Achim Blumensath blumens@fi.muni.cz

This document was last updated 2024-04-09. The latest version can be found at

www.fi.muni.cz/~blumens

COPYRIGHT 2024 Achim Blumensath

CC I

This work is licensed under the *Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License*. To view a copy of this

license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

A. Set Theory			1
A1 Basic set theory			3
 Sets and classes	•	•••	3 11
3 The cumulative hierarchy	•	•••	18
A2 Relations			27
1 Relations and functions	•	•••	27
 2 Products and unions	•	•••	36
4 Fixed points and closure operators	•	•••	39 47
A3 Ordinals			57
1 Well-orders	•	•••	57
2 Ordinals.	•	•••	64
 3 Induction and fixed points	•	 	74 85
A4 Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory			105
1 The Axiom of Choice	•	••	105 112
3 Cardinal arithmetic	•	· ·	116
4 Cofinality	•	•••	121
	•	•••	131

Stationary sets	134
Conclusion	145
Conserval Algorithms	
General Algebra	14/
Structures and homomorphisms	149
Structures	149
Homomorphisms	156
Categories	162
Congruences and quotients	175
Trees and lattices	187
Trees	187
Lattices	195
Ideals and filters	203
Prime ideals and ultrafilters	207
Atomic lattices and partition rank	215
Universal constructions	227
Terms and term algebras	227
Direct and reduced products	238
Directed limits and colimits	246
Equivalent diagrams	258
Links and dense functors	270
Accessible categories	285
Filtered limits and inductive completions	285
Extensions of diagrams	300
Presentable objects	316
Accessible categories	329
	Stationary sets

В5	Topology	341
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Open and closed sets	341 346 350 357 361 370 377
в6	Classical Algebra	385
1 2 3 4 5 6	Groups	385 389 397 403 410 425
C	First-Order Logic and its Extensions	441
C1	First-order logic	443
1 2 3 4 5 6	Infinitary first-order logic	443 454 460 465 472 481
C2	Elementary substructures and embeddings	493
1 2 3	Homomorphisms and embeddings	493 498 504

4 5	The Compactness TheoremAmalgamation	511 521
С3	Types and type spaces	527
1	Types	527
2	Type spaces	533
3	Retracts	546
4	Local type spaces	557
5	Stable theories	562
C4	Back-and-forth equivalence	577
1	Partial isomorphisms	577
2	Hintikka formulae	586
3	Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé games	589
4	κ -complete back-and-forth systems	598
5	The theorems of Hanf and Gaifman	605
C5	General model theory	613
1	Classifying logical systems	613
2	Hanf and Löwenheim numbers	617
3	The Theorem of Lindström	624
4	Projective classes	636
5	Interpolation	646
6	Fixed-point logics	657
D.	Axiomatisation and Definability	683
D1	Quantifier elimination	685
1	Preservation theorems	685
2	Quantifier elimination	689
3	Existentially closed structures	699
4	Abelian groups	704

5	Fields	710
D2	Products and varieties	715
1 2 3 4 5 D3 1 2 3	Ultraproducts	715 720 734 739 751 757 757 763 765
Е. <i>Е1</i>	Classical Model Theory Saturation	7 85 787
E. <i>E1</i> 1 2 3 4	Classical Model Theory Saturation Homogeneous structures Saturated structures Projectively saturated structures Pseudo-saturated structures	785 787 787 793 804 807
E. <i>E1</i> 1 2 3 4 <i>E2</i>	Classical Model Theory Saturation Homogeneous structures Saturated structures Saturated structures Projectively saturated structures Pseudo-saturated structures Definability and automorphisms	785 787 787 793 804 807 815

E3	Prime models	855
1 2 3 4	Isolated types	. 855 . 857 . 865 . 869
E4	\aleph_{o} -categorical theories	877
1 2 3 4	 ℵ₀-categorical theories and automorphisms	. 877 . 893 . 905 . 917
E5	Indiscernible sequences	925
1 2 3 4	Ramsey TheoryRamsey Theory for treesIndiscernible sequencesThe independence and strict order properties	. 925 . 929 . 941 . 952
Еб	Functors and embeddings	965
1 2 3	Local functors	. 965 . 972 . 981
E7	Abstract elementary classes	995
1 2 3 4	Abstract elementary classes	995 . 1004 . 1017 . 1021 .
F.	Independence and Forking	1029

F1	Geometries	1031
1 2 3 4 5	Dependence relations	1031 1036 1042 1049 1057
F2	Ranks and forking	1069
1 2 3 4	Morley rank and Δ -rank	1069 1083 1096 1113
F3	Simple theories	1125
1 2	Dividing and forking	1125 1134
F4	Theories without the independence property	1153
1 2 3 4	$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	1153 1167 1194 1206
F5	Theories without the array property	1219
1 2 3	The array property	1219 1228 1247

G. Geometric Model Theory

G1	Stable theories	1263
1 2 3 4 5 6	Definable types	1263 1268 1272 1278 1285 1290
G2	Models of stable theories	1297
1 2 3 4 5 6	Isolation relations	1297 1306 1314 1319 1328 1337
Re	commended Literature	1349
Sy	mbol Index	1351

Part F.

Independence and Forking

F1. Geometries

1. Dependence relations

We have seen that a vector space or an algebraically closed field (of a given characteristic) is uniquely determined by, respectively, its dimension and its transcendence degree. In this chapter we try to generalise these two results. We investigate first-order theories whose models are uniquely determined by some kind of dimension. We start by introducing an abstract notion of dimension. As for vector spaces and algebraically closed fields, this notion is based on a closure operator. With these tools in hand we can then prove categoricity results for certain theories. Our first application will be Theorem 4.13, which states that two models of the same dimension are isomorphic.

Definition 1.1. (a) A *dependence relation* on a set A is a system $D \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A)$ with the property that

 $X \in D$ iff $X_{o} \in D$ for some nonempty finite $X_{o} \subseteq X$.

A subset $X \subseteq A$ is *D*-dependent if $X \in D$. Otherwise, it is called *D*-independent.

(b) An element $a \in A$ *D*-depends on a set $X \subseteq A$ if $a \in X$ or there is an *D*-independent subset $I \subseteq X$ such that $I \cup \{a\}$ is *D*-dependent. The set of all elements *D*-depending on *X* is denoted by $\langle\!\langle X \rangle\!\rangle_D$.

(c) A dependence relation *D* on *A* is *transitive* if $\langle\!\langle \langle X \rangle\!\rangle_D \rangle\!\rangle_D = \langle\!\langle X \rangle\!\rangle_D$, for all $X \subseteq A$.

Remark. Note that, if *I* is *D*-independent then we have $a \in \langle I \rangle_D$ if and only if $I \cup \{a\}$ is *D*-dependent.

Example. (a) Let \mathfrak{B} be a \mathfrak{K} -vector space. Then

 $D := \{ X \subseteq V \mid X \text{ is linearly dependent } \}$

is a transitive dependence system on V.

(b) Let \Re be a field. Then

 $D := \{ X \subseteq K \mid X \text{ is algebraically dependent } \}$

is a transitive dependence system on *K*.

(c) Let $\mathfrak{G} = \langle V, E \rangle$ be an undirected graph. Then

 $D \coloneqq \{ X \subseteq E \mid E \text{ contains a cycle} \}$

is a transitive dependence system on *E*.

Lemma 1.2. Let *D* be a transitive dependence relation on *A*. The function $c : X \mapsto \langle \! \langle X \rangle \! \rangle_D$ is a finitary closure operator with the exchange property.

Proof. By definition *c* is finitary. To show that it is a closure operator note that we have $X \subseteq c(X)$ since all elements of *X D*-depend on *X*. As *D* is transitive we further have c(c(X)) = c(X). Finally, if $X \subseteq Y$ then every element *D*-depending on *X* also *D*-depends on *Y*. Hence, $c(X) \subseteq c(Y)$.

For the exchange property, suppose that $b \in c(X \cup \{a\}) \setminus c(X)$. Then there is a *D*-independent subset $I \subseteq X \cup \{a\}$ with $I \cup \{b\} \in D$. Let $I_o := I \setminus \{a\}$. Note that $I' := I_o \cup \{b\}$ is *D*-independent since, otherwise, we would have $b \in c(I_o) \subseteq c(X)$. Therefore, $I' \cup \{a\} \in D$ implies that $a \in c(I') \subseteq c(X \cup \{b\})$, as desired.

Lemma 1.3. Let D be a transitive dependence relation, I a D-independent set, and $I_o \subseteq I$. If $a \in \langle \! \langle I \rangle \! \rangle_D \setminus \langle \! \langle I_o \rangle \! \rangle_D$ then there exists an element $b \in I \setminus I_o$ such that $I' := (I \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\}$ is D-independent and $b \in \langle \! \langle I' \rangle \! \rangle_D$.

Proof. Since $a \in \langle I \rangle_D$ there is some *D*-independent subset $J \subseteq I$ such that $J \cup \{a\} \in D$. Choose *J* minimal. Since $a \notin \langle I_0 \rangle_D$ we have $J \notin I_0$.

Fix some element $b \in J \setminus I_o$ and set $J' := J \setminus \{b\}$ and $I' := I \setminus \{b\}$. By minimality of *J* we have $J' \cup \{a\} \notin D$. Consequently, $b \in \langle J' \cup \{a\} \rangle_D \subseteq \langle I' \cup \{a\} \rangle_D$.

It remains to prove that $I' \cup \{a\}$ is *D*-independent. For a contradiction, suppose that $I' \cup \{a\} \in D$. Then $a \in \langle I' \rangle_D$. Since *D* is transitive it follows that $b \in \langle I' \cup \{a\} \rangle_D \subseteq \langle I' \rangle_D$. Consequently, $I = I' \cup \{b\}$ is not *D*-independent. Contradiction.

We can characterise transitive dependence systems in terms of closure operators with the exchange property.

Proposition 1.4. (a) If c is a finitary closure operator on A with the exchange property, then

 $D := \{ X \subseteq A \mid \text{there is some } a \in X \text{ with } a \in c(X \setminus \{a\}) \}$

is a transitive dependence relation with $c(X) = \langle \! \langle X \rangle \! \rangle_D$ *, for all* X.

(b) A subset $D \subseteq \mathscr{P}(A)$ is a transitive dependence relation if and only if the function $c : X \mapsto \langle \! \langle X \rangle \! \rangle_D$ is a finitary closure operator with the exchange property.

Proof. (a) To show that *D* is a dependence relation let $X \in D$. We have to find a finite subset $X_o \subseteq X$ with $X_o \in D$. By definition, there is some element $a \in X$ with $a \in c(X \setminus \{a\})$. Since *c* is finitary it follows that there is some $X_o \subseteq X \setminus \{a\}$ with $a \in c(X_o)$. Consequently, $X_o \cup \{a\} \in D$.

It remains to show that *D* is transitive and that $c(X) = \langle \! \langle X \rangle \! \rangle_D$. We start with the latter. Let $a \in c(X)$ and choose a minimal subset $X_o \subseteq X$ with $a \in c(X_o)$. Then there is no $b \in X_o$ with $b \in c(X_o \setminus \{b\})$ since, otherwise, $c(X_o) = c(X_o \setminus \{b\})$ and X_o would not be minimal. It follows that X_o is *D*-independent while $X_o \cup \{a\}$ is not. Consequently, we have $a \in \langle \! \langle X \rangle \! \rangle_D$.

Conversely, suppose that $a \in \langle X \rangle_D$. Then there is a *D*-independent subset $I \subseteq X$ with $I \cup \{a\} \in D$. Hence, we can find an element $b \in I \cup \{a\}$ such that $b \in c((I \cup \{a\}) \setminus \{b\})$. If b = a then we have $a \in c(I) \subseteq c(X)$, as desired. Otherwise, let $I_0 := I \setminus \{b\}$. Since *I* is *D*-independent we have $b \notin c(I_0)$. Therefore, $b \in c(I_0 \cup \{a\}) \setminus c(I_0)$ implies that $a \in c(I_0 \cup \{b\}) \subseteq c(X)$. Finally, note that $c \circ c = c$ implies that *D* is transitive.

(b) (\Rightarrow) was already proved in Lemma 1.2. (\Leftarrow) By (a), we only have to show that, if *D* and *D'* are sets such that $\langle\!\langle X \rangle\!\rangle_D = \langle\!\langle X \rangle\!\rangle_{D'}$, for all $X \subseteq A$, then we have D = D'. By symmetry, suppose that there is a set $X \in D \setminus D'$. Then there is a finite nonempty subset $X_0 \subseteq X$ with $X_0 \in D \setminus D'$. Choose X_0 such that its size is minimal and fix some element $a \in X_0$. By minimality we have $X_0 \setminus \{a\} \notin D$. This implies that $a \in \langle\!\langle X_0 \setminus \{a\} \rangle\!\rangle_D$. But $X_0 \notin D'$ implies $X_0 \setminus \{a\} \notin D'$. Therefore, $a \notin \langle\!\langle X_0 \setminus \{a\} \rangle\!\rangle_{D'} = \langle\!\langle X_0 \setminus \{a\} \rangle\!\rangle_D$. A contradiction.

We can use this proposition to translate between dependence relations and closure operators. In the following we will use the terminology for both interchangeably, e.g., we will speak of independent sets with respect to a closure operator.

Using dependence relations or, equivalently, closure operators with the exchange property, we can introduce bases and dimensions as for vector spaces.

Definition 1.5. Let *D* be a dependence relation on *A*. A set $X \subseteq A$ is *D*-spanning if $\langle X \rangle_D = A$. A *D*-basis is a *D*-spanning set which is *D*-independent.

Lemma 1.6. Let *D* be a transitive dependence relation on *A* and $X \subseteq A$ a set. The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) X is a maximal D-independent set.
- (2) *X* is a minimal *D*-spanning set.
- (3) X is a D-basis.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Let *X* be maximal *D*-independent and suppose that there is some element $a \in A \setminus \langle \langle X \rangle \rangle_D$. Since *X* is *D*-independent we have $X \cup \{a\} \notin D$ and *X* is not maximal.

 $(2) \Rightarrow (3)$ Let *X* be minimal *D*-spanning. For a contradiction suppose that $X \in D$. Let $X_0 \subseteq X$ be a minimal subset with $X_0 \in D$ and fix some element $a \in X_0$. By minimality, $I := X_0 \setminus \{a\}$ is *D*-independent. Hence, $a \in \langle \! \langle I \rangle \! \rangle_D \subseteq \langle \! \langle X \smallsetminus \{a\} \rangle \! \rangle_D$. By transitivity, it follows that $\langle \! \langle X \smallsetminus \{a\} \rangle \! \rangle_D = \langle \! \langle X \rangle \! \rangle_D = A$. This contradicts the minimality of *X*.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Every *D*-basis *X* is *D*-independent. If *X* were not maximal, we could find an element $a \in A \setminus X$ such that $X \cup \{a\}$ were *D*-independent. But this would imply that $a \notin \langle X \rangle_D = A$. A contradiction.

Once we have shown that all bases have the same cardinality, we obtain a well-defined notion of dimension.

Lemma 1.7 (Exchange Lemma). Let *D* be a transitive dependence relation on *A*. If *I* is *D*-independent and *S* is *D*-spanning then there exists a subset $S_0 \subseteq S$ with $I \cap S_0 = \emptyset$ such that $I \cup S_0$ is a *D*-basis.

Proof. The set $F := \{J \mid J \text{ is } D \text{-independent with } I \subseteq J \subseteq I \cup S\}$ is inductively ordered by \subseteq since $\bigcup C \in D$ would imply that there is a finite subset $C_o \subseteq C$ with $\bigcup C_o \in D$. Consequently, *F* has a maximal element *B*. By maximality, every element of $S \setminus B$ *D*-depends on *B*. Hence, $S \subseteq \langle B \rangle_D$ implies that $\langle B \rangle_D \supseteq \langle S \rangle_D = A$, and *B* is a *D*-basis. Setting $S_o := B \setminus I$ yields the desired subset of *S*.

Lemma 1.8. Let *D* be a transitive dependence relation on *A*. If *I*, *J* are *D*-independent sets with $J \subseteq \langle \! \langle I \rangle \! \rangle_D$ then $|J| \leq |I|$.

Proof. Since *D* induces a transitive dependence relation on $\langle I \rangle_D$ we may assume that $A = \langle I \rangle_D$ and that *I* is a *D*-basis.

First, suppose that *J* is finite. We prove the claim by induction on $|J \setminus I|$. If $J \subseteq I$ then there is nothing to do. Hence, suppose that there is some element $a \in J \setminus I$, and set $H := I \cap J$. Since *J* is *D*-independent we have $a \in \langle I \rangle_D \setminus \langle H \rangle_D$. By Lemma 1.3, we can find an element $b \in I \setminus H$ such that $I_o := (I \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\}$ is *D*-independent and $b \in \langle I_o \rangle_D$. By transitivity of *D* it follows that $J \subseteq \langle I \rangle_D \subseteq \langle I_o \cup \{b\} \rangle_D = \langle I_o \rangle_D$. Since $|J \setminus I_o| < |J \setminus I|$ we can apply the induction hypothesis to conclude that $|J| \le |I_o| = |I|$.

It remains to consider the case that *J* is infinite. If *I* were finite, we could choose a subset $J_0 \subseteq J$ of size $|J_0| = |I| + 1$. This would contradict

the finite case proved above. Hence, *I* is also infinite. Since the operator $X \mapsto \langle \! \langle X \rangle \! \rangle_D$ is finitary we have

$$J \subseteq \bigcup \left\{ \left\langle \left\langle I_{o} \right\rangle \right\rangle_{D} \mid I_{o} \subseteq I \text{ is finite } \right\}.$$

If $I_{o} \subseteq I$ is finite, we have seen above that $|J \cap \langle \langle I_{o} \rangle \rangle_{D}| \leq |I_{o}|$. Consequently,

$$J = \bigcup \{ J \cap \langle \! \langle I_o \rangle \! \rangle_D \mid I_o \subseteq I \text{ is finite } \}$$

implies that

$$|J| \le \sum \left\{ \left| J \cap \langle\!\langle I_{o} \rangle\!\rangle_{D} \right| \ \middle| \ I_{o} \subseteq I \text{ is finite } \right\} \le |I|^{<\omega} = |I|. \qquad \Box$$

Theorem 1.9. Let D be a transitive dependence relation on A.

- (a) For every D-independent set I and every D-spanning set $S \supseteq I$ there exists a D-basis B with $I \subseteq B \subseteq S$.
- (b) There exists a D-basis and all D-bases have the same cardinality

Proof. (a) follows from Lemma 1.7.

(b) The existence of a *D*-basis follows from (a) by setting $I := \emptyset$ and S := A. The fact that two bases have the same cardinality follows from Lemma 1.8.

2. Matroids and geometries

It will be convenient to work with closure operators instead of dependence relations.

Definition 2.1. Let Ω be a set.

(a) A *matroid* is a pair $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ where cl is a finitary closure operator on Ω with the exchange property.

(b) A matroid $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is a *geometry* if it satisfies

$$cl(\emptyset) = \emptyset$$
 and $cl(\{a\}) = \{a\}$, for every $a \in \Omega$.

(c) Let $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ be a matroid. For $U, I \subseteq \Omega$, we say that *I* is *independent over U* if

$$a \notin cl(U \cup (I \setminus \{a\}))$$
, for all $a \in I$.

We call *I independent* if it is independent over the empty set.

A *basis* of a set $X \subseteq \Omega$ is an independent set $I \subseteq X$ with $cl(I) \supseteq X$. The *dimension* of X is the cardinality of any basis of X. We denote it by $\dim_{cl}(X)$. Similarly, we define a basis of X over a set U as a maximal set $I \subseteq X$ that is independent over U. The dimension $\dim_{cl}(X/U)$ of X over U is the cardinality of any such set.

Example. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a function and define

 $c(X) \coloneqq f^{-1}[f[X]], \text{ for } X \subseteq A.$

Then $\langle A, c \rangle$ forms a matroid.

Remark. With any matroid $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ we can associate the lattice $\langle \text{fix } cl, \subseteq \rangle$ of all closed sets and the closure space $\langle \Omega, \text{fix } cl \rangle$.

Exercise 2.1. Let $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ be a matroid, $X \subseteq \Omega$, and let $C \subseteq$ fix cl be a maximal chain of closed sets such that $A \subseteq cl(X)$, for all $A \in C$. Prove that $|C| = \dim_{cl}(X) \oplus 1$.

Definition 2.2. Let \mathfrak{B} be a vector space over a skew field \mathfrak{S} .

(a) The *linear matroid* associated with \mathfrak{V} is the matroid $\langle V, cl \rangle$ where $cl(X) := \langle \! \langle X \rangle \! \rangle_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is the linear subspace spanned by *X*.

(b) The *affine geometry* associated with \mathfrak{V} is the matroid $\langle V, cl \rangle$ where

$$cl(X) \coloneqq \{ s_0 x_0 + \dots + s_{n-1} x_{n-1} \mid n < \omega, s_i \in S, x_i \in X \text{ with} \\ s_0 + \dots + s_{n-1} = 1 \}.$$

Example. Let \mathfrak{V} be a vector space and let $x, y \in V$ be linearly independent. In the linear matroid the closure of $\{x, y\}$ is the plain through x, y, and the zero vector o. In the affine geometry the closure of $\{x, y\}$ is the line through x and y.

Remark. (a) The linear matroid is not a geometry since $cl \emptyset = \{o\} \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, the usual dimension of a linear subspace $U \subseteq V$ coincides with its dimension $\dim_{cl}(U)$ in the linear matroid as defined above.

(b) The affine geometry $\langle V, cl \rangle$ associated with a vector space \mathfrak{V} is really a geometry. But note that the usual affine dimension of an affine subspace $U \subseteq V$ is one less than its dimension $\dim_{cl}(U)$ in the affine geometry as defined above.

The dimension function of a matroid has the following basic properties. In fact, we will show below that every function of this kind arises from a matroid.

Definition 2.3. Let Ω be a set. A function dim : $\mathscr{P}(\Omega) \times \mathscr{P}(\Omega) \to Cn$ is a *geometric dimension function* if, for all sets $A, B, U, V \subseteq \Omega$, the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) $\dim(A/U) \leq |A \setminus U|$.
- (2) dim $(A \cup U/U)$ = dim(A/U).
- (3) $A \subseteq B$ and $U \subseteq V$ implies $\dim(A/V) \leq \dim(B/U)$.
- (4) If, for some ordinal γ, (A_α)_{α<γ} is an increasing chain of sets A_α ⊆ Ω, then

$$\dim(A_{<\gamma}/U) = \sum_{\alpha < \gamma} \dim(A_{\alpha}/U \cup A_{<\alpha}),$$

where $A_{<\alpha} \coloneqq \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} A_{\beta}$.

(5) For every element a ∈ Ω with dim(a/U) = 0, there is a finite subset U₀ ⊆ U such that dim(a/U₀) = 0.

First, let us show that the dimension function of a matroid has these properties.

Proposition 2.4. *The dimension function* \dim_{cl} *associated with a matroid* $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ *is a geometric dimension function.*

Proof. We have to check five conditions.

(1) If *I* is a basis of *A* over *U*, then $I \subseteq A \setminus U$. Hence, $\dim_{cl}(A/U) = |I| \leq |A \setminus U|$.

(2) Every basis of $A \cup U$ over U is also a basis of A over U.

(3) Every set $I \subseteq A$ that is independent over V is also independent over U. Hence, $|I| \leq \dim_{cl}(B/U)$.

(4) Let *I* be a basis of *U*. We define an increasing sequence of sets $(J_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ such that J_{α} is a basis of $U \cup A_{\alpha}$ with $I \subseteq J_{\alpha}$. We proceed by induction on $\alpha < \gamma$. Suppose that we have already defined J_{β} , for all $\beta < \alpha$. Set $J_{<\alpha} := I \cup \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} J_{\beta}$. By inductive hypothesis, $J_{<\alpha}$ is a basis of $U \cup A_{<\alpha}$. We can use Theorem 1.9 to extend $J_{<\alpha}$ to a basis J_{α} of $U \cup A_{\alpha}$. It follows that $B_{\alpha} := J_{\alpha} \setminus J_{<\alpha}$ is a basis of A_{α} over $U \cup A_{<\alpha}$ and $J_{<\gamma} \setminus I$ is a basis of $A_{<\gamma}$ over *U*. Hence,

$$\dim_{\mathrm{cl}}(A_{<\gamma}/U) = |J_{<\gamma} \setminus I| = \sum_{\alpha < \gamma} |B_{\alpha}| = \sum_{\alpha < \gamma} \dim_{\mathrm{cl}}(A_{\alpha}/U \cup A_{<\alpha}).$$

(5) If $\dim_{cl}(a/U) = 0$ then $a \in cl(U)$. Since cl has finite character, there is a finite subset $U_0 \subseteq U$ such that $a \in cl(U_0)$. This implies $\dim_{cl}(a/U_0) = 0$.

Before proving that, conversely, every geometric dimension function arises from a matroid, let us collect some immediate consequences of the definition of a dimension function.

Lemma 2.5. Let dim : $\mathcal{P}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \to Cn$ be a geometric dimension *function*.

- (a) $\dim(A \cup B/U) = \dim(A/U \cup B) \oplus \dim(B/U)$
- (b) If $(a_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is an enumeration of A then

$$\dim(A/U) = \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} \dim(a_{\alpha}/U \cup A_{<\alpha}),$$

where $A_{<\alpha} \coloneqq \{ a_{\beta} \mid \beta < \alpha \}.$

F1. Geometries

Proof. (a) Considering the two-element increasing sequence $B \subseteq A \cup B$, it follows from the axioms of a geometric dimension function that

$$\dim(A \cup B/U) = \dim(A \cup B/U \cup B) \oplus \dim(B/U)$$
$$= \dim(A \cup B \cup (U \cup B) / U \cup B) \oplus \dim(B/U)$$
$$= \dim(A/U \cup B) \oplus \dim(B/U).$$

(b) By (a) and the axioms of a geometric dimension function, we have

$$\dim(A/U) = \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} \dim(\{a_{\alpha}\} \cup A_{<\alpha} / U \cup A_{<\alpha})$$
$$= \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} \left[\dim(a_{\alpha}/U \cup A_{<\alpha}) \oplus \dim(A_{<\alpha}/U \cup A_{<\alpha})\right]$$
$$= \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} \dim(a_{\alpha}/X \cup A_{<\alpha}) \oplus o.$$

Proposition 2.6. Let dim : $\mathscr{P}(\Omega) \times \mathscr{P}(\Omega) \to Cn$ be a geometric dimension function. For $X \subseteq \Omega$, we define

$$\operatorname{cl}(X) \coloneqq \{ a \in \Omega \mid \dim(a/X) = o \}.$$

Then $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ *is a matroid such that* dim_{cl} = dim.

Proof. First, let us show that cl is a closure operator. Note that, for every $a \in X$, dim $(a/X) \le |\{a\} \setminus X| = 0$ implies that $a \in cl(X)$. Consequently, $X \subseteq cl(X)$.

For monotonicity, assume that $X \subseteq Y$ and let $a \in cl(X)$. Then

 $\dim(a/Y) \le \dim(a/X) = 0$ implies $a \in cl(Y)$.

It remains to show that cl(cl(X)) = X. Let $a \in cl(cl(X))$. Then dim(a/cl(X)) = o. Furthermore, dim(b/X) = o for each $b \in cl(X)$. Let $(b_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be an enumeration of cl(X) and set $B_{<\alpha} := \{ b_{\beta} | \beta < \alpha \}$. Then $B_{<\kappa} = cl(X)$ and, by Lemma 2.5 (b), it follows that

$$\dim(B_{<\kappa}/X) = \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} \dim(b_{\alpha}/X \cup B_{<\alpha}) \le \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} \dim(b_{\alpha}/X) = o.$$

Consequently, Lemma 2.5 (a) implies

$$\dim(a/X) \le \dim(\operatorname{cl}(X) \cup \{a\} / X)$$

= dim(a/cl(X)) \overline dim(cl(X)/X) = 0 \overline 0,

as desired.

We have shown that cl is a closure operator. To prove that it has finite character, suppose that $a \in cl(X)$. Then dim(a/X) = o. Hence, there is a finite subset $X_o \subseteq X$ such that $dim(a/X_o) = o$. This implies $a \in cl(X_o)$.

It remains to check that cl has the exchange property. Suppose that $b \in cl(U \cup \{a\}) \setminus cl(U)$. Then $dim(b/U \cup \{a\}) = o$. Since $b \notin cl(U)$, we have dim(b/U) = 1. Hence,

$$\dim(a/U \cup \{b\}) \oplus 1$$

= dim(a/U \cup \{b\}) \oplus dim(b/U)
= dim(ab/U)
= dim(b/U \cup \{a\}) \oplus dim(a/U) = dim(a/U) \le 1

implies that dim $(a/U \cup \{b\})$ = 0. Consequently, $a \in cl(U \cup \{b\})$.

We have shown that $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is a matroid. To conclude the proof, we must check that $\dim_{cl} = \dim$. We proceed in two steps. First, we show that $\dim(I/U) = |I|$ for every set *I* that is cl-independent over *U*. Let *I* be such a set. By definition of cl, it follows that

$$\dim(a/U \cup (I \setminus \{a\})) = 1$$
, for every $a \in I$.

Set $\kappa := |I|$ and let $(a_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be an enumeration of *I*. Setting $I_{<\alpha} := \{a_{\beta} \mid \beta < \alpha\}$ it follows from Lemma 2.5 (b) that

$$\dim(I/U) = \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} \dim(a_{\alpha}/U \cup I_{<\alpha})$$
$$\geq \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} \dim(a_{\alpha}/U \cup (I \setminus \{a_{\alpha}\})) = \kappa.$$

Therefore, $\dim(I/U) \leq |I \setminus U| \leq \kappa$ implies $\dim(I/U) = \kappa$.

F1. Geometries

Finally, we prove that $\dim(\operatorname{cl}(X)/U) = \dim(X/U)$, for every set *X*. Let $(a_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be an enumeration of $\operatorname{cl}(X)$ and set $A_{<\alpha} := \{ a_{\beta} \mid \beta < \alpha \}$. Then

$$\dim(\operatorname{cl}(X)/U) = \dim(\operatorname{cl}(X)/X) \oplus \dim(X/U)$$
$$= \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} \dim(a_{\alpha}/X \cup A_{<\alpha}) \oplus \dim(X/U)$$
$$\leq \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} \dim(a_{\alpha}/X) \oplus \dim(X/U)$$
$$= o \oplus \dim(X/U).$$

To prove that $\dim_{cl}(X/U) = \dim(X/U)$, let *I* be a cl-basis of *X* over *U*. Then $\dim(I/U) \le \dim(X/U) \le \dim(cl(I)/U) = \dim(I/U)$ implies that

$$\dim_{\rm cl}(X/U) = |I| = \dim(I/U) = \dim(X/U).$$

Note that it follows from Proposition 2.6 that a dimension function is uniquely determined by the set of all pairs *A*, *U* such that $\dim(A/U) = 0$.

Corollary 2.7. Let $d, d' : \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \to Cn$ be two geometric dimension functions. If

d(A/U) = 0 iff d'(A/U) = 0, for all $A, U \subseteq \Omega$,

then d = d'.

Proof. According to Proposition 2.6, we can associate with *d* and *d'* matroids $\langle \Omega, c \rangle$ and $\langle \Omega, c' \rangle$, respectively. Since d(A/U) = 0 if, and only if, d'(A/U) = 0, it follows that c = c'. Hence,

 $d = \dim_c = \dim_{c'} = d'.$

3. Modular geometries

There is a general construction turning an arbitrary matroid into a geometry. **Definition 3.1.** Let $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ be a matroid and $U \subseteq \Omega$. The *localisation* of $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ at *U* is the matroid $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle_{(U)} := \langle \Omega_{(U)}, cl_{(U)} \rangle$ where

$$\Omega_{(U)} \coloneqq \left\{ \operatorname{cl}(U \cup \{a\}) \mid a \in \Omega \setminus \operatorname{cl}(U) \right\},\$$
$$\operatorname{cl}_{(U)}(X) \coloneqq \left\{ L \in \Omega_{(U)} \mid L \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(U \cup \bigcup X) \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.2. Every localisation of a matroid is a geometry.

Exercise 3.1. Prove the preceding lemma.

Definition 3.3. Let \mathfrak{B} be a vector space over a skew field \mathfrak{S} . The *projective geometry* associated with \mathfrak{B} is the localisation $\langle V, cl \rangle_{(0)}$ of the linear matroid at the subspace $\{0\}$.

Remark. This coincides with the usual definition of a projective space: the points are the lines $L \subseteq V$ through the origin.

Lemma 3.4. Let $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ be a matroid, $U, X \subseteq \Omega$ sets, and $\langle \Omega_{(U)}, cl_{(U)} \rangle$ the localisation at U. Let

$$X_{(U)} \coloneqq \left\{ \operatorname{cl}(U \cup \{x\}) \mid x \in X \setminus \operatorname{cl}(U) \right\}$$

be the image of X in $\Omega_{(U)}$.

 $\dim_{\rm cl}(X/U) = \dim_{\rm cl}(X(U)).$

Proof. Let *I* be a basis of *X* over *U*. Then $I \cap cl(U) = \emptyset$. Hence, if we can show that

 $I_{(U)} := \{ \operatorname{cl}(U \cup \{a\}) \mid a \in I \}$

is a basis of $X_{(U)}$, then $|I_{(U)}| = |I|$ and the claim follows.

For $x \in X$, let $L_x := cl(U \cup \{x\})$. To show that $I_{(U)}$ is independent, suppose that there is some $a \in I$ such that

$$L_a \in \mathrm{cl}_{(U)}(I_{(U)} \setminus \{L_a\})$$

= $\left\{ L \in \Omega_{(U)} \mid L \subseteq \mathrm{cl}(U \cup \bigcup (I_{(U)} \setminus \{L_a\})) \right\}.$

Since $a \in L_a$ it follows that

$$a \in \operatorname{cl}(U \cup \bigcup(I_{(U)} \setminus \{L_a\})) \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(U \cup (I \setminus \{a\})).$$

Hence, I is not independent over U. A contradiction.

It remains to show that $X_{(U)} \subseteq cl_{(U)}(I_{(U)})$. Let $L_x \in X_{(U)}$. Then

$$U \cup \{x\} \subseteq U \cup X \subseteq cl(U \cup I) \text{ implies } L_x \in cl_{(U)}(I_{(U)}).$$

Some special properties of affine and projective geometries are worth singling out.

Definition 3.5. Let $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ be a matroid.

(a) $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is *modular* if the lattice $\langle \text{fix cl}, \subseteq \rangle$ of its closed sets is modular. The matroid is *locally modular* if all of its localisations at a single point $a \in \Omega$ are modular.

(b) $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is *disintegrated* if cl(X) = X, for all $X \subseteq \Omega$.

(c) $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is *locally finite* if the closure of every finite set is finite.

(d) A *morphism* between matroids is a continuous function between the corresponding closure spaces.

(e) $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is *homogeneous* if, for every finite set $U \subseteq \Omega$ and all $a, b \in \Omega \setminus cl(U)$, there is an isomorphism $\pi : \Omega \to \Omega$ with $\pi \upharpoonright cl(U) = id$ and $\pi(a) = b$.

We have defined modularity of a matroid in terms of the corresponding lattice of closed sets. The next lemma lists some equivalent conditions on the matroid itself.

Lemma 3.6. Let $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ be a matroid. The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is modular.
- (2) For all finite $X, Y \subseteq \Omega$, we have

 $\dim_{cl} (X \cap Y) + \dim_{cl} (X \cup Y) = \dim_{cl} (X) + \dim_{cl} (Y).$

(3) For all closed sets $C \subseteq \Omega$ and every pair of elements $a, x \in \Omega$ with $x \in cl(C \cup \{a\})$, there exists an element $c \in C$ with $x \in cl(\{a, c\})$.



(4) For all closed sets $C, D \subseteq \Omega$ and every element $x \in cl(C \cup D)$, there exist elements $c \in C$ and $d \in D$ with $x \in cl(\{c, d\})$.



Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) We have dim_{cl}(*X*) = dim_{cl}(cl(*X*)) and the latter dimension coincides with the height of cl(*X*) in the lattice $\langle \text{fix cl}, \subseteq \rangle$. Consequently, the equation follows from the modular law (Theorem B2.5.5).

(2) \Rightarrow (3) If $a \in C$, we can take $c \coloneqq x$ and, if $x \in cl(a)$, we can take an arbitrary $c \in C$. Hence, suppose that $a \notin C \cup cl(a)$ and choose a finite set $C_0 \subseteq C$ with $x \in cl(C_0 \cup \{a\})$. Then (2) implies that

$$\dim(C_{o} \cap cl(a, x)) = \dim(C_{o}) + \dim(a, x) - \dim(C_{o} \cup \{a, x\})$$
$$= \dim(C_{o}) + 2 - (\dim(C_{o}) + 1) = 1.$$

Hence, there is some $c \in C_0 \cap cl(a, x)$. By the exchange property it follows that $x \in cl(a, c)$, as desired.

 $(3) \Rightarrow (4)$ Since cl has finite character, there are finite sets $C_0 \subseteq C$ and $D_0 \subseteq D$ such that $x \in cl(C_0 \cup D_0)$. We prove the claim by induction on $|C_0|$. If $C_0 = \emptyset$ then $x \in cl(D_0) \subseteq D$ and we are done. Suppose that $C_0 = A \cup \{a\}$. Since $x \in cl(A \cup D_0 \cup \{a\})$, we can use (3) to find some $b \in cl(A \cup D_0)$ with $x \in cl(\{a, b\})$. By inductive hypothesis, there are $a' \in A$ and $d \in D_0$ such that $b \in cl(\{a', d\})$. Hence, $x \in cl(\{a, a', d\})$ and, applying (3) again, we can find some $c \in cl(\{a, a'\}) \subseteq C$ with $x \in cl(\{c, d\})$. $(4) \Rightarrow (1)$ Let $A, B, C \subseteq \Omega$ be closed sets with $A \subseteq B$. We have to show that $cl(A \cup (B \cap C)) = B \cap cl(A \cup C)$. According to Lemma B2.2.6, one inclusion holds in every lattice. For the other one, let $x \in B \cap cl(A \cup C)$. By (4) there are elements $a \in A$ and $c \in C$ with $x \in B \cap cl(\{a, c\})$. If $x \in cl(a)$ then $x \in A$ and we are done. Hence, suppose that $x \notin cl(a)$. By the exchange property, it then follows that $c \in cl(\{a, x\}) \subseteq cl(A \cup B) = B$. Hence, $c \in B \cap C$ and $x \in cl(\{a, c\}) \subseteq cl(A \cup (B \cap C))$.

Disintegrated, projective, and affine geometries frequently appear in model theory. The next lemma lists some of their properties.

Lemma 3.7. Disintegrated geometries and projective geometries are modular and homogeneous. Affine geometries are locally modular and homogeneous, but not modular if the dimension is at least 3.

Proof. To show that a disintegrated geometry $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is modular, one only has to check that

 $X \subseteq Y$ implies $X \cup (Y \cap Z) = Y \cap (X \cup Z)$.

To show that it is homogeneous, let $U \subseteq \Omega$ and $a, b \in \Omega \setminus U$. The bijection $h : \Omega \to \Omega$ exchanging *a* and *b* and fixing every other element of Ω is continuous.

Suppose that $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is the projective geometry associated with a vector space \mathfrak{B} . Modularity follows from Lemma B6.4.5. For homogeneity, let $U \subseteq \Omega$ be finite and $a, b \notin cl(U)$. Let $\langle V, cl_{\wedge} \rangle$ be the corresponding linear matroid. For every element $x \in \Omega$ there is a non-zero vector $\hat{x} \in V$ such that $x = cl_{\wedge}(\hat{x})$. Fix a basis *B* of $\hat{U} := cl_{\wedge}(\{\hat{x} \mid x \in U\})$. Since $\hat{a}, \hat{b} \notin \hat{U}$, there exists a linear map $h : V \to V$ fixing *B* and interchanging \hat{a} and \hat{b} . The function $\Omega \to \Omega$ induced by *h* is the desired continuous mapping.

Suppose that $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is the affine geometry associated with a vector space \mathfrak{B} and let $a \in \Omega$. Then $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle_{(a)} \cong \langle \Omega, cl \rangle_{(o)}$ and the latter geometry is isomorphic to the projective geometry associated with \mathfrak{B} . Since we have just seen that such geometries are modular, it follows that $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is locally modular.

To show that it is not modular let $u, v \in V$ be linearly independent vectors. Then $cl(o) \subseteq cl(o, u)$ but

$$cl(cl(o) \cup (cl(o, u) \cap cl(v, v + u))) = cl(cl(o) \cup \emptyset)$$

= cl(o),
and $cl(o, u) \cap cl(cl(o) \cup cl(v, v + u)) = cl(o, u) \cap cl(o, u, v)$
= cl(o, u).



For homogeneity, let $U \subseteq \Omega$ be finite and $a, b \notin cl(U)$ distinct elements. If $U = \emptyset$ and a and b are both non-zero, we can take some linear map $h : V \to V$ interchanging a and b. This map is continuous.

If $U = \emptyset$ and a = 0, we first apply a translation f that maps both a and b to non-zero vectors. Then we can use a linear map h as above. The composition $f^{-1} \circ h \circ f$ is the desired continuous map.

Note that there is one case where such a translation f does not exists. If \mathfrak{B} has only two elements. Then $V = \{a, b\}$ and the function interchanging a and b is continuous.

It remains to consider the case that $U \neq \emptyset$. Fix some $x \in U$. By applying a suitable translation f, we can assume that $x = o \in U$. Hence, cl(U) is a linear subspace of \mathfrak{B} . Let B be a basis of cl(U) and let $h : V \to V$ be a linear map fixing B and interchanging a and b. Then $f^{-1} \circ h \circ f$ is the desired continuous map.

Algebraically closed fields provide examples of geometries that are not locally modular.

Proposition 3.8. Let \Re be an algebraically closed field of infinite transcendence degree and let $\langle K, cl \rangle$ be the matroid where cl maps a set $X \subseteq K$ to its algebraic closure.

- (a) $\langle K, cl \rangle$ is homogeneous.
- (b) No localisation of $\langle K, cl \rangle$ at a finite set is modular.

Proof. (a) follows by Corollary B6.5.31.

(b) We consider the localisation $\langle K, cl \rangle_{(U)}$ at a finite set $U \subseteq K$. Let $n := \dim_{cl}(U)$. Since \Re has infinite transcendence degree, there are elements a, b, c, d that are algebraically independent over U. Set x := (a - c)/(b - d) and y := a - bx, and let

$$A \coloneqq \operatorname{cl}(a, b, U)$$
 and $B \coloneqq \operatorname{cl}(x, y, U)$.

Then $cl(A \cup B) = cl(a, b, x, U)$ has dimension n + 3, while A and B both have dimension n + 2. To show that $\langle K, cl \rangle_{(U)}$ is not modular it is sufficient to prove that the dimension of $A \cap B$ is different from n + 1.

In fact, we claim that $A \cap B = cl(U)$ and, hence, the dimension is n. Clearly, we have $U \subseteq A \cap B$. Conversely, consider an element $z \in A \cap B$. By (a), there exists an automorphism $\pi \in Aut \Re$ that fixes B pointwise and maps a to c. It follows that $\pi(b) = \pi((a - y)/x) = (c - y)/x = d$. Consequently, $z \in B$ implies $\pi(z) = z$, and $z \in A = cl(a, b, U)$ implies $z = \pi(z) \in cl(c, d, U)$. Thus,

$$z \in \operatorname{cl}(a, b, U) \cap \operatorname{cl}(c, d, U) = \operatorname{cl}(U).$$

We conclude this section with the following characterisation of homogeneous, locally finite geometries.

Theorem 3.9 (Cherlin, Mills, Zil'ber). Let $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ be a homogeneous, locally finite geometry of infinite dimension. Then exactly one of the following cases holds:

- (1) $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is disintegrated.
- (2) $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is isomorphic to a projective geometry over a finite field.
- (3) $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is isomorphic to an affine geometry over a finite field.

4. Strongly minimal sets

Having introduced geometries we are interested in first-order theories where the algebraic closure operator forms such a geometry.

Definition 4.1. Let \mathfrak{M} be a structure and $S \subseteq M^n$ an infinite *M*-definable relation.

(a) We call *S* minimal if, for every *M*-definable subset $X \subseteq S$, either *X*, or $S \setminus X$ is finite. A formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ with $\bar{c} \subseteq M$ is minimal if the relation $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathfrak{M}}$ it defines is minimal.

(b) A relation *S*, or a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$, is *strongly minimal*, if it is minimal in every elementary extension of \mathfrak{M} .

Example. (a) Let $\mathfrak{E} = \langle E, \sim \rangle$ be a structure where \sim is an equivalence relation with infinitely many classes each of which is infinite. For every $a \in E$, the formula $x \sim a$ is strongly minimal.

(b) Let \Re be an algebraically closed field. Every definable set $X \subseteq K$ is a boolean combination of solution sets of polynomials. Hence, every such set is either finite or cofinite. Therefore, *K* is strongly minimal.

(c) In $\mathfrak{A} = \langle \omega, \leq \rangle$ the set ω is minimal, but not strongly minimal since, in every elementary extension $\mathfrak{B} > \mathfrak{A}$ we can pick an element $c \in B \setminus \omega$ such that $(x \leq c)^{\mathfrak{B}}$ and $(x > c)^{\mathfrak{B}}$ are both infinite.

We are mainly interested in strongly minimal relations. As the next lemma shows, we can find such a relation by looking for a minimal relation in an \aleph_0 -saturated structure.

Lemma 4.2. Every minimal relation in an \aleph_0 -saturated structure \mathfrak{M} is strongly minimal.

Proof. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ be a minimal formula with parameters $\bar{c} \subseteq M$. To show that φ is strongly minimal we consider an elementary extension $\mathfrak{N} \geq \mathfrak{M}$ and a formula $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{d})$ with parameters $\bar{d} \subseteq N$. For a contradiction, suppose that both sets

$$\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})^{\mathfrak{N}} \cap \psi(\bar{x};\bar{d})^{\mathfrak{N}}$$
 and $\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})^{\mathfrak{N}} \smallsetminus \psi(\bar{x};\bar{d})^{\mathfrak{N}}$

F1. Geometries

are infinite.

Since \mathfrak{M} is \aleph_0 -saturated we can find a tuple $\bar{d}' \subseteq M$ with $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{d}'/\bar{c}) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{d}/\bar{c})$. For every $n < \omega$, we have

$$\mathfrak{N} \vDash \exists^{n} \bar{x} [\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \land \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{d})] \land \exists^{n} \bar{x} [\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \land \neg \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{d})]$$

which implies that

$$\mathfrak{N} \vDash \exists^{n} \bar{x} [\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \land \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{d}')] \land \exists^{n} \bar{x} [\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \land \neg \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{d}')].$$

It follows that all these formulae also hold in \mathfrak{M} . Consequently, both sets $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathfrak{M}} \cap \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{d}')^{\mathfrak{M}}$ and $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathfrak{M}} \setminus \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{d}')^{\mathfrak{M}}$ are infinite. A contradiction.

The reason for studying strongly minimal sets is the fact that the algebraic closure operator has the exchange property for these sets.

Lemma 4.3. Let \mathfrak{M} be a structure and $S \subseteq M^n$ a minimal set. The restriction of acl to *S* forms a matroid.

Proof. We have already seen in Lemma E2.1.2 that acl is a finitary closure operator. Hence, it remains to check that it has the exchange property.

Suppose that $\bar{a} \subseteq \operatorname{acl}(U \cup \bar{b}) \setminus \operatorname{acl}(U)$ for $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in S$. We have to show that $\bar{b} \subseteq \operatorname{acl}(U \cup \bar{a})$. There exists a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ over U such that $\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}}(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ is a finite set containing \bar{a} . Set $m := |\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}}(\bar{x}; \bar{b})|$ and let $\psi(\bar{y})$ be the formula stating that there are exactly m tuples $\bar{x} \in S$ such that $\mathfrak{M} \models \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$. If $\psi^{\mathfrak{M}}(\bar{y})$ is finite, $\mathfrak{M} \models \psi(\bar{b})$ implies that $\bar{b} \subseteq \operatorname{acl}(U)$. Consequently, we have $\bar{a} \subseteq \operatorname{acl}(U)$. A contradiction.

Hence, the set $\psi^{\mathfrak{M}}(\bar{y})$ is infinite. If $(\varphi(\bar{a}; \bar{y}) \land \psi(\bar{y}))^{\mathfrak{M}}$ is finite then $\bar{b} \subseteq \operatorname{acl}(U \cup \bar{a})$ and we are done. For a contradiction, suppose that this set if infinite. Since *S* is minimal it follows that the complement $S \cap \neg(\varphi(\bar{a}; \bar{y}) \land \psi(\bar{y}))^{\mathfrak{M}}$ is finite. Let $k < \aleph_0$ be its cardinality and let $\vartheta(\bar{x})$ be the formula stating that there are exactly *k* elements $\bar{y} \in S$ that do not satisfy $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \land \psi(\bar{y})$. If $\vartheta(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{M}}$ is finite then $\bar{a} \subseteq \operatorname{acl}(U)$. A contradiction.

Hence, $\vartheta(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{M}}$ is infinite and we can choose m + 1 distinct elements $\bar{a}_0, \ldots, \bar{a}_m \in \vartheta(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{M}}$. The set

$$B \coloneqq \bigcap_{i \le m} \left[\varphi(\bar{a}_i; \bar{y}) \land \psi(\bar{y}) \right]^{\mathfrak{M}}$$

is a finite intersection of cofinite sets and, therefore, cofinite itself. In particular, it is nonempty and we can find some element $\bar{b}^* \in B$. It follows that

$$\mathfrak{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_i; \bar{b}^*)$$
, for all $i \le m$.

Consequently, $|\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}^*)| > m$. But this implies that $\mathfrak{M} \neq \psi(\bar{b}^*)$. A contradiction.

The geometry of a strongly minimal relation is closely related to its logical properties. For instance, we shall show below that all independent sets are totally indiscernible with the same type. But first, let us collect some technical properties of strongly minimal relations.

Lemma 4.4. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ be a strongly minimal formula with parameters \bar{c} . Let \bar{s} be the sorts of the variables \bar{x} .

- (a) If \bar{d} is a tuple with $tp(\bar{d}) = tp(\bar{c})$ then $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{d})$ is also strongly minimal.
- (b) For every set $U \supseteq \overline{c}$, there exists a unique nonalgebraic type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{\overline{s}}(U)$ with $\varphi \in \mathfrak{p}$.

Proof. (a) For every formula $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{a})$ with parameters $\bar{a} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, we have to show that exactly one of

$$(\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{d})\wedge\psi(\bar{x};\bar{a}))^{\mathbb{M}}$$
 and $(\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{d})\wedge\neg\psi(\bar{x};\bar{a}))^{\mathbb{M}}$

is finite. Since $tp(\bar{d}) = tp(\bar{c})$ there is an automorphism π of \mathbb{M} with $\pi(\bar{d}) = \bar{c}$. Let $\bar{b} := \pi(\bar{a})$. As $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ is strongly minimal, exactly one of

$$(\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})\wedge\psi(\bar{x};\bar{b}))^{\mathbb{M}}$$
 and $(\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})\wedge\neg\psi(\bar{x};\bar{b}))^{\mathbb{M}}$

is finite. Since

$$\pi \left[(\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{d}) \land \psi(\bar{x};\bar{a}))^{\mathbb{M}} \right] = (\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c}) \land \psi(\bar{x};\bar{b}))^{\mathbb{M}},$$

and
$$\pi \left[(\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{d}) \land \neg \psi(\bar{x};\bar{a}))^{\mathbb{M}} \right] = (\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c}) \land \neg \psi(\bar{x};\bar{b}))^{\mathbb{M}},$$

the claim follows.

(b) Let \mathfrak{M} be an \aleph_0 -saturated model containing U and set

$$\mathfrak{p} := \left\{ \psi \mid \psi \text{ a formula over } U \text{ such that } (\varphi \land \psi)^{\mathfrak{M}} \text{ is infinite } \right\}.$$

Since φ is strongly minimal, it follows that

 $\psi \in \mathfrak{p}$ iff $\neg \psi \notin \mathfrak{p}$, for every formula ψ over U.

Hence, \mathfrak{p} is a complete type over *U* containing φ . Clearly, \mathfrak{p} is nonalgebraic since, if there were some algebraic formula $\psi \in \mathfrak{p}$, then $\varphi \wedge \psi$ were also algebraic, in contradiction to the definition of \mathfrak{p} .

Suppose that $q \in S^{s}(U)$ is another nonalgebraic type containing φ . To show that $q \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$, consider $\psi \in \mathfrak{q}$. Then $\varphi \land \psi \in \mathfrak{q}$ and, by assumption, this formula is nonalgebraic. By definition of \mathfrak{p} it follows that $\psi \in \mathfrak{p}$.

Lemma 4.5. Let $\varphi(\bar{x})$ be a strongly minimal formula over a set U of parameters. Let \bar{s} be the sorts of the variables \bar{x} , and let $\varphi \in S^{\bar{s}}(U)$ be the unique nonalgebraic type containing φ .

- (a) \mathfrak{p} is isolated if, and only if, $\varphi^{\mathbb{M}}$ contains only finitely many tuples in $\operatorname{acl}(U)$.
- (b) Let $V \supseteq U$ and let $q \in S^{\overline{s}}(V)$ be the unique nonalgebraic extension of \mathfrak{p} . If \mathfrak{p} is isolated, so is q.

Proof. (a) Let $R := \{ \bar{a} \in \varphi^{\mathbb{M}} \mid \bar{a} \subseteq \operatorname{acl}(U) \}$. For (\Leftarrow), suppose that $R = \{ \bar{a}_0, \ldots, \bar{a}_{n-1} \}$ is finite. For each i < n, we fix an algebraic formula ψ_i over U such that $\mathbb{M} \models \psi_i(\bar{a}_i)$. It follows that $\psi := \bigvee_{i < n} [\psi_i \land \varphi]$ is a formula over U defining R. We claim that $\varphi \land \neg \psi$ isolates \mathfrak{p} .

Since \mathfrak{p} is nonalgebraic, we have $\psi \notin \mathfrak{p}$. Therefore, $\varphi \land \neg \psi \in \mathfrak{p}$. Conversely, let \mathfrak{q} be an arbitrary complete type over *U* containing $\varphi \land \neg \psi$. If

q is nonalgebraic, it coincides with p, by Lemma 4.4 (b), and we are done. Therefore, we may assume that q contains an algebraic formula ϑ . Then each of the finitely many realisations of q is in acl(*U*). Consequently, $q^{\mathbb{M}} \subseteq R$, which implies that $\psi \in \mathfrak{q}$. A contradiction.

(⇒) For a contradiction, suppose that there is some $\psi(\bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{p}$ isolating \mathfrak{p} , but *R* is infinite. Let Γ be the set of all algebraic formulae over *U*. As \mathfrak{p} is the unique nonalgebraic type in $S^{\bar{s}}(U)$ containing φ , the set

$$\{\varphi \land \neg \psi\} \cup \{\neg \vartheta \mid \vartheta \in \Gamma\}$$

is inconsistent. Hence, there are finitely many formula $\vartheta_0, \ldots, \vartheta_{n-1} \in \Gamma$ such that

$$T(U) \cup \{\varphi, \neg \vartheta_0, \ldots, \neg \vartheta_{n-1}\} \vDash \psi.$$

Since *R* is infinite and all ϑ_i are algebraic, there is some element

$$ar{a} \in R \smallsetminus (artheta^{\mathbb{M}}_{\mathrm{o}} \cup \cdots \cup artheta^{\mathbb{M}}_{n-1}) \subseteq (arphi \land \neg artheta_{\mathrm{o}} \land \cdots \land \neg artheta_{n-1})^{\mathbb{M}} \subseteq \psi^{\mathbb{M}}$$
 .

But $tp(\bar{a}/U) \neq p$ since the former type is algebraic, while the latter one is not. Consequently, ψ does not isolate p. A contradiction.

(b) follows immediately from (a).

Proposition 4.6. Let \mathfrak{M} be a structure, $U \subseteq M$, and suppose that $S \subseteq M^k$ a *U*-definable minimal relation. If $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in S^n$ are finite tuples each of which is independent over *U*, then

 $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/U).$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on *n*. For n = 0 there is nothing to do. Suppose that we have already proved the claim for *n*-tuples and let $\bar{a}c \in S^{n+1}$ and $\bar{b}d \in S^{n+1}$ be both independent over *U*. By inductive hypothesis, we have $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/U)$. Let $\psi(\bar{x}, y)$ be a formula over *U* such that

$$\mathfrak{M}\vDash\psi(\bar{a},c)\,.$$

1053

 \square

F1. Geometries

Since $c \notin \operatorname{acl}(U \cup \bar{a})$ it follows that the set $S \cap \psi(\bar{a}, y)^{\mathfrak{M}}$ is infinite and its complement $S \setminus \psi(\bar{a}, y)^{\mathfrak{M}}$ is finite. Furthermore, $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/U)$ implies that

$$|S \setminus \psi(\bar{b}, y)^{\mathfrak{M}}| = |S \setminus \psi(\bar{a}, y)^{\mathfrak{M}}| < \aleph_{o}$$

Hence, $d \notin \operatorname{acl}(U \cup \overline{b})$ implies that $\mathfrak{M} \vDash \psi(\overline{b}, d)$.

Corollary 4.7. Let \mathfrak{M} be a structure, $U \subseteq M$ a set of parameters, and $S \subseteq M$ a U-definable minimal set. Every U-independent set $A \subseteq S$ is totally indiscernible over U.

Proof. Let $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in [A]^n$. Then \bar{a} and \bar{b} are *U*-independent and, therefore, they have the same type over *U*.

We have seen that we can use geometric methods to study models containing minimal sets. Let us turn to prove the existence of minimal sets.

Lemma 4.8. Let T be a \aleph_0 -stable theory over a countable signature Σ , $\mathfrak{M} \models T$ infinite, $\vartheta(\bar{x})$ a formula over M, and let $\kappa \leq |\vartheta^{\mathfrak{M}}|$ be an infinite cardinal. There exists a formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over M such that $\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}} \subseteq \vartheta^{\mathfrak{M}}, |\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}}| \geq \kappa$ and, for every formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ over M, we either have

$$|(\varphi \wedge \psi)^{\mathfrak{M}}| < \kappa \quad or \quad |(\varphi \wedge \neg \psi)^{\mathfrak{M}}| < \kappa.$$

Proof. For a contradiction, suppose that there is no such φ . We construct a family $(\varphi_w)_{w \in 2^{<\omega}}$ of formulae over M such that, for all $w \in 2^{<\omega}$, we have

$$\varphi_w^{\mathfrak{M}} \subseteq \mathfrak{Y}^{\mathfrak{M}}, \quad |\varphi_w^{\mathfrak{M}}| \ge \kappa \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{wo}^{\mathfrak{M}} \cap \varphi_{w1}^{\mathfrak{M}} = \varnothing.$$

We start with $\varphi_{\langle\rangle} := \vartheta$. Then $\varphi_{\langle\rangle}^{\mathfrak{M}} = \vartheta^{\mathfrak{M}}$ and $|\varphi_{\langle\rangle}^{\mathfrak{M}}| \ge \kappa$. For the inductive step, suppose that we have already defined φ_w . By assumption, there is a formula ψ over M such that

$$|(\varphi_w \wedge \psi)^{\mathfrak{M}}| \geq \kappa \quad \text{and} \quad |(\varphi_w \wedge \neg \psi)^{\mathfrak{M}}| \geq \kappa.$$

We set $\varphi_{wo} \coloneqq \varphi_w \land \psi$ and $\varphi_{w_1} \coloneqq \varphi_w \land \neg \psi$.

Having defined $(\varphi_w)_w$, let $U \subseteq M$ be the set of all parameters appearing in some φ_w . Then U is countable and the family $(\varphi_w)_{w \in 2^{<\omega}}$ is an embedding of $2^{<\omega}$ into $FO^{\bar{s}}[\Sigma_U]/T$, where \bar{s} are the sorts of \bar{x} . By Lemma B5.7.3, it follows that $|S^{\bar{s}}(U)| > \aleph_0$. A contradiction to \aleph_0 -stability.

Corollary 4.9. Let T be a \aleph_0 -stable theory over a countable signature Σ . Every infinite model of T contains a minimal relation.

Proof. This follows from the preceding lemma for $\vartheta(x) :=$ true and $\kappa := \aleph_0$.

We can use minimal sets to define isomorphisms between models.

Lemma 4.10. Every elementary function $f_o : A \to B$ can be extended to a elementary function $f : acl(A) \to acl(rng f_o)$ that is bijective.

Proof. W.l.o.g. we may assume that $B = \operatorname{rng} f_o$. Let F be the set of all elementary functions $g : C \to D$ such that $A \subseteq C \subseteq \operatorname{acl}(A)$ and $g \upharpoonright A = f_o$. Then $\langle F, \subseteq \rangle$ is inductively ordered. Hence, it has a maximal element $f : C \to D$. We claim that f is the desired function.

First of all, every elementary function is injective. For surjectivity, suppose that $b \in \operatorname{acl}(B) \setminus D$. Since $b \in \operatorname{acl}(D)$, we can use Lemma E3.1.3 to find a formula $\varphi(x; \overline{d})$ with parameters $\overline{d} \subseteq D$ isolating $\operatorname{tp}(b/D)$. Since $\operatorname{tp}(b/D)$ is algebraic, φ must be an algebraic formula. Fixing $\overline{c} \subseteq C$ such that $f(\overline{c}) = \overline{d}$ it follows that

 $f[\varphi(x;\bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}}] \subseteq \varphi(x;\bar{d})^{\mathbb{M}}$ and $|\varphi(x;\bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}}| = |\varphi(x;\bar{d})^{\mathbb{M}}|.$

Consequently, there exists some element $a \in \varphi(x; \bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}} \setminus C$. Furthermore, $\varphi(x; \bar{c})$ isolates $\operatorname{tp}(a/C)$. Hence, $f[\operatorname{tp}(a/C)] = \operatorname{tp}(b/D)$ and we have $f \cup \{\langle a, b \rangle\} \in F$. This contradicts the maximality of f.

It remains to prove that $C = \operatorname{acl}(A)$. Suppose that there exists an element $a \in \operatorname{acl}(A) \setminus C$. Then $\operatorname{tp}(a/C)$ is isolated and, as above, we can find an element *b* such that $f \cup \{\langle a, b \rangle\} \in F$. Again a contradiction.
Corollary 4.11. Let T be a theory, $\varphi(x)$ a strongly minimal formula, and \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} models of T. If dim $(\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}) = \dim(\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}})$, there exists a bijective elementary map $f : \operatorname{acl}(\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}) \to \operatorname{acl}(\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}})$.

Proof. Fix bases *I* and *J* of, respectively, $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}$. By assumption, |I| = |J|. Let $f_{\circ} : I \to J$ be a bijection. By Corollary 4.6, it follows that f_{\circ} is elementary. Hence, we can use Lemma 4.10 to extend f_{\circ} to an elementary map $f : \operatorname{acl}(I) \to \operatorname{acl}(J)$. Since $\operatorname{acl}(I) = \operatorname{acl}(\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $\operatorname{acl}(J) = \operatorname{acl}(\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}})$, this is the desired map.

We can apply the results on minimal sets to study theories where every model consists of a minimal set. In fact, it is sufficient that every model is generated by a minimal set.

Definition 4.12. Let *T* be a complete first-order theory.

(a) *T* is *strongly minimal* if the formula x = x is strongly minimal.

(b) *T* is *almost strongly minimal* if there exists a strongly minimal formula $\varphi(x; \bar{c})$ with parameters \bar{c} such that $tp(\bar{c})$ is isolated and

 $\operatorname{acl}(\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}} \cup \overline{c}) = M$, for every model \mathfrak{M} of $T(\overline{c})$.

Example. The theories DAG and ACF_p are strongly minimal.

Theorem 4.13. Let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be models of an almost strongly minimal theory *T* and let $\varphi(x; \bar{c})$ be the corresponding strongly minimal formula. Then

$$\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B} \quad \text{iff} \quad \dim(\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}/\bar{c}) = \dim(\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}/\bar{c}).$$

Proof. (\Rightarrow) is trivial and (\Leftarrow) follows from Corollary 4.11.

Corollary 4.14. *Every almost strongly minimal theory* T *is* κ *-categorical, for all* $\kappa > |T|$.

Proof. Let $\varphi(x; \bar{c})$ be the strongly minimal formula associated with T and let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be models of T of the same size |A| = |B| > |T|. Since

tp(\bar{c}) is isolated, there are tuples $\bar{a} \subseteq A$ and $\bar{b} \subseteq B$ realising tp(\bar{c}). Fix bases $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ of $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ over \bar{a} and of $\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}$ over \bar{b} , respectively. Then

$$\dim(\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}/\bar{a}) = |I| = |\operatorname{acl}(I)| = |A| \quad \text{and} \quad \dim(\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}/\bar{b}) = \cdots = |B|.$$

By Theorem 4.13, it follows that $\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B}$.

5. Vaughtian pairs and the Theorem of Morley

In this section we shall prove the Theorem of Morley which states that a countable first-order theory *T* that is κ -categorical, for *some* uncountable cardinal κ , is λ -categorical, for *all* uncountable cardinals λ . We have already seen in Theorem E6.3.16 that such a theory is necessarily \aleph_0 -stable. It follows that every uncountable model is saturated. Note that, according to Lemma E1.2.17, we have $|\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}}| < \aleph_0$ or $|\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}}| = |M|$, for every saturated model \mathfrak{M} of *T* and every formula φ . In fact, we will show below that a \aleph_0 -stable theory *T* is uncountable categorical if, and only if, this property holds for *all* uncountable models \mathfrak{M} .

Definition 5.1. Let *T* be a first-order theory.

(a) A *Vaughtian pair* for *T* consists of two models $\mathfrak{A} \prec \mathfrak{B}$ of *T* such that, for some formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over *A*, $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is infinite and $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}$.

(b) The *size* of a Vaughtian pair $\langle \mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \rangle$ is the tuple $\langle \kappa, \lambda \rangle$ where $\kappa := |A|$ and $\lambda := |B|$.

(c) If $\mathfrak{A} \leq \mathfrak{B}$ are structures, we denote by $\langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle$ the expansion of \mathfrak{B} by a new unary predicate *P* with value *A*.

Example. Let $\mathfrak{A} = \langle A, \sim \rangle$ where \sim is an equivalence relation on A and let $\mathfrak{B} > \mathfrak{A}$. Then $\langle \mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \rangle$ is a Vaughtian pair if, and only if, there is some $a \in A$ whose equivalence class

$$[a]_{\sim} := \{ b \in B \mid b \sim a \}$$

is infinite and contained in A.

In the first part of this section we will study constructions of Vaughtian pairs. The goal is Lemma 5.8 which states that a countable theory with a Vaughtian pair cannot be κ -categorical for an uncountable cardinal κ . In the second part of the section, we will then investigate minimal sets in theories without Vaughtian pairs.

We will use the following lemma to construct new Vaughtian pairs from a given one.

Lemma 5.2. Suppose that $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{A}' \subseteq \mathfrak{B}'$ are structures such that $(\mathfrak{B}, A) \equiv (\mathfrak{B}', A')$.

- (a) $\mathfrak{A} \leq \mathfrak{B}$ if, and only if, $\mathfrak{A}' \leq \mathfrak{B}'$.
- (b) Let $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be a formula and $\bar{a} \subseteq A$ and $\bar{a}' \subseteq A'$ tuples such that $\langle \mathfrak{B}, A, \bar{a} \rangle \equiv \langle \mathfrak{B}', A', \bar{a}' \rangle$. Then $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ is a witness for $\langle \mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \rangle$ being Vaughtian if, and only if, $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}')$ is a witness for $\langle \mathfrak{A}', \mathfrak{B}' \rangle$ being Vaughtian.

Proof. (a) By symmetry, it is sufficient to prove one direction. For every formula $\psi(\bar{x})$, $\mathfrak{A} \leq \mathfrak{B}$ implies

$$\langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle \vDash (\forall \bar{x}. \wedge_i P x_i) [\psi(\bar{x}) \leftrightarrow \psi^{(P)}(\bar{x})],$$

where $\psi^{(P)}$ is the relativisation of ψ to *P*. Hence, all these formulae also hold in $\langle \mathfrak{B}', A' \rangle$. This implies that $\mathfrak{A}' \leq \mathfrak{B}'$.

(b) Suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ witnesses that $\langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle$ is Vaughtian. By (a) and the fact that

$$\langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle \vDash \exists x \neg Px$$
,

it follows that $\mathfrak{A}' < \mathfrak{B}'$. Furthermore, for every $n < \omega$,

$$\langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle \vDash \exists^n \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \land \forall \bar{x} [\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \to \bigwedge_i Px_i].$$

Hence, the tuple \bar{a}' satisfies these formulae in $\langle \mathfrak{B}', A' \rangle$. Consequently, $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}')^{\mathfrak{A}'}$ is infinite and $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}')^{\mathfrak{A}'} = \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}')^{\mathfrak{B}'}$.

The aim of the following sequence of results is Proposition 5.7 below which states that, given an arbitrary Vaughtian pair, we can construct a pair of size $\langle \kappa, \aleph_0 \rangle$, for every infinite cardinal κ .

Lemma 5.3. Let *T* be a complete first-order theory. If there is a Vaughtian pair for *T*, then there are Vaughtian pairs for *T* of size $\langle \kappa, \kappa \rangle$, for every $\kappa \ge |T|$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{A} \prec \mathfrak{B}$ be a Vaughtian pair for T and let $\varphi(\bar{x})$ be the corresponding formula with parameters $\bar{a} \subseteq A$. Since $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is infinite, we can use the Compactness Theorem to construct an elementary extension $\langle \mathfrak{B}_1, A_1 \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle$ such that $|\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}_1}| \geq \kappa$. By the Theorem of Löwenheim and Skolem, we can choose an elementary substructure $\langle \mathfrak{B}_0, A_0 \rangle \leq \langle \mathfrak{B}_1, A_1 \rangle$ with $|B_0| = \kappa$, $|A_0| = \kappa$, and $\bar{a} \subseteq A_0$. By Lemma 5.2, it follows that $\mathfrak{A}_0 \prec \mathfrak{B}_0$ is a Vaughtian pair.

Proposition 5.4. Let T be a countable complete first-order theory. For every pair $\mathfrak{A}_0 \leq \mathfrak{B}_0$ of countable models of T there exist countable homogeneous models $\mathfrak{A} \leq \mathfrak{B}$ of T such that $\langle \mathfrak{B}_0, A_0 \rangle \leq \langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle$ and \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} realise the same types in $S^{<\omega}(T)$.

Proof. We start by proving the following claims.

(a) For every finite subset $U \subseteq A_0$ and every type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(U)$, there exists a countable extension $\langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{B}_0, A_0 \rangle$ such that \mathfrak{p} is realised in $\mathfrak{A} := \mathfrak{B}|_A$.

(b) For every finite subset $U \subseteq B_0$ and every type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(U)$, there exists a countable extension $\langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{B}_0, A_0 \rangle$ such that \mathfrak{p} is realised in \mathfrak{B} .

(c) There exists a countable extension $\langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{B}_0, A_0 \rangle$ such that $\mathfrak{A} := \mathfrak{B}|_A$ realises every type over a finite subset $U \subseteq A_0$ that is realised in \mathfrak{B}_0 .

(a) We set

$$\Phi \coloneqq \Delta \cup \left\{ \varphi^{(P)} \mid \varphi \in \mathfrak{p} \right\},\,$$

F1. Geometries

where Δ is the elementary diagram of $\langle \mathfrak{B}_{\circ}, A_{\circ} \rangle$. To show that Φ is satisfiable, we consider finitely many formulae $\varphi_{\circ}(\bar{x}), \ldots, \varphi_{n-1}(\bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{p}$. Since \mathfrak{p} is a type and, hence, finitely satisfiable in every model of *T*, we have $\mathfrak{A}_{\circ} \vDash \exists \bar{x} \bigwedge_{i < n} \varphi_i(\bar{x})$, which implies that

$$\langle \mathfrak{B}_{\circ}, A_{\circ} \rangle \vDash \exists \bar{x} \bigwedge_{i < n} \varphi_{i}^{(P)}(\bar{x}).$$

Consequently, Φ is finitely satisfiable. Fix a countable model $\langle \mathfrak{B}, A, \bar{a} \rangle$ of Φ . Then $\langle \mathfrak{B}_{\circ}, A_{\circ} \rangle \leq \langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle$ and $\bar{a} \subseteq A$ realises \mathfrak{p} .

(b) This claim follows immediately from compactness and the Theorem of Löwenheim and Skolem.

(c) Let $(\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha})_{\alpha<\omega}$ be an enumeration of all types over a finite set $U \subseteq A_{\circ}$ that are realised in \mathfrak{B}_{\circ} . We can use (a) to construct an increasing chain $\langle \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha}, A_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha<\omega}$ of countable models starting with $\langle \mathfrak{B}_{\circ}, A_{\circ} \rangle$ such that $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha+1} := \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha+1}|_{A_{\alpha+1}}$ realises \mathfrak{p}_{α} . The union $\langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle := \bigcup_{\alpha<\omega} \langle \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha}, A_{\alpha} \rangle$ is the desired extension of $\langle \mathfrak{B}_{\circ}, A_{\circ} \rangle$.

To prove the proposition we construct a chain $\langle \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha}, A_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \omega}$ of countable models starting with $\langle \mathfrak{B}_{\circ}, A_{\circ} \rangle$ as follows.

(1) For indices of the form $\alpha = 3n$, we use (c) to find a countable extension $\langle \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha+1}, A_{\alpha+1} \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha}, A_{\alpha} \rangle$ such that every type over a finite set $U \subseteq A_{\alpha}$ that is realised in \mathfrak{B}_{α} is realised in $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha+1}$.

(2) For indices $\alpha = 3n + 1$, we iterate (a) to find a countable extension $\langle \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha+1}, A_{\alpha+1} \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha}, A_{\alpha} \rangle$ such that, for all tuples $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in A_{\alpha}^{<\omega}$ with $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b})$ and every element $c \in A_{\alpha}$, there is an element $d \in A_{\alpha+1}$ such that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}c) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}d)$.

(3) For $\alpha = 3n + 2$, we use (b), amalgamation, and the Theorem of Löwenheim and Skolem to find an extension $\langle \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha+1}, A_{\alpha+1} \rangle \ge \langle \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha}, A_{\alpha} \rangle$ such that, for all tuples $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in B_{\alpha}^{<\omega}$ with $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b})$ and every element $c \in B_{\alpha}$, there is an element $d \in B_{\alpha+1}$ such that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}c) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}d)$.

The limit $\langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle := \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega} \langle \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha}, A_{\alpha} \rangle$ is a countable elementary extension of $\langle \mathfrak{B}_{0}, A_{0} \rangle$. Furthermore, by (1), the structures $\mathfrak{A} := \mathfrak{B}|_{A}$ and \mathfrak{B} realise the same types in $S^{<\omega}(T)$. Finally, (2) and (3) ensure that \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} are homogeneous.

Proposition 5.5. Let T be a countable complete first-order theory. If there is a Vaughtian pair for T, then there is a Vaughtian pair for T of size $\langle \aleph_0, \aleph_1 \rangle$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.3 and Proposition 5.4, we can find a Vaughtian pair $\mathfrak{A} < \mathfrak{B}$ for *T* of size $\langle \aleph_0, \aleph_0 \rangle$ such that \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} are homogeneous and realise the same types. By Theorem E1.1.9, this implies that $\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B}$. Let φ be a formula over *A* such that $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is infinite and $\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$.

We construct an elementary chain $(\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \aleph_1}$ of models of *T* such that, for every $\alpha < \aleph_1$, we have

$$\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{A}} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha+1}, M_{\alpha} \rangle \cong \langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle.$$

Note that, in particular, every \mathfrak{M}_{α} is isomorphic to \mathfrak{A} .

We start with $\mathfrak{M}_{0} := \mathfrak{B}$. For the successor step, suppose that we have already defined $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha} \cong \mathfrak{A}$. We choose an elementary extension $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha+1} \ge \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}$ such that $\langle \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha+1}, M_{\alpha} \rangle \cong \langle \mathfrak{B}, A \rangle$. Then $\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha+1}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$.

