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Abstract. In [13] the authors show that if $\mu$ is a strongly compact cardinal, $K$ is an Abstract Elementary Class (AEC) with $LS(K) < \mu$, and $K$ satisfies joint embedding (amalgamation) cofinally below $\mu$, then $K$ satisfies joint embedding (amalgamation) in all cardinals $\geq \mu$. The question was raised if the strongly compact upper bound was optimal.

In this paper we prove the existence of an AEC $K$ that can be axiomatized by an $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$-sentence in a countable vocabulary, so that if $\mu$ is the first measurable cardinal, then

1. $K$ satisfies joint embedding cofinally below $\mu$;
2. $K$ fails joint embedding cofinally below $\mu$; and
3. $K$ satisfies joint embedding above $\mu$.

Moreover, the example can be generalized to an AEC $K^\chi$ axiomatized in $\mathcal{L}_{\chi^+, \omega}$, in a vocabulary of size $\chi$, such that (1)-(3) hold with $\mu$ being the first measurable above $\chi$.

This proves that the Hanf number for joint embedding is contained in the interval between the first measurable and the first strongly compact. Since these two cardinals can consistently coincide, the upper bound from [13] is consistently optimal.

This is also the first example of a sentence whose joint embedding spectrum is (consistently) neither an initial nor an eventual interval of cardinals. By Theorem 3.26, it is consistent that for any club $C$ on the first measurable $\mu$, JEP holds exactly on $\lim C$ and everywhere above $\mu$.

1. Background

In [8, Conjecture 9.3], Grossberg made (essentially) the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.1. For every $\lambda$, there is a cardinal $\mu(\lambda)$ such that for every Abstract Elementary Class (AEC) $K$, if $K$ has the $\mu(LS(K))$-amalgamation property, then $K$ has the $\lambda$-amalgamation property for all $\lambda \geq \mu(LS(K))$.

This cardinal $\mu(LS(K))$ (if it exists) is called the Hanf number for amalgamation, and we can define similarly what means for a cardinal to be the Hanf number for joint embedding.

Baldwin and Boney in [13] proved the existence of a Hanf number for joint embedding (and amalgamation and a few other variants of these two properties) from large cardinals, although their definition of ‘Hanf number’ is slightly different from Grossberg’s: if $\mu$ is a strongly compact cardinal, $K$ is an AEC with $LS(K) < $
\( \mu \), and \( K \) satisfies amalgamation cofinally below \( \mu \), then \( K \) satisfies amalgamation in all cardinals \( \geq \mu \).

The confusion comes from the fact that Hanf number is most often used for the property of model existence. In this case, there are a number of equivalent formulations:

**Fact 1.2.** Letting \( P \) be the property that “there exists a model” (model-existence), the following properties are all equivalent:

1. \( P \) holds in *some* cardinality above \( \kappa \);
2. \( P \) holds in *every* cardinality above \( \kappa \);
3. \( P \) holds in cofinally many cardinalities below \( \kappa \);
4. \( P \) holds in eventually many cardinalities below \( \kappa \); and
5. \( P \) holds in *every* cardinality.

These equivalences heavily use the downward-closed nature of model existence (and the computation of the Hanf number using Morley’s Omitting Types Theorem for (3) and (4)). However this is not the case for other properties, such as joint embedding and amalgamation, and the equivalence of (1)-(5) fails in these cases.

*For the purposes of this paper we take the definition of the Hanf number to be that of Baldwin-Boney (cf. [13]).*

**Definition 1.3.** Fix a property \( P \). A function \( \mu_P(\kappa) \) from cardinals to cardinals will be called the *Hanf number for \( P \)* iff it satisfies the following:

- If \( K \) is an AEC that satisfies property \( P \) cofinally below \( \mu_P(\text{LS}(K)) \), then \( K \) satisfies \( P \) in every cardinality above \( \mu_P(\text{LS}(K)) \).

If \( P \) is obvious from the context, then we will write \( \mu(\kappa) \) instead of \( \mu_P(\kappa) \).

Properties \( P \) of interest are joint embedding, amalgamation, categoricity, existence of maximal models, etc. In this paper, we focus on the properties of joint embedding (JEP) and amalgamation (AP), especially the former.

In the language of Fact 1.2, Definition 1.3 states the implication (3) \( \rightarrow \) (2) for property \( P \). The question then becomes: Which of the implications between (1)-(5) are true for joint embedding, or amalgamation, and which ones are false?

One of the contributions of this paper is to provide an example that (3) does not imply (4) when \( P \) is JEP and \( \kappa \) is the first measurable. In particular, as stated in the abstract, there exists an AEC \( K \) that both satisfies and fails JEP cofinally below the first measurable. This also relates to Question 4.0.2 in [3], that asks whether there is an AEC, in particular one defined by an \( L_{\omega_1, \omega} \)-sentence, whose finite amalgamation spectrum is not an interval (that is, amalgamation restricted to the \( \kappa_n \) for \( n < \omega \)). If we drop the restriction to a finite spectrum and replace AP by JEP, we prove that the answer is positive. Notice that while our example exhibits quite interesting JEP-spectrum, the same is not true for the AP-spectrum. By Theorem 4.4, \( K^\chi \) fails amalgamation in every cardinal above \( 2^{\chi^+} \). This leaves the corresponding question (does (3) imply (4)) for AP open.

The status of the implications (1) \( \rightarrow \) (2) (as envisioned by Grossberg) and (2) \( \rightarrow \) (3) also remains open for both for JEP and AP.

**Open Questions 1.4.**
(i) Is there an AEC \( K \) that fails JEP eventually below \( \kappa \), \( \kappa \) being the first measurable or the first super compact, but satisfies JEP in all cardinalities above \( \kappa \)?

(ii) Same question as (i), but satisfy JEP in one cardinality above \( \kappa \)?

Although in this paper we will not deal with it, we ought to say that similar considerations about categoricity have long occupied researchers in the area, e.g. the main open problem for AECs (Shelah’s Categoricity Conjecture) is whether (1) implies (2) for categoricity.

Far from being optimal, a lower bound for the Hanf number for amalgamation is given in [11]. For every cardinal \( \kappa \) and every \( \alpha \) with \( \kappa \leq \alpha < \kappa^+ \) there exists an AEC \( W_{\alpha} \) in a vocabulary of size \( \kappa \), \( W_{\alpha} \) has countable Löwenheim-Skolem number, and it satisfies amalgamation up to \( \mathcal{P}_{\alpha} \), but fails amalgamation in \( \mathcal{P}_{\kappa^+} \).

Combining the results form [11] and [13], the Hanf number for AP is contained in the interval between \( \mathcal{P}_{\kappa^+} \) and the first strongly compact above \( \kappa \). As noted in [13], the gap between these two cardinals is immense.

The picture is not very promising for JEP either. On the one hand we have the strongly compact upper bound from [13]. On the other hand the examples from [4] and [5] provide a lower bound. From Fact 3.37 in [11], for every countable \( \alpha \) there exists an AEC \( (K_{\alpha}, \subset) \) defined by a universal \( \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega} \)-sentence such that \( LS(K_{\alpha}) = \aleph_0 \) and \( K_{\alpha} \) satisfies JEP up to and including \( \mathcal{P}_{\alpha} \), but it has not larger models. This proves that \( \mathcal{P}_{\omega_1} \) is a lower bound for \( \mu(\aleph_0) \), the Hanf number for JEP.

The above example can easily be generalized: for every \( \kappa \leq \alpha < \kappa^+ \), there exists an AEC \( (K_{\alpha}, \subset) \) defined by a universal \( \mathcal{L}_{\kappa^+, \omega} \)-sentence such that \( LS(K_{\alpha}) = \kappa \) and \( K_{\alpha} \) satisfies JEP up to and including \( \mathcal{P}_{\alpha} \), but it has not larger models. This proves that as in the case for AP, the Hanf number for JEP is contained in the interval between \( \mathcal{P}_{\kappa^+} \) and the first strongly compact above \( \kappa \).

