Maximal models up to the first measurable in ZFC

John T. Baldwin
University of Illinois at Chicago*
Saharon Shelah†
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

January 12, 2021

Abstract

Theorem: There is a *complete sentence* ϕ of $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$ such that ϕ has maximal models in a set of cardinals λ that is cofinal in the first measurable μ while ϕ has no maximal models in any $\chi \geq \mu$.

In this paper we prove in ZFC the existence of a *complete sentence* ϕ of $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$ such that ϕ has maximal models in a set of cardinals λ that is cofinal in the first measurable μ while ϕ has no maximal models in any $\chi \geq \mu$. In [BS2x], we proved a theorem with a similar result; the earlier proof required that $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$, and that there is an $S \subseteq S^{\lambda}_{\aleph_0}$, that is stationary non-reflecting, and $\diamond_S$ holds. Here, we show *in ZFC* that the sentence ϕ defined in [BS2x] has maximal models cofinally in μ. The additional hypotheses in [BS2x] allow one to demand that if N is a submodel with cardinality $< \lambda$ of the P_0-maximal model, N is $\boldsymbol{K}_1$-free (See Remark 4.1); that property fails for the example here. The existence of such a ϕ which is *not complete* is well-known (e.g. [Mag16]).

This paper contributes to the study of Hanf numbers for infinitary logics. Works such as [BKS09, BKS16, BS19, KLH16] study the spectrum of maximal models in the context where the class has a bounded number of models. We list now some properties that are true in every cardinality for first order logic but are true only eventually for complete sentences of $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$ or, more generally, for abstract elementary classes, and compare the cardinalities (the Hanf number) at which the eventual behavior must begin. Every infinite model of a first order theory has a proper elementary extension and so each theory has arbitrarily large models. Moreover, the amalgamation property holds for every complete first order theory. Morley [Mor65] showed that every sentence of $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$ that has models up to $\beth_{\omega_1}$ has arbitrarily large models and provided counterexamples showing that cardinal was minimal. Thus he showed the Hanf number for existence of $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-sentences in a countable vocabulary is $\beth_{\omega_1}$. Hjorth [Hjo02],

*Research partially supported by Simons travel grant G5402, G3535.
†Item 1147 on Shelah's publication list. Partially supported by European Research Council grant 338821, and by National Science Foundation grant 136974.

by a much more complicated argument, showed there are *complete* sentences ϕ_α for $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that ϕ_α has a model in $\aleph_\alpha$ and no larger so the Hanf number for complete sentences is $\aleph_{\omega_1}$. Boney and Unger [BU17], building on [She13] show that the Hanf number 'for all AEC's are tame' is the first strongly compact cardinal. They also show the analogous property for various variants on tameness is equivalent to the existence of almost (weakly) compact, measurable, strongly compact). The result here shows in ZFC that the Hanf number for extendability (every model of a complete sentence has a proper $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-elementary extension) is the first measurable cardinal. However, [BB17] show that an upper bound on the Hanf number for amalgamation is the first strongly compact. The actual value remains open.

Section 1 provides some background information on Boolean algebras. Section 2 is a set theoretic argument for the existence of a Boolean algebra with certain specified properties in any cardinal λ of the form $\lambda = 2^\mu$ that is less than the first measurable; this construction is completely independent of the model theoretic results. Then we make the connection with model theory. In particular, we link the construction here with the complete sentence ϕ from [BS2x]. Section 3 builds several approximations to the counterexample. Subsection 3.1 introduces the most basic class of models $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ and explains the connections with [BS2x]. Subsection 3.2 builds on this result to find a P_0-maximal model in $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ with cardinality λ satisfying certain further restrictions. Finally in Section 4, the class $\boldsymbol{K}_2$ of models of the complete sentence from [BS2x] is repeated. The P_0-maximal model from Section 3.2 is converted to the P_0-maximal model of $\boldsymbol{K}_2$. From this, it is easy to find a maximal model in $\boldsymbol{K}_2$ of roughly the same cardinality.

The first author acknowledges helpful conversations with Joel Berman, Will Boney, Ioannis Souldatos, and especially Sherwood Hachtman. We are particulary grateful for an extremely helpful referee report.

1 Preliminaries

This paper depends heavily on [BS2x] which contain a fuller background and essential material on Boolean algebras. In particular, the incomplete sentence with maximal models cofinal in the first measurable is described there and the construction of the desired complete sentence; in this paper we show in ZFC that sentence has maximal models below the first measurable. We repeat in this section the main slightly nonstandard definitions from Boolean algebra and some immediate consequences.

Definition 1.1 *1. A Boolean polynomial $p(v_0, \ldots, v_k)$ is a term formed by the compositions of the $\wedge, \vee, ^{-1}, 0, 1$ on the variables v_i; a polynomial over X arises when elements of X are substituted for some of the v_i.*

2. *For $X \subseteq B$ and B a Boolean algebra, $\overline{X} = X_B = \langle X \rangle_B$ denotes the subalgebra of B generated by X.*

3. *A set Y is* independent *(or* free*) over X* modulo *an ideal $\mathcal{I}$ (with domain I) in a Boolean algebra B if and only if for any Boolean polynomial $p(v_0, \ldots, v_k)$ (that*

is not identically 0*, i.e. non-trivial), and any* $a \in \langle X\rangle_B - \mathcal{I}$*, and distinct* $y_i \in Y$*,* $p(y_0, \ldots, y_k) \wedge a \notin \mathcal{I}$*.*

4. *A* Y *which is independent over* X *modulo* I *is called a* basis *for* $\langle X \cup Y \cup I\rangle$ *over* $\langle X \cup I\rangle$*.*

In this context, 'independent from' may sometimes be written 'independent over'. These are distinct notions for forking independence.

Observation 1.2 *If* $\mathcal{I}$ *is the* 0 *ideal, (i.e.,* Y *is independent over* X*),*

1. *the condition becomes: for any* $b \in \langle X\rangle_B - \{0\}$*,* $B \models p(y_0, \ldots, y_k) \wedge b > 0$*.*
2. *or, there is no non-trivial polynomial* $q(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})$ *and* $\mathbf{b} \subseteq X$ *such that* $q(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{b}) = 0$*.*

That 2) implies 1) is obvious. For the converse, put a counterexample $q(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{b}) = 0$ *in disjunctive normal form. Then for each disjunct (i.e. each constituent conjunction)* $q'(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{b}) = 0$ *(not all variables of* q *may appear in* q'*.) We can replace those* b*'s that appear in* q' *by a single element* b *of* $\langle X\rangle$ *to get a* $q''(\mathbf{y}, b) = 0$*;* q'' *contradicts condition 1).*

With Observation 1.2 we obtain an analog for Boolean algebras of the notion of dependence in vector spaces in rings or fields. $\{y_0, \ldots, y_k\}$ are dependent over X if some non-trivial polynomial $p(v_0, \ldots, v_k, w_0, \ldots w_m)$ and some $\mathbf{b}$ from X, $p(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{b}) = 0$. This yields that if B_2 is freely generated over B_1, all atoms in B_1 remain atoms in B_2. If not, there would be an atom a of b_1 and a term $\sigma(\mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_1)$ with $0_{B_1} < \sigma(\mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_1) < a$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_1) \in B_1$. But then $B_2 \models \sigma(\mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_1) \wedge a = 0$; this contradicts the freeness assumption. Note however that this notion of dependence (a depends on X if and only if $a \in \langle X\rangle$) does not satisfy the exchange axiom. See [Grä79, Chapter 5] for the strong consequences ff this dependence relation satisfies exchange.

There is no requirement that $\mathcal{I}$ be contained in X. Observe the following:

Observation 1.3

1. *If* $\mathcal{I}$ *is the* 0 *ideal, (i.e.,* Y *is independent from* X*), the condition becomes: for any* $a \in \langle X\rangle_B - \{0\}$*,* $B \models p(y_0, \ldots, y_k) \wedge a > 0$*. That is, every finite Boolean combination of elements of* Y *meets each non-zero* $a \in \langle X\rangle_B$*.*
2. *Let* π *map* B *to* $B/\mathcal{I}$*. If '*Y *is independent from* X *over* $\mathcal{I}$*' then the image of* Y *is free from the image of* X *(over* $\emptyset$*) in* $B/\mathcal{I}$*. Conversely, if* $\pi(Y)$ *is independent over* $\pi(X)$ *in* $B/\mathcal{I}$*, for any* Y' *mapping by* π *to* $\pi(Y)$*,* Y' *is independent from* X *over* $\mathcal{I}$*.*

   So, if X *is empty, the condition '*Y *is independent over* $\mathcal{I}$*' implies the image of* Y *is an independent subset of* $B/\mathcal{I}$*.*
3. *If a set* Y *is* independent *(or* free*) from* X *over an ideal* $\mathcal{I}$ *in a Boolean algebra* B *and* Y_0 *is a subset of* Y*, then* $Y - Y_0$ *is* independent *(or* free*) from* $X \cup Y_0$ *(*$\langle X \cup Y_0\rangle_B$*) over the ideal* $\mathcal{I}$ *in the Boolean algebra* B*.*

2 Set theoretic construction of a Boolean algebra

We define a property $\boxplus(\lambda)$, which asserts the existence in λ of a Boolean algebra that is ' uniformly $\aleph_1$-incomplete'. We then show certain condition on λ imply $\boxplus(\lambda)$. So this section has no model theory. The arguments here are similar to those around page 7 of [GS05]. We connect this construction with our model theoretic approach in Section 3.

Definition 2.1 **($\boxplus(\lambda)$)** *denotes: There are a Boolean algebra $\mathbb{B} \subset \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ with $|\mathbb{B}| = \lambda$ and a set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq {}^{\omega}\mathbb{B}$ such that:*

i) $\mathcal{A}$ has cardinality λ and if $\overline{A} = \{A_n : n \in \omega\} \in \mathcal{A}$ then for $\alpha < \lambda$ for all but finitely many n, $\alpha \notin A_n$.

ii) $\mathbb{B}$ includes the finite subsets of λ; but is such that for every non-principal ultrafilter D of λ (equivalently an ultrafilter of $\mathbb{B}$ that is disjoint from $\lambda^{<\omega}$) for some sequence $\langle A_n : n \in \omega\rangle \in \mathcal{A}$, there are infinitely many n with $A_n \in D$.

We may say that $(\mathbb{B}, \mathcal{A})$ witness uniform $\aleph_1$-incompleteness.

Theorem 2.2 (ZFC) *Assume for some μ, $\lambda = 2^{\mu}$ and λ is less than the* first measurable*, then $\boxplus(\lambda)$ from 2.1 holds.*

We need the following structure.