For limit ordinals δ , we set $\mathfrak{M}_{\delta} := \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}$. Then $\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}_{\delta}} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} \varphi^{\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$. To show that $\mathfrak{M}_{\delta} \cong \mathfrak{A}$ it is sufficient to prove that \mathfrak{M}_{δ} is homogeneous and that it realises the same types as \mathfrak{A} . For homogeneity, suppose that $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in M_{\delta}^{<\omega}$ and $c \in M_{\delta}$ are elements such that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b})$. Then there is some $\alpha < \delta$ such that $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, c \subseteq M_{\alpha}$. As $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha} \cong \mathfrak{A}$ is homogeneous, there is some $d \in M_{\alpha} \subseteq M_{\delta}$ such that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}c) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}d)$.

Clearly, every type realised in \mathfrak{A} is realised in $\mathfrak{M}_{\delta} \geq \mathfrak{A}$. Conversely, let $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(T)$ be realised in \mathfrak{M}_{δ} . Then there is some $\bar{a} \in M_{\delta}^{<\omega}$ with $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}) = \mathfrak{p}$. Let $\alpha < \delta$ be an index such that $\bar{a} \subseteq M_{\alpha}$. Then \mathfrak{p} is realised in $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha} \cong \mathfrak{A}$.

Having defined $(\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha})_{\alpha}$ we set $\mathfrak{N} := \bigcup_{\alpha < \aleph_1} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}$. Then $|N| = \aleph_1$ and $\varphi^{\mathfrak{N}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$. Hence, $\mathfrak{A} < \mathfrak{N}$ is the desired Vaughtian pair of size $\langle \aleph_0, \aleph_1 \rangle$. \Box

Lemma 5.6. Let T be a complete \aleph_0 -stable theory over a countable signature. Every uncountable model \mathfrak{M} of T has a proper elementary extension $\mathfrak{N} > \mathfrak{M}$ such that every countable type \mathfrak{p} realised in \mathfrak{N} is already realised in \mathfrak{M} .

F1. Geometries

Proof. By Lemma 4.8 there exists a formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over M such that $|\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}}| \geq \aleph_1$ and we have either

$$|(\varphi \wedge \psi)^{\mathfrak{M}}| \leq \aleph_{o} \quad \text{or} \quad |(\varphi \wedge \neg \psi)^{\mathfrak{M}}| \leq \aleph_{o},$$

for every formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ over *M*. Let \bar{s} be the sorts of the variables \bar{x} and set

$$\mathfrak{p} := \left\{ \psi(\bar{x}) \in \mathrm{FO}^{\bar{s}}[\Sigma_M] \mid (\varphi \land \psi)^{\mathfrak{M}} \text{ is uncountable} \right\}.$$

Note that, for $\psi_0, \ldots, \psi_{n-1} \in \mathfrak{p}$, we have

$$\left|\left(\varphi \wedge \bigvee_{i < n} \neg \psi_i\right)^{\mathfrak{M}}\right| = \left|\left(\varphi \wedge \neg \psi_{\circ}\right)^{\mathfrak{M}} \cup \cdots \cup \left(\varphi \wedge \neg \psi_{n-1}\right)^{\mathfrak{M}}\right| \leq \aleph_{\circ},$$

which implies that $\bigwedge_{i < n} \psi_i \in \mathfrak{p}$. Hence, $(\bigwedge_i \psi_i)^{\mathfrak{M}} \neq \emptyset$ and \mathfrak{p} is finitely satisfiable. Furthermore, by choice of φ , we have $\psi \in \mathfrak{p}$ or $\neg \psi \in \mathfrak{p}$, for every formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ over M. Therefore, \mathfrak{p} is a complete type.

Let $\mathfrak{M}_+ \geq \mathfrak{M}$ be an elementary extension containing a finite tuple $\overline{a} \in M_+^{\overline{s}}$ realising \mathfrak{p} . By Theorem E3.4.14, there exists a model $\mathfrak{M} \leq \mathfrak{N} \leq \mathfrak{M}_+$ that is atomic over $M \cup \overline{a}$.

To show that \mathfrak{N} has the desired property, we consider a countable type $\Phi(\bar{y})$ over M that is realised by some finite tuple $\bar{b} \in N^{<\omega}$. Since \mathfrak{N} is atomic over $M \cup \bar{a}$, there exists a formula $\chi(\bar{y}, \bar{a})$ over M isolating $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/M)$. Then $\mathfrak{N} \models \chi(\bar{b}, \bar{a})$ implies

$$\exists \bar{y} \chi(\bar{y}, \bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{p}$$

and $\forall \bar{y} [\chi(\bar{y}, \bar{x}) \to \vartheta(\bar{y})] \in \mathfrak{p}$, for all $\vartheta(\bar{y}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/M) \supseteq \Phi$.

Hence, the set

$$\Gamma \coloneqq \{\exists \bar{y}\chi(\bar{y},\bar{x})\} \cup \{\forall \bar{y}[\chi(\bar{y},\bar{x}) \to \vartheta(\bar{y})] \mid \vartheta(\bar{x}) \in \Phi\}$$

is a countable subset of $\mathfrak{p}.$ Furthermore, if a tuple $\bar{a}' \in M^{\bar{s}}$ realises \varGamma then we have

$$\mathfrak{M} \vDash \exists \bar{y} \chi(\bar{y}, \bar{a}')$$

and every $\bar{b}' \subseteq M$ with $\mathfrak{M} \models \chi(\bar{b}', \bar{a}')$ realises Φ . Let ψ_0, ψ_1, \ldots be an enumeration of Γ . By choice of \mathfrak{p} , we have

$$|\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}}| > \aleph_{o} \text{ and } |(\varphi \wedge \neg (\psi_{o} \wedge \cdots \wedge \psi_{n}))^{\mathfrak{M}}| \leq \aleph_{o}, \text{ for all } n.$$

It follows that $(\varphi \land \neg \land \Gamma)^{\mathfrak{M}} = \bigcup_{n < \omega} (\varphi \land \neg \land_{i < n} \psi_i)^{\mathfrak{M}}$ is countable and

$$(\varphi \land \bigwedge \Gamma)^{\mathfrak{M}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{M}} \smallsetminus (\varphi \land \neg \bigwedge \Gamma)^{\mathfrak{M}}$$

is uncountable. Hence, there are uncountably many $\bar{a}' \in M^{\bar{s}}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{M}\vDash\varphi(\bar{a}')\wedge\bigwedge\Gamma(\bar{a}').$$

As we have seen above, this implies that \mathfrak{M} contains a realisation of Φ .

Proposition 5.7. Let T be an \aleph_0 -stable, countable, complete first-order theory. If there is a Vaughtian pair for T, then there are Vaughtian pairs for T of size (\aleph_0, κ) , for every uncountable cardinal κ .

Proof. By Proposition 5.5, there is a Vaughtian pair $\mathfrak{A} < \mathfrak{B}$ for *T* of size $\langle \aleph_0, \aleph_1 \rangle$. Let φ be a formula over *A* such that $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is infinite and $\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$. Starting with $\mathfrak{M}_0 := \mathfrak{B}$, we construct a strictly increasing elementary chain $(\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$ such that $\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$, for all α .

As usual, we take unions $\mathfrak{M}_{\delta} := \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}$ for limit ordinals δ . For the successor step, suppose that \mathfrak{M}_{α} has already been defined. We apply Lemma 5.6 to find a proper elementary extension $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha+1} > \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}$ that realises the same countable types as \mathfrak{M}_{α} . In particular, $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha+1}$ does not realise the type

$$\{\varphi(x)\}\cup\{x\neq c\mid c\in\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}}\}.$$

Therefore, $\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha+1}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Let $\mathfrak{N} := \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha}$ be the union of the chain and choose an elementary substructure $\mathfrak{A} < \mathfrak{C} \leq \mathfrak{N}$ of size $|C| = \kappa$. Then $\mathfrak{A} < \mathfrak{C}$ is the desired Vaughtian pair of size $\langle \aleph_{0}, \kappa \rangle$.

F1. Geometries

We can use this proposition to show that uncountably categorical theories do not have Vaughtian pairs.

Lemma 5.8. Let T be a countable complete first-order theory with infinite models. If T is κ -categorical, for some uncountable cardinal κ , then T has no Vaughtian pairs.

Proof. For a contradiction, suppose that *T* is a κ -categorical theory with a Vaughtian pair. By Theorem E6.3.16, *T* is \aleph_0 -stable. Hence, we can use Proposition 5.7 to find a Vaughtian pair $\mathfrak{A} < \mathfrak{B}$ of size $\langle \aleph_0, \kappa \rangle$. Let φ be a formula such that $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is infinite and $\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$. By Theorem E1.2.16, *T* has a saturated model \mathfrak{C} of size κ . But $\mathfrak{B} \not\cong \mathfrak{C}$ since we have $|\varphi^{\mathfrak{C}}| = \kappa$ by Lemma E1.2.17. This contradicts κ -categoricity.

Next we study minimal formulae in theories without Vaughtian pairs. First, we show that such a theory is graduated which, according to Theorem D1.2.15, is equivalent to admitting elimination of the quantifier \exists^{\aleph_0} .

Lemma 5.9. Suppose that T is a theory without Vaughtian pairs. Let \mathfrak{M} be a model of T and $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ a formula over M. There exists a number $n < \omega$, such that, for all $\bar{c} \subseteq M$,

$$\left|\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})^{\mathfrak{M}}\right| > n \quad implies \quad \left|\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})^{\mathfrak{M}}\right| \geq \aleph_{o}.$$

Proof. Suppose that such a number *n* does not exist. Then we can find, for every $n < \omega$, parameters $\bar{c}_n \subseteq M$ with

 $n < \left|\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n)\right| < \aleph_{\rm o} .$

Let *P* be a new unary predicate and let $\Phi(\bar{y})$ be the set of formulae containing the following statements:

- *P* induces a proper elementary substructure;
- $\bigwedge_i Py_i;$
- there are infinitely many tuples \bar{x} such that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$;
- $\forall \bar{x}[\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{y}) \rightarrow \bigwedge_i Px_i].$

To see that $T \cup \Phi(\bar{y})$ is satisfiable, we fix an extension $\mathfrak{N} > \mathfrak{M}$. Since $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n)^{\mathfrak{M}}$ is finite, we have $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n)^{\mathfrak{N}} = \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n)^{\mathfrak{M}}$. For every finite subset $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$, we can therefore choose *n* large enough such that

$$\langle \mathfrak{N}, M \rangle \vDash T \cup \Phi_{o}(\bar{c}_{n}).$$

Let $\langle \mathfrak{B}, A, \bar{c} \rangle$ be a model of $T \cup \Phi$. Then $\mathfrak{A} := \mathfrak{B}|_A < \mathfrak{B}$ are models of Tand $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathfrak{A}} = \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathfrak{B}}$ is infinite. Hence, $\mathfrak{A} < \mathfrak{B}$ is a Vaughtian pair. A contradiction.

Corollary 5.10. *In a theory T without Vaughtian pairs, every minimal formula is strongly minimal.*

Proof. Let \mathfrak{M} be a model of T and $\varphi(\bar{x})$ a minimal formula over M. For a contradiction, suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is not strongly minimal. Then we can find an extension $\mathfrak{N} > \mathfrak{M}$ and a formula $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ with parameters $\bar{c} \subseteq N$ such that

$$\varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{N}} \cap \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathfrak{N}}$$
 and $\varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{N}} \setminus \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathfrak{N}}$

are both infinite. By Lemma 5.9 there exists a number $n < \omega$ such that, for all models \mathfrak{A} and all $\bar{a} \subseteq A$,

 $\begin{aligned} & \left|\varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{A}} \cap \psi(\bar{x};\bar{a})^{\mathfrak{A}}\right| > n \quad \text{implies} \quad \left|\varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{A}} \cap \psi(\bar{x};\bar{a})^{\mathfrak{A}}\right| \ge \aleph_{o}, \\ \text{and} \quad \left|\varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{A}} \smallsetminus \psi(\bar{x};\bar{a})^{\mathfrak{A}}\right| > n \quad \text{implies} \quad \left|\varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{A}} \smallsetminus \psi(\bar{x};\bar{a})^{\mathfrak{A}}\right| \ge \aleph_{o}. \end{aligned}$

By minimality of φ , it follows that

$$\mathfrak{M} \vDash \forall \bar{y} \Big[\big| \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{M}} \cap \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})^{\mathfrak{M}} \big| \le n \lor \big| \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{M}} \lor \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})^{\mathfrak{M}} \big| \le n \Big].$$

Since $\mathfrak{M} \leq \mathfrak{N}$, the same formula also holds in \mathfrak{N} . A contradiction.

Corollary 5.11. Let T be a countable, complete, \aleph_0 -stable theory without Vaughtian pairs and let \mathfrak{M}_0 be the prime model of T. There exists a strongly minimal formula $\varphi(x)$ over M_0 .

Proof. We use Corollary 4.9 to find a minimal formula $\varphi(x)$ over M_0 . By Corollary 5.10, this formula is strongly minimal. **Lemma 5.12.** Let *T* be a theory without Vaughtian pairs, \mathfrak{B} a model of *T*, and let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ be a strongly minimal formula with parameters $\bar{c} \subseteq B$.

- (a) If $\mathfrak{A} \prec \mathfrak{B}$ is a proper elementary substructure with $\overline{c} \subseteq A$, then $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}} \subset \varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}$.
- (b) dim $(\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}) = |B|$.
- (c) If T is \aleph_0 -stable then \mathfrak{B} is prime over $\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}} \cup \overline{c}$.

Proof. (a) $\mathfrak{A} \prec \mathfrak{B}$ implies $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq \varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}$. Furthermore, if $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}$, then $\mathfrak{A} \prec \mathfrak{B}$ would be a Vaughtian pair.

(b) Let *I* be a basis of $\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}$. If |I| < |B| then we can use the Theorem of Löwenheim and Skolem to find an elementary substructure $\mathfrak{A} < \mathfrak{B}$ of size |A| = |I| with $I \cup \overline{c} \subseteq A$. It follows that $\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}} \subseteq \operatorname{acl}(I) \subseteq A$. Hence, $\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}} = \varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ in contradiction to (a).

(c) Since *T* is \aleph_0 -stable there exists, according to Theorem E3.4.14 a unique prime model \mathfrak{M} over $\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}} \cup \overline{c}$. W.l.o.g. we may assume that $\mathfrak{M} \leq \mathfrak{B}$. Since $\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}} \cup \overline{c} \subseteq M \subseteq B$ it follows by (a) that M = B, as desired.

Lemma 5.13. Let T be a countable, complete first-order theory with infinite models. Suppose that there exists a strongly minimal formula $\varphi(x; \bar{c})$ such that

- $tp(\bar{c})$ is isolated,
- every model \mathfrak{M} of $T(\bar{c})$ is prime over $\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}} \cup \bar{c}$,
- no model \mathfrak{M} of $T(\overline{c})$ has a proper elementary substructure $\mathfrak{A} < \mathfrak{M}$ such that $\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}} \subseteq A$.

Then

$$\dim(\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}/\bar{c}) = \dim(\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}/\bar{c}) \quad implies \quad \mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B},$$

for all models $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$ of $T(\overline{c})$.

Proof. Set $S := \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $S' := \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathfrak{B}}$. Since dim $(S) = \dim(S')$ we can use Corollary 4.11 to find an elementary bijection $h_{\circ} : S \to S'$. As \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} are models of $T(\bar{c})$, we can extend h_{\circ} to an elementary map

 $h_1: S \cup \overline{c} \to S' \cup \overline{c}$. Because \mathfrak{A} is prime over $S \cup \overline{c}$, we can extend this map h_1 to an elementary map $h: \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$. We claim that h is surjective and, therefore, the desired isomorphism.

For a contradiction, suppose otherwise. Then we obtain a proper elementary substructure $\mathfrak{B}_{o} := f[\mathfrak{A}] < \mathfrak{B}$ with $S' \cup \overline{c} = \operatorname{rng} h_{1} \subseteq B_{o}$. But \mathfrak{B} is prime over $S' \cup \overline{c}$. A contradiction.

Theorem 5.14 (Morley). *Let T be a countable, complete first-order theory with infinite models. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *T* is κ -categorical, for some uncountable cardinal κ .
- (2) *T* is κ -categorical, for every uncountable cardinal κ .
- (3) *T* is \aleph_0 -stable and it has no Vaughtian pairs.
- (4) There exists a strongly minimal formula $\varphi(x; \bar{c})$ such that
 - $tp(\bar{c})$ is isolated,
 - every model \mathfrak{M} of $T(\overline{c})$ is prime over $\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}} \cup \overline{c}$,
 - no model \mathfrak{M} of $T(\overline{c})$ has a proper elementary substructure $\mathfrak{A} \prec \mathfrak{M}$ such that $\varphi^{\mathfrak{M}} \subseteq A$.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (1) is trivial.

 $(1) \Rightarrow (3)$ follows by Theorem E6.3.16 and Lemma 5.8.

 $(3) \Rightarrow (4)$ Let *T* be an \aleph_0 -stable theory without Vaughtian pairs. By Theorem E3.4.14, *T* has a prime model \mathfrak{M}_0 . We can use Corollary 5.11 to find a strongly minimal formula $\varphi(x; \bar{c})$ with parameters $\bar{c} \subseteq M_0$. Since prime models are atomic, the type of $\bar{c} \subseteq M_0$ is isolated. The remaining two claims of (4) follow by Lemma 5.12 (a) and (c), respectively.

(4) \Rightarrow (2) Let κ be an uncountable cardinal. To show that T is κ categorical, we consider two models \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} of size κ . Since tp(\bar{c}) is
isolated there are tuples $\bar{a} \subseteq A$ and $\bar{b} \subseteq B$ realising tp(\bar{c}). Thus, $\langle \mathfrak{A}, \bar{a} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathfrak{B}, \bar{b} \rangle$ are models of $T(\bar{c})$. Set $S \coloneqq \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a})^{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $S' \coloneqq \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})^{\mathfrak{B}}$.

Since \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} have no proper elementary substructures containing, respectively, $S \cup \overline{a}$ and $S' \cup \overline{b}$, it follows by the Theorem of Löwenheim

F1. Geometries

and Skolem that

 $\dim(S) = |A| = |B| = \dim(S').$

Consequently, we can use Lemma 5.13 to show that $\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B}$.

F2. Ranks and forking

1. Morley rank and Δ *-rank*

We have seen that each model of an uncountably categorical theory is governed by a strongly minimal set and that we can define a geometry on such a set. Unfortunately, for most theories we cannot find actual geometries. But there is a large class of theories where we have something slightly weaker. In this chapter we study the kind of combinatorial structure that will serve as our substitute for a geometry.

We start by defining certain ranks that provide a weak notion of dimension. Guided by the observation that, for a strongly-minimal formula φ over a model \mathfrak{M} , the Cantor-Bendixson rank of the set $\langle \varphi \rangle$ in $\mathfrak{S}^{\overline{s}}(M)$ is equal to 1, we take a look at the Cantor-Bendixson rank of type spaces. Let us first describe how to compute the Cantor-Bendixson rank in $\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(U)$ by using the equality of Cantor-Bendixson rank and partition rank.

Lemma 1.1. Let Δ be a set of formulae, U a set of parameters, and let Δ_U^+ be the set of all finite boolean combinations of formulae of the form $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ with $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \Delta$ and $\bar{c} \subseteq U$.

For an arbitrary formula φ *over U and an ordinal* α > 0*, we have*

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(U)}) \geq \alpha$$

if, and only if, for all ordinals $\beta < \alpha$ *, there are formulae* $\psi_i \in \Delta_U^+$ *, for i* $< \omega$ *, such that*

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi \wedge \psi_i \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(U)}) \geq \beta, \quad \text{for every } i,$$

and $\psi_i^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \psi_k^{\mathbb{M}} = \emptyset, \quad \text{for all } i \neq k.$

LOGIC, ALGEBRA & GEOMETRY 2024-04-09 — ©ACHIM BLUMENSATH

Proof. Note that, by definition of $\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(U)$ and Lemma c3.3.5,

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(U) = \mathfrak{S}_{\Delta_{U}^{-}}(\operatorname{FO}[\Sigma_{U}, X]/T(U))$$

$$\cong \mathfrak{S}_{\Delta_{U}^{+}}(\operatorname{FO}[\Sigma_{U}, X]/T(U)) = \mathfrak{S}_{\Delta^{+}}(U),$$

where Δ^+ is the set of all finite boolean combinations of formulae in Δ . Therefore, we may w.l.o.g. work in $\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta^+}(U)$. Set $C := \langle \varphi \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta^+}(U)}$ and let \mathfrak{S}_C be the subspace of $\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta^+}(U)$ induced by *C*. According to Corollary B5.7.10, we have

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta^+}(U)}) = \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{P}}(C/\operatorname{clop}(\mathfrak{S}_C)).$$

Furthermore,

 $\operatorname{rk}_{\mathbb{P}}(C/\operatorname{clop}(\mathfrak{S}_{C})) \geq \alpha$

if, and only if, for all $\beta < \alpha$, there are clopen sets $D_i \in \text{clop}(\mathfrak{S}_C)$, for $i < \omega$, such that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{P}}(D_i/\operatorname{clop}(\mathfrak{S}_C)) \geq \beta$$
 and $D_i \cap D_k = \emptyset$, for $i \neq k$.

Hence, it is sufficient to show that this latter condition is equivalent to the existence of formulae $\psi_i \in \Delta_U^+$, for $i < \omega$, such that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi \land \psi_i \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(U)}) \ge \beta, \quad \text{for every } i,$$

and $\psi_i^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \psi_k^{\mathbb{M}} = \emptyset, \quad \text{for all } i \neq k.$

(\Leftarrow) Given formulae ψ_i , we set $D_i := \langle \varphi \land \psi_i \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta^+}(U)}$. By Corollaries B5.7.10 and B5.7.13, it follows that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi \wedge \psi_i \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta^+}(U)}) = \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{P}}(D_i/\operatorname{clop}(D_i))$$

= $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{P}}(D_i/\operatorname{clop}(\mathfrak{S}_C)) \ge \beta$,

as desired.

 (\Rightarrow) By Lemma B5.7.11, the clopen sets D_i are of the form

$$D_i = C \cap \langle \psi'_i \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta^+}(U)} = \langle \varphi \land \psi'_i \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta^+}(U)},$$

for formulae $\psi'_i \in \Delta^+_U$. Setting

$$\psi_i \coloneqq \psi'_i \land \bigwedge_{k < i} \neg \psi'_k$$

we obtain formulae $\psi_i \in \Delta_U^+$ such that

$$\psi_i^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \psi_k^{\mathbb{M}} = \varnothing$$
, for $i \neq k$.

Furthermore, $D_i \cap D_k = \emptyset$, for k < i, implies that

$$D_i = D_i \setminus (D_0 \cup \cdots \cup D_{i-1}) = \langle \varphi \land \psi_i \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta^+}(U)}.$$

The claim follows since, by Corollaries B5.7.10 and B5.7.13,

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi \land \psi_i \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta^+}(U)}) = \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{P}}(D_i/\operatorname{clop}(D_i))$$

= $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{P}}(D_i/\operatorname{clop}(\mathfrak{S}_C)) \ge \beta$.

When using the Cantor-Bendixson rank to define the dimension of a definable relation, we have first to choose a set Δ of formulae and a set U of parameters to know which type space $\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(U)$ to consider. Let us take a look at what happens to the Cantor-Bendixson rank when we change these two sets. First of all, the dependence is monotone: if we enlarge the set of formulae or the set of parameters, the rank either increases, or it stays the same.

Lemma 1.2. Let Δ , Γ be sets of formulae, U, V sets of parameters, and Φ a set of formulae over U. Then

$$\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{CB}}(\langle \Phi \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(U)}) \leq \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{CB}}(\langle \Phi \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta \cup \Gamma}(U \cup V)}).$$

Proof. Let $\Delta_{\overline{U}}$ be the sets of all formulae of the form $\psi(\overline{x}; \overline{c})$ or $\neg \psi(\overline{x}; \overline{c})$ with $\psi \in \Delta$ and $\overline{c} \subseteq U$, and let $\Delta \Gamma_{UV}^{\neg}$ be the corresponding set of formulae for $\Delta \cup \Gamma$ and $U \cup V$. The statement follows from Lemma B5.7.14 since

$$\mathfrak{S}(i)^{-1}[\langle\Phi\rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(U)}] = \langle\Phi\rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta\cup\Gamma}(U\cup V)}$$

where $i : \Delta_U^{\neg} \to \Delta \Gamma_{UV}^{\neg}$ is the inclusion map.

1071

If the set of parameters is an \aleph_0 -saturated model, the Cantor-Bendixson rank does not change anymore.

Lemma 1.3. Let Δ be a set of formulae and $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ a single formula. If \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} are \aleph_0 -saturated structures with $\langle \mathfrak{A}, \bar{a} \rangle \equiv \langle \mathfrak{B}, \bar{b} \rangle$, then

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{a})\rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(A)}) = \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b})\rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(B)}).$$

Proof. By symmetry it is sufficient to prove that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{a})\rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(A)}) \geq \alpha$$

implies

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(B)}) \geq \alpha$$
.

We proceed by induction on α . For $\alpha = 0$ there is nothing to do. Since the limit step follows immediately from the inductive hypothesis, we may therefore assume that $\alpha = \beta + 1$. If

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}) \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(A)}) \geq \beta + 1,$$

we can use Lemma 1.1 to find formulae $\psi_n(\bar{x}; \bar{c}^n) \in \Delta_A^+$, for $n < \omega$, with $\bar{c}^n \subseteq A$ such that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{a}) \land \psi_n(\bar{x};\bar{c}^n) \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(A)}) \ge \beta,$$

and $\mathfrak{A} \models \neg[\psi_m(\bar{x};\bar{c}^m) \land \psi_n(\bar{x};\bar{c}^n)], \text{ for } m \neq n.$

Since $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq_{FO}^{\aleph_0} \mathfrak{B}$, we can inductively find tuples $\overline{d}^n \subseteq B$, for $n < \omega$, such that

$$\langle \mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}\bar{c}^{\circ}\ldots\bar{c}^{n}\rangle \equiv \langle \mathfrak{B}, \bar{b}\bar{d}^{\circ}\ldots\bar{d}^{n}\rangle, \text{ for all } n < \omega.$$

This implies that

$$\mathfrak{B} \vDash \neg [\psi_m(\bar{x}; \bar{d}^m) \land \psi_n(\bar{x}; \bar{d}^n)], \quad \text{for } m \neq n.$$

By inductive hypothesis, we furthermore have

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \land \psi_n(\bar{x}; \bar{d}^n) \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(B)}) \geq \beta$$
, for all n .

Consequently, Lemma 1.1 implies that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi(\tilde{x}; \tilde{b}) \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(B)}) \geq \beta + 1.$$

It follows that there is a limit of the Cantor-Bendixson rank for increasing sets of parameters. This limit is called the Δ -rank of the theory.

Definition 1.4. (a) Let Δ be a set of formulae and $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ an FO-formula with parameters $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. The Δ -rank of φ is

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})) \coloneqq \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c}) \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(M)}),$$

where $\mathfrak{M} \leq \mathbb{M}$ is an arbitrary \aleph_{o} -saturated model with $\overline{c} \subseteq M$.

(b) Let \bar{s} be a tuple of sorts and let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ be an FO-formula with parameters $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. The *Morley rank* of φ is

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{s}(\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{c})) \coloneqq \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{c})),$$

where Δ is the set of all first-order formulae $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ where the variables \bar{x} have sorts \bar{s} .

(c) For a set of formulae $\Phi(\bar{x})$ (possibly with parameters) we define

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\Phi) &\coloneqq \min \left\{ \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi) \mid \Phi \vDash \varphi \right\}, \\ \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\Phi) &\coloneqq \min \left\{ \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\varphi) \mid \Phi \vDash \varphi \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}}$ and $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, we set

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U) \coloneqq \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)), \\ \operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U) \coloneqq \operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)).$$

Remark. (a) Note that, by Lemmas 1.2 and 1.3, the definitions of $rk_{\Delta}(\varphi)$ and $rk_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi)$ do not depend on the choice of \mathfrak{M} . According to Theorem c3.4.5 (b), they also do not depend on what we consider the free variables of the formula φ . But note that, by Lemma 1.2, we have $rk_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi) \leq$

 $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{t}(\varphi)$, for $\overline{s} \subseteq \overline{t}$. This inequality can be strict. An example is given by the formula x = x with respect to the theory of infinite structures with empty signature. Then $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\overline{s}}(x = x) = |\overline{s}|$.

(b) If \mathfrak{p} is a complete type over an \aleph_0 -saturated model \mathfrak{M} , it follows by Theorem B5.7.8 and Corollary B5.7.9 that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\mathfrak{p}) = \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(M)).$$

Example. Consider the theory *T* of structures of the form (A, \sim) , where \sim is an equivalence relation on *A* with infinitely many classes, all of which are infinite. For $a \in \mathbb{M}$ and a model $\mathfrak{M} \prec \mathbb{M}$, we have

$$\operatorname{rk}_{M}(a/M) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a \in M, \\ 1 & \text{if } a \notin M \text{ and } a \sim b \text{ for some } b \in M, \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Exercise 1.1. Show that $rk_M^{\tilde{s}}(\varphi) = 1$, for every strongly minimal formula $\varphi(\tilde{x})$.

Exercise 1.2. Let *T* be the theory of structures of the form $\langle A, \sim \rangle$, where \sim is an equivalence relation on *A* with infinitely many classes, all of which are infinite. Determine the possible values of $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(ab/M)$, for two elements $a, b \in \mathbb{M}$ and a model $\mathfrak{M} \prec \mathbb{M}$.

Let us collect some basic properties of the Δ -rank of a formula.

Lemma 1.5. *Let T be a theory and* φ *,* ψ *formulae.*

- (a) $T \cup {\varphi} \vDash \psi$ implies $\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi) \le \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\psi)$.
- (b) $\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi \lor \psi) = \max \{\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi), \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\psi)\}.$
- (c) If Δ contains the formula x = y, then $\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi) = 0$ if, and only if, φ is algebraic and consistent with T.

Proof. (a) follows from Lemma B2.5.10, (b) from Lemma B2.5.11, and (c) follows immediately from the definition. \Box

Exercise 1.3. Show that $\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi \wedge \psi) \leq \min \{\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi), \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\psi)\}$, and that this inequality may be strict.

Lemma 1.6. Let $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be tuples and $U, V \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ sets of parameters.

(a)
$$\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta \cup \Gamma}(\bar{a}/U).$$

(b) $\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U) \ge \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U \cup V).$

(c) There exists a finite subset $U_{o} \subseteq U$ with $\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U_{o})$.

Proof. (a) follows immediately from Lemma 1.2.

(b) By definition of the Δ -rank of a type, we have

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U) = \min \{ \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi) \mid \varphi \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U) \}$$

$$\geq \min \{ \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi) \mid \varphi \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U \cup V) \}$$

$$= \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U \cup V) .$$

(c) Fix a formula $\varphi \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}/U)$ such that $\text{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi) = \text{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U)$. Let $U_{\circ} \subseteq U$ be the finite set of parameters from φ . Then $\varphi \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}/U_{\circ})$ implies

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U_{o}) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi) = \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U_{o}),$$

where the last inequality holds by (b).

For theories where it is defined, the Morley rank is usually better behaved than the Δ -rank. Let us collect some of its properties, in particular with respect to strongly minimal sets. First of all note that, using the equivalence of the Morley rank of a formula and its partition rank, we can define a notion of degree.

Definition 1.7. The *Morley degree* $\deg_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi)$ of a formula φ is the maximal number $m < \omega$ such that there are formulae $\psi_0, \ldots, \psi_{m-1}$ of rank $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\psi_i) = \operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi)$ such that $\psi_i^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \psi_k^{\mathbb{M}} = \emptyset$, for $i \neq k$. If such a number m does not exist, we set $\deg_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi) := \infty$.

Remark. It follows by Lemma B2.5.16 that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{s}(\varphi) < \infty$$
 implies $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathrm{M}}^{s}(\varphi) < \infty$.

Exercise 1.4. Show that a formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is strongly minimal if, and only if, $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi) = 1$ and $\operatorname{deg}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi) = 1$.

For types there is a related notion of degree: the number of *free* extensions.

Definition 1.8. Let $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$ be (partial) types with free variables of sort \bar{s} . We say that \mathfrak{q} is a *Morley-free extension* of \mathfrak{p} if $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\mathfrak{p})$.

Lemma 1.9. Let \mathfrak{p} be a (partial) type over U and suppose that $U \subseteq V$.

- (a) \mathfrak{p} has a Morley-free extension $\mathfrak{q} \in S^{\overline{s}}(V)$.
- (b) If rk^s_M(p) < ∞, then p has only finitely many Morley-free extensions in S^s(V).

Proof. Choose an \aleph_0 -saturated model \mathfrak{M} containing V.

(a) First suppose that $\alpha := \operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\overline{s}}(\mathfrak{p}) < \infty$. According to Lemma B5.5.15, the closed set $\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}^{\overline{s}}(M)}$ contains some type \mathfrak{r} with

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{S}^{\mathfrak{s}}(M)) = \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}^{\mathfrak{s}}(M)}) = \alpha$$

Set $\mathfrak{q} := \mathfrak{r}|_V$. Then $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{r}$ implies

$$\alpha = \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\mathfrak{p}) \geq \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\mathfrak{q}) \geq \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\mathfrak{r}) = \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{CB}}(\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{S}^{\tilde{s}}(M)) = \alpha.$$

Consequently, q is the desired extension of p.

It remains to consider the case where $rk_M^s(\mathfrak{p}) = \infty$. Then

 $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}^{\overline{s}}(M)}) = \infty$

implies that there is some $\mathfrak{r} \in \langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}^{\tilde{s}}(M)}$ with $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{S}^{\tilde{s}}(M)) = \infty$. As above, it follows that $\mathfrak{q} := \mathfrak{r}|_{V}$ is the desired Morley-free extension of \mathfrak{p} over *V*.

(b) Let $\alpha := \operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\overline{s}}(\mathfrak{p})$. By (a), every type $\mathfrak{q} \in \langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}^{\overline{s}}(V)}$ of rank α has an extension $\mathfrak{r} \in \langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}^{\overline{s}}(M)}$ of the same rank. These extensions are obviously distinct, for different types \mathfrak{q} . The claim follows since, according to Lemma B5.5.15, the set $\langle \mathfrak{p} \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}^{\overline{s}}(M)}$ contains only finitely many types \mathfrak{r} with $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(\mathfrak{r}/\mathfrak{S}^{\overline{s}}(M)) = \alpha$.

Corollary 1.10. For every formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over a set U, there exists some $\bar{a} \in \varphi^{\mathbb{M}}$ with $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi)$, where \bar{s} are the sorts of \bar{x} .

Proof. By Lemma 1.9, there exists a type $q \in S^{\bar{s}}(U)$ with $\{\varphi\} \subseteq q$ and $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(q) = \operatorname{rk}_{M}(\varphi)$. Every tuple \bar{a} realising q has the desired properties.

The following lemmas show that the notion of Morley rank generalises the dimension of a strongly minimal set. We start by showing that the Morley rank increases with the length of a tuple and that elements in the algebraic closure do not increase the rank.

Lemma 1.11. Let T be a first-order theory and let $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be a formula with free variables \bar{x} and \bar{y} of sorts \bar{s} and \bar{t} , respectively. Then

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\exists \bar{y}\varphi) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi).$$

Proof. We prove by induction on α that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\exists \bar{y}\varphi) \ge \alpha \quad \text{implies} \quad \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi) \ge \alpha \,.$$

For $\alpha = 0$, it is sufficient to note that the consistency of $\exists \bar{y}\varphi$ implies the one of φ . Hence, suppose that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\exists \bar{y}\varphi) \geq \alpha$, for some $\alpha > 0$, and let $\beta < \alpha$. By Lemma 1.1, there are formulae $\psi_k(\bar{x})$, for $k < \omega$, such that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\exists \bar{y}\varphi \wedge \psi_k) \ge \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_i^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \psi_k^{\mathbb{M}} = \varnothing, \quad \text{for all } i \neq k.$$

Note that, if $T \models \neg \exists \bar{y}$ true, then $\exists \bar{y}\varphi$ is inconsistent with *T*. Hence, $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\exists \bar{y}\varphi) = -1 \leq \operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi)$ and we are done. Consequently, we may assume that $T \models \exists \bar{y}$ true. We therefore have

$$\exists \bar{y}\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \land \psi_k(\bar{x}) \equiv \exists \bar{y}[\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \land \psi_k(\bar{x})] \mod T.$$

It follows by inductive hypothesis that

$$\beta \leq \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\exists \bar{y}\varphi \wedge \psi_k) = \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\exists \bar{y}(\varphi \wedge \psi_k)) \leq \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi \wedge \psi_k).$$

Since this holds for every β , it follows by Lemma 1.1 that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\overline{s}}(\varphi) \geq \alpha$. \Box

Lemma 1.12. Let $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}}$ and $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{M}^{\bar{t}}$ be finite tuples and $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ a set of parameters.

- (a) $\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}/U) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U).$
- (b) $\operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/\operatorname{acl}(U)) = \operatorname{rk}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U).$
- (c) $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}c/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U)$, for all $c \in \operatorname{acl}(U \cup \bar{a})$.

Proof. (a) Let $\alpha := \operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U)$. By definition, there is a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ over U such that $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ and $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}\bar{t}}(\varphi) = \operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U)$. Then $\exists \bar{y}\varphi \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)$ implies, by Lemma 1.11, that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}/U) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\exists \bar{y}\varphi) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}\bar{t}}(\varphi) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}\bar{t}}(\varphi) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U),$$

as desired.

(b) It follows by Lemma 1.6 that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/\operatorname{acl}(U)) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U)$. For a contradiction, suppose that this inequality is strict. Then there is some formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/\operatorname{acl}(U))$ such that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})) < \operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U)$. Since \bar{c} is algebraic over U, we know by Lemma E3.1.3 that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{c}/U)$ is isolated. Let $\psi(\bar{y})$ be a formula over U isolating this type and set

 $\vartheta(\bar{x}) \coloneqq \exists \bar{y} [\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \land \psi(\bar{y})].$

Then $\vartheta(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)$ implies, by Lemmas 1.5 and 1.11, that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}/U) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\vartheta) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi \wedge \psi) \leq \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi) < \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}/U).$$

A contradiction.

(c) We have just seen in (a) that $\operatorname{rk}_M(\bar{a}c/U) \ge \operatorname{rk}_M(\bar{a}/U)$. For the converse inequality, we prove by induction on α that, for elements $c \in \operatorname{acl}(U \cup \bar{a})$,

 $\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}c/U) \geq \alpha$ implies $\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}/U) \geq \alpha$.

For $\alpha = 0$, note that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U) \ge 0$ since $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)$ is satisfiable. For limit ordinals α , the claim follows immediately by the inductive hypothesis. For the successor step, let

$$\operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}c/U) \geq \alpha + 1$$

and, for a contradiction, suppose that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U) \leq \alpha$. Fix a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)$ over *U* with minimal rank. Since $c \in \operatorname{acl}(\bar{a}/U)$, there is a formula $\chi(\bar{x}, y)$ over *U* such that $\chi(\bar{a}, y)^{\mathbb{M}}$ is a finite set containing *c*. Let $m := |\chi(\bar{a}, y)^{\mathbb{M}}|$ and set

$$\vartheta(\bar{x}, y) \coloneqq \varphi(\bar{x}) \land \chi(\bar{x}, y) \land \neg \exists^{m+1} y \chi(\bar{x}, y) \,.$$

Since $\vartheta \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}c/U)$ we have $\text{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}u}(\vartheta) \ge \text{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}c/U) \ge \alpha + 1$, where *u* is the sort of *c*. By Lemma 1.1, there are formulae ψ_{n} , for $n < \omega$, such that $\text{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}u}(\vartheta \land \psi_{n}) \ge \alpha$ and $\psi_{i}^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \psi_{k}^{\mathbb{M}} = \emptyset$, for $i \neq k$. Set

$$\eta_n := \exists y(\vartheta \land \psi_n) \text{ and } \eta_I := \bigwedge_{i \in I} \eta_i, \text{ for } I \subseteq \omega.$$

First, let us show that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\overline{s}}(\eta_{n}) \geq \alpha$. By Lemma 1.10, there exists a tuple $\overline{b}d \in (\vartheta \wedge \psi_{n})^{\mathbb{M}}$ such that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(\overline{b}d/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\overline{s}u}(\vartheta \wedge \psi_{n})$. Then $d \in \operatorname{acl}(\overline{b})$ and, by inductive hypothesis,

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{b}d/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{su}(\vartheta \wedge \psi_n) \ge \alpha \quad \text{implies} \quad \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{b}/U) \ge \alpha.$$

Since $\eta_n \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/U)$, it follows that $\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\eta_n) \ge \alpha$.

Furthermore, for every set $I \subseteq \omega$ of size |I| > m, the formula η_I is unsatisfiable since $\mathbb{M} \models \eta_I(\bar{b})$ implies that there are elements $d_i \in \mathbb{M}$, for $i \in I$, such that $\mathbb{M} \models \vartheta_i(\bar{b}, d_i)$. But, since $|\vartheta(\bar{b}, y)|^{\mathbb{M}} \le m$ there must be indices i < k in I such that $d_i = d_k$. Hence, $\bar{b}d_i$ satisfies $\psi_i \land \psi_k$, which contradicts our choice of the formulae ψ_n , $n < \omega$.

In particular, $rk_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\eta_{I}) = -1 < \alpha$, for large enough sets *I*. The set

$$F := \left\{ I \subseteq \omega \mid \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\eta_{I}) \ge \alpha \text{ and there is no } J \supset I \text{ with} \\ \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\eta_{J}) \ge \alpha \right\}$$

is infinite, since every $I \in F$ is finite and, for each $n < \omega$, there is some $I \in F$ with $n \in I$. Fix countably many distinct sets $I_0, I_1, \dots \in F$ and set

$$\xi_n := \eta_{I_n} \wedge \bigwedge_{i < n} \neg \eta_{I_i} \, .$$

By definition of *F*, $i \neq k$ implies $I_i \notin I_k$. Therefore, $I_i \cup I_k \notin F$ and

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\eta_{I_{i}} \wedge \eta_{I_{k}}) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\eta_{I_{i} \cup I_{k}}) < \alpha, \quad \text{for } i \neq k.$$

By Lemma 1.5, this implies that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\eta_{I_{i}} \wedge \bigvee_{k < i} \eta_{I_{k}}) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\bigvee_{k < i} (\eta_{I_{i}} \wedge \eta_{I_{k}})) < \alpha.$$

Since $\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\eta_{I_i}) = \alpha$, it therefore follows that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\xi_{i}) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\eta_{I_{i}} \wedge \neg \bigvee_{k < i} \eta_{I_{k}}) \geq \alpha.$$

Note that $\xi_i \models \exists y \vartheta \models \varphi$ implies $\operatorname{rk}_M^{\overline{s}}(\varphi \land \xi_i) \ge \operatorname{rk}_M^{\overline{s}}(\xi_i) \ge \alpha$. As $\xi_i^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \xi_k^{\mathbb{M}} = \emptyset$, for $i \neq k$, it therefore follows by Lemma 1.1 that

$$\alpha < \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{s}(\varphi) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}/U) \leq \alpha$$
.

A contradiction.

Corollary 1.13. Let $\varphi(\bar{x})$ and $\psi(\bar{y})$ be formulae with parameters and let \bar{s} and \bar{t} by the sorts of, respectively, \bar{x} and \bar{y} . If there exists a parameterdefinable surjective function $f : \varphi^{\mathbb{M}} \to \psi^{\mathbb{M}}$ such that $f^{-1}(\bar{b})$ is finite, for every $\bar{b} \in \psi^{\mathbb{M}}$, then

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\varphi) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{t}}(\psi)$$

Proof. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be a set of parameters such that φ and ψ are over U and f is definable over U. By assumption, every $\bar{a} \in \varphi^{\mathbb{M}}$ is algebraic over $U \cup \{f(\bar{a})\}$. Since $f(\bar{a})$ is algebraic over $U \cup \bar{a}$, it follows by Lemma 1.12 that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}f(\bar{a})/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(f(\bar{a})/U).$$

1080

We can use Corollary 1.10 to find tuples $\bar{a} \in \varphi^{\mathbb{M}}$ and $\bar{b} \in \psi^{\mathbb{M}}$ with

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{b}/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{t}}(\psi).$$

Then $\psi \in \operatorname{tp}(f(\bar{a})/U)$ implies

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\overline{t}}(\psi) \ge \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(f(\overline{a})/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\overline{a}/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\overline{s}}(\varphi).$$

Conversely, by surjectivity of f, there is some $\bar{c} \in f^{-1}(\bar{b})$. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\varphi) \ge \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{c}/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{b}/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{t}}(\psi).$$

Finally, we are able to show that, in a strongly minimal set, the Morley rank of a finite tuple coincides with its dimension.

Theorem 1.14. Let $\varphi(x)$ be a strongly minimal formula over U.

 $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U) = \operatorname{dim}_{\operatorname{acl}}(\bar{a}/U)$, for all finite tuples $\bar{a} \subseteq \varphi^{\mathbb{M}}$.

Proof. Let $\bar{a}_0 \subseteq \bar{a}$ be an acl-basis of \bar{a} over U. Then $|\bar{a}_0| = \dim_{acl}(\bar{a}/U)$ and it follows by Lemma 1.12 that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{a}_{\mathrm{o}}/U)$$
.

Hence, it is sufficient to prove that $rk_M(\bar{a}_o/U) = |\bar{a}_o|$. W.l.o.g. we may assume that $\bar{a}_o = \bar{a}$, i.e., \bar{a} is independent over U. We prove the claim by induction on $m := |\bar{a}|$. Let \bar{s} be the sorts of \bar{a} .

First, suppose that m = 1, i.e., $\bar{a} = a_0$ and $\bar{s} = s_0$. As $\operatorname{tp}(a_0/U)$ contains the strongly minimal formula $\varphi(x)$, we have $\operatorname{rk}_M(a_0/U) \leq \operatorname{rk}_M^{s_0}(\varphi) = 1$. Conversely, $a_0 \notin \operatorname{acl}(U)$ implies that $\operatorname{tp}(a_0/U)$ is non-algebraic. Hence, for every formula $\psi(x) \in \operatorname{tp}(a_0/U)$, the set $\psi^{\mathbb{M}}$ is infinite and, therefore, $\operatorname{rk}_M^{s_0}(\psi) \geq 1$.

For the inductive step, suppose that m > 1. We start by showing that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U) \ge m$. Note that $|\operatorname{acl}(A)| \le |T|$, for every countable set A, while $|\varphi^{\mathbb{M}}| = |\mathbb{M}| > |T|$. Therefore, $\dim_{\operatorname{acl}}(\varphi^{\mathbb{M}}) > \aleph_{o}$ and we can fix a countably

infinite set $I = \{ b_i^n \mid n < \omega, i < m \} \subseteq \varphi^{\mathbb{M}}$ that is independent over U. Setting $\bar{b}^n := \langle b_0^n, \dots, \bar{b}_{m-1}^n \rangle$, it follows by Proposition F1.4.6 that

$$\operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}^n/U) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)$$
, for every $n < \omega$.

Let $I_o := \{ b_o^n \mid n < \omega \}$. Lemma F1.3.4 (a) implies that

$$\dim_{\mathrm{acl}}(\bar{b}^n/U \cup I_{\mathrm{o}}) = \dim_{\mathrm{acl}}(\bar{b}^n/U \cup \{b_{\mathrm{o}}^n\}) = m - 1.$$

By inductive hypothesis it therefore follows that

 $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\bar{b}^n/U\cup I_{\mathrm{o}})=m-1.$

Let $\vartheta(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)$ be a formula with $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\vartheta) = \operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U)$ and set $\psi_{n}(\bar{x}) \coloneqq x_{o} = b_{o}^{n}$. Then $\vartheta \wedge \psi_{n} \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}^{n}/U \cup I_{o})$ implies that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\vartheta \wedge \psi_n) \ge \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\tilde{b}^n/U \cup I_{\mathrm{o}}) \ge m-1.$$

Since $\psi_i^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \psi_k^{\mathbb{M}} = \emptyset$, for $i \neq k$, it follows by Lemma 1.1 that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}(\tilde{a}/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\vartheta) > \operatorname{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(\vartheta \wedge \psi_{n}) \geq m-1.$$

It remains to prove that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U) \leq m$. Let \mathfrak{M} be an \aleph_{\circ} -saturated model containing U. According to Proposition F1.4.6, every tuple \bar{c} that is independent over M has the same type over U as \bar{a} . Replacing \bar{a} by \bar{c} we may therefore w.l.o.g. assume that \bar{a} is independent over M. Fix a formula $\vartheta \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)$ such that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\vartheta) = \operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{a}/U)$. For a contradiction, suppose that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\vartheta) > m$. Then, by Lemma 1.1, there are formulae ψ_{i} , $i < \omega$, such that $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\vartheta \wedge \psi_{i}) \geq m$ and $\psi_{i}^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \psi_{k}^{\mathbb{M}} = \emptyset$, for $i \neq k$. By Lemma 1.3 and the definition of Morley rank, we can choose the formulae ψ_{i} over M. Since the sets $\psi_{i}^{\mathbb{M}}$ are disjoint, there is some index i such that $\bar{a} \notin \psi_{i}^{\mathbb{M}}$. Consequently, there exists a formula $\psi := \psi_{i}$ over M such that $\neg \psi \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/M)$ and $\operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\psi) \geq \operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\vartheta \wedge \psi) \geq m$.

By Corollary 1.10, there exists a tuple $\bar{b} \in \psi^{\mathbb{M}}$ with $\operatorname{rk}_{M}(\bar{b}/M) = \operatorname{rk}_{M}^{\bar{s}}(\psi)$. Since $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/M) \neq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/M)$, Proposition F1.4.6 implies that \bar{b} is

not independent over M. Let $\bar{b}_{\circ} \subseteq \bar{b}$ be an acl-basis of \bar{b} over M. By Lemma 1.12 and inductive hypothesis, it follows that

$$m \leq \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\psi) = \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\bar{b}/M) = \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\bar{s}}(\bar{b}_{\mathrm{o}}/M)$$
$$= \dim_{\mathrm{acl}}(\bar{b}_{\mathrm{o}}/M) = |\bar{b}_{\mathrm{o}}| < m,$$

a contradiction.

2. Independence relations

Besides closure operators and dimensions, a matroid can also be characterised in terms of a so-called *independence relation*. This characterisation is the easiest to generalise to the geometry-like configurations appearing in model theory. In this section we introduce independence relations and show that they give an alternative characterisation of matroids. In the next section, we then present the generalisation used in model theory.

Definition 2.1. Let cl be a closure operator on the set Ω . The *independence relation* $\sqrt[cl]{}$ associated with cl is the ternary relation between sets $A, B, U \subseteq \Omega$ that is defined by

 $A \bigvee_{U}^{cl} B$: iff every set $I \subseteq B$ that is independent over U is also independent over $U \cup A$.

Example. Let \mathfrak{V} be a vector space, $A, B, U \subseteq V$ subspaces with $U \subseteq A, B$, and let cl be the closure operator mapping a set $X \subseteq V$ to the subspace $\langle \!\langle X \rangle \!\rangle_{\mathfrak{V}}$ spanned by X. Then

$$A \bigvee^{\mathrm{cl}}_{U} B \quad \mathrm{iff} \quad A \cap B = U.$$

In the abstract, the properties of an independence relation $\sqrt[cl]{}$ are given by the following axioms.

Definition 2.2. Let Ω be a set and let $A \sqrt{U} B$ be a ternary relation on subsets $A, B, U \subseteq \Omega$.

(a) $\sqrt{}$ is an *abstract independence relation* if it satisfies the following conditions:

(MON) *Monotonicity*. If $A_{\circ} \subseteq A$ and $B_{\circ} \subseteq B$ then

 $A \sqrt{U} B$ implies $A_{\circ} \sqrt{U} B_{\circ}$.

(NOR) Normality.

 $A \sqrt{U} B$ implies $A \cup U \sqrt{U} B \cup U$.

(LRF) Left Reflexivity.

 $A \sqrt{A} B$, for all $A, B \subseteq \Omega$.

(LTR) Left Transitivity. If $A_0 \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2$ then

$$A_2 \sqrt{A_1} B$$
 and $A_1 \sqrt{A_0} B$ implies $A_2 \sqrt{A_0} B$.

(FIN) Finite Character.

 $A \sqrt{U} B$ iff $A_{\circ} \sqrt{U} B$ for all finite $A_{\circ} \subseteq A$.

(b) A *geometric independence relation* is an abstract independence relation $\sqrt{}$ that satisfies the following additional conditions:

(sym) Symmetry.

$$A \sqrt{U} B$$
 implies $B \sqrt{U} A$.

(BMON) Base Monotonicity.

$$A \sqrt{U} B \cup C$$
 implies $A \sqrt{U \cup C} B \cup C$.

(SRB) Strong Right Boundedness. Let γ be an ordinal and let $(U_{\alpha})_{\alpha \leq \gamma}$ be a strictly increasing chain of subsets $U_{\alpha} \subseteq \Omega$. If $A \swarrow_{U_{\alpha}} U_{\alpha+1}$, for all $\alpha < \gamma$, then $|\gamma| \leq |A|$.

(c) We call an abstract independence relation *symmetric, base monotone,* or *strongly right bounded* if it satisfies the corresponding axiom. Frequently, we will use the symbol \downarrow to denote symmetric independence relations.

Example. (a) Let Ω be a set. For $A, B, U \subseteq \Omega$, we set

 $A \sqrt[\circ]{U} B$: iff $A \subseteq U$.

 $\sqrt[\circ]{}$ is an abstract independence relation on Ω that satisfies (BMON) and (SRB), but not (SYM). Moreover, it is minimal in the sense that $\sqrt[\circ]{} \subseteq \sqrt{}$, for every abstract independence relation $\sqrt{}$ on Ω .

(b) Let Ω be a set. For $A, B, U \subseteq \Omega$, define

 $A \downarrow_U^{\circ} B$: iff $A \cap B \subseteq U$.

Then \downarrow° is a geometric independence relation. It is minimal in the sense that $\downarrow^{\circ} \subseteq \downarrow$, for every symmetric independence relation on Ω . Note that $\downarrow^{\circ} = \sqrt[c]{}$, where cl : $X \mapsto X$ is the trivial closure operator on Ω .

(c) Let $\mathfrak{G} = \langle V, E \rangle$ be an undirected graph. For $A, B, U \subseteq V$, we define

 $A \downarrow_U^{\text{sep}} B$: iff every path connecting an element of A to an element of B contains an element of U.

Then \downarrow^{sep} is an abstract independence relation that is symmetric and base monotone.

As most axioms are immediate we only check left transitivity. Suppose, for a contradiction, that $A_2 \downarrow_{A_1}^{\text{sep}} B$ and $A_1 \downarrow_{A_0}^{\text{sep}} B$, but $A_2 \downarrow_{A_0}^{\text{sep}} B$. Then there exists a path π from some vertex $a_2 \in A_2$ to some $b \in B$ such that π does not contain an element of A_0 . Since $A_2 \downarrow_{A_1}^{\text{sep}} B$, this path contains a vertex $a_1 \in A_1$. Let π' be the subpath of π connecting a_1 to b. Since $A_1 \downarrow_{A_o}^{\text{sep}} B$, this subpath contains a vertex of A_o . Hence, so does π . A contradiction.

(d) Let $\mathfrak{X} = \langle X, d \rangle$ be a metric space. For $A, B, U \subseteq X$, we define

$$A \downarrow_U^a B$$
 : iff for all $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ there is some $c \in U$
such that $d(a, b) = d(a, c) + d(c, b)$.

Again, \downarrow^d is a symmetric abstract independence relation.

Note that, for (undirected) trees, this definition generalises that in (c). Given a tree *T*, we define the distance between two vertices $u, v \in T$ as the length of the unique path between *u* and *v*. The independence relation \downarrow^d corresponding to this metric coincides with \downarrow^{sep} from (c) since the equation d(u, v) = d(u, w) + d(w, v) implies that *w* is a vertex on the path from *u* to *v*.

Exercise 2.1. Given an abstract independence relation $\sqrt{}$, we define the relation

 $A \bigvee_{U}^{\mathbf{b}} B$: iff $A \bigvee_{UB_{\mathbf{o}}} B$, for all $B_{\mathbf{o}} \subseteq B$.

Prove that $\sqrt[b]{}$ is a base monotone abstract independence relation.

Let us collect some immediate consequences of the axioms of an abstract independence relation. In proofs we will usually use the axioms (MON), (NOR), and (LRF) tacitly, while all uses of other axioms will be explicit. The first two lemmas contain versions of the left transitivity axiom that are frequently more convenient to use. The third lemma presents an infinite version of left transitivity.

Lemma 2.3. Let $\sqrt{}$ be an abstract independence relation.

 $A \bigvee_{U \cup C} B$ and $C \bigvee_{U} B$ implies $A \cup C \bigvee_{U} B$.

Proof. By (NOR), we have $A \cup U \cup C$ $\sqrt{U \cup C}$ B and $C \cup U$ \sqrt{U} B. By (LTR) it follows that $A \cup U \cup C$ \sqrt{U} B.

Lemma 2.4. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a base monotone abstract independence relation.

 $A \sqrt{U} B \cup C$ and $C \sqrt{U} B$ implies $A \cup C \sqrt{U} B$.

Proof. By (BMON), $A \sqrt{U} B \cup C$ implies $A \sqrt{U \cup C} B \cup C$. Since $C \sqrt{U} B$, it follows by Lemma 2.3 and monotonicity that $A \cup C \sqrt{U} B$.

Lemma 2.5. Let $\sqrt{}$ be an abstract independence relation.

- (a) If $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ is an increasing chain of sets with $A_i \ \sqrt{U} B$, for all $i \in I$, then $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \ \sqrt{U} B$.
- (b) If γ is an ordinal and $(A_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ an increasing chain of sets with $A_{\alpha} \sqrt{U \cup \bigcup_{i < \alpha} A_i} B$, for all $\alpha < \gamma$, then $\bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} A_{\alpha} \sqrt{U B}$.

Proof. (a) By (FIN) it is sufficient to show that $C \ \sqrt{U} B$, for all finite $C \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$. Hence, let $C \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$ be finite. As $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ is increasing, there exists an index $i \in I$ such that $C \subseteq A_i$. Consequently, $A_i \ \sqrt{U} B$ implies that $C \ \sqrt{U} B$.

(b) We prove the claim by induction on γ . For $\gamma = 0$, we have $\emptyset \sqrt{U} B$ by (LRF). For the inductive step, suppose that $\bigcup_{i < \alpha} A_i \sqrt{U} B$, for all $\alpha < \gamma$. By (a) it follows that $\bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} \bigcup_{i < \alpha} A_i \sqrt{U} B$. If γ is a limit ordinal, then $\bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} \bigcup_{i < \alpha} A_i = \bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} A_{\alpha}$ and we are done. Hence, suppose that $\gamma = \beta + 1$. Then

$$A_{\beta} \sqrt{U \cup \bigcup_{i < \beta} A_i} B$$
 and $\bigcup_{i < \beta} A_i \sqrt{U} B$

implies, by Lemma 2.3, that $A_\beta \sqrt{U} B$.

We will show that geometric independence relations are precisely those associated with a matroid. The easy direction is to show that every matroid induces a geometric independence relation. As a first step, let us see which axioms hold if we do not assume the exchange property.

Lemma 2.6. The independence relation $\sqrt[cl]{}$ associated with a finitary closure operator cl on Ω is an abstract independence relation.

Proof. We have to check five axioms.

(MON) Suppose that $A \bigvee_{U}^{cl} B$ and let $A_{\circ} \subseteq A$ and $B_{\circ} \subseteq B$. To show that $A_{\circ} \bigvee_{U}^{cl} B_{\circ}$, consider a subset $I \subseteq B_{\circ}$ that is independent over U. Since $A \bigvee_{U}^{cl} B$, I is also independent over $U \cup A$. In particular, it is independent over $U \cup A_{\circ}$.

(NOR) Suppose that $A \bigvee_{U}^{cl} B$. To show that $A \cup U \bigvee_{U}^{cl} B \cup U$, consider a set $I \subseteq B \cup U$ that is independent over U. Then $I \subseteq B$ and $A \bigvee_{U}^{cl} B$ implies that I is independent over $U \cup A$.

(LRF) Trivially, if $I \subseteq B$ is independent over A, then it is independent over A.

(LTR) Suppose that $A_2 \bigvee_{A_1}^{cl} B$ and $A_1 \bigvee_{A_0}^{cl} B$, for $A_0 \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2$. If *I* is independent over A_0 , it is independent over A_1 and, hence, also over A_2 .

(FIN) Suppose that $A \swarrow_{U}^{cl} B$. We have to find a finite set $A_o \subseteq A$ such that $A_o \swarrow_{U}^{cl} B$. By assumption, there is a set $I \subseteq B$ that is independent over U, but not over $U \cup A$. Hence, there is some element $b \in I$ such that $b \in cl(U \cup A \cup (I \setminus \{b\}))$. We choose a finite subset $A_o \subseteq A$ such that $b \in cl(U \cup A_o \cup (I \setminus \{b\}))$. Since I is independent over U, but not over $U \cup A_o$, it follows that $A_o \bowtie_{U}^{cl} B$.

To show that, for a matroid $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$, the relation $\sqrt[cl]{}$ is a geometric independence relation, we start with a technical lemma.

Lemma 2.7. Let $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ be a matroid and let $I, J \subseteq \Omega$ be sets that are both independent over U. If I is independent over $U \cup J$, then J is independent over $U \cup I$.

Proof. Suppose that *J* is not independent over $U \cup I$. Then there is some $b \in J$ such that

 $b \in \operatorname{cl}(U \cup I \cup (J \setminus \{b\})) \setminus \operatorname{cl}(U \cup (J \setminus \{b\})).$

By the exchange property, there is some $a \in I$ such that

 $a \in \operatorname{cl}(U \cup (I \setminus \{a\}) \cup J).$

Consequently, *I* is not independent over $U \cup J$.

Proposition 2.8. The relation $\sqrt[cl]{}$ associated with a matroid $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is a geometric independence relation.

Proof. We have already seen in Lemma 2.6 that $\sqrt[cl]{}$ is an abstract independence relation. Hence, it remains to check the following three axioms.

(SYM) Suppose that $A \bigvee_{U}^{cl} B$. To show that $B \bigvee_{U}^{cl} A$, consider a set $I \subseteq A$ that is independent over U. Let J be a basis of B over U. By assumption, J is independent over $U \cup A$. Hence, it follows by Lemma 2.7 that I is independent over $U \cup J$ and, therefore, over $U \cup B$.

(BMON) Since we have already shown (SYM), it is sufficient to prove that $A \cup C \quad \bigvee_{U}^{cl} B$ implies $A \cup C \quad \bigvee_{U\cup C}^{cl} B$. Thus, suppose that $A \cup C \quad \bigvee_{U}^{cl} B$. If $I \subseteq B$ is independent over $U \cup C$, it is also independent over U and, hence, over $U \cup A \cup C$.

(SRB) Let $(U_{\alpha})_{\alpha \leq \gamma}$ be a strictly increasing sequence with $A \swarrow_{U_{\alpha}}^{cl} U_{\alpha+1}$, for all $\alpha < \gamma$. By induction on α , we construct a decreasing chain $(I_{\alpha})_{\alpha \leq \gamma}$ of subsets $I_{\alpha} \subseteq A$ such that I_{α} is a basis of A over U_{α} . We start with an arbitrary basis I_{0} of A over U_{0} . For the inductive step, suppose that we have already defined I_{β} for all $\beta < \alpha$. For I_{α} we choose a maximal subset of $\bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} I_{\beta}$ that is independent over U_{α} .

Since $A \swarrow_{U_{\alpha}}^{cl} U_{\alpha+1}$ we can find a set $J \subseteq U_{\alpha+1}$ that is independent over U_{α} , but not over $U_{\alpha} \cup A$. By Lemma 2.7 it follows that I_{α} is not independent over $U_{\alpha} \cup J \subseteq U_{\alpha+1}$. Therefore, each inclusion $I_{\alpha+1} \supset I_{\alpha}$ is strict. It follows that $|\gamma| \leq |I_0| \leq |A|$.

Our next aim is to show that every geometric independence relation arises from a matroid. As motivation for the definition below, let us explain how one can recover the closure operation cl from the independence relation $\sqrt[cl]{}$ associated with it.

1089

Lemma 2.9. Let $\sqrt[cl]{}$ be the independence relation associated with a closure operator cl on Ω and let $a \in \Omega$ and $A, B, U \subseteq \Omega$.

(a)
$$a \in cl(U)$$
 iff $a \bigvee_{U \cup C}^{cl} a$
iff $a \bigvee_{U \cup C}^{cl} B$ for all $B, C \subseteq \Omega$.
(b) $A \subseteq cl(U \cup B)$ iff $B \bigvee_{U}^{cl} C \Rightarrow A \bigvee_{U}^{cl} C$ for all $C \subseteq \Omega$.

Proof. (a) First, suppose that $a \in cl(U)$. We claim that $a \sqrt[C]{U \cup C} B$, for all $B, C \subseteq \Omega$. Fix B and C and let $I \subseteq B$ be independent over $U \cup C$. Then I is independent over $cl(U \cup C)$ and, therefore, over $U \cup \{a\} \subseteq cl(U \cup C)$.

If $a \bigvee_{U\cup C}^{cl} B$, for all B, C, then, trivially, $a \bigvee_{U\cup C}^{cl} a$.

Hence, it remains to show that $a \bigvee_{U}^{cl} a$ implies $a \in cl(U)$. Suppose that $a \bigvee_{U}^{cl} a$. Since the set $\{a\}$ is not independent over $U \cup \{a\}$, it follows that $\{a\}$ is not independent over U. Hence, $a \in cl(U)$.

(b) (\Rightarrow) Suppose that $A \subseteq cl(U \cup B)$ and $B \bigvee_U^{cl} C$. To show that $A \bigvee_U^{cl} C$, consider a set $I \subseteq C$ that is independent over U. Then I is also independent over $U \cup B$ and, hence, over $cl(U \cup B)$. In particular, I is independent over $U \cup A \subseteq cl(U \cup B)$.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that $A \notin cl(U \cup B)$ and fix an element $a \in A \setminus cl(U \cup B)$. Then $B \bigvee^{cl}_{U} a$ since \emptyset and $\{a\}$ are both independent over U and independent over $U \cup B$. But $A \bigvee^{cl}_{U} a$ since $\{a\}$ is independent over U, but not over $U \cup A$.

We use the characterisation in (a) to associate a closure operator with an arbitrary abstract independence relation $\sqrt{}$.

Definition 2.10. Let $\sqrt{}$ be an abstract independence relation on the set Ω . For $U \subseteq \Omega$, we define

$$\operatorname{cl}_{\mathcal{A}}(U) := \{ a \in \Omega \mid a \ \sqrt{U \cup C} B \text{ for all } B, C \subseteq \Omega \}.$$

Let us start by proving that this definition results in a closure operator. The main technical argument is contained in the following lemma. **Lemma 2.11.** Let $\sqrt{}$ be an abstract independence relation on the set Ω .

 $A \subseteq \operatorname{cl}_{\mathcal{A}}(U)$ iff $A \sqrt{U \cup C} B$ for all $B, C \subseteq \Omega$.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Let $a \in A$. Then $a \sqrt{U \cup C} B$, for all sets B, C. Consequently, $a \in cl_{1/2}(U)$.

(⇒) By (FIN), it is sufficient to prove the claim for finite sets *A*. We proceed by induction on |A|. For $A = \emptyset$ and arbitrary sets $B, C \subseteq \Omega$, $U \cup C \sqrt{U \cup C} B$ implies that $\emptyset \sqrt{U \cup C} B$, as desired.

Hence, suppose that $A = A_o \cup \{a\}$ and that we have already shown that $A_o \quad \sqrt{U \cup C} \quad B$, for all sets B, C. Given $B, C \subseteq \Omega$, it follows that $A_o \quad \sqrt{U \cup C \cup \{a\}} \quad B$ and $a \quad \sqrt{U \cup C} \quad B$ which, by Lemma 2.3, implies that $A_o \cup \{a\} \quad \sqrt{U \cup C} \quad B$.

Corollary 2.12. Let $\sqrt{}$ be an abstract independence relation on the set Ω .

 $\operatorname{cl}_{\mathcal{V}}(U) \ \sqrt{U \cup C} B$, for all $B, C, U \subseteq \Omega$.

Proposition 2.13. Let $\sqrt{}$ be an abstract independence relation on the set Ω . Then $cl_{\sqrt{}}$ is a closure operator on Ω .

Proof. To show that $U \subseteq cl_{i}(U)$, consider $a \in U$ and $B, C \subseteq \Omega$. Then $U \cup C$ $\sqrt{U \cup C}$ *B* implies $a \sqrt{U \cup C}$ *B*. Hence, $a \in cl_{i}(U)$.

For monotonicity, let $U \subseteq V$ and suppose that $a \sqrt{U \cup C} B$, for all $B, C \subseteq \Omega$. Given $B, C \subseteq \Omega$, we have $a \sqrt{U \cup V \cup C} B$. Hence, $cl_{\sqrt{U}}(U) \subseteq cl_{\sqrt{U}}(V)$.

To show that $cl_{\vee}(cl_{\vee}(U)) = cl_{\vee}(U)$, fix an element $a \in cl_{\vee}(cl_{\vee}(U))$ and sets $B, C \subseteq \Omega$. Then

 $a \sqrt{\operatorname{cl}_{\mathcal{I}}(U) \cup \operatorname{cl}_{\mathcal{I}}(U \cup C)} B.$

Since we have already shown that $cl_{\sqrt{i}}$ is monotone, we have $cl_{\sqrt{i}}(U) \subseteq cl_{\sqrt{i}}(U \cup C)$ and it follows that $a \sqrt{cl_{\sqrt{i}}(U \cup C)} B$. Furthermore, according to Corollary 2.12, $cl_{\sqrt{i}}(U \cup C) \sqrt{U \cup C} B$. By Lemma 2.3 and monotonicity, it therefore follows that $a \sqrt{U \cup C} B$. Hence, $a \in cl_{\sqrt{i}}(U)$.
F2. Ranks and forking

For symmetric independence relations we have the following desirable relationship to the associated closure operator.

Lemma 2.14. Let \downarrow be an abstract independence relation on the set Ω satisfying (SYM) and (BMON).

$$A \downarrow_U B$$
 iff $cl_{\downarrow}(A) \downarrow_{cl_{\downarrow}(U)} cl_{\downarrow}(B)$, for all $A, B, U \subseteq \Omega$.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) By Corollary 2.12, we have $cl_{\downarrow}(U) \downarrow_U cl_{\downarrow}(B)$. Therefore, $cl_{\downarrow}(A) \downarrow_{cl_{\downarrow}(U)} cl_{\downarrow}(B)$ implies $cl_{\downarrow}(A) \downarrow_U cl_{\downarrow}(B)$, by Lemma 2.3. Hence, the claim follows by (MON).

(⇒) Suppose that $A \downarrow_U B$. Then $A \cup U \downarrow_U B$. We have shown in Corollary 2.12 that $cl_{\downarrow}(A \cup U) \downarrow_{A \cup U} B$. Using (LTR) we see that $cl_{\downarrow}(A \cup U) \downarrow_U B$. By symmetry, it follows in exactly the same way that $cl_{\downarrow}(A \cup U) \downarrow_U cl_{\downarrow}(B \cup U)$. Hence, we can use (BMON) and (MON) to show that $cl_{\downarrow}(A) \downarrow_{cl_{\downarrow}(U)} cl_{\downarrow}(B)$.

If an abstract independence relation $\sqrt{}$ is induced by a closure operator, we obtain this operator back if we form cl₂.

Lemma 2.15. $cl = cl_{cl'}$, for every finitary closure operator cl.

Proof. By definition of cl $_{cl/}$ and Lemma 2.9,

$$a \in \operatorname{cl}_{\operatorname{cl}}(U)$$
 iff $a \bigvee_{U \cup C}^{\operatorname{cl}} B$ for all sets B, C
iff $a \in \operatorname{cl}(U)$.

Remark. Note that, in general, the dual statement does not hold: there are distinct independence relations inducing the same closure operator.

For a geometric independence relation \downarrow , we not only obtain a closure operator, but even a matroid. Again, we begin with two technical lemmas.

Lemma 2.16. Let \downarrow be a geometric independence relation. Then

 $a \not\downarrow_U B$ iff $a \in \operatorname{cl}_{\downarrow}(U \cup B) \smallsetminus \operatorname{cl}_{\downarrow}(U)$.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Suppose that $a \in cl_{\downarrow}(U \cup B)$ and $a \downarrow_U B$. We have to show that $a \in cl_{\downarrow}(U)$. Hence, let $C, D \subseteq \Omega$ be arbitrary sets. Then $a \downarrow_{U \cup B} C \cup D$ and $a \downarrow_U B$ implies, by Lemma 2.3 and symmetry, that $a \downarrow_U C \cup D$. Consequently, we have $a \downarrow_{U \cup C} D$ by (BMON).

(⇒) Suppose that $a \not\downarrow_U B$. Then $a \notin cl_{\downarrow}(U)$. For a contradiction, assume that there are sets *C*, *D* such that $a \not\downarrow_{U \cup B \cup C} D$. Then (MON) implies

$$a \not\downarrow_U U \cup B \cup C$$
 and $a \not\downarrow_{U \cup B \cup C} U \cup B \cup C \cup D$.

By (SRB), it follows that $2 \le |\{a\}| = 1$. A contradiction.

Lemma 2.17. Let \downarrow be a geometric independence relation on Ω . For all $a \in \Omega$ and $B \subseteq \Omega$, there exists a finite set $B_0 \subseteq B$ such that $a \downarrow_{B_0} B$.

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on $\kappa := |B|$. For $\kappa < \aleph_0$, we have $a \downarrow_B B$ by (LRF) and symmetry. Hence, suppose that $\kappa \ge \aleph_0$. Let $(b_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be an enumeration of *B* and set $B_\alpha := \{b_i \mid i < \alpha\}$, for $\alpha \le \kappa$. If $a \downarrow_{\varnothing} B$, we are done. Otherwise, let α be the minimal ordinal such that $a \not \underset{\boxtimes}{\leftarrow} B_\alpha$. By Lemma 2.16, it follows that $a \in \text{cl}_{\perp}(B_\alpha)$. Consequently, $a \downarrow_{B_\alpha} B$. Note that $\alpha < \kappa$ since $a \downarrow_{\varnothing} B_\beta$ for all $\beta < \kappa$ would imply, by Lemma 2.5 and symmetry, that $a \downarrow_{\varnothing} B$. Hence $|B_\alpha| = |\alpha| < \kappa$, and we can apply the inductive hypothesis to find a finite set $U \subseteq B_\alpha$ with $a \downarrow_U B_\alpha$. Consequently, it follows by (LTR) and symmetry that $a \downarrow_U B$.

Proposition 2.18. *If* \downarrow *is a geometric independence relation on the set* Ω *, then* $\langle \Omega, cl_{\downarrow} \rangle$ *is a matroid.*

Proof. We have already seen in Proposition 2.13 that cl_{\downarrow} is a closure operator. Hence, it remains to check that it has finite character and the exchange property.

For finite character, suppose that $a \in cl_{\downarrow}(U)$. By Lemma 2.17 we can find a finite set $U_0 \subseteq U$ such that $a \downarrow_{U_0} U$. For all sets B, C it follows by $a \downarrow_U B \cup C$, Lemma 2.3, and (SYM) that $a \downarrow_{U_0} B \cup C$. Hence, (BMON) implies $a \downarrow_{U_0 \cup C} B$ and we have $a \in cl_{\downarrow}(U_0)$.

 \square

It remains to check the exchange property. Suppose that

$$b \in \mathrm{cl}_{\downarrow}(U \cup \{a\}) \smallsetminus \mathrm{cl}_{\downarrow}(U)$$
.

By Lemma 2.16, it follows that $b \not\downarrow_U a$. By symmetry, we have $a \not\downarrow_U b$ and we can use Lemma 2.16 again to conclude that

$$a \in \mathrm{cl}_{\downarrow}(U \cup \{b\}) \setminus \mathrm{cl}_{\downarrow}(U)$$
.

The next lemma, together with Lemma 2.15, shows that the operation $cl \mapsto \sqrt[cl]{}$ is a bijective function from the class of all matroids to the class of all geometric independence relations. Its inverse is given by the function $\downarrow \mapsto cl_{\downarrow}$.