Stimulated by early versions of [5], Baldwin and Shelah announced in [1] (under certain set theoretic hypotheses) there exists a complete \( \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega} \)-sentence with maximal models in cofinally many cardinalities below the first measurable. They also note that every model of size equal to or larger than the first measurable has a proper \( \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega} \)-elementary extension; one can take a countably complete ultrapower. This proves the first measurable cardinal to be the Hanf number for “maximality”, where “maximality” means “existence of a maximal model”.

Notice that this introduces yet another notion of a Hanf number. If \( \mu \) is the first measurable cardinal, then no \( \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega} \)-sentence has a maximal model above \( \mu \). In the language of Fact 1.2 and letting \( P \) be “maximality”, (1) and (2) are equivalent for the trivial reason that they are both always false. The example from [11] proves that (3) does not imply (1) (or (2)) for maximality. So, this notion of a Hanf number does not fit into the definition 1.3, which is our working definition for this paper.

The main result of the paper is to prove a lower bound for the Hanf number for JEP. In particular, we show that \( \mu(\aleph_0) \) is bounded below by the first measurable cardinal. Since by results of [12, Theorem 3.1], the first measurable and the first strongly compact can be consistently equal, this proves that the known bounds are consistently optimal. Of course, the first measurable and the first strongly compact can also be different. So, this leaves open the question whether the lower bound from the current paper or the upper bound from [13] can be improved.

Our example was inspired by [11]. In fact, the idea of the main construction in the current paper appears as Example 3.0.3. in [13]. Our contribution is to compute
the JEP- and AP- spectra of this example. Notice that our $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}$-sentence (as well as the sentence from Example 3.0.3 in [1]) is incomplete. This is in contrast to the main construction of [1], where Baldwin and Shelah go in great lengths to create a complete sentence. It is an open question whether the results from this paper can extend to the complete example of [1].

In Section 2 we describe the construction. The JEP-spectrum is given in Section 3 and the AP-spectrum in Section 4.

For the main definitions of Abstract Elementary Classes, we refer the reader to Baldwin [2]; however, they are not necessary to understand the main construction and theorems.

2. THE MAIN EXAMPLE

Fix an infinite cardinal $\chi$, although this can be taken to be $\aleph_0$. We will define a language $\tau^\chi$ and an AEC $K^\chi$.

The prototypical elements of $K^\chi$ will be structures of the form

$$M = (\kappa, \mathcal{P}(\kappa), \chi \mathcal{P}(\kappa), \in, \lor, \land, \cdot^c, 1, \cap, \pi_\alpha)_{\alpha < \chi^+}$$

where

1. $\chi \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ are the $\chi$-length sequences from $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ (the power set of $\kappa$);
2. $\in$ is the (extensional) ‘member of’ relation between $\kappa$ and $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$;
3. $(\mathcal{P}(\kappa), \lor, \land, \cdot^c, 1)$ is the standard Boolean algebra;
4. $\cap : \chi \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ returns the intersection of all elements of the sequence; and
5. $\pi_\alpha : \chi \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ returns the $\alpha$th element of the sequence.

However, we don’t want the entire theory of these structures and only demand that the members of $K^\chi$ satisfy a particular subset of their $\mathcal{L}_{\chi^+,\omega}$-theory.

Formally, set $\tau^\chi$ to consist of

- sorts $K$, $P$, and $Q$;
- constant $1$;
- unary functions $\cdot^c$, $\cap$, and $\pi_\alpha$ for $\alpha < \chi$;
- binary functions $\land$ and $\lor$; and
- a binary relation $\varepsilon$.

Now we define a sentence $\psi^\chi \in \mathcal{L}_{\chi^+,\omega}$ that consists of the conjunction of the following first-order assertions

1. $\varepsilon \subset K \times P$ is extensional;
2. $(P, \lor, \land, \cdot^c, 1)$ is a Boolean algebra;
3. $\varepsilon$ interacts with the Boolean algebra operations in the expected way: $1$ contains every element of $K$, a complement contains exactly the elements not in the original, etc;
4. $P$ contains all singletons: $\forall x \in K \exists Y \in P \forall z \in K (z \in Y \iff z = x)$; and

the conjunction of the following infinitary assertions:

5. the functions $\pi_\alpha : Q \rightarrow P$ are jointly extensional in the sense that

$$\forall A, B \in Q \left( A = B \iff \bigwedge_{\alpha < \chi} \pi_\alpha(A) = \pi_\alpha(B) \right)$$
the function $\cap : Q \to P$ returns the intersection in the sense that
\[ \forall A \in Q \forall x \in K \left( x \in \cap A \iff \bigwedge_{\alpha < \chi} x \in \pi_{\alpha}(A) \right) \]

Given any model $M$ of $\psi^x$, there is a natural embedding of the Boolean algebra induced on $P^M$ into the Boolean algebra on $\mathcal{P}(K^M)$, the powerset of $K^M$.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $M \subset N$ model $\psi^x$ and $X \in P^M$.

1. Define $\widehat{X}^M := \{ x \in K^M | M \models x \in X \}$.
2. $M$ and $N$ agree on $X$ iff they agree on every $X \in P^M$ such that $\widehat{X}^M$ is a finite subset of $K^M$.
3. Define $K^x$ to be the collection of all models of $\psi^x$ of size $\geq \chi$. For $M, N \in K^x$, let $M \prec_K^x N$ if $M \subset N$ and $M$ and $N$ agree on finite subsets.

Following standard convention, we will often use $K^x$ to refer to the pair $(K^x, \prec_K^x)$.

Crucial to our later analysis, the lack of full elementarity in the $\prec_K^x$ relation means that $M$ and $N$ do not need to agree on all sets. In particular, $M$ and $N$ agree on $1$ iff $K^M = K^N$. Note also that $\widehat{X}^M = \widehat{X}^N \cap K^M$.

**Proposition 2.2.** For each $\chi$, $(K^x, \prec_K^x)$ is an Abstract Elementary Class with Löwenheim-Skolem number $\chi$.

**Proof.** This is an easy argument and we leave the details to the reader. One approach is that a definitional expansion (by adding “finite subset” functions) turns $K^x$ into a universal class. \qed

**Observation 2.3.**

1. It is immediate from the definition that the size of $P$ is bounded by $2^{|K|}$ and the size of $Q$ by $|P|^\chi$. There is no restriction on the size of $K$. Therefore, $\psi^x$ has models in all infinite cardinalities.
2. Given any model $M \models \psi^x$, we can find an isomorphic copy $\widetilde{M}$ of $M$ such that
   - (a) $K^{\widetilde{M}} = K^M$;
   - (b) $P^{\widetilde{M}} \subset \mathcal{P}(K^M)$; and
   - (c) $Q^{\widetilde{M}} \subset \chi \mathcal{P}(K^M)$.

   However, this choice is very non-canonical.