Definition 2.3 *1. Fix the vocabulary τ with unary predicates P, U, a binary predicate C, and a binary function F.*

2. Let $\langle C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ list without repetitions *$\mathcal{P}(\mu)$ such that $C_0 = \emptyset$ and also let $\langle f_\alpha : \mu \le \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ list ${}^{\mu}\omega$.*

3. Define the τ-structure M by:

(a) The universe of M is λ;

(b) $P^M = \omega$; $U^M = \mu$;

(c) $C(x, y)$ is binary relation on $U \times M$ defined by $C(x, \alpha)$ if and only $x \in C_\alpha$. Note that C is extensional. I.e., elements of M uniquely code subsets of U^M;

(d) Let $F_2^M(\alpha, \beta)$ map $M \times U^M \to P^M$ by $F_2^M(\alpha, \beta) = f_\alpha(\beta)$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, $\beta < \mu$;

(e) $F_2^M(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ and $\beta \in [\mu, \lambda)$.

We use the following, likely well-known, fact pointed out to us by Sherwood Hachtman.

Fact 2.4 *Let $D \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ and suppose that for each partition $Y \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ of X into at most countably many sets, $|D \cap Y| = 1$. Then, D is a countably complete ultrafilter.*

We need the following lemma about M before finding a Boolean algebra $\mathbb{B}$ in M that satisfies $\boxplus$. We lay the basis for the notion of P-maximality, a counterexample to maximality must occur in a give predicate P (Definition 3.2.1).

Lemma 2.5 *If λ is less than the first measurable cardinal and $\lambda = 2^\mu$ for some μ there is a model M, with $|M| = \lambda$, and a countable vocabulary with P^M denoting the natural numbers such that every first order proper elementary extension N of M properly extends P^M.*

Proof. Fix M as in Definition 2.3. We first show that any proper elementary extension N of M extends U^M. Suppose for contradiction there exists $\alpha' \in N - M$ but $U^N = U^M$. By the full listing of the C_α, there is a $\beta \in M$ with $\{x : N \models C(x, \beta)\} = \{x : N \models C(x, \alpha')\}$. This contradicts extensionality of the relation C in N; but C is extensional in the elementary submodel M.

Now we show that if $U^M \subsetneq U^N$ and $P^M = P^N$, then there is a countably complete non-principal ultrafilter on μ, contradicting that μ is not measurable. Note that the sequence $\langle f_\alpha \colon \mu \leq \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ can be viewed as a list of all non-trivial partitions of μ into at most countably many pieces. Let $\nu^* \in U^N - U^M$. For $\alpha \in N$, denote $F_2^N(\alpha, \nu^*)$ by n_α. Since $P^M = P^N$, $n_\alpha \in M$. By elementarity, for $\alpha \in M, \eta \in U^M$, $F_2^N(\alpha, \eta) = F_2^M(\alpha, \eta) = f_\alpha(\eta)$. Now, let

$$D = \{x \subseteq U^M \colon x \neq \emptyset \wedge (\exists \alpha \in M)\, x \supseteq f_\alpha^{-1}(n_\alpha)\}.$$

We show D satisfies the conditions from Fact 2.4. Let W be a partition, indexed by f_α. Then $f_\alpha^{-1}(n_\alpha) \neq \emptyset$ and is in D. Suppose for contradiction there are $x_0 \neq x_1$ in W that are both in D. Then, there are $\alpha_i \in M$ such that $x_i \in W \cap D$ contains $f_{\alpha_i}^{-1}(n_{\alpha_i})$ for $i = 0, 1$. So, $N \models F(\alpha_i, \nu^*) = n_{\alpha_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Since $\alpha_i \in M$ and $M \prec N$, $M \models \exists x (F(\alpha_0, x) = n_{\alpha_0} \wedge F(\alpha_1, x) = n_{\alpha_1}$. So, by Definition 2.3 (d), for any witness a in M for this formula, $a \in x_0 \cap x_1$; but $x_0 \cap x_1 = \emptyset$ since W is a partition.

Finally, D is non-principal on U^M since if it were generated by an $a \in U^M$,

$$D = \{x \subseteq U : (\exists \alpha)\, x \supseteq f_\alpha^{-1}(n_\alpha)\} = \{x \subseteq U : a \in x\}.$$

Since $\{a\} \in D$, for some $\alpha_0 \in M$, $\{a\} = f_{\alpha_0}^{-1}(n_{\alpha_0})$. Note that $\alpha_0 \in M$, because the definition of D is about the model M. That is, $M \models \exists! y F(\alpha_0, y) = n_{\alpha_0}$. But $N \models F(\alpha_0, a) = n_{\alpha_0} \wedge F(\alpha_0, \nu^*) = n_{\alpha_0}$. This contradicts the assumption $M \prec N$ and completes the proof. $\square_{2.5}$

The following claim completes the proof of Theorem 2.2

Claim 2.6 *If $\mathbb{B}$ is the Boolean algebra of definable formulas in the M defined in Definition 2.3, there is an $\mathcal{A}$ such that $(\mathbb{B}, \mathcal{A})$ is uniformly $\aleph_1$-incomplete so $\boxplus(\lambda)$ holds.*

Proof. We may assume τ has Skolem functions for M and then define $\mathbb{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ as follows to satisfy $\boxplus$.(ii). Let $\mathbb{B}$ be the Boolean algebra of definable subsets of M. I.e.,

$$\mathbb{B} = \{X \subseteq M \colon \text{ for some } \tau\text{-formula } \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \text{ and } \mathbf{b} \in {}^{\lg(\mathbf{y})}M,\ \phi(M, \mathbf{b}) = X.\}$$

Note $\mathbb{B}$ is a Boolean algebra of cardinality λ with the normal operations. We define the Skolem functions a little differently than usual: as maps $\sigma_\phi = \sigma_{\phi(x,w,\mathbf{y})}$ from M^{n+1} to M for formulas $\phi(x, w, \mathbf{y})$ such that $\phi(\sigma_\phi(b, \boldsymbol{a}), b, \boldsymbol{a})$. Here $\lg(\mathbf{y}) = n$. Then, we specialize the Skolem functions by considering the unary function arising from fixing the $\mathbf{y}$ entry of $\sigma_\phi(w, \mathbf{y})$ to obtain $\sigma_\phi(w, \boldsymbol{a})$.

$$\begin{aligned} A_n^{\sigma_\phi(w,\boldsymbol{a})} &= \{\alpha < \lambda \colon \phi(\sigma_\phi^M(\alpha, \boldsymbol{a}), \alpha, \boldsymbol{a}) \wedge P(\sigma_\phi^M(\alpha, \boldsymbol{a})) \wedge \sigma_\phi^M(\alpha, \boldsymbol{a}) \not\leq n\} \\ &\cup \quad \{\alpha < \lambda \colon n = 0 \wedge \neg P(\sigma_\phi^M(\alpha, \boldsymbol{a})). \end{aligned}$$

Then let $\overline{A}_{\sigma_\phi(w,\boldsymbol{a})} = \langle A_n^{\sigma_\phi(w,\boldsymbol{a})} \colon n < \omega\rangle$ and

$$(*) \quad \mathcal{A} = \{\overline{A}_{\sigma_\phi(w,\boldsymbol{a})} : \text{ for some } \tau_M\text{-term } \sigma_\phi(w, \mathbf{y}) \text{ and } \boldsymbol{a} \in {}^{\lg(\mathbf{y})}M.\}$$

Note $|\mathcal{A}| = \lambda = \lambda^\omega$ as for each $\boldsymbol{a} \in M$ and each of the countably many terms $\sigma_\phi(w, \boldsymbol{a})$, $\overline{A}_{\sigma_\phi(x,w,\boldsymbol{a})}$ is a map from ω into $\mathbb{B}$. For each α, for each $0 < m < \omega$ and $\overline{A} = \overline{A}_{\sigma_\phi(\alpha,\mathbf{b})}$, the set $\{m \colon \alpha \in A_m\}$ is finite, bounded by $\sigma_\phi(\alpha, \boldsymbol{a})$. Thus, clause i) of $\boxplus$ is satisfied.

We now show Clause ii) of $\boxplus$. Let D be an arbitrary non-principal ultrafilter on λ and where $\phi(v, \mathbf{y})$ varies over first order τ-formulas such that $\mathbf{y}$ and $\boldsymbol{a}$ have the same length, define the type $p_D(x) = p(x)$ as:

$$p(x) = \{\phi(x, \boldsymbol{a}) \colon \{\alpha \in M \colon M \models \phi(\alpha, \boldsymbol{a})\} \in D\}.$$

Since D is an ultrafilter, p is a complete type over M. So there is an elementary extension N of M where an element d realizes p. Let N be the Skolem hull of $M \cup \{d\}$. Since D is non-principal, so is p; thus, $N \neq M$. By Lemma 2.5, we can choose a witness $c \in P^N - P^M$. Since, N is the Skolem hull of $M \cup \{d\}$ there is a Skolem term $\sigma(w, \mathbf{y}) = \sigma_\phi(w, \mathbf{y})$ and $\boldsymbol{a} \in M$ such that $c = \sigma^N(d, \boldsymbol{a})$. Since $c \notin M$, for each $n \in P^M$, $N \models \bigwedge_{k<n} c \neq k$ so $N \models \bigwedge_{k<n} \sigma(d, \boldsymbol{a}) \neq k$ so $\bigwedge_{k<n} \sigma(x, \boldsymbol{a}) \neq k$ is in p. That is, for each σ_ϕ, $A_{\sigma_\phi(w,\boldsymbol{a})}$ is in D. $\square_{2.6}$

3 Three Classes of Models and an Approximate Counterexample

In this section we define the model theoretic classes that produce first an amalgamation class $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ of finite structures (Section 3.1 then the class $\boldsymbol{K}_2$ (Definition 3.3.2) of models of a complete $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-sentence. Using Theorem 2.2, we build in Subsection 3.2 a model M_* in $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ with cardinality λ, which is P_0-maximal. Subsection **??** defines the classes $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{K}_2$ which give us the complete sentence. In Section 4 we modify M_* to a P_0-maximal model in $\boldsymbol{K}_2$ and then construct the required maximal model in $\boldsymbol{K}_2$.

3.1 Finitely generated models

We include, as needed, definitions of the classes of model $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}, \boldsymbol{K}_1, \boldsymbol{K}_2$ introduced in [BS2x]. For each i, $\boldsymbol{K}^i_{<\aleph_0}$ denotes the class of finitely generated members of $\boldsymbol{K}_i$.

Definition 3.1.1 *τ is a vocabulary with unary predicates P_0, P_1, P_2, P_4, binary R, $\wedge, \vee$, $\leq$ unary functions $^-$, G_1, constants 0,1 and unary functions F_n, for $n < \omega$. $\leq$ is a partial order on P_1^M and the Boolean algebra can be defined from it.*

We occasionally use the notations $(\forall^\infty n)$ and $(\exists^\infty n)$ to mean 'for all but finitely many' and 'for infinitely many' respectively. It is easy to see that $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ is $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-axiomatizable but far from complete. We denote the power set of X by $\mathcal{P}(X)$.