Lemma 2.19. If \downarrow is a geometric independence relation then $\sqrt[cl_{\downarrow}] = \downarrow$.

Proof. (\supseteq) Suppose that $A \swarrow_U B$. We have to show that $A \swarrow_U B$. By assumption, there exists a set $I \subseteq B$ that is cl_{\perp} -independent over U, but not over $U \cup A$. Fix an element $b \in I$ such that $b \in cl_{\perp}(U \cup A \cup I_o)$ where $I_o := I \setminus \{b\}$. Since $b \notin cl_{\perp}(U \cup I_o)$, it follows by Lemma 2.16 that $b \swarrow_{U \cup I_o} A$. By monotonicity, this implies that $B \swarrow_{U \cup I_o} A$. Hence, we can use symmetry and (BMON) to deduce that $A \swarrow_U B$.

(⊆) By (FIN) and symmetry, it is sufficient to show that $A ~ \sqrt[c]_U B$ implies $A \downarrow_U B$, for all finite sets A, B. Furthermore, we may assume by Lemmas 2.14 and 2.15 that A and B are cl_{\downarrow} -independent over U. Hence, suppose that $A ~ \sqrt[c]_U B$ for finite sets A and B that are cl_{\downarrow} -independent over U. We prove by induction on |B| that $B \downarrow_U A$. If $B = \emptyset$, then $U \downarrow_U A$ implies $\emptyset \downarrow_U A$. Hence, suppose that $B = B_0 \cup \{b\}$ and that we have already shown that $B_0 \downarrow_U A$. Since B is cl_{\downarrow} -independent over U, it is also cl_{\downarrow} -independent over $U \cup A$. Hence, $b \notin cl_{\downarrow} (U \cup A \cup B_0)$ and Lemma 2.16 implies that $b \downarrow_{U \cup B_0} A$. Together with $B_0 \downarrow_U A$ it follows by Lemma 2.3 that $B_0 \cup \{b\} \downarrow_U A$.

We conclude this section with a characterisation of modularity in terms of the independence relation $\sqrt[cl]{}$.

Proposition 2.20. A matroid $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is modular if, and only if,

$$A \bigvee_{\mathrm{cl}(A)\cap\mathrm{cl}(B)}^{\mathrm{cl}} B$$
, for all $A, B \subseteq \Omega$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Suppose that $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is modular and let $A, B \subseteq \Omega$. We have to show that $A \bigvee_{cl(A)\cap cl(B)}^{cl(A)\cap cl(B)} B$. By Lemmas 2.14 and 2.15, we may assume that A and B are closed sets. Hence, let A and B be closed and $I \subseteq B$ independent over $A \cap B$. Let $I_0 \subseteq I$ be a basis of I over A and set $C_0 := cl(I_0)$ and C := cl(I). We have to show that $I_0 = I$. Note that

$$cl(C_{o} \cup A) = cl(I_{o} \cup A) = cl(I \cup A) = cl(C \cup A).$$

By Lemma B2.2.9, it follows that

$$C = \operatorname{cl}(C_{\circ} \cup (C \cap A)) = \operatorname{cl}(I_{\circ} \cup (C \cap A)).$$

Hence, I_o is a basis of *C* over $C \cap A$. Since $I \supseteq I_o$ is independent over $C \cap A$, it follows that $I = I_o$ and *I* is independent over *A*.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that $A \bigvee_{cl(A)\cap cl(B)}^{cl(A)\cap cl(B)} B$, for all $A, B \subseteq \Omega$. To show that $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ is modular it is sufficient, by Lemma B2.2.9, to prove that

$$cl(A \cup C) = cl(B \cup C)$$
 implies $cl(A \cup (B \cap C)) = B$,

for all closed sets $A, B, C \subseteq \Omega$ with $A \subseteq B$. Hence, fix closed sets $A, B, C \subseteq \Omega$ with $A \subseteq B$ and $cl(A \cup C) = cl(B \cup C)$. Choose a maximal set $I \subseteq A$ that is independent over C. Then $cl(I \cup C) = cl(A \cup C) = cl(B \cup C)$ and I is a basis of $B \cup C$ over C. We claim that $B \subseteq cl(I \cup (B \cap C))$. Suppose otherwise. Then there is some element $b \in B \setminus cl(I \cup (B \cap C))$. Since $b \in B \subseteq cl(I \cup C)$ and $b \notin cl(I \cup (B \cap C))$, it follows that $I \cup \{b\}$ is independent over $B \cap C$, but not over C. Hence, $C \swarrow_{B \cap C}^{cl} B$. A contradiction.

We have shown that $B \subseteq cl(I \cup (B \cap C))$. It follows that

$$B \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(I \cup (B \cap C)) \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(A \cup (B \cap C)) \subseteq B,$$

as desired.

10	9	5

Corollary 2.21. Let $\langle \Omega, cl \rangle$ be a modular matroid. Then

 $A \bigvee_{U}^{\mathrm{cl}} B$ iff $\mathrm{cl}(A \cup U) \cap \mathrm{cl}(B \cup U) = \mathrm{cl}(U)$.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) According to Proposition 2.20, we have

$$A \cup U \bigvee^{\mathrm{cl}}_{\mathrm{cl}(A \cup U) \cap \mathrm{cl}(B \cup U)} B \cup U.$$

If $cl(A \cup U) \cap cl(B \cup U) = cl(U)$, then

 $A \cup U \bigvee^{\text{cl}}_{\text{cl}(U)} B \cup U \text{ implies } A \bigvee^{\text{cl}}_{U} B$,

by Lemma 2.14.

 (\Rightarrow) Suppose that $A \bigvee_{U}^{\text{cl}} B$. By Lemma 2.14, it follows that

 $\operatorname{cl}(A \cup U) \bigvee^{\operatorname{cl}}_{\operatorname{cl}(U)} \operatorname{cl}(B \cup U).$

For a contradiction, suppose that there is some element

 $c \in (\operatorname{cl}(A \cup U) \cap \operatorname{cl}(B \cup U)) \setminus \operatorname{cl}(U).$

Then $\{c\}$ is independent over cl(U), but not over $cl(A \cup U)$. Hence, $cl(A \cup U) \bigvee_{cl(U)}^{cl} cl(B \cup U)$. A contradiction.

3. Preforking relations

We would like to define an independence relation using Δ -rank or Morley rank as our notion of dimension. In general, the resulting relation will not be a geometric independence relation but something slightly weaker, called a *forking relation*. In this section, we introduce the abstract framework for forking relations and we will present several examples of such relations. To simplify notation, we will frequently omit union symbols and just write *AB* instead of $A \cup B$. **Definition 3.1.** Let *T* be a complete first-order theory and suppose that $A \sqrt{U} B$ is a ternary relation that is defined on the class of all small subsets *A*, *B*, $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$.

(a) The relation $\sqrt{}$ is a *preforking relation* for *T* if it is an abstract independence relation that satisfies (BMON) and the following two axioms: (INV) *Invariance*. $ABU \equiv_{\emptyset} A'B'U'$ implies that

 $A \sqrt{U} B$ iff $A' \sqrt{U'} B'$.

(DEF) *Definability.* If $A \swarrow_U B$, there are finite tuples $\bar{a} \subseteq A$ and $\bar{b} \subseteq B$ and a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U)$ such that

 $\bar{a}' \swarrow_{II} \bar{b}$, for all $\bar{a}' \in \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b})^{\mathbb{M}}$.

(b) The relation $\sqrt{}$ is a *forking relation* if it is a preforking relation that satisfies the following additional axiom:

(EXT) *Extension*. If $A \sqrt{U} B_0$ and $B_0 \subseteq B_1$ then there is some A' with

 $A' \equiv_{UB_{o}} A$ and $A' \sqrt{U} B_1$.

We are mostly interested in symmetric forking relations since many properties of geometric independence relations can be generalised to them. Unfortunately, there are first-order theories were no nontrivial symmetric forking relations exist. On the other hand there are always several natural preforking relations and below we will see that every preforking relation can be used to define a corresponding forking relation, although not necessarily a symmetric one.

Remark. The intersection of an arbitrary family of preforking relations is again a preforking relation. It follows that the class of all preforking relations on a structure \mathbb{M} forms a complete partial order.

Examples

Before proceeding let us collect several examples. We start with a trivial one.

Example. The trivial relation $\sqrt{}$ with $A \sqrt{}_U B$, for all sets A, B, U, is a symmetric forking relation.

Exercise 3.1. Prove that the relation

 $A \downarrow_U^{\circ} B$: iff $A \cap B \subseteq U$

is a symmetric preforking relation.

More interesting are the following three examples. The second one has historically been used to develop stability theory.

Definition 3.2. For \bar{a} , A, B, $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, we define

$A \sqrt[\operatorname{at}]{U} B$:iff	for every finite $\bar{a} \subseteq A$,	
		tp (\bar{a}/UB) is isolated by a	a formula over U.
$\bar{a} \bigvee^{\mathrm{df}}_{U} B$:iff	$tp(\bar{a}/UB)$ is definable ov	ver U.
$A \sqrt[s]{U} B$:iff	$ \bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{b}' \Rightarrow \bar{b} \equiv_{UA} \bar{b}', $	for all $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$.

If $\bar{a} \sqrt[s]{U} B$, we say that the type tp (\bar{a}/UB) is *invariant* over U. Otherwise, it *splits* over U.

Lemma 3.3.

- (a) $\sqrt[at]{\subseteq} \sqrt[df]{\subseteq} \sqrt[s]{}$
- (b) ^{at}/ *is an abstract independence relation that satisfies* (INV) *and* (ВМОN).
- (c) $\sqrt[df]{}$ is an abstract independence relation that satisfies (INV) and (BMON).
- (d) $\sqrt[s]{}$ is a preforking relation.

Proof. (a) Suppose that $A \sqrt[at]{U} B$ and let \bar{a} be an enumeration of A. To show that $A \sqrt[df]{U} B$, consider a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$. Let $\bar{a}_{\circ} \subseteq \bar{a}$

be the finite tuple of elements mentioned in φ . By assumption, there is a formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ over *U* isolating tp (\bar{a}_{\circ}/UB) . It follows that

$$\delta(\bar{y}) \coloneqq \forall \bar{x} [\psi(\bar{x}) \to \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})]$$

is a φ -definition of tp(\bar{a}/UB).

For the second inclusion, suppose that $A \quad \bigvee_U B$. Let $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$ be tuples with $\bar{b} \not\equiv_{UA} \bar{b}'$. We have to show that $\bar{b} \not\equiv_U \bar{b}'$. Fix a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}, \bar{c})$ with parameters $\bar{a} \subseteq A$ and $\bar{c} \subseteq U$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}; \bar{a}, \bar{c}) \land \neg \varphi(\bar{b}'; \bar{a}, \bar{c}) .$$

By assumption, tp (\bar{a}/UB) has a φ -definition $\delta(\bar{x})$ over U. It follows that $\mathbb{M} \models \delta(\bar{b}) \land \neg \delta(\bar{b}')$. Consequently, $\bar{b} \not\equiv_U \bar{b}'$.

(b) (INV) and (FIN) follow immediately from the definition.

(MON) Suppose that $A \bigvee_{U}^{\text{at}} B$ and let $A_{\circ} \subseteq A$, $B_{\circ} \subseteq B$. For $\bar{a} \subseteq A_{\circ}$ we know that $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ is isolated by a formula over U. Hence, so is $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/UB_{\circ})$.

(NOR) Suppose that $A \ \sqrt[at]{U} B$. Let $\bar{a} \subseteq A \cup U$ be finite. Then $\bar{a} = \bar{a}' \cup \bar{c}$ for $\bar{a}' \subseteq A$ and $\bar{c} \subseteq U$. Furthermore, $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}'/UB)$ is isolated by a formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over U and $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{c}/UB)$ is isolated by the formula $\bar{x} = \bar{c}$. Consequently, $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}'\bar{c}/UB)$ is isolated by $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') \coloneqq \varphi(\bar{x}) \land \bar{x}' = \bar{c}$.

(LRF) If $\bar{a} \subseteq A$ is finite then tp (\bar{a}/AB) is isolated by the formula $\bar{x} = \bar{a}$. Hence, $A \sqrt[at]{}_A B$.

(LTR) Suppose that $A_2 \quad \sqrt[at]{A_1} B$ and $A_1 \quad \sqrt[at]{A_0} B$ for $A_0 \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2$. Let $\bar{a} \subseteq A_2$ be finite. Then tp (\bar{a}/A_1B) is isolated by a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ with parameters $\bar{c} \subseteq A_1$. Furthermore, tp (\bar{c}/A_0B) is isolated by a formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ over A_0 . By Lemma E3.1.5, it follows that tp $(\bar{a}\bar{c}/A_0B)$ is isolated by the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{z}) \land \psi(\bar{z})$. Therefore, tp (\bar{a}/A_0B) is isolated by the formula $\exists \bar{z} [\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{z}) \land \psi(\bar{z})]$.

(BMON) Suppose that $A \sqrt[at]{U} BC$. For every $\bar{a} \subseteq A$, $tp(\bar{a}/UBC)$ is isolated by a formula over U and, hence, by a formula over $U \cup C$.

(c) (INV) follows immediately from the definition.

(MON) Suppose that $\bar{a} \sqrt[df]{U} B$. If $\bar{a}_{\circ} \subseteq \bar{a}$ and $B_{\circ} \subseteq B$ then

$$\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}_{\circ}/UB_{\circ}) \subseteq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$$

and every φ -definition of the latter type is also a φ -definition of the former one.

(NOR) Suppose that tp($\bar{a}/B\bar{c}$) is definable over \bar{c} . To find the desired $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{x}'; \bar{y})$ -definition of tp($\bar{a}\bar{c}/B\bar{c}$) over \bar{c} , let $\psi(\bar{y}, \bar{y}'; \bar{c})$ be a $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}', \bar{y})$ -definition of tp($\bar{a}/B\bar{c}$) over \bar{c} . For $\bar{b} \subseteq B \cup \bar{c}$ it follows that

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{c}; \bar{b}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} \vDash \psi(\bar{b}, \bar{c}; \bar{c}).$

Hence, $\psi(\bar{y}, \bar{c}; \bar{c})$ is a φ -definition of tp $(\bar{a}\bar{c}/B)$ over \bar{c} .

(LRF) Note that $\varphi(\bar{a}; \bar{y})$ is a $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ -definition of tp $(\bar{a}/B \cup \bar{a})$. Hence, tp $(\bar{a}/B\bar{a})$ is definable over \bar{a} .

(LTR) Suppose that $\bar{a}_{\circ}\bar{a}_{1}\bar{a}_{2} \quad \sqrt[df]{a_{\circ}\bar{a}_{1}} B$ and $\bar{a}_{\circ}\bar{a}_{1} \quad \sqrt[df]{a_{\circ}} B$. For every formula $\varphi(\bar{x}_{\circ}, \bar{x}_{1}, \bar{x}_{2}; \bar{y})$, there exist

- a φ -definition $\psi(\bar{y}; \bar{a}_0, \bar{a}_1)$ of tp $(\bar{a}_0 \bar{a}_1 \bar{a}_2 / B \bar{a}_0 \bar{a}_1)$ over $\bar{a}_0 \bar{a}_1$, and
- a $\psi(\bar{y}; \bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_1)$ -definition $\vartheta(\bar{y}; \bar{a}_0)$ of tp $(\bar{a}_0 \bar{a}_1 / B \bar{a}_0)$ over \bar{a}_0 .

For $\bar{b} \subseteq B \cup \bar{a}_{o}$, we have

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_{o}, \bar{a}_{1}, \bar{a}_{2}; \bar{b}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} \vDash \psi(\bar{b}; \bar{a}_{o}, \bar{a}_{1})$$
$$\text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} \vDash \vartheta(\bar{b}; \bar{a}_{o}) \,.$$

Hence, ϑ is a φ -definition of tp $(\bar{a}_0 \bar{a}_1 \bar{a}_2 / B \bar{a}_0)$ over \bar{a}_0 .

(вмом) Clearly, every φ -definition of tp (\bar{a}/UBC) over U is also a φ -definition of tp (\bar{a}/UBC) over $U \cup C$.

(FIN) Since each formula $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ contains only finitely many variables from \bar{x} , it follows that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ is definable over U if, and only if, $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}_{\circ}/UB)$ is definable over U, for all finite $\bar{a}_{\circ} \subseteq \bar{a}$.

(d) (INV) follows immediately from the definition.

(MON) Suppose that $A \sqrt[s]{U} B$ and let $A_o \subseteq A$ and $B_o \subseteq B$. For $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B_o$ it follows that

$$\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{b}'$$
 implies $\bar{b} \equiv_{UA} \bar{b}'$ implies $\bar{b} \equiv_{UA_o} \bar{b}'$.

Hence, $A_{\circ} \sqrt[s]{U} B_{\circ}$.

(NOR) Suppose that $A \sqrt[s]{U} B$. If $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B \cup U$ are tuples such that $\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{b}'$, then there are tuples $\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}'_0 \subseteq B$ and $\bar{c} \subseteq U$ such that $\bar{b} = \bar{b}_0 \cup \bar{c}$ and $\bar{b}' = \bar{b}'_0 \cup \bar{c}$. It follows that

$$\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{b}' \text{ implies } \bar{b}_{\circ} \equiv_U \bar{b}'_{\circ}$$

$$\text{implies } \bar{b}_{\circ} \equiv_{UA} \bar{b}'_{\circ}$$

$$\text{implies } \bar{b}_{\circ} \bar{c} \equiv_{UA} \bar{b}'_{\circ} \bar{c} \text{ implies } \bar{b} \equiv_{UA} \bar{b}'$$

Consequently, $AU \sqrt[s]{U} BU$.

(LRF) Since, trivially, $\bar{b} \equiv_A \bar{b}'$ implies $\bar{b} \equiv_A \bar{b}'$, we have $A \sqrt[s]{A} B$, for all sets A and B.

(LTR) Suppose that $A_2 \sqrt[s]{A_1} B$ and $A_1 \sqrt[s]{A_0} B$, for $A_0 \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2$. For $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$ it follows that

$$\bar{b} \equiv_{A_0} \bar{b}$$
 implies $\bar{b} \equiv_{A_1} \bar{b}$ implies $\bar{b} \equiv_{A_2} \bar{b}$.

as desired.

(BMON) Suppose that $A \sqrt[s]{U} BC$. Let $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B \cup C$ be tuples such that $\bar{b} \not\equiv_{UAC} \bar{b}'$. We claim that $\bar{b} \not\equiv_{UC} \bar{b}'$. There exists a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}, \bar{c}, \bar{d})$ with parameters $\bar{a} \subseteq A$, $\bar{c} \subseteq C$, and $\bar{d} \subseteq U$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}; \bar{a}, \bar{c}, \bar{d}) \land \neg \varphi(\bar{b}'; \bar{a}, \bar{c}, \bar{d})$$

Consequently, $\bar{b}\bar{c} \not\equiv_{UA} \bar{b}'\bar{c}$. Since $A \sqrt[s]{U} BC$ it follows that $\bar{b}\bar{c} \not\equiv_{U} \bar{b}'\bar{c}$. As $\bar{c} \subseteq C$ this means that $\bar{b} \not\equiv_{UC} \bar{b}'$, as desired.

(DEF) Suppose that $A \swarrow_U B$. Then there exist tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$ such that $\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{b}'$ and $\bar{b} \not\equiv_{UA} \bar{b}'$. Fix a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ over U and a tuple

 $\bar{a} \subseteq A$ such that

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \land \neg \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b}').$

For every tuple $\bar{a}' \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ it follows that

$$\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}', \bar{b}) \land \neg \varphi(\bar{a}', \bar{b}') \quad \text{implies} \quad \bar{a}' \checkmark_{U} \bar{b} \bar{b}'. \qquad \Box$$

Let us mention that, in general, $\sqrt[df]{}$ and $\sqrt[at]{}$ are no preforking relations.

Example. (a) The relation $\sqrt[df]{}$ is not definable. As a counterexample, consider the theory T of dense linear orders. Note that T has quantifier elimination. Let $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ be an irrational number. Then $\operatorname{tp}(a/\mathbb{Q})$ is not definable over \mathbb{Q} . Consider a formula $\varphi(x; \bar{b}) \in \operatorname{tp}(a/\mathbb{Q})$ with rational parameters $b_0 < \cdots < b_{n-1}$. By enlarging the tuple \bar{b} we may assume that there is some index i such that $b_i < a < b_{i+1}$. It follows that $\langle \mathbb{R}, \leq \rangle \models \varphi(a'; \bar{b})$, for all $a' \in (b_i, b_{i+1})$. But for $a' \in (b_i, b_{i+1}) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ the type $\operatorname{tp}(a'/\mathbb{Q})$ is definable over \mathbb{Q} . This contradicts (DEF).

(b) The relation $\sqrt[3]{i}$ is not definable. As a counterexample, consider the theory *T* of the structure $\langle \mathbb{R}, s \rangle$ where s(x) = x + 1. Note that tp(a/b) is isolated if, and only if, a = b + k, for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular $tp(\frac{1}{2}/o)$ is not isolated. Using an Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé argument, one can show that, for every formula $\varphi(x; y)$ with $\langle \mathbb{R}, s \rangle \models \varphi(\frac{1}{2}; o)$, there exists a number $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\langle \mathbb{R}, s \rangle \models \varphi(b; o)$, for all $b \ge a$. But, for $b \in \mathbb{N}$, the type tp(b/o) is isolated by the formula $x = s^b(o)$.

Let us take a look at the closure operators associated with these relations. In each case, we obtain the definable closure.

Lemma 3.4. $\operatorname{cl}_{df/} = \operatorname{cl}_{at/} = \operatorname{cl}_{s/} = \operatorname{dcl}$

Proof. Note that $\sqrt[at]{} \subseteq \sqrt[df]{} \subseteq \sqrt[s]{}$ implies $\operatorname{cl}_{at/} \subseteq \operatorname{cl}_{df/} \subseteq \operatorname{cl}_{s/}$. Hence, we only need to prove that $\operatorname{dcl} \subseteq \operatorname{cl}_{at/}$ and $\operatorname{cl}_{s/} \subseteq \operatorname{dcl}$.

For the first inclusion, note that every formula defining *a* over *U* isolates tp(a/UBC). Hence, $a \in dcl(U)$ implies $a \sqrt[at]{UC} B$, for all *B*, *C*.

For the second inclusion, consider an element $a \notin dcl(U)$. By Theorem E2.1.6, there exists an automorphism $\pi \in \mathbb{M}_U$ with $\pi(a) \neq a$. Setting $a' := \pi(a)$ it follows that $a \equiv_U a'$ and $a \not\equiv_{Ua} a'$. Hence, $a \swarrow_U aa'$ and $a \notin cl_{\$/}(U)$.

We conclude this section with the remark that, for forking relations, the definition of the closure operator $cl_{\sqrt{}}$ can be simplified.

Lemma 3.5. If $\sqrt{}$ is a forking relation, then

 $a \sqrt{U} a$ implies $a \sqrt{UC} B$ for all B, C.

Proof. Suppose that $a \sqrt{U} a$ and let B, C be arbitrary sets. By (EXT), there exists an element $a' \equiv_{Ua} a$ with $a' \sqrt{U} BC$. It follows that a' = a. Therefore, (BMON) implies $a \sqrt{UC} B$.

Finitely satisfiable types

Let us take a look at some consequences of the definability axiom (DEF). First, note that, by invariance, we can extend every preforking relation from subsets of \mathbb{M} to types.

Definition 3.6. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a preforking relation and $B, U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. (a) A partial type $\Phi(\bar{x})$ over $B\sqrt{-forks}$ over U if

 $\bar{a} \swarrow_{II} B$, for all $\bar{a} \in \Phi^{\mathbb{M}}$.

Similarly, we say that a single formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over $B\sqrt{-1}$ forks over U, if the type $\{\varphi\}$ does.

(b) A type \mathfrak{p} over *B* is $\sqrt{-free}$ over *U* if it does not $\sqrt{-fork}$ over *U*.

(c) For complete types $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{\overline{s}}(U)$ and $\mathfrak{q} \in S^{\overline{s}}(UB)$, we say that \mathfrak{q} is a $\sqrt{-free \ extension}$ of \mathfrak{p} if

 $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$ and \mathfrak{q} is $\sqrt{-free}$ over U.

We denote this fact by $\mathfrak{p} \leq \mathfrak{q}$.

Remark. (a) By (INV), we have $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} B$ if, and only if, $tp(\bar{a}/UB)$ is $\sqrt{-free}$ over U.

(b) By (DEF), a complete type $\mathfrak{p} \sqrt{-forks}$ over *U* if, and only if, some formula $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{p} \sqrt{-forks}$ over *U*.

Lemma 3.7. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a preforking relation. The set

$$F^{\bar{s}}_{\sqrt{A/U}} := \left\{ \mathfrak{p} \in S^{\bar{s}}(A) \mid \mathfrak{p} \text{ is } \sqrt{-free \text{ over } U} \right\}$$

is a closed subset of $\mathfrak{S}^{\tilde{s}}(A)$.

Proof. Let

 $\Phi := \{ \neg \varphi \mid \varphi \text{ a formula over } A \text{ that } \sqrt{-\text{forks over } U} \}.$

Then $\Phi \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$, for every $\mathfrak{p} \in F^{\overline{s}}(A/U)$, while (DEF) implies that $\Phi \notin \mathfrak{p}$, for every type \mathfrak{p} that $\sqrt{-forks}$ over U. Hence,

$$F^{\bar{s}}_{\checkmark}(A/U) \coloneqq \langle \Phi \rangle_{\mathfrak{S}^{\bar{s}}(A)} . \qquad \Box$$

Let us treat in more detail one important forking relation that is connected with the definability axiom. It is based on the notion of a finitely satisfiable type.

Definition 3.8. A type \mathfrak{p} is *finitely satisfiable* in a set U if, for every formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \in \mathfrak{p}$, there is some tuple $\bar{a} \subseteq U$ with $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}; \bar{c})$. We write

 $\bar{a} \sqrt[u]{U} B$: iff $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U \cup B)$ is finitely satisfiable in U.

Example. Let *T* be the theory of dense linear orders. For a single element $a \in \mathbb{M}$ and sets $U, B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, we have $a \sqrt[u]{U} B$ if, and only if, at least one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- $a \in U$, or
- $\Uparrow a \cap U \neq \emptyset$ and, for every $b \in \Uparrow a \cap (U \cup B)$, there is some $c \in \Uparrow a \cap U$ with $c \leq b$, or

• $||a \cap U \neq \emptyset$ and, for every $b \in ||a \cap (U \cup B)$, there is some $c \in ||a \cap U|$ with $c \ge b$.

We shall prove that $\sqrt[n]{}$ is the least preforking relation and that it is, in fact, a forking relation. Before doing so, let us give an alternative characterisation of finitely satisfiable types in terms of ultrafilters. (The letter 'u' in $\sqrt[n]{}$ stands for 'ultrafilter'.)

Definition 3.9. Let *T* be a theory over the signature Σ , let $U, B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be sets, and \mathfrak{u} an ultrafilter over $U^{\overline{s}}$, for some tuple \overline{s} of sorts. The *average type* of \mathfrak{u} over *B* is the set

$$\operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B) \coloneqq \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{FO}^{\bar{s}}[\Sigma_B] \mid U^{\bar{s}} \cap \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \in \mathfrak{u} \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.10. Let T be a complete first-order theory and u an ultrafilter over $U^{\bar{s}}$. Then Av(u/B) is a complete type over B that is finitely satisfiable in U.

Proof. We start by showing that $\operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B)$ is a type. For a contradiction, suppose that $T \cup \operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B)$ is unsatisfiable. Then there exist a finite subset $\Phi \subseteq \operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B)$ such that $T \models \neg \land \Phi$. By definition of $\operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B)$,

$$U^{\tilde{s}} \cap \varphi^{\mathbb{M}} \in \mathfrak{u}$$
, for all $\varphi \in \Phi$.

As ultrafilters are closed under finite intersections, it follows that

$$U^{\tilde{s}} \cap (\bigwedge \Phi)^{\mathbb{M}} \in \mathfrak{u}$$
.

In particular, $(\wedge \Phi)^{\mathbb{M}} \neq \emptyset$. Hence, $T \models \exists \bar{x} \land \Phi$. A contradiction.

Moreover, $\operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B)$ is complete since, for every formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over *B*,

$$\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B) \quad \text{iff} \quad U^{\bar{s}} \cap \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \in \mathfrak{u}$$
$$\text{iff} \quad U^{\bar{s}} \smallsetminus \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \notin \mathfrak{u}$$
$$\text{iff} \quad U^{\bar{s}} \cap \neg \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \notin \mathfrak{u}$$
$$\text{iff} \quad \neg \varphi(\bar{x}) \notin \operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B).$$

Finally, to show that $\operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B)$ is finitely satisfiable in U, note that $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B)$ implies $U^{\bar{s}} \cap \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \in \mathfrak{u}$. In particular, this set is not empty. Hence, there is some $\bar{a} \in U^{\bar{s}}$ satisfying $\varphi(\bar{x})$.

Lemma 3.11. A type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{\overline{s}}(B)$ is finitely satisfiable in U if, and only if, $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B)$, for some ultrafilter \mathfrak{u} over $U^{\overline{s}}$.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) follows by Lemma 3.10. For (\Rightarrow), suppose that \mathfrak{p} is finitely satisfiable in *U*. We start by showing that the set

 $\mathfrak{u}_{o} \coloneqq \left\{ U^{\tilde{s}} \cap \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \mid \varphi(\bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{p} \right\}.$

has the finite intersection property. Let

$$U^{\bar{s}} \cap \varphi_{o}(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}}, \ldots, U^{\bar{s}} \cap \varphi_{n}(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \in \mathfrak{u}_{o}, \quad \text{for } \varphi_{o}, \ldots, \varphi_{n} \in \mathfrak{p}.$$

Since \mathfrak{p} is closed under conjunction, it follows that $\varphi_0 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_n \in \mathfrak{p}$. As \mathfrak{p} is finitely satisfiable in U,

$$(U^{\bar{s}} \cap \varphi_{o}(\bar{x}))^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \cdots \cap (U^{\bar{s}} \cap \varphi_{n}(\bar{x}))^{\mathbb{M}}$$

= $U^{\bar{s}} \cap (\varphi_{o}(\bar{x}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_{n}(\bar{x}))^{\mathbb{M}} \neq \emptyset$,

as desired.

By Corollary B2.4.10, there exists an ultrafilter $\mathfrak{u} \supseteq \mathfrak{u}_0$ over $U^{\overline{s}}$. Since, for every formula φ over B,

$$U^{\overline{s}} \cap \varphi(\overline{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \in \mathfrak{u} \quad \text{iff} \quad U^{\overline{s}} \cap \varphi(\overline{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \in \mathfrak{u}_{o} ,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B) &= \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}) \mid U^{\bar{s}} \cap \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \in \mathfrak{u} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}) \mid U^{\bar{s}} \cap \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \in \mathfrak{u}_{o} \right\} = \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}) \mid \varphi \in \mathfrak{p} \right\} = \mathfrak{p}, \end{aligned}$$

 \Box

as desired.

Using this characterisation of finite satisfiable types, we can prove that $\sqrt[u]{}$ is a forking relation.

Proposition 3.12. $\sqrt[u]{}$ *is a forking relation.*

Proof. (INV) follows immediately from the definition.

(MON) If tp $(\bar{a}_{\circ}\bar{a}_{1}/UB)$ is finitely satisfiable in U and $B_{\circ} \subseteq B$, then tp $(\bar{a}_{\circ}/UB_{\circ})$ is finitely satisfiable in U.

(NOR) If tp $(\bar{a}/\bar{c}B)$ is finitely satisfiable in \bar{c} then so is tp $(\bar{a}\bar{c}/\bar{c}B)$.

(LRF) Clearly, tp $(\bar{a}/B\bar{a})$ is finitely satisfiable in \bar{a} .

(LTR) Suppose that tp $(\bar{a}_{0}\bar{a}_{1}\bar{a}_{2}/\bar{a}_{0}\bar{a}_{1}B)$ is finitely satisfiable in $\bar{a}_{0}\bar{a}_{1}$ and tp $(\bar{a}_{0}\bar{a}_{1}/\bar{a}_{0}B)$ is finitely satisfiable in \bar{a}_{0} . If $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_{0}, \bar{a}_{1}, \bar{a}_{2}, \bar{b})$, for $\bar{b} \subseteq \bar{a}_{0}B$, there exists a tuple $\bar{a}_{2}' \subseteq \bar{a}_{0}\bar{a}_{1}$ such that $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_{0}, \bar{a}_{1}, \bar{a}_{2}', \bar{b})$. Suppose that $\bar{a}_{2}' = \bar{a}_{0}'\bar{a}_{1}'$ with $\bar{a}_{0}' \subseteq \bar{a}_{0}$ and $\bar{a}_{1}' \subseteq \bar{a}_{1}$. Then there are tuples $\bar{c}_{1}, \bar{c}_{1}' \subseteq \bar{a}_{0}$ with $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_{0}, \bar{c}_{1}, \bar{a}_{0}'\bar{c}_{1}', \bar{b})$. Hence, tp $(\bar{a}_{0}\bar{a}_{1}\bar{a}_{2}/\bar{a}_{0}B)$ is finitely satisfiable in \bar{a}_{0} .

(BMON) Obviously, if tp (\bar{a}/UBC) is finitely satisfiable in U, it is also finitely satisfiable in $U \cup C$.

(DEF) Suppose that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ is not finitely satisfiable in U. Then there is some formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ such that $\mathbb{M} \not\models \varphi(\bar{a}'; \bar{b})$, for all $\bar{a}' \subseteq U$. It follows that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}'/U\bar{b})$ is not finitely satisfiable in U, for every tuple \bar{a}' that satisfies $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$.

(EXT) Suppose that the type $\mathfrak{p} := \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB_{\circ})$ is finitely satisfiable in Uand let $B_1 \supseteq B_{\circ}$. According to Lemma 3.11 there exists an ultrafilter \mathfrak{u} such that $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/UB_{\circ})$. Let \bar{a}' be a realisation of $\operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/UB_1)$. Then $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}'/UB_{\circ}) = \operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/UB_{\circ}) = \mathfrak{p}$ and $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}'/UB_1) = \operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/UB_1)$ is finitely satisfiable in U.

Our next aim is to show that $\sqrt[u]{}$ is the least preforking relation.

Theorem 3.13 (Adler). $\sqrt[u]{\subseteq \sqrt{}}$, for every preforking relation $\sqrt{}$.

Proof. For a contradiction, suppose that $A \sqrt[u]{U} B$ but $A \sqrt[u]{U} B$. By (DEF), there are a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ over U and tuples $\bar{a} \subseteq A$ and $\bar{b} \subseteq B$ such that $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ and

$$\bar{a}' \swarrow_{U} \bar{b}$$
, for all $\bar{a}' \in \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b})^{\mathbb{M}}$.

Since tp (\bar{a}/BU) is finitely satisfiable in U, there is some tuple $\bar{c} \subseteq U$ with $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{c}, \bar{b})$. Consequently, $\bar{c} \swarrow_U \bar{b}$ which, by (MON), implies that $U \swarrow_U B$. A contradiction to (LRF).

As a corollary we obtain the following result which, in the terminology introduced below, states that the relation $\sqrt[u]{}$ is *left local*. Below we will extend this result to all preforking relations.

Lemma 3.14. Let T be a complete first-order theory. For all $\bar{a}, B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, there is a set $U \subseteq \bar{a}$ of size $|U| \leq |T| \oplus |B|$ such that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ is finitely satisfiable in U.

Proof. We construct an increasing sequence $U_o \subseteq U_1 \subseteq ...$ of sets $U_n \subseteq \bar{a}$ with $|U_n| \leq |T| \oplus |B|$ as follows. We start with $U_o := \emptyset$. For the inductive step suppose that we have already constructed $U_n \subseteq \bar{a}$. For every formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}/BU_n)$, let $\bar{c}_{\varphi} \subseteq \bar{a}$ be the elements of \bar{a} that are mentioned in $\varphi(\bar{x})$. Note that \bar{c}_{φ} is finite. Let U_{n+1} be the set obtained from U_n by adding all these tuples \bar{c}_{φ} . Then $|U_{n+1}| \leq |T| \oplus |B| \oplus |U_n| \leq |T| \oplus |B|$.

Setting $U := \bigcup_{n < \omega} U_n$ it follows that $tp(\bar{a}/UB)$ is finitely satisfiable in *U*. Furthermore, $|U| \le |T| \oplus |B|$.

Let us conclude this section with a remark about sets where $\sqrt[u]{}$ is right reflexive.

Lemma 3.15. Let T be a complete first-order theory. A subset $M \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is the universe of a model of T if, and only if, $A \sqrt[u]{M} M$, for all sets A.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let $\mathfrak{M} \leq \mathbb{M}$ be a model of T and $\bar{a} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ a tuple. To show that $\bar{a} \ \sqrt[n]{M} M$, consider a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/M)$. Then $\mathbb{M} \models \exists \bar{x}\varphi$ implies $\mathfrak{M} \models \exists \bar{x}\varphi$. Hence, there is some $\bar{c} \subseteq M$ with $\mathfrak{M} \models \varphi(\bar{c})$.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that $A \sqrt[n]{M} M$ for all sets A. We prove that M satisfies the Tarski-Vaught Test. Let $\varphi(x)$ be a formula over M such that $\mathbb{M} \models \exists x \varphi(x)$. We fix an element $a \in \mathbb{M}$ with $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(a)$. Since $a \sqrt[n]{M} M$, there is some element $c \in M$ with $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(c)$. By Theorem c2.2.5, it follows that $M \leq \mathbb{M}$. Consequently, M is a model of T.

Local character and forking sequences

In the remainder of this section we study preforking relations with a property called *local character*. In the next section, we will prove that having local character is equivalent to being symmetric.

Definition 3.16. A ternary relation $\sqrt{}$ has *local character* if it satisfies the following two axioms:

(LLOC) Left Locality. There exists some cardinal κ such that, for all sets A and B, there is a subset $A_0 \subseteq A$ of size $|A_0| < \kappa \oplus |B|^+$ with $A \sqrt{A_0} B$.

(RLOC) *Right Locality.* There exists a cardinal κ such that, for all sets A and B, there is a subset $B_0 \subseteq B$ of size $|B_0| < \kappa \oplus |A|^+$ with $A \sqrt{B_0} B$.

If $\sqrt{}$ is right local, we denote by loc($\sqrt{}$) the least cardinal κ such that $\sqrt{}$ satisfies the condition in (RLOC). Similarly, loc_o($\sqrt{}$) the least cardinal κ such that $\sqrt{}$ satisfies the above condition for *finite* sets *A*. If $\sqrt{}$ is not right local, we set loc($\sqrt{}$) := ∞ and loc_o($\sqrt{}$) := ∞ .

We start by proving that every preforking relation is left local.

Proposition 3.17. Let T be a complete first-order theory and let $\sqrt{}$ be a preforking relation. For all sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, there exists a subset $A_0 \subseteq A$ of size $|A_0| \leq |T| \oplus |B|$ such that

 $A \sqrt{A_{\circ}} B$.

Proof. Let *A* and *B* be sets. By Lemma 3.14, there is a set $A_0 \subseteq A$ of size $|A_0| \leq |T| \oplus |B|$ such that $A \sqrt[n]{A_0} B$. By Theorem 3.13, this implies that $A \sqrt{A_0} B$.

Corollary 3.18. Let T be a complete first-order theory and let \downarrow a symmetric preforking relation. Then $loc(\downarrow) \leq |T|^+$.

The two parameters $loc_o(\sqrt{})$ and $loc(\sqrt{})$ are nearly the same. They can only differ if the first one is a singular cardinal.

Definition 3.19. For a cardinal κ , we denote by κ^{reg} the minimal regular cardinal with $\kappa^{\text{reg}} \ge \kappa$, that is,

$$\kappa^{\mathrm{reg}} := \begin{cases} \kappa & \text{if } \kappa \text{ is regular,} \\ \kappa^+ & \text{if } \kappa \text{ is singular.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.20. Let $\sqrt{}$ be an abstract independence relation that satisfies (BMON) and (RLOC). Then

$$loc_{o}(\checkmark) \leq loc(\checkmark) \leq loc_{o}(\checkmark)^{reg}$$
.

Proof. The lower bound follows immediately from the definitions. For the upper bound, let $\kappa := \log_o(\sqrt{})^{\text{reg}}$ and consider sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. We have to find a set $U \subseteq A$ of size $|U| < \kappa \oplus |A|^+$ with $A \sqrt{U} B$.

For every finite set $A_{\circ} \subseteq A$, we choose a set $U(A_{\circ}) \subseteq B$ of size $|U(A_{\circ})| < \log_{\circ}(\sqrt{2}) \le \kappa$ such that

 $A_{\circ} \sqrt{U(A_{\circ})} B$.

Setting $U := \bigcup \{ U(A_o) \mid A_o \subseteq A \text{ finite} \}$ it follows by (BMON) that

 $A_{\circ} \sqrt{U} B$, for all finite $A_{\circ} \subseteq A$.

By (FIN), this implies $A \sqrt{U} B$. Since the cardinal $\kappa \oplus |A|^+$ is regular, we furthermore have

$$|U| \leq \sum_{A_{o} \subseteq A \text{ finite}} |U(A_{o})| < \kappa \oplus |A|^{+}.$$

We can characterise preforking relations with local character in terms of so-called *forking chains*.

Definition 3.21. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a preforking relation.

(a) Let $A, U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be sets. A sequence of finite sets $(B_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ is a $\sqrt{-forking chain}$ for A over U if

$$A \swarrow_{UB[<\alpha]} B_{\alpha}$$
, for every $\alpha < \gamma$,

where we have set $B[<\alpha] := \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} B_{\beta}$. The ordinal γ is the *length* of the chain.

(b) We denote by $fc(\sqrt{})$ the least cardinal κ such that no finite set *A* has a $\sqrt{}$ -forking chain over \emptyset of length κ . If such a cardinal does not exist, we set $fc(\sqrt{}) := \infty$.

In the theorem below we show that the cardinal $fc(\sqrt{})$ is closely related to the parameter $loc(\sqrt{})$. As we will apply these results in a later chapter to relations that are not preforking relations, we state them in a slightly more general setting.

Definition 3.22. A ternary relation $\sqrt{}$ has *strong finite character* if it satisfies the following axiom:

(SFIN) Strong Finite Character.

 $A \sqrt{U} B$ iff $A_o \sqrt{U} B_o$ for all finite $A_o \subseteq A$ and $B_o \subseteq B$.

Remark. Note that every preforking relation has strong finite character since (SFIN) follows from (FIN) and (DEF).

The following lemma contains the key argument of the translation between $fc(\sqrt{})$ and $loc(\sqrt{})$.

Lemma 3.23. Let $\sqrt{}$ be an abstract independence relation that satisfies (BMON) and (SFIN), let κ be an infinite cardinal and $A \subseteq \mathbb{M}$.

- (a) If there exists some set B such that $A \swarrow_U B$, for all $U \subseteq B$ of size $|U| < \kappa$, then there is a $\sqrt{-forking}$ chain for A over \emptyset of length κ .
- (b) If κ is regular and every set B has a subset $U \subseteq B$ of size $|U| < \kappa$ with $A \sqrt{U} B$, then there is no $\sqrt{-forking}$ chain for A over \emptyset of length κ .

Proof. (a) We construct the desired $\sqrt{-forking chain (B_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}}$ by induction on α . Suppose that we have already defined B_{α} , for all $\alpha < \beta$. Then

$$\begin{split} & \left| B[<\beta] \right| < \aleph_{\circ} \le \kappa \,, \qquad & \text{for } \beta < \omega \,, \\ \text{and} & \left| B[<\beta] \right| \le \aleph_{\circ} \otimes |\beta| < \kappa \,, \quad & \text{for } \omega \le \beta < \kappa \,. \end{split}$$

In both cases it follows that $A \swarrow_{B[<\beta]} B$. Hence, we can use (SFIN) to find a finite set $B_{\beta} \subseteq B$ with $A \swarrow_{B[<\beta]} B_{\beta}$.

(b) Let $(B_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$ a sequence of finite sets of length κ . By assumption, there exists a set $U \subseteq B[<\kappa]$ of size $|U| < \kappa$ such that

 $A \sqrt{U} B[<\kappa].$

As κ is regular, there is some index $\alpha < \kappa$ with $U \subseteq B[<\alpha]$. By (BMON) and (MON) it follows that

$$A \sqrt{B[<\alpha]} B_{\alpha}$$

Consequently, $(B_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is no $\sqrt{-1}$ forking chain for A over \emptyset .

Proposition 3.24. Let $\sqrt{}$ be an abstract independence relation satisfying (BMON) and (SFIN). Then

 \square

$$\operatorname{loc}_{o}(\sqrt{}) \leq \operatorname{fc}(\sqrt{}) \leq \operatorname{loc}_{o}(\sqrt{})^{\operatorname{reg}}.$$

Proof. For the lower bound, consider a finite set *A* and an arbitrary set *B*. If there were no set $U \subseteq B$ of size $|U| < \text{fc}(\sqrt{})$ with $A \sqrt{U} B$, we could use Lemma 3.23 (a) to construct a $\sqrt{-}$ forking chain for *A* over \emptyset of length fc($\sqrt{}$). A contradiction.

For the upper bound, consider a finite set *A*. Then Lemma 3.23 (b) implies that there is no $\sqrt{-1}$ forking chain for *A* over \emptyset of length $loc_o(\sqrt{)}^{reg}$.

Theorem 3.25. For a preforking relation $\sqrt{}$, the following statements are equivalent:

- (1) \sqrt{has} local character.
- (2) $\sqrt{is right local}$.
- (3) For every set A, there exists a cardinal κ such that there is no √forking chain for A over Ø of length κ.

(4) There exists a cardinal κ such that, for every finite set A, there is no $\sqrt{-forking}$ chain for A over \emptyset of length κ .

(3) \Rightarrow (4) For every type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(\emptyset)$, fix a tuple $\bar{a}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ realising \mathfrak{p} . By (3), there are cardinals $\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}$ such that there are no $\sqrt{-}$ forking chains for $\bar{a}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ over \emptyset of length $\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}$. We claim that the cardinal

$$\kappa := \sup \{ \kappa_{\mathfrak{p}} \mid \mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(\emptyset) \}$$

has the desired properties. Let \bar{a} be a finite tuple and $(B_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$ a sequence of finite sets of length κ . Then $\bar{a} \equiv_{\emptyset} \bar{a}_{\mathfrak{p}}$, for $\mathfrak{p} := \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a})$, and there exists an automorphism π with $\pi(\bar{a}) = \bar{a}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Since $\kappa \ge \kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}$, there is an index $\alpha < \kappa$ such that

 $\bar{a}_{\mathfrak{p}} \sqrt{\pi[B[<\alpha]]} \pi[B_{\alpha}].$

By invariance, it follows that $\bar{a} \sqrt{B[<\alpha]} B_{\alpha}$. Hence, $(B_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is not a $\sqrt{-forking chain for \bar{a} over \emptyset}$.

4. Forking relations

In this section we consider the special properties of forking relations that follow form the extension axiom. We start by presenting a canonical way to turn every preforking relation into a forking relation.

Definition 4.1. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a preforking relation. We define a relation $\sqrt[*]{}$ by

$$A \sqrt[*]{_U B}$$
 : iff for every set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ there is some set $A' \subseteq \mathbb{M}$
with $A' \equiv_{UB} A$ and $A' \sqrt{_U BC}$.

Remark. Note that $\sqrt[*]{} \subseteq \sqrt{}$. Furthermore, by Proposition 4.5 below it will follow that $\sqrt[*]{} = \sqrt{}$ if, and only if, $\sqrt{}$ is a forking relation. Consequently, the operation $\sqrt{} \mapsto \sqrt[*]{}$ is a so-called *kernel operator*, the dual of a closure operator:

$$\sqrt[*]{\subseteq} \sqrt{}, \quad \sqrt[**]{=} \sqrt[*]{}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{}_{o} \subseteq \sqrt{}_{1} \Rightarrow \sqrt[*]{}_{o} \subseteq \sqrt[*]{}_{1}.$$

Before proving that $\sqrt[4]{}$ is a forking relation, we present two alternative definitions. The first one characterises such relations in terms of global types.

Definition 4.2. A *global type* is a complete type over \mathbb{M} .

Proposition 4.3. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a preforking relation and $\bar{a}, U, B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. Then

$$\bar{a} \sqrt[4]{U} B$$
 iff $tp(\bar{a}/UB)$ can be extended to a global type that is $\sqrt{-f}$ free over U.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Let $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ be a global type that is $\sqrt{-free}$ over U. To show that $\bar{a} \sqrt[*]{U} B$, consider a set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. Choosing some tuple \bar{a}' realising $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright UBC$, we have $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ and $\bar{a}' \sqrt{U} BC$.

 (\Rightarrow) Suppose that $\bar{a} \sqrt[*]{U} B$ and set

$$\Phi(\bar{x}) \coloneqq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB) \cup \{\neg \varphi(\bar{x}) \mid \varphi \text{ a formula over } \mathbb{M} \text{ that} \\ \sqrt{-\text{forks over } U} \}.$$

We start by proving that Φ is satisfiable. Let $\Phi_{\circ} \subseteq \Phi$ be finite. Then

$$\Phi_{o} \equiv \left\{\psi(\bar{x}), \neg \varphi_{o}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{o}), \ldots, \neg \varphi_{n}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{n})\right\},\$$

for some $\psi \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ and formulae $\varphi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_i)$ that $\sqrt{-\text{fork}}$ over U. Since $\bar{a} \sqrt[*]{U} B$, there exists a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ such that $\bar{a}' \sqrt{U} B \bar{c}_0 \dots \bar{c}_n$. Then \bar{a}' satisfies Φ_0 .

Hence, Φ is satisfiable and there exists a global type $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \Phi$. We claim that \mathfrak{p} is $\sqrt{-}$ free over U. For a contradiction, suppose that $\mathfrak{p} \models \varphi(\bar{x})$, for some formula φ that $\sqrt{-}$ forks over U. Then $\neg \varphi \in \Phi \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$. A contradiction.

The second characterisation considers forking relations in terms of types and formulae. The key here is that the formulae ψ_i below might have parameters that do not appear in Φ .

Lemma 4.4. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a preforking relation. A partial type $\Phi \sqrt[*]{-forks}$ over U if, and only if, for some $n < \omega$, there are formulae $\psi_0, \ldots, \psi_{n-1}$ with parameters such that

$$\Phi(\bar{x}) \vDash \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_i(\bar{x})$$
 and each $\psi_i \checkmark$ -forks over U .

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Fix a tuple $\bar{a} \in \Phi^{\mathbb{M}}$ and let *B* be a set such that Φ is a partial type over *B*. For a contradiction, suppose that $\bar{a} \sqrt[*]{U} B$. We choose a set *C* containing the parameters of every formula ψ_i . By definition of $\sqrt[*]{}$, there is some tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ such that $\bar{a}' \sqrt{U} BC$. Since $\Phi \models \bigvee_i \psi_i$, we have $\mathbb{M} \models \psi_i(\bar{a}')$, for some i < n. As $\psi_i \sqrt{-}$ forks over *U*, it follows that $\bar{a}' \sqrt{U} BC$. A contradiction.

(⇒) Suppose that $\Phi \sqrt[*]{-forks}$ over *U* and let *B* be some set such that Φ is a partial type over *B*. By definition of $\sqrt[*]{}$, there exists, for every tuple $\bar{a} \in \Phi^{\mathbb{M}}$, some set $C_{\bar{a}}$ such that

$$\bar{a}' \swarrow_{II} BC_{\bar{a}}$$
, for all $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$.

By (DEF), we can find a formula $\psi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\bar{a}}, \bar{c}_{\bar{a}})$ with parameters $\bar{b}_{\bar{a}} \subseteq B$ and $\bar{c}_{\bar{a}} \subseteq C_{\bar{a}}$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \psi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}_{\bar{a}}, \bar{c}_{\bar{a}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\bar{a}}, \bar{c}_{\bar{a}}) \checkmark \text{-forks over } U.$$

Consequently, the set

$$\Phi(\bar{x}) \cup \left\{ \neg \psi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\bar{a}}, \bar{c}_{\bar{a}}) \mid \bar{a} \in \Phi^{\mathbb{M}} \right\}$$

is inconsistent. By compactness, we can therefore find finitely many tuples $\bar{a}_0, \ldots, \bar{a}_{n-1}$ such that

$$\Phi(\bar{x}) \vDash \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_{\bar{a}_i}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\bar{a}_i}, \bar{c}_{\bar{a}_i})$$

and each formula $\psi_{\bar{a}_i}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{\bar{a}_i}, \bar{c}_{\bar{a}_i}) \sqrt{-1}$ forks over *U*.

1115

 \square

Next we prove that the operations $\sqrt{\mapsto} \sqrt[*]{}$ turns every preforking relation into a forking relation.

Proposition 4.5. If $\sqrt{is a preforking relation then <math>\sqrt[*]{is a forking relation}$. *Proof.* (INV) follows easily from the definition.

(MON) Suppose that $A_0A_1 \sqrt[*]{U} B$ and let $B_0 \subseteq B$. To show that $A_0 \sqrt[*]{U} B_0$ let $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. By definition of $\sqrt[*]{}$, there are sets A'_0 and A'_1 with $A'_0A'_1 \equiv_{UB} A_0A_1$ and $A'_0A'_1 \sqrt{U} BC$. This implies that $A'_0 \equiv_{UB_0} A_0$ and $A'_0 \sqrt{U} BC$.

(NOR) Suppose that $A \sqrt[*]{U} B$. To show that $AU \sqrt[*]{U} BU$, let $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. There is some set A' such that $A' \equiv_{UB} A$ and $A' \sqrt{U} BCU$. It follows by (NOR) that $A'U \sqrt{U} BCU$. Since $A'U \equiv_{UB} AU$ the claim follows.

(LRF) For all sets A, B, $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, we have $A \sqrt{A} BC$. Hence, $A \sqrt[*]{A} B$.

(LTR) Suppose that $A_2 \, \sqrt[4]{A_1} B$ and $A_1 \, \sqrt[4]{A_0} B$ for $A_0 \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2$. To show that $A_2 \, \sqrt[4]{A_0} B$ let $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. There exists a set A'_1 with $A'_1 \equiv_{A_0B} A_1$ and $A'_1 \, \sqrt{A_0} BC$. Let A'_2 be some set such that $A'_1A'_2 \equiv_{A_0B} A_1A_2$. By (INV) it follows that $A'_2 \, \sqrt[4]{A'_1} B$. Therefore, there exists a set A''_2 with $A''_2 \equiv_{A'_1B} A'_2$ and $A''_2 \, \sqrt{A'_1} BC$. By (LTR) it follows that $A''_2 \, \sqrt[4]{A_0} BC$, as desired.

(BMON) Suppose that $A \sqrt[*]{U} BC$. To show that $A \sqrt[*]{UC} BC$, let $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. There is a set A' with $A' \equiv_{UBC} A$ such that $A' \sqrt{U} BCD$. By (BMON) it follows that $A' \sqrt{UC} BCD$.

(EXT) Suppose that $A \sqrt[*]{U} B$ and let \bar{a} be an enumeration of A. By Proposition 4.3, there exists some global type $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ that is $\sqrt{-}$ free over U. Given a set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, we choose some tuple \bar{a}' realising $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright UBC$. Then $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ and $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}'/UBC) = \mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright UBC$ has the global extension \mathfrak{p} , which is $\sqrt{-}$ free over U. Hence, Proposition 4.3 implies that $\bar{a}' \sqrt[*]{U} BC$.

(DEF) Suppose that $\bar{a} \swarrow_U B$. Then there is a set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ such that $\bar{a}' \swarrow_U BC$ for all tuples $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$. Let Φ be the set of all formulae

 $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UBC)$ that $\sqrt{-fork}$ over U. Since $\sqrt{-fork}$ is definable, it follows by choice of C that the set

$$\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB) \cup \{\neg \varphi \mid \varphi \in \Phi\}$$

is inconsistent. Hence, there is some formula $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ such that

$$\psi(\bar{x};\bar{b}) \vDash \bigvee \Phi.$$

We claim that $\mathbb{M} \models \psi(\bar{a}'; \bar{b})$ implies $\bar{a}' \swarrow_U \bar{b}$. Suppose otherwise. Then there exists a tuple \bar{a}'' such that $\bar{a}'' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}'$ and $\bar{a}'' \sqrt{_U} BC$. But there is some formula $\varphi \in \Phi$ with $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}'')$. By definition of Φ this implies that $\bar{a}'' \swarrow_U BC$. A contradiction.

Lemma 4.6. $cl_{\sqrt{2}} = cl_{\sqrt{2}}$, for every preforking relation $\sqrt{2}$.

Proof. Note that $\sqrt[*]{\subseteq} \sqrt{}$ implies $\operatorname{cl}_{\sqrt[*]{\subseteq}} C_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Conversely, suppose that $a \notin \operatorname{cl}_{\sqrt[*]{UC}} D$. Then there are sets *B* and *C* such that $a \notin_{UC} B$. Hence, we can find a set *D* such that $a' \notin_{UC} BD$, for all $a' \equiv_{UCB} a$. In particular, we have $a \notin_{UC} BD$, which implies that $a \notin \operatorname{cl}_{\sqrt{}}(U)$.

Exercise 4.1. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a preforking relation. Prove that, if $\sqrt[*]{}$ is right local, then so is $\sqrt{}$.

To check whether a forking relation is contained in another one, we can frequently use the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. Let $\sqrt[6]{}$ be a relation satisfying (EXT) and let $\sqrt[1]{}$ be a relation satisfying (INV) and (MON). If, for all sets B and U, there exists some set C such that

 $A \sqrt[\circ]{U} BC$ implies $A \sqrt[1]{U} BC$, for all sets A, then $\sqrt[\circ]{\subseteq} \sqrt[1]{.}$ *Proof.* Suppose that $A \sqrt[\circ]{U} B$. By assumption, we can find a set C such that

$$A \sqrt[\circ]{U} BC$$
 implies $A \sqrt[1]{U} BC$, for all sets A.

By (EXT), there is some set $A' \equiv_{UB} A$ such that $A' \sqrt[\circ]{U} BC$. By choice of *C*, it follows that $A' \sqrt[1]{U} BC$. Consequently, (MON) and (INV) imply that $A \sqrt[1]{U} B$.

Morley sequences

The aim of this section is to introduce the notion of a basis for an arbitrary forking relation. Since, in general, forking relations are not symmetric, these bases are ordered. To simplify notation we write $\bar{a}[<k]$, for a sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$, to denote the set $\bigcup_{i < k} \bar{a}_i$.

Definition 4.8. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a preforking relation and $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{\bar{s}}(U \cup B)$ a type. (a) A $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence for \mathfrak{p} over U is an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ over $U \cup B$ such that every \bar{a}_i realises \mathfrak{p} and

 $\bar{a}_i \sqrt{U} \bar{a}[\langle i], \text{ for all } i \in I.$

We call $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ a $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence over U if it is a $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence for tp (\bar{a}_i/U) over U.

(b) A *reverse* $\sqrt{-Morley sequence}$ for \mathfrak{p} over U is an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ over $U \cup B$ such that every \bar{a}_i realises \mathfrak{p} and

 $\bar{a}[\langle i] \sqrt{U} \bar{a}_i$, for all $i \in I$.

Remark. If $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ is a $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence for \mathfrak{p} over U, then it follows by (FIN), Lemma 2.4, and induction, that

 $\bar{a}[I_1] \sqrt{U} \bar{a}[I_o]$, for all $I_o, I_1 \subseteq I$ with $I_o < I_1$.

For symmetric preforking relations, we obtain the following stronger result.

Lemma 4.9. Let \downarrow be a symmetric preforking relation and $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ a sequence such that

$$\bar{a}_i \downarrow_U \bar{a}[\langle i], \quad for all \ i \in I$$

Then

 $\bar{a}[K] \downarrow_U \bar{a}[L]$, for all disjoint $K, L \subseteq I$.

Proof. By (FIN), it is sufficient to prove the claim for finite sets K and L. We do so by induction on $|K \cup L|$. If both sets are empty, the claim follows by (NOR). Otherwise, let $k := \max(K \cup L)$. By (SYM), we may assume without loss of generality that $k \in K$. Set $K_0 := K \setminus \{k\}$. By inductive hypothesis, we have

 $\bar{a}[K_{o}] \downarrow_{U} \bar{a}[L].$

Furthermore,

```
\bar{a}_k \downarrow_U \bar{a}[\langle k ] implies \bar{a}_k \downarrow_U \bar{a}[K_o]\bar{a}[L].
```

Consequently, it follows by Lemma 2.4 that

 $\bar{a}_k \bar{a}[K_o] \downarrow_U \bar{a}[L].$

We can use the extension axiom to construct Morley sequences.

Proposition 4.10. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a forking relation. If $\bar{a} \sqrt{}_U B$ then there is a $\sqrt{}$ -Morley sequence $(\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ for tp (\bar{a}/UB) over U.

Proof. Set $\lambda := |T| \oplus |U| \oplus |B| \oplus |\bar{a}| \oplus \aleph_0$ and let $\kappa > \beth_{2^{\lambda}}$. First, we construct a sequence $(\bar{c}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$ of tuples realising tp (\bar{a}/UB) such that

 $\bar{c}_{\alpha} \sqrt{U} B\bar{c}[<\alpha]$, for all $\alpha < \kappa$.

By induction, suppose that we have already defined \bar{c}_{β} , for all $\beta < \alpha$. Since $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} B$, we can use (EXT) to find a tuple $\bar{c}_{\alpha} \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ such that $\bar{c}_{\alpha} \sqrt{U} B\bar{c}[<\alpha]$.

1119

Having constructed $(\bar{c}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$, we use Theorem E5.3.7 to find an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ over $U \cup B$ such that, for every $n < \omega$, there are indices $\alpha_0 < \cdots < \alpha_{n-1} < \kappa$ with

$$\bar{a}_{o}\ldots\bar{a}_{n-1}\equiv_{UB}\bar{c}_{\alpha_{o}}\ldots\bar{c}_{\alpha_{n-1}}$$

By (INV) and (MON) it follows that $\bar{a}_n \sqrt{U} B\bar{a}[<n]$. Hence, $(\bar{a}_n)_{n<\omega}$ is the desired $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence.

Corollary 4.11. Let \downarrow be a symmetric forking relation. For every tuple \bar{a} , every set U, and every linear order I, there exists a \downarrow -Morley sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ for $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)$ over U.

Proof. As \downarrow is symmetric, we have $\bar{a} \downarrow_U U$. Therefore, we can use Proposition 4.10 to find a \downarrow -Morley sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}$ for tp (\bar{a}/U) over U. By compactness and (FIN), it follows that there also exists a \downarrow -Morley sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i\in I}$ for tp (\bar{a}/U) over U that is indexed by I.

Lemma 4.12. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a forking relation and let \mathfrak{p} be a type over $U \cup B$. If there exists $a \sqrt{-}$ Morley sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$ for \mathfrak{p} over U, then there exists a reverse $\sqrt{-}$ Morley sequence $(\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ for \mathfrak{p} over U.

Proof. Let $(\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}$ be a $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence for \mathfrak{p} over U. By compactness, there exists a sequence $(\bar{a}_n)_{n<\omega}$ such that

$$\bar{a}_{\circ}\ldots\bar{a}_n\equiv_{UB}\bar{c}_n\ldots\bar{c}_{\circ}$$
, for all $n<\omega$.

By definition of a Morley sequence we have

 $\bar{c}_n \sqrt{U} \bar{c}_0 \dots \bar{c}_{n-1}.$

Hence (INV) implies that

 $\bar{a}_i \sqrt{U} \bar{a}_{i+1} \dots \bar{a}_n$, for all $i < n < \omega$.

Repeatedly applying Lemma 2.4 it follows that

 $\bar{a}_0 \dots \bar{a}_{n-1} \sqrt{U} \bar{a}_n$, for every $n < \omega$.

The following lemma can be used in some cases to construct a reverse $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence out of an indiscernible sequence.

Lemma 4.13. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a preforking relation and let I, J be linear orders such that I has no maximal element. If $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I+J}$ is indiscernible over U then $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ is a reverse $\sqrt{-}$ Morley sequence over $U \cup \bar{a}[I]$.

Proof. Clearly, $(\bar{a}_j)_{j \in J}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}[I]$. To show that it is a reverse $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence over $U \cup \bar{a}[I]$, it is sufficient, by (FIN), to prove that

$$\bar{a}_{j_0} \dots \bar{a}_{j_{k-1}} \sqrt{U\bar{a}[I]} \bar{a}_{j_k}$$
, for all $j_0 < \dots < j_k$ in J , $k < \omega$.

Hence, consider indices $j_0 < \cdots < j_k$ in *J*. By indiscernibility and the fact that *I* has no maximal element, we can find, for every finite set $I_0 \subseteq I$, indices $i_0 < \cdots < i_{k-1}$ in *I* such that

$$\bar{a}_{j_{\mathrm{o}}}\ldots\bar{a}_{j_{k-1}}\bar{a}_{j_{k}}\equiv_{U\bar{a}[I_{\mathrm{o}}]}\bar{a}_{i_{\mathrm{o}}}\ldots\bar{a}_{i_{k-1}}\bar{a}_{j_{k}}.$$

It follows that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}_{j_0} \dots \bar{a}_{j_{k-1}}/U \cup \bar{a}[I] \cup \bar{a}_{j_k})$ is finitely satisfiable in $U \cup \bar{a}[I]$. Consequently,

 $\bar{a}_{j_0}\ldots \bar{a}_{j_{k-1}} \sqrt[\mathbf{u}]{U\cup \bar{a}[I]} \bar{a}_{j_k}$ implies $\bar{a}_{j_0}\ldots \bar{a}_{j_{k-1}} \sqrt{U\cup \bar{a}[I]} \bar{a}_{j_k}$,

as desired.

For preforking relations that are contained in the splitting relation $\sqrt[5]{}$, we no not need to check for indiscernibility when proving that a given sequence is a Morley sequence.

Lemma 4.14. Let $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ and $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i \in I}$ be two sequences and $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ a set of parameters.

- (a) If $\bar{b}_i \equiv_{U\bar{a}[\langle i \rangle]} \bar{a}_i$ and $\bar{b}_i \sqrt[s]{U} \bar{a}[\langle i \rangle] \bar{b}[\langle i \rangle]$, for all $i \in I$, then $\alpha \equiv_U \beta$.
- (b) If $\bar{a}_j \equiv_{U\bar{a}[<i]} \bar{a}_i$ and $\bar{a}_i \sqrt[s]{U} \bar{a}[<i]$, for all $i \leq j$ in I, then α is indiscernible over U.

Proof. (a) We prove by induction on $n < \omega$ that

$$\bar{a}[\bar{i}] \equiv_U b[\bar{i}], \text{ for all } \bar{i} \in [I]^n.$$

For n = 0, the claim is trivial. For the inductive step, suppose that we have already proved it for n and consider a tuple of indices $\overline{i} \in [I]^{n+1}$. Setting $\overline{i}' := i_0 \dots i_{n-1}$ we have

$$\bar{a}[\bar{\imath}'] \equiv_U \bar{b}[\bar{\imath}']$$
 and $\bar{b}_{i_n} \sqrt[s]{U} \bar{a}[\bar{\imath}'] \bar{b}[\bar{\imath}']$,

which implies that $\bar{a}[\bar{i}'] \equiv_{U\bar{b}_{i_n}} \bar{b}[\bar{i}']$. Since $\bar{b}_{i_n} \equiv_{U\bar{a}[\langle i_n \rangle]} \bar{a}_{i_n}$, it follows that

$$\bar{a}[\bar{i}']\bar{a}_{i_n}\equiv_U \bar{a}[\bar{i}']\bar{b}_{i_n}\equiv_U \bar{b}[\bar{i}']\bar{b}_{i_n}.$$

(b) We have to prove that

$$\bar{a}[\bar{i}] \equiv_U \bar{a}[\bar{j}], \text{ for all } \bar{i}, \bar{j} \in [I]^n, n < \omega.$$

Hence, let $\bar{i}, \bar{j} \in [I]^n$. First, we consider the case where $i_s \leq j_s$, for all s < n. Then we have

$$\bar{a}_{j_s} \equiv_{U\bar{a}_{i_0}...\bar{a}_{i_{s-1}}} \bar{a}_{i_s}$$
 and $\bar{a}_{j_s} \sqrt[s]{U} \bar{a}_{i_0}...\bar{a}_{i_{s-1}} \bar{a}_{j_0}...\bar{a}_{j_{s-1}}$,

for all s < n. Consequently, it follows by (a) that $\bar{a}[\bar{i}] \equiv_U \bar{a}[\bar{j}]$.

For the general case, let $\overline{i}, \overline{j} \in [I]^n$ be arbitrary. We set

 $k_s \coloneqq \max\{i_s, j_j\}, \quad \text{for } s < n.$

Then $\bar{k} \in [I]^n$ and it follows by the special case considered above that $\bar{a}[\bar{i}] \equiv_U \bar{a}[\bar{k}] \equiv_U \bar{a}[\bar{j}]$.

As an application of Morley sequences we show that, for forking relations, right locality and symmetry are equivalent. One direction is based on the following two lemmas. **Lemma 4.15.** Let $\sqrt{-be}$ a right local forking relation, $B, U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ sets, and let $\kappa \ge \operatorname{loc}(\sqrt{}) \oplus |B|^+$ be a regular cardinal. For every reverse $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i < \kappa}$ over U, there exists an index $\alpha < \kappa$ such that

$$B\bar{a}[<\beta] \sqrt{U} \bar{a}_{\beta}, \text{ for all } \alpha \leq \beta < \kappa.$$

Proof. By (RLOC), there exists a set $U_0 \subseteq U \cup \bar{a}[<\kappa]$ of size

$$|U_{\rm o}| < \operatorname{loc}(\sqrt{}) \oplus |B|^+ \leq \kappa$$

such that

$$B \sqrt{U_{o}} U\bar{a}[<\kappa].$$

Set $I := \{ i < \kappa \mid \bar{a}_i \cap U_o \neq \emptyset \}$. Then $|I| < \kappa$ and, by regularity of κ , there exists an index $\alpha < \kappa$ that is larger than every element of I. For $\alpha \leq \beta < \kappa$, it follows by (BMON) and monotonicity that $B \sqrt{U\bar{a}[<\beta]} \bar{a}_{\beta}$. Since $(\bar{a}_i)_{i < \kappa}$ is a reverse $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence, we furthermore have $\bar{a}[<\beta] \sqrt{U} \bar{a}_{\beta}$. By Lemma 2.3, it follows that $B\bar{a}[<\beta] \sqrt{U} \bar{a}_{\beta}$.

Lemma 4.16. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a right local preforking relation. If there exists a reverse $\sqrt{-}$ Morley sequence $(\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ for tp (\bar{a}/BU) over U then B $\sqrt{_U} \bar{a}$.

Proof. Set $\kappa := |B|^+ \oplus \operatorname{loc}(\sqrt{})^+$ and let $(\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ be a reverse $\sqrt{}$ -Morley sequence. By compactness, we can extend $(\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ to an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i < \kappa}$ over $B \cup U$ of length κ . By (FIN) and (INV) it follows that

 $\bar{a}[<\alpha] \sqrt{U} \bar{a}_{\alpha}$, for all $\alpha < \kappa$.

Hence, $(\bar{a}_i)_{i < \kappa}$ is a reverse $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence. By Lemma 4.15, there is some index $\alpha < \kappa$ with $B \sqrt{U} \bar{a}_{\alpha}$. As $\bar{a}_{\alpha} \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$, we can use (INV) to conclude that $B \sqrt{U} \bar{a}$.

Theorem 4.17 (Adler). A forking relation $\sqrt{}$ is right local if, and only if, it is symmetric.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) follows by Corollary 3.18.

(⇒) If $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} B$, we can use Proposition 4.10 and Lemma 4.12 to construct a reverse $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence of tp (\bar{a}/UB) over U. Therefore, it follows by Lemma 4.16 that $B \sqrt{U} \bar{a}$.

F3. Simple theories

1. Dividing and forking

In this section we introduce the central forking relation of model theory, which is simply called *forking*.

Definition 1.1. Let *T* be a first-order theory, *U* a set of parameters, and $k < \omega$.

(a) We say that a set Φ of formulae over U is *k*-inconsistent (with respect to T) if $T(U) \cup \Phi_0$ is inconsistent, for every subset $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$ of size $|\Phi_0| \ge k$.

(b) A formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ with parameters \bar{c} *k*-divides over U if there exists a sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$ such that

- $\bar{c}_n \equiv_U \bar{c}$, for all $n < \omega$, and
- the set { $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n) \mid n < \omega$ } is *k*-inconsistent.

We say that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ divides over U if it k-divides over U, for some $k < \omega$.

(c) A set Φ of formulae *divides* over U if $T(\mathbb{M}) \cup \Phi \vDash \varphi$, for some formula φ that divides over U. We define

$$\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} B$$
 : iff $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ does not divide over U .

(d) A set Φ of formulae *forks* over U if there are finitely many formulae $\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_{n-1}$ such that

 $T(\mathbb{M}) \cup \Phi \vDash \varphi_{0} \lor \cdots \lor \varphi_{n-1}$

and each φ_i divides over *U*. We define

$$\bar{a} \sqrt[f]{U} B$$
 : iff $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ does not fork over U .

logic, algebra & geometry 2024-04-09 - ©achim blumensath

Example. (a) Consider the structure $\langle \mathbb{Q}, < \rangle$ and let b < c be rational numbers. The formula $\varphi(x; b, c) := b < x \land x < c$ divides over the set $U := \{a \in \mathbb{Q} \mid a < b\}$ since we can choose numbers b_n and c_n such that $b \leq b_0 < c_0 < b_1 < c_1 < \dots$ Then $b_n c_n \equiv_U bc$ and the set $\{b_n < x \land x < c_n \mid n < \omega\}$ is 2-inconsistent.

(b) We consider the tree $\langle A^{<\omega}, \leq \rangle$ where *A* is an infinite set. Fix a vertex $u_0 \in A^{<\omega}$, an element $a \in A$, and set $u := u_0 a$. The formula $\varphi(x; u) := u \leq x$ divides over the set $U := \{ v \in A^{<\omega} \mid u_0 \neq v \}$ since, fixing distinct elements $b_n \in A$, for $n < \omega$, we can set $c_n := ub_n$. Then $c_n \equiv_U u$ and $\{ c_n \leq x \mid n < \omega \}$ is 2-inconsistent.

Remark. Note that, if a formula φ divides over U and $\psi \models \varphi$, then ψ also divides over U. It follows that a formula φ divides over U if, and only if, the set $\{\varphi\}$ divides over U. Furthermore, if a set Φ divides over U, then there exists a finite subset $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$ such that the formula $\wedge \Phi_0$ divides over U. In particular, a complete type \mathfrak{p} divides over U if, and only if, some formula $\varphi \in \mathfrak{p}$ divides over U. The same holds for forking.

Below we will prove that $\sqrt[d]{}$ is a preforking relation and $\sqrt[f]{}$ the associated forking relation. Before doing so, let us give an alternative characterisation of dividing in terms of indiscernible sequences.

Lemma 1.2. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ be a formula and $\bar{c}, U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ divides over U.
- (2) There exists an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over U such that $\bar{c}_o = \bar{c}$ and the set $\{ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n) \mid n < \omega \}$ is k-inconsistent, for some $k < \omega$.
- (3) There exists an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$ over U such that $\bar{c}_0 = \bar{c}$ and the set

$$T(\bigcup_{n<\omega} \bar{c}_n) \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$$

is inconsistent.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (1) and (2) \Rightarrow (3) are trivial.