**Definition 2.4.**

(a) An AEC $K$ satisfies the $\kappa$-Joint Embedding Property or JEP($\kappa$) iff $K_\kappa$ is not empty and for all $M_0, M_1 \in K_\kappa$, there are $N \in K$ and $K$-embeddings $f_i : M_i \to N$. The joint embedding spectrum of $K$ or JEP-spectrum is the collection of all cardinals $\kappa$ such that $K$ satisfies JEP($\kappa$).
(b) Similarly, define AP($\kappa$) and the AP-spectrum for the amalgamation property.
(c) A model $M$ of $\psi^x$ is of type $(\lambda, \kappa)$ with $\lambda \geq \kappa$, if $|M| = \lambda$ and $|K^M| = \kappa$.
(d) Given $M \in K^x$, we say that an ultrafilter $U$ on the Boolean algebra $P^M$ is $Q^M$-complete iff for every $A \in Q^M$, if $\pi_{\alpha}(A) \in U$ for all $\alpha < \chi$, then $\cap^M(A) \in U$. 
3. The Joint Embedding Property

In this section we determine the joint embedding spectrum of \( K^X \). It turns out (Lemma 3.3) that the question of when two models can be jointly embedded depends on whether they can be extended in a certain way, called \( K \)-extendibility.

**Definition 3.1.** Let \( M \in K^X \).

1. \( M \) is \( K \)-extendible iff there is \( N \in K^X \) such that \( M \not\preceq_K N \) and \( K^M \subseteq K^N \).
2. \( M \) is \( K \)-maximal iff whenever \( N \in K^X \) has \( M \not\preceq_K N \), then \( K^M \subseteq K^N \).

So given a \( K \)-maximal model, it is either \( K \)-extendible or truly maximal. The next lemma connects \( K \)-extendibility to the existence of sufficiently complete ultrafilters.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let \( M \in K^X \). The following are equivalent:

1. \( M \) is \( K \)-extendible.
2. For all cardinals \( \lambda \), there exists some \( N \in K^X \) with \( M \not\preceq_K N \) and \( |K^N \setminus K^M| = \lambda \).
3. There exists a non-principal ultrafilter \( U \) on \( P^M \) that is \( Q^M \)-complete.

**Proof.** The implication (2) \( \Rightarrow \) (1) is immediate. We start by proving that (1) \( \Rightarrow \) (3). Suppose we have \( M,N \in K^X \) that witness the \( K \)-extendibility of \( M \). By assumption, there exists some \( d \in K^N \setminus K^M \). We then build an ultrafilter \( U_d \subseteq P^M \) as follows: for \( X \in P^M \), we set

\[
X \in U_d \text{ if and only if } N \models d \varepsilon X
\]

Then \( U_d \) is an ultrafilter by the standard set-theoretic argument; see, e.g. Theorem 5.6 in \ref{10}. We only prove \( U_d \) is non-principal and \( Q^M \)-complete.

Assume that \( U_d \) is principal and generated by some \( X_0 \in P^M \). By definition, \( P^M \) contains all finite subsets of \( K^M \).

(3) It follows that \( X_0^M \) is a singleton, say \( X_0^M = \{ x \} \). By definition of \( \prec_K \), \( M,N \) agree on all finite subsets of \( K^M \). In particular, \( X_0^M = X_0^N \). By the definition of \( U_d \), this implies that \( d = x \in K^M \).

Contradiction.

Let \( A \in Q^M \) such that \( X_\alpha := \pi^M_\alpha (A) \in U_d \), for all \( \alpha < \chi \). Since \( N \models d \varepsilon X_\alpha \) for every \( \alpha < \chi \), we must have \( N \models d \varepsilon \cap A \). Thus, \( \cap^{\chi} (A) = \cap^{\chi} (A) \in U_d \).

Next we prove that (3) \( \Rightarrow \) (1). Suppose that \( M \in K^X \) and there is a non-principal, \( Q^M \)-complete ultrafilter \( U \) on \( P^M \). Without loss of generality \( M \) satisfies the conclusions of Observation 2.3 and 2. Define \( N \) to be an \( \prec_K \)-extension of \( M \) as follows: Extend \( K^M \) by \( \lambda \)-many new elements to form \( K^N \). Say \( K^N = K^M \cup \lambda \).

Define \( \varepsilon^N \) on the new elements by, for \( X \in P^M \),

\[
N \models x \varepsilon X \iff X \in U.
\]

This implies that for every \( X \in P^M \), either \( X^N = X^M \), or \( X^N = X^M \cup (K^N \setminus K^M) \).

Which of the two is the case is determined by membership in \( U \).

\footnote{Another approach is to observe that \( U_d \) is the set of all sets whose \( \mu \)-measure equals to 1, where \( \mu \) is defined on \( P^M \) by \( \mu(X) = 1 \) when \( N \models d \in X \), and \( \mu(X) = 0 \) otherwise. \( U_d \) is an ultrafilter because \( \mu \) is \( 2 \)-valued.}

\footnote{This means that if \( K_0 \) is a finite subset of \( K^M \), there exists some \( X \in P^M \) with \( \hat{X}^M = K_0 \). See also clause (4) of \( \psi^X \).}
Additionally, we extend $P$ so that $P^N$ contains all finite subsets of $K^N$. This means that for every $F$ finite subset of $K^N$ that is not a subset of $K^M$, we introduce a new element $X_F$ in $P^N$ and define $\varepsilon^N$ is such a way that $\hat{X}^N_F = F$.

Moreover, $M$ and $N$ agree on $Q, \pi, \cap, \bigwedge, X /$ and on $\varepsilon |_{K^M \times P^M}$, and $\bigvee, \wedge, \circ$ have the intended interpretations.

We verify that $N$ is in $K^N$ and $M \prec K^N N$. $\varepsilon^N$ is extensional because the same is true for $\varepsilon^M$ and we only introduced elements in $P^N \backslash P^M$ for the finite subsets of $K^N$ that are not in $K^M$. Conditions (2), (3) are easy to verify using the fact that $U$ is an ultrafilter. We leave the details to the reader. (4) and (5) are immediate.

We verify that $N$ is in $K^N$ and $M \prec K^N N$. $\varepsilon^N$ is extensional because the same is true for $\varepsilon^M$ and we only introduced elements in $P^N \backslash P^M$ for the finite subsets of $K^N$ that are not in $K^M$. Conditions (2), (3) are easy to verify using the fact that $U$ is an ultrafilter. We leave the details to the reader. (4) and (5) are immediate.

We prove (6) using the $Q$-completeness of $U$. If $A \in Q^N = Q^M$, then $Y = \bigcap^N A = \bigcap^N A$ is in $U$ if and only if for all $\alpha$, $\pi_\alpha(A) \in U$. The one direction follows from $U$ being an ultrafilter, the other direction follows from $U$ being $Q$-complete.

We take cases: If $Y = \bigcap^N A \in U$, then $\hat{Y}^N = \hat{Y}^M \cup (K^N \backslash K^M)$ and $\pi_\alpha(A) = \pi_\alpha(M) \cup (K^N \backslash K^M)$, for all $\alpha$. If $Y \notin U$, then $\hat{Y}^N = \hat{Y}^M$ and $\pi_\alpha(A) = \pi_\alpha(M)$ , for some $\alpha$ (maybe not for all $\alpha$). In either case, $\hat{Y}^N = \bigcap^N \pi_\alpha(A)$ , which completes the proof that $N \in K^\chi$.

It remains to prove $M \prec K^N N$. The fact that $M \subset N$ is immediate. Let $X$ be in $P^M$ so that $\hat{X}^M$ is a finite set. We need to prove that $\hat{X}^N = \hat{X}^M$. Since $\hat{X}^M$ is finite and $U$ is non-principal, $X \notin U$. Therefore, $\hat{X}^N = \hat{X}^M$ as desired. □

**Corollary 3.3.** Assume $M \prec K^N N$. If $M$ is not $K$-extendible, then the same is true for $N$.

**Proof.** By definition of $K$-extendibility, $K^N$ must equal $K^M$. Since $M \subset N$, $P^M$ is a sub-Boolean Algebra of $P^N$. If $N$ were $K$-extendible, by Lemma 3.2 there would be a non-principal ultrafilter $U$ on $P^N$ which is $Q^N$-complete. The restriction of $U$ on $P^M$ leads to a contradiction. □

The key factor for determining whether two $M_0, M_1 \in K^\chi$ can be jointly embedded is the size of $K^M_0$ and $K^M_1$. If $|K^M_0| = |K^M_1|$, then this is possible as seen by the next Lemma 3.3. In fact more is true: For every $\kappa$, there is a single structure $M \in K^\chi$ that can embed all other $M' \in K^\chi$ with $|K^M'| = \kappa$. This universality property holds true because the Boolean algebra $(P, \bigvee, \wedge, \circ, 1, 0)$ interpreted in $M$ (the universal model) coincides with the Boolean algebra of the power set of $K^M$. If $|K^M_0| < |K^M_1|$, then $M_0, M_1$ can be jointly embedded if and only if $M_0$ is $K$-extendible. This is the content of Lemma 3.3.