Definition 3.1.2 ($\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$) *$M \in \boldsymbol{K}^{-1}_{<\aleph_0}$ is the class of* finitely generated *structures M satisfying the following conditions.*

1. *P_0^M, P_1^M, P_2^M partition M.*
2. *$(P_1^M, 0, 1, \wedge, \vee, \leq, ^-)$ is a Boolean algebra ($^-$ is complement). We also consider ideals and restrictions to them of the relations/operations except for complement.*
3. *$R \subset P_0^M \times P_1^M$ with $R(M, b) = \{a : R^M(a, b)\}$ and the set of $\{R(M, b) : b \in P_1^M\}$ is a Boolean algebra. $f^M : P_1^M \mapsto \mathcal{P}(P_0^M)$ by $f^M(b) = R(M, b)$ is a Boolean algebra homomorphism into $\mathbb{P}(P_0^M)$.*

   Note that f is not[1] *in τ; it is simply a convenient abbreviation for the relation between the Boolean algebra P_1^M and the set algebra on P_0 by the map $b \mapsto R(M, b)$.*
4. *$P_{4,n}^M$ is the set containing each join of n distinct atoms from P_1^M; P_4^M is the union of the $P_{4,n}^M$ and so is an ideal. That is, P_4^M is the set of all finite joins of atoms.*

   There is an element $b^* \in P_1^M$ such that $P_4^M = \{c : c \leq^M b_*\}$. Note that b_* is not a function symbol in τ.
5. *G_1^M is a bijection from P_0^M onto $P_{4,1}^M$ such that $R(M, G_1^M(a)) = \{a\}$. (Note that $P_0^M = \emptyset$ is allowed.*
6. *P_2^M is finite (and may be empty). Further, for each $c \in P_2^M$ the $F_n^M(c)$ are functions from P_2^M into P_1^M. Note that it is allowed that for all but finitely many n, $F_n^M(c) = 0_{P_1^M}$.*
7. *(*countable incompleteness*) If $a \in P_{4,1}^M$ and $c \in P_2^M$ then $(\forall^\infty n)\ a \not\leq_M F_n^M(c)$. As, $a \wedge F_n^M(c) = 0$. Since a is an atom, this implies $\bigwedge_{n\in\omega}\{x\colon (G_1(x) \in F_n^M(c)\} = 0$.*
8. *P_1^M is generated as a Boolean algebra by $P_4^M \cup \{F_n^M(c) \colon c \in P_2^M, n \in \omega\} \cup X$ where X is a finite subset of P_1^M.*

Definition 3.1.3 *1. K_{-1} is the class of τ structures M such that every finitely generated substructure of M is in $\boldsymbol{K}^{-1}_{<\aleph_0}$. K^{-1}_μ is the members of K_{-1} with cardinality μ.*

[1] The subsets of P_0^M are *not* elements of M.

2. *We say $M \in K_{-1}$ is* atomic *if P_1^M is atomic as a Boolean algebra. That is, P_4^M is dense in $\boldsymbol{B}_M$.*

3.2 A P_0-maximal model in $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$

In this section we invoke Theorem 2.2 to show (Theorem 3.2.6) that we can construct P_0-maximal structures in the class $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ of appropriate cardinality below the first measurable.

Definition 3.2.1 *We say $M \in K_{-1}$ is P_0*-maximal *(in K_{-1}) if $M \subseteq N$ and $N \in K_{-1}$ implies $P_0^M = P_0^N$.*

The notion $\mathrm{uf}(M)$ is the crucial link between Section 2 and P_0-maximality. Lemma 3.2.4 is central for Theorem 3.2.6 and is applied in Theorem 4.9.

Definition 3.2.2 ($\mathrm{uf}(M)$) *For $M \in K_{-1}$, let $\mathrm{uf}(M)$ be the set of ultrafilters D of the Boolean Algebra P_1^M such that $D \cap P_{4,1}^M = \emptyset$ and for each $c \in P_2^M$ only finitely many of the $F_n^M(c)$ are in D.*

For applications we rephrase this notion with the following terminology. For any $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ and $d \in P_2^M$, let $S_d^M(D) = \{n : F_n^M(d) \in D\}$. So $\mathrm{uf}(M) = \emptyset$ if and only if for every ultrafilter D on P_1^M, there exists a $d \in P_2^M$ such that $S_d^M(D)$ is infinite.

We use the following standard properties of a Boolean algebra B and ideal I in proving Lemma 3.2.4 and deducing Claim 3.2.9 from Definition 3.2.8.

Fact 3.2.3

1. *$b \wedge c \in I$ implies b/I and c/I are disjoint.*
2. *$b \triangle c \in I$ implies $b/I = c/I$.*
3. *$b - c \in I$ implies $b/I \leq c/I$.*

For our collection of structures $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$, we can characterize P_0-maximality in terms of ultrafilters.

Lemma 3.2.4 *An $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ is P_0-maximal if and only if $\mathrm{uf}(M) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose M is not P_0-maximal and $M \subset N$ with $N \in \boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ and $d^* \in P_0^N - P_0^M$. Then $\{b \in M : R^N(d^*, b)\}$ is a non-principal ultrafilter D_0 of the Boolean algebra P_1^M [BS2x, 3.3.11]. To see D_0 is non-principal suppose there is a $b_0 \in P_1^M$ such that $D_0 = \{b \in M : b_0 \leq b\}$. Note $b_0 = G_1^M(a)$ for some $a \in P_0^M$. But $N \models G_1^N(d^*) \not\geq b_0$, contradicting $\{d^*\} \in D_0$.

For each $c \in P_2^M$, since $N \in \boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$, by countable incompleteness (clause 7 of Definition 3.1.2), for all $a \in P_0^N$ and all but finitely many n, $G_1^N(a) \not\leq F_n^N(c)$. Since $F_n^N(c) = F_n^M(c)$, only finitely many of the $F_n^M(c)$ can be in D_0, which implies $D_0 \in \mathrm{uf}(M)$. By contraposition we have the right to left.

Conversely, if $D \in \mathrm{uf}(M)$, we can construct an extension by adding an element $d \in P_0^N$ satisfying $R^N(d, b)$ iff $b \in D$. Let P_1^N be the Boolean algebra generated by

$P_1^M \cup \{G_1(d)\}$ modulo the ideal generated by $\{G_1^N(d) - b : b \in D\}$; this implies that in the quotient $G_1(d) \leq b$. (Compare Fact 3.2.3). Let $P_2^N = P_2^M$ and $F_n^N(c) = F_n^M(c)$. Since $D \in \mathrm{uf}(M)$, it is easy to check that $N \in \boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$. $\square_{3.2.4}$

We now introduce the requirement that the Boolean algebras constructed will, when the atoms are factored out, be free. Moreover, There is a set $Y \subseteq P_2^N$ with $|Y| = \lambda$ such that different $c \in Y$ generate coinitially disjoint collections of $F_n^N(c)$ as c varies. This strong requirement is used inductively in this section to construct the first approximation. The correction in Section 4 loses this disjointness (and thus freeness).

Definition 3.2.5 (Nicely Free) *We say $M \in K_{-1}$ is* nicely free *when $|P_1^M| = \lambda$ and there is a sequence $\mathbf{b} = \langle b_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ such that*

- *(a) $b_\alpha \in P_1^M - P_4^M$;*
- *(b) $\langle b_\alpha / P_4^M : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ generate P_1^M / P_4^M freely;*
- *(c) there is a set $Y \subset P_2^M$ of cardinality λ and a sequence $\langle u_c : c \in Y\rangle$ of pairwise disjoint sets of distinct ordinals such that, for $c \in Y$, setting $u_c = \{F_n^M(c) : n < \omega\}$, $\langle u_c : c \in Y$ partitions a subset of the basis (mod atoms) $\langle b_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$.*

Nicely free is quite distinct from the notion $\boldsymbol{K}_1$*-free* introduced in [BS2x]. There are maximal nicely free models but there are no maximal $\boldsymbol{K}_1$-free models. Note that condition Definition 3.2.5.c asserts that a *sub*set of P_2^M partitions a *sub*set of the basis.

Here is the main theorem of Section 3. The hypotheses $\lambda = 2^\mu$ and λ is less than the first measurable cardinal were used essentially as the hypotheses for proving $\boxplus(\lambda)$, the existence of a uniformly $\aleph_1$-incomplete Boolean algebra. But here we use $\boxplus(\lambda)$ and don't rely again on λ being less than the first measurable cardinal. The argument here does depends on $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$, which follows from $\lambda = 2^\mu$. By constructing a nicely free model, we introduce at this stage the independence requirements, needed in Section 4 to satisfy Definition 3.3.1.6, on the $F_n(c)$.

Theorem 3.2.6 *If for some μ, $\lambda = 2^\mu$ and λ is less than the first measurable cardinal then there is a P_0-maximal model M_* in $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ such that $|P_i^{M_*}| = \lambda$ (for $i = 0, 1, 2$), $P_1^{M_*}$ is an atomic Boolean algebra, $\mathrm{uf}(M_*) = \emptyset$, and M_* is nicely free.*

Proof. We first construct by induction a P_0-maximal model in $\boldsymbol{K}^{-1}$. The property $\boxplus(\lambda)$ (Definition 2.1) appears in the construction to satisfy Specification (f) and is used in the proof that the construction works in considering possibility 2. We choose M_ϵ, D_ϵ and other auxiliaries by induction for $\epsilon \leq \omega + 1$ to satisfy the following *specifications* of the construction.

Construction 3.2.7 (Specifications)

- *(a) For $\epsilon \leq \omega + 1$, M_ϵ is a continuous increasing chain of members of K_λ^{-1} with each $P_1^{M_\epsilon}$ atomic and $P_1^{M_{\omega+1}} = P_1^{M_\omega}$;*
- *(b) For all $\epsilon \leq \omega$, $|P_i^{M_\epsilon}| = \lambda$ and $P_i^{M_\omega} = P_i^{M_{\omega+1}}$ for $i = 0, 1$;*
- *(c) For all $\epsilon \leq \omega + 1$, $P_1^{M_\epsilon} / P_4^{M_\epsilon}$ is a free Boolean algebra;*

(d) *(i) If $\epsilon < \omega$, $D_\epsilon \in \mathrm{uf}(M_\epsilon)$.*

(ii) If $\epsilon = 0$, then $\mathbf{b}_{-1} = \langle b_{-1,\alpha} \colon \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is a free basis of $P_1^{M_0}/P_4^{M_0}$, listed without repetition, and $\langle F_n^{M_0}(c) \colon n < \omega, c \in P_2^{M_0} \rangle$ lists $\langle b_{-1,\alpha} \colon \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ without repetition.

(iii) if $\epsilon = \zeta + 1 < \omega$ then there is a free basis $\mathbf{b}_\zeta = \langle b_{\zeta,\alpha}/P_4^{M_\zeta} \colon \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ of $P_1^{M_\epsilon}/P_4^{M_\epsilon}$. Note $b_{\zeta,\alpha} \in P_1^{M_\epsilon} - P_1^{M_\zeta}$.