(3) \Rightarrow (2) Let $(\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U with $\bar{c}_0 = \bar{c}$ such that

$$T(\bigcup_{n<\omega} \bar{c}_n) \cup \{ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n) \mid n < \omega \}$$

is inconsistent. Then there exists a finite subset $I \subseteq \omega$ such that

 $T(\bigcup_{n\in I}\bar{c}_n)\cup\{\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c}_n)\mid n\in I\}$

is inconsistent. Let $n_0 < \cdots < n_{k-1}$ be an enumeration of *I*. For every *k*-tuple of indices $i_0 < \cdots < i_{k-1}$, $\bar{c}[\bar{i}] \equiv_U \bar{c}[\bar{n}]$ implies that

$$T(\bar{c}_{i_0}\ldots\bar{c}_{i_{k-1}})\cup\{\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c}_{i_0}),\ldots,\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c}_{i_{k-1}})\}$$

is inconsistent. Hence, $\{ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n) \mid n < \omega \}$ is *k*-inconsistent.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ divides over U. Then there exists a sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}$ such that $\bar{c}_n \equiv_U \bar{c}$ and $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent, for some *k*. By Proposition E5.3.6, there exists an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{d}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over U with

$$\operatorname{Av}((c_n)_n/U) \subseteq \operatorname{Av}((d_n)_n/U).$$

In particular, $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{c}/U) \subseteq \operatorname{Av}((d_n)_n/U)$ and

$$\neg \exists \bar{z} [\varphi(\bar{z}; \bar{x}_{o}) \land \cdots \land \varphi(\bar{z}; \bar{x}_{k-1})] \in \operatorname{Av}((d_{n})_{n}/U).$$

Consequently, $\bar{d}_o \equiv_U \bar{c}$ and the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent. Fixing an automorphism $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_U$ with $\pi(\bar{d}_o) = \bar{c}$, we obtain a sequence $(\pi(\bar{d}_n))_{n < \omega}$ with the desired properties.

Exercise 1.1. Prove that a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ divides over a set *U* if, and only if, it divides over some model $M \supseteq U$. (*Hint*. Use Lemma E5.3.11.)

Lemma 1.3. The following statements are equivalent:

(1) $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b}$
- (2) For every infinite indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i\in I}$ over U with $\bar{b} = \bar{b}_i$, for some i, there exists a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}$ such that $(\bar{b}_i)_{i\in I}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}'$.
- (3) For every indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over U with $\bar{b} = \bar{b}_0$, there is some $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}$ such that

$$\bar{b}_m \equiv_{U\bar{a}'} \bar{b}_n$$
, for all $m, n < \omega$.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (3) is trivial.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose that $\bar{a} \swarrow_U \bar{b}$. By Lemma 1.2, we can find a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U\bar{b})$ and an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over U such that $\bar{c}_n \equiv_U \bar{c}$ and $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent, for some $k < \omega$. By adding and permuting free variables of φ , we may assume that $\bar{c}_n = \bar{b}_n \bar{d}$ where $\bar{d} \subseteq U$ and $\bar{b}_n \equiv_U \bar{b}$, for all *n*. Finally, applying an automorphism of \mathbb{M} , we may assume that $\bar{b}_0 = \bar{b}$.

To show that (3) fails, consider a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}$. Then

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}'; \bar{b}_{\circ} \bar{d}),$$

but the *k*-inconsistency of $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_n \bar{d}) \mid n < \omega\}$ implies that there is some n < k with

$$\mathbb{M} \not\models \varphi(\bar{a}'; \bar{b}_n \bar{d}) \,.$$

Consequently, $\bar{b}_n \not\equiv_{U\bar{a}'} \bar{b}_0$.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) Consider an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over *U* with $\bar{b} = \bar{b}_0$ and suppose that there is no such tuple \bar{a}' . Then the set

$$tp(\bar{a}/Ub) \cup \{ \varphi(\bar{x}; b_i) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{x}; b_j) \mid i, j < \omega \text{ and } \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \text{ a formula over } U \}$$

is inconsistent. This set is equivalent to the union

$$\bigcup_{n<\omega}\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x},\bar{b}_n), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x},\bar{x}')\coloneqq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U).$$

By compactness, we can therefore find a finite subset $\Phi \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ and indices $n_0 < \cdots < n_{k-1} < \omega$ such that

$$T \cup \Phi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{n_o}) \cup \cdots \cup \Phi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{n_{k-1}})$$

is inconsistent. Setting $\varphi := \bigwedge \Phi$ it follows by indiscernibility that

$$T \vDash \neg \exists \bar{x} [\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{i_{o}}) \land \cdots \land \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{i_{k-1}})],$$

for every increasing tuple $i_0 < \cdots < i_{k-1}$. Hence, $\{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent and φ divides over *U*. Consequently, $\bar{a} \swarrow_U \bar{b}$.

 $(3) \Rightarrow (2)$ Let $(\bar{b}_i)_{i \in I}$ be an infinite indiscernible sequence over U with $\bar{b}_{i_0} = \bar{b}$, for some $i_0 \in I$. Setting

$$\Psi \coloneqq \left\{ \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}[\bar{i}]) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}[\bar{k}]) \mid \psi \text{ a formula over } U \text{ and} \\ \operatorname{ord}(\bar{i}) = \operatorname{ord}(\bar{k}) \right\},$$

it is sufficient to prove that $tp(\bar{a}/U\bar{b}) \cup \Psi$ is satisfiable.

Fix a dense linear order $J \supseteq I$ without end points. Using Lemma E5.3.9, we can extend $(\bar{b}_i)_{i \in I}$ to an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i \in J}$ over U. By (3) and compactness, there exists a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}$ such that

$$\bar{b}_i \equiv_{U\bar{a}'} \bar{b}_j$$
, for all $i, j \in J$.

To show that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U\bar{b}) \cup \Psi$ is satisfiable, let $\Psi_0 \subseteq \Psi$ be finite and let $I_0 \subseteq I$ be the finite set of all indices i such that Ψ_0 contains the constants \bar{b}_i . By the Theorem of Ramsey, there exist an order embedding $h_0: I_0 \to J$ such that the sequence $(\bar{b}_{h(i)})_{i \in I_0}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}'$ with respect to the formulae in Ψ_0 . We extend $h_0: I_0 \to J$ to an order embedding $h: I_0 \cup \{i_0\} \to J$. There exists an automorphism $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_U$ mapping $\bar{b}_{h(i)}$ to \bar{b}_i , for $i \in I_0 \cup \{i_0\}$. Then the tuple $\pi(\bar{a}')$ satisfies $\bigcup_{i \in I_0 \cup \{i_0\}} \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U\bar{b}_i) \cup \Psi_0$. In particular, it satisfies $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U\bar{b}) \cup \Psi_0$. \Box

Remark. Comparing the statement in (2) above with Lemma E5.3.11, we see that, when $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} B$, we can choose $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ while, in general, we only find $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U} \bar{a}$.

Example. (a) Consider the structure $\langle \mathbb{Q}, < \rangle$ and let b < a < c be elements. Then $bc \sqrt[d]{\otimes} a$ but $a \sqrt[d]{\otimes} bc$. In particular, $\sqrt[d]{}$ is not symmetric.

We have already seen above that $\varphi(x; b, c) := b < x \land x < c$ divides over $\downarrow b$ and, hence, also over the empty set. Consequently, $a \swarrow_{\varnothing} bc$. To show that $bc \ \sqrt[d]{\varnothing} a$, let $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over \varnothing . Choose elements b' and c' such that b' < a < c' and $b' < a_i < c'$, for all $i < \omega$. Then $b'c' \equiv_a bc$ and $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$ is indiscernible over $\{b', c'\}$. By Lemma 1.3, it follows that $bc \ \sqrt[d]{\varnothing} a$.

(b) Let $\langle A, \sim \rangle$ be a structure where \sim is an equivalence relation with infinitely many classes all of which are infinite. Fix elements $a, b \in A$ and a set $U \subseteq A$. Then

$$a \bigvee_{U}^{d} b$$
 iff $\{a\} \cap \{b\} \subseteq U$ and,
 $a \nleftrightarrow b$ or there is some $c \in U$ with $b \sim c$.

Let us show next that $\sqrt[d]{}$ is a preforking relation, that $\sqrt[f]{}$ is the corresponding forking relation, and that acl is the closure operator associated with them.

Proposition 1.4. $\sqrt[d]{}$ *is a preforking relation.*

Proof. Throughout the proof we will tacitly make use of the characterisation of $\sqrt[d]{}$ from Lemma 1.3.

(INV) follows immediately from the definition.

(MON) Suppose that $\bar{a}_{\circ}\bar{a}_{1}\sqrt[d]{U}B$ and let $B_{\circ} \subseteq B$. For a contradiction, suppose that $\bar{a}_{\circ}\sqrt[d]{U}B_{\circ}$. Then we can find a formula $\varphi \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}_{\circ}/UB_{\circ})$ that divides over U. Hence, $\varphi \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}_{\circ}\bar{a}_{1}/UB)$ implies that $\bar{a}_{\circ}\bar{a}_{1}\sqrt[d]{U}B$. A contradiction.

(NOR) Suppose that $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{c} \bar{b}$. To show that $\bar{a}\bar{c} \sqrt[d]{c} \bar{b}\bar{c}$, let $(\bar{b}_n\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over \bar{c} with $\bar{b}_0\bar{c}_0 = \bar{b}\bar{c}$. Then $\bar{c}_n = \bar{c}$, for all n. Since $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{c} \bar{b}$, there is a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{\bar{b}\bar{c}} \bar{a}$ such that $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $\bar{a}'\bar{c}$. Hence, $(\bar{b}_n\bar{c})_{n<\omega}$ is also indiscernible over $\bar{a}'\bar{c}$. As $\bar{a}'\bar{c} \equiv_{\bar{b}\bar{c}} \bar{a}\bar{c}$, the claim follows. (LRF) Let \bar{a} , \bar{b} be tuples. To show that $\bar{a} \sqrt[4]{a} \bar{b}$ it is sufficient to note that every indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over \bar{a} is also indiscernible over $\bar{a} \cup \bar{a}$.

(LTR) Suppose that $\bar{a}_{0}\bar{a}_{1}\bar{a}_{2} \sqrt[d]{\bar{a}_{0}\bar{a}_{1}}\bar{b}$ and $\bar{a}_{0}\bar{a}_{1} \sqrt[d]{\bar{a}_{0}}\bar{b}$. Let $(\bar{b}_{n})_{n<\omega}$ be an infinite indiscernible sequence over \bar{a}_{0} such that $\bar{b}_{0} = \bar{b}$. We have to find tuples

$$\bar{a}_{0}''\bar{a}_{1}''\bar{a}_{2}'' \equiv_{\bar{a}_{0}\bar{b}} \bar{a}_{0}\bar{a}_{1}\bar{a}_{2}$$

such that $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $\bar{a}_0''\bar{a}_1''\bar{a}_2''$. Since $\bar{a}_0\bar{a}_1 \sqrt[d]{\bar{a}_0}\bar{b}$, there are tuples $\bar{a}_0'\bar{a}_1' \equiv_{\bar{a}_0\bar{b}} \bar{a}_0\bar{a}_1$ such that $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $\bar{a}_0'\bar{a}_1'$. Let \bar{a}_2' be a tuple such that

$$\bar{a}_{\mathsf{o}}'\bar{a}_{\mathsf{i}}'\bar{a}_{\mathsf{o}}' \equiv_{\bar{a}_{\mathsf{o}}\bar{b}} \bar{a}_{\mathsf{o}}\bar{a}_{\mathsf{i}}\bar{a}_{\mathsf{o}}$$

Then $\bar{a}'_{0}\bar{a}'_{1}\bar{a}'_{2}\sqrt[d]{}_{\bar{a}'_{0}\bar{a}'_{1}}\bar{b}$ and there are tuples

$$\bar{a}_{o}''\bar{a}_{1}''\bar{a}_{2}'' \equiv_{\bar{a}_{o}'\bar{a}_{1}'\bar{b}} \bar{a}_{o}'\bar{a}_{1}'\bar{a}_{2}'$$

such that $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $\bar{a}_{o}''\bar{a}_{1}''\bar{a}_{2}''$. Since

$$\bar{a}_{o}^{\prime\prime} = \bar{a}_{o}$$
 and $\bar{a}_{o}^{\prime\prime}\bar{a}_{1}^{\prime\prime}\bar{a}_{2}^{\prime\prime} \equiv_{\bar{a}_{o}\bar{b}} \bar{a}_{o}\bar{a}_{1}\bar{a}_{2}$

the claim follows.

(BMON) Suppose that $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{c} \bar{b} \bar{d}$. To show that $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{c} \bar{d} \bar{b}$, let $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ be a sequence of indiscernibles over $\bar{c} \bar{d}$ with $\bar{b}_0 = \bar{b}$. Then $(\bar{b}_n \bar{d})_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over \bar{c} . Consequently, there is some tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{\bar{c}\bar{b}\bar{d}} \bar{a}$ such that $(\bar{b}_n \bar{d})_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $\bar{a}'\bar{c}$. It follows that $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $\bar{a}'\bar{c}\bar{d}$.

(DEF) Suppose that $\bar{a} \swarrow_U B$. Then there exists a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in$ tp (\bar{a}/UB) that divides over U. For every $\bar{a}' \in \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})^{\mathbb{M}}$ it follows that tp $(\bar{a}'/U\bar{b})$ divides over U.

Before proving that $\sqrt[f]{}$ is the forking relation associated with $\sqrt[d]{}$, let us show that forking satisfies the axiom (EXT) even for incomplete types.

Lemma 1.5. A partial type Φ over $U \cup C$ forks over U if, and only if, every complete type $\mathfrak{p} \in \langle \Phi \rangle$ forks over U.

Proof. Clearly, if Φ forks over U, then so does every type containing Φ . Conversely, suppose that every $\mathfrak{p} \in \langle \Phi \rangle$ forks over U. For each $\mathfrak{p} \in \langle \Phi \rangle$, we fix a formula $\varphi_{\mathfrak{p}} \in \mathfrak{p}$ that forks over U. By compactness,

$$\left\langle \Phi \right\rangle = \left\{ \left. \mathfrak{p} \right| \left. \mathfrak{p} \in \left\langle \Phi \right\rangle \right\} \subseteq \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \left\langle \Phi \right\rangle} \left\langle \varphi_{\mathfrak{p}} \right\rangle$$

implies that there are finitely many types $\mathfrak{p}_0, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_{n-1} \in \langle \Phi \rangle$ such that

 \square

$$\langle \Phi \rangle \subseteq \langle \varphi_{\mathfrak{p}_{o}} \rangle \cup \cdots \cup \langle \varphi_{\mathfrak{p}_{n-1}} \rangle.$$

Consequently, $\Phi \vDash \varphi_{\mathfrak{p}_0} \lor \cdots \lor \varphi_{\mathfrak{p}_{n-1}}$ and Φ forks over U.

Proposition 1.6. $\sqrt[f]{} = *(\sqrt[d]{})$

Proof. (\subseteq) To prove that $\sqrt[f]{\subseteq} *(\sqrt[d]{})$, note that $\sqrt[f]{\subseteq} \sqrt[d]{}$ and that the operation $\sqrt{\to} \sqrt[s]{}$ is monotone. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that $\sqrt[f]{=} *(\sqrt[f]{})$, i.e., that $\sqrt[f]{}$ satisfies (EXT). Hence, suppose that $\bar{a} \sqrt[f]{}_U B$ and let *C* be an arbitrary set. By Lemma 1.5, there exists a complete type \mathfrak{p} over $U \cup B \cup C$ that contains tp (\bar{a}/UB) and that does not fork over *U*. Fix a realisation \bar{a}' of \mathfrak{p} . Then $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ and $\bar{a}' \sqrt[f]{}_U BC$.

(2) Suppose that $\bar{a} \swarrow_U B$. Then we can find finitely many formulae $\varphi_0(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_0), \ldots, \varphi_{n-1}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{n-1})$ that each divide over U and such that

$$\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB) \vDash \varphi_{o}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{o}) \lor \cdots \lor \varphi_{n-1}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{n-1}).$$

For every tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$, there is some i < n such that $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi_i(\bar{a}'; \bar{c}_i)$. Consequently,

$$\bar{a}' \bigvee_{U} B\bar{c}_{0} \dots \bar{c}_{n-1}, \text{ for all } \bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}.$$

Hence, $\bar{a}^* (\sqrt[d]{}_{U} B$ does not hold.

Corollary 1.7. $\sqrt[f]{}$ *is a forking relation.*

Lemma 1.8. $cl_{f/} = cl_{d/} = acl$

Proof. By Lemma F2.4.6, it is sufficient to prove that $cl_{d/} = acl$.

For one inclusion, let $a \notin acl(U)$. Then there exists an indiscernible sequence $(a_n)_{n < \omega}$ over U with $a_0 = a$ and $a_i \neq a_k$, for $i \neq k$. Since a is the only element realising tp(a/Ua) and $(a_n)_n$ is not indiscernible over $U \cup \{a\}$ it follows by Lemma 1.3 that $a \swarrow_U a$.

Conversely, suppose that there are sets *B*, *C* such that $a \swarrow_{UC} B$. By Lemma 1.2, we can find a formula $\varphi(x; \bar{c}) \in \operatorname{tp}(a/UCB)$ and an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$ such that $\bar{c}_0 = \bar{c}$ and $\{\varphi(x; \bar{c}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent, for some *k*. For every $n < \omega$, fix an element a_n such that $a_n \bar{c}_n \equiv_U a \bar{c}$. Since $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(a_n; \bar{c}_n)$ and $\{\varphi(x; \bar{c}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is *k*inconsistent, there exists an infinite subset $I \subseteq \omega$ such that $a_i \neq a_j$, for distinct *i*, $j \in I$. As each a_n satisfies $\operatorname{tp}(a/U)$ it follows that $a \notin \operatorname{acl}(U)$. \Box

At first sight, the definition of $\sqrt[d]{}$ might seem rather ad-hoc. The following result indicates that $\sqrt[d]{}$ plays a rather distinguished role: it is the largest preforking relation that is contained in every symmetric forking relation.

Theorem 1.9. $\sqrt[d]{\subseteq} \downarrow$, for every symmetric forking relation \downarrow .

Proof. Suppose that $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b}$. Since \downarrow is symmetric, (LRF) implies that $B \downarrow_U U$. Therefore, we can use Proposition F2.4.10 and Lemma F2.4.12 to construct a reverse \downarrow -Morley sequence $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ for tp (\bar{b}/U) over U. By (INV) we may assume that $\bar{b}_o = \bar{b}$. Since $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b}$ there is a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}$ such that $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $U\bar{a}'$. Hence, $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ is a reverse \downarrow -Morley sequence for tp (\bar{b}/U) over $U\bar{a}'$. Since \downarrow is right local, it follows by Lemma F2.4.16 that $\bar{a}' \downarrow_U \bar{b}$. By invariance we obtain $\bar{a} \downarrow_U \bar{b}$.

Remark. In the next section we will show that there are theories where $\sqrt[d]{}$ is symmetric and a forking relation. For such theories, $\sqrt[d]{}$ is the largest preforking relation that is contained in every symmetric forking relation.

To conclude this section we compare $\sqrt[d]{}$ and $\sqrt[f]{}$ with the preforking relations introduced in Section F2.3. First, let us introduce the forking relation associated with the splitting relation $\sqrt[s]{}$.

Definition 1.10. $\sqrt[i]{:= *(\sqrt[s]{})}$.

Lemma 1.11. $\sqrt[i]{\subseteq \sqrt[d]{}}$

Proof. Suppose that $\bar{a} \sqrt[i]{U} B$. To show that $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} B$, consider a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ and let $(\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$ be a sequence such that $\bar{c}_n \equiv_U \bar{c}$, for all *n*. We have to show that the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is not *k*-inconsistent for any *k*.

There is a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ such that

 $\bar{a}' \sqrt[s]{U} B\bar{c}[<\omega].$

Hence, $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}'/UB\bar{c}[<\omega])$ implies that

 $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}'/UB\bar{c}[<\omega]), \text{ for all } n.$

Consequently, \bar{a}' satisfies $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ and this set is not *k*-inconsistent.

Proposition 1.12. $\sqrt[u]{} \subseteq \sqrt[i]{} \subseteq \sqrt[f]{} \subseteq \sqrt[d]{}$

Proof. The inclusions $\sqrt[u]{\subseteq i} \subseteq \sqrt[d]{}$ follow from Theorem F2.3.13 and the preceding lemma, respectively. Since the operation $\sqrt{\mapsto \sqrt[s]{}}$ is monotone and idempotent, we further have $\sqrt[i]{} = {}^{*}(\sqrt[i]{}) \subseteq {}^{*}(\sqrt[d]{}) = \sqrt[f]{}$.

2. Simple theories and the tree property

The aim of this section is to characterise those theories where the relation $\sqrt[f]{}$ is symmetric. In the same way as stable theories are characterised by the absence of the order property, we will present a combinatorial property causing $\sqrt[f]{}$ to be non-symmetric.

Definition 2.1. A first-order theory *T* is *simple* if $\sqrt[f]$ is symmetric. For simple theories we will write \bigcup^f and \bigcup^d instead of $\sqrt[f]$ and $\sqrt[d]$. In later chapters, where \bigcup^f will be the only forking relation under consideration, we will frequently drop the superscript and just write \bigcup .

Before giving a combinatorial characterisation of simple theories, let us note some special properties of the relation \bigcup^{f} in such theories. It follows from Theorem 1.9 that, for complete types in simple theories, forking and dividing is the same. According to the next lemma this is also true for partial types.

Lemma 2.2. Let T be a simple theory, $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ a set of formulae over U, and $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ forks over U.
- (2) $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ divides over U.
- (3) For every \downarrow^{f} -Morley sequence $(\bar{c}_{n})_{n < \omega}$ for $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{c}/U)$ over U, the set $\bigcup_{i < \omega} \Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{n})$ is inconsistent.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (1) follows immediately from the definition of forking.

(3) \Rightarrow (2) Let $(\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}$ be a \downarrow^{f} -Morley sequence for tp (\bar{c}/U) over U. Applying a U-automorphism we can ensure that $\bar{c}_0 = \bar{c}$. By assumption, $\bigcup_{n<\omega} \Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n)$ is inconsistent. Using compactness, we obtain a finite subset $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$ such that $\bigcup_{n<\omega} \Phi_0(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n)$ is inconsistent. Set $\varphi := \wedge \Phi_0$. By Lemma 1.2, it follows that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ divides over U. Since $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \models \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$, so does $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) Suppose that $(\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}$ is a \downarrow^{f} -Morley sequence for tp (\bar{c}/U) over U such that the set $\bigcup_{n<\omega} \Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n)$ is consistent. Fix a regular cardinal $\kappa \ge \operatorname{loc}(\downarrow^{f}) \oplus |\bar{x}|^{+}$. By compactness, there exists a \downarrow^{f} -Morley sequence $(\bar{c}_i)_{i<\kappa}$ for tp (\bar{c}/U) over U such that $\bigcup_{i<\kappa} \Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_i)$ is consistent. Let \bar{a} be a tuple satisfying this set. By Lemma F2.4.15, we can find an index $\alpha < \kappa$ such that

$$\bar{a}\bar{c}[<\alpha] \downarrow^{\mathrm{f}}_{U} \bar{c}_{\alpha}$$

Consequently, $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{\alpha})$ does not fork over *U*. By (INV), the same holds for $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$.

Next, we present an improved version of Lemma 1.3.

Proposition 2.3 (Kim). *Let T be a simple theory. The following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) $\bar{a} \downarrow^{\mathrm{d}}_{U} \bar{b}$
- (2) $\bar{a} \downarrow_U^{\rm f} \bar{b}$
- (3) For every infinite \downarrow^{f} -Morley sequence $(\bar{b}_{i})_{i \in I}$ for $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/U)$ over U there exists a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}$ such that $(\bar{b}_{i})_{i \in I}$ is a \downarrow^{f} -Morley sequence over $U \cup \bar{a}'$.
- (4) For some \downarrow^{f} -Morley sequence $(\bar{b}_{i})_{i < \omega}$ for $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/U)$ over U there exists a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}$ such that $(\bar{b}_{i})_{i < \omega}$ is a \downarrow^{f} -Morley sequence over $U \cup \bar{a}'$.

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) has already been shown in Lemma 2.2 and (1) \Rightarrow (3) is a special case of Lemma 1.3.

 $(3) \Rightarrow (4)$ is trivial since we have seen in Corollary F2.4.11 that, for symmetric forking relations, Morley sequences always exist.

(4) \Rightarrow (2) Let $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ be a \downarrow^{f} -Morley sequence for tp (\bar{b}/U) over $U \cup \bar{a}'$, for some $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}$. Set $\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') \coloneqq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U)$. Then \bar{a}' realises $\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b})$. Hence, \bar{a}' is a realisation of $\bigcup_{i < \omega} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i)$ and it follows by Lemma 2.2 that $\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b})$ does not fork over U.

Right locality

Note that, if the relation $\sqrt[f]{}$ is right local, then $\sqrt[f]{} \subseteq \sqrt[d]{}$ implies that $\sqrt[d]{}$ is also right local. (This is also a consequence of Lemma 2.2.) In this section we will prove that the converse is also true: if $\sqrt[d]{}$ is right local, then so is $\sqrt[f]{}$. Recall the notion of a $\sqrt{}$ -forking chain introduced in Section F2.3.

Definition 2.4. (a) We call $\sqrt[d]{}$ -forking chains and $\sqrt[f]{}$ -forking chains *dividing chains* and *forking chains*, respectively.

(b) A *specification* of a dividing chain $(b_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ for \bar{a} over U is a sequence $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, k_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$ of pairs consisting of a formula $\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{y}_{\alpha})$ and a natural number k_{α} such that, for all $\alpha < \gamma$,

$$\mathbb{M} \models \varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{a}; \bar{b}_{\alpha})$$
 and $\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\alpha}) k_{\alpha}$ -divides over $U \cup \bar{b}[<\alpha]$.

Similarly, a *specification* of a forking chain $(\bar{b}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ for \bar{a} over U is a sequence $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, \bar{\psi}_{\alpha}, \bar{k}_{\alpha}, m_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$, where φ_{α} is a formula, m_{α} a natural number, $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha}$ an m_{α} -tuple of formulae, and \bar{k}_{α} is an m_{α} -tuple of natural numbers such that, for all $\alpha < \gamma$,

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{a}; b_{\alpha})$$

and there are tuples $\bar{d}_0, \ldots, \bar{d}_{m_{\alpha}-1}$ such that

$$\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; b_{\alpha}) \vDash \psi_{\alpha, \circ}(\bar{x}, d_{\circ}) \lor \cdots \lor \psi_{\alpha, m_{\alpha}-1}(\bar{x}, d_{m_{\alpha}-1})$$

and each $\psi_{\alpha,i}(\bar{x}, \bar{d}_i) k_{\alpha,i}$ -divides over $U \cup \bar{b}[<\alpha]$.

(c) A dividing chain is *uniform* if it has a specification $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, k_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$ where

$$\varphi_{\alpha} = \varphi_{\beta}$$
 and $k_{\alpha} = k_{\beta}$, for all $\alpha, \beta < \gamma$.

Similarly, we say that a forking chain is *uniform* if it has a specification $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, \bar{\psi}_{\alpha}, \bar{k}_{\alpha}, m_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$ where

$$\varphi_{\alpha} = \varphi_{\beta}, \quad m_{\alpha} = m_{\beta}, \quad \psi_{\alpha,i} = \psi_{\beta,i}, \quad k_{\alpha,i} = k_{\beta,i},$$

for all α , $\beta < \gamma$ and $i < m_{\alpha}$.

Note that, according to Theorem F2.3.25, $\sqrt[4]{}$ is not right local if, and only if, there are arbitrarily long dividing chains. The same holds for $\sqrt[f]{}$ and forking chains. Our aim is therefore to show that, if a theory has arbitrarily long forking chains, then there are also arbitrarily long dividing chains. We start with the observation that any subsequence of a forking chain is again a forking chain. As a consequence we can use the Pigeon Hole Principle to construct uniform forking chains.

Lemma 2.5. *Let* γ *be an ordinal and* $I \subseteq \gamma$ *.*

- (a) If $(\bar{b}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ is a dividing chain for \bar{a} over U with the specification $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, k_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$, then $(\bar{b}_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in I}$ is a dividing chain for \bar{a} over U with specification $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, k_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha \in I}$.
- (b) If (b
 α){α<y} is a forking chain for ā over U with the specification (φ_α, ψ_α, k_α, m_α)_{α<y}, then (b
 α){α∈I} is a forking chain for ā over U with specification (φ_α, ψ_α, k
 _α, m_α)_{α∈I}.

Proof. (a) Fix $\alpha \in I$ and set $B := \bigcup \{ \bar{b}_{\beta} \mid \beta \in I, \beta < \alpha \}$. It is sufficient to show that $\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\alpha}) k_{\alpha}$ -divides over $U \cup B$. This follows from the definition of dividing and the fact that $\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\alpha}) k_{\alpha}$ -divides over the superset $U \cup \bar{b}[<\alpha] \supseteq U \cup B$.

(b) follows analogously.

Corollary 2.6. Let $\kappa > |T|$ be a cardinal. If there exists a forking chain for \bar{a} over U of length κ , then there also exists a uniform forking chain for \bar{a} over U of length κ .

Proof. Let $(\bar{b}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be a forking chain for \bar{a} over U with specification $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, \bar{\psi}_{\alpha}, \bar{k}_{\alpha}, m_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \kappa}$. Since there are at most $|T| < \kappa$ formulae over \emptyset , there exist a subset $I \subseteq \kappa$ of size $|I| = \kappa$, formulae $\varphi, \bar{\psi}$, and numbers m, \bar{k} such that

$$\varphi_{\alpha} = \varphi, \quad m_{\alpha} = m, \quad \psi_{\alpha,i} = \psi_i, \quad k_{\alpha,i} = k_i,$$

for all $\alpha < \kappa$ and i < m. By Lemma 2.5, the subsequence $(\bar{b}_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in I}$ is a uniform forking chain for \bar{a} over U.

The key property of dividing which allows us to turn forking chains into dividing chains is contained in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.7. Suppose that the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ k-divides over a set U. For every set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, there is some tuple $\bar{b}' \equiv_U \bar{b}$ such that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}')$ k-divides over $U \cup C$.

Proof. By Lemma 1.2, there exists an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over U such that $\bar{b}_o = \bar{b}$ and the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is k-inconsistent. Using Lemma E5.3.11, we can find a set $C' \equiv_U C$ such that $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup C'$. Let $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_U$ be an automorphism with $\pi[C'] = C$, and set $\bar{b}'_n \coloneqq \pi(\bar{b}_n)$. Then $(\bar{b}'_n)_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup C$ and the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}'_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is k-inconsistent. By Lemma 1.2, it follows that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}'_o) k$ -divides over $U \cup C$. Since $\bar{b}'_o \equiv_U \bar{b}_o = \bar{b}$, the claim follows.

Corollary 2.8. Let $(\overline{b}_i)_{i < n}$ be a dividing chain for \overline{a} over U with finite length. For every set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, there exist tuples

$$\bar{a}'\bar{b}_{0}'\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1}'\equiv_{U}\bar{a}\bar{b}_{0}\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1}$$

such that $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i < n}$ is a dividing chain for \bar{a}' over $U \cup C$ with the same specification as $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < n}$.

Proof. Let $\langle \varphi_i, k_i \rangle_{i < n}$ be a specification of $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < n}$. We prove the claim by induction on *n*. For n = 0, there is nothing to do. Hence, suppose that n > 0. We can use Lemma 2.7 to find a tuple $\bar{b}'_0 \equiv_U \bar{b}_0$ such that $\varphi_0(\bar{x}; \bar{b}'_0) k_0$ -divides over $U \cup C$. Let $\pi \in \text{Aut } \mathbb{M}_U$ be an automorphism with $\pi(\bar{b}_0) = \bar{b}'_0$. Then $(\pi(\bar{b}_i))_{0 < i < n}$ is a dividing chain for $\pi(\bar{a})$ over $U \cup \bar{b}'_0$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to it, we obtain tuples

$$\bar{a}'\bar{b}'_{1}\ldots\bar{b}'_{n-1}\equiv_{U\bar{b}'_{n}}\pi(\bar{a})\pi(\bar{b}_{1})\ldots\bar{\pi}(\bar{b}_{n-1})$$

such that $(\bar{b}'_i)_{0 < i < n}$ is a dividing chain for \bar{a}' over $U \cup C \cup \bar{b}'_0$. Since

$$\bar{a}'\bar{b}_{0}'\bar{b}_{1}'\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1}'\equiv_{U}\pi(\bar{a})\bar{b}_{0}'\pi(\bar{b}_{1})\ldots\bar{\pi}(b_{n-1})\equiv_{U}\bar{a}\bar{b}_{0}\bar{b}_{1}\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1},$$

it follows that $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i < n}$ is the desired dividing chain for \bar{a}' over $U \cup C$. \Box

In order to turn a forking chain into a dividing chain, we iterate the following construction.

Lemma 2.9. Let $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < n}$ be a dividing chain for \bar{a} over $U \cup C$ with a finite length n and with the specification $\langle \varphi_i, k_i \rangle_{i < n}$. If

 $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UC) \vDash \vartheta_{o}(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_{o}) \lor \cdots \lor \vartheta_{m-1}(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_{m-1}),$

where each $\vartheta_j(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_j) l_j$ -divides over U, then there exist an index j < mand a tuple $\bar{d}' \equiv_U \bar{d}_j$ such that $\bar{d}', \bar{b}_0, \dots, \bar{b}_{n-1}$ is a dividing chain for \bar{a} over U with specification

$$\langle \vartheta_j, l_j \rangle, \langle \varphi_0, k_0 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \varphi_{n-1}, k_{n-1} \rangle.$$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on *n*. For n = 0, pick an index *j* such that $\mathbb{M} \models \vartheta_j(\bar{a}; \bar{d}_j)$. Then \bar{d}_j is a dividing chain for \bar{a} over *U* with specification $\langle \vartheta_j, l_j \rangle$. Hence, suppose that n > 0. By Corollary 2.8, there exist tuples

$$\bar{a}'\bar{b}_{o}'\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1}'\equiv_{UC}\bar{a}\bar{b}_{o}\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1}$$

such that $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i < n}$ is a dividing chain for \bar{a}' over $U \cup C \cup \bar{d}_0 \dots \bar{d}_{n-1}$. Since $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UC} \bar{a}$, there is some index j < m such that

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \vartheta_j(\bar{a}'; \bar{d}_j).$

It follows that $\bar{d}_j, \bar{b}'_0, \ldots, \bar{b}'_{n-1}$ is a dividing chain for \bar{a}' over U with specification

$$\langle \vartheta_j, l_j \rangle, \langle \varphi_0, k_0 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \varphi_{n-1}, k_{n-1} \rangle.$$

Fix a tuple \bar{d}' such that

$$\bar{a}\bar{d}'\bar{b}_{0}\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1}\equiv_{U}\bar{a}'\bar{d}_{j}\bar{b}'_{0}\ldots\bar{b}'_{n-1}.$$

Then $\bar{d}', \bar{b}_0, \ldots, \bar{b}_{n-1}$ is the desired dividing chain.

Corollary 2.10. Let $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < n}$ be a uniform forking chain for \bar{a} over U with specification $\langle \varphi, \bar{\psi}, \bar{k}, m \rangle_{i < n}$. There exists a function $g : [n] \rightarrow [m]$ and a dividing chain $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i < n}$ for \bar{a} over U with specification

 \Box

$$\langle \psi_{g(\circ)}, k_{g(\circ)} \rangle, \ldots, \langle \psi_{g(n-1)}, k_{g(n-1)} \rangle.$$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on *n*. For n = 0, there is nothing to do. Hence, suppose that n > 0. Applying the inductive hypothesis to the subchain $(\bar{b}_i)_{0 < i < n}$ we obtain a dividing chain $(\bar{b}'_i)_{0 < i < n}$ for \bar{a} over $U \cup \bar{b}_0$ with specification

$$\langle \psi_{g(1)}, k_{g(1)} \rangle, \ldots, \langle \psi_{g(n-1)}, k_{g(n-1)} \rangle$$

Since $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}; \bar{b}_{o})$ and

$$\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}_{o})\vDash\psi_{o}(\bar{x};\bar{d}_{o})\lor\cdots\lor\psi_{m-1}(\bar{x};\bar{d}_{m-1}),$$

for suitable $\bar{d}_0, \ldots, \bar{d}_{m-1}$, we can use Lemma 2.9 to find an index j < mand a tuple $\bar{b}'_0 \equiv_U \bar{d}_j$ such that $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i < n}$ is a dividing chain for \bar{a} over Uwith specification

$$\langle \psi_j, k_j \rangle, \langle \psi_{g(1)}, k_{g(1)} \rangle, \dots, \langle \psi_{g(n-1)}, k_{g(n-1)} \rangle.$$

Starting from a sufficiently long forking chain, we have constructed arbitrarily long finite dividing chains. According to the next lemma, this is sufficient to obtain dividing chains of every ordinal length.

Lemma 2.11. Let φ be a formula and $k < \omega$ a number. If, for each $n < \omega$, there exists a uniform dividing chain for \bar{a} over U of length n with specification $\langle \varphi, k \rangle_{i < n}$, then, for every ordinal γ , we can find a uniform dividing chain for \bar{a} over U of length γ with specification $\langle \varphi, k \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$.

Proof. Let γ be an ordinal. We define the following set of formulae with variables \bar{x} , \bar{y}^{α} , \bar{z}_{i}^{α} , for $\alpha < \gamma$ and $i < \omega$.

$$\begin{split} \Phi &\coloneqq \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}^{\alpha}) \mid \alpha < \gamma \right\} \\ &\cup \left\{ \psi(\bar{z}_{i}^{\alpha}; \bar{y}^{\beta_{0}}, \dots, \bar{y}^{\beta_{n-1}}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{y}^{\alpha}; \bar{y}^{\beta_{0}}, \dots, \bar{y}^{\beta_{n-1}}) \mid \right. \\ &\psi \text{ a formula over } U, \ i, n < \omega, \text{ and} \\ &\beta_{o} < \dots < \beta_{n-1} < \alpha < \gamma \right\} \\ &\cup \left\{ \neg \exists \bar{x} [\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{z}_{i_{o}}^{\alpha}) \land \dots \land \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{z}_{i_{k-1}}^{\alpha})] \mid \right. \\ &\alpha < \gamma, \ i_{o} < \dots < i_{k-1} < \omega \right\}. \end{split}$$

Note that, if \bar{a} , \bar{b}^{α} , and \bar{c}_{i}^{α} , for $\alpha < \gamma$ and i < n, satisfy Φ , then

$$\bar{c}_i^{\alpha} \equiv_{U\bar{b}[<\alpha]} \bar{b}^{\alpha}$$

and the set { $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_i^{\alpha}) \mid i < \omega$ } is *k*-inconsistent. Hence, the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}^{\alpha})$ *k*-divides over $U\bar{b}[<\alpha]$. Consequently, $(\bar{b}^{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ is a dividing chain for \bar{a} over U with specification $\langle \varphi, k \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$.

It therefore remains to show that Φ is satisfiable. Let $\Phi_o \subseteq \Phi$ be finite and let $I \subseteq \gamma$ be the finite set of indices α such that Φ_o contains some of the variables \bar{y}^{α} or \bar{z}_i^{α} , for $i < \omega$. Choose a uniform dividing chain $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < n}$ for \bar{a} over U of length n := |I|. We can satisfy Φ_o by interpreting \bar{x} by $\bar{a}, \bar{y}^{\alpha}$ by the corresponding \bar{b}_i , and \bar{z}_i^{α} by tuples witnessing the fact that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i)$ *k*-divides over $U \cup \bar{b}[<i]$. By the Compactness Theorem, it follows that Φ is satisfiable.

Combining the results of this section, we have proved that, if $\sqrt[f]{}$ is not right local, then neither is $\sqrt[d]{}$.

Theorem 2.12. *Let T be a complete first-order theory. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $\sqrt[d]{}$ is right local.
- (2) $\sqrt[f]{}$ is right local.
- (3) There is no dividing chain of length $|T|^+$.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (1) If $\sqrt[f]{}$ is right local, then *T* is simple. Hence, it follows by Lemma 2.2 that $\sqrt[d]{} = \sqrt[f]{}$. In particular, $\sqrt[d]{}$ is right local.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) If there are arbitrarily long dividing chains, it follows by Theorem F2.3.25 that $\sqrt[d]{}$ is not right local.

(3) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose that $\sqrt[f]{}$ is not right local and set $\kappa := |T|^+$. By Theorem F2.3.25, there exists a forking chain of length κ for a suitable tuple \bar{a} over the empty set \emptyset . Using Corollary 2.6 we obtain a uniform forking chain of the same length. Let $\langle \varphi, \bar{\psi}, \bar{k}, m \rangle_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be its specification. According to Corollary 2.10, there exists, for every $n < \omega$, a dividing chain of length *n* with specification $\langle \vartheta_i, l_i \rangle_{i < n}$, where $\vartheta_i \in \overline{\psi}$ and $l_i \in \overline{k}$, for every i < n.

By the Pigeon Hole Principle and Lemma 2.5, we can find a formula $\vartheta \in \bar{\psi}$ and a number $l \in \bar{k}$ such that, for every $n < \omega$, there exists a uniform dividing chain of length *n* with specification $\langle \vartheta, l \rangle_{i < n}$. Consequently, it follows from Lemma 2.11 that there exist arbitrarily long dividing chains.

The tree property

The following combinatorial property characterises simple theories in the same way as the order property characterises stable theories.

Definition 2.13. Let *T* be a first-order theory. A formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ has the *tree property* if there exists a family $(\bar{c}_{\eta})_{\eta \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ of parameters and a number $k < \omega$ such that

- for every $\beta \in \omega^{\omega}$, the set $\{ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{\eta}) \mid \eta < \beta \}$ is consistent and
- for every $\eta \in \omega^{<\omega}$, the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{\eta i}) \mid i < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent.

Exercise 2.1. Prove that, in the theory of dense linear orders, the formula $\varphi(x; y_0, y_1) := y_0 < x \land x < y_1$ has the tree property.

Before proving that a theory is simple if, and only if, no formula has the tree property, let us note that the tree property implies the order property.

Lemma 2.14. Every formula with the tree property has the order property.

Proof. Let $(\bar{c}_{\eta})_{\eta \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ be a family witnessing the tree property of the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$. For every $\beta \in \omega^{\omega}$, we choose a tuple \bar{a}_{β} satisfying $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{\eta}) \mid \eta < \beta\}$. To prove that φ has the order property it is sufficient to find indices $\eta_{0} < \eta_{1} < \ldots$ in $\omega^{<\omega}$ and a sequence $(\beta_{n})_{n<\omega}$ in ω^{ω} such that $\eta_{n} < \beta_{n}$ and

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_{\beta_i}; \bar{c}_{\eta_k}) \quad \text{iff} \quad i \leq k.$

We proceed by induction on *n*, starting with $\eta_o := \langle \rangle$ and an arbitrary $\beta_o \in \omega^{\omega}$. For the inductive step, suppose that η_n and β_n are already defined. The *k*-inconsistency of $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{\eta_n i}) \mid i < \omega\}$ implies that, for each $m \leq n$, there are only finitely many $i < \omega$ such that

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_{\beta_m}; \bar{c}_{\eta_n i}).$

Hence, there is some $i < \omega$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \neg \varphi(\bar{a}_{\beta_m}; \bar{c}_{\eta_n i}), \quad \text{for all } m \leq n.$$

We set $\eta_{n+1} := \eta_n i$, for such an index *i*, and we choose some $\beta_{n+1} \in \omega^{\omega}$ such that $\eta_{n+1} < \beta_{n+1}$. Then $\eta_m < \beta_{n+1}$ implies that

 $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_{\beta_{n+1}}; \bar{c}_{\eta_m}), \quad \text{for all } m \le n+1.$

To show that simple theories are exactly those where no formula has the tree property, we introduce a generalised form of the tree property.

Definition 2.15. Let κ be a cardinal, γ an ordinal, $(\varphi_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ a sequence of formulae, and $(k_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ a sequence of numbers.

(a) A family $(\bar{c}_{\eta})_{\eta \in \kappa^{\leq \gamma}}$ of tuples $\bar{c}_{\eta} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is a *dividing* κ -tree with specification $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, k_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$ if

- for each $\beta \in \kappa^{\gamma}$, the set { $\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{\beta \upharpoonright (\alpha+1)}) \mid \alpha < \gamma$ } is consistent,
- for each $\eta \in \kappa^{<\gamma}$, the set $\{ \varphi_{|\eta|}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{\eta\alpha}) \mid \alpha < \kappa \}$ is $k_{|\eta|}$ -inconsistent.

We call γ the *height* of the dividing κ -tree.

(b) A dividing κ -tree $(\bar{c}_{\eta})_{\eta \in \kappa^{\leq \gamma}}$ with specification $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, k_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$ is *uniform* if

 $\varphi_{\alpha} = \varphi_{\beta}$ and $k_{\alpha} = k_{\beta}$, for all $\alpha, \beta < \gamma$.

Remark. Note that a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ has the tree property if, and only if, there exists a uniform dividing ω -tree of height ω with specification $\langle \varphi, k \rangle_{n < \omega}$, for some $k < \omega$.

Lemma 2.16. Let $\kappa > |T|$ be a cardinal. If there exists a dividing ω -tree of height κ , then there also exists an uniform dividing ω -tree of height ω .

Proof. Let $(b_{\eta})_{\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}}$ be a dividing ω -tree of height κ and let $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, k_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be its specification. Since $\kappa > |T|$, there exist a subset $I \subseteq \kappa$ of size $|I| = \kappa$, a formula φ_* , and a number $k_* < \omega$ such that

 $\varphi_{\alpha} = \varphi_{*}$ and $k_{\alpha} = k_{*}$, for all $\alpha \in I$.

Choose a strictly increasing map $h : \omega \to I$. We inductively define an embedding $g : \omega^{<\omega} \to \omega^{<\kappa}$ as follows. We start with $g(\langle \rangle) := \langle \rangle$. If $g(\eta)$ is already defined, we choose some $\zeta \in \omega^{<\kappa}$ with $g(\eta) \leq \zeta$ and $|\zeta| = h(|\eta|)$, and we set $g(\eta i) := \zeta i$, for $i < \omega$.

We claim that the family $(\bar{b}_{g(\eta)})_{\eta \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ is a uniform dividing ω -tree of height ω . By construction, the set $\{\varphi_*(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{g(\eta n)}) \mid n < \omega\}$ is k_* inconsistent, for every $\eta \in \omega^{<\omega}$. Furthermore, for each $\beta \in \omega^{\omega}$, we can choose some $\beta' \in \omega^{<\kappa}$ with

$$\beta' \ge g(\beta \upharpoonright \alpha)$$
, for all $\alpha < \omega$,

and we see that

$$\left\{ \varphi_*(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{g(\eta)}) \mid \eta \prec \beta \right\} \subseteq \left\{ \varphi_\alpha(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\beta' \upharpoonright (\alpha+1)}) \mid \alpha < \gamma \right\}$$

is consistent.

The following lemma contains the main technical argument we use to relate the tree property to dividing.

Lemma 2.17. *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) There exists a dividing ω -tree of height γ .
- (2) *There exists a dividing chain of length y*.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Set $\kappa := (2^{|T| \oplus |\gamma|})^+$. If there is a dividing ω -tree, we can use the Compactness Theorem to construct a dividing κ -tree $(\bar{b}_{\eta})_{\eta \in \kappa^{\leq \gamma}}$.

 \square

Let $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, k_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$ be its specification. We define an embedding $h : \kappa^{\leq \gamma} \rightarrow \kappa^{\leq \gamma}$ as follows. We start with $h(\langle \rangle) := \langle \rangle$. If $|\eta|$ is a limit ordinal, we set

$$h(\eta) \coloneqq \sup \{ h(\zeta) \mid \zeta \prec \eta \}.$$

For the successor step, we proceed as follows. Suppose that the value of $h(\eta)$ is already defined. Let \bar{s} be the sorts of $\bar{b}_{\eta \circ}$. As $|S^{\bar{s}}(\bigcup_{\zeta \leq \eta} \bar{b}_{\zeta})| < \kappa$ there exists a subset $I \subseteq \kappa$ of size $|I| = \kappa$ such that

$$\bar{b}_{\eta i} \equiv_{\bigcup_{\zeta \leq \eta} \bar{b}_{\zeta}} \bar{b}_{\eta k}$$
, for all $i, k \in I$.

We fix a bijection $g : \kappa \to I$ and we set $h(\eta i) := h(\eta)g(i)$.

Having defined the embedding *h*, we fix some $\beta \in \kappa^{<\omega}$ and we set $\bar{c}_{\alpha} := \bar{b}_{h(\beta \upharpoonright (\alpha+1))}$, for $\alpha < \gamma$. We claim that the sequence $(\bar{c}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ is a dividing chain for some \bar{a} over \emptyset with specification $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, k_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$.

Set $\beta' := \sup \{ h(\beta \upharpoonright \alpha) \mid \alpha < \gamma \}$ and choose some tuple \bar{a} satisfying

$$\left\{ \varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\beta' \upharpoonright (\alpha+1)}) \mid \alpha < \gamma \right\}.$$

Then

$$\{ \varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{\alpha}) \mid \alpha < \gamma \} = \{ \varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{h(\beta \upharpoonright (\alpha+1))}) \mid \alpha < \gamma \}$$

= $\{ \varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\beta' \upharpoonright (\alpha+1)}) \mid \alpha < \gamma \},$

implies that

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{a}; \bar{c}_{\alpha}), \quad \text{for all } \alpha < \gamma.$

It therefore remains to show that $\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{\alpha}) k_{\alpha}$ -divides over $\bar{c}[<\alpha]$. Let $\bar{a}_n := \bar{b}_{h((\beta \upharpoonright \alpha)n)}$, for $n < \omega$. Then $\bar{a}_n \equiv_{\bar{c}[<\alpha]} \bar{b}_{h(\beta \upharpoonright (\alpha+1))} = \bar{c}_{\alpha}$ and the set $\{\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is k_{α} -inconsistent.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Given a dividing chain $(\bar{c}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ for \bar{a} over U with specification $\langle \varphi_{\alpha}, k_{\alpha} \rangle_{\alpha < \gamma}$, we construct a dividing ω -tree $(\bar{b}_{\eta})_{\eta \in \omega^{\leq \gamma}}$ with the additional property that, for every $\eta \in \omega^{\leq \gamma}$,

$$(b_{\eta \restriction (\alpha+1)})_{\alpha < |\eta|} \equiv_{\varnothing} (\bar{c}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < |\eta|}.$$

If $\eta = \langle \rangle$ or if $|\eta|$ is a limit ordinal, we can choose an arbitrary tuple b_{η} , since the definition of a dividing ω -tree places no constraint on such tuples. Hence, it remains to consider the successor step. Suppose that \bar{b}_{η} has already been defined and set $\alpha := |\eta|$. Since

$$(\bar{b}_{\eta\uparrow(i+1)})_{i<\alpha}\equiv_{\varnothing} (\bar{c}_i)_{i<\alpha}.$$

there exists some \bar{b}' such that

$$(\bar{b}_{\eta\uparrow(i+1)})_{i<\alpha}\bar{b}'\equiv_{\varnothing}(\bar{c}_i)_{i<\alpha}\bar{c}_{\alpha}.$$

Since $\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{\alpha}) k_{\alpha}$ -divides over $U \cup \bar{c}[<\alpha]$, we can find a sequence $(\bar{c}'_n)_{n<\omega}$ such that $\bar{c}'_n \equiv_{U\bar{c}[<\alpha]} \bar{c}_{\alpha}$ and $\{\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}'_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is k_{α} -inconsistent. By choice of \bar{b}' , we can therefore find a sequence $(\bar{b}'_n)_{n<\omega}$ such that

$$\bar{b}'_n \equiv_{\bigcup_{i < \alpha} \bar{b}_{\eta \upharpoonright (i+1)}} \bar{b}'$$

and $\{\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}'_{n}) \mid n < \omega\}$ is k_{α} -inconsistent. We set $\bar{b}_{\eta i} := \bar{b}'_{i}$, for $i < \omega$.

To see that the family $(\bar{b}_{\eta})_{\eta \in \omega^{\leq \gamma}}$ constructed in this way is a dividing ω -tree, note that, for each $\beta \in \omega^{\gamma}$, $(\bar{b}_{\eta \uparrow (\alpha+1)})_{\alpha < \gamma} \equiv_{\emptyset} (\bar{c}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \gamma}$ implies that the set $\{\varphi_{\alpha}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\beta \uparrow (\alpha+1)}) \mid \alpha < \gamma\}$ is consistent.

Using these two lemmas, we obtain the following characterisation of simple theories.

Theorem 2.18. *Let T be a complete first-order theory. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) T is simple.
- (2) $\sqrt[d]{is right local.}$
- (3) No formula has the tree property.
- (4) There is no dividing chain of length $|T|^+$.
- (5) For some cardinal κ , there is no dividing chain of length κ .

Proof. $(4) \Rightarrow (5)$ is trivial and $(1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (4)$ was already shown in Theorem 2.12.

(5) \Rightarrow (3) Suppose that there exists a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ with the tree property. Fix a family $(\bar{c}_{\eta})_{\eta \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ and a number $k < \omega$ witnessing this fact.

For every cardinal κ , we will construct a dividing chain of length κ . Given κ , we use compactness to find a family $(\bar{b}_{\eta})_{\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}}$ such that

- for every $\beta \in \omega^{\kappa}$, the set $\{ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\eta}) \mid \eta < \beta \}$ is consistent and
- for every $\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}$, the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\eta i}) \mid i < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent.

In particular, $(\bar{b}_{\eta})_{\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}}$ is a uniform dividing ω -tree of height κ . Hence, we can use Lemma 2.17 to obtain a dividing chain of length κ . A contradiction.

 $(3) \Rightarrow (4)$ Suppose that there exists a dividing chain of length $\kappa := |T|^+$. We will show that some formula has the tree property. By Lemma 2.17, there exists a dividing ω -tree $(\bar{b}_{\eta})_{\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}}$ of height κ . Hence, we can use Lemma 2.16 to obtain a uniform dividing ω -tree $(\bar{b}'_{\eta})_{\eta \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ of height ω . Let $\langle \varphi, k \rangle_{n < \omega}$ be its specification. Then the formula φ has the tree property. A contradiction.

Corollary 2.19. *Every stable theory is simple.*

Proof. This follows by Theorem 2.18 and Lemma 2.14.

Corollary 2.20. A theory T is simple if, and only if, T^{eq} is simple.

Proof. Clearly, if φ has the tree property with respect to T, it also has the tree property with respect to T^{eq} . Conversely, if φ has the tree property with respect to T^{eq} we can use Proposition E2.2.10 to construct a formula φ' that has the tree property with respect to T.

Finally, we show that no simple theory has the strict order property. Consequently, all simple theories that are not stable have the independence property.

Proposition 2.21. No simple theory has the strict order property.

Proof. Suppose that the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ has the strict order property. We will show that the formula

$$\psi(\bar{x};\bar{y}_{o}\bar{y}_{1}) \coloneqq \neg \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{y}_{o}) \land \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{y}_{1})$$

has the tree property. By compactness, there exists a sequence $(\bar{c}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ such that

$$\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_i)^{\mathbb{M}} \subset \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_k)^{\mathbb{M}}$$
, for all $i < k$.

We define two functions $\lambda, \rho : \omega^{<\omega} \to \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\lambda(\eta) < \rho(\eta)$, for all η . We proceed by induction on $\eta \in \omega^{<\omega}$ starting with $\lambda(\langle \rangle) := 0$ and $\rho(\langle \rangle) := 1$. If $\lambda(\eta) < \rho(\eta)$ are already defined, we choose a strictly increasing sequence $\lambda(\eta) < z_0 < z_1 < \cdots < \rho(\eta)$ and we set $\lambda(\eta i) := z_i$ and $\rho(\eta i) := z_{i+1}$, for $i < \omega$.

Having defined λ and ρ , we set $\bar{b}_{\eta} \coloneqq \bar{c}_{\lambda(\eta)} \bar{c}_{\rho(\eta)}$, for $\eta \in \omega^{<\omega}$. To show that this family witnesses the tree property of ψ , note that

$$\psi(\bar{x};\bar{b}_{\eta})^{\mathbb{M}}=\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c}_{\rho(\eta)})^{\mathbb{M}}\smallsetminus\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c}_{\lambda(\eta)})^{\mathbb{M}}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{split} \psi(\bar{x};\bar{b}_{\eta})^{\mathbb{M}} &\subseteq \psi(\bar{x};\bar{b}_{\zeta})^{\mathbb{M}}, \qquad \text{for } \eta \leq \zeta, \\ \text{and} \quad \psi(\bar{x};\bar{b}_{\eta})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \psi(\bar{x};\bar{b}_{\zeta})^{\mathbb{M}} = \emptyset, \quad \text{for incomparable } \eta \text{ and } \zeta. \end{split}$$

Consequently, the set { $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\eta i}) | i < \omega$ } is 2-inconsistent, for every η . Furthermore, for every $\beta \in \omega^{\omega}$, we can use compactness and the fact that $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\eta})^{\mathbb{M}} \neq \emptyset$, for all η , to show that { $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\eta}) | \eta < \beta$ } is satisfiable.

Strongly minimal theories

We conclude this section by considering the example of strongly minimal theories. Note that such theories are stable and, hence, simple. We will show that, for strongly minimal theories, the relations $\sqrt[f]{}$ and $\sqrt[acl]{}$ coincide. One of the inclusions holds in general. **Lemma 2.22.** If $\sqrt{}$ is a forking relation, then $\sqrt{\subseteq \sqrt[c_1]{/}}$.

Proof. Suppose that $A \sqrt{U} B$. To show that $A \sqrt[c]{U} B$, consider a set $I \subseteq B$ that is not $cl_{\sqrt{-}independent}$ over $U \cup A$. We have to show that I is not $cl_{\sqrt{-}independent}$ over U. There exists an element $b \in I$ such that $b \in cl_{\sqrt{-}(UAI_{\circ})}$ where $I_{\circ} \coloneqq I \setminus \{b\}$. Consequently, $b \sqrt{UAI_{\circ}} B$. By (BMON), $A \sqrt{U} B$ implies $A \sqrt{UI_{\circ}} B$. Hence, it follows by Lemma F2.2.3 that $Ab \sqrt{UI_{\circ}} B$. In particular, we have $b \sqrt{UI_{\circ}} b$ which, by Lemma F2.3.5, implies that $b \in cl_{\sqrt{-}(UI_{\circ})}$. Therefore, I is not $cl_{\sqrt{-}independent}$ over U.

The converse is given by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.23. Let T be a simple theory and S a U-definable strongly minimal set. Then

 $A \stackrel{\text{acl}}{\bigvee}_{U} B \text{ implies } A \downarrow_{U}^{f} B, \text{ for all } A, B, U \subseteq \mathbb{S}.$

Proof. Recall that we have shown in Lemma F1.4.3 that $\langle S, acl \rangle$ forms a matroid. By (DEF), it is sufficient to prove the claim for finite sets *A* and *B*. Hence, suppose that *A* and *B* are finite sets with $A \stackrel{acl}{\searrow} B$. We choose bases $I \subseteq A$ and $J \subseteq B$ of, respectively, *A* over *U* and *B* over *U*, and enumerations \bar{a} of *I* and \bar{b} of *J*. Then $\bar{a} \stackrel{acl}{\searrow} U \bar{b}$. Since \bar{b} is independent over *U*, it follows that it is also independent over $U \cup \bar{a}$. Hence, $\bar{a}\bar{b}$ is independent over *U*.

To show that $\bar{a} \downarrow_U^f \bar{b}$, let $(\bar{b}_n)_{n < \omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over Uwith $\bar{b}_o = \bar{b}$. Note that the union $\bar{b}[<\omega]$ is independent over U. We choose a tuple $\bar{a}' \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ such that $|\bar{a}'| = |\bar{a}|$ and \bar{a}' is independent over $U \cup \bar{b}[<\omega]$. According to Proposition F1.4.6, we have $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}$. Since $\bar{b}[<\omega]$ is independent over $U \cup \bar{a}'$, it follows by the same proposition that the sequence $(\bar{b}_n)_{n < \omega}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}'$. By Lemma 1.3, it follows that $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b}$. Since T is simple, this implies that $\bar{a} \downarrow_U^f \bar{b}$. Hence, we can use Lemma F2.2.14 to show that $\operatorname{acl}(\bar{a}U) \downarrow_U^f \operatorname{acl}(\bar{b}U)$. By monotonicity, it follows that $A \downarrow_U^f B$. **Corollary 2.24.** For a strongly minimal theory T, we have $\sqrt[acl]{} = \downarrow^f = \downarrow^d$. In particular, T is simple and \downarrow^f is a geometric independence relation.

Proof. First, note that, according to Lemma F1.4.3, $\langle \mathbb{M}, \text{acl} \rangle$ is a matroid. Hence, it follows from Proposition F2.2.8 that ${}^{\text{acl}}/$ is a geometric independence relation. We have seen in Corollary F1.4.14 that a strongly minimal theory *T* is κ -categorical, for every $\kappa > |T|$. Consequently, it follows by Theorem E6.3.16 that *T* is stable. Using Corollary 2.19, we see that *T* is simple. Therefore, the equality ${}^{\text{acl}}/{}^{\prime} = {}^{\text{f}} = {}^{\text{d}}$ follows the two preceding lemmas.

Exercise 2.2. Prove that, in an arbitrary theory, $\sqrt[acl]{}$ satisfies (INV) and (DEF).

F4. Theories without the independence property

1. Honest definitions

Alternation numbers

We have seen in Proposition E5.4.2 that the independence property can be characterised by counting the number of segments of sets of the form $[\![\varphi(\bar{a}_i)]\!]_{i\in I}$ for an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i\in I}$. In this section we will use this characterisation to derive various properties of theories without the independence property. We start by setting up the required combinatorial machinery.

Definition 1.1. Let $\varphi(\bar{x})$ be a formula over \mathbb{M} .

(a) The φ -alternation number $\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\alpha)$ of a sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ is the maximal number $n < \omega$ such that there are indices $\bar{k} \in [I]^{n+1}$ with

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_{k_i}) \leftrightarrow \neg \varphi(\bar{a}_{k_{i+1}}), \quad \text{for all } i < n.$

If this maximum does not exist, we set $alt_{\varphi}(\alpha) \coloneqq \infty$.

(b) The alternation rank of φ is

 $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{alt}}(\varphi) \coloneqq \max \left\{ \operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\alpha) \mid \alpha \text{ an indiscernible sequence in } \mathbb{M} \right\}.$

If this maximum does not exist, we set $rk_{alt}(\varphi) \coloneqq \infty$.

(c) A sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ is maximally φ -alternating over U if it is indiscernible over U and

$$\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\alpha) = \operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\alpha\beta) < \infty$$
,

LOGIC, ALGEBRA & GEOMETRY 2024-04-09 — ©ACHIM BLUMENSATH

for every extension $\alpha\beta$ of α that is still indiscernible over U.

Using these notions, we can characterise the independence property as follows.

Proposition 1.2. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ be a formula without parameters and let $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. The following statements are equivalent.

- (1) $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ does not have the independence property.
- (2) $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{alt}}(\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})) < \infty$, for all $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$.
- (3) There exists some number $n < \omega$ such that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{alt}}(\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})) \leq n$$
, for all $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$.

- (4) $\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})}(\alpha) < \infty$, for every indiscernible sequence α over U and every tuple $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$.
- (5) Let $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. Every indiscernible sequence α over U has an extension $\alpha\beta$ that is maximally $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ -alternating over U.

Proof. $(3) \Rightarrow (2)$ is trivial.

(2) \Rightarrow (5) Suppose that $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{alt}}(\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})) < \infty$ and let α be an indiscernible sequence over *U*. We construct a maximally $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ -alternating extension of α by induction on the difference

 $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{alt}}(\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})) - \operatorname{alt}_{\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})}(\alpha).$

If α is already maximally $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ -alternating, there is nothing to do. Hence, suppose otherwise. Then we can find some extension $\alpha\beta$ that is indiscernible over U such that $\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})}(\alpha\beta) > \operatorname{alt}_{\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})}(\alpha)$. By inductive hypothesis, this sequence has an extension $\alpha\beta\gamma$ that is maximally $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ -alternating over U.

(5) \Rightarrow (4) Let $\alpha\beta$ be a maximally $\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})$ -alternating extension of α over *U*. Then $\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})}(\alpha) \leq \operatorname{alt}_{\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})}(\alpha\beta) < \infty$.

(4) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ has the independence property. By Proposition E5.4.2, there exists an indiscernible sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$

and a tuple \bar{c} such that

 $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_n; \bar{c})$ iff *n* is even.

Hence, $\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi(\tilde{x};\tilde{c})}(\alpha) = \infty$.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) Suppose that, for every number $n < \omega$, there exists some tuple $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ such that $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{alt}}(\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})) > n$. We claim that φ has the independence property. Let Ψ be a set of formulae stating that the sequence $(\bar{x}_i)_{i < \omega}$ is indiscernible and set

 $\Phi \coloneqq \Psi \cup \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}_{2i}; \bar{y}) \mid i < \omega \right\} \cup \left\{ \neg \varphi(\bar{x}_{2i+1}; \bar{y}) \mid i < \omega \right\}.$

We will show that Φ is satisfiable. Then there exists an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i < \omega}$ and a tuple \bar{b} such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_i; \bar{b})$$
 iff *i* is even,

and it follows by Proposition E5.4.2 that φ has the independence property.

Thus, let $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$ be finite. Then there exists a number $n < \omega$ such that all variables occurring in Φ_0 are among $\bar{x}_0, \ldots, \bar{x}_{2n-1}$. By assumption, we can find a tuple \bar{c} and an indiscernible sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ such that

$$\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c})}(\alpha) \geq 2n$$
.

We choose indices $\bar{m} \in [I]^{2n+1}$ such that

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_{m_i}; \bar{c}) \leftrightarrow \neg \varphi(\bar{a}_{m_{i+1}}; \bar{c}), \quad \text{for all } i < 2n.$

Depending on whether or not $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_{m_0}; \bar{c})$, it follows that either the sequence $(\bar{a}_{m_i})_{0 \le i < 2n}$ or the sequence $(\bar{a}_{m_i})_{1 \le i < 2n+1}$ satisfies Φ_0 together with the tuple \bar{c} .

Below we will frequently make use of the following consequence of this characterisation.

Corollary 1.3. Let T be a theory without the independence property and let Δ be a finite set of formulae over \mathbb{M} . Every indiscernible sequence α over U has an extension $\alpha\beta$ that is maximally φ -alternating over U, for all $\varphi \in \Delta$.

Proof. Let α be indiscernible over U. We construct the desired extension by induction on $|\Delta|$. If $\Delta = \emptyset$, we can take the sequence α itself. Hence, we may assume that there is some formula $\varphi \in \Delta$. Suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}) = \varphi_0(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ where $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ and $\varphi_0(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ is a formula without parameters. As $\varphi_0(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ does not have the independence property, it follows by Proposition 1.2 that α has a maximally φ -alternating extension $\alpha\beta$. By inductive hypothesis, this sequence has an extension $\alpha\beta\gamma$ that is maximally ψ -alternating, for every $\psi \in \Delta \setminus \{\varphi\}$. Since $\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\alpha\beta) \leq \operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\alpha\beta\gamma)$, this extension is also maximally φ -alternating. Hence, $\alpha\beta\gamma$ is the desired extension of α .

Honest definitions

Stable theories have the property that every set $\mathbb{A} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is self-contained as far as definable relations are concerned, that is, all parameter-definable relations $\mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbb{A}^{\bar{s}}$ are definable with parameters from \mathbb{A} itself. In this section, we will prove that theories without the independence property have a similar, but weaker property: the parameters are not necessarily in the set \mathbb{A} , but in some elementary extension. We start by taking a look at the stable case.

Definition 1.4. A set $\mathbb{A} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is *stably embedded* if, for every parameterdefinable relation $\mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}}$, there is a formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over \mathbb{A} such that

$$\mathbb{R} \cap \mathbb{A}^{\bar{s}} = \varphi^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \mathbb{A}^{\bar{s}}.$$

Proposition 1.5. *In a stable theory, every set* $A \subseteq M$ *is stably embedded.*

Proof. Let $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ be a formula with parameters $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. As *T* is stable, it follows by Theorem c3.5.17 that the type tp (\bar{c}/\mathbb{A}) is definable over \mathbb{A} . Consequently, there exists a formula $\delta_{\psi}(\bar{y})$ over \mathbb{A} such that

$$\mathbb{M} \models \delta_{\psi}(\bar{a})$$
 iff $\mathbb{M} \models \psi(\bar{a}; \bar{c})$.

This implies that $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \mathbb{A}^{\bar{s}} = \delta_{\psi}(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap \mathbb{A}^{\bar{s}}.$

For theories with the independence property, we need to consider elementary extensions of the given structure to find the desired parameters. Alternatively, we can also use the following finitary version of stable embeddedness.

Definition 1.6. An *honest definition* of a relation $\mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}}$ over a set U is a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ without parameters such that, for every finite $U_0 \subseteq U$, there is some tuple $\bar{c} \subseteq U$ with

$$\mathbb{R} \cap U^{\bar{s}}_{o} \subseteq \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap U^{\bar{s}} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cap U^{\bar{s}}.$$

Example. The set \mathbb{Q} of rationals is not stably embedded in $\langle \mathbb{R}, \leq \rangle$. For instance, for the parameter-definable relation $(0, \sqrt{2})$, there is no formula $\varphi(x)$ over \mathbb{Q} with

$$\varphi^{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Q} = (0, \sqrt{2}) \cap \mathbb{Q}$$
.

But $(0, \sqrt{2})$ *does* have an honest definition over \mathbb{Q} . For every finite subset $A \subseteq (0, \sqrt{2})$, we have

$$(0,\sqrt{2})\cap A\subseteq \varphi(x;a,b)^{\mathbb{R}}\cap \mathbb{Q}\subseteq (0,\sqrt{2})\cap \mathbb{Q},$$

where $\varphi(x; y, z) := y \le x \land x \le z$ and *a* and *b* are, respectively, the minimal and the maximal element of *A*.

Below we will prove that these two weaker version of stable embeddedness are equivalent and that they hold in theories without the independence property. The key argument is contained in the following lemma.

Lemma 1.7. Let $\kappa > |T|$ be a cardinal and let $\langle \mathfrak{M}, C \rangle \leq \langle \mathfrak{M}_+, C_+ \rangle$ be structures where the former one has size $|M| < \kappa$ and the latter one is κ -saturated. For all sets $A, B \subseteq M_+$ of size $|A|, |B| < \kappa$ with $A \sqrt[u]{C} B$, there exists some $A' \subseteq C_+$ such that $A' \equiv_B A$.

Proof. Let $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i < \lambda}$ be an enumeration of A and let $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be a set such that $\langle \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C} \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{M}_+, C_+ \rangle$. Set

$$\Phi(\bar{x}) \coloneqq \operatorname{Th}(\langle \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C} \rangle) \cup \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/B) \cup \{ Px_i \mid i < \lambda \},\$$

where the type $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/B)$ is taken with respect to the structure \mathbb{M} and P is the predicate symbol of $\langle \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C} \rangle$ corresponding to the set \mathbb{C} . If $\Phi(\bar{x})$ is satisfiable, it follows by κ -saturation of $\langle \mathfrak{M}_+, C_+ \rangle$ that there is some tuple $\bar{a}' \subseteq M_+$ with $\langle \mathfrak{M}_+, C_+ \rangle \models \Phi(\bar{a}')$. By definition of Φ , this implies that $\bar{a}' \subseteq C_+$ and $\bar{a}' \equiv_B \bar{a}$. Hence, it remains to prove that Φ is satisfiable.

Let $\Phi_{o} \subseteq \Phi$ be finite. Then

$$\Phi_{\rm o}(\bar{x}) \equiv \psi \wedge \varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in I} Px_i,$$

for suitable formulae $\psi \in \text{Th}(\langle \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C} \rangle)$, $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}/B)$, and some finite set $I \subseteq \lambda$. Since $\bar{a} \quad \sqrt[\mathbf{u}]{}_{C} B$, we can find some tuple $\bar{a}' \subseteq C \subseteq C_{+}$ with $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}')$. Consequently,

$$\langle \mathfrak{M}_+, C_+ \rangle \vDash \psi \land \varphi(\bar{a}') \land \bigwedge_{i \in I} Pa'_i,$$

and \bar{a}' satisfies $\Phi_{o}(\bar{x})$.

A second technical ingredient we need in the proof below is the notion of a type *generating* a sequence.

Definition 1.8. Let \mathfrak{p} be a type. A sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ is generated by \mathfrak{p} over U if \bar{a}_i realises $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright U\bar{a}[\langle i]$, for all $i \in I$.

Exercise 1.1. Prove that, for every type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{\overline{s}}(\mathbb{M})$ and every small index set *I*, there is some sequence $(\overline{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ generated by \mathfrak{p} .

When using a suitable type, the generated sequence is automatically a Morley sequence.

Lemma 1.9. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a preforking relation and \mathfrak{p} a global type that is $\sqrt{}$ -free over U. Every sequence generated by \mathfrak{p} over a set $U \cup C$ is a $\sqrt{}$ -Morley sequence for $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright UC$ over U.

The existence of honest definitions turns out to being equivalent to not having the independence property.

Theorem 1.10. Let $\varphi(\bar{x})$ be a formula over \mathbb{M} and let \bar{s} be the sorts of \bar{x} . *The following statements are equivalent:*

 \square

- (1) $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{alt}}(\varphi) < \infty$.
- (2) For every set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, there is a honest definition of $\varphi^{\mathbb{M}}$ over C.
- (3) For every model \mathfrak{M} containing the parameters of φ , every set $C \subseteq M$ of parameters, and every $(|T| \oplus |M|)^+$ -saturated elementary extension $\langle \mathfrak{M}_+, C_+ \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{M}, C \rangle$, there exists a formula $\varphi_+(\bar{x})$ over C_+ such that

$$\varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}} \subseteq \varphi_{+}(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}}_{+} \subseteq \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}}_{+}.$$

Proof. (3) \Rightarrow (2) Fix a model \mathfrak{M} containing the parameters of φ , a set $C \subseteq M$, and a $(|T| \oplus |M|)^+$ -saturated elementary extension $\langle \mathfrak{M}_+, C_+ \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{M}, C \rangle$. By (3), there is some formula $\varphi_+(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ with parameters $\bar{c} \subseteq C_+$ such that

$$\varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}} \subseteq \varphi_{+}(\bar{x};\bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}}_{+} \subseteq \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}}_{+}.$$

We claim that $\varphi_+(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ is a honest definition of $\varphi^{\mathbb{M}}$ over *C*. Let $C_0 \subseteq C$ be finite. Then

$$\langle \mathfrak{M}_{+}, C_{+} \rangle \vDash \bigwedge_{\bar{a} \in C_{o}^{\bar{s}}} [\varphi_{+}(\bar{a}; \bar{c}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{a})] \land (\forall \bar{x}. \wedge_{i} Px_{i}) [\varphi_{+}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \rightarrow \varphi(\bar{x})].$$

Consequently,

$$\langle \mathfrak{M}, C \rangle \vDash (\exists \bar{y}. \wedge_i P y_i) \Big[\bigwedge_{\bar{a} \in C_0^{\bar{s}}} [\varphi_+(\bar{a}; \bar{y}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{a})] \\ \wedge (\forall \bar{x}. \wedge_i P x_i) [\varphi_+(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \to \varphi(\bar{x})] \Big],$$

and there is some tuple $\bar{c}' \subseteq C$ such that

$$\varphi^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C_{\mathsf{o}}^{\bar{s}} \subseteq \varphi_{+}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}')^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}} \subseteq \varphi^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}}.$$

(2) \Rightarrow (1) For a contradiction, suppose that $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{alt}}(\varphi(\bar{x})) = \infty$ but $\varphi^{\mathbb{M}}$ has honest definitions over all sets $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. By compactness there

exists an indiscernible sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ such that $\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\alpha) = \infty$. Omitting some elements of α we may assume that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_n)$$
 iff *n* is even.