**Lemma 3.4.** Let $\kappa \geq \chi$. There exists a model $M \in K^\chi$ of type $(2^\kappa, \kappa)$ such that for any other $N \in K^\chi$ with $|K^N| = \kappa$, there is an $\prec K^\chi$-embedding from $N$ to $M$. Moreover, $M$ is $K$-maximal.

**Proof.** Let $M$ be the standard model generated by $K^M = \kappa, P^M = \mathcal{P}(\kappa), Q^M = ^\chi \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. We claim that $M$ is the desired model.

Let $N \in K^\chi$ with $|K^N| = \kappa$. Define a $K^\chi$-embedding $f$ from $N$ to $M$ as follows: $f$ is a bijection from $K^N$ to $\kappa$; this is possible by cardinality assumptions. For each $X \in P^N$, set $f(X) = \{f(x) \mid x \in X^N\} \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. For each $A \in Q^N$, let $f(A)$ be the sequence $\langle f(\pi_\alpha(A)) \mid \alpha < \chi \rangle \in ^\chi \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. It is immediate that $f$ is an $K^\chi$-embedding.
For the moreover, the extensionality of $\in$ and the $\pi_\alpha$ imply that any extension of $M$ cannot grow $P$ or $Q$ without growing $K$.

\textbf{Lemma 3.5.} Let $M_0,M_1 \in K^\chi$. If $|K^{M_0}| < |K^{M_1}|$, then $M_0$ and $M_1$ can be jointly embedded if and only if $M_0$ is $K$-extendible.

\textit{Proof.} First, suppose that $M_0$ and $M_1$ can be jointly embedded into some $M \in K^\chi$. Then $|K^M| \geq |K^{M_1}| > |K^{M_0}|$. By Lemma 3.2, $M_0$ is $K$-extendible.

Right-to-left: Assume that $M_0$ is $K$-extendible. By Lemma 3.2 there exists some $M'_0 \in K^\chi$, $M_0 \not\prec\chi M'_0$ and $|K^{M'_0}| = |K^{M_1}|$. Use Lemma 3.4 to joint embed $M'_0$ and $M_1$ to a common $M$. Then $M$ serves also as the joint embedding of $M_0$ and $M_1$. $\square$

Recall that there are no countably complete, non-principal ultrafilters on any set of size less than the first measurable cardinal. More generally, fixing $\chi$, there is no $\chi^+$-complete, non-principal ultrafilter on any set of size less than the first measurable larger than $\chi$ (if one exists). If there is no measurable above $\chi$, then there are no $\chi^+$-complete, non-principal ultrafilters at all. We utilize these facts to prove the existence of models that are not $K$-extendible.

\textbf{Definition 3.6.} Given a cardinal $\kappa$, set

$$m(\kappa) := \inf\{\lambda \mid \lambda > \kappa \text{ and } \lambda \text{ is measurable}\}$$

If there are no measurable cardinals above $\kappa$, then set $m(\kappa) = \infty$ (which is greater than every ordinal by convention).

\textbf{Lemma 3.7.} Let $\chi \leq \kappa < m(\chi)$. There exists a model $M \in K^\chi$ of type $(2^\kappa, \kappa)$ that is $\not\prec\chi_K$-maximal. In particular, $M$ is not $K$-extendible.

\textit{Proof.} Let $M$ be the standard model on $(\kappa, P(\kappa), \chi P(\kappa))$ as in Lemma 3.3. We know it is $K$-maximal, and we claim that $M$ is maximal. By the remark following Definition 3.1 it suffices to show that it is not $K$-extendible.

If it were $K$-extendible, then Lemma 3.2 would imply that there is a $Q^M$-complete, non-principal ultrafilter $U$ on the Boolean algebra $P^M$. However, since $P^M = P(\kappa)$, $U$ is an ultrafilter on $\kappa$. Moreover, since $Q^M = \chi P(\kappa)$, the $Q^M$-completeness of $U$ is a different name for $\chi$-completeness (in the normal sense). This would imply that there is a $\chi$-complete ultrafilter on $\kappa$; however, this contradicts $\kappa < m(\chi)$. $\square$

\textbf{Theorem 3.8.} Let $\chi \leq \kappa < m(\chi)$. Then $K^\chi$ fails JEP$(2^\kappa)$.

\textit{Proof.} Let $M$ be the model from Lemma 3.7 $M$ is of type $(2^\kappa, \kappa)$. Let $N$ be any model in $K$ of type $(2^\kappa, 2^\kappa)$. Take for instance $K^N = 2^\kappa$, $P^N$ contains all finite and co-finite subsets of $K^N$ and $Q^N$ is empty.

By Lemma 3.5 $M$ and $N$ can be jointly embedded if and only if $M$ is $K$-extendible. But $M$ is not $K$-extendible by Lemma 3.7 which proves the corollary. $\square$

Once we are above a measurable, $K$-extendibility and, therefore, joint embedding become trivial to accomplish.

\textbf{Lemma 3.9.} If $\kappa \geq m(\chi)$, then every model in $K^\chi_\kappa$ is $K$-extendible.
Theorem 3.11. If Observation 2.3. To prove JEP

Proof. Lemma 3.4 in the case

\(|\mu| = \kappa\). In particular, \(K^{\mu}/U \supseteq K^\mu\). This witnesses that \(M\) is \(K\)-extendible. \(\square\)

Theorem 3.10. If \(\kappa \geq m(\chi)\), then \(K^\chi\) satisfies JEP(\(\kappa\)).

Proof. As we noted, if \(M \in K^\chi\), then \(|K^M| = \kappa\). The statement follows from Lemma 3.4 in the case \(|K^{M_0}| = |K^{M_1}|\), or otherwise from Lemmas 3.5 and 3.9 \(\square\)

We can also show that joint embedding holds at strong limit cardinals.

Theorem 3.11. If \(\kappa \geq \chi\) is a strong limit cardinal, then \(K^\chi\) satisfies JEP(\(\kappa\)).

Proof. The strong limit assumption implies that if \(M \in K^\chi\), then \(|K^M| = \kappa\) by Observation 2.3. To prove JEP(\(\kappa\)), let \(M_0, M_1 \in K^\chi\) both of size \(\kappa\). It follows that \(|K^{M_0}| = |K^{M_1}| = \kappa\), so they are both jointly embeddable into the universal model \(N\) given by Lemma 3.4. Since \(K^\chi\) is an AEC (Proposition 2.2), there is \(N' \succ N\) of size \(\kappa\) that contains the images of \(M_0, M_1\). This proves JEP(\(\kappa\)). \(\square\)

Notice that Theorem 3.11 holds true even for \(\kappa = \chi\).

Suppose that there is a measurable above \(\chi\) and let \(\mu = m(\chi)\). Then Theorem 3.11 yields a cofinal sequence in \(\mu\) on which joint embedding holds, while Theorem 3.8 yields a cofinal sequence on which JEP fails. Under GCH this gives a complete characterization of the JEP-spectrum of \(K\).