(e) *if $\epsilon = \omega + 1$, for each $\overline{d} \in {}^\omega(P_1^{M_{\omega+1}} - P_4^{M_{\omega+1}})$ such that for each $a \in P_0^{M_\omega}$ satisfying that all but finitely many n, $a \notin R(M_\omega, d_n)$, there is a $c \in P_2^{M_{\omega+1}}$, $F_n^{M_{\omega+1}}(c) = d_n$; (We will in fact have that $P_1^{M_{\omega+1}} = P_1^{M_\omega}$ and $P_4^{M_{\omega+1}} = P_4^{M_\omega}$.)*

(f) *$\epsilon = \zeta + 1 < \omega$:*

Let $\mathbb{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ be as in Definition 2.1. There is a 1-1 function f_ϵ from λ onto $P_{4,1}^{M_\epsilon}$ such that:

i) for every $X \in \mathbb{B}$ (from $\boxplus$) there is a $b = b_X \in P_1^{M_\epsilon}$ such that

$$\{\alpha < \lambda \colon f_\epsilon(\alpha) \leq_{M_\epsilon} b_X\} = \{\alpha < \lambda \colon \alpha \in X\};$$

ii) for each $\overline{A} = \langle A_n : n < \omega \rangle \in \mathcal{A}$ there is a $c \in P_2^{M_\epsilon}$ such that for each n:

$$A_n = \{\alpha < \lambda \colon f_\epsilon(\alpha) \leq_{P_1^{M_\epsilon}} F_n^{M_\epsilon}(c)\}.$$

Carrying out the construction.

case 1: When $\epsilon = 0$, take $P_1^{M_0}$ as the Boolean algebra generated by a set $P_{4,1}^{M_0}$ of cardinality λ along with a set $\{b_{-1,\alpha} \colon \alpha < \lambda\}$ of independent subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$. Let G_1 be a bijection between a set $P_0^{M_0}$ and $P_{4,1}^{M_0}$. Set $P_4^{M_0}$ as the ideal generated by the image of G_1. For $a \in P_0^{M_0}$ and $b \in P_1^M$, define $R^{M_0}(a, b)$ to hold if $G_1(a) \leq b$. Set $P_2^{M_0}$ as a set of cardinality of λ and let $\langle F_n^{M_0}(c) \colon n < \omega, c \in P_2^{M_0} \rangle$ list $\langle b_{-1,\alpha} \colon \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ without repetition. Thus, any non-principal ultrafilter on $P_1^{M_0}$ is in $\mathrm{uf}(M_0)$.

case 2: For $\epsilon = \omega$, $M_\omega = \bigcup_{n<\omega} M_n$. Since the set of free generators is extended at the step, the union is also free mod P_4^M.

case 3: If $\epsilon = \zeta + 1 < \omega$, the main effort is to verify clauses (c), (d), and (f) of Specification 3.2.7. The element b_{ζ,a_α} is the b_{A_α} from Specification 3.2.7.f.(i).

Now, to construct M_ϵ:

(i) Recall that $D_\zeta \in \mathrm{uf}(M_\zeta)$.

(ii) choose as the new atoms introduced at this stage a set $B_\epsilon \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ with $B_\epsilon \cap M_\zeta = \emptyset$ and $|B_\epsilon| = \lambda$.

(iii) Let f_ϵ be a one-to-one function from λ onto $B_\epsilon \cup P_{4,1}^{M_\zeta}$.

(iv) Let $\langle X_\gamma \colon \gamma < \lambda \rangle$ list the elements of $\mathbb{B}$ (definable subsets of M 2.6) from $\boxplus$.(ii) with $X_0 = \emptyset$.

(v) Fix a sequence $\{b_{\zeta,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\}$, which are distinct and not in $M_\zeta \cup B_\epsilon$, and let $\mathbb{B}'_\zeta$ be the Boolean Algebra generated freely by

$$P_1^{M_\zeta} \cup \{b_{\zeta,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\} \cup \{f_\epsilon(\alpha) : \alpha < \lambda\}.$$

Using Lemma 3.2.3, we apply the following definition at the successor stage. Here we take an abstract Boolean algebra $\mathbb{B}'_\zeta$ and impose relations to embed $P_1^{M_\zeta}$ in a quotient $\mathbb{B}''_\zeta$ of $\mathbb{B}'_\zeta$.

Definition 3.2.8 (Ideal) *Let I_ζ be the ideal of $\mathbb{B}'_\zeta$ generated by:*

(i) $\sigma(a_0, \dots a_m)$ *when* $\sigma(x_0, \dots x_m)$ *is a Boolean term,* $a_0, \dots a_m \in P_1^{M_\zeta}$ *and* $P_1^{M_\zeta} \models \sigma(a_0, \dots a_m) = 0$.

The next two clauses aim to show that in M_ζ / I_ζ, the element $b_{\zeta,\gamma}$ is the b_{X_γ} from Specification 3.2.7 f.i). That is, $\{\alpha < \lambda : f_\epsilon(\alpha) \leq_{M_\epsilon} b_{\gamma,\zeta}\} = \{\alpha < \lambda : \alpha \in X_\gamma\}$. Recall (Definition 2.1) that the X_γ enumerate $\mathbb{B}$ and are subsets of λ.

(ii) $f_\epsilon(\alpha) - b_{\zeta,\gamma}$ *when* $\alpha \in X_\gamma$ *and* $\alpha, \gamma < \lambda$.

(iii) $b_{\zeta,\gamma} \wedge f_\epsilon(\alpha)$ *when* $\alpha \in \lambda - X_\gamma$ *and* $\alpha, \gamma < \lambda$.

To show the $f_\epsilon(\gamma)$ are disjoint atoms we add:

(iv) For any $f_\epsilon(\gamma)$ and any $b \in \mathbb{B}'_\zeta$ either $(f_\epsilon(\gamma) \wedge b) \in I_\zeta$ or $(f_\epsilon(\gamma) - b) \in I_\zeta$.

(v) $f_\epsilon(\gamma_1) \wedge f_\epsilon(\gamma_2)$ *when* $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \lambda$;

(vi) $f_\epsilon(\alpha) - b$ *when* $\alpha < \lambda$, $f_\epsilon(\alpha) \notin P_{4,1}^{M_\zeta}$ *and* $b \in D_\zeta$.

This asserts: Every new atom is below each $b \in D_\zeta$ and is used at the end of case 3 of the construction.

Let $\mathbb{B}''_\zeta = \mathbb{B}'_\zeta / I_\zeta$. Applying Fact 3.2.3, we see from Definition 3.2.8:

Claim 3.2.9 *The structure $P_1^{M_\zeta}$ is embedded as a Boolean algebra into $\mathbb{B}''_\zeta$ by the map $b \mapsto b/I_\zeta$ and*

1. *For $\gamma < \lambda$, $f_\zeta(\gamma)/I_\zeta$ is an atom of $\mathbb{B}''_\zeta$;*
2. *If $b \in P_1^{M_\zeta}$ is non-zero, then $b/I_\zeta \geq_{\mathbb{B}''_\zeta} f_\epsilon(\gamma)$ for some $\gamma < \lambda$. (Since f_ϵ^{-1} induces an isomorphism of $\mathbb{B}''_\zeta$ into $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$)*

We take a further quotient of $\mathbb{B}'_\zeta$. Let

$$J_\zeta = \{b \in \mathbb{B}'_\zeta : b/I_\zeta \wedge_{\mathbb{B}''_\zeta} f_\epsilon(\gamma) = 0 \text{ for every } \gamma < \lambda\}.$$

Then J_ζ is an ideal of $\mathbb{B}'_\zeta$ extending I_ζ so $b \mapsto b/J_\zeta$ is a homomorphism. Further, $f_\epsilon(\gamma)$ is an atom of $\mathbb{B}'_\zeta / J_\zeta$ for $\gamma < \lambda$. These atoms are distinct and dense in $\mathbb{B}'_\zeta / J_\zeta$. That is, $\mathbb{B}_\epsilon$ is an atomic Boolean algebra.

Notation 3.2.10 *Let* $\mathbb{B}_\epsilon$ *be* $\mathbb{B}'_\zeta/J_\zeta$ *with quotient map,* $j_\epsilon(b) = b/J_\zeta$.

Now we define M_ϵ by setting $P_1^{M_\epsilon} = \mathbb{B}_\epsilon$ which contains $P_1^{M_\zeta}$; $P_{4,1}^{M_\epsilon}$ is the injective image in $P_1^{M_\epsilon}$ of $P_{4,1}^{M_\zeta} \cup B_\epsilon$. For $a \in P_{4,1}^{M_\epsilon}$ and $b \in P_1^{M_\epsilon}$ set $R^{M_\epsilon}(a,b)$ if for some γ, $a = f_\epsilon(\gamma)/J_\zeta$ and $f_\epsilon(\gamma)/J_\zeta \leq_{\mathbb{B}_\epsilon} b/J_\zeta$. Finally, let D_ϵ be the ultrafilter on $P_1^{M_\epsilon}$ generated by

$$D_\zeta \cup \{j_\epsilon(-b_{\zeta,\gamma})\colon \gamma < \lambda\} \cup \{j_\epsilon(-f_\epsilon(\gamma))\colon \gamma < \lambda\}.$$

By Claim 3.2.9, we have the cardinality and atomicity conditions of Specification 3.2.7.(a) and (b); the definition of I_ζ guarantees, (c) and (d).(ii), (d).(iii). We verify $M_\epsilon \in \boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ below. The elements $b_{\zeta,\gamma}$ along with (our later) definition of $F_n^{M_\epsilon}(c)$ show d.i), $D_\epsilon \in \mathrm{uf}(M_\epsilon)$, (as no new $F_n(c)$ is in D_ϵ); the elements of B_ϵ show D_ϵ is non-principal as each complement of an atom is in the ultrafilter. Note that Specification 3.2.7.(e) does not apply except in the $\omega + 1$st stage of the construction.

For Specification 3.2.7 (f) (i), let X be a set of atoms of M_ϵ and note that we can choose b_X by conditions ii) and iii) in Definition 3.2.8 of I_ζ.

We can choose $P_2^{M_\epsilon}$ and $F_n^{M_\epsilon}$ to satisfy Specification 3.2.7 (f) (ii). Fix an $\overline{A} \in \mathcal{A}$ (as given by $\boxplus$). Fix a $c = c_{\overline{A}}$ and define, using the last paragraph, the $F_n^{M_\epsilon}(c)$ as b_{A_n}, so that for each n, $A_n = \{\alpha < \lambda : f_\epsilon(\alpha) \leq_{P_1^{M_\epsilon}} F_n^{M_\epsilon}(c)\}$. These are the only new $c \in P_2^{M_\epsilon}$.

Thus, it remains only to show that $M_\epsilon \in \boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$. Most of the cases are obvious. E.g. for Definition 3.1.2.(8), just look at where the generators can be and recall countable free algebras are atomless. Showing M_ϵ satisfies countable incompleteness, Definition 3.1.2.(7), is a bit more complex but we do so now.

(⧫) If $a \in P_{4,1}^{M_\epsilon}$ and $c \in P_2^{M_\epsilon}$ then $(\forall^\infty n)\ a \not\leq_{M_\epsilon} F_n^{M_\epsilon}(c)$.