Let $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ be an honest definition of $\varphi^{\mathbb{M}}$ over the set $C := \bar{a}[<\omega]$ and let $C_{o} := \bar{a}[<2k + 2]$ where $k := |\bar{y}|$. By assumption, there is some tuple $\bar{c} \subseteq C$ such that

$$arphi^{\mathbb{M}}\cap C^{ar{s}}_{\mathrm{o}}\subseteq \psi(ar{x};ar{c})^{\mathbb{M}}\cap C^{ar{s}}\subseteq arphi^{\mathbb{M}}\cap C^{ar{s}}.$$

Fix some tuple $\overline{j} \in [\omega]^k$ such that $\overline{c} \subseteq \overline{a}[\overline{j}]$. Then there is some index i < 2k + 1 such that

$$\operatorname{ord}(i\overline{j}) = \operatorname{ord}((i+1)\overline{j})$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \psi(\bar{a}_i; \bar{c}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{a}_{i+1}; \bar{c}).$$

If *i* is even, then

$$\psi(\bar{x};\bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}} \subseteq \varphi^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}} \qquad \text{implies} \quad \bar{a}_{i+1} \notin \psi(\bar{x};\bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}},$$

while $\varphi^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}}_{o} \subseteq \psi(\bar{x};\bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}} \quad \text{implies} \quad \bar{a}_{i} \in \psi(\bar{x};\bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}}.$

A contradiction. In the case where *i* is odd, we can show in the same way that $\bar{a}_i \notin \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}}$ and $\bar{a}_{i+1} \in \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})^{\mathbb{M}}$.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) Let $F \subseteq S^{\bar{s}}(M_+)$ be the set of all types over M_+ that are finitely satisfiable in *C* and let $F_{\varphi} := F \cap \langle \varphi \rangle$ be the subset of those types containing φ . As $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{alt}}(\varphi) < \infty$, we can choose, for every type $\mathfrak{p} \in F$, a sequence $\alpha_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq C_+$ that is generated by \mathfrak{p} over *C* and such that $\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi(\bar{x})}(\alpha_{\mathfrak{p}})$ is maximal (among all such sequences in C_+).

Let $\bar{a}' \subseteq C_+$ be a tuple realising $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright C \alpha_{\mathfrak{p}}$, for some $\mathfrak{p} \in F$. We claim that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}')$$
 iff $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{p}$.

By Lemma 1.7, there is some $\bar{a}'' \in C^{\bar{s}}_+$ realising $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright M \alpha_{\mathfrak{p}} \bar{a}'$. Then the sequence $\alpha_{\mathfrak{p}} \bar{a}' \bar{a}''$ is generated by \mathfrak{p} over *C* and our choice of $\alpha_{\mathfrak{p}}$ implies that

$$\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\alpha_{\mathfrak{p}}\bar{a}'\bar{a}'') = \operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\alpha_{\mathfrak{p}}).$$

As φ is over *M*, it follows by choice of \bar{a}'' that

 $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}')$ iff $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}'')$ iff $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{p}$,

as desired.

For types $\mathfrak{p} \in F_{\varphi}$, the claim we have just proved implies that

Th $(\langle \mathbb{M}_M, \mathbb{C} \rangle) \cup \mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright C \alpha_{\mathfrak{p}} \cup \{Px_0, \dots, Px_{n-1}\} \vDash \varphi(\bar{x}),$

where $\bar{x} = x_0 \dots x_{n-1}$, \mathbb{C} is a set such that $\langle \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C} \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{M}_+, C_+ \rangle$, and *P* is the predicate symbol corresponding to \mathbb{C} . Therefore, we can use compactness to find a formula $\vartheta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright C\alpha_{\mathfrak{p}}$ such that

$$\mathrm{Th}(\langle \mathbb{M}_M, \mathbb{C} \rangle) \cup \{ \vartheta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\bar{x}), Px_{\mathfrak{o}}, \ldots, Px_{n-1} \} \vDash \varphi(\bar{x}) \,.$$

Note that $\vartheta_{\mathfrak{p}} \in \mathfrak{p}$ implies $\mathfrak{p} \in \langle \vartheta_{\mathfrak{p}} \rangle$. Hence,

$$F_{\varphi} \subseteq \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in F_{\varphi}} \langle \vartheta_{\mathfrak{p}} \rangle \,.$$

By Lemma F2.3.7, F is a closed set. Hence, so is $F_{\varphi} = F \cap \langle \varphi(\bar{x}) \rangle$. As closed sets in Hausdorff spaces are compact, it follows that there exists a finite subset $F_{o} \subseteq F_{\varphi}$ such that

$$F_{\varphi} \subseteq \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in F_{\mathbf{o}}} \langle \vartheta_{\mathfrak{p}} \rangle \,.$$

We claim that

$$\varphi_+(\bar{x}) \coloneqq \bigvee_{\mathfrak{p}\in F_{\mathbf{o}}} \vartheta_{\mathfrak{p}}$$

is the desired formula.

Consider a tuple $\bar{a} \in C^{\bar{s}}$ with $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a})$. Then $\mathfrak{p} := \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/M_+)$ is trivially finitely satisfiable in *C*. Hence, $\mathfrak{p} \in F_{\varphi}$ and we have $\vartheta_{\mathfrak{q}} \in \mathfrak{p}$, for some $\mathfrak{q} \in F_{0}$. This implies that $\varphi_{+}(\bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{p}$. Consequently,

$$\varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}} \subseteq \varphi_{+}(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}} \subseteq \varphi_{+}(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C_{+}^{\bar{s}}$$

For the second inclusion, let $\bar{a} \in C^{\bar{s}}_+$ be a tuple with $\mathbb{M} \models \vartheta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\bar{a})$, for some $\mathfrak{p} \in F_{\mathfrak{o}}$. Then we have $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a})$, by choice of $\vartheta_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Hence,

$$\varphi_+(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}}_+ \subseteq \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}}_+.$$

As a corollary, we obtain the following weak variant of stable embeddedness for theories without the independence property.

Corollary 1.11. For every model \mathfrak{M} , every set $C \subseteq M$, and every formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over M with $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{alt}}(\varphi) < \infty$, there exists an elementary extension $\langle \mathfrak{M}_+, C_+ \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{M}, C \rangle$ and a formula $\varphi_+(\bar{x})$ over C_+ such that

$$\varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}} = \varphi_+(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap C^{\bar{s}}.$$

Another convenient consequence of Theorem 1.10 is contained in the proposition below. Again we isolate the main argument in a lemma.

Lemma 1.12. Let *T* be a theory without the independence property and κ an infinite cardinal. Let \mathfrak{M} be a model of *T* of size $|M| < \kappa$, $B \subseteq M$ a set, and $\langle \mathfrak{M}_+, B_+ \rangle \ge \langle \mathfrak{M}, B \rangle$ a κ -saturated elementary extension. For every set $C \subseteq M$, there exists a set $U \subseteq B_+$ of size $|U| \le |T| \oplus |C|$ such that

 $\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{b}'$ implies $\bar{b} \equiv_C \bar{b}'$, for all $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$.

Proof. For every formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over *C*, we use Theorem 1.10 to find a formula φ_+ over B_+ such that

$$\varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap B^{\bar{s}} \subseteq \varphi_{+}(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap (B_{+})^{\bar{s}} \subseteq \varphi(\bar{x})^{\mathbb{M}} \cap (B_{+})^{\bar{s}}.$$

Let $U \subseteq B_+$ be a set of size $|U| \leq |T| \oplus |C|$ containing the parameters of each of these formulae φ_+ .

To show that *U* has the desired properties, consider tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$ with $\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{b}'$. For every formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over *C* and every finite set *I* of indices, it follows that

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{M} &\models \varphi(\bar{b}|_{I}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} &\models \varphi_{+}(\bar{b}|_{I}) \\ \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} &\models \varphi_{+}(\bar{b}|'_{I}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} &\models \varphi(\bar{b}|'_{I}) \,. \end{split}$$

Consequently, $\bar{b} \equiv_C \bar{b}'$.

Proposition 1.13. Let T be a theory without the independence property, \mathfrak{M} a model of T, and $B \subseteq M$. Then there exists an elementary extension $\langle \mathfrak{M}_+, B_+ \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{M}, B \rangle$ such that, for every set $A \subseteq M$, there exists a set $U \subseteq B_+$ of size $|U| \leq |T| \oplus |A|$ with $A \sqrt[5]{U} B_+$.

Proof. We iterate the preceding lemma. Let $\langle \mathfrak{M}_+, B_+ \rangle$ be the union of an elementary chain $\langle \mathfrak{M}_n, B_n \rangle_{n < \omega}$ starting with $\langle \mathfrak{M}_0, B_0 \rangle \coloneqq \langle \mathfrak{M}, B \rangle$ where each $\langle \mathfrak{M}_{n+1}, B_{n+1} \rangle \ge \langle \mathfrak{M}_n, B_n \rangle$ is $(|T| \oplus |M_n|)^+$ -saturated. We inductively construct a sequence $(U_n)_{n < \omega}$ of sets $U_n \subseteq B_{n+1}$ of size $|U_n| \le |T| \oplus |A|$ as follows. Suppose that we have already defined $U_0, \ldots, U_{n-1} \subseteq B_n \subseteq M_n$. By Lemma 1.12, there exists some set $U_n \subseteq B_{n+1}$ of size

$$|U_n| \le |T| \oplus |A| \oplus |U_o| \oplus \cdots \oplus |U_{n-1}| = |T| \oplus |A|$$

such that

$$\bar{b} \equiv_{U_n} \bar{b}'$$
 implies $\bar{b} \equiv_{A \cup U_0 \cup \dots \cup U_{n-1}} \bar{b}'$, for all $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B_n$.

Set $U := \bigcup_{n < \omega} U_n$ and let $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B_+$ be finite tuples with $\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{b}'$. Then $|U| \leq |T| \oplus |A|$ and there is some $k < \omega$ such that $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B_k$. It follows that

$$\bar{b} \equiv_{A \cup U_0 \cup \dots \cup U_{n-1}} \bar{b}'$$
, for all $n \ge k$.

Consequently, $\bar{b} \equiv_{AU} \bar{b}'$, as desired.

For infinite tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B_+$ with $\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{b}'$, it therefore follows that

$$\bar{b}|_I \equiv_U \bar{b}'|_I$$
 implies $\bar{b}|_I \equiv_{AU} \bar{b}'|_I$, for all finite sets *I*.

Consequently, $\bar{b} \equiv_{AU} \bar{b}'$.

1163
Convex equivalence relations

As an application we study the structure of indiscernible sequences in theories without the independence property.

Definition 1.14. Let $\Im = \langle I, \leq \rangle$ be a linear order and ~ an equivalence relation on *I*.

(a) ~ is *convex* if

 $i \sim j$ implies $i \sim k$ for all $i \leq k \leq j$.

(b) ~ is *finite* if it has only finitely many classes.

(c) The *intersection number* in(\sim) of a convex equivalence relation \sim is the least cardinal κ such that \sim can be written as an intersection of κ finite convex equivalence relations.

(d) For tuples $\bar{i}, \bar{j} \in I^{<\omega}$, we set

$$\overline{i} \sim \overline{j}$$
 : iff $\operatorname{ord}(\overline{i}) = \operatorname{ord}(\overline{j})$ and $i_s \sim j_s$ for all s .

(e) For a subset $C \subseteq I$ and tuples $\overline{i}, \overline{j} \subseteq I$, we define

 $\bar{i} \equiv_{C}^{\circ} \bar{j}$: iff $\Im, \bar{i}\bar{c} \equiv^{\circ} \Im, \bar{j}\bar{c}$ where \bar{c} is an enumeration of C.

Let us note that the relation \equiv_C° is convex and that its definition for tuples is consistent with the notation introduced in (d) above.

Lemma 1.15. \equiv_C° is a convex equivalence relation with $in(\equiv_C^{\circ}) \leq |C|$ that satisfies

 $\overline{i} \equiv_C^{\circ} \overline{j}$: iff $\operatorname{ord}(\overline{i}) = \operatorname{ord}(\overline{j})$ and $i_s \equiv_C^{\circ} j_s$ for all s.

Proof. For the bound on the intersection number, note that

$$\equiv_C^{\mathsf{o}} = \bigcap_{c \in C} \equiv_{\{c\}}^{\mathsf{o}}.$$

The other claims are straightforward.

The statement of the preceding lemma has a weak converse: every convex equivalence relation can be obtained as a coarsening of a relation of the form \equiv_C° .

Lemma 1.16. Let ~ be a convex equivalence relation on a linear order I and J a complete linear order containing I. Then there exists a set $C \subseteq J$ of size $|C| \leq in(\sim) \oplus \aleph_0$ such that the restriction of \equiv_C^o to I refines ~.

Proof. Set $\kappa := in(\sim) \oplus \aleph_0$ and let *F* be a set of finite convex equivalence relations of size $|F| \le \kappa$ such that $\sim = \bigcap F$. We set

 $C := \{ \inf E \mid E \text{ an } \approx \text{-class for some} \approx \in F \}$ $\cup \{ \sup E \mid E \text{ an } \approx \text{-class for some} \approx \in F \},\$

where we take the infima and suprema in the ordering *J*. Then $|C| \le |F| \otimes \aleph_0 \le \kappa$ and the restriction of \equiv_C^0 to *I* refines ~.

Theorem 1.17. Let *T* be a theory without the independence property and $\alpha = (\bar{a}^i)_{i \in I}$ an indiscernible sequence over *U*. For every set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, there exist a linear order $J \supseteq I$, an indiscernible sequence $\alpha_+ = (\bar{a}^j)_{j \in J}$ over *U* with $\alpha_+ \upharpoonright I = \alpha$, and a subset $K \subseteq J$ of size $|K| \leq |T| \oplus |C|$ such that

 $\bar{i} \equiv_{K}^{\circ} \bar{j}$ implies $\bar{a}[\bar{i}] \equiv_{UC} \bar{a}[\bar{j}]$, for all $\bar{i}, \bar{j} \in [J]^{<\omega}$.

Proof. Let \mathfrak{M} be a model containing $U \cup C \cup \alpha$. Suppose that the sequence α consists of γ -tuples $\bar{a}^i = (a_k^i)_{k < \gamma}$ and set

$$P := U \cup \left\{ \begin{array}{l} a_k^i \mid i \in I, \ k < \gamma \right\},$$

$$E := \left\{ \left\langle a_k^i, a_l^i \right\rangle \mid i \in I, \ k, l < \gamma \right\},$$

$$F := \left\{ \left\langle a_k^i, a_k^j \right\rangle \mid i, j \in I, \ k < \gamma \right\},$$

$$R := \left\{ \left\langle a_k^i, a_l^j \right\rangle \mid i < j \text{ in } I, \ k, l < \gamma \right\}.$$

Fix an $|M|^+$ -saturated elementary extension

$$\langle \mathfrak{M}_+, P_+, U_+, E_+, F_+, R_+ \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{M}, P, U, E, F, R \rangle.$$

Using the relations E_+ , F_+ , and R_+ , we see that there are a linear order $I_+ \supseteq I$, an ordinal $\gamma_+ \ge \gamma$, and a family $(b_k^i)_{i \in I_+, k < \gamma_+}$ of elements such that

- $P_+ = U_+ \cup \{ b_k^i \mid i \in I_+, k < \gamma_+ \},$
- $b_k^i = a_k^i$, for $i \in I$ and $k < \gamma$,
- the sequence (b
 ⁱ)_{i∈I+} consisting of b
 ⁱ := (bⁱ_k)_{k<γ+}, i ∈ I+, is indiscernible over U+.

By Lemma 1.12, we can find a set $W \subseteq P_+$ of size $|W| \leq |T| \oplus |C|$ such that

$$\bar{a} \equiv_W \bar{a}'$$
 implies $\bar{a} \equiv_C \bar{a}'$, for all $\bar{a}, \bar{a}' \subseteq P$.

We claim that the sequence $\alpha' := (\bar{b}^i|_{\gamma})_{i \in I_+}$ and the set

 $K \coloneqq \{ i \in I_+ \mid \bar{b}^i \cap W \neq \emptyset \}$

have the desired properties. Consider tuples $\bar{i}, \bar{j} \in [I_+]^{<\omega}$ with $\bar{i} \equiv_K^o \bar{j}$ and let \bar{k} be an enumeration of K. Since $(\bar{b}^i)_{i \in I_+}$ is indiscernible over U, it follows that

 $\bar{\imath} \equiv^{\circ}_{K} \bar{\jmath} \implies \mathfrak{I}_{+}, \bar{\imath}\bar{k} \equiv^{\circ} \mathfrak{I}_{+}, \bar{\jmath}\bar{k} \implies \bar{b}[\bar{\imath}\bar{k}] \equiv_{U} \bar{b}[\bar{\jmath}\bar{k}].$

Fix an enumeration \bar{c} of U. Since $\bar{a}[\bar{i}], \bar{a}[\bar{j}], \bar{c} \subseteq P$, it follows by choice of W that

$$\bar{a}[\bar{i}]\bar{c} \equiv_W \bar{a}[\bar{j}]\bar{c}$$
 implies $a[\bar{i}]\bar{c} \equiv_C \bar{a}[\bar{j}]\bar{c}$.

Hence, $\bar{a}[\bar{i}] \equiv_{UC} \bar{a}[\bar{j}]$ and the claim follows.

Corollary 1.18. Let T be a theory without the independence property and $\alpha = (\bar{a}^i)_{i \in I}$ an indiscernible sequence over U. For every set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, there exists a convex equivalence relation \approx on I with $in(\approx) \leq |T| \oplus |C|$ such that

$$\bar{\imath} \approx \bar{\jmath}$$
 implies $\bar{a}[\bar{\imath}] \equiv_{UC} \bar{a}[\bar{\jmath}]$.

Proof. Let $\alpha' = (\bar{a}^j)_{j \in J}$ and $K \subseteq J$ be the sequence and the set obtained from Theorem 1.17. We claim that the restriction \approx of \equiv_K° to *I* has the desired properties. By Lemma 1.15, \approx is convex and

 $\operatorname{in}(\approx) \leq |K| \leq |T| \oplus |C|.$

Consider tuples $\overline{i}, \overline{j} \subseteq I$ with $\overline{i} \approx \overline{j}$. Then

 $\operatorname{ord}(\overline{i}) = \operatorname{ord}(\overline{j})$ and $i_s \approx j_s$ for all s,

and it follows by Lemma 1.15 that $\bar{i} \equiv_{K}^{o} \bar{j}$. By choice of α' and K, this implies that $\bar{a}[\bar{i}] \equiv_{UC} \bar{a}[\bar{j}]$.

Corollary 1.19. Let *T* be a theory without the independence property, $\alpha = (\bar{a}^i)_{i \in I}$ an indiscernible sequence over *U*, and $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ a set of parameters. If cf $I > |T| \oplus |C|$, then there exists an index $k \in I$ such that the subsequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \geq k}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup C \cup \bar{a}[<k]$.

Proof. Let $\alpha' = (\bar{a}^j)_{j \in J}$ and $K \subseteq J$ be the sequence and the set obtained from Theorem 1.17. Since cf I > |K|, there exists some index $k \in J \setminus K$ that is greater than all elements of K. This index has the desired properties.

2. Lascar invariant types

As forking is less well-behaved in non-simple theories, we need additional tools to investigate theories without the independence properties.

Lascar strong types

We start by studying the question of when two tuples \bar{a} , \bar{b} can appear as elements of the same indiscernible sequence.

Definition 2.1. For two tuples \bar{a} and \bar{b} , we write

 $\bar{a} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}$: iff there is some indiscernible sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$ over U such that $\bar{c}_0 = \bar{a}$ and $\bar{c}_1 = \bar{b}$. We denote the transitive closure of \approx_U^{ls} by \equiv_U^{ls} . If $\bar{a} \equiv_U^{\text{ls}} \bar{b}$, we say that \bar{a} and \bar{b} have the same *Lascar strong type* over *U*.

Remark. Clearly, $\bar{a} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}$ implies $\bar{a} \equiv_{U} \bar{b}$.

Example. If $b \in acl(Ua)$, then $a \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} b$ iff a = b.

Exercise 2.1. Prove that \approx_U^{ls} is reflexive and symmetric, but in general not transitive.

Let us start by giving an alternative characterisation of the relation \approx_U^{ls} in terms of formulae that are *chain-bounded*.

Definition 2.2. A formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ where \bar{x} and \bar{y} have the same sorts is *chain-bounded* if there exists a number $n < \omega$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \neg \exists \bar{x}_{o} \cdots \exists \bar{x}_{n} \bigwedge_{o \leq i < k \leq n} \varphi(\bar{x}_{i}, \bar{x}_{k}).$$

Remark. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be a formula where \bar{x} and \bar{y} both have sorts \bar{s} . By compactness, it follows that the formula φ is not chain-bounded if, and only if, for every strict linear order $\langle I, \langle \rangle$, there exist a homomorphism $\langle I, \langle \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}}, \varphi^{\mathbb{M}} \rangle$.

Example. If $\chi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in FE^{\bar{s}}(U)$, then $\neg \chi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is chain-bounded.

Lemma 2.3. The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) $\bar{a} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}$
- (2) $\bar{a} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{C} \bar{b}$, for all finite $C \subseteq U$.
- (3) $\bar{a} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{M} \bar{b}$, for some model $M \supseteq U$.
- (4) For every set C, there exists some set $C' \equiv_U C$ such that $\bar{a} \approx_{UC'}^{\text{ls}} \bar{b}$.
- (5) $\mathbb{M} \models \neg \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$, for every chain-bounded formula φ over U.
- (6) $\bigcup_{0 \le i < k < \omega} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_k)$ is satisfiable, where $\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') \coloneqq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U)$.

Proof. (4) \Rightarrow (3) Fix an arbitrary model \mathfrak{M} containing U. By (4), there is some $M' \equiv_U M$ such that $\bar{a} \approx_{M'}^{\text{ls}} \bar{b}$.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) \Rightarrow (2) If $(\bar{c}_i)_{i < \omega}$ is an indiscernible sequence over a model $M \supseteq U$ with $\bar{c}_0 = \bar{a}$ and $\bar{c}_1 = \bar{b}$, then $(\bar{c}_i)_{i < \omega}$ is also indiscernible over U.

Similarly, if $(\bar{c}_i)_{i < \omega}$ is indiscernible over U, it is also indiscernible over every subset $C \subseteq U$.

(2) \Rightarrow (5) Consider a chain-bounded formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ over U. Fix a finite set $C \subseteq U$ such that φ is over C. Since $\bar{a} \approx_C^{\text{ls}} \bar{b}$, there exists an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over C such that $\bar{c}_0 = \bar{a}$ and $\bar{c}_1 = \bar{b}$. If $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$, then φ would not be chain-bounded since indiscernibility would imply that

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{c}_i, \bar{c}_k)$, for all $i < k < \omega$.

Therefore, $\mathbb{M} \models \neg \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$.

(5) \Rightarrow (6) Suppose that $\bigcup_{0 \le i < k < \omega} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_k)$ is inconsistent. By compactness, there exists a number $n < \omega$ and a finite subset $\Phi \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ such that $\bigcup_{0 \le i < k < n} \Phi(\bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_k)$ is inconsistent. Setting $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') := \bigwedge \Phi$ we have

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \neg \exists \bar{x}_{0} \cdots \exists \bar{x}_{n-1} \bigwedge_{0 \le i < k < n} \varphi(\bar{x}_{i}, \bar{x}_{k}).$$

Hence, φ is chain-bounded formula, and $\varphi \in \mathfrak{p}$ implies $\mathbb{M} \nvDash \neg \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$.

(6) \Rightarrow (4) Let $(\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}$ be a sequence satisfying $\bigcup_{0 \le i < k < \omega} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_k)$. By Proposition E5.3.6, there exists an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{d}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over U with

$$\operatorname{Av}((\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}/U) \subseteq \operatorname{Av}((\bar{d}_n)_{n<\omega}/U).$$

Since $\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_1) \subseteq \operatorname{Av}((\bar{c}_n)_n/U)$, the sequence $(\bar{d}_n)_{n<\omega}$ also satisfies $\bigcup_{0 \le i < k < \omega} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_k)$. In particular, $\bar{d}_0 \bar{d}_1 \equiv_U \bar{a}\bar{b}$ and there exists an automorphism $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_U$ such that $\pi(\bar{d}_0) = \bar{a}$ and $\pi(\bar{d}_1) = \bar{b}$. We can use Lemma E5.3.11 to find a set $C' \equiv_U C$ such that $(\pi(\bar{d}_n))_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup C'$. It follows that $\bar{a} \approx_{UC'}^{\operatorname{ls}} \bar{b}$.

Our next goal is to show that, for a model \mathfrak{M} , the relation \equiv^{ls}_{M} coincides with \equiv_{M} . We start with a technical lemma.

Lemma 2.4. If $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ are chain-bounded, then so is $\varphi \lor \psi$.

Proof. Suppose that $\varphi \lor \psi$ is not chain-bounded. Then there exists a sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash (\varphi \lor \psi)(\bar{c}_i, \bar{c}_k), \text{ for all } i < k < \omega.$$

By the Theorem of Ramsey, we can find an infinite subset $I \subseteq \omega$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{c}_i, \bar{c}_k), \quad \text{for all } i < k \text{ in } I,$$

or
$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \psi(\bar{c}_i, \bar{c}_k), \quad \text{for all } i < k \text{ in } I.$$

In the first case, φ is not chain-bounded; in the second case, ψ is not chain-bounded.

Proposition 2.5. For a model \mathfrak{M} , the following statements are equivalent:

- (1) $\bar{a} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{M} \bar{b}$
- (2) $\bar{a} \equiv_M \bar{b}$
- (3) $\bar{a} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{M} \bar{c} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{M} \bar{b}$, for some \bar{c} .
- (4) There exist tuples $\bar{c}_0, \bar{c}_1, \ldots$ such that the sequences $\bar{a}, \bar{c}_0, \bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2, \ldots$ and $\bar{b}, \bar{c}_0, \bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2, \ldots$ are both indiscernible over M.
- (5) $\mathbb{M} \models \exists \bar{y} [\neg \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{y}) \land \neg \varphi(\bar{b}, \bar{y})], \text{ for every chain-bounded for$ $mula } \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \text{ over } M.$

Proof. $(3) \Rightarrow (1)$ is trivial.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) By definition of \equiv_M^{ls} , there are tuples $\bar{c}_0, \ldots, \bar{c}_n$ such that

 $\bar{a} = \bar{c}_{o} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{M} \cdots \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{M} \bar{c}_{n} = \bar{b}$.

For each k < n, there is an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{d}_i^k)_{i < \omega}$ over M with $\bar{d}_o^k = \bar{c}_k$ and $\bar{d}_1^k = \bar{c}_{k+1}$. Consequently, $\bar{c}_k \equiv_M \bar{c}_{k+1}$ and the claim follows.

(2) \Rightarrow (4) Suppose that $\bar{a} \equiv_M \bar{b}$. By Lemma F2.3.15, we have $\bar{a} \sqrt[u]{M} M$. As $\sqrt[u]{}$ is a forking relation, the type tp (\bar{a}/M) has some $\sqrt[u]{}$ -free extension $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{\bar{s}}(\mathbb{M})$. We construct a sequence $\beta = (\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$ by inductively

choosing a tuple \bar{c}_n realising $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright M\bar{a}\bar{a}'\bar{c}[< n]$. Since $\sqrt[u]{\subseteq \sqrt[s]{}}$, the type \mathfrak{p} is invariant over *M* and the sequences $\alpha := \bar{\alpha}\beta$ and $\alpha' := \bar{\alpha}'\beta$ both satisfy the conditions of Lemma F2.4.14 (b). Hence, they are indiscernible over M.

(4) \Rightarrow (3) Suppose that $\bar{a}, \bar{c}_0, \bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2, \dots$ and $\bar{b}, \bar{c}_0, \bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2, \dots$ are indiscernible sequences over M. Then

$$\bar{a} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{M} \bar{c}_{\mathrm{o}}$$
 and $\bar{b} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{M} \bar{c}_{\mathrm{o}}$,

and the claim follows by symmetry of \approx^{ls}_{M} . (2) \Rightarrow (5) Suppose that $\bar{a} \equiv_{M} \bar{b}$. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be a chain-bounded formula over M and let n be the minimal number such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \neg \exists \bar{x}_{o} \cdots \exists \bar{x}_{n} \bigwedge_{o \leq i < k \leq n} \varphi(\bar{x}_{i}, \bar{x}_{k}).$$

Then

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \exists \bar{x}_{0} \cdots \exists \bar{x}_{n-1} \bigwedge_{0 \le i < k < n} \varphi(\bar{x}_{i}, \bar{x}_{k})$$

As the same formula holds in \mathfrak{M} , there are tuples $\bar{c}_0, \ldots, \bar{c}_{n-1}$ in M such that

$$\mathfrak{M} \vDash \bigwedge_{0 \leq i < k < n} \varphi(\bar{c}_i, \bar{c}_k) \, .$$

By choice of *n*, there is an index k < n such that $\mathbb{M} \neq \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{c}_k)$. Since $\bar{a} \equiv_M \bar{b}$ we also have $\mathbb{M} \neq \varphi(\bar{b}, \bar{c}_k)$. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \neg \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{c}_k) \land \neg \varphi(b, \bar{c}_k).$$

 $(5) \Rightarrow (3)$ Set

$$\Phi(\bar{y}) \coloneqq \left\{ \neg \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{y}) \land \neg \varphi(\bar{b}, \bar{y}) \mid \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \text{ a chain-bounded} \right.$$
formula over $M \left. \right\}.$

If there is a tuple \bar{c} satisfying Φ , then it follows from Lemma 2.3 that

 $\bar{a} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{M} \bar{c}$ and $\bar{b} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{M} \bar{c}$.

Hence, it remains to show that $T(\mathbb{M}) \cup \Phi$ is satisfiable. Let $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$ be finite. Then there are chain-bounded formulae $\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_{n-1}$ over M such that

$$\Phi_{o} = \left\{ \neg \varphi_{i}(\bar{a}, \bar{y}) \land \neg \varphi_{i}(\bar{b}, \bar{y}) \mid i < n \right\}.$$

By Lemma 2.4 the disjunction $\psi := \varphi_0 \vee \cdots \vee \varphi_{n-1}$ is also chain-bounded. Therefore, (5) implies that there is some tuple \bar{c} with

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \neg \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{c}) \land \neg \psi(\bar{b}, \bar{c}).$$

Consequently, \bar{c} satisfies $T(\mathbb{M}) \cup \Phi_0$. By compactness, it follows that $T(\mathbb{M}) \cup \Phi$ is satisfiable.

Finally we provide several characterisations of the relation \equiv_U^{ls} for arbitrary sets U. One of them is in terms of bounded equivalence relations, where boundedness is an analog to the notion of chain-boundedness, but for the complement of the relation.

Definition 2.6. Let $\mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbb{M}^{\tilde{s}} \times \mathbb{M}^{\tilde{s}}$ be a relation.

(a) \mathbb{R} is *U*-invariant if

 $\bar{a}\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{a}'\bar{b}'$ implies $\langle \bar{a}, \bar{b} \rangle \in \mathbb{R} \Leftrightarrow \langle \bar{a}', \bar{b}' \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$.

(b) \mathbb{R} is *co-chain-bounded* if there exists a small cardinal κ such that, for every sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i < \kappa}$ in $\mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}}$, there are indices i < j with $\langle \bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$. A co-chain-bounded equivalence relation is simply called *bounded*.

Before concentrating on equivalence relations, let us first give several characterisations of co-chain-boundedness for arbitrary relations.

Proposition 2.7. Let $\mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}} \times \mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}}$ be a *U*-invariant relation. The following statements are equivalent.

- (1) \mathbb{R} is co-chain-bounded.
- (2) $\approx^{\text{ls}}_U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$
- (3) For every indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over U with $\bar{a}_n \in \mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}}$, we have $\langle \bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$, for all $i < j < \omega$.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (3) Let $(\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U. For every pair of indices $i < j < \omega$, we obtain an indiscernible sequence $\bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j, \bar{a}_{j+1}, \ldots$ over U, which witnesses that $\bar{a}_i \approx_U^{\text{ls}} \bar{a}_j$. By (2), this implies that $\langle \bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$.

(3) \Rightarrow (2) Let $\bar{a} \approx_{U}^{\text{ls}} \bar{b}$. By definition, there exists an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over U with $\bar{c}_0 = \bar{a}$ and $\bar{c}_1 = \bar{b}$. Hence, it follows by (3) that $\langle \bar{c}_0, \bar{c}_1 \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) Let \mathbb{R} be co-chain-bounded and let κ be the corresponding cardinal. For a contradiction, suppose that there exists an indiscernible sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ such that $\langle \bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j \rangle \notin \mathbb{R}$, for some i < j. We extend α to an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i < \kappa}$ of length κ . By *U*-invariance, it follows that $\langle \bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j \rangle \notin \mathbb{R}$, for all $i < j < \kappa$. This contradicts our choice of κ .

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose that \mathbb{R} is not co-chain-bounded. Then there exists a sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i < \kappa}$ of length $\kappa := \beth_{\lambda^+}$ where $\lambda := 2^{|T| \oplus |U| \oplus |\bar{s}|}$ such that

$$\langle \bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j \rangle \notin \mathbb{R}$$
, for all $i < j < \kappa$.

We can use Theorem E5.3.7 to find an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_n)_{n < \omega}$ over *U* such that, for every $\bar{i} \in [\omega]^{<\omega}$, there is some $\bar{j} \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ with

$$\bar{b}[\bar{i}] \equiv_U \bar{a}[\bar{j}].$$

By *U*-invariance, it follows that $\langle \bar{b}_i, \bar{b}_j \rangle \notin \mathbb{R}$, for all $i < j < \omega$. This contradicts (3).

For equivalence relations, we obtain the following characterisation.

Proposition 2.8. Let \approx be a *U*-invariant equivalence relation on $\mathbb{M}^{\tilde{s}}$. The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) \approx is bounded.
- (2) \approx has at most $2^{|T| \oplus |U| \oplus |\tilde{s}|}$ classes.
- (3) $\equiv^{\text{ls}}_U \subseteq \approx$
- (4) For every indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_n)_{n<\omega}$ over U with $\bar{a}_n \in \mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}}$, we have $\bar{a}_i \approx \bar{a}_j$, for all $i, j < \omega$.
- (5) For every model \mathfrak{M} containing U,

$$\bar{a} \equiv_M \bar{b}$$
 implies $\bar{a} \approx \bar{b}$, for all $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}}$.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (1) is trivial, and the equivalence (1) \Leftrightarrow (4) has already been proved in Proposition 2.7. The equivalence (1) \Leftrightarrow (3) also follows by Proposition 2.7 since \approx is an equivalence relation and \equiv_U^{ls} is the transitive closure of \approx_U^{ls} . Consequently, we have

 $\equiv^{\mathrm{ls}}_U \subseteq \approx \quad \text{iff} \quad \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_U \subseteq \approx .$

(4) \Rightarrow (5) Suppose that $\bar{a} \equiv_M \bar{b}$. By Proposition 2.5 (4), we can find a sequence $\gamma = (\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$ such that $\bar{a}\gamma$ and $\bar{b}\gamma$ are both indiscernible over M. By (4), this implies that $\bar{a} \approx \bar{c}_0 \approx \bar{b}$.

(5) \Rightarrow (2) Fix a model \mathfrak{M} containing U of size $|M| \leq |T| \oplus |U|$. Then $\equiv_M \subseteq \approx$ implies that \approx has at most as many classes as \equiv_M . The latter number is $|S^{\bar{s}}(M)| \leq 2^{|T| \oplus |M| \oplus |\bar{s}|} = 2^{|T| \oplus |U| \oplus |\bar{s}|}$.

Corollary 2.9. Let $U \subseteq M$.

- (a) \approx^{ls}_{U} is the finest relation that is co-chain-bounded and U-invariant.
- (b) \equiv_U^{ls} is the finest equivalence relation that is bounded and U-invariant.

Over arbitrary sets U, we can characterise the relation \equiv_U^{ls} as follows.

Proposition 2.10. Let $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \mathbb{M}^{\bar{s}}$ and $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. The following statements are equivalent:

(1) $\bar{a} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}$

- (2) $\bar{a} \approx \bar{b}$, for every equivalence relation \approx on \mathbb{M} that is bounded and *U*-invariant.
- (3) There are tuples $\bar{c}_0, \ldots, \bar{c}_n$ and models $M_0, \ldots, M_{n-1} \supseteq U$, for some $n < \omega$, such that

$$\bar{a}=\bar{c}_{0}\equiv_{M_{0}}\bar{c}_{1}\equiv_{M_{1}}\cdots\equiv_{M_{n-2}}\bar{c}_{n-1}\equiv_{M_{n-1}}\bar{c}_{n}=b.$$

(4) There are models $M_0, \ldots, M_{n-1} \supseteq U$, for some $n < \omega$, and automorphisms $\pi_i \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_{M_i}$ such that

$$\overline{b} = (\pi_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \pi_{o})(\overline{a}).$$

Proof. (3) \Leftrightarrow (4) follows from the fact that $\bar{c}_i \equiv_{M_i} \bar{c}_{i+1}$ if, and only if, there exists some automorphism $\pi_i \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_{M_i}$ with $\bar{c}_{i+1} = \pi(\bar{c}_i)$.

(1) ⇒ (2) follows by Proposition 2.8 (3).
(2) ⇒ (3) Let ~* be the transitive closure of the relation

$$\bar{c} \sim \bar{d}$$
 : iff $\bar{c} \equiv_M \bar{d}$, for some model \mathfrak{M} containing U .

This relation is clearly *U*-invariant. Furthermore, it is bounded since it satisfies property (4) of Proposition 2.8. By (2), it follows that $\bar{a} \sim^* \bar{b}$.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) By Proposition 2.5, there are tuples \bar{d}_i , for i < n, such that

$$\bar{c}_i \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{M_i} \bar{d}_i \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{M_i} \bar{c}_{i+1}.$$

According to Lemma 2.3 this implies that

$$\bar{c}_i \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_U \bar{d}_i \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_U \bar{c}_{i+1}$$
, for all $i < n$.

Hence, $\bar{a} = \bar{c}_0 \equiv^{\text{ls}}_U \bar{c}_n = \bar{b}$.

Two tuples are said to have the same *strong type* over a set U if they are elementarily equivalent over $\operatorname{acl}^{eq}(U)$. The next result shows that having the same Lascar strong type implies having the same strong type.

Corollary 2.11. $\bar{a} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}$ implies $\bar{a} \equiv_{\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(U)} \bar{b}$.

Proof. Suppose that $\bar{a} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}$. We can use Proposition 2.10 to find tuples $\bar{c}_0, \ldots, \bar{c}_n$ and models $M_0, \ldots, M_{m-1} \supseteq U$ such that

$$\bar{a} = \bar{c}_0 \equiv_{M_0} \cdots \equiv_{M_{n-1}} \bar{c}_n = b$$

This implies that

$$\bar{a} = \bar{c}_{\mathrm{o}} \equiv_{M_{\mathrm{o}}^{\mathrm{eq}}} \cdots \equiv_{M_{n-1}^{\mathrm{eq}}} \bar{c}_n = \bar{b}$$

Since $\operatorname{acl}^{\operatorname{eq}}(U) \subseteq M_i^{\operatorname{eq}}$, for all *i*, it follows that

$$\bar{a} = \bar{c}_{o} \equiv_{\operatorname{acl}^{\operatorname{eq}}(U)} \cdots \equiv_{\operatorname{acl}^{\operatorname{eq}}(U)} \bar{c}_{n} = b.$$

We conclude our investigation of Lascar strong types by two technical results. The first one shows that the relation \approx_U^{ls} satisfies a restricted form of the back-and-forth property.

Lemma 2.12. If $\bar{a} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}$ and $\bar{c} \sqrt[d]{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}$, there exists a tuple \bar{d} such that $\bar{a}\bar{c} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}\bar{d}$.

Proof. Let $(\bar{a}_i)_{i<\omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U with $\bar{a}_o = \bar{a}$ and $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{b}$. Since the subsequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{o< i<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}$ and $\bar{c} \sqrt[d]{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}$, we can use Lemma F3.1.3 to find an element $\bar{c}' \equiv_{U\bar{a}\bar{b}} \bar{c}$ such that $(\bar{a}_i)_{o< i<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $U\bar{a}\bar{c}'$. Applying an $U\bar{a}\bar{b}$ -automorphism mapping \bar{c}' to \bar{c} , we obtain an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}'_i)_{o< i<\omega}$ over $U\bar{a}\bar{c}$ such that

$$(\bar{a}'_i)_{0 < i < \omega} \equiv_{U\bar{a}\bar{b}} (\bar{a}_i)_{0 < i < \omega}.$$

Replacing \bar{a}_i by \bar{a}'_i , for $0 < i < \omega$, we may therefore assume that the sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{0 < i < \omega}$ is indiscernible over $U\bar{a}\bar{c}$.

For every $i < \omega$, we choose an automorphism $\pi_i \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_U$ such that $\pi_i(\bar{a}_n) = \bar{a}_{n+i}$, for all n, and we set $\bar{c}_i := \pi_i(\bar{c})$. Since $(\bar{a}_i)_{0 < i < \omega}$ is indiscernible over $U\bar{a}\bar{c}$, it follows that

$$\bar{c}\bar{a}b \equiv_U \bar{c}\bar{a}\bar{a}_n \equiv_U \bar{c}_i\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_{n+i}$$
, for all $i < \omega$ and $0 < n < \omega$.

By Proposition E5.3.6, there exists an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{c}'_i \bar{a}'_i)_{i < \omega}$ over *U* such that

$$\operatorname{Av}((\bar{c}_i\bar{a}_i)_{i<\omega}/U) \subseteq \operatorname{Av}((\bar{c}'_i\bar{a}'_i)_{i<\omega}/U).$$

In particular, we have

 $\bar{c}'_i\bar{a}'_i\bar{a}'_{n+i}\equiv_U \bar{c}_i\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_{n+i}\equiv_U \bar{c}\bar{a}\bar{b}.$

Let σ be an *U*-automorphism such that $\sigma(\bar{c}'_{o}) = \bar{c}, \sigma(\bar{a}'_{o}) = \bar{a}$, and $\sigma(\bar{a}'_{1}) = \bar{b}$. The tuple $\bar{d} := \sigma(\bar{c}'_{1})$ has the desired properties.

The second observation contains a strengthening of the extension axiom.

Lemma 2.13. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a forking relation and suppose that $\bar{a} \sqrt{}_U U$. For every set B, there exists a tuple $\bar{a}' \approx^{\text{ls}}_U \bar{a}$ such that $\bar{a}' \sqrt{}_U B$.

Proof. Since $\bar{a} \ \sqrt{U} \ U$, we can use Proposition F2.4.10 to construct a $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequence $(\bar{a}_n)_{n<\omega}$ for $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)$ over U. Applying a suitable automorphism we may assume that $\bar{a}_o = \bar{a}$. Since $\bar{a}[>o] \ \sqrt{U} \ \bar{a}_o$, there exists a sequence $\alpha' \equiv_{U\bar{a}_o} \bar{a}[>o]$ such that $\alpha' \ \sqrt{U} \ B\bar{a}_o$. Let $\alpha' = (\bar{a}'_i)_{o<i<\omega}$. As $\bar{a}_o \alpha'$ is indiscernible over U, we have $\bar{a}_o \approx_U^{\mathrm{ls}} \bar{a}'_1$. Since $\bar{a}'_1 \ \sqrt{U} \ B$, the claim follows.

Lascar invariance

To study theories without the independence property, we introduce variants of the relations $\sqrt[s]{}$ and $\sqrt[i]{}$ that are based on Lascar strong types instead of elementary equivalence.

Definition 2.14. For *A*, *B*, $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ we define

$A \sqrt[q]{U} B$: iff	$\bar{b} pprox_U^{\mathrm{ls}} \bar{b}' \Rightarrow \bar{b} pprox_{UA}^{\mathrm{ls}} \bar{b}'$	for all $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$,
$A \sqrt[ls]{U} B$:iff	$ar{b}\equiv^{\mathrm{ls}}_Uar{b}' \Rightarrow ar{b}\equiv_{UA}ar{b}'$	for all $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$,
$A \bigvee^{\text{li}}_U B$: iff	$A^*(\bigvee^{\mathrm{ls}})_U B$.	

If $\bar{a} \sqrt[|s|]{U} B$, we say that tp (\bar{a}/UB) is Lascar invariant over U.

Note that $\sqrt[s]{\subseteq} \sqrt[ls]{\subseteq} \sqrt[q]{}$. Unfortunately, the relation $\sqrt[ls]{}$ is not a preforking relation since it fails transitivity. But $\sqrt[q]{}$ is. Hence, in order to show that $\sqrt[li]{}$ is a forking relation, we will prove below that $\sqrt[li]{} = (\sqrt[q]{})$.

Exercise 2.2. Prove that $\sqrt[1s]{}$ satisfies all axioms of a preforking relation except for (LTR).

Before turning to $\sqrt[li]{}$, we take a look at the relation $\sqrt[q]{}$.

Lemma 2.15. $\sqrt[q]{}$ *is a preforking relation.*

Proof. (INV) follows immediately from the definition.

(MON) Suppose that $A \sqrt[q]{U} B$ and let $A_o \subseteq A$ and $B_o \subseteq B$. For tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B_o \subseteq B$, we have

$$ar{b} pprox_U^{
m ls} ar{b}' \Rightarrow ar{b} pprox_{UA}^{
m ls} ar{b}' \Rightarrow ar{b} pprox_{UA_o}^{
m ls} ar{b}'$$

(вмом) Suppose that $A \sqrt[q]{U} BC$ and let $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$. Fixing an enumeration \bar{c} of C, we have

$$\bar{b} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{UC} \bar{b}' \Rightarrow \bar{b}\bar{c} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}'\bar{c} \Rightarrow \bar{b}\bar{c} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{UA} \bar{b}'\bar{c} \Rightarrow \bar{b} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{UCA} \bar{b}'.$$

(NOR) Suppose that $A \sqrt[q]{U} B$. To show that $AU \sqrt[q]{U} BU$, consider tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq U \cup B$ with $\bar{b} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}'$. Reordering \bar{b} and \bar{b}' , we may assume that $\bar{b} = \bar{b}_{0}\bar{c}$ and $\bar{b}' = \bar{b}'_{0}\bar{c}$ for $\bar{b}_{0}, \bar{b}'_{0} \subseteq B$ and $\bar{c} \subseteq U$. Consequently,

$$\bar{b}_{\rm o}\bar{c}\approx^{\rm ls}_U\bar{b}'_{\rm o}\bar{c} \Rightarrow \bar{b}_{\rm o}\approx^{\rm ls}_U\bar{b}'_{\rm o} \Rightarrow \bar{b}_{\rm o}\approx^{\rm ls}_{UA}\bar{b}'_{\rm o} \Rightarrow \bar{b}_{\rm o}\bar{c}\approx^{\rm ls}_{UA}\bar{b}'_{\rm o}\bar{c}.$$

(LRF) To show that $A \sqrt[q]{}_A B$, let $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$. Since, trivially,

 $\bar{b} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{A} \bar{b}'$ implies $\bar{b} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{A} \bar{b}'$,

the claim follows.

(LTR) Suppose that $A_2 \sqrt[q]{A_1} B$ and $A_1 \sqrt[q]{A_0} B$ for $A_0 \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2$. To show that $A_2 \sqrt[q]{A_0} B$, consider two tuples $\overline{b}, \overline{b}' \subseteq B$. Then

$$\bar{b} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{A_{\mathrm{o}}} \bar{b}' \quad \Rightarrow \quad \bar{b} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{A_{\mathrm{i}}} \bar{b}' \quad \Rightarrow \quad \bar{b} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{A_{\mathrm{a}}} \bar{b}'.$$

(FIN) Suppose that $A_o \sqrt[q]{U} B$, for all finite $A_o \subseteq A$. To show that $A \sqrt[q]{U} B$, consider two tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$. Then

$$\bar{b} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}'$$
 implies $\bar{b} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{UA_{\circ}} \bar{b}'$, for all finite $A_{\circ} \subseteq A$.

By Lemma 2.3, it follows that $\bar{b} \approx_{UA}^{ls} \bar{b}'$.

(DEF) Suppose that $\bar{a} \not \ll_U B$. Then there are tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$ such that

$$\bar{b} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}'$$
 and $\bar{b} \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}'$.

By Lemma 2.3, there exists some formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}; \bar{z})$ over U such that $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}; \bar{a})$ is chain-bounded and $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{b}, \bar{b}'; \bar{a})$. Let n be the minimal number such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \neg \exists \bar{x}_{0} \cdots \exists \bar{x}_{n-1} \bigwedge_{0 \le i < k < n} \varphi(\bar{x}_{i}, \bar{x}_{k}; \bar{a}),$$

and set

$$\psi(\bar{z}) \coloneqq \varphi(\bar{b}, \bar{b}'; \bar{z}) \land \neg \exists \bar{x}_0 \cdots \exists \bar{x}_{n-1} \bigwedge_{0 \le i < k < n} \varphi(\bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_k; \bar{z}).$$

If \bar{a}' is a tuple satisfying $\psi(\bar{x})$, then $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}; \bar{a}')$ is chain-bounded and it follows by Lemma 2.3 that $\bar{b} \approx^{ls}_{U\bar{a}'} \bar{b}'$. Hence, $\bar{a}' \approx^{q}_{U} B$.

There is also a characterisation of $\sqrt[q]{}$ in terms of indiscernible sequences, which is obtained by simply replacing the relation \approx^{ls}_U by its definition.

Lemma 2.16. $A \sqrt[q]{U} B$ if, and only if, for every indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i<\omega}$ over U with \bar{b}_0 , $\bar{b}_1 \subseteq B$, we can find some indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i<\omega}$ over $U \cup A$ with $\bar{b}'_0 = \bar{b}_0$ and $\bar{b}'_1 = \bar{b}_1$.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) To show that $A \sqrt[q]{U} B$, consider two tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq B$ with $\bar{b} \approx^{l_s}_U \bar{b}'$. Then there is some indiscernible sequence $(\bar{c}_i)_{i<\omega}$ over U with $\bar{c}_0 = \bar{b}$ and $\bar{c}_1 = \bar{b}'$. By assumption, we can find an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{c}'_i)_{i<\omega}$ over $U \cup A$ with $\bar{c}'_0 = \bar{c}_0$ and $\bar{c}'_1 = \bar{c}_1$. This implies that $\bar{b} = \bar{c}'_0 \approx^{l_s}_{U\cup A} \bar{c}'_1 = \bar{b}'$.

(⇒) Suppose that $A \sqrt[q]{U} B$ and let $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U with $\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1 \subseteq B$. Then $\bar{b}_0 \approx^{\text{ls}}_U \bar{b}_1$, which implies that $\bar{b}_0 \approx^{\text{ls}}_{UA} \bar{b}_1$. Consequently, there is some indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i < \omega}$ over $U \cup A$ with $\bar{b}'_0 = \bar{b}_0$ and $\bar{b}'_1 = \bar{b}_1$.

Before proving that $\sqrt[li]{}$ is a forking relation, we collect several different characterisations of this relation. We start with the following one.

Lemma 2.17. $A \bigvee_{U}^{\text{li}} B$ if, and only if, for every finite set of indiscernible sequences $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}$ over U, there exists a set $A' \equiv_{UB} A$ such that each α_i is indiscernible over $U \cup A'$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Suppose that $A \bigvee_{U}^{\text{li}} B$ and let $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}$ be indiscernible over U. W.l.o.g. we may assume that each α_i is indexed by a dense order I_i . By definition of \bigvee_{V}^{li} , there exists a set $A' \equiv_{UB} A$ such that

 $A' \bigvee^{\mathrm{ls}}_{U} B\alpha_{\mathrm{o}} \ldots \alpha_{n-1}.$

We claim that each sequence α_i is indiscernible over $U \cup A'$. Suppose that $\alpha_i = (\bar{a}_i^i)_{j \in I_i}$. By Lemma E5.3.12, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\bar{a}^{i}[\bar{k}] \equiv_{UA'} \bar{a}^{i}[\bar{l}]$$
, for all $\bar{k}, \bar{l} \in [I_{i}]^{n}$ such that $\bar{k} = \bar{u}s\bar{v}$ and
 $\bar{l} = \bar{u}t\bar{v}$ with $s < t$.

Given \bar{u}, \bar{v}, s, t , we fix a strictly increasing function $g : \omega \to I_i$ such that

g(o) = s, g(1) = t, and $g(j) < \overline{v}$, for all $j < \omega$.

The sequence $(\bar{a}^i [\bar{u}g(j)\bar{v}])_{j<\omega}$ witnesses that

 $\bar{a}^i[\bar{u}s\bar{v}] \approx^{\mathrm{ls}}_U \bar{a}^i[\bar{u}t\bar{v}].$

Therefore, $A' \sqrt[ls]{U} B\alpha_0 \dots \alpha_{n-1}$ implies that $\bar{a}^i [\bar{u}s\bar{v}] \equiv_{UA'} \bar{a}^i [\bar{u}t\bar{v}]$.

(\Leftarrow) Let \bar{a} , B, and U be sets such that, for all indiscernible sequences $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}$ over U, there is some tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ such that each α_i is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}'$. To show that $\bar{a} \quad \bigvee_U B$, consider some set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. We have to find some tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ such that $\bar{a}' \quad \bigvee_U BC$. To do so, it is sufficient to prove that the set

$$\begin{split} \Phi(\bar{x}) &\coloneqq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB) \\ &\cup \{ \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}') \mid \bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq UBC, \ \bar{b} \equiv^{\operatorname{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}' \, \} \end{split}$$

is satisfiable. Hence, consider a finite subset $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$. Then there are formulae $\varphi_0(\bar{x}; \bar{y}_0), \ldots, \varphi_n(\bar{x}; \bar{y}_n)$ and parameters $\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}'_0, \ldots, \bar{b}_n, \bar{b}'_n \subseteq U \cup B \cup C$ such that $\bar{b}_i \equiv^{\text{ls}}_U \bar{b}'_i$, for all $i \leq n$, and

$$\Phi_{o} \subseteq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB) \cup \{ \varphi_{i}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{i}) \leftrightarrow \varphi_{i}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}'_{i}) \mid i \leq n \}.$$

For each $i \leq n$, we fix a finite sequence $\bar{c}_{o}^{i} \approx_{U}^{ls} \cdots \approx_{U}^{ls} \bar{c}_{m(i)}^{i}$ with $\bar{c}_{o}^{i} = \bar{b}_{i}$ and $\bar{c}_{m(i)}^{i} = \bar{b}_{i}^{i}$ and, for every j < m(i), we choose an indiscernible sequence β_{j}^{i} over U starting with the tuples \bar{c}_{j}^{i} and \bar{c}_{j+1}^{i} . By assumption, there exists a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ such that every β_{j}^{i} is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}'$. This implies that

$$\bar{c}_j^i \approx_{U\bar{a}'}^{\mathrm{ls}} \bar{c}_{j+1}^i$$
.

Hence, $\bar{b}_i \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U\bar{a}'} \bar{b}'_i$, which implies that $\bar{b}_i \equiv_{U\bar{a}'} \bar{b}'_i$. Consequently, \bar{a}' realises Φ_0 .

It follows that $\sqrt[1]{i}$ is the coarsest forking relation that preserves indiscernibility.

Proposition 2.18. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a forking relation. Then $\sqrt{} \subseteq \sqrt[1i]{}$ if, and only if, whenever β is an indiscernible sequence over some set U and $A \sqrt{}_U \beta$, then β is indiscernible over $U \cup A$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Suppose that $\sqrt{\subseteq} \sqrt[1i]{}$ and that $A \sqrt{U} \beta$, for some indiscernible sequence β over U. Then $A \sqrt[1i]{U} \beta$ and we can use Lemma 2.17 to find a set $A' \equiv_{U\beta} A$ such that β is indiscernible over $U \cup A'$. Since $A'\beta \equiv_U A\beta$, it follows that β is also indiscernible over $U \cup A$.

(\Leftarrow) To show that $\checkmark \subseteq \sqrt[1i]{}$, suppose that $A \sqrt[]{}_U B$. We use the characterisation of Lemma 2.17 to prove that $A \sqrt[1i]{}_U B$. Hence, consider indiscernible sequences $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}$ over U. By (EXT), there exists a set $A' \equiv_{UB} A$ such that

 $A' \sqrt{U} B\alpha_0 \ldots \alpha_{n-1}.$

By assumption, $A' \sqrt{U} \alpha_i$ implies that α_i is indiscernible over $U \cup A'$.

We also need the following technical lemma about the splitting relation $\sqrt[s]{}$.

Lemma 2.19. Let $\bar{a} \sqrt[s]{U} M$ where \mathfrak{M} is a κ -saturated model and $U \subseteq M$ a set of size $|U| < \kappa$. For every set C, there exists a unique extension of $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/M)$ over $M \cup C$ that is $\sqrt[s]{-free}$ over U.

Proof. For uniqueness, suppose that there are two extension \mathfrak{p} and \mathfrak{p}' of $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/M)$ over $C \supseteq M$ that are both $\sqrt[s]{-free}$ over U. Fix realisations \bar{b} and \bar{b}' of these two types and consider a finite tuple $\bar{c} \subseteq C$. Since \mathfrak{M} is κ -saturated, we can find some tuple $\bar{d} \subseteq M$ with $\bar{d} \equiv_U \bar{c}$. Then

 $\bar{b} \sqrt[s]{U} C$, $\bar{b}' \sqrt[s]{U} C$, and $\bar{c} \equiv_U \bar{d}$

implies $\bar{c} \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{d}$ and $\bar{c} \equiv_{U\bar{b}'} \bar{d}$. Furthermore,

 $\bar{b} \equiv_M \bar{a} \equiv_M \bar{b}'$ implies $\bar{b} \equiv_{U\bar{d}} \bar{b}'$.

Consequently,

 $\bar{b}\bar{c}\equiv_U\bar{b}\bar{d}\equiv_U\bar{b}'\bar{d}\equiv_U\bar{b}'\bar{c}.$

Hence, $\bar{b} \equiv_{U\bar{c}} \bar{b}'$, for all finite $\bar{c} \subseteq C$, which implies that $\bar{b} \equiv_{UC} \bar{b}'$. Consequently, $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/C) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}'/C) = \mathfrak{p}'$.

It remains to prove the existence of a $\sqrt[s]{-free}$ extension. As \mathfrak{M} is κ -saturated, it realises every type over U. Hence, there exists a function $g: C^{<\omega} \to M^{<\omega}$ such that

$$g(\bar{c}) \equiv_U \bar{c}$$
, for all $\bar{c} \in C^{<\omega}$.

We claim that

$$\mathfrak{p} \coloneqq \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \mid \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \text{ a formula, } \bar{c} \in C^{<\omega}, \ \mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}; g(\bar{c})) \right\}$$

is the desired type.

Let us start by showing that the set \mathfrak{p} is satisfiable. Consider finitely many formulae $\varphi_0(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_0), \dots, \varphi_n(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_n) \in \mathfrak{p}$ and set $\bar{c} := \bar{c}_0 \dots \bar{c}_n$ and $\bar{d} := g(\bar{c}_0) \dots g(\bar{c}_n)$. By definition of \mathfrak{p} , we have

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi_{\circ}(\bar{a}; g(\bar{c}_{\circ})) \land \cdots \land \varphi_{n}(\bar{a}; g(\bar{c}_{n})) \land$$

By κ^+ -saturation of \mathfrak{M} , there exists a tuple $\bar{b} \subseteq M$ with $\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{c}$. Then

$$g(\bar{c}) \equiv_U \bar{c} \equiv_U \bar{b}$$
 and $\bar{a} \sqrt[s]{U} M$ implies $g(\bar{c}) \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}$.

Choosing some tuple \bar{a}' such that $\bar{a}\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{a}'\bar{c}$, it follows that

$$\bar{a}g(\bar{c}) \equiv_U \bar{a}\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{a}'\bar{c}$$
.

Suppose that $g(\bar{c}) = \bar{d}_0 \dots \bar{d}_n$. Then

$$\mathbb{M} \models \varphi_i(\bar{a}; g(\bar{c}_i))$$
 and $\bar{a} \sqrt[s]{U} M$ implies $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi_i(\bar{a}; \bar{d}_i)$.

By choice of \bar{a}' , it follows that

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi_{o}(\bar{a}'; \bar{c}_{o}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_{n}(\bar{a}'; \bar{c}_{n}).$

Thus, \bar{a}' is the desired tuple satisfying every $\varphi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_i)$.

Furthermore, note that \mathfrak{p} is a complete type over *C* since, for every formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ with parameters $\bar{c} \subseteq C$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c}) \in \mathfrak{p} & \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a};g(\bar{c})) \\ \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} \nvDash \neg \varphi(\bar{a};g(\bar{c})) & \text{iff} \quad \neg \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c}) \notin \mathfrak{p} \,. \end{aligned}$$

To see that \mathfrak{p} is $\sqrt[s]{-free}$ over U, consider two tuples $\bar{c}, \bar{c}' \subseteq C$ such that $\bar{c} \equiv_U \bar{c}'$. Then

$$g(\bar{c}) \equiv_U \bar{c} \equiv_U \bar{c}' \equiv_U g(\bar{c}') \text{ and } \bar{a} \sqrt[s]{U} M$$

implies that $g(\bar{c}) \equiv_{U\bar{a}} g(\bar{c}')$. For a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ over *U*, it follows that

$$\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \in \mathfrak{p} \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}; g(\bar{c})) \\ \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}; g(\bar{c}')) \quad \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}') \in \mathfrak{p} . \square$$

Proposition 2.20. Let \bar{a} , $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ and let \mathfrak{M} be a model containing U that is $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -saturated and strongly $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -homogeneous. The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) $\bar{a} \sqrt[\mathrm{li}]{U} M$.
- (2) $\bar{a} \sqrt[\mathrm{ls}]{U} M.$
- (3) $\bar{a} \sqrt[q]{U} M$.
- (4) $\bar{b} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}' \Rightarrow \bar{b} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}'$ for all finite $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq M$.
- (5) $\bar{a} \sqrt[s]{N} M$, for all models $\mathfrak{N} \leq \mathfrak{M}$ containing U.
- (6) For all models $\mathfrak{N} \leq \mathfrak{M}$ containing U, we have

$$\bar{b} \equiv_N \bar{b}' \Rightarrow \bar{b} \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}', \quad \text{for all } \bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq M.$$

(7) $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/M)$ is invariant under all automorphisms of \mathfrak{M} that fix some model $\mathfrak{N} \leq \mathfrak{M}$ containing U.

- (8) Every indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ over U that is contained in M is also indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}$.
- (9) For every indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i<\omega}$ over U with $\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1 \subseteq M$, we can find some indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i<\omega}$ over $U \cup \bar{a}$ with $\bar{b}'_0 = \bar{b}_0$ and $\bar{b}'_1 = \bar{b}_1$.
- (10) $\bar{b}_{o} \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}_{1}$, for every indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_{i})_{i < \omega}$ over U with $\bar{b}_{o}, \bar{b}_{1} \subseteq M$.

Proof. Set $\kappa := |T| \oplus |U|$.

 $(3) \Leftrightarrow (9)$ was already proved in Lemma 2.16.

(3) \Rightarrow (4) Consider two finite tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq M$ with $\bar{b} \equiv_U^{ls} \bar{b}'$. By definition of \equiv^{ls} , there are tuples $\bar{c}_0, \ldots, \bar{c}_n$ such that $\bar{c}_0 = \bar{b}, \bar{c}_n = \bar{b}'$ and $\bar{c}_i \approx_U^{ls} \bar{c}_{i+1}$, for all i < n. As \mathfrak{M} is κ^+ -saturated, we may assume that $\bar{c}_0, \ldots, \bar{c}_n$ are contained in M. By (3), it follows that $\bar{c}_i \approx_{U\bar{a}}^{ls} \bar{c}_{i+1}$, for all i < n. This implies that $\bar{b} \equiv_{U\bar{a}}^{ls} \bar{b}'$.

(4) \Rightarrow (7) Let $\pi \in \text{Aut } \mathfrak{M}_N$, for some model $\mathfrak{N} \leq \mathfrak{M}$ containing *U*. For every finite $\bar{b} \subseteq M$, it follows by Proposition 2.5 that

$$\begin{split} \bar{b} &\equiv_N \pi(\bar{b}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \bar{b} \equiv^{\mathrm{ls}}_N \pi(\bar{b}) \\ &\Rightarrow \quad \bar{b} \equiv^{\mathrm{ls}}_{N\bar{a}} \pi(\bar{b}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \bar{b} \equiv_{\bar{a}} \pi(\bar{b}) \end{split}$$

Consequently, for every formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$,

$$\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/M)$$
 iff $\varphi(\bar{x}; \pi(\bar{b})) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/M)$.

 $(7) \Rightarrow (2)$ Let $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq M$ be tuples with $\bar{b} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}'$. First, we consider the case where \bar{b} and \bar{b}' are finite. By Proposition 2.10, there are tuples $\bar{c}_0, \ldots, \bar{c}_n$ and models $N_0, \ldots, N_{m-1} \supseteq U$ such that

$$\bar{a} = \bar{c}_0 \equiv_{N_0} \bar{c}_1 \equiv_{N_1} \cdots \equiv_{N_{n-2}} \bar{c}_{n-1} \equiv_{N_{n-1}} \bar{c}_n = b.$$

Replacing each model \mathfrak{N}_i by a suitable elementary substructure, we can ensure that $|N_i| = \kappa$. By κ^+ -saturation of \mathfrak{M} , we may therefore assume that $N_i \subseteq M$. Hence, κ^+ -homogeneity of \mathfrak{M} implies that there

are automorphisms $\pi_i \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathfrak{M}_{N_i}$ with $\pi_i(\bar{c}_i) = \bar{c}_{i+1}$. By (7) it follows that $\bar{c}_i \equiv_{N_i\bar{a}} \bar{c}_{i+1}$. Consequently, $\bar{b} \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}'$.

For infinite tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq M$, it follows that

$$\bar{b} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}' \implies \bar{b}|_{I} \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}'|_{I}, \text{ for all finite sets of indices } I \Rightarrow \bar{b} \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}'.$$

Consequently, $\bar{a} \sqrt[1]{U} M$.

(2) \Rightarrow (5) Let $\mathfrak{N} \leq \mathfrak{M}$ be a model containing *U* and consider two tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq M$ with $\bar{b} \equiv_N \bar{b}'$. Let \bar{c} be an enumeration of *N*. By (2) and Proposition 2.5, it follows that

$$\begin{split} \bar{b} \equiv_N \bar{b}' &\Rightarrow \bar{b}\bar{c} \equiv_N \bar{b}'\bar{c} \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{b}\bar{c} \equiv_N^{\mathrm{ls}} \bar{b}'\bar{c} \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{b}\bar{c} \equiv_U^{\mathrm{ls}} \bar{b}'\bar{c} \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{b}\bar{c} \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}'\bar{c} \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{b}\bar{c} \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}'\bar{c} \\ &\Rightarrow \bar{b} \equiv_{U\bar{a}\bar{c}} \bar{b}' \Rightarrow \bar{b} \equiv_{N\bar{a}} \bar{b}'. \end{split}$$

 $(5) \Rightarrow (6)$ is trivial.

(6) \Rightarrow (10) Let $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U such that $\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1 \subseteq M$. We fix an arbitrary model $\mathfrak{N} \leq \mathfrak{M}$ of size $|N| = \kappa$ containing U. By Lemma E5.3.11, there is some model $N' \equiv_U N$ such that $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ is indiscernible over N'. In particular, we have $\bar{b}_0 \equiv_{N'} \bar{b}_1$. By κ^+ -saturation of \mathfrak{M} , we can find some set $N'' \subseteq M$ with $N'' \equiv_{U\bar{b}_0\bar{b}_1} N'$. Hence, $\bar{b}_0 \equiv_{N''} \bar{b}_1$ and (6) implies that $\bar{b}_0 \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}_1$.

(10) \Rightarrow (8) Let $(\bar{b}_i)_{i<\omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U that is contained in M. To show that $(\bar{b}_i)_{i<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}$, we will prove that

$$\bar{b}[\bar{i}] \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}[\bar{k}], \text{ for all } \bar{i}, \bar{k} \in [\omega]^n, n < \omega.$$

It is sufficient to consider the case where $\bar{i} < \bar{k}$. Hence, let $\bar{i} < \bar{k}$ be elements of $[\omega]^n$. Fix some increasing sequence $\bar{l}_0 < \bar{l}_1 < ...$ in $[\omega]^n$

with $\bar{l}_0 = \bar{i}$ and $\bar{l}_1 = \bar{k}$. We set $\bar{c}_j := \bar{b}[\bar{l}_j]$. Then $(\bar{c}_j)_{j < \omega}$ is indiscernible over U and it follows by (10) that $\bar{b}[\bar{i}] = \bar{c}_0 \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{c}_1 = \bar{b}[\bar{k}]$.

(8) \Rightarrow (9) Let $(\bar{b}^n)_{n<\omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U such that $\bar{b}^\circ, \bar{b}^1 \subseteq M$. We first consider the special case where the tuples \bar{b}^n are finite. Since \mathfrak{M} is κ^+ -saturated, it contains some sequence $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i<\omega}$ with $\bar{b}'[\omega] \equiv_{U\bar{b}_0\bar{b}_1} \bar{b}[\omega]$. Then $\bar{b}'_\circ = \bar{b}_\circ, \bar{b}'_1 = \bar{b}_1$ and it follows by (8) that $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}$.

For the general case, let $\Phi((\bar{x}^n)_{n<\omega})$ be a set of formulae stating that the sequence $(\bar{x}^n)_{n<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}$ and that $\bar{x}^\circ = \bar{b}^\circ$ and $\bar{x}^1 = \bar{b}^1$. We have to show that Φ is satisfiable. Thus, consider a finite subset $\Phi_\circ \subseteq \Phi$. Then there is a finite set I of indices such that the formulae in Φ_\circ only contain variables x_i^n with $i \in I$. Applying the special case we have proved above to the sequence $(\bar{b}^n|_I)_{n<\omega}$, we obtain an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}'_n)_{n<\omega}$ over $U \cup \bar{a}$ with $\bar{b}'_\circ = \bar{b}^\circ$ and $\bar{b}'_1 = \bar{b}^1$. This sequence satisfies Φ_\circ .

(1) \Rightarrow (2) follows since $\sqrt[l]{i} = (\sqrt[l]{s}) \subseteq \sqrt[l]{s}$.

(5) \Rightarrow (1) Fix some set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. We have to show that there is some tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_M \bar{a}$ with $\bar{a}' \sqrt[1]{V_U} MC$. Let $\mathfrak{N} \leq \mathfrak{M}$ be a model containing U of size $|N| = \kappa$. Then $\bar{a} \sqrt[s]{N} M$ and we can use Lemma 2.19 to find some tuple $\bar{a}_N \equiv_M \bar{a}$ such that $\bar{a}_N \sqrt[s]{N} MC$ and tp (\bar{a}_N/MC) is the unique $\sqrt[s]{-free}$ extension of tp (\bar{a}/M) . Furthermore, if we are given two such models $\mathfrak{N}, \mathfrak{N}' \leq \mathfrak{M}$, we can find some model $\mathfrak{N}^+ \leq \mathfrak{M}$ containing $N \cup N'$ of size $|N^+| = \kappa$. Then

 $\bar{a}_N \sqrt[s]{_{N^+}} MC$, $\bar{a}_{N'} \sqrt[s]{_{N^+}} MC$, and $\bar{a}_N \equiv_M \bar{a}_{N'}$,

and it follows by uniqueness that $\bar{a}_N \equiv_{MC} \bar{a}_{N'}$. Consequently, choosing $\bar{a}' := \bar{a}_{N_0}$, for an arbitrary model \mathfrak{N}_0 , we have

$$\bar{a}' \equiv_M \bar{a}$$
 and $\bar{a}' \sqrt[s]{N} MC$, for all models $U \subseteq N \subseteq M$
of size $|N| = \kappa$.

We claim that $\bar{a}' \sqrt[1]{N} MC$. Consider two tuples $\bar{b}, \bar{b}' \subseteq MC$ with $\bar{b} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}'$. By Lemma 2.3, there is some model $N \supseteq U$ with $\bar{b} \equiv_N \bar{b}'$. We

can choose *N* of size $|N| = \kappa$ and, by κ^+ -saturation of \mathfrak{M} , we may assume that $N \subseteq M$. Consequently,

$$\bar{a}' \sqrt[s]{_N MC}$$
 implies $\bar{b} \equiv_{N\bar{a}'} \bar{b}'$

as desired.

Corollary 2.21. $\bigvee^{\text{li}} = {}^{*}(\bigvee^{\text{q}})$ is a forking relation.

Proof. We have seen in Lemma 2.15 that $\sqrt[q]{}$ is a preforking relation. Consequently, $*(\sqrt[q]{})$ is a forking relation and it remains to prove that it coincides with $\sqrt[li]{}$. The inclusion $\sqrt[ls]{} \subseteq \sqrt[q]{}$ follows immediately from the respective definitions. Consequently, $\sqrt[li]{} = *(\sqrt[ls]{}) \subseteq *(\sqrt[q]{})$. Conversely, by the implication (3) \Rightarrow (1) of Proposition 2.20, we have

$$A^*(\sqrt[q]{}_U M$$
 implies $A^{\text{li}}_U M$,

for sufficiently saturated models \mathfrak{M} . According to Lemma F2.4.7, this implies that $*(\sqrt[q]{}) \subseteq \sqrt[li]{}$.

Corollary 2.22. $\sqrt[s]{\subseteq} \sqrt[ls]{\subseteq} \sqrt[q]{}$ and $\sqrt[i]{\subseteq} \sqrt[li]{\subseteq} \sqrt[f]{}$

Proof. The first two inclusions follow immediately from the respective definitions. For the thrid one, it follows that

$$\mathbf{i}'_{\mathsf{v}} = \mathbf{i}'(\mathbf{s}'_{\mathsf{v}}) \subseteq \mathbf{i}'(\mathbf{s}'_{\mathsf{v}}) = \mathbf{i}'_{\mathsf{v}}.$$

For the last inclusion, it is sufficient to prove that

 $A \bigvee_{U}^{\text{li}} M$ implies $A \bigvee_{U}^{\text{d}} M$,

for every sufficiently saturated model \mathfrak{M} , since Lemma F2.4.7 then implies that $\sqrt[l]{i} = *(\sqrt[l]{i}) \subseteq *(\sqrt[d]{i}) = \sqrt[f]{i}$.

Hence, suppose that $A \sqrt[U]{U} M$ where \mathfrak{M} is a $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -saturated and strongly $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -homogeneous model containing U. By finite character it is sufficient to show that $A \sqrt[d]{U} B$, for every finite subset $B \subseteq M$.

Hence, let $B \subseteq M$ be finite, and consider an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i<\omega}$ over U where \bar{b}'_{\circ} is an enumeration of B. By $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -saturation of \mathfrak{M} , we can find an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i<\omega}$ over U such that $\bar{b}[\omega] \subseteq M$ and $\bar{b}[\omega] \equiv_{U\bar{b}'_{\circ}} \bar{b}'[\omega]$. By Proposition 2.20 (8), this sequence is indiscernible over $U \cup A$. Let A' be some set such that

$$A\bar{b}[\omega] \equiv_{U\bar{b}_{0}'} A'\bar{b}'[\omega].$$

Then $(\bar{b}'_i)_{i < \omega}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup A'$ and it follows by Lemma F3.1.3 that $A \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b}'_0$.

It the remainder of this section we compare the relations $\sqrt[li]{}$ and $\sqrt[f]{}$.

Definition 2.23. We call an independence relation $\sqrt{\text{weakly bounded if}}$, there exists a function $f : Cn \rightarrow Cn$ such that

 $\operatorname{mult}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq f(|T| \oplus |U|), \quad \text{for all } \mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(U).$

In this case we also say that $\sqrt{}$ is weakly bounded by *f*.

We can characterise $\sqrt[li]{}$ as the coarsest weakly bounded forking relation.

Proposition 2.24.

- (a) $\sqrt[1]{i}$ is weakly bounded by $f(\kappa) = 2^{2^{\kappa}}$.
- (b) $\sqrt{\subseteq \sqrt[1]{i}}$, for every weakly bounded forking relation $\sqrt{.}$

Proof. (a) Fix a type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(U)$ and some set $C \supseteq U$. We have to show that \mathfrak{p} has at most $\kappa := 2^{2^{|T|\oplus|U|}} \sqrt[1i]{-}$ free extensions over C. For $\mathfrak{q} \in S^{<\omega}(C)$, let $g_{\mathfrak{q}}$ be the function mapping a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ over U to the set

$$g_{\mathfrak{q}}(\varphi) \coloneqq \left\{ \left[\tilde{b} \right]_{\equiv_{U}^{\mathrm{ls}}} \mid \varphi(\tilde{x}; \tilde{b}) \in \mathfrak{q} \right\}.$$

We claim that $g_q = g_{q'}$ implies q = q'.

For the proof, suppose that $g_q = g_{q'}$ and let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in q$. Then $[\bar{b}]_{\equiv_U^{ls}} \in g_q = g_{q'}$ implies that there is some tuple $\bar{b}' \equiv_U^{ls} \bar{b}$ with $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}') \in q'$. Fix a tuple \bar{a}' realising q'. Then $\bar{a}' \downarrow_U^{ls} C$ and

$$\bar{b} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}' \text{ implies } \mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}'; \bar{b}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{a}'; \bar{b}').$$

Consequently, $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in \mathfrak{q}'$, as desired.