Corollary 3.12. Assume GCH holds. \(K^\chi\) satisfies JEP(\(\kappa\)) if and only if \(\kappa \geq \chi\) is a limit cardinal below \(m(\chi)\) or \(\kappa \geq m(\chi)\).

Corollary 3.13. The Hanf number \(\mu(\aleph_0)\) for JEP is at least a measurable cardinal.

In the rest of this section we determine the joint embedding spectrum even when GCH fails, in particular for cardinals \(\chi \leq \kappa < m(\chi)\) such that \(\kappa < 2^{<\kappa}\). Our results shows that JEP(\(\kappa\)) fails for almost all such cardinals. Depending on cardinal arithmetic there might be some cardinals in the vicinity of strong limits\footnote{If \(\kappa\) is a strong limit, the cardinals for which JEP(\(\lambda\)) is open are no larger than \(\kappa^{<\kappa}\).} for which our method does not give an answer. The precise statement is given in Theorem 3.24.

Our abstract tool is the following lemma, which reduces our problem to finding a particular model.

Lemma 3.14. Suppose that \(\kappa \geq \chi\) and \(\lambda < \kappa \leq 2^\chi\). If \(K^\chi\) contains a model of type \((\kappa, \lambda)\) that is not \(K\)-extendible, then \(K^\chi\) fails JEP(\(\kappa\)).

Proof. Let \(M\) be a model as in the assumption and let \(N\) be a model of type \((\kappa, \kappa)\). Then \(|M| = |N| = \kappa\) and \(|K^N| > |K^M|\). By Lemma 3.5, \(M\) and \(N\) can not be jointly embedded, so JEP(\(\kappa\)) fails. \(\square\)

When \(\kappa = \chi\), such a model is easy to build.

Lemma 3.15. There exists a model \(M \in K^\chi\) of type \((\chi, \chi)\) which is not \(K\)-extendible.
**Definition 3.18.** A cardinal $\kappa$ is weakly compact if and only if for every $\kappa$-complete Boolean algebra $B \subseteq P(\kappa)$ generated by $\kappa$-many subsets, there is a $\kappa$-complete non-principal ultrafilter on $B$. We will consider a weakening of this large cardinal notion as in [6, Definition 2.1].

**Remark.** Let $B$ be a Boolean algebra on $\kappa$ and let $U$ be an ultrafilter on $B$. Then $U$ is $\lambda$-complete, for some $\lambda \leq \kappa$, if and only if for every $W \subseteq B$, a partition of $B$ of size $|W| < \lambda$, there exists some $w \in W$ that belongs to $U$.

**Proof.** Define $M$ by setting $K^M = \chi$; $P^M$ contains all finite and cofinite subsets of $\chi$; and $Q^M$ contains for every limit ordinal $\beta \leq \chi$ the sequence of tails $\{\langle \alpha, \chi \rangle \mid \alpha < \beta \}$. It follows that $M$ has type $(\chi, \chi)$ and $M \subseteq K^\chi$.

We also claim that $M$ is not $K$-extendible, or, equivalently by Lemma [3.2], there is no non-principal $Q^M$-complete ultrafilter on $P^M$. Assume otherwise and let $U$ be such an ultrafilter. We prove by induction on $\alpha$ that $\langle \alpha, \chi \rangle \in U$. For the successor stage use the fact that $U$ is non-principal. For the limit stages use the fact that $U$ is $Q^M$-complete.

Therefore, $U$ contains all the sets of the form $\langle \alpha, \chi \rangle$, $\alpha < \chi$. Using $Q^M$-completeness once more, $U$ must contain $\cap_\alpha \langle \alpha, \chi \rangle = \emptyset$. Contradiction.

**Corollary 3.16.** $K^\chi$ fails JEP($\kappa$) for all $\chi^+ \leq \kappa \leq 2^\kappa$.

Our next goal is to extend Lemma 3.15 and Corollary 3.16 to higher cardinalities. This will be achieved in Corollary 3.20. We need some preliminary work before we can prove Corollary 3.20.

The proof of the following fact is standard, see, e.g., [7, Lemma 4.2.3].

**Fact 3.17.** Let $B$ be a Boolean algebra on $\kappa$ and let $U$ be an ultrafilter on $B$. Then $U$ is $\lambda$-complete, for some $\lambda \leq \kappa$, if and only if for every $W \subseteq B$, a partition of $B$ of size $|W| < \lambda$, there exists some $w \in W$ that belongs to $U$.

**Definition 3.18.** A cardinal $\kappa$ in $\delta$-weakly compact for $\delta \leq \kappa$ if every $\kappa$-complete Boolean algebra $B \subseteq P(\kappa)$ generated by $\kappa$-many subsets has a $\delta$-complete non-principal ultrafilter on $B$.

Note that $\kappa$-weakly compact is the same as weakly compact.

Recall that by assumption we deal only with Boolean algebras that contain the finite subsets of $\kappa$. Then a $\kappa$-complete boolean algebra $B$ contains all subsets of size $< \kappa$. In particular, $\kappa^{< \kappa} \leq |B|$. On the other hand, any $\kappa$-complete Boolean algebra generated by $\kappa$-many subsets must have size $\leq \kappa^{< \kappa}$. Combining the two inequalities, $|B| = \kappa^{< \kappa}$.

**Lemma 3.19.** Fix an infinite cardinal $\chi$. If $\chi < \kappa \leq m(\chi)$ and $\kappa$ is $\chi^+$-weakly compact, then $\kappa$ is weakly compact.

**Proof.** Assume otherwise. That is there exists some $\kappa$-complete Boolean algebra $B \subseteq P(\kappa)$ generated by $\kappa$-many subsets such that there is no $\kappa$-complete non-principal ultrafilter on $B$, but there is a $\chi^+$-complete, non-principal ultrafilter $U$ on $B$. Let $\mu^+$ be the least cardinal so $U$ is not $\mu^+$-complete. Note that we must have $\chi^+ \leq \mu < \kappa$.

Since $U$ is not $\mu^+$-complete, by Fact 3.17 there exists some partition $W = \{w_i \mid i < \mu\}$ of $B$ such that $w_i \notin U$ for all $i < \mu$. Define a function $f : \kappa \to \mu$ by $f(x) = i$ if $x \in w_i$.

The function $f$ is defined on $\kappa$ and is onto $\mu$. Use $f$ to define a complete Boolean algebra $C \subseteq P(\mu)$ and some ultrafilter $V$ on $C$ as follows: $Y \in C$ if and only if $f^{-1}(Y) \in B$, and $Y \in V$ if and only if $f^{-1}(Y) \in U$. 


It is routine to verify that $C = \mathcal{P}(\mu)$ and that $V$ is a $\mu$-complete, non-principal ultrafilter on $C$. Thus, $\mu$ must be measurable, contradicting the assumption that $\chi < \mu < \kappa \leq m(\chi)$. □

**Corollary 3.20.** Assume $\chi \leq \kappa < m(\chi)$. If $\kappa$ is not weakly compact, then $\text{JEP}(\lambda)$ fails for all $\max\{\kappa^+, \kappa^{<\kappa}\} \leq \lambda \leq 2^\kappa$.

**Proof.** By Lemma 3.19, $\kappa$ is not $\chi^+$-weakly compact. By definition there is a Boolean algebra $B$ on $\kappa$, $B$ of size $\kappa^{<\kappa}$, that admits no non-principal $\chi^+$-complete ultrafilter. Then use $B$ to construct a model $M \in K^\kappa$ of type $(\kappa^{<\kappa}, \kappa)$ that is not $K$-extendible by defining $K^M = \kappa$, $P^M = B$ and $Q^M = B^\kappa$. By Lemma 3.14, if $\kappa < \kappa^{<\kappa}$, $K^\kappa$ fails $\text{JEP}(\kappa^{<\kappa})$.