If $c \in P_2^{M_\zeta}$, $F_n^{M_\epsilon}(c) = F_c^{M_\zeta} \in P_1^{M_\zeta}$ and we know by induction that ⧫ holds for $a \in P_{4,1}^{M_\zeta}$. For $a \in P_{4,1}^{M_\epsilon} - P_{4,1}^{M_\zeta}$, Definition 3.1.2.5. and condition (vi) on I_ζ (from Definition 3.2.8) imply $a \leq_{M_\epsilon} b$ for every $b \in D_\zeta$. As $c \in P_2^{M_\zeta}$ and $D_\zeta \in \mathrm{uf}(M_\zeta)$, all but finitely many $e_n = F_n^\zeta(c)$, are *not* in D_ζ. So for all but finitely many n, $e_n^- \in D_\zeta$. That is, $a \leq_{M_\epsilon} e_n^-$; so $a \wedge_{M_\epsilon} e_n = \emptyset$ as required.

If $c \in P_2^{M_\epsilon} - P_2^{M_\zeta}$ then by our choice of $P_2^{M_\epsilon}$ and the $F_n^{M_\epsilon}$, there is an $\overline{A}_c$ that is enumerated by the $F_n^{M_\epsilon}(c)$ and satisfies ⧫ by (i) of $\boxplus$ (Definition 2.1.(i)). This completes the verification of ⧫ at stage ϵ and so M_ϵ satisfies all the specifications of the induction.

<u>case 4:</u> $\epsilon = \omega + 1$:

Only clauses (c) and (e) of Specification 3.2.7 are relevant. Define $P_2^{M_\epsilon}$ and $F_n^{M_\epsilon}$ to satisfy clause (e). Since $P_i^{M_\epsilon} = P_i^{M_\omega}$ for $i = 0, 1$, specification c) is immediate. This completes the construction.

The construction suffices.

Having completed the induction, let $M = M_{\omega+1}$. Using specifications d) and a) of 3.2.7, it is straightforward to verify that $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ and the Boolean algebra is atomic. By (b), $P_i^{M_\omega}$ for $i = 0, 1$ have cardinality λ. And by (f), the same holds for $P_2^{M_{\omega+1}}$.

We now show M is nicely free. Let $\mathbf{b} = \langle b'_\beta \colon \beta < \lambda\rangle$ enumerate $\langle b_{n,\alpha}\colon n < \omega, \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ without repetition and such that $\{b_{-1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\} = \{b'_{2\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\}$. So this picks out the first level P_0^M which is enumerated by the $F_n^{M_0}(c)$ for $c \in P_2^{M_0}$ and $n < \omega$ by case 1 of the construction.

Now, $\mathbf{b}$ satisfies the requirements in Definition 3.2.5 of nicely free. As, by Specifications 3.2.7. (c), (d) and since P_1^M is constructed as the union of the $P_1^{M_n}$, P_1^M/P_4^M is generated freely by $\mathbf{b}/P_4^M$. Finally, clause c) of Definition 3.2.5 holds by clause (d).ii) of Specification 3.2.7.

The crux is to show $M = M_{\omega+1}$ is P_0-maximal. For this, assume for a contradiction:

(*) P_0^M is not maximal; by Lemma 3.2.4, there is a $D \in \mathrm{uf}(M_{\omega+1}) = \mathrm{uf}(M_\omega)$.

For every $n < \omega$, is there a $d \in D$ such that $R(M_\omega, d) \cap M_n = \emptyset$?

Possibility 1 : For every $n < \omega$, the answer is yes, exemplified by $d_n \in D$. Now for each $a \in P_0^{M_n}$, $a \notin R(M_\omega, d_m)$ for all $m \geq n$. So the sequence $\overline{d} = \langle d_n : n < \omega\rangle$ satisfies the hypothesis of Specification 3.2.7.(e) and so there is a $c \in P_2^M$ such that for each $n < \omega$, $F_n^M(c) = d_n$. Thus, recalling Definition 3.2.2, $D \notin \mathrm{uf}(M)$.

Possibility 2 : For some $n < \omega$, there is no such d_n; without loss of generality, assume $n > 0$. We apply specification f) with $\epsilon = n$. Recall that f_n is a 1-1 map from λ onto $P_{4,1}^{M_n}$. Let g_1 be the following homomorphism from the Boolean algebra $P_1^{M_{\omega+1}} = P_1^{M_\omega}$ into $\mathcal{P}(\lambda) : g_1(b) = \{\alpha < \lambda : f_n(\alpha) \leq_{\mathbb{B}_{M_\omega}} b\}$. By Specification f.i) of 3.2.7, the Boolean algebra $\mathbb{B}$ provided by $\boxplus$ is contained in the range of g_1.

Let $\mathcal{I}_n$ denote the ideal of P_1^M generated by $P_{4,1}^M - P_{4,1}^{M_n}$. Since D is non-principal, $\mathcal{I}_n \cap D = \emptyset$. Now, g_1 maps any $b \in P_1^{M_\omega} - P_4^{M_\omega}$ (and, thus, any $b \in P_1^{M_\omega} - \mathcal{I}_n$) to a nonempty subset of λ. Recalling $\mathcal{I}_n \cap D = \emptyset$, g_1 embeds the quotient algebra $P_1^{M_{\omega+1}}/\mathcal{I}_n$ into the Boolean Algebra $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$. Hence, $D_1 = g_1(D)$ is an ultrafilter of the Boolean Algebra $\mathrm{rg(g_1)}$ and so $D_2 = D_1 \cap \mathbb{B}$ is an ultrafilter of the Boolean algebra $\mathbb{B}$. We show, for any $\alpha < \lambda$, $\{\alpha\} \notin D_2$. As, $f_n(\alpha) \in P_{4,1}^{M_\omega}$ and so $f_n(\alpha)$ is not in D. So $\{\alpha\} \notin D_1$. Thus, $\lambda - \{\alpha\} \in D_1$ and so $\lambda - \{\alpha\} \in D_2$. So $\{\alpha\} \notin D_2$ as promised.

Now we apply the second clause of $\boxplus$ to the ultrafilter D_2. Since we satisfied specification f.ii) in the construction, we can conclude there is $\overline{A} = \langle A_n \colon n < \omega\rangle \in \mathcal{A}$ such that for infinitely many k, A_k is in D_2. Thus, $u = \{k \colon A_k \in D\}$ is infinite. We will finish the proof by showing there is a c such that $u = u_c$ (Definition 3.2.5) is the set of images of the $F_n^M(c)$.

Since we are in possibility 2), each $A_k \in \mathbb{B}$, $A_k \in \mathrm{rg(g_1)}$. So we can choose $d_k \in P_1^{M_\omega}$ with $g_1(d_k) = A_k$. As $A_k \in D_2$, by the choice of D_1, D_2 we have d_k is in the ultrafilter D from the hypothesis for contradiction: (*).

We show the sequence $\overline{d} = \langle d_k : k < \omega\rangle$ satisfies the hypothesis of clause e of Specification 3.2.7. First, $d_k \in P_1^{M_\omega} - P_4^{M_\omega}$ as D is a non-principal ultrafilter on $P_1^{M_\omega}$ so the first hypothesis is satisfied. Further, for every $a \in P_0^{M_\omega}$ all but finitely many k, $G_1^{M_\omega}(a) \not\leq_{M_\omega} d_k$ because $\overline{A} \in \mathcal{A}$, which implies by $\boxplus$ ii) that for every $\alpha < \lambda$, for some k_α, we have $k \geq k_\alpha$ implies $\alpha \notin A_k$. Now by the definition of g_1, recalling $g_1(d_k) = A_k$, we have $k \geq k_\alpha$ implies $f_k(\alpha) \not\leq d_k$ (in $P_1^{M_\omega}$). So by Specification 3.2.7. f.ii), there is a $c \in P_2^{M_n}$ such that if for all $k < \omega$, $F_k^{M_n}(c) = d_k$.

So, for each finite k, $d_k \in D$ and $F_k^{M_{\omega+1}}(c) = d_k$. This contradicts $D \in \mathrm{uf}(M_{\omega+1})$ and we finish. $\square_{3.2.6}$

3.3 $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{K}_2$

We now introduce some terminology from [BS2x]. We first describe the finitely generated models and then the extension to $\boldsymbol{K}_2$, the models of the complete sentence.

Definition 3.3.1 ($\boldsymbol{K}^1_{<\aleph_0}$ Defined) *M is in the class of structures $\boldsymbol{K}^1_{<\aleph_0}$ if $M \in \boldsymbol{K}^{-1}_{<\aleph_0}$ and there is a* witness $\langle n_*, \boldsymbol{B}, b_* \rangle$ *such that:*

1. *$b_* \in P_1^M$ is the supremum of the finite joins of atoms in P_1^M. Further, for some k, $\bigcup_{j \leq k} P^M_{4,j} = \{c : c \leq b_*\}$ and for all $n > k$, $P^M_{4,n} = \emptyset$.*
2. *$\boldsymbol{B} = \langle B_n : n \geq n_* \rangle$ is an increasing sequence of finite Boolean subalgebras of P_1^M.*
3. *$B_{n_*} \supsetneq \{a \in P_1^M : a \leq b_*\} = P_4^M$; the subset $P_4^M \cup \{F_n^M(c) \colon n < n_*, c \in P_2^M\}$ generates B_{n_*}.*

   Moreover, the Boolean algebra B_{n_*} is free over the ideal P_4^M (equivalently, B_{n_*}/P_4^M is a free Boolean algebra[2]).
4. *$\bigcup_{n \geq n_*} B_n = P_1^M$.*
5. *P_2^M is finite and not empty. Further, for each $c \in P_2^M$ the $F_n^M(c)$ for $n < \omega$ are independent over P_4^M.*
6. *The set $\{F_m^M(c) : m \geq n_*, c \in P_2^M\}$ (the enumeration is without repetition) is free from B_{n_*} over P_4^M, $B_{n_*} \supsetneq P_4^M$ and $F_m^M(c) \wedge b_* = 0$ for $m \geq n_*$. (In this definition, $0 = 0^{P_1^M}$.)*

   In detail, let $\sigma(\ldots x_{c_i} \ldots)$ be a Boolean algebra term in the variables x_{c_i} (where the c_i are in P_2^M which is not identically 0. Then, for finitely many $n_i \geq n_*$ and a finite sequence of $c_i \in P_2^M$:

   $$\sigma(\ldots F^M_{n_i}(c_i) \ldots) > 0.$$

   Further, for any non-zero $d \in B_{n_*}$ with $d \wedge b_* = 0$, (i.e. $d \in B_n - P^4_M$),

   $$\sigma(\ldots F^M_{n_i}(c_i) \ldots) \wedge d > 0.$$
7. *For every $n \geq n_*$, B_n is generated by $B_{n_*} \cup \{F_m^M(c) : n > m \geq n_*, c \in P_2^M\}$. Thus P_1^M and so M is generated by $B_{n_*} \cup P_2^M$.*

Note that the free generation in item 6 of Definition 3.3.1 is not preserved by arbitrary direct limits and so is not a property of each model in $\boldsymbol{K}_1$. In particular, as M_* is corrected to a model of $\boldsymbol{K}_1$, we check the freeness only for finitely generated submodels as it will be false in general.