To conclude the proof, let $N \supseteq U$ be a model of size $|T| \oplus |U|$. Note that the number of \equiv_N -classes of finite tuples is at most $|S^{<\omega}(N)| = 2^{|N|}$. By Proposition 2.5, it follows that there are also at most that many \equiv_U^{ls} equivalence classes of finite tuples. Hence, there are at most $2^{2^{|N|}} = \kappa$ functions of the form g_q . It follows that there are at most $\kappa \sqrt[1]{-}$ free extensions of \mathfrak{p} over *C*.

(b) For a contradiction, suppose that there is a weakly bounded forking relation $\sqrt{}$ with $\sqrt{} \notin \sqrt{}^{li}$. Then there are $\bar{a}, B, U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ such that

$$\bar{a} \sqrt{U} B$$
 and $\bar{a} \bigvee_{U}^{\text{li}} B$.

Let $f : Cn \to Cn$ be the function bounding $\sqrt{}$ and let $M \supseteq U \cup B$ be a model that is $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -saturated and strongly $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -homogeneous. By (EXT), we can find some tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ with $\bar{a}' \sqrt{}_U M$. By (MON), we have $\bar{a}' \downarrow_U M$. Hence, we can use Proposition 2.20 (10) to find an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ over U with $\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1 \subseteq M$ such that $\bar{b}_0 \not\equiv_{U\bar{a}'} \bar{b}_1$. Fix some formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \neg \varphi(\bar{a}'; \bar{b}_{o}) \land \varphi(\bar{a}'; \bar{b}_{1}).$$

Let $I \subseteq \omega$ be an infinite set of indices such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}'; \bar{b}_i) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{a}'; \bar{b}_k) \quad \text{for all } i, k \in I,$$

and let $(\bar{c}_j)_{j\in J}$ be an extension of $(\bar{b}_i)_{i\in I\cup\{0,1\}}$ of size $|J| > f(|T| \oplus |U|)$ that is indiscernible over U and such that the order J is strongly \aleph_0 -homogeneous. Fix a tuple $\bar{a}'' \equiv_{UM} \bar{a}'$ with $\bar{a}'' \sqrt{U} M\bar{c}[J]$. For every

 $j \in J$, fix an order automorphism $\sigma_j : J \to J$ such that $\sigma_j(o) = j$ and let $\pi_j \in Aut \mathbb{M}_U$ be an automorphism with

$$\pi_j(\bar{c}_k) = \bar{c}_{\sigma_j(k)}, \quad \text{for all } k \in J.$$

Setting $\bar{a}_j \coloneqq \pi_j(\bar{a}'')$ it follows by invariance that

$$\bar{a}_j \sqrt{U} \bar{c}[J]$$
 and $\bar{a}_j \not\equiv_{U \bar{c}[J]} \bar{a}_k$, for $j \neq k$.

Hence, $\operatorname{mult}_{\sqrt{}}(\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)) \ge |J| > f(|T| \oplus |U|)$. A contradiction.

Corollary 2.25. *Let T be a complete first-order theory. The following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) $\sqrt{f} = \frac{li}{\sqrt{.}}$
- (2) $\sqrt[f]{}$ is weakly bounded.
- (3) If β is an indiscernible sequence over some set U and $A \sqrt[f]{U} \beta$, then β is indiscernible over $U \cup A$.

Proof. (1) ⇒ (2) follows by Proposition 2.24 (a). (2) ⇒ (1) The inclusion $\sqrt[1i]{\subseteq} \sqrt[f]{follows}$ by Corollary 2.22, while $\sqrt[f]{\subseteq} \sqrt[1i]{follows}$ by Proposition 2.24 (b). (1) ⇒ (3) follows by Proposition 2.18. (3) ⇒ (1) The inclusion $\sqrt[1i]{\subseteq} \sqrt[f]{follows}$ by Corollary 2.22, while $\sqrt[f]{\subseteq} \sqrt[1i]{follows}$ by Proposition 2.18.

Theorem 2.26. If a theory T does not have the independence property, then $\sqrt[\text{li}] = \sqrt[\text{f}]$.

Proof. The inclusion $\sqrt[li]{\subseteq} \sqrt[f]{}$ was proved in Corollary 2.22. For the converse, it is sufficient, by Lemma F2.4.7, to prove that

 $\bar{a} \sqrt[f]{U} M$ implies $\bar{a} \sqrt[li]{U} M$,

for all models \mathfrak{M} that are $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -saturated and strongly $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -homogeneous.

Hence, let $\bar{a} \sqrt[f]{U} M$. We check condition (10) of Proposition 2.20. Let $(\bar{b}_i)_{i<\omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U with $\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1 \subseteq M$. Then $\bar{a} \sqrt[f]{U} M$ implies that $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b}_0 \bar{b}_1$. By Lemma F3.1.3, there exists a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}_0\bar{b}_1} \bar{a}$ such that the sequence $(\bar{b}_{2i}\bar{b}_{2i+1})_{i<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}'$. For a contradiction, suppose that $\bar{b}_0 \neq_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}_1$. Then $\bar{b}_0 \neq_{U\bar{a}'} \bar{b}_1$ and there is some formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over $U \cup \bar{a}'$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}_{o}) \land \neg \varphi(\bar{b}_{1}).$$

By indiscernibility of $(\bar{b}_{2i}\bar{b}_{2i+1})_{i<\omega}$ over $U\cup \bar{a}'$, it follows that

 $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{b}_i)$ iff *i* is even.

Hence, Proposition E5.4.2 implies that T has the independence property. A contradiction.

Proposition 2.27. A simple theory T does not have the independence property if, and only if, $\sqrt[1i]{} = \sqrt[f]{}$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) follows by Theorem 2.26.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that *T* is a simple theory with the independence property. We have to show that $\sqrt[1i]{} \neq \sqrt[f]{}$. We can use Proposition E5.4.2 to find an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_n)_{n<\omega}$ and a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ with parameters $\bar{b} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ such that

 $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_n; \bar{b})$ iff *n* is even.

Using Proposition E5.3.6 we fix an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}'_n \bar{a}''_n)_{n < \omega + \omega}$ over \bar{b} with

$$\operatorname{Av}((\bar{a}'_{n}\bar{a}''_{n})_{n<\omega+\omega}/\bar{b}) \supseteq \operatorname{Av}((\bar{a}_{2n}\bar{a}_{2n+1})_{n<\omega}/\bar{b}).$$

Note that this implies that the interleaved sequence \bar{a}'_{o} , \bar{a}''_{o} , \bar{a}'_{1} , \bar{a}''_{1} , ... is indiscernible. In particular, we have

$$\bar{a}'_{\omega} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{a}''_{\omega}$$
 where $U \coloneqq \bar{a}'[<\omega] \bar{a}''[<\omega]$.

Let $A := \bar{a}'[\langle \omega + \omega] \bar{a}''[\langle \omega + \omega]$. Indiscernibility implies that $A \sqrt[u]{U} \bar{b}$. Since $\sqrt[u]{\subseteq} \sqrt[f]{}$, it follows that $A \sqrt[f]{U} \bar{b}$ and, by symmetry, $\bar{b} \sqrt[f]{U} A$. But

$$\bar{a}'_{\omega} \not\equiv_{\bar{b}} \bar{a}''_{\omega}$$
 implies $\bar{a}'_{\omega} \not\approx^{\text{ls}}_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}''_{\omega}$.

Hence, $\bar{b} \swarrow^{q}_{U} A$, which implies that $\bar{b} \swarrow^{li}_{U} A$. Consequently, $\sqrt{f} \neq \sqrt{li}$.

Theorem 2.28. *Let T be a complete first-order theory. The following state-ments are equivalent:*

- (1) T is stable.
- (2) *T* is simple and it does not have the independence property.
- (3) *T* is simple and $\sqrt[li]{} = \sqrt[f]{}$.
- (4) $\sqrt[li]{}$ is symmetric.
- (5) $\sqrt[li]{}$ is right local.

Proof. (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) was already proved in Proposition 2.27.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) If *T* is stable, it is simple by Corollary F3.2.19 and it does not have the independence property by Proposition E5.4.11.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Let *T* be a simple theory without the independence property. We have shown in Proposition F3.2.21 that *T* also does not have the strict order property. Consequently, it follows by Proposition E5.4.11 that *T* is stable.

(3) \Rightarrow (4) If *T* is simple, $\sqrt[f]{}$ is symmetric. Hence, so is $\sqrt[h]{} = \sqrt[f]{}$.

(4) \Rightarrow (5) Since $\sqrt[1]{i}$ is a forking relation, this implication follows by Theorem F2.4.17.

 $(5) \Rightarrow (3)$ If $\sqrt[l]{i}$ is right local, so is $\sqrt[f]{2} \sqrt[l]{i}$. Consequently, *T* is simple. Furthermore, Theorem F2.4.17 implies that $\sqrt[l]{i}$ is symmetric. Therefore, it follows by Theorem F3.1.9 that $\sqrt[f]{2} \sqrt[d]{2} \sqrt[l]{i}$.

3. $\sqrt[i]{-Morley sequences}$

In this section we study $\sqrt[i]{}$ -Morley sequences in theories without the independence property.

Cofinal types

We start by noting that finiteness of the alternation number can be used to define a kind of 'limit type' of a sequences.

Definition 3.1. The *cofinal type* of a sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ is the set

 $CF(\alpha) \coloneqq \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}) \mid \varphi \text{ a formula over } \mathbb{M} \text{ such that} \\ \left[\varphi(\bar{a}_i) \right]_{i \in I} \text{ is cofinal in } I \right\}.$

Lemma 3.2. Let *T* be a theory without the independence property and let α be an indiscernible sequence. Then CF(α) is a complete type over \mathbb{M} which is finitely satisfiable in α .

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$. For completeness, consider a formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over \mathbb{M} . Since $\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\alpha) < \infty$, there exists some index $k \in I$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_i) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{a}_j)$$
, for all $i, j \ge k$.

Consequently,

$$\varphi \in \mathrm{CF}(\alpha)$$
 iff $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_k)$ iff $\neg \varphi \notin \mathrm{CF}(\alpha)$

To show that $CF(\alpha)$ is consistent, consider finitely many formulae $\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n \in CF(\alpha)$. There exists some index $k \in I$ such that

 $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi_i(\bar{a}_i)$, for all $i \ge k$ and all $j \le n$.

In particular,

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi_{o}(\bar{a}_{k}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_{n}(\bar{a}_{k}).$

Hence, $\{\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_n\}$ is satisfiable. As the tuple satisfying this set belongs to α , it further follows that $CF(\alpha)$ is finitely satisfiable in α .

Cofinal types can be used to construct $\sqrt[i]{-Morley}$ sequences as follows.

Lemma 3.3. Let *T* be a theory without the independence property and $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ an indiscernible sequence over *U* where the order *I* has no first element. Let $\alpha^{\text{op}} := (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I^{\text{op}}}$ be the sequence with reverse ordering and let $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i \in J}$ be generated by CF(α^{op}) over UC α .

- (a) β is a $\sqrt[i]{-Morley}$ sequence over UC α .
- (b) $\beta \alpha$ is indiscernible over U.

Proof. We start by proving that, for every formula φ over $UC\alpha$ and every tuple $\overline{j} \in [J]^n$, there are arbitrarily small indices $\overline{i} \in [I]^n$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}[\bar{j}]) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{a}[\bar{i}]) \,.$$

We proceed by induction on *n*. For n = 0 there is nothing to do. Hence, suppose that we have proved the claim already for $n < \omega$ and that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}[\bar{j}], \bar{b}_l),$$

where $\bar{j} \in [J]^n$ and $l \in J$ are indices with $\bar{j} < l$. Since \bar{b}_l realises the type $CF(\alpha^{op}) \upharpoonright UC\alpha\bar{b}[< l]$, we have $\varphi(\bar{b}[\bar{j}], \bar{x}) \in CF(\alpha^{op})$. Consequently, there are arbitrarily small $k \in I$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}[\bar{j}], \bar{a}_k)$$
.

By inductive hypothesis, we can find arbitrarily small i < k such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}[\bar{i}], \bar{a}_k).$$

Having proved the claim, it follows by Corollary E5.4.3 that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}[\bar{j}]) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{b}[\bar{j}']), \text{ for all formulae } \varphi \text{ over } UC\alpha \text{ and} \\ \text{ all indices } \bar{j}, \bar{j}' \in [J]^n.$$

Hence, β is indiscernible over $UC\alpha$. As α is indiscernible over U, it further follows that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}[\bar{j}], \bar{a}[\bar{k}]) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{a}[\bar{i}], \bar{a}[\bar{k}]),$$

for all formulae φ over U and all indices $\overline{i} \in [I]^n$, $\overline{k} \in [I]^m$, $\overline{j} \in [J]^n$ with $\overline{i} < \overline{k}$. This implies that $\beta \alpha$ is indiscernible over U.

To show that β is a $\sqrt[i]{}$ -Morley sequence, it remains to prove that

$$\bar{b}_j \sqrt[i]{UC\alpha} \bar{b}[< j], \text{ for all } j \in J.$$

We have shown in Lemma 3.2 that $CF(\alpha^{op})$ is a global type that is finitely satisfiable in α . In particular, it is invariant over $UC\alpha$. Hence, the type $CF(\alpha^{op}) \upharpoonright UC\alpha \bar{b}[< j]$ realised by \bar{b}_j has a global extension $CF(\alpha^{op})$ that is invariant over $UC\alpha$.

As a concluding remark let us note that being generated by a type p only depends on the average type of the sequence.

Lemma 3.4. Let $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ and $\beta = (\bar{a}_j)_{j \in J}$ be infinite indiscernible sequences over U and $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{\bar{s}}(U\alpha\beta)$ a type that is invariant over U.

- (a) If α is generated by \mathfrak{p} over U and Av $(\alpha/U) = Av(\beta/U)$, then β is also generated by \mathfrak{p} over U.
- (b) If α and β are generated by \mathfrak{p} over U, then $\operatorname{Av}(\alpha/U) = \operatorname{Av}(\beta/U)$.

Proof. (a) Let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ be a formula over U such that $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{b}_j; \bar{b}[\bar{k}])$, for some $\bar{k} < j$ in J. Let $\bar{l}i$ be a tuple in I with the same order type as $\bar{k}j$. Then $\operatorname{Av}(\alpha/U) = \operatorname{Av}(\beta/U)$ implies that $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_i; \bar{a}[\bar{l}])$. Consequently, $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}[\bar{l}]) \in \mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright U\bar{a}[<i]$. Since $\bar{a}[\bar{l}] \equiv_U \bar{b}[\bar{k}]$, it follows by invariance of \mathfrak{p} that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}[\bar{k}]) \in \mathfrak{p}$.

(b) We prove by induction on *n* that

$$\bar{a}[\bar{i}] \equiv_U b[\bar{j}]$$
, for all $\bar{i} \in [I]^n$ and $\bar{j} \in [J]^n$.

For n = 0, there is nothing to do. Hence, suppose that we have proved the claim already for tuples of length n and consider tuples $\overline{i} \in [I]^{n+1}$ and

 $j \in [J]^{n+1}$. Set $\bar{i}' := i_0 \dots i_{n-1}$ and $\bar{j}' := j_0 \dots j_{n-1}$ and let $\varphi(\bar{x}_0, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$ be a formula over U. By inductive hypothesis and invariance of \mathfrak{p} , it follows that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}[\bar{i}'], \bar{a}_{i_n}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{a}[\bar{i}'], \bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{p} \\ \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{b}[\bar{j}'], \bar{x}) \in \mathfrak{p} \\ \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}[\bar{j}'], \bar{b}_{j_n}) \,. \qquad \Box$$

The confluence property

Our next aim is to prove a combinatorial characterisation of $\sqrt[i]{-Morley}$ sequences in terms of the so-called *confluence property*.

Definition 3.5. Let *U* be a set of parameters.

(a) Let $\alpha = (\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ be a family of indiscernible sequences $\alpha_k = (\bar{a}_i^k)_{i \in I_k}$ over *U*. We say that α is *confluent over U* if there exists some tuple \bar{c} such that, for every $k \in K$, the extended sequence $\alpha_k \bar{c}$ is still indiscernible over *U*.

(b) A complete type $\Phi((\bar{x}_i)_{i < \omega})$ over *U* has the *confluence property* if every family $\alpha = (\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ of indiscernible sequences $\alpha_k = (\bar{a}_i^k)_{i \in I_k}$ over *U* with

$$\operatorname{Av}(\alpha_k/U) = \Phi$$
, for all $k \in K$,

is confluent over U.

(c) We say that a sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ has the *confluence property* over a set *U* if it is indiscernible over *U* and Av(α/U) has the confluence property.

We start by showing how to find sequences with the confluence property.

Lemma 3.6. Every infinite sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ such that

 $\bar{a}_j \equiv_{U\bar{a}[\langle i \rangle]} \bar{a}_i$ and $\bar{a}_i \sqrt[i]{U} \bar{a}[\langle i \rangle]$, for all $i \leq j$ in I,

has the confluence property over U.

Proof. Indiscernibility follows by Lemma F2.4.14. For the confluence property of $\operatorname{Av}(\alpha/U)$, we choose a $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -saturated model \mathfrak{M} of T containing U and we use Proposition E5.3.6 to find an indiscernible sequence $\alpha' = (\bar{a}'_n)_{n < \omega}$ over U of length ω with $\operatorname{Av}(\alpha'/U) = \operatorname{Av}(\alpha/U)$. By invariance of $\sqrt[1]{}$, we have

$$\bar{a}'_n \sqrt[i]{U} \bar{a}'[< n], \quad \text{for all } n < \omega.$$

Since $\sqrt[i]{}$ is a forking relation, we can choose, by induction on $n < \omega$, tuples

$$\bar{b}_n \equiv_{U\bar{a}'[such that $\bar{b}_n \sqrt[i]{U} M\bar{a}'[.$$$

By Lemma F2.4.14, we have $(\bar{b}_n)_{n < \omega} \equiv_U (\bar{a}'_n)_{n < \omega}$. Hence, $\beta = (\bar{b}_n)_{n < \omega}$ is an indiscernible sequence over *U* with

$$\operatorname{Av}(\beta/U) = \operatorname{Av}(\alpha'/U) = \operatorname{Av}(\alpha/U).$$

To show that this average type has the confluence property over U, consider a family of indiscernible sequences $\beta_k = (\bar{b}_i^k)_{i \in I_k}$, for $k \in K$, over U with $\operatorname{Av}(\beta_k/U) = \operatorname{Av}(\beta/U)$. Since $\bar{b}_0 \sqrt[s]{U} M$, it follows by Lemma 2.19 that there is some tuple $\bar{c} \equiv_M \bar{b}_0$ such that

$$\bar{c} \sqrt[s]{U} M\beta \cup \bigcup_{k \in K} \beta_k.$$

We claim that every sequence $\beta_k \bar{c}$ is indiscernible over *U*. Note that $\bar{c} \sqrt[s]{U} \beta_k$. By Lemma F2.4.14, it is therefore sufficient to prove that

$$\bar{c} \equiv_{U\bar{b}^k[\langle i \rangle]} \bar{b}_i^k$$
, for all $i \in I_k$.

According to Lemma 2.19, tp (\bar{b}_i^k/M) has a unique $\sqrt[s]{-free}$ extension over $M \cup \bar{b}^k[\langle i \rangle]$. Consequently,

$$\bar{c} \sqrt[s]{}_M \bar{b}^k[\langle i], \quad \bar{b}_i^k \sqrt[s]{}_M \bar{b}^k[\langle i], \text{ and } \bar{c} \equiv_M \bar{b}_o \equiv_M \bar{b}_i^k$$

implies that $\bar{c} \equiv_{M\bar{b}^k[\langle i]} \bar{b}_i^k.$

In particular, every $\sqrt[4]{}$ -Morley sequence has the confluence property. The converse statement also holds. The proof is split into several steps. We start by showing that every sequence α with the confluence property is generated by some invariant type. This type is the so-called *eventual type* of α .

Definition 3.7. The *eventual type* of a sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ is the set

$$\operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U) \coloneqq \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}) \mid \varphi(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{CF}(\alpha\beta) \text{ for some maximally} \\ \varphi \text{-alternating extension } \alpha\beta \text{ of } \alpha \text{ over } U \right\}$$

Example. We consider the theory of open dense linear orders. By quantifier-elimination, every strictly increasing sequence $\alpha = (a_i)_{i \in I}$ in \mathbb{M} is indiscernible. Furthermore, such a sequence α is maximally (x > c)-alternating, for $c \in \mathbb{M}$, if $a_i > c$, for some $i \in I$. It follows that the eventual type $\text{Ev}(\alpha/\emptyset)$ contains all formulae of the form x > c with $c \in \mathbb{M}$.

Lemma 3.8. Let $\varphi(\bar{x})$ be a formula over \mathbb{M} and $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ an infinite indiscernible sequence over U.

(a) If α is maximally φ -alternating over U, then

 $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in CF(\alpha)$ iff $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in CF(\alpha\beta)$,

for every extension $\alpha\beta$ of α that is indiscernible over U.

(b) If α has the confluence property over U, then

 $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in CF(\alpha\beta)$ iff $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in CF(\alpha\gamma)$.

for all maximally φ -alternating extensions $\alpha\beta$ and $\alpha\gamma$ of α .

Proof. (a) Set $n := \operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\alpha)$ and let $\overline{k} \in [I]^{n+1}$ be a sequence of indices such that

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_{k_i}) \leftrightarrow \neg \varphi(\bar{a}_{k_{i+1}}), \quad \text{for all } i < n.$
Then

$$\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \mathrm{CF}(\alpha)$$
 iff $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_{k_n})$.

For a contradiction, suppose that there is an extension $\alpha\beta = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I+J}$ that is indiscernible over *U* such that

$$\varphi(\bar{x}) \in CF(\alpha/\mathbb{M})$$
 iff $\varphi(\bar{x}) \notin CF(\alpha\beta/\mathbb{M})$.

Then there is some index $j \in J$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_j) \leftrightarrow \neg \varphi(\bar{a}_{k_n}).$$

Consequently, the tuple $\bar{k}j \in [I + J]^{n+2}$ witnesses that $alt_{\varphi}(\alpha\beta) > n$. Hence, α is not maximally φ -alternating. A contradiction.

(b) As $\alpha\beta$ and $\alpha\gamma$ have the same average type over *U* as α and this type has the confluence property, we can find some tuple \bar{c} such that $\alpha\beta\bar{c}$ and $\alpha\gamma\bar{c}$ are indiscernible over *U*. Since $\alpha\beta$ and $\alpha\gamma$ are maximally φ -alternating, it follows by (a) that

$$\begin{split} \varphi(\bar{x}) \in \mathrm{CF}(\alpha\beta) & \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x}) \in \mathrm{CF}(\alpha\beta\bar{c}) \\ & \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{c}) \\ & \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x}) \in \mathrm{CF}(\alpha\gamma\bar{c}) \\ & \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x}) \in \mathrm{CF}(\alpha\gamma). \end{split}$$

Lemma 3.9. Let *T* be a theory without the independence property and let $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ be an infinite sequence with the confluence property over *U*.

- (a) $\mathfrak{p} := \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U)$ is a complete type over \mathbb{M} .
- (b) \mathfrak{p} is invariant over U.
- (c) α is generated by \mathfrak{p} over U.

Proof. (a) Let $\varphi(\bar{x})$ be a formula over \mathbb{M} . By Corollary 1.3 there exists a maximally φ -alternating extension $\alpha\beta$ of α . Then $\alpha\beta$ is also maximally

 $\neg \varphi$ -alternating and it follows by Lemma 3.8 (b) that

$$\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U) \quad \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{CF}(\alpha\beta)$$
$$\text{iff} \quad \neg \varphi(\bar{x}) \notin \operatorname{CF}(\alpha\beta)$$
$$\text{iff} \quad \neg \varphi(\bar{x}) \notin \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U).$$

Hence, it remains to prove that $\text{Ev}(\alpha/U)$ is satisfiable. Consider finitely many formulae $\varphi_0(\bar{x}), \ldots, \varphi_n(\bar{x}) \in \text{Ev}(\alpha/U)$. By Corollary 1.3 there exists an extension $\alpha\beta$ of α that is maximally φ_i -alternating over U, for all $i \leq n$. Suppose that $\beta = (\bar{b}_j)_{j \in J}$. Then

$$\varphi_i(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U)$$
 implies $\varphi_i(\bar{x}) \in \operatorname{CF}(\alpha\beta)$, for all $i \le n$,

and there exists some index $k \in J$ such that

 $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi_i(\bar{b}_i)$, for all $j \ge k$ and $i \le n$.

This implies that $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi_{\circ}(\bar{b}_k) \land \cdots \land \varphi_n(\bar{b}_k)$. Hence, $\{\varphi_{\circ}, \ldots, \varphi_n\}$ is satisfiable.

(b) Consider tuples $\bar{b} \equiv_U \bar{b}'$ and a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ over *U*. To show that

$$\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U)$$
 iff $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}') \in \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U)$

we use Corollary 1.3 to find an extension $\alpha\beta$ of α that is maximally $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ -alternating and maximally $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}')$ -alternating over U. Choose a sequence $\alpha'\beta'$ such that

$$\alpha\beta\bar{b}\equiv_U \alpha'\beta'\bar{b}'.$$

Then $\alpha'\beta'$ is maximally $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}')$ -alternating. As the type $\operatorname{Av}(\alpha\beta/U) = \operatorname{Av}(\alpha'\beta'/U)$ has the confluence property over *U*, there is some tuple \bar{c} such that $\alpha\beta\bar{c}$ and $\alpha'\beta'\bar{c}$ are both indiscernible over *U*. It follows by

Lemma 3.8 (a) that

$$\begin{split} \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}) \in \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U) & \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}) \in \operatorname{CF}(\alpha\beta) \\ & \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}') \in \operatorname{CF}(\alpha'\beta') \\ & \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}') \in \operatorname{CF}(\alpha'\beta'\bar{c}) \\ & \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{c};\bar{b}') \\ & \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}') \in \operatorname{CF}(\alpha\beta\bar{c}) \\ & \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}') \in \operatorname{CF}(\alpha\beta) \\ & \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}') \in \operatorname{CF}(\alpha\beta) \\ & \text{iff} \quad \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}') \in \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U) \,. \end{split}$$

(c) To show that \bar{a}_k realises the type $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright U\bar{a}[<k]$, we consider a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}_0, \ldots, \bar{y}_{n-1})$ over U and a tuple $\bar{i} \in [I]^n$ of indices with $\bar{i} < k$. Fix a maximally $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}[\bar{i}])$ -alternating extension $\alpha\beta$ of α over U and let \bar{c} be a tuple such that $\alpha\beta\bar{c}$ is indiscernible over U. Then Lemma 3.8 implies that

$$\begin{split} \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{a}[\bar{\imath}]) &\in \mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright U\bar{a}[$$

where the last step follows by indiscernibility.

Combining the above results, we obtain the following characterisation of $\sqrt[i]{-Morley}$ sequences in theories without the independence property.

 \square

Theorem 3.10. Let *T* be a theory without the independence property, $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ an infinite sequence, and \mathfrak{p} a type. The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) α is a $\sqrt[i]{-Morley}$ sequence for $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright U$ over U and $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U)$.
- (2) α has the confluence property over U and $\mathfrak{p} = \text{Ev}(\alpha/U)$.

(3) \mathfrak{p} is a global type that is invariant over U and α is generated by \mathfrak{p} over U.

Proof. The implication $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$ follows by Lemma 3.6, and $(2) \Rightarrow (3)$ was already proved in Lemma 3.9.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) For $i \leq j$ in *I*, we have

$$\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}_j/U\bar{a}[$$

Furthermore, tp $(\bar{a}_i/U\bar{a}[<i])$ extends to p, a complete type over \mathbb{M} that is invariant over U. Consequently, we have $\bar{a}_i \sqrt[i]{U} \bar{a}[<i]$ and it follows by Lemma F2.4.14 that α is indiscernible over U.

We have shown that α is a $\sqrt[1]{}$ -Morley sequence for $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright U$ over U. It therefore remains to prove that $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U)$. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \in \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U)$ be a formula with parameters $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. Then $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \in \operatorname{CF}(\alpha\beta)$, for some maximally $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ -alternating extension $\alpha\beta$ of α over U. Let \bar{b} be a tuple realising $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright U\alpha\beta\bar{c}$. Applying Lemma 3.4 to the sequences α and $\alpha\beta$, it follows that $\alpha\beta$ is generated by \mathfrak{p} over U. By choice of \bar{b} , so is $\alpha\beta\bar{b}$. Consequently, Lemma F2.4.14 implies that the sequence $\alpha\beta\bar{b}$ is indiscernible over U. As $\alpha\beta$ is maximally $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ -alternating, we therefore have $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \in \operatorname{CF}(\alpha\beta\bar{b})$, which implies that $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{b}; \bar{c})$. By choice of \bar{b} , it follows that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \in \mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright U\alpha\beta\bar{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$.

Corollary 3.11. Let α and β be infinite $\sqrt[i]{-Morley}$ sequences over U. The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) $\operatorname{Av}(\alpha/U) = \operatorname{Av}(\beta/U)$
- (2) $\operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/U) = \operatorname{Ev}(\beta/U)$
- (3) There is some complete type \mathfrak{p} over \mathbb{M} that is invariant over U such that α and β are both generated by \mathfrak{p} .

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (3) By Theorem 3.10, both sequences are generated by the type $\text{Ev}(\alpha/U) = \text{Ev}(\beta/U)$, which is complete and invariant over *U*.

(3) \Rightarrow (2) If α and β are both generated by \mathfrak{p} , it follows by Theorem 3.10 that $\text{Ev}(\alpha/U) = \mathfrak{p} = \text{Ev}(\beta/U)$.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) By Theorem 3.10, α is generated by $\mathfrak{p} := \text{Ev}(\alpha/U)$. Hence, Lemma 3.4 implies that so is β .

 $(3) \Rightarrow (1)$ follows by Lemma 3.4.

As a consequence we can derive the following bound on the number of invariant global types.

Proposition 3.12. Let T be a theory without the independence property and let \mathfrak{M} be a model of T. There exists a bijection between types $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(\mathbb{M})$ that are invariant over M and average types $Av(\alpha/M)$ of infinite $\sqrt[1]{-Morley}$ sequences α over M.

Proof. We map a type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(\mathbb{M})$ that is invariant over *M* to the average type

 $\Phi_{\mathfrak{p}} \coloneqq \operatorname{Av}(\alpha/M)$,

where α is any infinite sequence generated by \mathfrak{p} over M. According to Theorem 3.10, the resulting sequence is a $\sqrt[i]{-Morley}$ sequence. Furthermore, if α and β are both generated by \mathfrak{p} over M, it follows by Corollary 3.11 that $\operatorname{Av}(\alpha/M) = \operatorname{Av}(\beta/M)$. Consequently, $\Phi_{\mathfrak{p}}$ does not depend on the choice of α .

The inverse of the function $\mathfrak{p} \mapsto \Phi_{\mathfrak{p}}$ maps an average type Φ of an infinite $\sqrt[i]{-Morley}$ sequence α over M to the type $\mathfrak{p}_{\Phi} := \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/M)$. Again it follows by Corollary 3.11 that the type \mathfrak{p}_{Φ} does not depend on the choice of α .

It remains to prove that the functions $\mathfrak{p} \mapsto \Phi_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\Phi \mapsto \mathfrak{p}_{\Phi}$ are inverse to each other. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(\mathbb{M})$ be a type that is invariant over M and let α be an infinite sequence that is generated by \mathfrak{p} over M. Then it follows by Theorem 3.10 that $\mathfrak{p}_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{p}}} = \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/M) = \mathfrak{p}$.

Conversely, consider an average type Φ of some infinite $\sqrt[i]{}$ -Morley sequence α and let $\mathfrak{p}_{\Phi} := \operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/M)$. By Theorem 3.10, α is generated by \mathfrak{p}_{Φ} , which implies that $\Phi_{\mathfrak{p}_{\Phi}} = \operatorname{Av}(\alpha/M) = \Phi$.

As an application, we derive the following characterisation of theories without the independence property.

Theorem 3.13. *Let T be a complete first-order theory. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *T* does not have the independence property.
- (2) $\sqrt[f]{}$ is weakly bounded by $f(\kappa) = 2^{\kappa}$.
- (3) There is some cardinal $\kappa \ge |T|$ such that, for every type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(M)$ where M is a model of size $|M| = \kappa$, there are less than $2^{2^{\kappa}} \sqrt[\mathbf{u}]{-free}$ extensions of \mathfrak{p} over any given set $C \supseteq M$.
- (4) For every $\kappa \ge |T|$, every set U of size $|U| = \kappa$, every type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(U)$, and every set C, there are at most $2^{\kappa} \sqrt[\mathfrak{u}]{-free}$ extensions of \mathfrak{p} over $U \cup C$.

Proof. $(4) \Rightarrow (3)$ is trivial.

(2) \Rightarrow (4) Let $\kappa \ge |T|$ and let U be a set of size $|U| = \kappa$. Consider a type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{<\omega}(U)$ and some set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. Let $(\mathfrak{q}_i)_{i<\lambda}$ be an enumeration of all $\sqrt[\mathbf{u}]$ -free extensions of \mathfrak{p} over $U \cup C$. Since $\sqrt[\mathbf{u}] \subseteq \sqrt[\mathbf{f}]$, it follows that each \mathfrak{q}_i is also a $\sqrt[\mathbf{f}]$ -free extension of \mathfrak{p} . By (2), there are at most $2^{|T|\oplus|U|}$ such extensions. Hence, $\lambda \le 2^{|T|\oplus|U|} = 2^{\kappa}$.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) Let $U, C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be sets and let $(\mathfrak{p}_i)_{i < \lambda}$ be an enumeration without repetitions of all types over $U \cup C$ that do not fork over U. We have to show that $\lambda \leq 2^{|T| \oplus |U|}$. Let \mathfrak{M} be a model of T containing U of size $|M| \leq |T| \oplus |U|$ and let \mathfrak{N} be a model containing $M \cup C$ that is $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -saturated and strongly $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -homogeneous. By (EXT), we can fix, for every $i < \lambda$, some type $\mathfrak{q}_i \supseteq \mathfrak{p}_i$ over N that does not fork over U. Note that $\mathfrak{p}_i \neq \mathfrak{p}_k$ implies that $\mathfrak{q}_i \neq \mathfrak{q}_k$, for $i \neq k$. Since T does not have the independence property, it follows by Theorem 2.26 that $\sqrt[f]{f} = \sqrt[li]{f}$. Hence, each \mathfrak{q}_i is $\sqrt[li]{f}$ -free over U and, thus, also over M. Consequently, we can use Proposition 2.20 to show that \mathfrak{q}_i is $\sqrt[i]{f}$ -free over M. Note that there are at most $2^{|T|\oplus |M|} = 2^{|T|\oplus |U|}$ average types $\operatorname{Av}(\alpha/M)$ of $\sqrt[i]{f}$ -Morley sequences α over M. By Corollary 3.11, this means that there also are at most that many eventual type $\operatorname{Ev}(\alpha/M)$ of such sequences α . Therefore we can use Theorem 3.10 to show that there are at most that many types over N that are $\sqrt[i]{f}$ -free over M. This implies that $\lambda \leq 2^{|T|\oplus |U|}$.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose that there is some formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ with the independence property. Then there are families $(\bar{a}_i)_{i < \omega}$ and $(\bar{b}_s)_{s \subseteq \omega}$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_s)$$
 iff $i \in s$.

Let \mathfrak{M} be a model of *T* of size $|M| = \kappa$ that contains α and β . We have seen in Theorem B2.4.13 that there are $2^{2^{\kappa}}$ ultrafilters over the set $A := \{ \bar{a}_i \mid i < \kappa \}$. For every ultrafilter \mathfrak{u} over *A*, set

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{u}} \coloneqq \operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/MC)$$
.

By Lemma F2.3.10, $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{u}}$ is a $\sqrt[\mathfrak{u}]{}$ -free extension of $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{u}} \upharpoonright M$. Furthermore, if $\mathfrak{u} \neq \mathfrak{v}$ are distinct ultrafilters, we can fix some set $B \in \mathfrak{u} \setminus \mathfrak{v}$ and an index $s \subseteq \omega$ such that

$$\mathfrak{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_i; b_s) \quad \text{iff} \quad \bar{a}_i \in B.$$

Consequently, $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_s) \in \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{u}} \setminus \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{v}}$, which implies that $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{u}} \neq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{v}}$. It follows that there are at least $2^{2^{\kappa}}$ types over $M \cup C$ that are $\sqrt[\mathfrak{u}]{}$ -free over M.

4. Dp-rank

Mutually indiscernible sequences

We can characterise theories without the independence property also in terms of a rank that is based on mutually indiscernible sequences.

Definition 4.1. A family $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ of sequences is *mutually indiscernible* over a set *U* if each sequence α_k is indiscernible over $U \cup \alpha[K \setminus \{k\}]$.

Before giving the definition of the dp-rank, we collect some technical properties of mutually indiscernible sequences. Let us start with ways to construct such families. The first observation is trivial. **Lemma 4.2.** Let $\alpha := (\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U and let \sim be a convex equivalence relation on I. The family $(\alpha|_E)_{E \in I/\sim}$ is mutually indiscernible over U.

Lemma 4.3. Let $(\alpha_k)_{k < \gamma}$ be a family of sequences and U a set of parameters. If $(\beta_k)_{k < \gamma}$ is a family such that each β_k is an indiscernible sequence over $U\alpha[>k]\beta[<k]$ with

 $\operatorname{Av}(\beta_k/U\alpha[>k]\beta[<k]) \supseteq \operatorname{Av}(\alpha_k/U\alpha[>k]\beta[<k]),$

then $(\beta_k)_{k < \gamma}$ is mutually indiscernible over U.

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha_k = (\bar{a}_i^k)_{i \in I_k}$ and $\beta_k = (\bar{b}_i^k)_{i \in J_k}$, for $k < \gamma$. To show that $(\beta_k)_{k < \gamma}$ is mutually indiscernible over *U*, we fix some index $k < \gamma$ and we prove by induction on $k < l \le \gamma$ that β_k is indiscernible over $U\alpha[\ge l]\beta[\downarrow l \setminus \{k\}]$. The result then follows for $l = \gamma$.

For l = k + 1, the claim holds by choice of β_k . For the inductive step, suppose that we have already shown that β_k is indiscernible over the set $U\alpha[\geq l]\beta[\downarrow l \setminus \{k\}]$. To show that it is also indiscernible over

$$U\alpha[\geq (l+1)]\beta[\downarrow (l+1) \setminus \{k\}],$$

consider a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}_0, \ldots, \bar{x}_{n-1}; \bar{c}, \bar{d})$ with parameters

$$\bar{c} \subseteq \beta^l$$
 and $\bar{d} \subseteq U\alpha[\geq (l+1)]\beta[\downarrow l \setminus \{k\}].$

We have to show that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}^k[\bar{\imath}]; \bar{c}, \bar{d}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{b}^k[\bar{\jmath}]; \bar{c}, \bar{d}), \quad \text{for all } \bar{\imath}, \bar{\jmath} \in [J_k]^n.$$

W.l.o.g. we may assume that $\bar{c} = \bar{b}^l[\bar{s}]$, for some $\bar{s} \in [J_l]^m$. Fix indices $\bar{i}, \bar{j} \in [J_k]^n$. By inductive hypothesis, the sequence β_k is indiscernible over $U\alpha[\geq l]\beta[\downarrow l \smallsetminus \{k\}]$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{b}^k[\bar{\imath}]; \bar{a}^l[\bar{t}], \bar{d}) \leftrightarrow \neg \varphi(\bar{b}^k[\bar{\jmath}]; \bar{a}^l[\bar{t}], \bar{d}),$$

for all and all $\bar{t} \in [I_l]^m$. This implies that the formula

 $\varphi(\bar{b}^k[\bar{\imath}];\bar{x},\bar{d}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{b}^k[\bar{\jmath}];\bar{x},\bar{d})$

belongs to

$$\operatorname{Av}(\alpha_l/U\alpha[>l]\beta[l]\beta[$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}^k[\bar{\imath}]; \bar{b}^l[\bar{s}], \bar{d}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{b}^k[\bar{\jmath}]; \bar{b}^l[\bar{s}], \bar{d}), \qquad \Box$$

Let us note the following property of sequences 'diagonally crossing' a family of mutually indiscernible sequences.

Lemma 4.4. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ be a family of mutually indiscernible sequences $\alpha_k = (\bar{a}_i^k)_{i \in I_k}$ over U.

- (a) $(\bar{a}_{\eta(k)}^k)_{k\in K} \equiv_U (\bar{a}_{\zeta(k)}^k)_{k\in K}$, for all $\eta, \zeta \in \prod_{k\in K} I_k$.
- (b) If the index set K is ordered and the sequence $\alpha = (\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ is indiscernible over U, then each sequence of the form $(\bar{a}_{\eta(k)}^k)_{k \in K}$ with $\eta \in \prod_{k \in K} I_k$ is also indiscernible over U.

Proof. (a) We prove by induction on $n < \omega$ that

$$\bar{a}_{\eta(k_{0})}^{k_{0}} \dots \bar{a}_{\eta(k_{n-1})}^{k_{n-1}} \equiv_{U\alpha[K \smallsetminus \bar{k}]} \bar{a}_{\zeta(k_{0})}^{k_{0}} \dots \bar{a}_{\zeta(k_{n-1})}^{k_{n-1}}, \quad \text{for all } \bar{k} \in [K]^{n}.$$

For n = 0, there is nothing to do. For the inductive step, suppose that we have proved the claim already for n and let $\bar{k} \in [K]^{n+1}$. By mutual indiscernibility, we have

$$\bar{a}_{\eta(k_n)}^{k_n} \equiv_{U\alpha[K\smallsetminus\{k_n\}]} \bar{a}_{\zeta(k_n)}^{k_n}.$$

Therefore, it follows by inductive hypothesis that

$$\bar{a}_{\eta(k_{0})}^{k_{0}} \dots \bar{a}_{\eta(k_{n-1})}^{k_{n-1}} \bar{a}_{\eta(k_{n})}^{k_{n}} \equiv_{U\alpha[K \smallsetminus \bar{k}]} \bar{a}_{\zeta(k_{0})}^{k_{0}} \dots \bar{a}_{\zeta(k_{n-1})}^{k_{n-1}} \bar{a}_{\eta(k_{n})}^{k_{n}}$$
$$\equiv_{U\alpha[K \smallsetminus \bar{k}]} \bar{a}_{\zeta(k_{0})}^{k_{0}} \dots \bar{a}_{\zeta(k_{n-1})}^{k_{n-1}} \bar{a}_{\zeta(k_{n})}^{k_{n}}.$$

(b) Note that indiscernibility of α implies that all index orders I_k are isomorphic. Hence, we may w.l.o.g. assume that $I_k = I$, for some fixed order I. Fix an element $i \in I$. Indiscernibility of α over U implies that the restriction $(\bar{a}_i^k)_{k \in K}$ is also indiscernible over U. By (a) it follows that so is every sequence of the form $(\bar{a}_{\eta(k)}^k)_{k \in K}$ with $\eta \in I^K$.

We obtain the following generalisation of Lemma E5.3.11.

Corollary 4.5. Suppose that $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ is a family of mutually indiscernible sequences over U. For every set C, there exists a set $C' \equiv_U C$ such that $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U \cup C'$.

Proof. Suppose that $K = \kappa$ is a cardinal and let $\alpha_k = (\bar{a}_i^k)_{i \in I_k}$. By induction on $k < \kappa$, we use Proposition E5.3.6 to choose an indiscernible sequence $\beta_k = (\bar{b}_i^k)_{i \in I_k}$ over $U \cup C \cup \alpha[>k]\beta[<k]$ such that

$$\operatorname{Av}(\beta_k/U\alpha[>k]\beta[k]\beta[$$

Then it follows by Lemma 4.3 that the family $(\beta_k)_{k \in K}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U \cup C$. As each α_k is indiscernible over $U \cup \alpha[K \setminus \{k\}]$, we have

$$\operatorname{Av}(\beta_k/U\alpha[K\smallsetminus\{k\}]) = \operatorname{Av}(\alpha_k/U\alpha[K\smallsetminus\{k\}]).$$

This implies that

$$(\beta_k)_{k\in K}\equiv_U (\alpha_k)_{k\in K}$$

Therefore, there exists an automorphism $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_U$ mapping one family to the other one. Consequently, $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U \cup \pi[C]$.

Corollary 4.6. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ be a family of mutually indiscernible sequences $\alpha_k = (\bar{a}_i^k)_{i \in I_k}$ over U. For every family of linear orders $J_k \supseteq I_k$, $k \in K$, there exist sequences $\alpha'_k = (\bar{a}_j^k)_{j \in J_k}$ extending α_k such that the family $(\alpha'_k)_{k \in K}$ is mutually indiscernible over U. *Proof.* As in the preceding corollary, we choose by induction on k an indiscernible sequence $\beta_k = (\bar{b}_i^k)_{i \in J_k}$ over $U \cup \alpha[>k]\beta[<k]$ such that

$$\operatorname{Av}(\beta_k/U\alpha[>k]\beta[k]\beta[$$

Then it follows by Lemma 4.3 that the family $(\beta_k)_{k \in K}$ is mutually indiscernible over U. As each α_k is indiscernible over $U \cup \alpha[K \setminus \{k\}]$, we have

$$\operatorname{Av}(\beta_k|_{I_k}/U\alpha[K\smallsetminus\{k\}]) = \operatorname{Av}(\alpha_k/U\alpha[K\smallsetminus\{k\}]).$$

Consequently, there exists an automorphism $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_U$ mapping each $\beta_k|_{I_k}$ to α_k . The family $(\pi(\beta_k))_{k \in K}$ is the desired extension of α .

Proposition 4.7. Let *T* be a theory without the independence property and let $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ be a family of mutually indiscernible sequences over *U*. For every set *C*, there exists a subset $K_0 \subseteq K$ of size $|K_0| \leq |T| \oplus |C|$ such that $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K \setminus K_0}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U \cup C$.

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha_k = (\bar{a}_i^k)_{i \in I_k}$ where each $\bar{a}_i^k = (a_{i,j}^k)_{j < \gamma_k}$ is a γ_k -tuple. Let \mathfrak{M} be a model containing U and all sequences α_k , and define

$$P := U \cup \left\{ a_{i,j}^{k} \mid k \in K, \ i \in I_{k}, \ j < \gamma_{k} \right\},$$

$$E := \left\{ \left\langle a_{i,j}^{k}, a_{i,j'}^{k} \right\rangle \mid k \in K, \ i \in I_{k}, \ j, j' < \gamma_{k} \right\},$$

$$F := \left\{ \left\langle a_{i,j}^{k}, a_{i',j'}^{k} \right\rangle \mid k \in K, \ i, i' \in I_{k}, \ j, j' < \gamma_{k} \right\},$$

$$R := \left\{ \left\langle a_{i,j}^{k}, a_{i',j}^{k} \right\rangle \mid k \in K, \ i < i' \text{ in } I_{k}, \ j < \gamma_{k} \right\}.$$

Fix an $|M|^+$ -saturated elementary extension

 $\langle \mathfrak{M}_+, P_+, U_+, E_+, F_+, R_+ \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{M}, P, U, E, F, R \rangle.$

Using the relations E_+ , F_+ , and R_+ we see that there are a set $K_+ \supseteq K$, linear orders I_k^+ , ordinals γ_k^+ , and a family

 $\left(b_{i,j}^k\right)_{k\in K_+, i\in I_k^+, \ j<\gamma_k^+}$

of elements such that, setting $\bar{b}_i^k \coloneqq (b_{i,j}^k)_{j < \gamma_k^+}$ and $\beta_k \coloneqq (\bar{b}_i^k)_{i \in I_k^+}$, we have

- $P_+ = U_+ \cup \beta[K_+]$,
- $I_k^+ \supseteq I_k$, $\gamma_k^+ \ge \gamma_k$, and $b_{i,j}^k = a_{i,j}^k$, for $k \in K$, $i \in I_k$, $j < \gamma_k$,
- the family $(\beta_k)_{k \in K_+}$ is mutually indiscernible over U_+ .

By Lemma 1.12, we can find a set $W \subseteq P_+$ of size $|W| \leq |T| \oplus |C|$ such that

$$\bar{a} \equiv_W \bar{a}'$$
 implies $\bar{a} \equiv_C \bar{a}'$, for all $\bar{a}, \bar{a}' \subseteq P$.

We choose a set $K_0 \subseteq K$ of size $|K_0| \leq |W| \leq |T| \oplus |C|$ such that $W \subseteq \beta[K_0]$. We claim that the family $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K \setminus K_0}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U \cup C$. Fix $k \in K' := K \setminus K_0$ and let $\bar{i}, \bar{j} \in [I_k]^m$. We have to show that

$$\bar{a}^k[\bar{\imath}] \equiv_{UC\alpha[K'\smallsetminus\{k\}]} \bar{a}^k[\bar{\jmath}].$$

Let $\overline{d} \subseteq U \cup \alpha[K' \setminus \{k\}]$ be finite. Since the sequence β_k is indiscernible over $U \cup \beta[K \setminus \{k\}] \supseteq \overline{d}\beta[K_\circ]$, we have

$$\bar{b}^k[\bar{\imath}] \equiv_{\bar{d}\beta[K_o]} \bar{b}^k[\bar{\jmath}]$$
, which implies that $\bar{a}^k[\bar{\imath}]\bar{d} \equiv_W \bar{a}^k[\bar{\jmath}]\bar{d}$.

By choice of *W*, it follows that $\bar{a}^k[\bar{\imath}]\bar{d} \equiv_C \bar{a}^k[\bar{\jmath}]\bar{d}$. We have shown that

$$\bar{a}^k[\bar{\imath}] \equiv_{C\bar{d}} \bar{a}^k[\bar{\jmath}], \text{ for all finite } \bar{d} \subseteq U \cup \alpha[K' \smallsetminus \{k\}].$$

Consequently, $\bar{a}^k[\bar{\imath}] \equiv_{UC\alpha[K' \setminus \{k\}]} \bar{a}^k[\bar{\jmath}].$

Dp-rank

After these preparations we can introduce the dp-rank.

Definition 4.8. Let $\Phi(\bar{x})$ be a set of formulae over \mathbb{M} and $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ a set of parameters.

(a) The *dp-rank* $\operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\Phi/U)$ of Φ over U is the least cardinal κ such that, for every tuple \overline{b} realising Φ and every family $(\alpha_i)_{i < \kappa}$ of infinite

mutually indiscernible sequences over U, there is some index $i < \kappa$ such that α_i is indiscernible over $U\bar{b}$. If such a cardinal does not exist, we set $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{dp}}(\Phi/U) := \infty$.

(b) For a tuple $\bar{a} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, we set

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\bar{a}/U) \coloneqq \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)/U).$$

Remark. Note that $\operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\Phi/U) = o$ if, and only if, Φ is inconsistent.

Example. Let us consider the theory of $\langle \mathbb{Q}, \leq \rangle$. By quantifier-elimination it follows that a family $\alpha = (\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ of sequences is mutually indiscernible over a set *U* if, and only if, all tuples in α_k have the same order type over the set $U \cup \alpha[K \setminus \{k\}]$.

Consider a partial type $\Phi(\bar{x})$ with *n* free variables \bar{x} . We claim that

 $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\Phi/\emptyset) \leq n+1$.

Let \overline{b} be an *n*-tuple realising Φ and $\alpha = (\alpha_k)_{k \le n+1}$ a family of infinite mutually indiscernible sequences. For simplicity, let us assume that each α_k is a sequence of singletons. For $i \ne j$, it follows that either $\alpha_i < \alpha_j$ or $\alpha_j < \alpha_i$. Furthermore, for every i < n, there is at most one index k such that α_k contains both elements below and above b_i . Therefore, we can find some index $k \le n + 1$ such that

$$\alpha_k < b_i$$
 or $b_i < \alpha_k$, for all $i < n$.

This implies that α_k is indiscernible over *b*.

We start by stating some basic monotonicity properties of the dp-rank.

Lemma 4.9. Let Φ be a partial type over U. Then

$$\operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\Phi/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\Phi/UC)$$
, for every set C.

Proof. Let $\kappa := \operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\Phi/U)$ and consider a tuple \overline{b} realising Φ and a family $(\alpha_k)_{k < \kappa}$ of infinite mutually indiscernible sequences over $U \cup C$.

Suppose that $\alpha_k = (\bar{a}_i^k)_{i \in I_k}$ and let \bar{c} be an enumeration of C. Setting $\alpha'_k := (\bar{a}_i^k \bar{c})_{i \in I_k}$, we obtain a family $(\alpha'_k)_{k < \kappa}$ of infinite mutually indiscernible sequences over U. By choice of κ , there exists some index $k < \kappa$ such that α'_k is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{b}$. Consequently, α_k is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{b}\bar{c}$. Hence, $\operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\Phi/UC) \le \kappa$.

For the converse inequality, let $\lambda < \kappa$. Then there exists a tuple \bar{b} realising Φ and a family $(\alpha_k)_{k<\lambda}$ of infinite mutually indiscernible sequences over U such that no α_k is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{b}$. By Corollary 4.5, there exists an automorphism $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_U$ such that the family $(\pi(\alpha_k))_{k<\lambda}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U \cup C$. It follows that the tuple $\pi(\bar{b})$ realises Φ and no sequence $\pi(\alpha_k)$ is indiscernible over $U \cup C \cup \pi(\bar{b})$. Hence, $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\Phi/UC) > \lambda$.

Corollary 4.10.

- (a) $\Phi \subseteq \Psi$ implies $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\Phi/U) \ge \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\Psi/U)$.
- (b) $U \subseteq V$ implies $\operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\bar{a}/U) \ge \operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\bar{a}/V)$.

Proof. (a) follows immediately from the definition. For (b), note that Lemma 4.9 and (a) implies that

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\bar{a}/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)/V) \ge \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\bar{a}/V).$$

The next proposition collects several alternative characterisations of the dp-rank.

Proposition 4.11. Let $\Phi(\bar{x})$ be a partial type over U and $\kappa > 0$ a cardinal. *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\Phi/U) \leq \kappa$
- (2) For every tuple b realising Φ and every family $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ of infinite mutually indiscernible sequences over U, there is a set $K_0 \subseteq K$ of size $|K_0| < \kappa$ such that, for every $k \in K \setminus K_0$, all elements of α_k have the same type over $U\overline{b}$.

(3) For every tuple \bar{b} realising Φ and every family $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ of infinite mutually indiscernible sequences over U, there is a set $K_0 \subseteq K$ of size $|K_0| < \kappa$ such that the subfamily $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K \setminus K_0}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U\bar{b}$.

Proof. $(3) \Rightarrow (2)$ is trivial.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose that there exist a tuple \bar{b} realising $\Phi(\bar{x})$ and a family $(\alpha_k)_{k<\kappa}$ of infinite mutually indiscernible sequences $\alpha_k = (\bar{a}_i^k)_{i\in I_k}$ over U such that no α_k is indiscernible over $U\bar{b}$. By Corollary 4.6, we may assume that every index order I_k is dense. For each $k < \kappa$, there are indices $\bar{i}, \bar{j} \in [I_k]^{<\omega}$ such that

 $\bar{a}^k[\bar{\imath}] \not\equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}^k[\bar{\jmath}].$

Using Lemma E5.3.12 we obtain indices $\bar{u}^k < s^k < t^k < \bar{v}^k$ in I_k such that

$$\bar{a}^k [\bar{u}^k s^k \bar{v}^k] \not\equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}^k [\bar{u}^k t^k \bar{v}^k]$$

It follows that the family $(\alpha'_k)_{k < \kappa}$ with $\alpha'_k \coloneqq (\bar{a}^k [l\bar{u}^k \bar{v}^k])_{\bar{u}^k < l < \bar{v}^k}$ violates (2).

(1) \Rightarrow (3) First, we consider the case where κ is infinite. Suppose that there exist a tuple \bar{b} realising Φ and a family $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K}$ of infinite mutually indiscernible sequences over U such that, for every $K_0 \subseteq K$ of size $|K_0| < \kappa$, the subfamily $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K \setminus K_0}$ is not mutually indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{b}$. By induction on $i < \kappa$, we choose an index $k_i \in K$ and a finite subset $s_i \subseteq K$ as follows. Suppose that we have already defined k_j and s_j , for all j < i. Set $S := k[\langle i] \cup s[\langle i]$. Then $|S| < \kappa$ and, by assumption, we can find an index $k_i \in K \setminus S$ such that the sequence α_{k_i} is not indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{b} \cup \alpha[K \setminus (S \cup \{k_i\})]$. Therefore, we can find a finite subset $s_i \subseteq K \setminus (S \cup \{k_i\})$ such that α_{k_i} is not indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{b} \cup \alpha[K \setminus (S \cup \{k_i\})]$.

Having defined $(k_i)_{i < \kappa}$ and $(s_i)_{i < \kappa}$, we set

$$C \coloneqq \bigcup_{i < \kappa} \alpha[s_i]$$

Then the family $(\alpha_{k_i})_{i < \kappa}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U \cup C$, but no sequence α_{k_i} is indiscernible over $U \cup C \cup \overline{b}$. Consequently, it follows by Lemma 4.9 that $\operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\Phi/U) = \operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\Phi/UC) > \kappa$.

It remains to consider the case where $\kappa = n + 1$ is finite. Let $(\alpha_k)_{k < \lambda}$ be a family of infinite mutually indiscernible sequences over U and let \overline{b} be a tuple realising Φ . We construct the desired subset $K_0 \subseteq \lambda$ by induction on λ .

If $\lambda \leq n$, we can take $K_0 := \lambda$. Hence, suppose that $\lambda = n + m + 1 < \omega$ and that we have already proved the claim for families of size n + m. Extending the sequences α_k if necessary, we may assume that they do not have a last element. By induction on $k < \lambda$, we choose a sequence β_k indexed by \mathbb{Z} such that the sequence β^{op} with the reversed ordering is generated by the type $\mathfrak{p}_k := CF(\alpha_k)$ over $U\bar{b}\alpha[<\lambda]\beta[<k]$. By Lemma 3.3, the family $(\alpha_k^+)_{k<\lambda}$ with $\alpha_k^+ := \alpha_k \beta_k$ is mutually indiscernible over U. As $(\alpha_k)_{k<\lambda}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U\beta[<\lambda]$ and

$$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\Phi/U\beta[<\lambda]) = \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\Phi/U) \le n+1 \le \lambda$$
,

we can find an index $k_o < \lambda$ such that α_{k_o} is indiscernible over $U\beta[<\lambda]\bar{b}$. Furthermore, since $(\alpha_k^+)_{k\in\lambda\smallsetminus\{k_o\}}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U\alpha_{k_o}$, we can use the inductive hypothesis to find a set $H \subseteq \lambda \smallsetminus \{k_o\}$ of size $|H| \le n$ such that $(\alpha_k^+)_{k\in\lambda\smallsetminus\{H\cup\{k_o\}\}}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U\alpha_{k_o}\bar{b}$. If the sequence α_{k_o} is indiscernible over $U\bar{b}\alpha[\lambda\smallsetminus(H\cup\{k_o\})]$, then $(\alpha_k)_{k\in\lambda\smallsetminus H}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U\bar{b}$ and we are done.

For a contradiction, suppose otherwise. Then there is some finite set $C \subseteq U\bar{b}\alpha[\lambda \setminus (H \cup \{k_o\})]$ such that α_{k_o} is not indiscernible over C. Let \bar{c}_k be an enumeration of $C \cap \alpha_k$ and set $C_o := C \cap (U \cup \bar{b})$. Since $(\alpha_k^+)_{k \in \lambda \setminus (H \cup \{k_o\})}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U\bar{b}\alpha_{k_o}$, we can find, for every $k \in \lambda \setminus (H \cup \{k_o\})$, a tuple $\bar{d}_k \subseteq \beta_k$ such that

$$\bar{d}_k \equiv_{U\bar{b}\alpha_{k_o}\alpha^+[\lambda \setminus (H \cup \{k,k_o\})]} \bar{c}_k.$$

It follows that α_{k_o} is not indiscernible over $C_o \cup \bigcup_k \bar{d}_k \subseteq U\bar{b}\beta[<\lambda]$. This contradicts our choice of k_o .

It remains to consider the case where λ is an infinite cardinal. For every ordinal $\gamma < \lambda$, we can use the inductive hypothesis to find a set $H_{\gamma} \subseteq \gamma$ of size $|H_{\gamma}| \leq n$ such that the family $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \gamma \setminus H_{\gamma}}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U\bar{b}$. We will construct finite sets $K_0, \ldots, K_{n-1} \subseteq \lambda$ and indices $s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1} < \lambda$ as follows. Suppose that we have already chosen K_0, \ldots, K_{i-1} and s_0, \ldots, s_{i-1} such that

$$\{s_0, \ldots, s_{i-1}\} \subseteq H_{\gamma}$$
, for arbitrarily large γ .

If the family $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \lambda \setminus \{s_0, \dots, s_{i-1}\}}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U\bar{b}$, we are done. Otherwise, there exists a finite set $K_i \subseteq \lambda \setminus \{s_0, \dots, s_{i-1}\}$ such that $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K_i}$ is not mutually indiscernible over $U\bar{b}$. By choice of the sets H_{γ} , we have $K_i \cap H_{\gamma} \neq \emptyset$, for all $\gamma < \lambda$. As the set K_i is finite, there is therefore some index $s_i \in K_i$ such that

$$\{s_0, \ldots, s_{i-1}, s_i\} \subseteq H_{\gamma}$$
, for arbitrarily large γ .

Having constructed s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1} as above, it follows that there are arbitrarily large γ such that $H_{\gamma} = \{s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1}\}$. Hence, there are arbitrarily large $\gamma < \lambda$ such that the family $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \gamma \setminus \{s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1}\}}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U\bar{b}$. This implies that $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \lambda \setminus \{s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1}\}}$ is also mutually indiscernible over $U\bar{b}$.

We can use this characterisation to give a straightforward proof that the dp-rank is sub-additive.

Proposition 4.12. $\operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U) \oplus 1 \leq \operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\bar{a}/U) \oplus \operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\bar{b}/U\bar{a}).$

Proof. Let $\kappa := \operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\bar{a}/U)$ and $\lambda := \operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\bar{b}/U\bar{a})$. To show that

 $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U)\oplus 1\leq \kappa\oplus\lambda$,

consider a tuple $\bar{a}'\bar{b}' \equiv_U \bar{a}\bar{b}$ and a family $(\alpha_k)_{k\in K}$ of infinite mutually indiscernible sequences over *U*. According to Proposition 4.11 (3), it is sufficient to find a subset $K' \subseteq K$ of size $|K'| \oplus 1 < \kappa \oplus \lambda$ such that $(\alpha_k)_{k\in K \setminus K'}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U\bar{a}'\bar{b}'$. Note that invariance implies that $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\bar{b}'/U\bar{a}') = \operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\bar{b}/U\bar{a})$. We use the characterisation in Proposition 4.11 (3) two times: first, to find a subset $K_0 \subseteq K$ of size $|K_0| < \kappa$ such that $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K \setminus K_0}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}'$; and then, to find a subset $K_1 \subseteq K \setminus K_0$ of size $|K_1| < \lambda$ such that $(\alpha_k)_{k \in K \setminus (K_0 \cup K_1)}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}'\bar{b}'$. Since $|K_0 \cup K_1| \oplus 1 < \kappa \oplus \lambda$, the claim follows.

The dp-rank is well-behaved in theories without the independence properties. In particular, it always exists.

Theorem 4.13. Let *T* be a complete first-order theory. The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) *T* does not have the independence property.
- (2) $\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\Phi/U) \leq |T|^+ \oplus |\bar{x}|^+$, for every partial type $\Phi(\bar{x})$ with variables \bar{x} and every set U.
- (3) $\operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\Phi/U) < \infty$, for every partial type $\Phi(\bar{x})$ and every set U.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Let \bar{b} be a tuple realising Φ and $(\alpha_k)_{k < \kappa}$ a family of infinite mutually indiscernible sequences over U of size $\kappa := |T|^+ \oplus |\bar{x}|^+$. By Proposition 4.7, there exists a set $K_0 \subseteq \kappa$ of size $|K_0| \leq |T| \oplus |\bar{b}| < \kappa$ such that the family $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \kappa \setminus K_0}$ is mutually indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{b}$. Fix $k \in \kappa \setminus K_0 \neq \emptyset$. Then α_k is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{b}$.

 $(2) \Rightarrow (3)$ is trivial.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Let κ be an infinite cardinal and let $I := \omega \times \kappa$, ordered lexicographically. Suppose that there exists a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ with the independence property. By compactness, there exists a tuple \bar{b} and an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I}$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{a}_i; \bar{b}) \quad \text{iff} \quad i \in \{o\} \times \kappa.$$

By Lemma 4.2, the sequences $\alpha_i := (\bar{a}_{\langle i,k \rangle})_{k < \kappa}$ are mutually indiscernible over \emptyset , but none of them is indiscernible over \bar{b} . This implies that $\operatorname{rk}_{dp}(\bar{b}/\emptyset) > \kappa$.

F5. Theories without the array property

1. The array property

In this chapter we consider a property of formulae that generalises both the tree property and the independence property. It is based on families of tuples with a two-dimensional index set.

Definition 1.1. Let γ , δ be ordinals and $\alpha = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i < \gamma, j < \delta}$ a family of tuples.

(a) The *i*-th row of α is the sequence $\alpha^i := (\bar{a}_{ij})_{j < \delta}$, its *j*-th column is $\alpha_j := (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i < \gamma}$, and its diagonal is $(\bar{a}_{ii})_{i < \min\{\gamma, \delta\}}$.

(b) For $I \subseteq \gamma$ and $J \subseteq \delta$, we set

$$\bar{a}[I;J] \coloneqq \bigcup_{i \in I, j \in J} \bar{a}_{ij} \, .$$

(c) α is *biindiscernible* over a set *U* if the sequence $(\alpha^i)_{i < \gamma}$ of rows and the sequence $(\alpha_j)_{j < \delta}$ of columns are both indiscernible over *U*. We call α *strongly indiscernible* over *U* if, in addition, the sequence $(\alpha^i)_{i < \gamma}$ of rows is mutually indiscernible over *U*.

We start with presenting two methods to construct strongly indiscernible families.

Lemma 1.2. Let $\alpha = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i < \gamma, j < \delta}$ be a family such that the sequence of rows $(\alpha^i)_{i < \gamma}$ is both mutually indiscernible over U and indiscernible over U. Then α is strongly indiscernible.

LOGIC, ALGEBRA & GEOMETRY 2024-04-09 — ©ACHIM BLUMENSATH

Proof. It remains to prove that the sequence of columns $(\alpha_j)_{j < \delta}$ is indiscernible over U. Fix indices $\overline{l} \in [\gamma]^m$ and $\overline{i}, \overline{j} \in [\delta]^n$. We claim that

 $\bar{a}[\bar{l};\bar{\imath}] \equiv_U \bar{a}[\bar{l};\bar{\jmath}].$

Let s < m. Since α^{l_s} is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{a}[\gamma \setminus \{l_s\}; \delta]$, we have

$$\bar{a}[l_s;\bar{\imath}] \equiv_{U\bar{a}[\gamma \setminus \{l_s\};\delta]} \bar{a}[l_s;\bar{\jmath}],$$

which implies that

$$\bar{a}[l_{0}...l_{s-1};\bar{i}]\bar{a}[l_{s};\bar{i}]\bar{a}[l_{s+1}...l_{m-1};\bar{j}]$$

$$\equiv_{U} \bar{a}[l_{0}...l_{s-1};\bar{i}]\bar{a}[l_{s};\bar{j}]\bar{a}[l_{s+1}...l_{m-1};\bar{j}].$$

By transitivity, it follows that $\bar{a}[\bar{l};\bar{i}] \equiv_U \bar{a}[\bar{l};\bar{j}]$.

The next remark generalises Lemma F4.4.2.

Lemma 1.3. Let $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i < \delta \gamma}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U and define

$$\alpha = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i < \gamma, j < \delta} \quad by \quad \bar{a}_{ij} \coloneqq b_{\delta i+j}.$$

Then α is strongly indiscernible over U.

Proof. Note that the *i*-th row

$$\alpha^{i} = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{j < \delta} = (\bar{b}_{\delta i+j})_{j < \delta}$$

is indiscernible over

$$U \cup \overline{b}[\langle \delta i] \cup \overline{b}[\geq \delta(i+1)] = U \cup \bigcup_{l \neq i} \alpha^l.$$

By Lemma 1.2, it is therefore sufficient to show that the sequence of rows $(\alpha^i)_{i < \gamma}$ is indiscernible over *U*. Fix indices $\bar{i}, \bar{j} \in [\gamma]^m$ and $\bar{l} \in [\delta]^n$. Then

$$(b_{\delta i_s+l_t})_{s< m,t< n} \equiv_U (b_{\delta j_s+l_t})_{s< m,t< n}$$

implies that $\bar{a}[\bar{\imath};\bar{l}] \equiv_U \bar{a}[\bar{\jmath};\bar{l}]$.

1220

 \square

Using two-dimensional families we can introduce the array property, which generalises the independence property and the tree property.

Definition 1.4. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ be a formula and $k < \omega$.

(a) We say that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ is *consistent over* a family $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i \in I}$ of tuples if the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i) \mid i \in I\}$ is consistent. Similarly, we say that φ is *inconsistent* or *k*-*inconsistent* over β , it the above set is, respectively, inconsistent or *k*-inconsistent.

(b) A *k*-array for φ is a family $\alpha = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i,j < \omega}$ of tuples such that

- φ is *k*-inconsistent over each row $\alpha^i = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{j < \omega}$, $i < \omega$, and
- for every function $\eta : \omega \to \omega, \varphi$ is consistent over the sequence $(\bar{a}_{i\eta(i)})_{i < \omega}$.

(c) We say that φ has the *array property*, or the *tree property of the second kind*, if, for some $k < \omega$, there exists a *k*-array for φ . A theory *T* has the *array property* if some formula does.

Let us first note that we can choose a *k*-array always to be strongly indiscernible.

Lemma 1.5. A formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ has a k-array if, and only if, it has a strongly indiscernible k-array.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) is trivial. For (\Rightarrow), suppose that the formula φ has a *k*-array $\alpha = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i,j<\omega}$ with rows $(\alpha^i)_{i<\omega}$. By induction on *i*, we use Proposition E5.3.6 to choose an indiscernible sequence $\beta^i = (\bar{b}_{ij})_{j<\omega}$ over $\alpha[>i]\beta[<i]$ such that

$$\operatorname{Av}(\beta^{i}/\alpha[>i]\beta[i]\beta[$$

According to Lemma F4.4.3, the family $(\beta^i)_{i < \omega}$ is mutually indiscernible. Furthermore, the *k*-inconsistency of { $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_{ij}) \mid j < \omega$ } implies the *k*-inconsistency of { $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{ij}) \mid j < \omega$ }.

To show that all sets of the form $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{i\eta(i)}) \mid i < \omega\}$ are consistent, it is sufficient by compactness to prove that, for every $n < \omega$ and every

 $\eta : [n] \to \omega$, there exists some tuple \bar{c} with

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \bigwedge_{i < n} \varphi(\bar{c}; \bar{b}_{i\eta(i)}).$$

To do so, we prove by induction on $m \le n$, that, for every function $\eta : [n] \to \omega$, there is some tuple \bar{c} with

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \bigwedge_{i < m} \varphi(\bar{c}; \bar{b}_{i\eta(i)}) \land \bigwedge_{m \leq i < n} \varphi(\bar{c}; \bar{a}_{i\eta(i)}).$$

For m = 0, the existence of \bar{c} follows by choice of the \bar{a}_{ij} . For the inductive step, suppose that, for every $\eta : [n] \to \omega$, we have already found a tuple \bar{c} such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \psi_{\eta}(\bar{c}; \bar{a}_{m\eta(m)}),$$

where

$$\psi_{\eta}(\bar{x};\bar{y}) \coloneqq \bigwedge_{i < m} \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}_{i\eta(i)}) \land \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{y}) \land \bigwedge_{m < i < n} \varphi(\bar{c};\bar{a}_{i\eta(i)}).$$

For a given $j < \omega$, we consider the function $\eta' : [n] \to \omega$ with $\eta'(m) := j$ and $\eta'(i) := \eta(i)$, for $i \neq m$. Then $\psi_{\eta'} = \psi_{\eta}$ and the inductive hypothesis implies that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \exists \bar{x} \psi_{\eta}(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_{mj}), \text{ for every } j < \omega.$$

Hence,

$$\exists \bar{x}\psi_{\eta}(\bar{x};\bar{y}) \in \operatorname{Av}(\alpha_m/\alpha[>m]\beta[m]\beta[$$

Consequently, there is some tuple \bar{c} such that

 $\mathbb{M} \vDash \psi_{\eta}(\bar{c}; \bar{b}_{m\eta(m)}).$

We have shown that the family $\beta = (\beta^i)_{i < \omega}$ has all of the desired properties except possibly for biindiscernibility. To conclude the proof,

 \square

we can use Proposition E5.3.6 to choose an indiscernible sequence $\beta' = (\beta'^i)_{i < \omega}$ such that

$$\operatorname{Av}(\beta'/\varnothing) \supseteq \operatorname{Av}(\beta/\varnothing)$$
.

By Lemma 1.2, it follows that β' is strongly indiscernible.

Next we show that the class of theories without the array property generalises both the simple theories and those without the independence property. We start by proving this implication for formulae.

Proposition 1.6. *Every formula with the array property has the tree property and the independence property.*

Proof. Suppose that φ has a *k*-array $(\bar{a}_{ij})_{i,j<\omega}$. We start by showing that φ has the tree property. We set

 $\bar{c}_{\langle\rangle} := \bar{a}_{00}$ and $\bar{c}_w := \bar{a}_{nw_{n-1}}$, for $w \in \omega^n$, n > 0.

Then the family $(\bar{c}_w)_{w \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ is a witness for the tree property of φ since

• for every $\eta \in \omega^{\omega}$, the set

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{c}_{w}) \mid w < \eta \end{array} \right\}$$

= $\left\{ \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{a}_{oo}) \right\} \cup \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{a}_{(n+1)\eta(n)}) \mid n < \omega \right\}$

is consistent and

• for every $w \in \omega^{<\omega}$ of length n := |w|, the set

$$\left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_{wi}) \mid i < \omega \right\} = \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_{(n+1)i}) \mid i < \omega \right\}$$

is *k*-inconsistent.

It remains to check the independence property. By Lemma 1.5, we may assume that α is strongly indiscernible. Let *m* be the maximal number such that, for some infinite subset $I \subseteq \omega$, there exists a tuple \overline{c} with

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{c}; \bar{a}_{ij}), \quad \text{for all } i \in I \text{ and } j < m.$$

As φ is *k*-inconsistent over every column, we have m < k. Furthermore, it follows by maximality of *m* that there exists an infinite subset $J \subseteq I$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \neg \varphi(\bar{c}; \bar{a}_{im}), \text{ for all } i \in J.$$

Choose a strictly increasing function $g : \omega \to J$ and define $\eta : \omega \to \omega$ by

$$\eta(i) \coloneqq \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \text{ is even,} \\ m & \text{if } i \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

It follows that

 $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{c}; \bar{a}_{g(i)\eta(i)})$ iff *i* is even.

Since, according to Lemma F4.4.4, the sequence $(\bar{a}_{g(i)\eta(i)})_{i<\omega}$ is indiscernible, it follows by Proposition E5.4.2 that φ has the independence property.

Thus, theories without the array property generalise both simple theories and theories without the independence property.

Corollary 1.7. *Let T be a complete first-order theory with the array property. Then T is not simple and it has the independence property.*

Our next goal is an alternative characterisation of the array property.

Definition 1.8. Let $\alpha = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i < \gamma, j < \delta}$ be a family of tuples.

(a) The *transpose* of α is $\alpha^T := (\bar{a}_{ji})_{i < \delta, j < \gamma}$.

(b) The *column k-condensation* of α is the family $\alpha^{(k)} := (\bar{a}'_{ij})_{i < \gamma, j < \delta}$ with

 $\bar{a}'_{ij} \coloneqq \bar{a}[k * i; j]$ where $k * i \coloneqq \langle ki, ki + 1, \dots, ki + k - 1 \rangle$.