For $\lambda$ any cardinal in the interval $(\kappa^{<\kappa}, 2^\kappa]$ (if any), we work similarly. Construct a model $N \in K^\kappa$ of type $(\lambda, \kappa)$ such that $M \not\leq^*_K N$. Define $N$ by letting $K^N = K^M = \kappa$, $P^N$ is a Boolean Algebra extension of $P^M = B$ that has size $\lambda$ and $Q^N = Q^M = B^\kappa$. By Corollary 3.13, $N$ is not $K$-extendible and by Lemma 3.14 again, $K^\kappa$ fails $\text{JEP}(\lambda)$. □

We can strengthen this failure to the first strong limit above $\kappa$. Recall the following definition.

**Definition 3.21.** For any cardinal $\kappa$,

- $\beth_0(\kappa) = \kappa$
- $\beth_{\alpha+1}(\kappa) = 2^{\beth_\alpha(\kappa)}$
- $\beth_\lambda(\kappa) = \sup_{\alpha < \lambda} \beth_\alpha(\kappa)$, for $\lambda$ limit

If no $\kappa$ is mentioned, we assume that $\kappa = \aleph_0$.

**Fact 3.22.**

(a) All strong limit cardinals are of the form $\beth_\lambda$, for limit $\lambda$.
(b) For any $\kappa$ the least strong limit above $\kappa$ is $\beth_\omega(\kappa)$.

**Lemma 3.23.** Let $\chi \leq \kappa < m(\chi)$ such that $\kappa$ is not weakly compact. Then $\text{JEP}(\lambda)$ fails for all $\max\{\kappa^+, \kappa^{<\kappa}\} \leq \lambda \leq \beth_\omega(\kappa)$.

**Proof.** We prove by induction on $\alpha$ that if $\kappa \leq \aleph_\alpha < \beth_\omega(\kappa)$, then $\text{JEP}(\lambda)$ fails for all $\max\{\kappa^+, \kappa^{<\kappa}\} \leq \lambda \leq 2^{\aleph_\alpha}$.

The base case $\aleph_\alpha = \kappa$ is exactly Corollary 3.20. There are two other cases to consider:

**Successor:** Let $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and by inductive hypothesis $\text{JEP}(\lambda)$ fails for all

$$\text{max}\{\kappa^+, \kappa^{<\kappa}\} \leq \lambda \leq 2^{\aleph_\beta}$$

We apply Corollary 3.20 for $\aleph_\alpha$ and we get that $\text{JEP}(\lambda)$ fails for all

$$\text{max}\{\aleph_\alpha^+, \aleph_\alpha^{<\aleph_\alpha}\} \leq \lambda \leq 2^{\aleph_\alpha}$$

We claim that $\max\{\aleph_\alpha^+, \aleph_\alpha^{<\aleph_\alpha}\} \leq (2^{\aleph_\beta})^+$ and the result follows by combining (3.1), (3.2), and the claim.

We prove the claim: $\aleph_\alpha \leq 2^{\aleph_\beta}$ implies that $\aleph_\alpha^+ \leq (2^{\aleph_\beta})^+$. Also, $\aleph_\alpha^{<\aleph_\alpha} = \aleph_\alpha^{<\aleph_\alpha} = 2^{\aleph_\beta} < (2^{\aleph_\beta})^+$.

**Limit:** By inductive hypothesis, if $\beta < \alpha$, $\text{JEP}(\lambda)$ fails for all

$$\text{max}\{\kappa^+, \kappa^{<\kappa}\} \leq \lambda \leq 2^{\aleph_\beta}$$
Taking supremum, we conclude the failure for all
\[(3.4) \quad \max\{\kappa^+, \kappa^{<\kappa}\} \leq \lambda < 2^{\aleph_\alpha}\]

We apply Corollary \[3.20\] for \(\aleph_\alpha\): \(JEP(\lambda)\) fails for all
\[(3.5) \quad \max\{\aleph^{\aleph_\alpha}_+\{\aleph^{<\aleph_\alpha}_\alpha\} \leq \lambda \leq 2^{\aleph_\alpha}\]

We split into two sub-cases:

**Sub-Case 1:** The value of \(2^{\aleph_\alpha}\) is eventually constant for \(\beta < \alpha\).

Then \(\aleph^{\aleph_\alpha}_+\{\aleph^{<\aleph_\alpha}_\alpha\} = 2^{\aleph_\alpha}\), for some \(\beta < \alpha\). Working as in the successor case, we can prove that \(\max\{\aleph^{\aleph_\alpha}_+, \aleph^{<\aleph_\alpha}_\alpha\} \leq (2^{\aleph_\alpha})^+\) and the result follows by combining (3.3), (3.5), and the claim.

**Sub-Case 2:** The value of \(2^{\aleph_\alpha}\) is not eventually constant for \(\beta < \alpha\).

We claim that \(\aleph_\alpha < 2^{\aleph_\alpha}\). If \(2^{\aleph_\alpha}\) were equal to \(\aleph_\alpha\), this would make \(\aleph_\alpha\) a strong limit cardinal. By Fact 3.22, \(\aleph_\alpha \geq \aleph_\omega(\kappa)\) which is a contradiction. It follows that \(\max\{\aleph^{\aleph_\alpha}_+, \aleph^{<\aleph_\alpha}_\alpha\} = 2^{\aleph_\alpha}\), and the result follows by combining (3.4) and (3.5).

Summarizing, we have the following:

**Theorem 3.24.** Fix cardinals \(\chi\) and \(\kappa\) with \(\chi < \kappa < m(\chi)\). Then the following is true of \(K^\chi\):

1. If \(\kappa = \chi\), then \(JEP(\lambda)\) fails for all \(\chi^+ \leq \lambda < \aleph_\omega\).
2. If \(\kappa\) is an uncountable strong limit, but not an inaccessible, then \(JEP(\lambda)\) fails for all \(\kappa^{<\kappa} \leq \lambda < \aleph_\omega(\kappa)\).
3. If \(\kappa\) is an inaccessible, but not a weakly compact, then \(JEP(\lambda)\) fails for all \(\kappa^+ \leq \lambda < \aleph_\omega(\kappa)\).
4. If \(\kappa\) is a weakly compact, then \(JEP(\lambda)\) fails for all \(\max\{\kappa^+, \kappa^{<\kappa}\} \leq \lambda \leq \aleph_\omega(\kappa)\).

**Proof.** The first case follows from Lemma 3.16 and (the proof of) Lemma 3.23. For the next two cases the result follows from Lemma 3.25 and some cardinal arithmetic. If \(\kappa\) is an uncountable strong limit, but not an inaccessible, then \(cf(\kappa) = \kappa\) and \(\max\{\kappa^+, \kappa^{<\kappa}\} = \kappa^{<\kappa}\). If \(\kappa\) is an inaccessible, then \(\max\{\kappa^+, \kappa^{<\kappa}\} = \kappa^+\).

For the last case, notice that Lemma 3.23 does not apply because \(\kappa\) is weakly compact. Instead apply the same Lemma to \(\kappa^+\).

Since \(\aleph_\omega(\kappa)\) is a strong limit cardinal, the above Theorem together with Theorems 3.10 and 3.11 determine the JEP-spectrum of \(K^\chi\):

- \(JEP(\lambda)\) holds if \(\lambda\) is a strong limit (including potentially the case \(\lambda = \chi\)) or if \(\lambda\) is greater or equal to the first measurable;
- \(JEP(\lambda)\) fails in all other cases, except some cardinals (if any) in the interval \([\kappa^+, \kappa^{<\kappa}])\), where \(\kappa\) is strong limit, for which the question is open.