Recall some terminology from [BS2x].

[2] A further equivalence: $|Atom(B_{n_*})|/|P^M_{4,1}|$ is a power of two.

Definition 3.3.2 ($\boldsymbol{K}_1, \boldsymbol{K}_2$ Defined) *1. $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ denotes the collection of all direct limits of models in $\boldsymbol{K}^1_{<\aleph_0}$.*

2. *We say a model M in $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ is rich if for any $N_1, N_2 \in \boldsymbol{K}^1_{<\aleph_0}$ with $N_1 \subseteq N_2$ and $N_1 \subseteq M$, there is an embedding of N_2 into M over N_1.*

3. *$\boldsymbol{K}_2 \subseteq \boldsymbol{K}_1$ is the class of rich models.*

Since $\boldsymbol{K}^1_{<\aleph_0}$ has joint embedding, amalgamation and only countably many finitely generated models, we construct in the usual way a generic model, thus $\boldsymbol{K}_2$ is not empty.

Fact 3.3.3 *There is a countable generic model M for $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ (Corollary 3.2.18 of [BS2x]). We denote its Scott sentence by ϕ. $\boldsymbol{K}_2$ is the class of models of this ϕ.*

4 Correcting M_* to a model of $\boldsymbol{K}_2$

We now 'correct' the P_0-maximal model of $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$, M_*, constructed in Section 3, to obtain a P_0-maximal model M (Definition 3.2.1) of the complete sentence constructed in [BS2x], i.e. $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_2$. In Theorem 4.18 we modify M_*, to construct a model $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_2$ with $P_2^M \subseteq P^{M_*}$ and redefining the F_n, but retaining $M \restriction (P_0^M \cup P_1^M) = M_* \restriction (P_0^{M_*} \cup P_1^{M_*})$. The old values of $F_n^{M_*}$ will be used to divide the work of ensuring each ultrafilter D is not in $\mathrm{uf}(M)$ by for each D, attending one by one to only those c with infinitely many $F_n^{M_*}(c)$ in D.

We now describe some of the salient properties of the model M obtained by 'correcting' the M_* of Section 3.

Remark 4.1 (The Corrections) *1. The domains of the structures constructed in this section are subsets of M_*; the F_n are redefined so the new structures are substructures only of the reduct of M_* to $\tau - \{F_n : n < \omega\}$.*

2. *In particular, for all the M considered here $P_1^M = P_1^{M_*}$ and these Boolean algebras have the same set of ultrafilters. However, $\mathrm{uf}(M) \neq \mathrm{uf}(M_*)$ as the definition of uf depends on properties of the F_n.*

3. *The set $\{F_n^M(c) : c \in P_2^M\}$ is not required to be an independent subset in $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$.*

4. *Lemma 4.13 demands a sequence of finite Boolean algebras B_n to witness finitely generated substructures belong to $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ (not required for $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$). The stronger class of $\boldsymbol{K}_1$-free structures [BS2x, Definition 3.2.11], which is closed under extension by members of $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ and so has no maximal models plays no active role in this paper. In particular, the final counterexample, Theorem 4.18, is in $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ but is not $\boldsymbol{K}_1$-free.*

5. *The proof is in ZFC. The proof in [BS2x] that a non-maximal model in λ makes λ measurable depends on $\diamond$.*

The main task of this section is to prove:

Theorem 4.2 *If λ is less than the first measurable cardinal, $2^{\aleph_0} < \lambda$, and for some μ, $2^\mu = \lambda$ (whence $\lambda^\omega = \lambda$), then there is a P_0-maximal model in $\boldsymbol{K}_2$ of cardinality λ.*

Conclusion 4.3, summarises the results of the construction in Theorem 3.2.6, specifically to fix our assumptions for this section.

Conclusion 4.3 *If λ is as in Theorem 4.2 then there is a model M_* with $|M_*| = \lambda$ satisfying:*

1. *$P_1^{M_*}$ is an atomic Boolean algebra and M_* is P_0-maximal. Further, $|P_i^{M_*}| = \lambda$ for $i = 0, 1$.*
2. *$P_{4,1}^{M_*}$ is the set of atoms of M_*.*
3. *M_* is nicely free (Definition 3.2.5); in particular, $P_1^{M_*}/P_4^{M_*}$ is a free Boolean algebra of cardinality λ.*

In order to 'correct' M_* to a model in $\boldsymbol{K}_2$, we lay out some notation for the indexing of the tasks performed in the construction, the generating set of $P_1^{M_*}$, and the free basis of the Boolean algebra $P_1^{M_*}/P_4^{M_*}$.

Notation 4.4 *We define a family of trees of sequences:*

1. *For $\alpha < \lambda$, let $\mathcal{T}_\alpha = \{\langle\rangle\} \cup \{\alpha\widehat{\ }\eta; \eta \in {}^{<\omega}3\}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} \mathcal{T}_\alpha$.*
2. *$\lim(\mathcal{T}_\alpha)$ is the collection of paths through $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$.*

Combining the requirements for constructing M_* (Specification 3.2.7) and the Definition 3.2.5 of nicely free, we have

Claim 4.5 (Fixing Notation) *Since M_* is nicely free, without loss of generality, we may assume:*

1. *The universe of M_* is λ and the 0 of $P_1^{M_*}$ is the ordinal 0.*
2. *We can choose sequences of elements of $P_1^{M_*}$, $\mathbf{b} = \langle b_\eta \colon \eta \in \mathcal{T}\rangle$ so that their images in the natural projection of $P_1^{M_*}$ on $P_1^{M_*}/P_4^{M_*}$ freely generate $P_1^{M_*}/P_4^{M_*}$.*
3. *For every $a \in P_{4,1}^{M_*}$ and the even ordinals $\alpha < \lambda$, there is an n such that for any $\nu \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$, $\lg(\nu) \geq n$ implies $a \wedge \nu = 0$.*

Proof. The only difficulty is deducing from c) of Definition 3.2.5 (nicely free) that 3) holds. For that, we can insist that for each even α, for some $c \in P_2^{M_*}$, $\{b'_{\omega\alpha+n} \colon n < \omega\}$ enumerates $u_c = \{F_n^{M_*}(c) : n < \omega\}$ (from Definition 3.2.5.c). Now for $\alpha > 0$, let $\langle b_\eta \colon \eta \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha \setminus \{\langle\rangle\}\rangle$ list $\{b'_{\omega\alpha+n} \colon n < \omega\}$ without repetition and $\langle b_\eta \colon \eta \in \mathcal{T}_0\rangle$ list $\{b'_n \colon n < \omega\}$. By Definition 3.1.2.7 ($\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$) we have: for every $a \in P_{4,1}^{M_*}$ for all but finitely many n, $a \wedge b'_{\omega\alpha+n} = 0_{P_1^{M_*}}$; whence for even α all but finitely many of the $\nu \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ satisfy $a \wedge b_\nu = 0_{P_1^{M_*}}$. $\Box_{4.5}$

Note that Claim 4.5 provides a 1-1 map from $P_2^{M_*}$ to ordinals less than λ. We introduce the collection of models that is the starting point for the following construction.

Definition 4.6 ($\mathbb{M}_1$ **Defined)** *Let $\mathbb{M}^1 = \mathbb{M}^1_\lambda$ be the set of $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ such that the universe of M is contained in λ, the universe of M_*, and for $i < 2$, (or $i = 4$ or $(4, 1)$) $P_i^M = P_i^{M_*}$, $M\restriction(P_0^M \cup P_1^M) = M_*\restriction(P_0^{M_*} \cup P_1^{M_*})$ while P_2^M will not equal $P_2^{M_*}$.*

The posited M_* differs from any $M \in \mathbb{M}_1$ only in that P_2^M may be a proper subset of P_2^{M*} and the newly defined $F_n^M(c)$ (usually) do not equal the $F_n^{M_*}(c)$. We now spell out the tasks which must be completed to correct M_* to the required member of $\boldsymbol{K}_2$. The $F_n^{M_*}(c)$ are used as oracles.

Definition 4.7 (Tasks) *1. Let $\boldsymbol{T}_1$, the set of 1-tasks, be the set of pairs (N_1, N_2) such that:*

(a) $N_1 \subseteq N_2 \subseteq \lambda$

(b) $N_1, N_2 \in \boldsymbol{K}^1_{<\aleph_0}$

(c) $N_1 \subset M$ for some $M \in \mathbb{M}_1$. More explicitly, $P_2^M \subseteq P_2^{M_*}$ and $N_1\restriction(P_0^M \cup P_1^M) \subseteq M_*$ and $(F_n^M \restriction P_2^{N_1}) = F_n^{N_1}$ for each n.

2. Let $\boldsymbol{T}_2$, the set of 2-tasks, be the set of $c \in P_2^{M_*}$.

3. $\boldsymbol{T} = \boldsymbol{T}_1 \cup \boldsymbol{T}_2$.

4. Let $\langle \mathbf{t}_\alpha \colon \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ enumerate $\boldsymbol{T}$.

Note $|\boldsymbol{T}_1| = |\boldsymbol{T}_2| = |\boldsymbol{T}|$.

Definition 4.8 (Task Satisfaction) *The task $\mathbf{t}$ is* relevant *to the structure M if $M \in \mathbb{M}_1$ and i) if $\mathbf{t}$ is 1-task (N_1, N_2) and $N_1 \subseteq M$ or ii) if $\mathbf{t}$ is a 2-task c and $c \in P_2^M$.*

We say $M \in \mathbb{M}_1$ satisfies the task $\mathbf{t}$ *if either:*

A) $\mathbf{t} = (N_1, N_2) \in \boldsymbol{T}_1$ (so $N_1 \subset M$) and there exists an embedding of N_2 into M over N_1.

B) $\mathbf{t} = c$, where $c \in P_2^{M_*}$, is in $\boldsymbol{T}_2$ and for every ultrafilter D on P_1^M, such that for infinitely many n, $F_n^{M_*}(c) \in D$, there is a $d \in P_2^M$ such that for infinitely many n, $F_n^M(d) \in D$.

Recall Definition 3.2.2 of $\mathrm{uf}(M)$ and Lemma 3.2.4 connecting $\mathrm{uf}(M)$ with P_0-maximality of M.

Claim 4.9 *If $M \in \mathbb{M}_1$ satisfies all tasks in $\boldsymbol{T}$ and is in $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ then M is P_0-maximal and, in particular, satisfying the tasks in $\boldsymbol{T}_1$ guarantees it is in $\boldsymbol{K}_2$.*

Proof. For P_0-maximality of M, it suffices, by Lemma 3.2.4, to show $\mathrm{uf}(M) = \emptyset$. But, since $\mathrm{uf}(M_*) = \emptyset$, for every ultrafilter D on $P_1^{M_*}$ there is $c \in P_2^{M_*}$ with $S_c^{M*}(D)$ infinite (Definition 3.2.2) and satisfying task c means there is $d \in P_2^M$ such that $S_d^M(D)$ is infinite and so D is not in $\mathrm{uf}(M)$. Since M and M^* have the same ultrafilters, this implies $\mathrm{uf}(M) = \emptyset$, as required. The second assertion follows by realizing that satisfying all the tasks in $\boldsymbol{T}_1$ establishes the model is rich, which suffices by Fact 3.3.3. $\square_{4.9}$.