For $\overline{i} \in [\gamma]^n$, we similarly set

 $k \star \overline{i} \coloneqq (k \star i_{0}) \dots (k \star i_{n-1}).$

(c) For a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$, we set

$$\varphi^{(k)}(\bar{x};\bar{y}_{0}\ldots\bar{y}_{k-1})\coloneqq\bigwedge_{i< k}\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{y}_{i}).$$

Remark. Note that a formula φ is consistent over a column α_j if, and only if, $\varphi^{(k)}$ is consistent over the condensed column $\alpha_j^{(k)}$.

Lemma 1.9. Let $\alpha = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i < \gamma, j < \delta}$ be a family of tuples and $k < \omega$.

- (a) If α is biindiscernible over U, then so are α^T and $\alpha^{(k)}$.
- (b) If α is strongly indiscernible over U, then so is $\alpha^{(k)}$.

Proof. (a) Clearly, if α is biindiscernible over U, so is α^T . To see that the column *k*-condensation $\alpha^{(k)} = (\bar{b}_{ij})_{i < \gamma, j < \delta}$ is also biindiscernible over U, note that, for all tuples of indices $\bar{i}, \bar{j}, \bar{l}$,

 $\bar{a}[k * \bar{l}; \bar{\imath}] \equiv_U \bar{a}[k * \bar{l}; \bar{\jmath}] \quad \text{implies} \quad \bar{b}[\bar{l}; \bar{\imath}] \equiv_U \bar{b}[\bar{l}; \bar{\jmath}],$ and $\bar{a}[k * \bar{\imath}; \bar{l}] \equiv_U \bar{a}[k * \bar{\jmath}; \bar{l}] \quad \text{implies} \quad \bar{b}[\bar{\imath}; \bar{l}] \equiv_U \bar{b}[\bar{\jmath}; \bar{l}].$

(b) Suppose that α is strongly indiscernible over U. It follows by (a) that the column k-condensation $\beta := \alpha^{(k)} = (\bar{b}_{ij})_{i < \gamma, j < \delta}$ is biindiscernible over U. To prove that the family $(\beta^i)_{i < \gamma}$ of rows is mutually indiscernible over U, consider indices $\bar{i}, \bar{j} \in [\delta]^n$ and set

$$B_l := U \cup \bar{b}[\gamma \setminus \{l\}; \delta].$$

Then $B_l = U \cup \bar{a}[\gamma \setminus k * l; \delta]$ and

$$\bar{a}[k * l; \bar{\imath}] \equiv_{UB_l} \bar{a}[k * l; \bar{\jmath}]$$
 implies $\bar{b}[l; \bar{\imath}] \equiv_{UB_l} \bar{b}[l; \bar{\jmath}]$.

Hence, β^l is indiscernible over $U \cup B_l$.

Lemma 1.10. Let T be a theory without the array property, $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ a formula, and $\alpha = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i,j<\omega}$ a biindiscernible family.

(a) Suppose that α is strongly indiscernible. If φ is consistent over the o-th column $\alpha_0 = (\bar{a}_{i0})_{i < \omega}$, it is consistent over all of α .

F5. Theories without the array property

(b) If φ is consistent over the diagonal $(\bar{a}_{ii})_{i < \omega}$ of α , the formula $\varphi^{(k)}$ is consistent over the diagonal $(\bar{b}_{ii})_{i < \omega}$ of the column k-condensation $\alpha^{(k)} = (\bar{b}_{ij})_{i,j < \omega}$.

Proof. (a) By compactness, it is sufficient to prove that, for every $k < \omega$, φ is consistent over $(\bar{a}_{ij})_{i < k, j < \omega}$. Fix $k < \omega$. By Lemma 1.9, the column k-condensation $\alpha^{(k)} = (\bar{b}_{ij})_{i,j < \omega}$ is also strongly indiscernible. Furthermore, as φ is consistent over $(\bar{a}_{io})_{i < \omega}$ and $\bar{a}[\omega; o] = \bar{b}[\omega; o]$, it follows that $\varphi^{(k)}$ is consistent over $(\bar{b}_{io})_{i < \omega}$. By Lemma F4.4.4, this implies that $\varphi^{(k)}$ is consistent over $(\bar{b}_{i,\eta(i)})_{i < \omega}$, for every $\eta : \omega \to \omega$. As $\varphi^{(k)}$ does not have the array property, there therefore exists some $i < \omega$ such that $\varphi^{(k)}$ is consistent over $(\bar{b}_{ij})_{j < \omega}$. By indiscernibility, it follows that it is also consistent over $(\bar{b}_{oj})_{j < \omega}$. This implies that φ is consistent over $(\bar{b}_{oj})_{j < \omega}$.

(b) We can use Corollary E5.3.10 to extend the sequence $(\alpha^i)_{i < \omega}$ of rows to an indiscernible sequence $(\alpha^i)_{i < \omega^2}$ of length ω^2 . Suppose that $\alpha^i = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{j < \omega}$ and set $\bar{c}_{ij} \coloneqq \bar{a}_{\omega i+j,i}$. By mutual indiscernibility of $(\alpha^i)_i$, we have

$$(\bar{c}_{ij})_{i,j<\omega} = (\bar{a}_{\omega i+j,i})_{i,j<\omega} \equiv (\bar{a}_{\omega i+j,0})_{i,j<\omega}.$$

Furthermore, according to Lemma 1.3, the latter family is strongly indiscernible. Hence, so is $(\bar{c}_{ij})_{i,j<\omega}$. Furthermore, by biindiscernibility of α , we have

$$(\bar{c}_{io})_{i<\omega} = (\bar{a}_{\omega i,i})_{i<\omega} \equiv (\bar{a}_{ii})_{i<\omega}.$$

Consequently, the consistency of φ over $(\bar{a}_{ii})_{i < \omega}$ implies the consistency of φ over $(\bar{c}_{io})_{i < \omega}$. It therefore follows by (a) that φ is consistent over $(\bar{c}_{ij})_{i,j < \omega}$. Finally, by bindiscernibility of α , we have

$$(\bar{c}_{ij})_{i<\omega,j< k} = (\bar{a}_{\omega i+j,i})_{i<\omega,j< k} \equiv (\bar{a}_{ki+j,i})_{i<\omega,j< k}.$$

Consequently, φ is consistent over $(\bar{a}_{ki+j,i})_{i < \omega, j < k}$, which implies that $\varphi^{(k)}$ is consistent over $(\bar{b}_{ii})_{i < \omega}$.

Proposition 1.11. A theory T does not have the array property if, and only if, for every biindiscernible family $\alpha = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i,j<\omega}$, the consistency of a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ over the diagonal $(\bar{a}_{ii})_{i<\omega}$ implies the consistency of φ over α .

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Suppose that some formula φ has a *k*-array. By Lemma 1.5, we can choose this *k*-array to be biindiscernible. It follows that φ is consistent over the diagonal of α , but not over α itself.

(⇒) Suppose that *T* does not have the array property and let α be a biindiscernible family such that φ is consistent over the diagonal of α . By compactness, it is sufficient to prove that, for every $k < \omega$, φ is consistent over $(\bar{a}_{ij})_{i,j < k}$. By Lemma 1.10, $\varphi^{(k)}$ is consistent over the diagonal of $\alpha^{(k)}$. Since $\beta := (\alpha^{(k)})^T$ has the same diagonal, it follows by another application of Lemma 1.10 that $(\varphi^{(k)})^{(k)}$ is consistent over the diagonal of $\beta^{(k)} = (\bar{b}_{ij})_{i,j < \omega}$. In particular, $(\varphi^{(k)})^{(k)}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{oo})$ is consistent. Since $\bar{b}_{oo} = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i,j < k}$ the claim follows.

As an application, let us show that, in theories without the array property, we can characterise dividing in the following way.

Definition 1.12. A formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ array-divides over a set U if there exists a biindiscernible family $\beta = (\bar{b}_{ij})_{i,j<\omega}$ over U such that $\bar{b}_{oo} = \bar{b}$ and φ is inconsistent over β .

Lemma 1.13. Every formula that divides over U also array-divides over U.

Proof. Suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ divides over U. Then there exists an indiscernible sequence $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ over U such that $\bar{b}_0 = \bar{b}$ and φ is k-inconsistent over β . By Corollary E5.3.10, we can extend β to an indiscernible sequence $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega^2}$ over U of length ω^2 . Set $\alpha := (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i,j < \omega}$ with $\bar{a}_{ij} := \bar{b}_{\omega i+j}$. By Lemma 1.3, it follows that α is biindiscernible over U. Furthermore, $\bar{a}_{00} = \bar{b}$ and φ is inconsistent over α . Hence, $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ array-divides over U.

Corollary 1.14. Let T be a theory without the array property. A formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ divides over U if, and only if, it array-divides over U.

Proof. We have proved the implication (\Rightarrow) already in Lemma 1.13. For (\Leftarrow) , suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ does not divide over U. To show that it does not array-divide over U, consider a biindiscernible family $\beta = (\bar{b}_{ij})_{i,j<\omega}$ over U such that $\bar{b}_{00} = \bar{b}$. Since the diagonal $(\bar{b}_{ii})_{i<\omega}$ is indiscernible over U, the fact that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{00})$ does not divide over U implies that φ is consistent over $(\bar{b}_{ii})_{i<\omega}$. By Proposition 1.11, it follows that φ is consistent over β .

2. Forking and dividing

Extension bases

Our first question regarding theories without the array property is over which base sets forking and dividing coincide. For this to be the case, the forking relation should have all the properties of the dividing relation. Therefore, we start by collecting some of them.

Definition 2.1. Let $\sqrt[6]{}$ and $\sqrt[1]{}$ be preforking relations and $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. We say that $\sqrt[6]{}$ -forking implies $\sqrt[1]{}$ -forking over U if every formula that $\sqrt[6]{}$ -forks over U also $\sqrt[1]{}$ -forks over U. Similarly, we say that $\sqrt[6]{}$ and $\sqrt[1]{}$ coincide over U if we have implications in both directions.

Definition 2.2. Let $\sqrt{}$ be an independence relation and $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ a set.

(a) We say that $\sqrt{}$ has *left extension over a set U* if it satisfies the following axiom:

(LEXT) *Left Extension*. If $A_o \sqrt{U} B$ and $A_o \subseteq A_1$ then there is some B' with

$$B' \equiv_{UA_{o}} B$$
 and $A_1 \sqrt{U} B'$.

(b) *U* is a $\sqrt{-base}$ if $A \sqrt{U}$, for all $A \subseteq \mathbb{M}$.

(c) *U* is a $\sqrt{-extension \ base}$ if *U* is a $\sqrt{-base}$ and $\sqrt{-base}$ has left extension over *U*.

Let us first note that $\sqrt{-bases}$ do exist.

Lemma 2.3. (a) Every set is a $\sqrt{-base}$ if $\sqrt{}$ is one of the relations $\sqrt[ls]{}$, $\sqrt[s]{}$, or $\sqrt[d]{}$.

- (b) $\sqrt[u]{}$ has left extension over every set.
- (c) Every model is a $\sqrt[u]{-extension base}$.
- (d) Every model is a $\sqrt{-base}$ for all preforking relations $\sqrt{-}$.

Proof. (a) It follows immediately form the definition that $A \sqrt[s]{U} U$, for all sets A and U. As we have seen in Corollary F4.2.22 that $\sqrt[s]{\subseteq} \sqrt[ls]{it}$ follows that $A \sqrt[ls]{U} U$ as well. For $\sqrt[d]{}$, the claim follows immediately from the characterisation in Lemma F3.1.3.

(b) Suppose that $A \sqrt[u]{U} \bar{b}$ and let $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. We have to show that there is some tuple $\bar{b}' \equiv_{UA} \bar{b}$ with $AC \sqrt[u]{U} \bar{b}'$. In other words, we have to show that the set

$$\Phi(\bar{x}) \coloneqq \operatorname{tp}(b/UA)$$
$$\cup \{ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \mid \bar{c} \subseteq UAC \text{ and } \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \text{ a formula over } U$$
such that $\mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi(\bar{b}; \bar{d})$ for all $\bar{d} \subseteq U \}$

is satisfiable. For a contradiction, suppose that Φ is inconsistent. Then we can find a formula $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}) \in \text{tp}(\bar{b}/UA)$, finitely many formulae $\varphi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{y}_i)$ over U, and parameters $\bar{c}_i \subseteq UAC$ such that

$$\psi(\bar{x};\bar{a}) \vDash \bigvee_{i < n} \neg \varphi_i(\bar{x};\bar{c}_i) \text{ and } \mathbb{M} \vDash \varphi_i(\bar{b};\bar{d}) \text{ for all } \bar{d} \subseteq U.$$

W.l.o.g. we may assume that the parameters \bar{c}_i are all of the form $\bar{c}_i = \bar{a}\bar{c}$, for some tuple $\bar{c} \subseteq UAC$ that is disjoint from \bar{a} . Hence,

 $\psi(\bar{x};\bar{a}) \vDash \bigvee_{i < n} \neg \varphi_i(\bar{x};\bar{a},\bar{c})$

and it follows by the Coincidence Lemma that

$$\psi(\bar{x};\bar{y}) \vDash \forall \bar{z} \bigvee_{i < n} \neg \varphi_i(\bar{x};\bar{y},\bar{z})$$

Since $A \sqrt[u]{U} \overline{b}$, there is some tuple $\overline{a}' \subseteq U$ such that $\mathbb{M} \models \psi(\overline{b}; \overline{a}')$. Fix some tuple $\overline{d} \subseteq U$. Then it follows by the above implication that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \bigvee_{i < n} \neg \varphi_i(\bar{b}; \bar{a}', \bar{d}).$$

Hence, there is some index *i* with $\mathbb{M} \models \neg \varphi_i(\bar{b}; \bar{a}', \bar{d})$. As $\bar{a}'\bar{d} \subseteq U$, this contradicts our choice of φ_i .

(c) We have already seen in Lemma F2.3.15 that each model is a $\sqrt[4]{-}$ base. Hence, the claim follows by (b).

(d) It follows by (c) that every model \mathfrak{M} is a $\sqrt[u]{-base}$. Furthermore, we have shown in Theorem F2.3.13 that $\sqrt[u]{\subseteq} \sqrt{}$. Hence, \mathfrak{M} is also a $\sqrt{-base}$.

The reason we are interested in extension bases is the following result.

Lemma 2.4. If forking equals dividing over U, then U is a $\sqrt[f]{-extension}$ base.

Proof. As forking equals dividing over U, it is sufficient to show that U is a $\sqrt[d]{-\text{extension base}}$. We have already shown in Lemma 2.3 that U is a $\sqrt[d]{-\text{base}}$. It therefore remains to show that $\sqrt[d]{-\text{has left extension over } U$.

Suppose that $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b}$ and let $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. To find some tuple $\bar{b}' \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{b}$ with $\bar{a}\bar{c} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b}'$, we set $\mathfrak{p} := \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/U\bar{a})$ and

$$\Phi(\bar{x}) \coloneqq \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}) \cup \{\neg \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{c}) \mid \varphi(b, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) \text{ divides over } U\}.$$

Clearly, every tuple \bar{b}' realising $\Phi(\bar{x})$ has the desired properties. Hence, it remains to prove that Φ is consistent.

For a contradiction, suppose otherwise. Then

$$\mathfrak{p} \models \bigvee_{i < n} \varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{c}),$$

where each formula $\varphi_i(\bar{b}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$ divides over *U*. In particular, the disjunction

$$\psi(\bar{b},\bar{y},\bar{z})\coloneqq\bigvee_{i< n}\varphi_i(\bar{b},\bar{y},\bar{z})$$

forks over *U*. By assumption, this implies that ψ also divides over *U*. Thus, there exists an indiscernible sequence $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ over *U* such that $\bar{b}_o = \bar{b}$ and $\{\psi(\bar{b}_i, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) \mid i < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent, for some $k < \omega$. By Lemma E5.3.11, we can find a sequence $\beta' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \beta$ such that $\beta' = (\bar{b}'_i)_{i < \omega}$ is indiscernible over $U\bar{a}$. As \mathfrak{p} is a type over $U\bar{a}$, it follows that

$$\operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}'_i/U\bar{a}) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}'_o/U\bar{a}) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/U\bar{a}) = \mathfrak{p}, \text{ for all } i < \omega.$$

This implies that $\mathbb{M} \models \psi(\bar{b}'_i, \bar{a}, \bar{c})$, for all *i*. Thus, the tuple $\bar{c}\bar{a}$ satisfies the set $\{\psi(\bar{b}'_i, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) \mid i < \omega\}$, which is *k*-inconsistent by choice of β' . A contradiction.

Quasi-dividing and the Broom Lemma

Before attacking the questions of when forking and dividing coincide, we take a look at a weakening of dividing called *quasi-dividing*.

Definition 2.5. A formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ *quasi-divides* over a set *U* if there are tuples $\bar{b}_0, \ldots, \bar{b}_{n-1}$, for some $n < \omega$, such that

$$\bar{b}_i \equiv_U \bar{b}$$
 and $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i) \mid i < n\}$ is inconsistent.

Lemma 2.6. Dividing implies quasi-dividing.

Proof. Suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ divides over U. Then there is a sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ such that $\bar{b}_i \equiv_U \bar{b}$ and $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i) \mid i < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent, for some $k < \omega$. Consequently, the tuples $\bar{b}_0, \ldots, \bar{b}_{k-1}$ show that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ quasi-divides over U.

We start with a technical lemma that, given a forking relation with left extension, constructs something like a Morley sequence for the inverse relation.

Lemma 2.7. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a forking relation with left extension over a set U, $\beta = (\bar{b}_n)_{n < \omega}$ an indiscernible sequence over $U \cup C$, and \bar{a} a tuple such that

$$C \sqrt{U} \bar{a}\beta$$
 and $\bar{b}_n \sqrt{U} \bar{a}\bar{b}[< n]$, for all $0 < n < \omega$

For every number $k < \omega$, there exists a sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i < k}$ such that $\bar{a}_0 = \bar{a}$ and, for all i < k,

$$\bar{a}_i\bar{b}_i\equiv_{UC}\bar{a}\bar{b}_o$$
 and $C\bar{a}_{k-1}\bar{b}_{k-1}\ldots\bar{a}_{i+1}\bar{b}_{i+1}\sqrt{U}\bar{a}_i\bar{b}_i$.

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on k. For k = 0, there is nothing to do. For the inductive step, suppose that we have already found a sequence $\alpha' = (\bar{a}'_i)_{i < k}$ of length k. We will construct one of length k + 1. Let $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_{UC}$ be an automorphism such that $\sigma(\bar{b}_n) = \bar{b}_{n+1}$, for all $n < \omega$. Note that $C \sqrt{U} \bar{a} \bar{b}_0 \dots \bar{b}_k$ and $\bar{b}_i \sqrt{U} \bar{a} \bar{b}_0 \dots \bar{b}_{i-1}$ implies, by Lemma F2.2.4 and induction on i < k, that

$$C\bar{b}_k\ldots\bar{b}_{k-i+1}\sqrt{U}\,\bar{a}\bar{b}_o\ldots\bar{b}_{k-i}$$

For i = k, we obtain

$$C\bar{b}_k\ldots\bar{b}_1\sqrt{U}\,\bar{a}\bar{b}_0$$
.

By (LEXT), we can therefore find tuples $\bar{a}'\bar{b}' \equiv_{UC\bar{b}_k...\bar{b}_1} \bar{a}\bar{b}_0$ such that

$$C\bar{b}_k\ldots\bar{b}_1\sigma(\bar{a}'_{k-1})\ldots\sigma(\bar{a}'_{o})\ \sqrt{U}\ \bar{a}'\bar{b}'.$$

Let $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_{UC\bar{b}_k...\bar{b}_1}$ be an automorphism with $\pi(\bar{a}'\bar{b}') = \bar{a}\bar{b}_0$ and set

$$\bar{a}_{\circ} \coloneqq \bar{a}$$
 and $\bar{a}_{i+1} \coloneqq \pi(\sigma(\bar{a}'_i))$, for $i < k$.

Then invariance implies that

$$C\bar{b}_k\ldots\bar{b}_1\bar{a}_k\ldots\bar{a}_1\,\sqrt{U}\,\bar{a}\bar{b}_0\,.$$

We claim that the sequence $\alpha := (\bar{a}_i)_{i < k+1}$ obtained in this way has the desired properties.

Clearly, we have $\bar{a}_0 = \bar{a}$. Furthermore, since $\pi(\bar{b}_i) = \bar{b}_i$ for $0 < i \le k$, we have

$$\bar{a}_{i+1}\bar{b}_{i+1} = \pi(\sigma(\bar{a}'_i))\bar{b}_{i+1} \equiv_{UC} \sigma(\bar{a}'_i)\sigma(\bar{b}_i) \equiv_{UC} \bar{a}'_i\bar{b}_i \equiv_{UC} \bar{a}\bar{b}_0.$$

For the last condition, note that, for i < k,

$$C\bar{a}'_{k-1}\bar{b}_{k-1}\ldots\bar{a}'_{i+1}\bar{b}_{i+1}\sqrt{U}\bar{a}'_{i}\bar{b}_{i}$$

$$\Rightarrow C\pi(\sigma(\bar{a}'_{k-1}\bar{b}_{k-1}\ldots\bar{a}'_{i+1}\bar{b}_{i+1}))\sqrt{U}\pi(\sigma(\bar{a}'_{i}\bar{b}_{i}))$$

$$\Rightarrow C\bar{a}_{k}\bar{b}_{k}\ldots\bar{a}_{i+2}\bar{b}_{i+2}\sqrt{U}\bar{a}_{i+1}\bar{b}_{i+1}.$$

Furthermore, we have already seen above that

$$C\bar{a}_k\bar{b}_k\ldots\bar{a}_1\bar{b}_1\sqrt{U}\,\bar{a}_o\bar{b}_o.$$

The following result is our main technical lemma. Note that, in the case where ψ = false, it states that a formula that forks in a particular way also quasi-divides.

Lemma 2.8 (Broom Lemma). Let $\sqrt{\subseteq} \sqrt[1i]{}$ be a forking relation with left extension over some set U. Suppose that

$$\vartheta(\bar{x};\bar{a}) \vDash \psi(\bar{x};\bar{c}) \lor \bigvee_{i < n} \varphi_i(\bar{x};\bar{b}^i)$$

and there are indiscernible sequences $\beta_i = (\bar{b}_j^i)_{j < \omega}$ over U such that

- $\bar{b}_{o}^{i} = \bar{b}^{i}$ and { $\varphi_{i}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{i}^{i}) \mid j < \omega$ } is k-inconsistent, for every i < n,
- $\bar{b}^i_j \sqrt{U} \beta[\langle i] \bar{b}^i[\langle j], \text{ for all } i < n \text{ and } 0 < j < \omega,$

• $\bar{c} \sqrt{U} \beta[< n]$.

Then there exist a number $m < \omega$ and tuples $\bar{a}_0, \ldots, \bar{a}_{m-1} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ such that

$$\bigwedge_{i < m} \vartheta(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_i) \vDash \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \quad and \quad \bar{a}_i \equiv_U \bar{a}, \quad for \ all \ i < m.$$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on *n*. For n = 0, there is nothing to do. For the inductive step, suppose that we have already shown the claim for *n*. We aim to prove it for n + 1. According to Proposition F4.2.18, $\bar{c} \sqrt{U} \beta_0 \dots \beta_n$ implies that each sequence β_i is indiscernible over $U \cup \bar{c}$. Consequently, we can use Lemma 2.7 with $\bar{a} \coloneqq \beta_0 \dots \beta_{n-1}$ and $\beta \coloneqq \beta_n$ to construct a sequence $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i < k}$ such that

- $\alpha_{o} = \beta_{o} \dots \beta_{n-1}$,
- $\alpha_i \bar{b}_i^n \equiv_{U\bar{c}} \alpha_0 \bar{b}_0^n$, for all i < k,
- $\bar{c}\alpha_{k-1}\bar{b}_{k-1}^n\ldots\alpha_{i+1}\bar{b}_{i+1}^n\sqrt{U}\alpha_i\bar{b}_i^n$, for all i < k.

For each j < k, we choose an automorphism $\pi_j \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_{U\bar{c}}$ such that $\pi_j(\alpha_0 \bar{b}_0^n) = \alpha_j \bar{b}_j^n$. Then

$$\vartheta(\bar{x};\pi_j(\bar{a})) \vDash \psi(\bar{x};\bar{c}) \lor \bigvee_{i < n+1} \varphi_i(\bar{x};\pi_j(\bar{b}^i)).$$

Consequently,

$$\bigwedge_{j < k} \vartheta(\bar{x}; \pi_j(\bar{a})) \vDash$$
$$\bigwedge_{j < k} \Big[\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \lor \bigvee_{i < n} \varphi_i(\bar{x}; \pi_j(\bar{b}^i)) \lor \varphi_n(\bar{x}; \pi_j(\bar{b}^n)) \Big].$$

This implies that

$$\bigwedge_{j < k} \vartheta(\bar{x}; \pi_j(\bar{a})) \land \neg \Big[\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \lor \bigvee_{i < n} \bigvee_{j < k} \varphi_i(\bar{x}; \pi_j(\bar{b}^i)) \Big]$$
$$\vDash \bigwedge_{j < k} \varphi_n(\bar{x}; \pi_j(\bar{b}^n)) .$$

Since { $\varphi_n(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_j^n) \mid j < \omega$ } is *k*-inconsistent and $\pi_j(\bar{b}^n) = \bar{b}_j^n$, it follows that the formula

$$\bigwedge_{j < k} \vartheta(\bar{x}; \pi_j(\bar{a})) \land \neg \Big[\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \lor \bigvee_{i < n} \bigvee_{j < k} \varphi_i(\bar{x}; \pi_j(\bar{b}^i)) \Big]$$

is inconsistent. Hence,

$$\bigwedge_{j < k} \vartheta(\bar{x}; \pi_j(\bar{a})) \vDash \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}) \lor \bigvee_{i < n} \bigvee_{j < k} \varphi_i(\bar{x}; \pi_j(\bar{b}^i)).$$

For $s \leq k$, set

$$\psi_s(\bar{x};\bar{c}^s) \coloneqq \psi(\bar{x};\bar{c}) \lor \bigvee_{i < n} \bigvee_{s \leq j < k} \varphi_i(\bar{x};\pi_j(\bar{b}^i)).$$

By induction on *s*, we will find tuples $\bar{a}_0, \ldots, \bar{a}_{m-1}$ such that

$$\bigwedge_{i < m} \vartheta(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_i) \vDash \psi_s(\bar{x}; \bar{c}^s) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{a}_i \equiv_U \bar{a}, \quad \text{for all } i < m.$$

Then the statement of the lemma will follow for s = k. For s = 0, we can take the tuples $\pi_i(\bar{a})$ from above. For the inductive step, suppose that

$$\bigwedge_{i < m} \vartheta(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_i) \vDash \psi_s(\bar{x}; \bar{c}^s) \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{a}_i \equiv_U \bar{a}.$$

Note that

$$\psi_s(\bar{x};\bar{c}^s) \equiv \psi_{s+1}(\bar{x};\bar{c}^{s+1}) \vee \bigvee_{i < n} \varphi_i(\bar{x};\pi_s(\bar{b}^i))$$

and the sequences $\pi_s(\beta_i)$ satisfy

- $\pi_s(\bar{b}_o^i) = \pi_s(\bar{b}^i)$ and $\{\varphi_i(\bar{x}; \pi_s(\bar{b}_j^i)) \mid j < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent, for every i < n,
- $\pi_s(\bar{b}_j^i) \ \sqrt{U} \ \pi_s(\beta[\langle i]) \pi_s(\bar{b}^i[\langle j]), \text{ for all } i < n \text{ and } j < \omega.$
Furthermore, $\bar{b}^{\circ} \dots \bar{b}^{n-1} \subseteq \beta_{\circ} \dots \beta_{n-1} = \alpha_{\circ}$ implies

 $\pi_j(\bar{b}^\circ)\ldots\pi_j(\bar{b}^{n-1})\subseteq\pi_j(\alpha_\circ)=\alpha_j.$

Consequently, we have $\bar{c}^{s+1} \subseteq \bar{c}\alpha_{k-1} \dots \alpha_{s+1}$ and

$$\bar{c}\alpha_{k-1}\ldots\alpha_{s+1}\sqrt{U}\alpha_s$$
 implies $\bar{c}^{s+1}\sqrt{U}\pi_s(\beta[< n]).$

Therefore, we can use the inductive hypothesis on *n* to obtain a number $m' < \omega$ and tuples \bar{a}_{ij} , for i < m and j < m', such that $\bar{a}_{ij} \equiv_U \bar{a}_i \equiv_U \bar{a}$ and

$$\bigwedge_{j < m'} \bigwedge_{i < m} \vartheta(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_{ij}) \vDash \psi_{s+1}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}^{s+1}).$$

Remark. Note that we do *not* require that $\bar{b}_{o}^{i} \sqrt{U} \beta[\langle i \rangle]$. This will be essential in the applications below.

Recall that the Lemma of Kim states that, in a simple theory, every $\sqrt[f]{-Morley}$ sequence is a witness for dividing. The next result contains a similar statement for certain $\sqrt{-Morley}$ sequences.

Lemma 2.9. Let $\sqrt{\subseteq} \sqrt[1i]{}$ be a forking relation, $U a \sqrt{-extension}$ base, and $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ a formula without the array property. For every tuple \bar{b} such that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ divides over U, there exists a model \mathfrak{M} containing U and a global type \mathfrak{p} extending $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}/M)$ such that \mathfrak{p} is $\sqrt{-free}$ over U and every sequence generated by \mathfrak{p} over M witnesses that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ divides over U.

Proof. Since $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ divides over U, there exists a number $k < \omega$ and an indiscernible sequence $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ over U such that $\bar{b}_o = \bar{b}$ and the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i) \mid i < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent. Let \mathfrak{N} be a $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -saturated and strongly $(|T| \oplus |U|)^+$ -homogeneous model containing U. We can use Lemma E5.3.9 to extend β to an indiscernible sequence $\beta' = (\bar{b}_i)_{i < \lambda}$ over U of length $\lambda := (2^{|T| \oplus |N|})^+$. As $\beta' \sqrt{U} U$, we find a sequence $\beta'' = (\bar{b}_i')_{i < \lambda}$ such that $\beta'' \equiv_U \beta'$ and $\beta'' \sqrt{U} N$.

As there are at most $2^{|T|\oplus |N|} < \lambda$ types over *N*, there exists an infinite subset $I \subseteq \lambda$ such that every tuple \bar{b}_i'' with $i \in I$ has the same type over *N*.

Let \mathfrak{q}_0 be this type and let $\mathfrak{M} \leq \mathfrak{N}$ be some model containing *U* of size $|M| \leq |T| \oplus |U|$. Choose a strictly increasing function $g : \omega \to I$ and set $\alpha := (\bar{b}''_{g(i)})_{i < \omega}$.

Let \mathfrak{q} be the type of α over N. Since $\beta'' \sqrt{U} N$ and $\sqrt{\subseteq} \sqrt[4]{i}$, it follows that \mathfrak{q}_0 and \mathfrak{q} are $\sqrt[4]{i}$ -free over U. By Proposition F4.2.20 (5), this implies that they are $\sqrt[8]{i}$ -free over M. By saturation of \mathfrak{N} , there exists a sequence $(\alpha_i)_{i < \omega}$ in N that is generated by \mathfrak{q} over M. By Lemma F2.4.14, $(\alpha_i)_{i < \omega}$ is indiscernible over M. Suppose that $\alpha_i = (\bar{a}_n^i)_{n < \omega}$.

Let *i*, *j*, *k* < ω . As \mathfrak{q} is $\sqrt[s]{-\text{free over } M}$ it follows by transitivity that

$$\alpha[>k] \sqrt[s]{}_M \alpha[\leq k].$$

Since \bar{a}_i^k and \bar{a}_i^k both realise $q_0 \upharpoonright M\alpha[< k]$, we furthermore have

$$\bar{a}_i^k \equiv_{M\alpha[< k]} \bar{a}_j^k \,.$$

Consequently, $\alpha[>k] \sqrt[s]{M\alpha[<k]} \alpha_k$ implies that

 $\bar{a}_i^k \equiv_{M\alpha[< k]\alpha[> k]} \bar{a}_j^k.$

As in Lemma F4.4.4, it follows that

$$(\bar{a}_{\eta(k)}^k)_{k<\omega} \equiv_M (\bar{a}_{o}^k)_{k<\omega}, \text{ for all } \eta:\omega\to\omega.$$

By Proposition F2.4.3, \mathfrak{q}_0 has some global extension \mathfrak{q}_1 that is $\sqrt{-free}$ over U. Fix a tuple \bar{b}' realising $\mathfrak{q}_1 \upharpoonright M$. Then $\bar{b}' \equiv_U \bar{b}$ and there exists an automorphism $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_U$ with $\pi(\bar{b}') = \bar{b}$. Applying π to \mathfrak{q}_1 we obtain a global type \mathfrak{p} extending tp $(\bar{b}/\pi[M])$ that is $\sqrt{-free}$ over U. We claim that this type \mathfrak{p} and the model $M' := \pi[M]$ have the desired properties.

As q_1 is $\sqrt{-free}$ over U, so is \mathfrak{p} . By base monotony it follows that \mathfrak{p} is $\sqrt{-free}$ over M. Hence, consider a sequence $(\bar{c}_i)_{i < \omega}$ generated by \mathfrak{p} over M. As each tuple \bar{c}_i realises $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright U = \mathfrak{q}_1 \upharpoonright U$, we have $\bar{c}_i \equiv_U \bar{b}$. Set $\bar{d}_i := \pi^{-1}(\bar{c}_i)$. Then the sequence $(\bar{d}_i)_{i < \omega}$ is generated by \mathfrak{q}_1 over M. Since so is the sequence $(\bar{a}_o^i)_{i < \omega}$, it follows by Lemma F2.4.14 that

$$(\bar{d}_i)_{i<\omega}\equiv_M (\bar{a}^i_{o})_{i<\omega}.$$

Note that $\alpha_i \equiv_M \alpha$ implies that $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_n^i) \mid n < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent. If the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_o^i) \mid i < \omega\}$ were consistent, the family $(\bar{a}_j^i)_{i,j < \omega}$ would form a *k*-array. Since the formula φ does not have the array property, the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_o^i) \mid i < \omega\}$ is therefore inconsistent. By indiscernibility, it follows that it is *l*-inconsistent, for some *l*. Hence, so is the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_i) \mid i < \omega\}$ and, applying the automorphism π , also the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_i) \mid i < \omega\}$.

Using these lemmas we can derive the first step of our proof that forking equals dividing over certain sets.

Lemma 2.10. Let *T* be a theory without the array property and $\sqrt{\subseteq} \sqrt[1i]{a}$ forking relation. Then forking implies quasi-dividing over every $\sqrt{-extension}$ base *U*.

Proof. Consider a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a})$ that forks over U. By Lemma F2.4.4, there are formulae $\psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i)$ that divide over U such that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}) \models \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i)$. By Lemma 2.9, there are models \mathfrak{M}_i and global types \mathfrak{p}_i , for i < n, such that \mathfrak{p}_i extends $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{b}_i/M)$, \mathfrak{p}_i is $\sqrt{-free}$ over U, and every sequence generated by \mathfrak{p}_i over M witnesses that $\psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i)$ divides over U. For i < n, we choose a sequence $\beta_i = (\bar{b}_j^i)_{j < \omega}$ generated by \mathfrak{p}_i as follows. We start with $\bar{b}_o^i := \bar{b}_i$, which realises $\mathfrak{p}_i \upharpoonright M$. For j > o, we choose a tuple \bar{b}_i^i realising $\mathfrak{p}_i \upharpoonright M\beta[< i]\bar{b}^i[< j]$. It follows that

- $\bar{b}_{o}^{i} = \bar{b}_{i}$ and the set { $\varphi_{i}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{j}^{i}) \mid j < \omega$ } is k_{i} -inconsistent, for every i < n,
- $\bar{b}_{j}^{i} \sqrt{U} \beta[\langle i] \bar{b}^{i}[\langle j]$, for all i < n and $0 < j < \omega$,
- $\varnothing \sqrt{U} \beta[< n].$

By Lemma 2.8, we can therefore find tuples $\bar{a}_i \equiv_U \bar{a}$, for i < m, such that

$$\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{a}) \vDash \text{false} \lor \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_i(\bar{x};\bar{b}_i) \text{ implies } \bigwedge_{i < m} \varphi(\bar{x};\bar{a}_i) \vDash \text{false}.$$

Consequently, $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a})$ quasi-divides over U.

Strict Lascar invariance

Above we have found a criterion for the fact that forking implies quasidividing over a given set. It remains to find conditions showing that quasi-dividing implies dividing. To do so, we introduce the following combination of the relations $\sqrt[li]{}$ and $\sqrt[f]{}$.

Definition 2.11. For sets $A, B, U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, we define

 $A \sqrt[\operatorname{fli}]{}_U B : \operatorname{iff} A \sqrt[\operatorname{li}]{}_U B \text{ and } B \sqrt[\operatorname{fli}]{}_U A,$ $A \sqrt[\operatorname{sli}]{}_U B : \operatorname{iff} A (\sqrt[\operatorname{fli}]{}_U B).$

Lemma 2.12. $\bar{a} \sqrt[\text{sli}]{U} B$ if, and only if, $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ has a global extension \mathfrak{p} that is Lascar-invariant over U and such that

$$BC \sqrt[f]{U} \bar{a}', \text{ for all } C \subseteq \mathbb{M} \text{ and all } \bar{a}' \text{ realising } \mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright UBC.$$

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Let \mathfrak{p} be an extension of $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/UB)$ as above. To show that $\bar{a} * (\sqrt[f]{U})_U B$, we fix some set $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. Let \bar{a}' be a tuple realising $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright UBC$. Then $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB} \bar{a}$ and, by choice of \mathfrak{p} , we have $\bar{a} \sqrt[l]{U} BC$ and $BC \sqrt[f]{U} \bar{a}$. This implies that $\bar{a} \sqrt[f]{U} BC$.

(⇒) Let $\bar{a}^* (\sqrt[fli]{}_U B$. By Proposition F2.4.3, tp (\bar{a}/UB) has a global extension p that is $\sqrt[fli]{}_{-}$ free over U. As $\sqrt[fli]{}_{-} \subseteq \sqrt[li]{}_{+}$, it is also Lascar invariant over U. For the second condition, suppose that $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ and let \bar{a}' be a realisation of $\mathfrak{p} \upharpoonright UBC$. Then $\bar{a}' \sqrt[fli]{}_U BC$ implies $BC \sqrt[f]{}_U \bar{a}'$.

Lemma 2.13. The relation $\frac{\text{fli}}{\sqrt{}}$ satisfies (INV), (MON), (NOR), and (FIN).

Proof. (INV) follows from invariance of $\sqrt[li]{}$ and $\sqrt[f]{}$.

(MON) Suppose that $A \quad \bigvee_{U}^{\text{fli}} B$ and let $A_{\circ} \subseteq A$ and $B_{\circ} \subseteq B$. Then $A \quad \bigvee_{U}^{\text{li}} B$ and $B \quad \bigvee_{U}^{\text{f}} A$ and it follows that $A_{\circ} \quad \bigvee_{U}^{\text{li}} B_{\circ}$ and $B_{\circ} \quad \bigvee_{U}^{\text{fli}} A_{\circ}$. Hence, $A_{\circ} \quad \bigcup_{U}^{\text{fli}} B_{\circ}$.

(NOR) Suppose that $A \sqrt[f]{U} B$. Then $A \sqrt[l]{U} B$ and $B \sqrt[f]{U} A$ and it follows that $AU \sqrt[l]{U} BU$ and $BU \sqrt[f]{U} AU$. Hence, $AU \sqrt[f]{U} BU$.

(FIN) Suppose that $A_{\circ} \bigvee^{\text{fli}}_{U} B$, for all finite $A_{\circ} \subseteq A$. Then $A_{\circ} \bigvee^{\text{li}}_{U} B$ and $B \bigvee^{\text{f}}_{U} A_{\circ}$, for all finite $A_{\circ} \subseteq A$. This implies that $A \bigvee^{\text{li}}_{U} B$ and $B \bigvee^{\text{f}}_{U} A$. Hence, $A \bigvee^{\text{fli}}_{U} B$.

Corollary 2.14. The relation $\sqrt[\text{sli}]$ satisfies (INV), (MON), (NOR), (FIN), and (EXT).

Proof. A closer look at the proof of Proposition F2.4.5 reveals that, to establish the axioms (INV), (MON), (NOR), (FIN), and (EXT) for the relation $\sqrt[*]{}$, we only need to assume that $\sqrt{}$ satisfies (INV), (MON), (NOR), and (FIN).

The reason we are interested in the relation $\sqrt[sli]{}$ is the following variant of the Lemma of Kim for theories with the array property.

Lemma 2.15. Let T be a theory without the array property, $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ a formula that divides over U, and $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ a sequence such that

 $\bar{b}_n \equiv_U \bar{b}$ and $\bar{b}_n \sqrt[\mathrm{sli}]{U} \bar{b}[< n]$, for all $n < \omega$.

Then $\{ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_n) \mid n < \omega \}$ is inconsistent.

Proof. Applying a suitable automorphism, we may assume that $\bar{b}_{\circ} = \bar{b}$. Since the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ divides over U, there exists an indiscernible sequence $\alpha = (\bar{a}_i)_{i < \omega}$ such that $\bar{a}_{\circ} = \bar{b}$ and $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_i) \mid i < \omega\}$ is *k*-inconsistent, for some $k < \omega$. By induction on $n < \omega$, we construct a family $(\alpha_i)_{i < n}$ of sequences $\alpha_i = (\bar{a}_i^j)_{i < \omega}$ such that

- each α_j is indiscernible over $U\alpha[\langle j]\bar{b}_{j+1}\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1}$,
- $\alpha_j \equiv_U \alpha$, and $\bar{a}_o^j = \bar{b}_j$.

For n = 1, we can take the sequence $\alpha_0 := \alpha$. For the inductive step, suppose we have already constructed a family $(\alpha'_j)_{j < n}$ of size *n*. Since

$$\bar{b}_n \sqrt[\mathrm{sli}]{U} \bar{b}[< n],$$

we can use (EXT) to find a family $(\alpha_i'')_{i < n}$ such that

$$\alpha''[< n] \equiv_{U\bar{b}[< n]} \alpha'[< n] \text{ and } \bar{b}_n \sqrt[\operatorname{sli}]_U \alpha''[< n].$$

Since $\bar{b}_n \equiv_U \bar{b}$, there is some indiscernible sequence $\alpha'_n \equiv_U \alpha$ starting with \bar{b}_n . Note that $\bar{b}_n \sqrt[\text{sli}]_U \alpha''[\langle n]$ implies that $\alpha''[\langle n] \sqrt[\text{d}]_U \bar{b}_n$. By Lemma F3.1.3, we can therefore find a sequence $\alpha''_n \equiv_{U\bar{b}_n} \alpha'_n$ such that α''_n is indiscernible over $\alpha''[\langle n]$. We claim that the family $(\alpha''_i)_{i < n+1}$ has the desired properties.

Let i < n. By construction the sequence α''_i is indiscernible over $U\alpha''[\langle i]\bar{b}_{i+1}\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1}$. Furthermore, we have $\bar{b}_n \sqrt[|i|]{U} \alpha''[\langle n]$, which implies that

$$\bar{b}_n \sqrt[\mathrm{li}]{_{U\alpha''[< i]\bar{b}_{i+1}\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1}}} \alpha''_i.$$

By Proposition F4.2.18, it therefore follows that α''_i is also indiscernible over $U\alpha''[\langle i]\bar{b}_{i+1}\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1}\bar{b}_n$. Finally, the sequence α''_n is indiscernible over $U\alpha''[\langle n]$ by construction.

Having constructed sequences $(\alpha_j)_{j < n}$ of length *n*, for every $n < \omega$, it follows by compactness that there also exists an infinite family $(\alpha_j)_{j < \omega}$ with the same properties.

To conclude the proof suppose, towards a contradiction, that the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_n) \mid n < \omega\}$ is consistent. For $\eta : \omega \to \omega$ and $n < \omega$, a straightforward induction on *i* shows that

$$\bar{a}_{\eta(0)}^{0}\ldots\bar{a}_{\eta(n-1)}^{n-1}\equiv_{U}\bar{a}_{\eta(0)}^{0}\ldots\bar{a}_{\eta(n-i-1)}^{n-i-1}\bar{a}_{0}^{n-i}\ldots\bar{a}_{0}^{n-1}.$$

This implies that

$$(\bar{a}^i_{\eta(i)})_{i<\omega} \equiv_U (\bar{a}^i_{\circ})_{i<\omega} = (\bar{b}_i)_{i<\omega}.$$

Consequently, { $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_{\eta(i)}^{i}) | i < \omega$ } is consistent, for every $\eta : \omega \to \omega$. Furthermore, $\alpha_{j} \equiv_{U} \alpha$ implies that { $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}_{n}^{i}) | n < \omega$ } is *k*-inconsistent, for some *k*. Consequently, the family $(\bar{a}_{i}^{j})_{i,j<\omega}$ forms a *k*-array for φ . A contradiction. We obtain our first result for forking equalling dividing over $\sqrt[sli]$ -bases.

Proposition 2.16. Let T be a theory without the array property and U a $\sqrt[sli]{-base}$. Then forking equals dividing over U.

Proof. Suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a})$ forks over U. Then there exist formulae $\psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i)$ that divide over U such that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}) \models \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i)$. Set $\bar{c} := \bar{a}\bar{b}_0 \dots \bar{b}_{n-1}$ and let $\mathfrak{p} := \operatorname{tp}(\bar{c}/U)$. Since $\bar{c} \stackrel{\operatorname{sli}}{\bigvee}_U U$ there exists a global type \mathfrak{q} extending \mathfrak{p} that is $\stackrel{\operatorname{fli}}{\bigvee}$ -free over U. Let \mathfrak{M} be a model containing U and let $\gamma = (\bar{c}_i)_{i < \omega}$ be a sequence generated by \mathfrak{q} over M. Note that, by Proposition F4.2.20 (5), \mathfrak{q} is $\stackrel{\mathrm{s}}{\checkmark}$ -free over M. Hence, it follows by Lemma F2.4.14, that γ is a $\stackrel{\operatorname{sli}}{\bigvee}$ -Morley sequence. Suppose that $\bar{c}_i = \bar{a}^i \bar{b}_0^i \dots \bar{b}_{n-1}^i$. We claim that the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a}^i) \mid i < \omega\}$ is inconsistent. Since γ is indiscernible and $\bar{a}^i \equiv_U \bar{a}$, this implies that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{a})$ divides over U.

For a contradiction, suppose that there exists a tuple *d* realising the above set. Then there exists a function $g : \omega \rightarrow [n]$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \psi_{g(i)}(\bar{d}; \bar{b}_{g(i)}^i), \quad \text{for all } i < \omega.$$

Choose an infinite subset $I \subseteq \omega$ and an index k < n such that g(i) = k, for all $i \in I$. It follows that $\{\psi_k(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_k^i) \mid i < \omega\}$ is consistent. This contradicts Lemma 2.15

It remains to prove that $\sqrt{-\text{extension bases are also } \sqrt[\text{sli}]{-\text{bases. We start}}}$ with a technical lemma.

Lemma 2.17. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a forking relation and U a $\sqrt{}$ -base such that forking implies quasi-dividing over U.

(a) Every type \mathfrak{p} over U has a global extension \mathfrak{q} that is $\sqrt{-free}$ over U and such that

$$C \sqrt[f]{U} \bar{a}$$
, for all $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ and all \bar{a} realising $\mathfrak{q} \upharpoonright UC$.

(b) Every type \mathfrak{p} over U has a global extension \mathfrak{q} that is $\sqrt[f]{-free}$ over U and such that

$$C \sqrt{U} \bar{a}$$
, for all $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ and all \bar{a} realising $q \upharpoonright UC$.

Proof. (a) Fix a tuple \bar{a} realising \mathfrak{p} and set

$$\Phi(\bar{x}) \coloneqq \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}) \cup \{ \neg \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \mid \bar{b} \subseteq \mathbb{M}, \ \varphi(\bar{a}; \bar{y}) \sqrt[f]{-\text{forks over } U} \} \\ \cup \{ \neg \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \mid \bar{b} \subseteq \mathbb{M}, \ \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \sqrt{-\text{forks over } U} \}.$$

By (DEF), every global type containing Φ has the desired properties. Hence, it remains to show that Φ is satisfiable.

For a contradiction, suppose otherwise. Then there exist formulae $\varphi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{y}_i)$, i < m, and $\psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{z}_i)$, i < n, and corresponding parameters $\bar{b}_0, \ldots, \bar{b}_{m-1}, \bar{b}'_0, \ldots, \bar{b}'_{n-1}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{p} \vDash \bigvee_{i < m} \varphi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i) \vee \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{b}'_i),$$

each $\varphi_i(\bar{a}; \bar{y}) \sqrt[f]{}$ -forks over U, and each $\psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{b}'_i) \sqrt{}$ -forks over U. As the disjunction $\bigvee_{i < m} \varphi_i(\bar{a}; \bar{y}_i)$ also $\sqrt[f]{}$ -forks over U, we may assume that m = 1.

Since forking implies quasi-dividing over U, there are parameters $\bar{a}_0, \ldots, \bar{a}_{k-1}$ such that $\bar{a}_i \equiv_U \bar{a}$ and the set $\{\varphi_0(\bar{a}_i; \bar{y}) \mid i < k\}$ is inconsistent. Set $\bar{c} := \bar{a}_0 \ldots \bar{a}_{k-1}$ and $\mathfrak{r}(\bar{x}_0, \ldots, \bar{x}_{k-1}) := \operatorname{tp}(\bar{c}/U)$. Then

$$\mathfrak{r} \upharpoonright \bar{x}_j \vDash \varphi_{\circ}(\bar{x}_j; \bar{b}_{\circ}) \lor \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_i(\bar{x}_j; \bar{b}'_i) \, .$$

Hence,

$$\mathfrak{r} \vDash \bigwedge_{j < k} \left[\varphi_{\circ}(\bar{x}_{j}; \bar{b}_{\circ}) \lor \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_{i}(\bar{x}_{j}; \bar{b}'_{i}) \right].$$

Consequently,

$$\mathfrak{r} \models \neg \bigwedge_{j < k} \varphi_{\circ}(\bar{x}_{j}; \bar{b}_{\circ})$$
 implies that $\mathfrak{r} \models \bigvee_{j < k} \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_{i}(\bar{x}_{j}; \bar{b}'_{i})$

Since *U* is a $\sqrt{-base}$, we have $\bar{c} \sqrt{U} U$. Hence, there is some tuple $\bar{c}' \equiv_U \bar{c}$ such that $\bar{c}' \sqrt{U} \bar{b}'_0 \dots \bar{b}'_{n-1}$. As $\bar{c}' = \bar{c}'_0 \dots \bar{c}'_{k-1}$ realises \mathfrak{r} , there are indices j < k and i < n such that $\mathbb{M} \models \psi_i(\bar{c}'_j; \bar{b}'_i)$. But this implies that $\bar{c}'_j \sqrt{U} \bar{b}'_i$. A contradiction.

(b) The proof is similar to the one above. Fix a tuple \bar{a} realising p and set

$$\Phi(\bar{x}) \coloneqq \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}) \cup \{ \neg \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \mid \bar{b} \subseteq \mathbb{M}, \ \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \sqrt[f]{-\text{forks over } U} \}$$
$$\cup \{ \neg \psi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \mid \bar{b} \subseteq \mathbb{M}, \ \psi(\bar{a}; \bar{y}) \sqrt{-\text{forks over } U} \}.$$

Suppose that Φ is inconsistent. Then we can find formulae $\varphi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{y}_i)$, i < m, and $\psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{z}_i)$, i < n, and parameters $\bar{b}_0, \ldots, \bar{b}_{m-1}, \bar{b}'_0, \ldots, \bar{b}'_{n-1}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{p} \vDash \bigvee_{i < m} \varphi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i) \vee \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{b}'_i),$$

each $\varphi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i) \sqrt[f]{-\text{forks over } U}$, and each $\psi_i(\bar{a}; \bar{z}_i) \sqrt{-\text{forks over } U}$. As above, we may assume that m = 1.

Since forking implies quasi-dividing over U, there are parameters $\bar{c}_0, \ldots, \bar{c}_{k-1}$ such that $\bar{c}_j \equiv_U \bar{b}_0$ and the set $\{\varphi_0(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_j) \mid j < k\}$ is inconsistent. Choose tuples \bar{d}_{ji} such that

$$\bar{c}_j \bar{d}_{j0} \dots \bar{d}_{j(n-1)} \equiv_U \bar{b}_0 \bar{b}'_0 \dots \bar{b}'_{n-1}, \quad \text{for } j < k.$$

Since the type \mathfrak{p} is over *U*, it follows by invariance that

$$\mathfrak{p} \models \varphi_{\circ}(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_j) \lor \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_{ji}), \text{ for all } j < k.$$

As above, this implies that

$$\mathfrak{p} \vDash \bigvee_{j < k} \bigvee_{i < n} \psi_i(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_{ji}) \,.$$

Set $\bar{d} := (\bar{d}_{ji})_{j < k, i < n}$. As U is a $\sqrt{-base}$, we have $\bar{d} \sqrt{U} U$. Consequently, there is some tuple $\bar{d}' \equiv_U \bar{d}$ such that

$$\bar{d}' \sqrt{U} \bar{a}$$

Since \bar{a} realises \mathfrak{p} , there are indices j < k and i < n such that

$$\mathbb{M} \vDash \psi_i(\bar{a}; \bar{d}'_{ji}).$$

But this implies that $\bar{d}'_{ii} \swarrow_U \bar{a}$. A contradiction.

Corollary 2.18. Let T be a theory without the array property and U a $\sqrt[li]{-base}$ such that forking implies quasi-dividing over U. Then U is a $\sqrt[sli]{-base}$.

Proof. Fix a tuple $\bar{a} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. We can use Lemma 2.17 to find a global extension \mathfrak{q} of $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}/U)$ that is $\sqrt[1]{}$ -free over U and such that $C \sqrt[f]{}_U \bar{a}'$, for all sets $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ and all tuples \bar{a}' realising $\mathfrak{q} \upharpoonright UC$. By Lemma 2.12, this implies that $\bar{a} \sqrt[\operatorname{sli}]_U U$.

Corollary 2.19. Let T be a theory without the array property and $\sqrt{\subseteq} \sqrt[1i]{}$ a forking relation. Every $\sqrt{-extension}$ base is a $\sqrt[sli]{-base}$.

Proof. Let *U* be a $\sqrt{-}$ extension base. We have proved in Lemma 2.10 that forking implies quasi-dividing over *U*. Furthermore, since $\sqrt{\subseteq} \sqrt[1]{}$ and *U* is a $\sqrt{-}$ base, it is also a $\sqrt[1]{}$ -base. Consequently, the claim follows by Corollary 2.18.

Proposition 2.20. Let T be a theory without the array property. Then forking equals dividing over every set that is a $\sqrt{-\text{extension base}}$, for some forking relation $\sqrt{\subseteq \frac{1i}{\sqrt{-\infty}}}$.

Proof. By Corollary 2.19, every $\sqrt{-\text{extension base is a } \sqrt[\text{sli}]{-\text{base. Hence,}}}$ the claim follows by Proposition 2.16.

Corollary 2.21. *Let T be a theory without the array property. Then forking equals dividing over every model M.*

Proof. We have seen in Lemma 2.3 (c) that every model is a $\sqrt[u]{-extension}$ base. Consequently, the claim follows by Proposition 2.20.

Combining the above results we obtain the following characterisation of those sets over which forking equals dividing.

Theorem 2.22 (Chernikov, Kaplan). Let *T* be a theory without the array property and $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be a set. The following statements are equivalent.

- (1) Forking equals dividing over U.
- (2) U is a $\sqrt[f]{-base}$.
- (3) $\sqrt[f]{}$ has left extension over U.

Proof. The implications (1) \Rightarrow (2) and (1) \Rightarrow (3) follow by Lemma 2.4. Conversely, suppose that (2) or (3) holds. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ be a formula that forks over *U*. To show that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ also divides over *U*, we fix a model \mathfrak{M} containing *U*.

If (2) holds, we have $M \sqrt[f]{U} U$ which, by (EXT), implies that there is some model $M' \equiv_U M$ with $M' \sqrt[f]{U} \bar{b}$.

If (3) holds, we have $U \sqrt[f]{U} \bar{b}$ which, by (LEXT), implies that there is some model $M' \equiv_U M$ with $M' \sqrt[f]{U} \bar{b}$.

Thus, in both cases we have found a model M' such that $M' \sqrt[f]{U} \bar{b}$. We claim that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ also forks over M'. Since forking equals dividing over models, it then follows that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ divides over M'. In particular, it divides over U.

To prove the claim suppose, for a contradiction, that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ does not fork over M'. Then we have $\bar{a} \sqrt[f]{M'} \bar{b}$, for every tuple \bar{a} satisfying $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$. By (LTR), this implies that $\bar{a}M' \sqrt[f]{U} \bar{b}$, which contradicts the fact that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ forks over U.

Corollary 2.23. *Let T be a theory without the array property.*

- (a) A set U is a $\sqrt[\text{sli}]$ -base if, and only if, it is a $\sqrt[\text{li}]$ -base.
- (b) Forking equals dividing over every $\sqrt[li]{-base}$.

Proof. (b) Let U be a $\sqrt[1]{}$ -base. Since $\sqrt[1]{} \subseteq \sqrt[f]{}$, it is also a $\sqrt[f]{}$ -base. By Theorem 2.22, it follows that forking equals dividing over U.

(a) The implication (\Rightarrow) follows by the inclusion $\sqrt[sli]{\subseteq \sqrt[li]{}}$. For (\Leftarrow) , let *U* be a $\sqrt[li]{}$ -base. By (b), forking equals dividing over *U*. Since dividing implies quasi-dividing, it follows that forking implies quasi-dividing over *U*. By Corollary 2.18, it follows that *U* is a $\sqrt[sli]{}$ -base.

3. The Independence Theorem

The Independence Theorem contains a characterisation of simple theories in terms of a certain property of the forking relation. A weaker version of this property also holds for theories without the array property. In this section we will present the weak version, use it to derive the strong one, and show that the latter characterises simple theories.

The chain condition

Before turning to the Independence Theorem itself, we first consider a closely related property called the *chain condition*.

Definition 3.1. A preforking relation $\sqrt{}$ satisfies the *chain condition* over a set $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ if, for every indiscernible sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i \in I}$ over U and every set of formulae $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ such that, for some $i_0 \in I$, the set $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{i_0})$ does not $\sqrt{-}$ fork over U, the union $\bigcup_{i \in I} \Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i)$ also does not $\sqrt{-}$ fork over U.

The chain condition can be characterised is several equivalent ways. The following list is somewhat parallel to the characterisation of dividing in Lemma F3.1.3.

Proposition 3.2. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a forking relation and $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ a set of parameters. The following statements are equivalent.

- (1) $\sqrt{}$ satisfies the chain condition over U.
- (2) If a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ does not $\sqrt{-fork}$ over U and $\bar{b} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}'$, then $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \wedge \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}')$ also does not $\sqrt{-fork}$ over U.

- (3) For every cardinal λ, there exists a cardinal κ such that, for every partial type p over U and every family (q_i)_{i<κ} of partial types of size |q_i| < λ such that no p ∪ q_i √-forks over U, there are indices i < j such that p ∪ q_i ∪ q_j does not √-fork over U.
- (4) For every indiscernible sequence $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ over U and every tuple $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} \bar{b}_0$, there exists a sequence $\beta' \equiv_{U\bar{b}_0} \beta$ such that β' is indiscernible over U \bar{a} and $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} \beta'$.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (3) By Corollary F4.2.9, there exists a cardinal κ such that, for every sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i < \kappa}$ of tuples of size $|\bar{b}_i| < \lambda$, there are indices i < j such that $\bar{b}_i \approx_U^{\text{ls}} \bar{b}_j$. Increasing κ , if necessary, we may ensure that κ is larger than the number of sets of formulae of size less than λ . We claim that this cardinal κ has the desired properties.

Let \mathfrak{p} and $(\mathfrak{q}_i)_{i < \kappa}$ be types as above. Then there exists a subset $I \subseteq \kappa$ of size $|I| = \kappa$, a set $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ of formulae (without parameters), and tuples $\bar{b}_i \in \mathbb{M}^{<\lambda}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{q}_i(\bar{x}) = \Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i), \text{ for all } i \in I.$$

By choice of κ , we can find indices i < j in I such that $\bar{b}_i \approx^{\text{ls}}_U \bar{b}_j$. We claim that the type

$$\mathfrak{p} \cup \mathfrak{q}_i \cup \mathfrak{q}_j = \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}) \cup \Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i) \cup \Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_j)$$

does not $\sqrt{-}$ fork over *U*.

For a contradiction, suppose otherwise. By compactness, we can then find finite sets $\Psi_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ and $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$ such that

$$\Psi_{o}(\bar{x}) \cup \Phi_{o}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{i}) \cup \Phi_{o}(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{j}) \quad \sqrt{-\text{forks over } U}.$$

Setting

$$\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{y}) \coloneqq \bigwedge \Psi_{o}(\bar{x}) \land \bigwedge \Phi_{o}(\bar{x};\bar{y}),$$

it follows that the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i) \wedge \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_j) \sqrt{-\text{forks over } U.}$ On the other hand, $\mathfrak{p} \cup \mathfrak{q}_i \vDash \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i)$ implies that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i)$ does not $\sqrt{-\text{fork}}$ over U. As $\bar{b}_i \approx^{\text{ls}}_U \bar{b}_j$, this contradicts (2).

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Let κ be the cardinal from (3) associated with $\lambda := |\Phi|^+$. Extending the sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i \in I}$ we may assume that $|I| \ge \kappa$. For $w \subseteq I$, set

$$\Phi_w \coloneqq \bigcup_{i \in w} \Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i)$$

By compactness, it is sufficient to show that there is no finite subset $w \subseteq I$ such that $\Phi_w \sqrt{-1}$ forks over U. We proceed by induction on |w|. For $w = \{i\}$, the claim holds since $\bar{b}_i \equiv_U \bar{b}_{i_0}$ and $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{i_0})$ does not $\sqrt{-fork}$ over U. Hence, suppose that n := |w| > 1. Let $F := [I]^{n-1}$. By inductive hypothesis, no set Φ_s with $s \in F \sqrt{-1}$ forks over U. Hence, we can use (3) to find indices $s \neq t \in F$ such that $\Phi_s \cup \Phi_t$ does not $\sqrt{-fork}$ over U. Choosing sets $u, v \in F$ such that ord(uv) = ord(st) and $w \subseteq u \cup v$, it follows by indiscernibility that $\Phi_w \subseteq \Phi_u \cup \Phi_v$ does not $\sqrt{-1}$ fork over U. (1) \Rightarrow (4) Set $\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') \coloneqq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}_{o}/U)$. We extend β to an indiscernible sequence $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i < \gamma}$ over U of length $\gamma \ge \exists_{\lambda^+}$ where $\lambda \coloneqq 2^{|T| \oplus |U| \oplus |\bar{b}_0|}$. By the chain condition, the union $\bigcup_{i < \gamma} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i)$ does not $\sqrt{-1}$ fork over U. Hence, there exists a tuple \bar{a}' realising $\bigcup_{i < y} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i)$ such that $\bar{a}' \sqrt{U} \beta$. Then $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}_o} \bar{a}$ and we can find a sequence $\beta' = (\bar{b}'_i)_{i < \gamma}$ such that $\bar{a}'\beta \equiv_{U\bar{b}_0} \bar{a}\beta'$. By Theorem E5.3.7 and choice of γ , there exists an indiscernible sequence $\beta'' = (\bar{b}''_n)_{n < \omega}$ over $U\bar{a}\bar{b}_0$ such that, for every $\bar{i} \in [\omega]^{<\omega}$, there is some $\bar{j} \in [\gamma]^{<\omega}$ with

$$\bar{b}^{\prime\prime}[\bar{\imath}] \equiv_{U\bar{a}\bar{b}_{o}} \bar{b}^{\prime}[\bar{\jmath}].$$

By finite character, $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} \bar{b}_{\circ}\beta'$ implies that $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} \bar{b}_{\circ}\beta''$. By choice of β'' we can find, for every $n < \omega$, some tuple $\bar{j} \in [\gamma]^n$ such that

$$\bar{b}_{\circ}\bar{b}_{\circ}^{\prime\prime}\ldots\bar{b}_{n-1}^{\prime\prime}\equiv_{U\bar{a}\bar{b}_{\circ}}\bar{b}_{\circ}\bar{b}^{\prime}[\bar{j}]\equiv_{U\bar{b}_{\circ}}\bar{b}_{\circ}\bar{b}[\bar{j}]\equiv_{U\bar{b}_{\circ}}\bar{b}_{\circ}\bar{b}_{1}\ldots\bar{b}_{n}.$$

This implies that $\bar{b}_{\circ}\beta'' \equiv_{U\bar{b}_{\circ}}\beta$. Hence, the sequence $\beta''' \coloneqq \bar{b}_{\circ}\beta''$ has the desired properties.

(4) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose that (2) does not hold. Then we can find a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ and an indiscernible sequence $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ over *U* such

that the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\circ})$ does not $\sqrt{-fork}$ over U, but the conjunction $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\circ}) \wedge \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{1})$ does. We choose a tuple $\bar{a} \in \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\circ})^{\mathbb{M}}$ with $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} \bar{b}_{\circ}$. For every sequence $\beta' = (\bar{b}'_{i})_{i < \omega} \equiv_{U\bar{b}_{\circ}} \beta$ that is indiscernible over $U\bar{a}$, we then have $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}; \bar{b}'_{i})$, for all i. As the conjunction $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}'_{\circ}) \wedge \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}'_{1}) \sqrt{-forks}$ over U, it follows that $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} \beta'$, for each such sequence β' . Therefore, (4) fails as well.

As several of the characterisations of the chain condition are similar to characterisations of the dividing relation, we obtain the following implication.

Lemma 3.3. If a preforking relation $\sqrt{}$ satisfies the chain condition over a set *U* then

$$\bar{a} \sqrt{U} \bar{b}$$
 implies $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b}$.

Proof. Suppose that $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} \bar{b}$. To show that $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b}$, we use condition (3) from Lemma F3.1.3. Hence, let $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U with $\bar{b}_0 = \bar{b}$. Setting $\Phi(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') := \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U)$, it follows by the chain condition that there exists a tuple \bar{a}' realising $\bigcup_{n<\omega} \Phi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_n)$ with $\bar{a}' \sqrt{U} \bar{b}$. In particular, we have

$$\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}} \bar{a}$$
 and $\bar{b}_i \equiv_{U\bar{a}'} \bar{b}_k$, for all $i, k < \omega$.

As a first application of the chain condition, let us show that arraydividing equals dividing. Once we have shown that in theories without the array property $\sqrt[d]{}$ satisfies the chain condition, the following result will generalise Corollary 1.14.

Proposition 3.4. Suppose that $\sqrt[d]{}$ satisfies the chain condition over a set U. A formula divides over U if, and only if, it array-divides over U.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) was already proved in Lemma 1.13. For (\Leftarrow), suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ does not divide over *U*. To show that it also does not arraydivide over *U*, we consider a family $\beta = (\bar{b}_{ij})_{i,j < \omega}$ that is biindiscernible over U with $\bar{b}_{oo} = \bar{b}$. We apply the chain condition to the sequence $\beta^{\circ} = (\bar{b}_{io})_{i < \omega}$ to show that the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{io}) \mid i < \omega\}$ does not divide over U. Applying the chain condition again, this time to the sequence $(\beta^i)_{i < \omega}$ of rows, it follows that the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{ij}) \mid i, j < \omega\}$ does not divide over U. In particular, this set is consistent.

Finally, we show that, in theories without the array property, $\sqrt[f]{}$ satisfies the chain condition. We start by proving this implication over models before generalising it to arbitrary $\sqrt[f]{}$ -bases.

Lemma 3.5. Let T be a theory without the array property and let \mathfrak{M} be a model of T. Then $\sqrt[f]{}$ satisfies the chain condition over M.

Proof. We check condition (2) of Proposition 3.2. Let $\bar{b} \approx_M^{l_s} \bar{b}'$ be tuples and $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ a formula such that the conjunction $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \land \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}')$ forks over M. We have to show that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ also forks over M. Set $\kappa := \Box_{\lambda^+}$ where $\lambda := 2^{|T| \oplus |M|}$. Since $\bar{b} \approx_U^{l_s} \bar{b}'$, there exists an indiscernible sequence $\beta' = (\bar{b}'_i)_{i < \kappa}$ over M of length κ such that $\bar{b}'_0 = \bar{b}$ and $\bar{b}'_1 = \bar{b}'$. We have seen in Lemma 2.3 that M is a $\sqrt[n]{}$ -extension base. By Corollary 2.19 this implies that M is a $\sqrt[sli]{}$ -base. Furthermore, we have shown in Corollary 2.14 that $\sqrt[sli]{}$ satisfies the extension axiom. Hence, we have $\beta' \sqrt[sli]{}_M M$ and there exists a global type $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \operatorname{tp}(\beta'/M)$ that is $\sqrt[sli]{}$ -free over M. Let $\beta = (\beta^i)_{i < \omega}$ be a sequence generated by \mathfrak{p} over M where $\beta^i = (\bar{b}_{ij})_{j < \omega}$. By indiscernibility of β° and the fact that forking equals dividing over M, it follows for all pairs $j \neq j'$ of indices that the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\circ j}) \land \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{\circ j'})$ divides over M. By choice of β and Lemma 2.15, this implies that the set

 $\{\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}_{ij})\land\varphi(\bar{x};\bar{b}_{ij'})\mid i<\omega\}$

is inconsistent. We can use Theorem E5.3.7 to find an indiscernible sequence $\alpha = (\alpha^i)_{i < \omega}$ over M such that, for every $\bar{i} \in [\omega]^{<\omega}$, there is some $\bar{j} \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$ with $\alpha[\bar{i}] \equiv_M \beta[\bar{j}]$. It follows that the family α is biindiscernible over M and the formula φ is inconsistent over α . Consequently, $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{00})$ array-divides over *M*. According to Corollary 1.14 and Theorem 2.22, this implies that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{00})$ also divides and forks over *M*.

Theorem 3.6. In a theory without the array property, $\sqrt[f]{}$ satisfies the chain condition over every $\sqrt[f]{}$ -base.

Proof. Let *U* be a $\sqrt[f]{-base}$, $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ a formula, and $\beta = (\bar{b}_i)_{i < \omega}$ an indiscernible sequence over *U* such that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_0)$ does not fork over *U*. Fix a model \mathfrak{M} containing *U*. Then $M \sqrt[f]{U} U$ and it follows by (EXT) that there exists a model $M' \equiv_U M$ such that $M' \sqrt[f]{U} \beta$. According to Theorem 2.22, we have $M' \sqrt[d]{U} \beta$. By Lemma F2.2.4, it therefore follows that a formula over β divides over *U* if, and only if, it divides over *M'*. In particular, $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_0)$ does not divide over *M'*. By Lemma 3.5, the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_0) \land \varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_1)$ does not divide over *M'*. Hence, it also does not divide over *U*. \Box

Corollary 3.7. In a theory without the array property, $\sqrt[d]{}$ satisfies the chain condition over every $\sqrt[f]{}$ -base.

Proof. Let *U* be a $\sqrt[4]{-base}$. According to Theorem 2.22, forking equals dividing over *U*. Consequently, $\sqrt[4]{}$ has the chain condition over *U* if, and only if, $\sqrt[4]{}$ does. Hence, the claim follows by the preceding theorem.

The Independence Theorem

There are two versions of the Independence Theorem: a weak one that holds in all theories without the array property, and a strong one that characterises simple theories.

Definition 3.8. (a) A preforking relation $\sqrt{}$ satisfies the *Weak Independence Theorem* over a set $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ if it has the following property:

(WIND) If $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{b}', \bar{c} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ are tuples satisfying

 $\bar{c} \sqrt{U} \bar{a} \bar{b}$, $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} \bar{b} \bar{b}'$, and $\bar{b} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}'$,

then there exists a tuple \bar{c}' such that

$$\bar{c}' \sqrt{U} \bar{a} \bar{b}', \quad \bar{c}' \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{c}, \text{ and } \bar{b}' \bar{c}' \equiv_{U} \bar{b} \bar{c}.$$

(b) A preforking relation $\sqrt{}$ satisfies the *Independence Theorem* over a set $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ if it has the following property:

(IND) If $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, A, B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ are tuples such that

$$\bar{a} \equiv_U \bar{b}$$
, $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} A$, $\bar{b} \sqrt{U} B$, and $A \sqrt{U} B$,

then there exists a tuple \bar{c} such that

$$\bar{c} \equiv_{UA} \bar{a}$$
, $\bar{c} \equiv_{UB} \bar{b}$, and $\bar{c} \sqrt{_U AB}$.

We say that $\sqrt{}$ satisfies the Independence Theorem for a class $C \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{M})$, if it satisfies the theorem over every $U \in C$.

Remark. The statement of the second axiom becomes clearer when we rephrase it in terms of types. Then it reads:

Let $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{r}$ be types over, respectively, $U, U \cup A$, and $U \cup B$. If \mathfrak{q} and \mathfrak{r} are $\sqrt{-free}$ extensions of \mathfrak{p} and $A \sqrt{U} B$, then $\mathfrak{q} \cup \mathfrak{r}$ is also a $\sqrt{-free}$ extension of \mathfrak{p} .

We start by proving that the weak version holds in all theories without the array property.

Theorem 3.9. For a forking relation $\sqrt{}$, the chain condition over a set U implies the Weak Independence Theorem over U.

Proof. Suppose that $\sqrt{}$ satisfies the chain condition over U and let

 $\bar{c} \sqrt{U} \bar{a} \bar{b}, \quad \bar{a} \sqrt{U} \bar{b} \bar{b}', \text{ and } \bar{b} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}'.$

F5. Theories without the array property

We first consider the case where $\bar{b} \approx_U^{l_s} \bar{b}'$. By Lemma 3.3, we have $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b} \bar{b}'$ and, hence, $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b} \bar{b}'$. Therefore, we can use Lemma F4.2.12 to find a tuple \bar{a}' such that $\bar{a} \bar{b} \approx_U^{l_s} \bar{a}' \bar{b}'$. Thus, there exists an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_i \bar{b}_i)_{i<\omega}$ over U with $\bar{a}_0 \bar{b}_0 \bar{a}_1 \bar{b}_1 = \bar{a} \bar{b} \bar{a}' \bar{b}'$. Since we have $\bar{c} \sqrt{U} \bar{a}_0 \bar{b}_0$, it follows by Proposition 3.2 (4) that there is a tuple $\bar{c}' \equiv_{U\bar{a}_0\bar{b}_0} \bar{c}$ such that $\bar{c}' \sqrt{U} \bar{a}[\omega] \bar{b}[\omega]$ and $(\bar{a}_i \bar{b}_i)_{i<\omega}$ is indiscernible over $U\bar{c}'$. This implies that

$$\bar{c}' \sqrt{U} \bar{a} \bar{b}', \quad \bar{c}' \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{c}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{b}' \bar{c}' \equiv_{U} \bar{b} \bar{c}' \equiv_{U} \bar{b} \bar{c}$$

It remains to prove the general case. Fix a sequence $\bar{b}_{o} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \cdots \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}_{n}$ such that $\bar{b}_{o} = \bar{b}$ and $\bar{b}_{n} = \bar{b}'$. By (EXT), there is a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}\bar{b}'} \bar{a}$ such that $\bar{a}' \sqrt{U} \bar{b}_{o} \dots \bar{b}_{n}$. Choosing tuples $\bar{b}'_{o}, \dots, \bar{b}'_{n}$ with

$$\bar{a}\bar{b}_{o}^{\prime}\ldots\bar{b}_{n}^{\prime}\equiv_{U\bar{b}\bar{b}^{\prime}}\bar{a}^{\prime}\bar{b}_{o}\ldots\bar{b}_{n}$$

it follows that $\bar{b}'_{o} = \bar{b}, \, \bar{b}'_{n} = \bar{b}',$

$$\bar{b}'_{\rm o} pprox_U^{
m ls} \cdots pprox_U^{
m ls} \bar{b}'_n$$
 and $\bar{a} \, \sqrt{_U} \, \bar{b}'_{\rm o} \dots \bar{b}'_n$.