We finish this section by producing models of ZFC+ “there is a measurable” where Theorem 3.24 characterizes the JEP spectrum of \(K^\chi\). The main tool is the following theorem of Paris and Kunen (see \[9\] Theorem 21.3).

**Fact 3.25.** Assume GCH and let \(\kappa\) be a measurable cardinal. Let \(D\) be a normal measure on \(\kappa\) and let \(A\) be a set of regular cardinals below \(\kappa\) such that \(A \notin D\). Let \(F\) be a function on \(A\) such that \(F(\alpha) < \kappa\) for all \(\alpha \in A\), and:

(i) \(cf F(\alpha) > \alpha\);
(ii) \(F(\alpha_1) \leq F(\alpha_2)\) whenever \(\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2\).
Then there is a generic extension \( V[G] \) of \( V \) with the same cardinals and cofinalities, such that \( \kappa \) is measurable in \( V[G] \), and for every \( \alpha \in A \), \( V[G] \models 2^{\alpha} = F(\alpha) \).

Moreover, the powersets of cardinals not in \( A \) have the smallest possible cardinality that satisfies \( \kappa < cf(2^\kappa) \) and that the powerset function is increasing.

**Theorem 3.26.** Assume GCH and fix an infinite cardinal \( \chi \). Given a club \( C \) on \( m(\chi) \), there is a generic extension \( V[G] \) that preserves cardinalities and cofinalities, \( m(\chi) \) remains a measurable cardinal and \( K^\chi \) satisfies JEP(\( \lambda \)) iff \( \lambda \in \text{lim } C \) or \( \lambda \geq m(\chi) \).

**Proof.** The goal is to force the cardinal arithmetic of \( V[G] \) to make the limit points of \( C \) the uncountable strong limit cardinals while preserving the measurability of \( m(\chi) \). Since limits of strong limit cardinals are also strong limits, it suffices that we ensure that all cardinals in \( \text{lim } C \setminus \text{lim lim } C \) are strong limits.

Let \( U \) be a normal ultrafilter on \( m(\chi) \). \( U \) contains all clubs, so \( \text{lim } C \in U \). Given \( \lambda \in \text{lim } C \setminus \text{lim lim } C \), \( \lambda \) has cofinality \( \omega \) and the set \( \text{lim } C \cap \lambda \) is bounded in \( \lambda \). Let \( \{ \kappa^\lambda_n \mid n < \omega \} \) be an increasing sequence of regular cardinals converging to \( \lambda \) and choose \( \kappa^\lambda_n \) such that it is above all cardinals in \( \text{lim } C \cap \lambda \). Then define a function \( F \) with domain \( \{ \kappa^\lambda_n \mid n < \omega, \lambda \in \text{lim } C - \text{lim lim } C \} \) by

\[
F(\kappa^\lambda_n) = \kappa^\lambda_{n+1}
\]

Using Theorem 3.25 we can force to preserve cofinalities and the measurability of \( m(\chi) \) while enforcing

\[
V[G] \models \text{``}2^{\kappa^\lambda_n} = \kappa^\lambda_{n+1} \text{''}
\]

Thus we have guaranteed that in \( V[G] \), \( \text{lim } C = \{ \nabla_\lambda \mid \lambda < m(\chi) \} \). It follows from the moreover clause of Theorem 3.25 that in \( V[G] \), \( 2^{\kappa^\lambda} = (\nabla_\lambda)^+ \), for all limit \( \lambda < m(\chi) \).

We claim that JEP(\( \lambda \)) if and only if \( \lambda \in \text{lim } C \) or \( \lambda \geq m(\chi) \). The right-to-left direction is from Theorems 3.11 and 3.10 and the fact that the cardinals in \( \text{lim } C \) are strong limits. The left-to-right direction follows from Theorem 3.24 and the above observation that in \( V[G] \), \( 2^{\kappa^\lambda} = (\nabla_\lambda)^+ \), for all \( \nabla_\lambda \in \text{lim } C \). The only case that needs some more attention is the successor of weakly compact cardinals. If \( \kappa \) is weakly compact, then Theorem 3.24 case (4) implies that JEP(\( \lambda \)) fails for all \( \kappa^+ \leq \lambda < \nabla_\kappa(\kappa) \). The case for \( \lambda = \kappa^+ \) remains open. But since \( \kappa^+ = 2^\kappa \), then JEP fails at \( \kappa^+ \) by Theorem 3.8. \( \square \)

4. **Amalgamation**

In this section, we investigate the amalgamation spectrum of \( K^\chi \) and show that amalgamation will always eventually fail, regardless of large cardinals.

We start by providing a strong condition for when elements can be identified in the amalgam. Then we prove Lemma 4.3 which is an analogue of Lemma 3.2 for disjoint amalgamation.

Recall that by the proof of Lemma 3.2 if \( M_0 \sim^{M_0}_{M_1} M_1 \) and \( K^{M_1} \setminus K^{M_0} \neq \emptyset \), then for every \( d \in K^{M_1} \setminus K^{M_0} \) we can define a \( P^{M_0} \)-complete, non-principal ultrafilter \( U_d \) on \( P^{M_0} \) by

\[
X \in U_d \text{ if and only if } M_1 \models d \in X
\]

When there is ambiguity, we will refer to this ultrafilter by \( U_{d_{M_0}^{M_1}} \).
Lemma 4.1. Assume $M_0, M_1, M_2, N \in K^\chi$ and $N$ is the amalgam of $M_1, M_2$ over $M_0$. If $d_1 \in K^{M_1} \setminus K^{M_0}, i = 1, 2$, then $d_1$ and $d_2$ can be identified in $N$ if and only if $U^{d_1}_{d_1, M_0} = U^{d_2}_{d_2, M_0}$.

Proof. First, suppose that $d_1$ and $d_2$ are identified in the amalgam $N$. Since $M_1, M_2$ are $\not\prec_{\chi}$-substructures of $N$, $U^{d_1}_{d_1, M_0} = U^{N, M_0} = U^{d_2}_{d_2, M_0} = U^{M_2, M_0}$.

Second, we need to prove that for every $X \in P^{M_0}$, $d_1 \vDash X$ iff $d_2 \vDash X$. Indeed,

$$N \models d_1 \vDash X \iff M_1 \models d_1 \vDash X$$

iff $X \in U^{d_1}_{d_1, M_0}$

iff $X \in U^{M_2, M_0}$

iff $M_2 \models d_2 \vDash X$

iff $N \models d_2 \vDash X$.

$\square$

Definition 4.2. Let $N, M_l \in K^\chi, l = 0, 1, 2$ and $N$ is an amalgam of $M_1$ and $M_2$ over $M_0$. Say that the amalgamation is disjoint on the $K$-sort if in $N$ no elements of $K^{M_1} \setminus K^{M_0}$ are identified with any elements of $K^{M_2} \setminus K^{M_0}$.

Lemma 4.3. Let $M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K^\chi$ with $M_0 \not\prec_{\chi} M_1$ and $M_0 \not\prec_{\chi} M_2$. Then $M_1, M_2$ can be amalgamated over $M_0$ and the amalgamation is disjoint on the $K$-sort if and only if for every $d \in K^{M_1} \setminus K^{M_0}$ the ultrafilter $U^d_{d, M_0}$ on $P^{M_0}$ defined above can be extended to a non-principal ultrafilter on $P^{M_3-i}$ that is $Q^{M_3-i}$-complete, for $i = 1, 2$.