Definition 4.11 lays out the use of the generating elements b_η in correcting the F_n^{M*} to require independence while maintaining that infinite intersections of members of the ultrafilter under consideration are empty. The infinite sequence η_d will guide the choice of $F_n^M(d)$.

The following facts about the relation of symmetric difference and ultrafilters are central for calculations below.

Remark 4.10 *Recall that the operation of symmetric difference is associative.*

1. *Suppose $\mathbb{B}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{B}_2$ are Boolean algebras with $a \in \mathbb{B}_1$, and $b_1 \neq c_1$ are in $\mathbb{B}_2$, and $\{b_1, c_1\}$ is independent over $\mathbb{B}_1$ in $\mathbb{B}_2$.*

   The element $(b_1 \bigtriangleup c_1) \bigtriangleup a \in \mathbb{B}_2$ is independent over $\mathbb{B}_1$. More generally, if $\{b_i, c_i : i < \omega\}$ are independent over $\mathbb{B}_1$, $\{a_i : i < \omega\} \subseteq \mathbb{B}_1$, $e_i = b_i \bigtriangleup c_i \bigtriangleup a_i$,e and $f_i = b_i \bigtriangleup c_i$ then each of $\{e_i : i < \omega\}$ and $\{f_i : i < \omega\}$ are independent over $\mathbb{B}_1$.

2. *Let D be an ultrafilter on a Boolean algebra $\mathbb{B}$.*

   (a) *For $a, b \in D$,*
   ($a \in D$ iff $b \in D$) if and only if $a \bigtriangleup b \notin D$.

   (b) *If $a_0, a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{B}$ are distinct then at least one of $a_i \bigtriangleup a_j \notin D$.*

   (c) *More importantly for our use later, it is easy to check:*
   ($a_0 \in D$ iff $a_1 \in D$)
   iff
   $$(a_0 \bigtriangleup a_1 \bigtriangleup a_2) \in D \leftrightarrow a_2 \in D.$$

3. *If a is an atom, $a \wedge b_0 = 0$ and $a \wedge b_1 = 0$, then $a \wedge (b_0 \bigtriangleup b_1) = 0$.*

Proof. 1) If the element $(b \bigtriangleup c) \bigtriangleup a \in \mathbb{B}_2$ is not independent over $\mathbb{B}_1$ there is a polynomial p over $\mathbb{B}_1$ with $p((b \bigtriangleup c) \bigtriangleup a) \in \mathbb{B}_1$. But then, by Observation 1.2, $p(x, y) = p((x \bigtriangleup y) \bigtriangleup a)$ is also a polynomial over $\mathbb{B}_1$ witnessing $\{b, c\}$ is dependent over $\mathbb{B}_1$. In the more general case any polynomial witnessing dependence in n of the e_i (f_i) give a polynomial in $2n$ of the a_i, b_i, c_i witnessing dependence of the original set.

2) For a), if, say $a \in D$ and $b \notin D$, then $a - b$ and hence $a \bigtriangleup b \in D$ so we have 'left to right' by contraposition. If both are in D, so is their meet which is disjoint from $a \bigtriangleup b$ so $a \bigtriangleup b \notin D$. Since $a^- \bigtriangleup b^- = a \bigtriangleup b$, we have the result if neither is in D.

b) holds since the intersection over all pairs $i, j < 3$ of the $a_i \bigtriangleup a_j$ is empty. And c) is propositional logic from a) and b).

3) $a \leq (b_0^- \wedge b_1^-) \leq (b_0^- \bigtriangleup b_1^-) \leq (b_0 \bigtriangleup b_1)^-$. As a is an atom, $a \wedge (b_0 \bigtriangleup b_1) = 0$. $\square_{4.10}$

We define a class $\mathbb{M}_2 \subseteq \mathbb{M}_1$ such that for each $d \in P_2^M \in \mathbb{M}_2$ there is an ordinal α_d, a tree of elements of P_1^M, indexed by sequences in $(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha_d}) \subseteq {}^{<\omega}3$, a target path η_d through that tree and a sequence $a_{d,n}$, whose indices are not in $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha_d}$, but which satisfy that each $a \in P_{4,1}^{M_*} = P_{4,1}^M$ is in at most finitely many $a_{d,n}$. In the construction (Theorem 4.18) of a model in $\mathbb{M}_2$, η_d guides definition of the sequence $F_k^M(b_{\eta_d})$. The $a_{d,n}$

are introduced to make Definition 4.11.B uniform. In cases 2 and 3 of Theorem 4.18 $a_{d,n}$ is always 0. In case 4, where the $F_n^M(d)$ are defined as M is corrected from M_*, $a_{d,n} = F_n^{M_*}(d)$. The result is the values of the $F_n^M(d)$ are both independent over a finite initial segment and satisfy $\bigwedge_{n<\omega} F_n^M(d) = \emptyset$. The next definition abstracts from this construction to identify the key ideas of the proof that if $M \in \mathbb{M}_2$ then $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_1$ (Lemma 4.13). The notation $\langle Z\rangle$ denotes the Boolean subalgebra of P_1^M generated by Z.

Definition 4.11 (**$\mathbb{M}_2$ Defined**) *Let $\mathbb{M}_2$ be the set of $M \in \mathbb{M}_1$ such that there is a sequence $w = \langle(\alpha_d, \eta_d, a_{d,n})\colon d \in P_2^M, n < \omega\rangle$ witnessing the membership, which means:*

A (a) For each $d \in P_2^M$, $\alpha_d < \lambda$ is even and $d_1 \neq d_2$ implies $\eta_{d_1} \neq \eta_{d_2}$. (In case 4 of Lemma 4.18, many d_η have the same α_η.)

(b) $\langle\alpha_d\rangle \triangleleft \eta_d \in \lim(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha_d})$.

B For each $n < \omega$, the $a_{d,n}$ are in $P_1^{M_*} = P_1^M$ and for each $d \in P_2^M$, there are[3] distinct $\nu_1[d,n]$ and $\nu_2[d,n]$ that extend $\eta_d{\restriction}n$, $\nu_i(0) = \alpha_d$, and have length $n+1$ such that:

(a) For every n,

$$F_n^M(d) = (b_{\nu_1[d,n]} \bigtriangleup b_{\nu_2[d,n]}) \bigtriangleup a_{d,n};$$

(b) for each $a \in P_{4,1}^{M_*}$ and each $d \in P_2^M$, there are only finitely many n with $a \leq_{P_1^{M_*}} a_{d,n}$.

C For each finite $Y \subseteq P_2^M$ there is a list $\langle d_\ell : \ell < |Y|\rangle$ of Y such that:

(a) The d_ℓ list Y without repetition and $\alpha_\ell = \alpha_{d_\ell}$.

(b) If $i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < |Y|$ and $\alpha_{i_1} = \alpha_{i_3}$ then $\alpha_{i_2} = \alpha_{i_1}$.

(c) There is[4] a $k_1 = k_1^Y$ such that

i. For $i \neq j$, both less than n, $\eta_i{\restriction}k_1^Y \neq \eta_j{\restriction}k_1^Y$.

ii. Let α_ℓ abbreviate α_{d_ℓ}, and set $W \subseteq P_1^{M_*}$ to be:

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \{a_{d_k,n} : k < |Y| \wedge n < \omega\} \\ &\quad \cup \{F_i^M(d_k) : i < |Y|, k < k_1^Y\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Then W is included in the subalgebra $\mathbb{B}_Y^0$ of P_1^M generated by

$$\{b_\nu\colon \bigwedge_{i<n} (\eta_i{\restriction}k_1^Y) \ntrianglelefteq \nu \text{ for } i < |Y|\} \cup \{b_{\langle\rangle}\} \cup P_{4,1}^M.$$

Note that the B_Y^0 is a cocountable subset of P_1^M (the complement is contained in finite set of countable trees).

We will apply the following lemma three times to show that for $M \in \mathbb{M}_2$, the set $\{F_n^M(c)\}$ is countably incomplete (witnessing Definition 3.1.2.7).

[3] I.e., $\nu_1[d,n]$ depends on d and n.

[4] See proof of *goal* in Lemma 4.18.

Lemma 4.12 *For any α, if $\rho \neq \nu$ are in $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$ and c is an even ordinal γ, then for all but finitely many n*

$$a \wedge (b_\nu \vartriangle b_\rho \vartriangle a_{d,n}) = 0.$$

Proof. Recall from 4.5.3, that for every $a \in P_{4,1}^{M_*}$ and the even ordinals $\alpha < \lambda$, there is an n, such that for any $\nu, \rho \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ with $\lg(\nu) \geq n$ and $\lg(\rho) \geq n$, $a \wedge b_\nu = 0$ and $a \wedge b_\rho = 0$. When $a_{d,n} = 0$ the result is immediate from Lemma 4.10.3. When $a_{d,n} = F_n^{M_*}(c)$, since γ is even, and applying Claim 4.5, it follows that for every $a \in P_{4,1}^{M_*}$, and large enough n, we have the result. $\square_{4.12}$

We will show in Lemma 4.13 that members of $\mathbb{M}_2$ are in $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ and then in Theorem 4.18 that there are structures in $\mathbb{M}_2$ that are in $\boldsymbol{K}_2$. Two main features distinguish $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ from $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$. The $F_n(d)$ retain the 'countable incompleteness' property from $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ but also must be independent; $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_1$ when M is a direct limit of members of $\boldsymbol{K}^1_{<\aleph_0}$.

Lemma 4.13 *If $M \in \mathbb{M}_2$, then $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_1$.*

Proof. Suppose $M \in \mathbb{M}_2$. Let $Y \subset P_2^M$ and $X \subset P_1^M$ be finite; we shall find $N = N_{XY} \in \boldsymbol{K}^1_{<\aleph_0}$ such that $Y \cup X \subseteq N \subseteq M$; this suffices. As, $\boldsymbol{K}_1$ is defined to be the collection of direct limits of finitely generated structures[5] in $\boldsymbol{K}^1_{<\aleph_0}$.

Our two main goals in this proof are to find an N, n_*, b_* in which i) the $F_k^M \restriction N$ satisfy property 6 (independence) of Definition 3.3.1 over a B_{n_*} and property 7 of Definition 3.1.2 and then ii) construct a sequence of finite Boolean algebras $\langle B_n : n \geq n_* \rangle$ with $N = \bigcup_{n<\omega} B_n$ that witness 2 and 3 of Definition 3.3.1.

The finite $k_1 = k_1^Y$ specified in Definition 4.11 depends only on Y; in the next definition we increase k_1 to a $k_1^X = k_1^{XY}$ and using the definition of $\mathbb{M}_2$ show the $F_k^M(d)$ are independent over X for $k \geq k_1^{XY}$.

We build two increasing chains of length $|Y|$ of subboolean algebras. The $\mathbb{B}_\ell$ will be cocountable, while the $\mathbb{F}_\ell$ will be countable. The existence of k_1^{XY} satisfying the conditions of Definition 4.14 is proved in Fact 4.15.