By the special case we have proved above, we can inductively find tuples $\bar{c}_0, \ldots, \bar{c}_n$ such that $\bar{c}_0 = \bar{c}$,

$$\bar{c}_{i+1} \sqrt{U} \bar{a} \bar{b}'_{i+1}, \quad \bar{c}_{i+1} \equiv_{U\bar{a}} \bar{c}_i, \text{ and } \bar{b}'_{i+1} \bar{c}_{i+1} \equiv_U \bar{b}'_i \bar{c}_i.$$

The tuple $\bar{c}' \coloneqq \bar{c}_n$ has the desired properties.

By Theorem 3.6, we can conclude that, in theories without the array property, $\sqrt[f]{}$ satisfies the chain condition and, thus, the Weak Independence Theorem over $\sqrt[f]{}$ -bases.

Corollary 3.10 (Weak Independence Theorem; Ben Yaacov, Chernikov). *In a theory T without the array property,* $\sqrt[f]{}$ *satisfies the Weak Independence Theorem over every* $\sqrt[f]{}$ *-base.*

Let us turn to the strong version of the Independence Theorem. Our goal is to show that it characterises \downarrow^{f} in simple theories: a symmetric forking relation \downarrow satisfies the Independence Theorem if, and only if, $\downarrow = \downarrow^{f}$ and the theory in question is simple. We start by proving that forking satisfies (IND) in simple theories.

Theorem 3.11 (Independence Theorem). In a simple first-order theory \int_{1}^{f} satisfies the Independence Theorem for the class of all models.

Proof. Let \mathfrak{M} be a model and suppose that

 $\bar{a} \equiv_M \bar{b}$, $\bar{a} \downarrow_M^f A$, $\bar{b} \downarrow_M^f B$, and $A \downarrow_M^f B$.

As in simple theories every set is a \downarrow^{f} -base, we have $\bar{a} \downarrow_{MA}^{f} MA$. Therefore, we can use Lemma F4.2.13 to find a tuple $\bar{a}' \equiv_{MA} \bar{a}$ such that $\bar{a}' \downarrow_{MA}^{f} B\bar{a}_{\circ}\bar{b}$. Then it follows by transitivity that

 $\bar{a}' \downarrow_{MA}^{f} B\bar{b} \text{ and } \bar{a}' \downarrow_{M}^{f} A \text{ implies } \bar{a}' \downarrow_{M}^{f} A B\bar{b},$ $\bar{a}' \downarrow_{M}^{f} AB \text{ and } B \downarrow_{M}^{f} A \text{ implies } B\bar{a}' \downarrow_{M}^{f} A,$ $\bar{a}' \downarrow_{M}^{f} B\bar{b} \text{ and } \bar{b} \downarrow_{M}^{f} B \text{ implies } \bar{a}'\bar{b} \downarrow_{M}^{f} B.$

Furthermore, $\bar{a}' \equiv_M \bar{a} \equiv_M \bar{b}$, which implies that $\bar{a}' \equiv^{\text{ls}}_M \bar{b}$. Hence, we can apply Corollary 3.10 to the statement $A \downarrow^{\text{f}}_M B\bar{a}'$ to find a set A' such that

$$A' \downarrow_M^{\mathrm{f}} B\bar{b}, \quad A' \equiv_{MB} A, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{b}A' \equiv_M \bar{a}'A.$$

Let \bar{c} be a tuple such that $A'B\bar{b} \equiv_M AB\bar{c}$. Then

$$A \downarrow_M^{\mathrm{f}} \bar{c}B$$
 and $\bar{c} \downarrow_M^{\mathrm{f}} B$ implies $AB \downarrow_M^{\mathrm{f}} \bar{c}$.

Furthermore, we have

$$\bar{c}A \equiv_M \bar{b}A' \equiv_M \bar{a}'A \equiv_M \bar{a}A$$
 and $\bar{c}B \equiv_M \bar{b}B$.

It remains to prove that forking is the only symmetric forking relations satisfying the Independence Theorem.

Definition 3.12. A class $C \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{M})$ of small sets is *invariant* if

 $C \equiv_{\varnothing} C'$ implies $C \in \mathcal{C} \Leftrightarrow C' \in \mathcal{C}$.

We call C dense if, for every set $A \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, there is some $C \in C$ with $A \subseteq C$.

Example. Every class containing all models is dense. In particular, the class of all $\sqrt[4]{-}$ extension bases and the class of all $\sqrt[4]{-}$ bases are invariant and dense.

We start with a lemma constructing a Morley sequence. The proof follows the lines of the proofs of Lemmas F2.4.13 and F2.4.15.

Lemma 3.13. Let \downarrow be a right local forking relation, let $C \subseteq \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{M})$ be invariant and dense, and let $(\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ be an indiscernible sequence over U. There exists a set $C \in C$ containing U and a type $\mathfrak{p} \in S^{\bar{s}}(C)$ extending $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}_0/U)$ such that $(\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ is a \downarrow -Morley sequence for \mathfrak{p} over C.

Proof. Let $\kappa := \operatorname{loc}(\downarrow)^+ \oplus |\bar{a}_0|^+$. We can use Lemma E5.3.9 to extend $(\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ to an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{a}_\alpha)_{\alpha \le \kappa}$ over *U*. We construct an increasing chain $(C_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ of sets $C_\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ such that, for every $\alpha < \kappa$,

 $U \cup \bar{a}[<\alpha] \subseteq C_{\alpha}$ and $(\bar{a}_i)_{\alpha < i \le \kappa}$ is indiscernible over C_{α} .

For the inductive step, suppose that C_i has already been defined for all $i < \alpha$. As C is dense, we can choose some set $C' \in C$ containing $V_{\alpha} := U \cup \bar{a}[<\alpha] \cup \bigcup_{i < \alpha} C_i$. Since the sequence $(\bar{a}_i)_{\alpha < i < \kappa}$ is indiscernible over V_{α} , we can apply Lemma E5.3.11 to obtain a set $C_{\alpha} \equiv_{V_{\alpha}} C'$ such that $(\bar{a}_i)_{\alpha < i < \kappa}$ is indiscernible over $V_{\alpha} \cup C_{\alpha}$. By invariance, it follows that $C_{\alpha} \in C$.

After having constructed the sequence $(C_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \kappa}$, we can find a set $W \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} C_{\alpha}$ of size $|W| < \operatorname{loc}(\downarrow) \oplus |\bar{a}_{\circ}|^{+} \le \kappa$ such that

$$\bar{a}_{\kappa} \downarrow_{W} \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} C_{\alpha}$$

Since κ is regular, there exists an index $\gamma < \kappa$ such that $W \subseteq C_{\gamma}$. By (MON) and (BMON), it follows that

$$\bar{a}_{\kappa} \downarrow_{C_{\gamma}} \bigcup_{\gamma < i < \kappa} \bar{a}_i.$$

By (INV), we therefore have

$$\bar{a}_{\alpha} \downarrow_{C_{\gamma}} \bigcup_{\gamma < i < \alpha} \bar{a}_{i}$$
, for all $\gamma < \alpha < \kappa$.

Hence, $(\bar{a}_{\alpha})_{\gamma < \alpha < \kappa}$ is a \downarrow -Morley sequence for tp $(\bar{a}_{\kappa}/C_{\gamma})$ over C_{γ} . Fix an automorphism $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_U$ such that $\pi[\bar{a}_{\gamma+n+1}] = \bar{a}_n$, for all $n < \omega$. By invariance, it follows that $(\bar{a}_n)_{n < \omega}$ is a \downarrow -Morley sequence for $\mathfrak{p} :=$ tp $(\pi[\bar{a}_{\kappa}]/\pi[C_{\gamma}])$ over $C := \pi[C_{\gamma}]$.

The main argument is contained in a technical lemma which states that the Independence Theorem implies the following weaker variant of the chain condition.

Definition 3.14. A preforking relation $\sqrt{}$ satisfies the *chain condition* for Morley sequences over a set $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ if, for every $\sqrt{-}$ Morley sequence $(\bar{b}_i)_{i\in I}$ over U and every set of formulae $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ such that, for some $i_0 \in I$, the set $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_{i_0})$ does not $\sqrt{-}$ fork over U, the union $\bigcup_{i\in I} \Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_i)$ also does not $\sqrt{-}$ fork over U.

Lemma 3.15. Let $\sqrt{}$ be a forking relation satisfying the Independence Theorem over a set U. Then $\sqrt{}$ satisfies the chain condition for Morley sequence over U.

Proof. Let $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ be a $\sqrt{-}$ Morley sequence over U and let $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ be a set such that $\Phi(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_0)$ does not $\sqrt{-}$ fork over U. We fix a tuple \bar{a} with $\bar{a} \sqrt{U} \bar{b}_0$ and we set $\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') \coloneqq \mathfrak{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}_0/U)$. We have to show that there exists a tuple \bar{c} realising $\bigcup_{n<\omega} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_n)$ such that $\bar{c} \sqrt{U} \bar{b}[<\omega]$.

To do so, we construct a sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$ such that

$$\bar{c}_n \sqrt{U} \bar{b}[\leq n]$$
 and \bar{c}_n realises $\bigcup_{i\leq n} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i)$.

We start with $\bar{c}_0 := \bar{a}$. Then \bar{c}_0 realises $\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_0)$ and $\bar{c}_0 \sqrt{U} \bar{b}_0$. For the inductive step, suppose that \bar{c}_n has already been defined. Let \bar{a}' be a realisation of $\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{n+1})$. Then

$$\bar{a}' \equiv_U \bar{c}_n$$
, $\bar{a}' \sqrt{U} \bar{b}_{n+1}$, $\bar{c}_n \sqrt{U} \bar{b}[\leq n]$,

and $\bar{b}_{n+1} \sqrt{U} \bar{b}[\leq n]$,

which, by the Independence Theorem, implies that there is a tuple \bar{c}_{n+1} such that

$$\bar{c}_{n+1} \equiv_{U\bar{b}_{n+1}} \bar{a}', \quad \bar{c}_{n+1} \equiv_{U\bar{b}[\leq n]} \bar{c}_n, \text{ and } \bar{c}_{n+1} \sqrt{U} \bar{b}[\leq n] \bar{b}_{n+1}.$$

It follows that \bar{c}_{n+1} realises the types $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}'/U\bar{b}_{n+1}) = \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_{n+1})$ and $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{c}_n/U\bar{b}[\leq n]) \supseteq \bigcup_{i\leq n} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i)$.

In particular, note that $\bar{c}_{n+1} \equiv_{U\bar{b}[\leq n]} \bar{c}_n$. Hence, having constructed the sequence $(\bar{c}_n)_{n < \omega}$, we can use the Compactness Theorem to find a tuple \bar{c} such that

$$\bar{c} \equiv_{U\bar{b}[< n]} \bar{c}_n$$
, for all $n < \omega$.

Consequently, \bar{c} realises $\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_n)$. Furthermore, (INV) and (DEF) implies that $\bar{c} \sqrt{U} \bar{b}[<\omega]$.

For symmetric forking relations, we can strengthen Lemma 3.3 as follows.

Theorem 3.16. If a symmetric forking relation \downarrow satisfies the chain condition for Morley sequences for a class *C* that is invariant and dense, then $\downarrow = \sqrt[d]{}$.

Proof. We have shown in Theorem F3.1.9 that $\sqrt[d]{\subseteq} \downarrow$, for every symmetric forking relation. Conversely, suppose that $\bar{a} \downarrow_U \bar{b}$. To show that $\bar{a} \sqrt[d]{U} \bar{b}$, set $\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') \coloneqq \mathfrak{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/U)$ and let $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ by an indiscernible sequence over U with $\bar{b}_0 = \bar{b}$. By Lemma F3.1.3 (3), it is sufficient to show that there is a tuple realising $\bigcup_{n<\omega} \mathfrak{p}(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_n)$. As \downarrow is right local, we can

use Lemma 3.13 to find a set $C \in C$ containing U such that $(\bar{b}_n)_{n<\omega}$ is a \downarrow -Morley sequence over C. Since $\bar{a} \downarrow_U \bar{b}_0$, there is some $\bar{a}' \equiv_{U\bar{b}_0} \bar{a}$ such that $\bar{a}' \downarrow_U C\bar{b}_0$. Set $\mathfrak{p}'(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') \coloneqq \operatorname{tp}(\bar{a}'\bar{b}_0/C)$. By the chain condition for Morley sequences, the union $\bigcup_{n<\omega} \mathfrak{p}'(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_n)$ does not \downarrow -fork over C. In particular, it is consistent. Hence, it follows that there is a tuple realising

$$\bigcup_{n<\omega}\mathfrak{p}(\bar{x},\bar{b}_n)\subseteq\bigcup_{n<\omega}\mathfrak{p}'(\bar{x},\bar{b}_n).$$

We obtain the following characterisation of simple theories.

Theorem 3.17. *Let T be a complete first-order theory. The following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) T is simple.
- (2) *There exists a symmetric forking relation ↓ satisfying the Independence Theorem for the class of all models.*
- (3) There exists a symmetric forking relation ↓ satisfying the chain condition for Morley sequences for the class of all models.
- (4) There exists a symmetric forking relation ↓ satisfying the chain condition for the class of all models.

Proof. (4) \Rightarrow (3) is trivial; (3) \Rightarrow (1) follows by Theorem 3.16; (1) \Rightarrow (4) by Lemma 3.5; (1) \Rightarrow (2) was already proved in Theorem 3.11; and (2) \Rightarrow (3) follows by Lemma 3.15.

As an application we consider the theory of the random graph.

Proposition 3.18. *The theory of the random graph is simple.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.16, it is sufficient to prove that the relation

 $A \downarrow_U^{o} B$: iff $A \cap B \subseteq U$

is a symmetric forking relation satisfying the Independence Theorem. \downarrow° obviously satisfies the axioms (INV), (MON), (NOR), (LRF), (BMON), and (SYM).

(LTR) Suppose that $A_2 \downarrow_{A_1}^{\circ} B$ and $A_1 \downarrow_{A_o}^{\circ} B$ where $A_0 \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2$. Then $A_2 \cap B \subseteq A_1$ and $A_1 \cap B \subseteq A_0$. Hence,

$$A_2 \cap B \subseteq A_1 \cap B \subseteq A_0$$
 ,

which implies that $A_2 \downarrow_{A_o}^{\circ} B$. (DEF) Suppose that $A \not\downarrow_U^{\circ} B$. Then there is some element $b \in A \cap B \setminus U$. For every element $a \in (x = b)^{\mathbb{M}}$ it follows that $a \not\downarrow_{U}^{\circ} b$.

(EXT) Suppose that $\bar{a} \downarrow_U^{\circ} B_{\circ}$ and let $B_{\circ} \subseteq B_1$. Using the extension axioms, we can find a tuple \bar{a}' such that

$$\operatorname{atp}(\bar{a}'/UB_{o}) = \operatorname{atp}(\bar{a}/UB_{o})$$
 and $(\bar{a}' \smallsetminus U) \cap B_{1} = \varnothing$.

By ultrahomogeneity, there exists an automorphism $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut} \mathbb{M}_{UB_0}$ mapping \bar{a} to \bar{a}' . Hence, $\bar{a}' \equiv_{UB_0} \bar{a}$ and $\bar{a}' \downarrow_U^o B_1$.

(IND) We prove that \downarrow° satisfies the Independence Theorem for the class of all subsets of \mathbb{M} . Suppose that

$$\bar{a} \equiv_U \bar{b}$$
, $\bar{a} \downarrow_U^{\circ} A$, $\bar{b} \downarrow_U^{\circ} B$, and $A \downarrow_U^{\circ} B$.

Replacing A and B by, respectively, $A \setminus U$ and $B \setminus U$, we may assume that $A \cap U = \emptyset$ and $B \cap U = \emptyset$. Let

$$\overline{d} := \overline{a} \cap U, \quad \overline{a}' := \overline{a} \setminus U, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{b}' := \overline{b} \setminus U.$$

Note that $\bar{a}' \cap (U \cup A) = \emptyset$ and $\bar{b}' \cap (U \cup B) = \emptyset$. Since U, A, B are disjoint, we can use the extension axioms to find a tuple \bar{c}' disjoint from $U \cup A \cup B$ such that

$$\operatorname{atp}(\bar{c}'/UA) = \operatorname{atp}(\bar{a}'/UA)$$
 and $\operatorname{atp}(\bar{c}'/UB) = \operatorname{atp}(\bar{b}'/UB)$.

It follows that

$$\bar{c}'\bar{d} \equiv_{UA} \bar{a}'\bar{d}, \quad \bar{c}'\bar{d} \equiv_{UB} \bar{b}'\bar{d}, \text{ and } \bar{c}'\bar{d} \downarrow_U^{\circ} AB.$$

Recommended Literature

Set theory

- M. D. Potter, Sets. An Introduction, Oxford University Press 1990.
- A. Lévy, Basic Set Theory, Springer 1979, Dover 2002.
- K. Kunen, *Set Theory. An Introduction to Independence Proofs*, North-Holland 1983.
- T. J. Jech, Set Theory, 3rd ed., Springer 2003.

Algebra and Category Theory

- G. M. Bergman, *An Invitation to General Algebra and Universal Constructions*, 2nd ed., Springer 2015.
- P. M. Cohn, Universal Algebra, 2nd ed., Springer 1981.
- P. M. Cohn, Basic Algebra, Springer 2003.
- S. Lang, Algebra, 3rd ed., Springer 2002.
- F. Borceux, Handbook of Categorical Algebra, Cambridge University Press 1994.
- S. MacLane, Categories for the Working Mathematician, 2nd ed., Springer 1998.
- J. Adámek, J. Rosický, and M. Vitale, *Algebraic Theories*, Cambridge University Press 2011.
- J. Adámek and J. Rosický, *Locally Presentable and Accessible Categories*, Cambridge University Press 1994.

Topology and lattice theory

- R. Engelking, General Topology, 2nd ed., Heldermann 1989.
- C.-A. Faure, A. Frölicher, Modern Projective Geometry, Kluwer 2000.
- P. T. Johnstone, Stone Spaces, Cambridge University Press 1982.
- G. Gierz, K. H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J. D. Lawson, M. Mislove, and D. S. Scott, *Continuous Lattices and Domains*, Cambridge University Press 2003.

Model theory

- K. Tent and M. Ziegler, *A Course in Model Theory*, Cambridge University Press 2012.
- W. Hodges, *Model Theory*, Cambridge University Press 1993.
- B. Poizat, A Course in Model Theory, Springer 2000.
- C. C. Chang and H. J. Keisler, Model Theory, 3rd ed., North-Holland 1990.

General model theory

J. Barwise and S. Feferman, eds., Model-Theoretic Logics, Springer 1985.

- J. T. Baldwin, *Categoricity*, AMS 2010.
- R. Diaconescu, Institution-Independent Model Theory, Birkhäuser 2008.
- H.-D. Ebbinghaus and J. Flum, Finite Model Theory, Springer 1995.

Stability theory

- S. Buechler, Essential Stability Theory, Springer 1996.
- E. Casanovas, *Simple Theories and Hyperimaginaries*, Cambridge University Press 2011.
- A. Pillay, Geometric Stability Theory, Oxford Science Publications 1996.
- F. O. Wagner, Simple Theories, Kluwer Academic Publishers 2000.
- S. Shelah, *Classification Theory*, 2nd ed., North-Holland 1990.

Symbol Index

Chapter A1

S	universe of sets, 5
$a \in b$	membership, 5
$a \subseteq b$	subset, 5
HF	hereditary finite sets, 7
$\cap A$	intersection, 11
$A \cap B$	intersection, 11
$A \smallsetminus B$	difference, 11
$\operatorname{acc}(A)$	accumulation, 12
$\operatorname{fnd}(A)$	founded part, 13
$\bigcup A$	union, 21
$A \cup B$	union, 21
$\mathscr{P}(A)$	power set, 21
cut A	cut of <i>A</i> , 22

Chapter A2

$\langle a_0,\ldots,a$	$_{n-1}\rangle$ tuple, 27
$A \times B$	cartesian product, 27
dom f	domain of f , 28
rng f	range of <i>f</i> , 29
f(a)	image of a under f , 29
$f: A \to B$	function, 29
B^A	set of all functions
	$f: A \rightarrow B$, 29

id _A	identity function, 30
$S \circ R$	composition of relations, 30
$g \circ f$	composition of functions,
	30
R^{-1}	inverse of <i>R</i> , 30
$R^{-1}(a)$	inverse image, 30
$R _C$	restriction, 30
$R \upharpoonright C$	left restriction, 31
R[C]	image of C , 31
$(a_i)_{i\in I}$	sequence, 37
$\prod_i A_i$	product, 37
pr _i	projection, 37
ā	sequence, 38
$\bigcup_i A_i$	disjoint union, 38
$A \cup B$	disjoint union, 38
in_i	insertion map, 39
$\mathfrak{A}^{\mathrm{op}}$	opposite order, 40
$\Downarrow X$	initial segment, 41
$\Uparrow X$	final segment, 41
$\downarrow X$	initial segment, 41
$\uparrow X$	final segment, 41
[<i>a</i> , <i>b</i>]	closed interval, 41
(a,b)	open interval, 41
$\max X$	greatest element, 42
min X	minimal element, 42
sup X	supremum, 42
$\inf X$	infimum, 42

$\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B}$	isomorphism, 44	κ^{λ}	cardinal exponentiation,
$\operatorname{fix} f$	fixed points, 48		116
lfp <i>f</i>	least fixed point, 48	$\sum_i \kappa_i$	cardinal sum, 121
gfp <i>f</i>	greatest fixed point, 48	$\prod_i \kappa_i$	cardinal product, 121
[<i>a</i>]~	equivalence class, 54	cf α	cofinality, 123
A/\sim	set of ~-classes, 54	\beth_{α}	beth alpha, 126
TC(R)	transitive closure, 55	$(<\kappa)^{\lambda}$	$\sup_{\mu} \mu^{\lambda}$, 127
		$\kappa^{<\lambda}$	$\sup_{\mu} \kappa^{\mu}$, 127

Chapter A3

Chapter в1

category of sets, 163

homomorphisms, 163

homomorphisms, 163

a^+	successor, 59		
ord(A)	order type, 64	$R^{\mathfrak{A}}$	relation of श, 149
On	class of ordinals, 64	$f^{\mathfrak{A}}$	function of A, 149
On _o	von Neumann ordinals, 69	$A^{\tilde{s}}$	$A_{s_0} \times \cdots \times A_{s_n}$, 151
$\rho(a)$	rank, 73	$\mathfrak{A}\subseteq\mathfrak{B}$	substructure, 152
$A^{<\infty}$	functions $\downarrow \alpha \rightarrow A$, 74	$Sub(\mathfrak{A})$	substructures of थ, 152
21 + 23	sum, 85	$\mathfrak{Sub}(\mathfrak{A})$	substructure lattice, 152
21.23	product, 86	$\mathfrak{A} _X$	induced substructure, 152
$\mathfrak{o}(\mathfrak{B})$	exponentiation of	$\langle\!\langle X \rangle\!\rangle_{\mathfrak{A}}$	generated substructure, 153
21	well-orders, 86	$\mathfrak{A} _{\Sigma}$	reduct, 155
$\alpha + \beta$	ordinal addition 80	$\mathfrak{A} _T$	restriction to sorts in T , 155
α·β	ordinal multiplication 80	$\mathfrak{A}\cong\mathfrak{B}$	isomorphism, 156
μ (β)	ordinal exponentiation 80	ker f	kernel of f , 157
α	ordinal exponentiation, by	$h(\mathfrak{A})$	image of <i>h</i> , 162
		\mathcal{C}^{obj}	class of objects, 162
C1		$\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$	morphisms $\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{b}$, 162
Chapter	A4	$g \circ f$	composition of morphisms,
			162
A	cardinality, 113	$id_{\mathfrak{a}}$	identity, 163
∞	cardinality of proper	$\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{mor}}$	class of morphisms, 163

121	caramanty, 115	$1d_a$	identity, 163
∞	cardinality of proper	$\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{mor}}$	class of morphism
	classes, 113	Set	category of sets, 1
Cn	class of cardinals, 113	$\mathfrak{Hom}(\Sigma)$	category of
\aleph_{α}	aleph alpha, 115		homomorphism
$\kappa \oplus \lambda$	cardinal addition, 116	$\mathfrak{Hom}_{\mathrm{s}}(\Sigma)$	category of strict
$\kappa\otimes\lambda$	cardinal multiplication, 116		homomorphism

$\mathfrak{Emb}(\Sigma)$	category of embeddings,	Chapter	r B3
Set _* Set ² C^{op} F^{op} $(F \downarrow G)$ $F \cong G$ Cong(\mathfrak{A}) Cong(\mathfrak{A})	category of pointed sets, 163 category of pairs, 163 opposite category, 166 opposite functor, 168 comma category, 170 natural isomorphism, 172 set of congruence relations, 176 congruence lattice, 176	$T[\Sigma, X]$ t_{ν} free(t) $t^{\mathfrak{A}}[\beta]$ $\mathfrak{T}[\Sigma, X]$ $t[x/s]$ Sig Bar Sig	finite Σ -terms, 227 subterm at v , 228 free variables, 231 value of t , 231 term algebra, 232 substitution, 234 category of signatures and variables, 235 category of signatures, 236 category of variables, 236
શ/~	quotient, 179	$\begin{array}{l} \mathfrak{Term} \\ \mathfrak{A} _{\mu} \\ \mathrm{Str}[\Sigma] \end{array}$	category of terms, 236 μ -reduct of \mathfrak{A} , 237 class of Σ -structures, 237
Chapter	r B2	$\operatorname{Str}[\Sigma, X]$	class of all Σ -structures with variable assignments, 237
$ x \\ x \cdot y$	length of a sequence, 187 concatenation, 187	StrVar Str	category of structures and assignments, 237
$\leq \leq_{\text{lex}}$ v	lexicographic order, 187 level of a vertex, 190	$ \prod_{i} \mathfrak{A}^{i} $ $ \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket $ $ \bar{a} \approx \bar{b} $	direct product, 239 set of indices, 241 filter equivalence, 241
$frk(v)$ $a \sqcap b$ $a \sqcup b$	foundation rank, 192 infimum, 195 supremum, 195	$ \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{u} & \mathfrak{u}_{\mathfrak{u}} \\ \mathfrak{u} \\ \mathfrak{u} \\ \mathfrak{U}^{i} \\ \mathfrak{U}^{i} / \mathfrak{u} \\ \mathfrak{U}^{\mathfrak{u}} \end{aligned} $	restriction of u to <i>J</i> , 242 reduced product, 242 ultrapower, 243
a^* $\mathfrak{L}^{\mathrm{op}}$ $\mathrm{cl}_{\downarrow}(X)$	complement, 198 opposite lattice, 204 ideal generated by <i>X</i> , 204	$ \lim_{d \to D} D $ $ \lim_{d \to D} D $ $ \int_{d \to U} D $	directed colimit, 251 colimit of <i>D</i> , 253 directed limit, 256 componentwise
$\operatorname{cl}_{\uparrow}(X)$ \mathfrak{B}_{2}	filter generated by <i>X</i> , 204 two-element boolean	J . P	composition for cocones,

algebra, 208

partition rank, 220

height of *a*, 215

 $\deg_{P}(a)$ partition degree, 224

ht(a)

 $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{P}}(a)$

258 image of a cocone under a

 $G[\mu]$

 \mathfrak{Z}_n

functor, 260 partial order of an alternating path, 271

\mathfrak{Z}_n^\perp	partial order of an
	alternating path, 271
$f \wedge g$	alternating-path
	equivalence, 272
$[f]_F^{\wedge}$	alternating-path
	equivalence class, 272
$s \star t$	componentwise
	composition of links, 275
π_t	projection along a link, 276
in_D	inclusion link, 276
D[t]	image of a link under a
	functor, 279
$\operatorname{Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C})$	inductive $\mathcal{P} ext{-completion}$,
	280
$Ind_{all}(\mathcal{C})$	inductive completion, 280

Chapter в4

$\operatorname{Ind}_{\kappa}^{\lambda}(\mathcal{C})$	inductive
	(κ, λ) -completion, 291
$\operatorname{Ind}(\mathcal{C})$	inductive completion, 292
\bigcirc	loop category, 313
$\ \mathfrak{a}\ $	cardinality in an accessible
	category, 329
$\mathfrak{Sub}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathfrak{a})$	category of \mathcal{K} -subobjects,
	337
$\mathfrak{Sub}_{\kappa}(\mathfrak{a})$	category of κ -presentable
	subobjects, 337

Chapter в5

$\operatorname{cl}(A)$	closure of <i>A</i> , 343
int(A)	interior of <i>A</i> , 343
∂A	boundary of <i>A</i> , 343

$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{CB}}(x/A)$	Cantor-Bendixson rank,
	365
(-)	• •

- spec(\mathfrak{L}) spectrum of \mathfrak{L} , 370
- $\langle x \rangle$ basic closed set, 370
- $clop(\mathfrak{S})$ algebra of clopen subsets, 374

Chapter вб

automorphism group, 386
set of cosets, 386
factor group, 388
symmetric group, 389
action of <i>g</i> on <i>a</i> , 390
orbit of <i>ā</i> , 390
pointwise stabiliser, 391
setwise stabiliser, 391
basic open set of the group
topology, 395
degree, 399
lattice of ideals, 400
quotient of a ring, 402
kernel, 402
spectrum, 402
direct sum, 405
direct power, 405
dimension, 409
field of fractions, 411
subfield generated by \bar{a} , 414
polynomial function, 415
) automorphisms over K, 423
absolute value, 426

 $FO_{\kappa\aleph_0}(wo)$ FO with well-ordering

Chapter C1

-			quantifier, 482
$ZL[\mathfrak{K}, X]$	Zariski logic, 443	W	well-ordering quantifier,
⊨ ,	satisfaction relation, 444		482
$BL(\mathfrak{B})$	boolean logic, 444	$Q_\mathcal{K}$	Lindström quantifier, 482
$FO_{\kappa \aleph_0}[\Sigma,$	X] infinitary first-order	$SO_{\kappa\aleph_0}[\Sigma,$	Ξ] second-order logic, 483
	logic, 445	MSO _{KNo} [2	Σ, Ξ] monadic
$\neg \varphi$	negation, 445		second-order logic, 483
$\wedge \Phi$	conjunction, 445	\mathcal{PO}	category of partial orders,
$\lor \Phi$	disjunction, 445		488
$\exists x \varphi$	existential quantifier, 445	Lb	Lindenbaum functor, 488
$\forall x \varphi$	universal quantifier, 445	$\neg \varphi$	negation, 490
$FO[\Sigma, X]$	first-order logic, 445	$\varphi \lor \psi$	disjunction, 490
$\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi[\beta]$	satisfaction, 446	$\varphi \wedge \psi$	conjunction, 490
true	true, 447	$L _{\Phi}$	restriction to Φ , 491
false	false, 447	L/Φ	localisation to Φ , 491
$\varphi \lor \psi$	disjunction, 447	\vDash_{\varPhi}	consequence modulo Φ ,
$\varphi \wedge \psi$	conjunction, 447		491
$\varphi \to \psi$	implication, 447	$\equiv \phi$	equivalence modulo Φ , 491
$\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$	equivalence, 447		
free(φ)	free variables, 450		
$qr(\varphi)$	quantifier rank, 452	Chapte	r C2
$\operatorname{Mod}_L(\Phi)$	class of models, 454	1	
$\varPhi\vDash\varphi$	entailment, 460	$\mathfrak{Emb}_L(\Sigma)$	category of <i>L</i> -embeddings,
≡	logical equivalence, 460		493
Φ^{\vDash}	closure under entailment,	$QF_{\kappa\aleph_0}[\Sigma,$	X] quantifier-free
	460	Ũ	formulae, 494
$\operatorname{Th}_L(\mathfrak{J})$	<i>L</i> -theory, 461	$\exists \Delta$	existential closure of Δ , 494
\equiv_L	<i>L</i> -equivalence, 462	$\forall \Delta$	universal closure of Δ , 494
$ ext{dnf}(arphi)$	disjunctive normal form,	$\exists_{\kappa \Join_0}$	existential formulae, 494
	467	$\forall_{\kappa leph_o}$	universal formulae, 494
$\operatorname{cnf}(arphi)$	conjunctive normal form,	$\exists^+_{\kappaleph_{\mathbf{o}}}$	positive existential
	467		formulae, 494
$\operatorname{nnf}(\varphi)$	negation normal form, 469	\preceq_{Δ}	Δ -extension, 498
Logic	category of logics, 478	\leq	elementary extension, 498
$\exists^{\lambda} x \varphi$	cardinality quantifier, 481	$\varPhi^{\vDash}_{\varDelta}$	Δ -consequences of Φ , 521

\leq_{Δ}	preservation of Δ -formulae,		game, 589
	521	$\mathrm{EF}^{\kappa}_{\infty}(\mathfrak{A}, d)$	$(\bar{a},\mathfrak{B},\bar{b})$
			Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé
			game, 589
Chapte	r C3	$I_{\mathrm{FO}}^{\kappa}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B})$) partial FO-maps of size κ ,
1	0		598
S(L)	set of types, 527	$\sqsubseteq_{iso}^{\kappa}$	$\infty \kappa$ -simulation, 599
$\langle \Phi \rangle$	types containing Φ , 527	\cong_{iso}^{κ}	$\infty\kappa$ -isomorphic, 599
$tp_{I}(\bar{a}/\mathfrak{M})$) <i>L</i> -type of \bar{a} , 528	$\mathfrak{A} \sqsubseteq_{o}^{\kappa} \mathfrak{B}$	$I^{\kappa}_{o}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B}):\mathfrak{A}\sqsubseteq^{\kappa}_{\mathrm{iso}}\mathfrak{B},599$
$S_L^{\bar{s}}(T)$	type space for a theory, 528	$\mathfrak{A} \equiv^{\kappa}_{o} \mathfrak{B}$	$I_{\mathrm{o}}^{\kappa}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B}):\mathfrak{A}\equiv_{\mathrm{iso}}^{\kappa}\mathfrak{B},599$
$S_L^{\overline{s}}(U)$	type space over <i>U</i> , 528	$\mathfrak{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathrm{FO}}^{\kappa} \mathfrak{B}$	$I_{\mathrm{FO}}^{\kappa}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B}):\mathfrak{A}\sqsubseteq_{\mathrm{iso}}^{\kappa}\mathfrak{B},599$
$\bar{\mathfrak{S}(L)}$	type space, 533	$\mathfrak{A} \equiv_{\mathrm{FO}}^{\kappa} \mathfrak{B}$	$I_{\rm FO}^{\kappa}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B}):\mathfrak{A}\equiv_{\rm iso}^{\kappa}\mathfrak{B},599$
$f(\mathfrak{p})$	conjugate of p, 543	$\mathfrak{A} \sqsubseteq_{\infty}^{\kappa} \mathfrak{B}$	$I^{\kappa}_{\infty}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B}):\mathfrak{A}\sqsubseteq^{\kappa}_{\mathrm{iso}}\mathfrak{B},599$
$\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(L)$	$\mathfrak{S}(L _{\Delta})$ with topology	$\mathfrak{A}\equiv^{\kappa}_{\infty}\mathfrak{B}$	$I^{\kappa}_{\infty}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B}):\mathfrak{A}\equiv^{\kappa}_{\mathrm{iso}}\mathfrak{B},599$
	induced from $\mathfrak{S}(L)$, 557	$\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{A})$	Gaifman graph, 605
$\langle \Phi angle_{\Delta}$	closed set in $\mathfrak{S}_{\Delta}(L)$, 557		
$\mathfrak{p} _{\Delta}$	restriction to Δ , 560		
$\operatorname{tp}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U) \Delta$ -type of \bar{a} , 560		Chapter C5	

		$L \leq L'$
Chapte	r C4	(A)
-		(B)
\equiv_{α}	α -equivalence, 577	(B_{+})
\equiv_{∞}	∞ -equivalence, 577	(C)
$\mathrm{pIso}_{\kappa}(\mathfrak{A},$	3) partial isomorphisms,	(cc)
	578	(fop)
$\bar{a}\mapsto \bar{b}$	map $a_i \mapsto b_i$, 578	
Ø	the empty function, 578	(кр)
$I_{\alpha}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B})$	back-and-forth system, 579	(lsp)
$I_{\infty}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B})$	limit of the system, 581	
\cong_{α}	α -isomorphic, 581	(rel)
≅∞	∞ -isomorphic, 581	
$m =_k n$	equality up to k , 583	(SUB)
$\varphi_{\mathfrak{A},\bar{a}}^{\alpha}$	Hintikka formula, 586	
$\mathrm{EF}_{\alpha}(\mathfrak{A},\bar{a})$	$(\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B})$	(TUP)
· ·	Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé	$hn_{\kappa}(I)$

ler 03 ľ

$\leq L'$	L' is as expressive as L , 613
A)	algebraic, 614
3)	boolean closed, 614
B _+)	positive boolean closed, 614
c)	compactness, 614
cc)	countable compactness, 614
op)	finite occurrence property,
	614
KP)	Karp property, 614
.sp)	Löwenheim-Skolem
	property, 614
rel)	closed under relativisations,
	614
UB)	closed under substitutions,
	614
TUP)	Tarski union property, 614
$n_{\kappa}(L)$	Hanf number, 618

$\ln_{\kappa}(L)$	Löwenheim number, 618	ACF
$\operatorname{wn}_{\kappa}(L)$	well-ordering number, 618	
occ(L)	occurrence number, 618	RCF
$\operatorname{pr}_{\Gamma}(\mathcal{K})$	Γ -projection, 636	
$PC_{\kappa}(L,\Sigma)$	projective <i>L</i> -classes, 636	
$L_{o} \leq_{pc}^{\kappa} L_{1}$	projective reduction, 637	
$\operatorname{RPC}_{\kappa}(L, Z)$	E) relativised projective	Ch
	L-classes, 641	
$L_{\rm o} \leq_{\rm rpc}^{\kappa} L_{\rm 1}$	relativised projective	(<11
	reduction, 641	(\µ HO
$\Delta(L)$	interpolation closure, 648	1100
ifp f	inductive fixed point, 658	പ
$\liminf f$	least partial fixed point, 658	511~
$\limsup f$	greatest partial fixed point,	ч∀
	658	11 V 6
f_{φ}	function defined by φ , 664	വേ⊬
FO _{KNo} (LF	P) least fixed-point logic,	511 V
	664	чо
FO _{KNo} (IF	P) inflationary fixed-point	по
	logic, 664	сп[
$FO_{\kappa\aleph_0}(PF$	P) partial fixed-point	ու
	logic, 664	тт₩Г
\lhd_{φ}	stage comparison, 675	п۷

Chapter D1

tor(&)	torsion subgroup, 704	ł
a/n	divisor, 705	5
, DAG	theory of divisible	Ι
	torsion-free abelian	ł
	groups, 706	
ODAG	theory of ordered divisible	I
	abelian groups, 706	
div(&)	divisible closure, 706	(
F	field axioms, 710	Ţ

theory of algebraically
closed fields, 710
theory of real closed fields,
710

Chapter D2

$(<\mu)^{\lambda} \qquad \bigcup_{\kappa<\mu} \kappa^{\lambda},$ 721
$HO_{\infty}[\Sigma, X]$ infinitary Horn
formulae, 735
$SH_{\infty}[\Sigma, X]$ infinitary strict Horn
formulae, 735
$H \forall_{\infty} [\Sigma, X]$ infinitary universal
Horn formulae, 735
$\operatorname{SH} \forall_{\infty} [\Sigma, X]$ infinitary universal
strict Horn formulae, 735
HO[Σ , X] first-order Horn formulae,
735
SH[Σ , X] first-order strict Horn
formulae, 735
$H\forall [\Sigma, X]$ first-order universal Horn
formulae, 735
SH $\forall [\Sigma, X]$ first-order universal
strict Horn formulae, 735
$\langle C; \Phi \rangle$ presentation, 739
Prod(\mathcal{K}) products, 744
Sub(\mathcal{K}) substructures, 744
Iso(\mathcal{K}) isomorphic copies, 744
Hom(\mathcal{K}) weak homomorphic
images, 744
$ERP(\mathcal{K})$ embeddings into reduced
products, 744
$\operatorname{QV}(\mathcal{K})$ quasivariety, 744
Var(\mathcal{K}) variety, 744

Chapter D3

(f,g)	open cell between f and g ,	\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}
[<i>f</i> , <i>g</i>]	757 closed cell between f and g ,	a
	757	
$B(\bar{a},\bar{b})$	box, 758	a
Cn(D)	continuous functions, 772	
dim C	dimension, 773	

Chapter E2

$\operatorname{dcl}_L(U)$	<i>L</i> -definitional closure, 815
$\operatorname{acl}_L(U)$	<i>L</i> -algebraic closure, 815
$\operatorname{dcl}_{\operatorname{Aut}}(U)$	Aut-definitional closure,
	817
$\operatorname{acl}_{\operatorname{Aut}}(U)$	Aut-algebraic closure, 817
\mathbb{M}	the monster model, 825
$A \equiv_U B$	having the same type
	over <i>U</i> , 826
\mathfrak{M}^{eq}	extension by imaginary
	elements, 827
$\operatorname{dcl}^{\operatorname{eq}}(U)$	definable closure in \mathfrak{M}^{eq} ,
	827
$\operatorname{acl}^{\operatorname{eq}}(U)$	algebraic closure in M ^{eq} ,
	827
T^{eq}	theory of \mathbb{M}^{eq} , 829
Gb(p)	Galois base, 837

Chapter E3

 $I_{cl}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B})$ elementary maps with I closed domain and range, \approx 873

Chapter E4

$\mathfrak{pMor}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathfrak{a},$	b) category of partial
	morphisms, 894
$\mathfrak{a} \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{K}} \mathfrak{b}$	forth property for objects
	in <i>K</i> , 895
$\mathfrak{a} \sqsubseteq_{\operatorname{pres}}^{\kappa} \mathfrak{b}$	forth property for
	κ -presentable objects,
	895
$\mathfrak{a} \equiv_{\mathrm{pres}}^{\kappa} \mathfrak{b}$	back-and-forth equivalence
	for κ -presentable objects,
	895
$\operatorname{Sub}_{\kappa}(\mathfrak{a})$	κ -presentable subobjects,
	906
$atp(\bar{a})$	atomic type, 917
$\eta_{\mathfrak{pq}}$	extension axiom, 918
$T[\mathcal{K}]$	extension axioms for \mathcal{K} , 918
$T_{ran}[\Sigma]$	random theory, 918
$\kappa_n(\varphi)$	number of models, 920
$\Pr_{\mathfrak{M}}^{n}[\mathfrak{M}\vDash$	φ] density of models, 920

Chapter E5

$[I]^{\kappa}$	increasing κ -tuples, 925
$\kappa \to (\mu)_{\lambda}^{\nu}$	partition theorem, 925
$pf(\eta, \zeta)$	prefix of ζ of length $ \eta $, 930
$\mathfrak{T}_*(\kappa^{$	index tree with small
	signature, 930
$\mathfrak{T}_n(\kappa^{$	index tree with large
	signature, 930
$\langle\!\langle X \rangle\!\rangle_n$	substructure generated in
	$\mathfrak{T}_n(\kappa^{, 930$
$\operatorname{Lvl}(\bar{\eta})$	levels of $\bar{\eta}$, 931
\approx_*	equal atomic types in \mathfrak{T}_* ,
	931

\approx_n equ	al atomic types in \mathfrak{T}_n ,	
2	931	
$\approx_{n,k}$ ref	inement of \approx_n , 932	
$\approx_{\omega,k}$ un	ion of $\approx_{n,k}$, 932	
$\bar{a}[\bar{\imath}]$ $\bar{a}^{i_{o}}$	$ \bar{a}^{i_{n-1}}$, 941	
$\operatorname{tp}_{\Delta}(\bar{a}/U) \Delta$ -	type, 941	
$\operatorname{Av}((\bar{a}^i)_i/U)$	average type, 943	
$\llbracket \varphi(\bar{a}^i) rbracket$ inc	lices satisfying φ , 952	
$\operatorname{Av}_1((\bar{a}^i)_i/C)$) unary average type,	
962		

Chapter E6

$\mathfrak{Emb}(\mathcal{K})$	embeddings between
	structures in $\mathcal K$, 965
p^F	image of a partial
-	isomorphism under F,
	968
$\operatorname{Th}_L(F)$	theory of a functor, 971
\mathfrak{A}^{α}	inverse reduct, 975
$\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{M})$	relational variant of M, 977
$\operatorname{Av}(F)$	average type, 986

Chapter E7

$\ln(\mathcal{K})$	Löwenheim number, 995
$\mathfrak{A} \preceq_{\mathcal{K}} \mathfrak{B}$	K-substructure, 996
$\operatorname{hn}(\mathcal{K})$	Hanf number, 1003
\mathcal{K}_{κ}	structures of size κ , 1004
$I^{\kappa}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B})$	K-embeddings, 1008
$\mathfrak{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{K}}^{\kappa} \mathfrak{B}$	$I_{\mathcal{K}}^{\kappa}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B}):\mathfrak{A}\sqsubseteq_{\mathrm{iso}}^{\kappa}\mathfrak{B},$ 1008
$\mathfrak{A} \equiv^{\kappa}_{\mathcal{K}} \mathfrak{B}$	$I_{\mathcal{K}}^{\kappa}(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{B}):\mathfrak{A}\equiv_{\mathrm{iso}}^{\kappa}\mathfrak{B},$ 1008

Chapter F1

 $\langle\!\langle X \rangle\!\rangle_D$ span of *X*, 1031 dim_{cl}(*X*) dimension, 1037 dim_{cl}(*X*/*U*) dimension over *U*, 1037

Chapter F2

$\mathrm{rk}_{\Delta}(\varphi)$	∆-rank, 1073
$\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\tilde{s}}(arphi)$	Morley rank, 1073
$\deg^{\bar{s}}_{M}(\varphi)$	Morley degree of φ , 1075
(MON)	Monotonicity, 1084
(NOR)	Normality, 1084
(lrf)	Left Reflexivity, 1084
(ltr)	Left Transitivity, 1084
(fin)	Finite Character, 1084
(sym)	Symmetry, 1084
(bmon)	Base Monotonicity, 1084
(SRB)	Strong Right Boundedness,
	1085
cl	closure operation
	associated with $$, 1090
(inv)	Invariance, 1097
(def)	Definability, 1097
(EXT)	Extension, 1097
$A \sqrt[df]{U} B$	definable over, 1098
$A \sqrt[\operatorname{at}]{U} B$	isolated over, 1098
$A \sqrt[s]{U} B$	non-splitting over, 1098
$\mathfrak{p} \leq \mathfrak{q}$	$\sqrt{-}$ free extension, 1103
$A \sqrt[u]{U} B$	finitely satisfiable, 1104
$\operatorname{Av}(\mathfrak{u}/B)$	average type of u, 1105
(lloc)	Left Locality, 1109
(rloc)	Right Locality, 1109
Symbol Index

loc()	right locality cardinal of $$,	Chapter F5	
$loc_{o}()$	finitary right locality cardinal of $$, 1109	(LEXT) Left Extension, 1228 $A \bigvee^{\text{fli}}_{U} B$ combination of \bigvee^{li} and \bigvee^{fli}_{V}	/,
$\kappa^{\rm reg}$	regular cardinal above κ , 1110	1239 A $\sqrt[\text{sli}]{_U} B$ strict Lascar invariance,	
fc(√)	length of $-1000000000000000000000000000000000000$	1239 (WIND) Weak Independence	
(sfin) ∛	Strong Finite Character, 1111 forking relation to $$, 1113	(IND) Independence Theorem, 1253	

Chapter F3

$A \sqrt[d]{U} B$	non-dividing, 1125
$A \sqrt[f]{U} B$	non-forking, 1125
$A \sqrt[i]{U} B$	globally invariant over, 1134

Chapter F4

	1	
$\operatorname{alt}_{\varphi}(\bar{a}_i)_{i\in I}$ φ -alternation number,		
1153	(rsh)]
$\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{alt}}(arphi)$ alternation rank, 1153	$lbm(\sqrt{)}$	1
in(~) intersection number, 1164	4 []	
$\bar{a} \approx^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}$ indiscernible sequence starting with $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \dots,$ 1167	$A[I]$ $A[<\alpha]$ $A[\leq\alpha]$ $A \leq \alpha$	l l l
$\bar{a} \equiv^{\text{ls}}_{U} \bar{b}$ Lascar strong type	$A \perp_U^{ac} B$	(
equivalence, 1168	$A \frac{si}{u} R$	\$
$CF((\bar{a}_i)_{i \in I})$ cofinal type, 1194	$\Upsilon_{\kappa\lambda}$	ı
$\operatorname{Ev}((\tilde{a}_i)_{i \in I})$ eventual type, 1199	$Un(\kappa, \lambda)$	(
$\operatorname{rk}_{\operatorname{dp}}(\overline{a}/U)$ dp-rank, 1211		

Chapter G1

$\bar{a} \downarrow^!_U B$	unique free extension, 1274
$\operatorname{mult}_{\operatorname{p}}(\mathfrak{p})$	$\sqrt{-multiplicity}$ of \mathfrak{p} , 1279
$\operatorname{mult}()$	multiplicity of $$, 1279
$\operatorname{st}(T)$	minimal cardinal T is
	stable in, 1290

Chapter G2

(rsh)	Right Shift, 1297
$lbm(\sqrt{)}$	left base-monotonicity
	cardinal, 1297
A[I]	$\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$, 1306
$A[<\alpha]$	$\bigcup_{i<\alpha}A_i$, 1306
$A[\leq \alpha]$	$\bigcup_{i \leq \alpha} A_i$, 1306
$A \perp^{\operatorname{do}}_U B$	definable orthogonality,
	1328
$A \sqrt[si]{U} B$	strong independence, 1332
$\Upsilon_{\kappa\lambda}$	unary signature, 1338
$\operatorname{Un}(\kappa,\lambda)$	class of unary structures,
	1338

1360

Lf(κ , λ) class of locally finite unary

structures, 1338

abelian group, 385 abstract elementary class, 995 abstract independence relation, 1084 κ -accessible category, 329 accumulation, 12 accumulation point, 364 action, 390 acyclic, 519 addition of cardinals, 116 addition of ordinals, 89 adjoint functors, 234 affine geometry, 1037 aleph, 115 algebraic, 149, 815 algebraic class, 996 algebraic closure, 815 algebraic closure operator, 51 algebraic diagram, 499 algebraic elements, 418 algebraic field extensions, 418 algebraic logic, 487 algebraic prime model, 694 algebraically closed, 815 algebraically closed field, 418, 710 algebraically independent, 418 almost strongly minimal theory, 1056 alternating path in a category, 271

alternating-path equivalence, 272 φ -alternation number, 1153 alternation rank of a formula, 1153 amalgamation class, 1005 amalgamation property, 910, 1004 amalgamation square, 652 Amalgamation Theorem, 521 antisymmetric, 40 arity, 28, 29, 149 array, 1221 array property, 1221 array-dividing, 1227 associative, 31 asynchronous product, 752 atom, 445 atom of a lattice, 215 atomic, 215 atomic diagram, 499 atomic structure, 855 atomic type, 917 atomless, 215 automorphism, 156 automorphism group, 386 average type, 943 average type of an Ehrenfeucht-Mostowski functor, 986

average type of an indiscernible system, 949 average type of an ultrafilter, 1105 Axiom of Choice, 109, 458 Axiom of Creation, 19, 458 Axiom of Extensionality, 5, 458 Axiom of Infinity, 24, 458 Axiom of Replacement, 132, 458 Axiom of Separation, 10, 458 axiom system, 454 axiomatisable, 454

back-and-forth property, 578, 893 back-and-forth system, 578 Baire, property of –, 363 ball, 342 $\sqrt{-base, 1228}$ base monotonicity, 1084 base of a partial morphism, 894 base projection, 894 base, closed —, 344 base, open —, 344 bases for a stratification, 1336 basic Horn formula, 735 basis, 110, 1034, 1037 beth, 126 Beth property, 648, 822 bidefinable, 885 biindiscernible family, 1219 biinterpretable, 891 bijective, 31 boolean algebra, 198, 455, 490 boolean closed, 490 boolean lattice, 198 boolean logic, 444, 462 bound variable, 450

boundary, 343, 758 κ -bounded, 598 bounded equivalence relation, 1172 bounded lattice, 195 bounded linear order, 583 bounded logic, 618 box, 758 branch, 189 branching degree, 191 canonical base, 834 canonical definition, 831 weak -, 847 canonical diagram, 337 canonical parameter, 831 weak —, 846 canonical projection from the \mathcal{P} -completion, 309 Cantor discontinuum, 351, 534 Cantor normal form, 100 Cantor-Bendixson rank, 365, 377 cardinal, 113 cardinal addition, 116 cardinal exponentiation, 116, 126 cardinal multiplication, 116 cardinality, 113, 329 cardinality quantifier, 482 cartesian product, 27 categorical, 877, 909 category, 162 δ -cell, 773 cell decomposition, 775 Cell Decomposition Theorem, 776 chain, 42 L-chain, 501 chain condition, 1247

chain condition for Morley sequences, 1257 chain in a category, 267 chain topology, 350 chain-bounded formula, 1168 Chang's reduction, 532 character, 105 characteristic, 710 characteristic of a field, 413 choice function, 106 Choice, Axiom of —, 109, 458 class, 9, 54 clopen set, 341 =-closed, 512 closed base, 344 closed function, 346 closed interval, 757 closed set, 51, 53, 341 closed subbase, 344 closed subset of a construction, 871, 1307 closed unbounded set, 135 closed under relativisations, 614 closed under substitutions, 614 closure operator, 51, 110 closure ordinal, 81 closure space, 53 closure under reverse ultrapowers, 734 closure, topological –, 343 co-chain-bounded relation, 1172 cocone, 253 cocone functor, 258 codomain of a partial morphism, 894 codomain projection, 894 coefficient, 398 cofinal, 123 cofinality, 123

Coincidence Lemma, 231 colimit, 253 comma category, 170 commutative, 385 commutative ring, 397 commuting diagram, 164 comorphism of logics, 478 compact, 352, 613 compact, countably –, 613 Compactness Theorem, 515, 531 compactness theorem, 718 compatible, 473 complement, 198 complete, 462 κ -complete, 598 complete partial order, 43, 50, 53 complete type, 527 completion of a diagram, 306 (λ, κ) -completion of a diagram, 307 (λ, κ) -completion of a partial order, 300 composition, 30 composition of links, 275 concatenation, 187 condition of filters, 721 cone, 257 confluence property, 1197 confluent family of sequences, 1197 congruence relation, 176 conjugacy class, 391 conjugate, 817 conjugation, 391 conjunction, 445, 490 conjunctive normal form, 467 connected category, 271 connected, definably -, 761 consequence, 460, 488, 521

```
Index
```

consistence of filters with conditions, degree of a polynomial, 399 dense class, 1256 721 dense linear order, 600 consistency over a family, 1221 consistent, 454 κ -dense linear order, 600 dense order, 454 constant, 29, 149 dense set, 361 constructible set, 869 dense sets in directed orders, 246 $\sqrt{-\text{constructible set, 1306}}$ construction, 869 dense subcategory, 281 $\sqrt{-\text{construction}, 1306}$ dependence relation, 1031 continuous, 46, 133, 346 dependent, 1031 contradictory formulae, 627 dependent set, 110 contravariant, 168 derivation, 398 convex equivalence relation, 1164 diagonal functor, 253 diagonal intersection, 137 coset, 386 countable, 110, 115 diagram, 251, 256 countably compact, 613 *L*-diagram, 499 covariant, 167 Diagram Lemma, 499, 634 difference, 11 cover, 352 Creation, Axiom of —, 19, 458 dimension, 1037 cumulative hierarchy, 18 dimension function, 1038 dimension of a cell, 773 cut, 22 dimension of a vector space, 409 deciding a condition, 721 direct limit, 252 definability of independence relations, direct power, 405 direct product, 239 1097 direct sum of modules, 405 definable, 815 definable expansion, 473 directed, 246 definable orthogonality, 1329 directed colimit, 251 definable Skolem function, 842 directed diagram, 251 definable structure, 885 κ -directed diagram, 251 definable type, 570, 1098 directed limit, 256 definable with parameters, 759 discontinuum, 351 definably connected, 761 discrete linear order, 583 defining a set, 447 discrete topology, 342 definition of a type, 570 disintegrated matroid, 1044 definitional closed, 815 disjoint union, 38 definitional closure, 815 disjunction, 445, 490

disjunctive normal form, 467 distributive, 198 dividing, 1125 dividing chain, 1136 dividing κ -tree, 1144 divisible closure, 706 divisible group, 705 domain, 28, 151 domain of a partial morphism, 894 domain projection, 894 dp-rank, 1211 dual categories, 172 Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé game, 589, 592 Ehrenfeucht-Mostowski functor, 986, 1002 Ehrenfeucht-Mostowski model, 986 element of a set, 5 elementary diagram, 499 elementary embedding, 493, 498 elementary extension, 498 elementary map, 493 elementary substructure, 498 elimination uniform — of imaginaries, 840 elimination of finite imaginaries, 853 elimination of imaginaries, 841 elimination set, 690 embedding, 44, 156, 494 Δ -embedding, 493 \mathcal{K} -embedding, 995 elementary —, 493 embedding of a tree into a lattice, 222 embedding of logics, 478 embedding of permutation groups, 886 embedding, elementary -, 498

endomorphism ring, 404 entailment, 460, 488 epimorphism, 165 equivalence class, 54 equivalence formula, 826 equivalence of categories, 172 equivalence relation, 54, 455 *L*-equivalent, 462 α -equivalent, 577, 592 equivalent categories, 172 equivalent formulae, 460 Erdős-Rado theorem, 928 Euklidean norm, 341 even, 922 exchange property, 110 existential, 494 existential closure, 699 existential quantifier, 445 existentially closed, 699 expansion, 155, 998 expansion, definable —, 473 explicit definition, 648 exponentiation of cardinals, 116, 126 exponentiation of ordinals, 89 extension, 152, 1097 Δ -extension, 498 extension axiom, 918 $\sqrt{-\text{extension base, 1228}}$ extension of fields, 414 extension, elementary -, 498 Extensionality, Axiom of –, 5, 458 factorisation, 180

Factorisation, 180 Factorisation Lemma, 158 factorising through a cocone, 317 faithful functor, 167 family, 37

field, 397, 457, 498, 710 field extension, 414 field of a relation, 29 field of fractions, 411 field, real —, 426 field, real closed —, 429 filter, 203, 207, 530 κ -filtered category, 285 κ -filtered colimit, 285 κ -filtered diagram, 285 final segment, 41 κ -finitary set of partial isomorphisms, 598 finite, 115 finite character, 51, 105, 1084 strong —, 1111 finite equivalence relation, 1164 finite intersection property, 211 finite occurrence property, 613 finite, being — over a set, 775 finitely axiomatisable, 454 finitely branching, 191 finitely generated, 154 finitely presentable, 317 finitely satisfiable type, 1104 first-order interpretation, 446, 475 first-order logic, 445 fixed point, 48, 81, 133, 657 fixed-point induction, 77 fixed-point rank, 675 Fodor Theorem of —, 139 follow, 460 forcing, 721 forgetful functor, 168, 234 forking chain, 1136 $\sqrt{-\text{forking chain}, 1110}$

 $\sqrt{-\text{forking formula, 1103}}$ forking relation, 1097 $\sqrt{-\text{forking type, 1103}}$ formal power series, 398 formula, 444 forth property for partial morphisms, 895 foundation rank, 192 founded, 13 Fraïssé limit, 912 free algebra, 232 free extension of a type, 1103 $\sqrt{-}$ free extension of a type, 1103 free model, 739 free structures, 749 $\sqrt{-\text{free type, 1103}}$ free variables, 231, 450 full functor, 167 full subcategory, 169 function, 29 functional, 29, 149 functor, 167 Gaifman graph, 605 Gaifman, Theorem of –, 611 Galois base, 834 Galois saturated structure, 1011 Galois stable, 1011 Galois type, 997 game, 79 generalised product, 751 *κ*-generated, 255, 965 generated substructure, 153 generated, finitely -, 154 generating, 41 generating a sequence by a type, 1158 generating an ideal, 400

generator, 154, 739 geometric dimension function, 1038 geometric independence relation, 1084 geometry, 1036 global type, 1114 graduated theory, 698, 783 graph, 39 greatest element, 42 greatest fixed point, 657 greatest lower bound, 42 greatest partial fixed point, 658 group, 34, 385, 456 group action, 390 group, ordered —, 705 guard, 447 Hanf number, 618, 637, 1003 Hanf's Theorem, 606

Hausdorff space, 351 having κ -directed colimits, 253 height, 190 height in a lattice, 215 Henkin property, 858 Henkin set, 858 Herbrand model, 511, 858 hereditary, 12 κ -hereditary, 910, 965 hereditary finite, 7 Hintikka formula, 586, 587 Hintikka set, 513, 858, 859 history, 15 hom-functor, 258 homeomorphism, 346 homogeneous, 787, 925 ≈-homogeneous, 931 κ -homogeneous, 604, 787 homogeneous matroid, 1044

homomorphic image, 156, 744 homomorphism, 156, 494 Homomorphism Theorem, 183 homotopic interpretations, 890 honest definition, 1157 Horn formula, 735

ideal, 203, 207, 400 idempotent link, 313 idempotent morphism, 313 identity, 163 image, 31 imaginaries uniform elimination of -, 840 imaginaries, elimination of -, 841 imaginary elements, 826 implication, 447 implicit definition, 647 inclusion functor, 169 inclusion link, 276 inclusion morphism, 491 inconsistent, 454 k-inconsistent, 1125 increasing, 44 independence property, 952 independence relation, 1084 independence relation of a matroid, 1083 Independence Theorem, 1253 independent, 1031 /-independent family, 1289 independent set, 110, 1037 index map of a link, 275 index of a subgroup, 386 indiscernible sequence, 941 indiscernible system, 949, 1337 induced substructure, 152

inductive, 77 inductive completion, 291 inductive completion of a category, 280 inductive fixed point, 81, 657, 658 inductively ordered, 81, 105 infimum, 42, 195 infinitary first-order logic, 445 infinitary second-order logic, 483 infinite, 115 Infinity, Axiom of —, 24, 458 inflationary, 81 inflationary fixed-point logic, 664 initial object, 166 initial segment, 41 injective, 31 κ -injective structure, 1008 inner vertex, 189 insertion, 39 inspired by, 950 integral domain, 411, 713 interior, 343, 758 interpolant, 653 interpolation closure, 648 interpolation property, 646 Δ -interpolation property, 646 interpretation, 444, 446, 475 intersection, 11 intersection number, 1164 interval, 757 invariance, 1097 invariant class, 1256 invariant over a subset, 1325 *U*-invariant relation, 1172 invariant type, 1098 inverse, 30, 165 inverse diagram, 256

inverse limit, 256 inverse reduct, 975 irreducible polynomial, 416 irreflexive, 40 $\sqrt{-isolated, 1297}$ isolated point, 364 isolated type, 855, 1098 isolation relation, 1297 isomorphic, 44 α -isomorphic, 581, 592 isomorphic copy, 744 isomorphism, 44, 156, 165, 172, 494 isomorphism, partial —, 577 joint embedding property, 1005 κ -joint embedding property, 910 Jónsson class, 1005 Karp property, 613 kernel, 157 kernel of a ring homomorphism, 402 label, 227 large subsets, 825 Lascar invariant type, 1178 Lascar strong type, 1168 lattice, 195, 455, 490 leaf, 189 least element, 42 least fixed point, 657 least fixed-point logic, 664 least partial fixed point, 658 least upper bound, 42 left extension, 1228 left ideal, 400 left local, 1109 left reflexivity, 1084

left restriction, 31 left transitivity, 1084 left-narrow, 57 length, 187 level, 190 level embedding function, 931 levels of a tuple, 931 lexicographic order, 187, 1024 lifting functions, 655 limit, 59, 257 limit stage, 19 limiting cocone, 253 limiting cone, 257 Lindenbaum algebra, 489 Lindenbaum functor, 488 Lindström quantifier, 482 linear independence, 406 linear matroid, 1037 linear order, 40 linear representation, 687 link between diagrams, 275 literal, 445 local, 608 local character, 1109 local enumeration, 772 κ -local functor, 965 local independence relation, 1109 localisation morphism, 491 localisation of a logic, 491 locality, 1109 locality cardinal, 1306 locally compact, 352 locally finite matroid, 1044 locally modular matroid, 1044 logic, 444 logical system, 485 Łoś' theorem, 715

Łoś-Tarski Theorem, 686 Löwenheim number, 618, 637, 641, 995 Löwenheim-Skolem property, 613 Löwenheim-Skolem-Tarski Theorem, 520 lower bound, 42 lower fixed-point induction, 658 map, 29 Δ -map, 493 map, elementary —, 493 mapping, 29 matroid, 1036 maximal element, 42 maximal ideal, 411 maximal ideal/filter, 203 maximally φ -alternating sequence, 1153 meagre, 362 membership relation, 5 minimal, 13, 57 minimal element, 42 minimal polynomial, 419 minimal rank and degree, 224 minimal set, 1049 model, 444 model companion, 699 model of a presentation, 739 model-complete, 699 κ -model-homogeneous structure, 1008 modular, 198 modular lattice, 216 modular law, 218 modular matroid, 1044 modularity, 1094 module, 403

monadic second-order logic, 483 monoid, 31, 189, 385 monomorphism, 165 monotone, 758 monotonicity, 1084 monster model, 825 Morley degree, 1075 Morley rank, 1073 Morley sequence, 1118 Morley-free extension of a type, 1076 morphism, 162 morphism of logics, 478 morphism of matroids, 1044 morphism of partial morphisms, 894 morphism of permutation groups, 885 multiplication of cardinals, 116 multiplication of ordinals, 89 multiplicity of a type, 1279 mutually indiscernible sequences, 1206

natural isomorphism, 172 natural transformation, 172 negation, 445, 489 negation normal form, 469 negative occurrence, 664 neighbourhood, 341 neutral element, 31 node, 189 normal subgroup, 387 normality, 1084 nowhere dense, 362

o-minimal, 760, 956 object, 162 occurrence number, 618 oligomorphic, 390, 877 omitting a type, 528 omitting types, 532 open base, 344 open cover, 352 open dense order, 455 open interval, 757 Open Mapping Theorem, 1276 open set, 341 open subbase, 345 opposite category, 166 opposite functor, 168 opposite lattice, 204 opposite order, 40 orbit, 390 order, 454 order property, 567 order topology, 349, 758 order type, 64, 941 orderable ring, 426 ordered group, 705 ordered pair, 27 ordered ring, 425 ordinal, 64 ordinal addition, 89 ordinal exponentiation, 89 ordinal multiplication, 89 ordinal, von Neumann —, 69

pair, 27

parameter equivalence, 831 parameter-definable, 759 partial fixed point, 658 partial fixed-point logic, 664 partial function, 29 partial isomorphism, 577 partial isomorphism modulo a filter, 727

partial morphism, 894 partial order, 40, 454 partial order, strict —, 40 partition, 55, 220 partition degree, 224 partition rank, 220 partitioning a relation, 775 path, 189 path, alternating — in a category, 271 Peano Axioms, 484 pinning down, 618 point, 341 polynomial, 399 polynomial function, 416 polynomial ring, 399 positive existential, 494 positive occurrence, 664 positive primitive, 735 power set, 21 predicate, 28 predicate logic, 444 prefix, 187 prefix order, 187 preforking relation, 1097 prelattice, 207 prenex normal form, 469 preorder, 206, 488 κ -presentable, 317 presentation, 739 preservation by a function, 493 preservation in products, 734 preservation in substructures, 496 preservation in unions of chains, 497 preserving a property, 168, 262 preserving fixed points, 655 $\sqrt{-\kappa}$ -prime, 1314 prime field, 413

prime ideal, 207, 402 prime model, 868 prime model, algebraic, 694 primitive formula, 699 principal ideal/filter, 203 Principle of Transfinite Recursion, 75, 133 product, 27, 37, 744 product of categories, 170 product of linear orders, 86 product topology, 357 product, direct —, 239 product, generalised -, 751 product, reduced —, 242 product, subdirect —, 240 projection, 37, 636 projection along a functor, 260 projection along a link, 276 projection functor, 170 projective class, 636 projective geometry, 1043 projectively reducible, 637 projectively κ -saturated, 804 proper, 203 property of Baire, 363 pseudo-elementary, 636 pseudo-saturated, 807 quantifier elimination, 690, 711 quantifier rank, 452 quantifier-free, 453 quantifier-free formula, 494 quantifier-free representation, 1338 quasi-dividing, 1231

quasivariety, 743

quotient, 179

Rado graph, 918 Ramsey's theorem, 926 random graph, 918 random theory, 918 range, 29 rank, 73, 192 Δ -rank, 1073 rank, foundation –, 192 real closed field, 429, 710 real closure of a field, 429 real field, 426 realising a type, 528 reduced product, 242, 744 reduct, 155 *μ*-reduct, 237 refinement of a partition, 1336 reflecting a property, 168, 262 reflexive, 40 regular, 125 regular filter, 717 regular logic, 614 relation, 28 relational, 149 relational variant of a structure, 976 relativisation, 474, 614 relativised projective class, 640 relativised projectively reducible, 641 relativised quantifiers, 447 relativised reduct, 640 Replacement, Axiom of –, 132, 458 replica functor, 979 representation, 1338 restriction, 30 restriction of a filter, 242 restriction of a Galois type, 1015 restriction of a logic, 491 restriction of a type, 560

retract of a logic, 547 retraction, 165 retraction of logics, 546 reverse ultrapower, 734 right local, 1109 right shift, 1297 ring, 397, 457 ring, orderable —, 426 ring, ordered —, 425 root, 189 root of a polynomial, 416 Ryll-Nardzewski Theorem, 877 satisfaction, 444 satisfaction relation, 444, 446 satisfiable, 454 saturated, 793 κ -saturated, 667, 793 $\sqrt{-\kappa}$ -saturated, 1314 κ -saturated, projectively —, 804 Scott height, 587 Scott sentence, 587 second-order logic, 483 section, 165 segment, 41 semantics functor, 485 semantics of first-order logic, 446 semi-strict homomorphism, 156 semilattice, 195 sentence, 450 separated formulae, 627 Separation, Axiom of -, 10, 458 sequence, 37 shifting a diagram, 313 signature, 149, 151, 235, 236 simple structure, 412 simple theory, 1135

simply closed, 694 singular, 125 size of a diagram, 251 skeleton of a category, 265 skew embedding, 938 skew field, 397 Skolem axiom, 505 Skolem expansion, 999 Skolem function, 505 definable —, 842 Skolem theory, 505 Skolemisation, 505 small subsets, 825 sort, 151 spanning, 1034 special model, 807 specification of a dividing chain, 1137 specification of a dividing κ -tree, 1144 specification of a forking chain, 1137 spectrum, 370, 531, 534 spectrum of a ring, 402 spine, 981 splitting type, 1098 stabiliser, 391 stability spectrum, 1290 κ -stable formula, 564 κ -stable theory, 573 stably embedded set, 1156 stage, 15, 77 stage comparison relation, 675 stationary set, 138 stationary type, 1272 Stone space, 374, 531, 534 $\sqrt{-\text{stratification, 1306}}$ strict homomorphism, 156 strict Horn formula, 735 strict Δ -map, 493

strict order property, 958 strict partial order, 40 strictly increasing, 44 strictly monotone, 758 strong *y*-chain, 1017 strong y-limit, 1017 strong finite character, 1111 strong limit cardinal, 808 strong right boundedness, 1085 strongly homogeneous, 787 strongly κ -homogeneous, 787 strongly independent, 1332 strongly local functor, 981 strongly minimal set, 1049 strongly minimal theory, 1056, 1149 structure, 149, 151, 237 subbase, closed —, 344 subbase, open —, 345 subcategory, 169 subcover, 352 subdirect product, 240 subdirectly irreducible, 240 subfield, 413 subformula, 450 subset, 5 subspace topology, 346 subspace, closure —, 346 substitution, 234, 465, 614 substructure, 152, 744, 965 Δ -substructure, 498 \mathcal{K} -substructure, 996 substructure, elementary -, 498 substructure, generated —, 153 substructure, induced —, 152 subterm, 228 subtree, 190 successor, 59, 189

successor stage, 19 sum of linear orders, 85 superset, 5 supersimple theory, 1294 superstable theory, 1294 supremum, 42, 195 surjective, 31 symbol, 149 symmetric, 40 symmetric group, 389 symmetric independence relation, 1084 syntax functor, 485 system of bases for a stratification, 1336

 $T_{\rm o}$ -space, 534 Tarski union property, 614 tautology, 454 term, 227 term algebra, 232 term domain, 227 term, value of a -, 231 term-reduced, 466 terminal object, 166 L-theory, 461 theory of a functor, 971 topological closure, 343, 758 topological closure operator, 51, 343 topological group, 394 topological space, 341 topology, 341 topology of the type space, 533 torsion element, 704 torsion-free, 705 total order, 40 totally disconnected, 351

totally indiscernible sequence, 942 totally transcendental theory, 574 transcendence basis, 418 transcendence degree, 418 transcendental elements, 418 transcendental field extensions, 418 transfinite recursion, 75, 133 transitive, 12, 40 transitive action, 390 transitive closure, 55 transitive dependence relation, 1031 transitivity, left —, 1084 translation by a functor, 260 tree, 189 φ -tree, 568 tree property, 1143 tree property of the second kind, 1221 tree-indiscernible, 950 trivial filter, 203 trivial ideal, 203 trivial topology, 342 tuple, 28 Tychonoff, Theorem of —, 359 type, 560 *L*-type, 527 *Ξ*-type, 804 *α*-type, 528 *s*-type, 528 type of a function, 151 type of a relation, 151 type space, 533 type topology, 533 type, average —, 943 type, average — of an indiscernible system, 949 type, complete —, 527 type, Lascar strong —, 1168

types of dense linear orders, 529

ultrafilter, 207, 530 κ -ultrahomogeneous, 906 ultrapower, 243 ultraproduct, 243, 797 unbounded class, 1003 uncountable, 115 uniform dividing chain, 1137 uniform dividing κ -tree, 1144 uniform elimination of imaginaries, 840 uniform forking chain, 1137 uniformly finite, being — over a set, 776 union, 21 union of a chain, 501, 688 union of a cocone, 293 union of a diagram, 292 unit of a ring, 411 universal, 494 κ -universal, 793 universal quantifier, 445 universal structure, 1008 universe, 149, 151 unsatisfiable, 454 unstable, 564, 574 upper bound, 42 upper fixed-point induction, 658

valid, 454 value of a term, 231 variable, 236 variable symbols, 445 variables, free —, 231, 450 variety, 743 Vaughtian pair, 1057 vector space, 403 vertex, 189 von Neumann ordinal, 69

weak *y*-chain, 1017 weak *y*-limit, 1017 weak canonical definition, 847 weak canonical parameter, 846 weak elimination of imaginaries, 847 weak homomorphic image, 156, 744 Weak Independence Theorem, 1252 weakly bounded independence relation, 1189 weakly regular logic, 614 well-founded, 13, 57, 81, 109 well-order, 57, 109, 132, 598 well-ordering number, 618, 637 well-ordering quantifier, 482, 483 winning strategy, 590 word construction, 972, 977

Zariski logic, 443 Zariski topology, 342 zero-dimensional, 351 zero-divisor, 411 Zero-One Law, 922 ZFC, 457 Zorn's Lemma, 110

,	The R	lomai	n and	Fraktu	r alp	habet	S
A	а	থ	a	Ν	п	N	n
В	b	B	\mathfrak{b}	Ο	0	\mathfrak{O}	Ø
С	С	C	C	P	р	\mathfrak{P}	p
D	d	D	d	Q	9	\mathfrak{Q}	q
Ε	е	E	e	R	r	R	r
F	f	F	f	S	S	S	۶ J
G	g	છ	g	T	t	T	t
H	h	H	\mathfrak{h}	U	и	U	u
Ι	i	I	í	V	ν	V	v
J	j	J	j	W	w	W	w
Κ	k	R	f	X	x	\mathfrak{X}	ŗ
L	l	£	ĺ	Y	y	Y	ŋ
Μ	т	M	m	Ζ	z	3	8

		The Gree	k alph	abet	
A	α	alpha	Ν	v	nu
В	β	beta	Ξ	ξ	xi
Γ	γ	gamma	0	0	omicron
Δ	δ	delta	Π	π	pi
Ε	ε	epsilon	Р	ρ	rho
Ζ	ζ	zeta	Σ	σ	sigma
Η	η	eta	T	τ	tau
Θ	θ	theta	Υ	υ	upsilon
Ι	l	iota	Φ	ϕ	phi
Κ	κ	kappa	X	χ	chi
Λ	λ	lambda	Ψ	ψ	psi
М	μ	mu	Ω	ω	omega