Note that $U^d_{d, M_0}$ is an ultrafilter on the Boolean algebra (defined by) $P^{M_0}$. Since $M_0 \not\prec_{\chi} M_3-i$, we have that $P^{M_0}$ is a sub-Boolean algebra of $P^{M_3-i}$. Consequently, $U^d_{d, M_0}$ is a filter on $P^{M_3-i}$. Then Lemma 4.3 says that $M_1, M_2$ can be amalgamated over $M_0$ exactly when $U^d_{d, M_0}$ can be extended to an ultrafilter on $P^{M_3-i}$ and this can be done for every $d$.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. First, suppose that $N$ is a $K$-disjoint amalgam of $M_1, M_2$ over $M_0$. Consider the case where $d \in K^{M_1} \setminus K^{M_0}$. The case $d \in K^{M_2} \setminus K^{M_0}$ is symmetric and we omit it.

In the amalgam $d$ is an element of $K^N \setminus K^{M_2}$. Define as before the ultrafilter $U^N_{d, M_2}$. Then $U^N_{d, M_2}$ is a non-principal ultrafilter on $P^{M_2}$ that is $Q^{M_2}$-complete.

We need to prove that $U^N_{d, M_2}$ extends $U^d_{d, M_0}$. Let $X \in P^{M_0}$. Then

$$X \in U^N_{d, M_2} \text{ iff } N \models d \vDash X$$

iff $M_1 \models d \vDash X$

iff $X \in U^d_{d, M_0}$.

Second, suppose that we have this extension property and let $U^d_{d, M_0}$ denote the $Q^{M_3-i}$-complete ultrafilter on $P^{M_3-i}$ that extends $U^d_{d, M_0}$. Furthermore, suppose that $M_1$ and $M_2$ are disjoint except for the common copy of $M_0$ and that the elements of $Q^M$ are actually $\chi$-sequences from $P^M$.

We define the amalgam $N$ of $M_1, M_2$ over $M_0$: $K^N$ equals $K^{M_1} \cup K^{M_2}$. 


\( P^N \) is the Boolean algebra generated by \( P^{M_1} \cup P^{M_2} \) and all the finite subsets of \( K^N \). We identify two elements \( X \in P^{M_1} \) and \( Y \in P^{M_2} \), if \( \tilde{X}^{M_1} \) and \( \tilde{Y}^{M_2} \) is the same subset of \( K^{M_0} \).

\( Q^N \) equals \( Q^{M_1} \cup Q^{M_2} \), modulo the requirement that if \( A \in Q^{M_1} \) and \( B \in Q^{M_2} \) are such that for all \( \alpha < \chi \), \( \pi^M_\alpha(A) = \pi^M_\alpha(B) \), then we identify \( A \) and \( B \) in the amalgam.

All that remains is to define \( \varepsilon^N \). It suffices to define \( \varepsilon^N \) on \( K^N \times (P^{M_1} \cup P^{M_2}) \), and then extend it to the rest of \( P^N \) by the Boolean algebra rules. We require that \( \varepsilon^N \) extend \( \varepsilon^{M_1} \cup \varepsilon^{M_2} \). Suppose \( d \in K^{M_1} \setminus K^{M_0} \) and \( X \in P^{M_3} \). Then we set

\[
N \models d \in X \iff X \in V^M_{d,M_0}
\]

Notice that if \( X \in P^{M_0} \), then \( X \in V^M_x,M_0 \) iff \( X \in U^M_x,M_0 \) iff \( M_i = x \varepsilon X \). So, \( N \) and \( M_i \) agree on \( \varepsilon \) on their common domain.

The reader can verify that \( N \in K^K \) and that \( M_i \prec_K N \) working as in the proof of Lemma 3.2. In particular, the \( Q^{M_3} \)-completeness of \( V^M_{d,M_0} \) is crucial as in Lemma 3.2.

Observe that the proof of the above Lemma does not yield a disjoint amalgam for \( M_1, M_2 \). The reason is that some elements of \( P^{M_1}, P^{M_2} \) and some elements of \( Q^{M_1}, Q^{M_2} \) may be identified. Nevertheless, amalgamation is disjoint on the \( K \)-sort.

Using Lemma 4.3, we prove that \( K^K \) fails amalgamation above \( 2^{x^+} \). The idea of the proof is due to Spencer Unger.

**Theorem 4.4.** Let \( \kappa \geq 2x^+ \). Then \( K^K \) fails \( AP(\kappa) \).

**Proof.** First, we will build a filter \( F \) on \( \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \) generated by \( \leq \kappa \)-many sets that cannot be extended to a \( \chi \)-complete ultrafilter on all of \( \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \); indeed, we will identify a Boolean algebra \( P_1 \) and collection of \( \chi \)-sequences \( Q_1 \) such that \( F \) cannot be extended to a \( Q_1 \)-complete ultrafilter on \( P_1 \). To do so, partition \( \kappa \) into \( \{ A_\alpha \mid \alpha < \chi^+ \} \) and define the filter \( F \) on \( \kappa \) by, for \( X \subset \kappa \),

\[
X \in F \text{ if and only if there is } \beta < \chi^+ \text{ such that } \bigcup_{\alpha > \beta} A_\alpha \subset X
\]

Note that \( F \) is \( \chi \)-complete and contains every cofinite set (and even the co-\( \chi \)-sized sets). Let \( P_0 \subset \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \) be the Boolean algebra generated by the sets measured by \( F \). Then set \( P_1 \supset P_0 \) be the Boolean algebra generated by

\[
\left\{ \bigcup_{\alpha \in S} A_\alpha \mid S \subset \chi^+ \right\}
\]

Now, define our set of \( \chi \)-sequences by

\[
Q_1 := \left\{ \left( \bigcup_{\alpha \in S_i} A_\alpha \mid i < \chi \right) \mid (S_i)_{i < \chi} \in \chi^+ \mathcal{P}(\chi^+) \right\}
\]

**Claim:** \( F \) cannot be extended to a \( Q_1 \)-complete filter \( G \) that measures all sets in \( P_1 \).
Suppose it could. From $G$, we can define a non-principal ultrafilter $U$ on $\chi^+$ by,

$$Y \in U \text{ if and only if } \bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} A_\alpha \in G$$

Each of these sets is in $P_1$ by construction, so this is a non-principal ultrafilter following the standard argument. Moreover, $U$ is $\chi$-complete precisely because $G$ is $Q_1$-complete. This is a contradiction because there can be no $\chi$-complete, non-principal ultrafilter over $\chi^+$. This completes the proof of the claim.

Second, we reverse engineer the proof of Lemma 4.3 to show that this construction forces a failure of amalgamation. We build a triple of models $M_0, M_1, M_2$. Unless otherwise specified $\varepsilon$ is the regular $\in$ (‘belongs to’) relation and the boolean algebra operations are the usual intersection, union and complement. We specify $(K, P, Q)$:

- $M_0$ is defined by $(\kappa, P_0, \emptyset)$;
- $M_1$ is defined by $(\kappa \cup \{d\}, P_0, \emptyset)$; $d$ belongs to some $X \in P_0$ if and only if $X \in F$; and
- $M_2$ is defined by $(\kappa, P_1, Q_1)$.

Note that $F$ is an ultrafilter on $P_0$ as $P_0$ contains precisely the sets that $F$ measures. By construction, $M_0 \prec^K_\kappa M_1, M_2$. Tracing the definition, $U_{M_1, M_0}^{M_2} = F$. So by Lemma 4.3, the triple $(M_0, M_1, M_2)$ can be amalgamated iff $F$ can be extended to a $Q_{M_2}$-complete filter on $P_{M_2}$. However, this is impossible by the claim.

We finish the proof by observing that all these models have size $\kappa + \left(2^{\chi^+}\right)^\chi = \kappa$. So $K^K_\kappa$ fails AP($\kappa$).

\[ \square \]
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