \)-tame.

Question 8.3. Is the \( \lambda \)-tameness hypothesis necessary?

Lemma 8.4. Assume \( s \) is a good \( F \)-frame without stability and assume \( s^{<\alpha} \) has symmetry. If \( \vec{a}_0 \vec{a}_1 \) is independent in \( (M, M_0, N) \), then \( \vec{a}_1 \vec{a}_0 \) is independent in \( (M, M_0, N) \).

Proof. This is follows directly from the statement of symmetry. \( \Box \)

The next result tells us that if we have symmetry, independence does not depend on the order.

Theorem 8.5. Assume \( s \) is a good \( F \)-frame without stability. Let \( M \prec M_0 \prec N \) be elements of \( K_F \), and let \( I \subseteq N \) with \( |I| < \alpha \). Assume \( s^{<\alpha} \) has symmetry. The following are equivalent:

1. \( I \) is independent in \( (M, M_0, N) \).
(2) For all $\beta < \alpha$ and all enumerations $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i<\beta}$ of $I$, $\bar{a}$ is independent in $(M, M_0, N)$.

Proof. (2) implies (1) because $|I| < \alpha$, so $I$ has an enumeration of type $\beta := |I|$.

Let’s see (1) implies (2). Assume not.

Take $\beta < \alpha$ minimal such that some $I \subseteq N$ is independent in $(M, M_0, N)$, but there is an enumeration $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i<\beta}$ of $I$ of type $\beta$ which is not independent in $(M, M_0, N)$.

By Fact 3.26, $\beta$ must be infinite. If $\beta = \gamma + 1$ is successor, then $\bar{a}' := (a_\beta) \smallfrown (a_i)_{i<\gamma}$ is an enumeration of $I$ of type $\gamma$, so by minimality of $\beta$ must be independent in $(M, M_0, N)$. By Lemma 8.4, $\bar{a}$ must also be independent in $(M, M_0, N)$, contradiction.

If $\beta$ is limit, let $\bar{a}_\gamma := (a_i)_{i<\gamma}$ for $\gamma < \beta$. By monotonicity, any subset of $I$ is independent in $(M, M_0, N)$, so by minimality of $\beta$, $\bar{a}_\gamma$ must be independent in $(M, M_0, N)$ for all $\gamma < \beta$. By continuity, $\bar{a}$ is also independent in $(M, M_0, N)$, contradiction. \qed

In particular, we obtain the continuity property of Jarden and Sitton ([JS12, Definition 5.5]):

**Corollary 8.6.** Assume $\mathfrak{s}$ is a good $\lambda$-frame without stability. If $K$ is $\lambda$-tame, then $\mathfrak{s}^{<\lambda^+}$ satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 8.5. Thus the continuity property holds, and so the conclusion of [JS12, Theorem 5.6] holds.
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