Definition 4.14 **(k_1)** *Let the sequence $\langle (a_{d,k}, \eta_d, \alpha_d) \colon d \in P_2^M, k < \omega \rangle$* witness $M \in$ *$\mathbb{M}_2$ as in Definition 4.11. Let $\langle d_i : i < n \rangle$ enumerate Y without repetition and denote, for $i < n$, η_{d_i} by η_i and α_{d_i} by α_i. Without loss, the $\langle \eta_i(0) \colon i < n \rangle$ are non-decreasing. Fix $k_1 = k_1^{XY}$ such that*

1. *$k_1^{XY} \geq k_1^Y$ (see Definition 4.11.B)*
2. *$\langle \eta_i \restriction k_1^{XY} : i < n \rangle$ are distinct for $i < n$.*
3. *$k_1^{XY} \geq \max\{\lg(\nu) : b_\nu \in \langle X \cup \{F_k^M(d_i) : i < |Y|, k < k_1^Y\}$*
4. *We consider the following sets determined by $X \cup Y$.*
   - *(a) $\boldsymbol{F}_{\leq 0} = \boldsymbol{F}_0 = X \cup \{F_k^M(d_i) \colon i < |Y| = n, k \leq k_1^{XY}\}$;*
   - *(b) For $1 \leq \ell < |Y|$, $\boldsymbol{F}_\ell = \{F_k^M(d_\ell) : k \geq k_1^{XY}\}$;*

[5] Note there is an common substructure of M containing any finite collection of finitely generated (as in this argument) substructures of M.

(c) $\boldsymbol{F}_{\leq \ell+1} = \boldsymbol{F}_{\leq \ell} \cup \boldsymbol{F}_{\ell+1}$;

(d) $\mathbb{F}^{\ell} = \langle \boldsymbol{F}_{\leq \ell} \rangle_M$.

5.
$$\mathbb{B}^{\ell}_{XY} = \{b_\nu \colon \bigwedge_{\ell<i<n} (\eta_i \restriction k_1^{XY}) \ntrianglelefteq \nu \textit{ for } i < \ell+1\} \cup \{b_{\langle\rangle}\} \cup P^M_{4,1}.$$

Note that $\mathbb{B}^0_{XY} \supseteq \mathbb{B}^0_Y$ since $k_1^{XY} \geq k_1^Y$. B_{n_*} will be $\mathbb{F}^0$ and N will be $\mathbb{F}^{n-1}$. Note that while the $\mathbb{B}^{\ell}$ are cocountable, the $\boldsymbol{F}_\ell$ are countable.

Since X and Y are finite we now choose k_1^{XY} to satisfy conditions 1-3 of Definition 4.14; we now show the other conditions are satisfied.

Fact 4.15 *There is a $k_1 = k_1^{XY}$ such that for each ℓ, $\boldsymbol{F}_\ell$ is contained in $\mathbb{B}^{\ell}_{XY}$.*

Proof. Recall (Claim 4.5) that M_* is free on the $\{b_\eta : \eta \in \mathcal{T}\}$ modulo the $P_4^{M_*}$. Choose k_1^{XY} larger than the length of any ν such that for some $x \in X$ b_ν is a generator in a minimal representation of x or $\nu(0) \in \overline{\alpha} = \{\alpha_0, \dots \alpha_{n-1}\}$. Then,

$$\boldsymbol{F}_0 \subseteq \langle \{b_\nu : \nu \in \mathcal{T}, \lg(\nu) < k_1^{XY}\}\rangle \cup \{b_{\langle\rangle}\} \cup P_4^M \subseteq \mathbb{B}^0_{XY}.$$

As ℓ increases $F_k^M(d_i)$ for $i < \ell$ are admitted to $\mathbb{B}^{\ell}_Y$ and so $\boldsymbol{F}_\ell \subseteq \mathbb{B}^0_{XY}$. $\square_{4.15}$

To establish goal i) we need the following claim.

Lemma 4.16 *For each $1 \leq \ell < n$, $\boldsymbol{F}_\ell$ is independent over $\mathbb{B}^0_Y$ mod P_4^M.*

Proof. We prove this claim by showing by induction on $\ell \leq |Y| = n$:

$$(\oplus_\ell) \;\; \boldsymbol{F}_\ell = \{F_k^M(d_i) \colon k \geq k_1^{XY} \text{ and } i < \ell\}$$

is independent in P_1^M over $\mathbb{B}^{\ell-1}_{XY}$ mod P_4^M.

For $1 \leq \ell < |Y|$, the induction on ℓ shows incrementally, at stage $\ell+1$, the independence of the $b_{\eta_\ell \restriction r}$ with $r \geq k_1^{XY}$ over $\mathbb{B}^{\ell}_Y$. By Claim 4.5.2 and the choice of $r \geq k_1^{XY}$, the $\{b_{\nu_1[d_\ell, r]} : r \geq k_1^{XY}\}$ are independent mod P_4^M. Thus (using the f_i from Remark 4.10) the infinite set $\{b_{\nu_1[d_\ell,n]} \bigtriangleup b_{\nu_2[d_\ell,n]}) \colon i \in \{0,1\}, n \geq k_1^{XY}\rangle$ is independent over $\mathbb{B}^{\ell-1}_Y$. By Definition 4.11.C) the $\{a_{d_\ell,k} \colon k \geq k_1^Y\}$ are in $\mathbb{B}^{\ell}_Y$. Recall,

$$F_n^M(d_\ell) = (b_{\nu_1[d_\ell,n]} \bigtriangleup b_{\nu_2[d_\ell,n]}) \bigtriangleup a_{d_\ell,n}.$$

So, Lemma 4.10.2 (now using the e_i) implies $\boldsymbol{F}_\ell$ is independent over $\mathbb{B}^{\ell}_Y$. Since independence is transitive (Lemma 1.3.3) $\boldsymbol{F}_\ell$ is independent over $\mathbb{B}^0_Y$. $\square_{4.16}$

By Lemma 4.12, for sufficiently large n, $a \nleq F_n^M(d_\ell)$. So the countable incompleteness condition in the definition $\boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ is satisfied. This completes goal i). To accomplish goal ii) and finish the proof of Lemma 4.13 by satisfying conditions 2-4 of Definition 3.3.1, we must define appropriate P_i^N and find a sequence of finite Boolean algebras B_n witnessing that $N \in \boldsymbol{K}^1_{<\aleph_0}$. Let $P_1^N = \mathbb{F}^{n-1}$. We have P_1^N is freely generated (modulo the ideal generated by the atoms of B_{n_*}) by a countable set over

$B_{n_*} = \mathbb{F}^0$. Let b_* be the supremum of the atoms in B_{n_*}, and P_4^N the predecessors of b_*.

For $m \geq n_*$, let B_m be generated by B_{n_*} and the first m elements of this generating set. Then P_1^N/P_4^N is atomless. Set $P_0^N = \{(G_1^M)^{-1}(a) : a \in P_{4,1}^M \cap P_1^N$ and $P_2^N = Y$; thus $P_{4,1}^N \subseteq B_{n_*}$. Moreover, since M satisfies Definition 4.11.B.c, N satisfies Definition 3.1.2.c the $F_n^N(c)$ witness incompleteness). Boolean algebras are locally finite and we can recognize whether $\langle X\rangle$ is free if by whether it has $2^{|X|}$ atoms. Thus, we can refine the sequence B_m to finite free algebras to witness that $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_1$. $\Box_{4.13}$

Now we show $\mathbb{M}_2$ is non-empty and at least one member satisfies all the tasks. In case 4) of this argument we address the requirement that $\mathrm{uf}(M_\alpha) = \emptyset$ and so $\mathrm{uf}(M) = \emptyset$ as well. We need the following observation because as the construction proceeds, an N_1 may become a substructure of M_β because some value of an F_n is newly defined on a point of $P_2^{M_\beta}$.

Notation 4.17 *We can enumerate* $\boldsymbol{T}$ *as* $\langle t_\alpha \colon \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ *such that each task appears* λ *times, as we assumed in Hypothesis 4.3 that* $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$.

For Theorem 4.18, to realize all the tasks, $\lambda > 2^{\aleph_0}$ would suffice; the requirement in Lemma 2.5 that $\lambda = 2^\mu$ is used to get maximal models. The object of case 3) is to ensure that the final model is rich (existentially complete); case 4) shows $\mathrm{uf}(M) = \mathrm{uf}(M_*) = \emptyset$. After addressing each task a final section on witnesses verifies the $M \in \mathbb{M}_2$.

Theorem 4.18 *There is an* $M \in \mathbb{M}_2$ *that satisfies all the tasks, is in* $\boldsymbol{K}_2$*, and is* P_0*-maximal.*

Proof. As we construct M, we show at appropriate stages that tasks from $\boldsymbol{T}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{T}_2$ are satisfied. Then we show each stage α the goal: $M_\alpha \in \mathbb{M}_2$. We choose M_α by induction on $\alpha \leq \lambda$ such that:

1. $\mathbf{w}_\alpha$ witnesses $M_\alpha \in \mathbb{M}_2$ (Definition 4.11). And for $\beta < \alpha$, w_α extends w_β. That is, for $d \in P_2^{M_\beta}$, $\alpha_d[\mathbf{w}_\alpha] = \alpha_d[\mathbf{w}_\beta]$, $\eta_d[\mathbf{w}_\alpha] = \eta_d[\mathbf{w}_\beta]$, and $a_{d,n}[\mathbf{w}_\alpha] = a_{d,n}[\mathbf{w}_\beta]$.
2. $P_2^{M_\alpha} \subseteq P_2^{M_*}$ has cardinality at most $|\alpha| + 2^{\aleph_0}$.
3. if $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and $\mathbf{t}_\beta$ is relevant to M_β, M_α satisfies task $\mathbf{t}_\beta$.

case 1 If $\alpha = 0$, set $M_0 = M_* {\restriction} (P_0^{M_*} \cup P_1^{M_*})$.

case 2 Take unions at limits.

case 3 $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and say, $\mathbf{t}_\beta = (N_1, N_2)$. (Definition 4.7)

Task: We first verify task $\beta + 1$.

If N_1 is not embedded in M_β then the task is irrelevant and let $M_\alpha = M_\beta$ and $\mathbf{w}_\alpha = \mathbf{w}_\beta$. If it is, let $\langle d_i \colon i < m\rangle$ enumerate $P_2^{N_2} - P_2^{N_1}$. By induction, since

$M_\beta \in \mathbb{M}_2$ there are witnesses $w_\beta = \langle a_{d,k}, \eta_d, \alpha_d \rangle$ (formally $\langle a^\beta_{d,k}, \eta^\beta_d, \alpha^\beta_d \rangle$) for each $d \in P_2^{M_\beta}$.

Let $U_\alpha = \{\delta : (\exists b_\nu \in M_\beta)[\nu(0) = \delta]\}$. Clearly $|U_\alpha| \leq |\alpha| + 2^{\aleph_0}$ and

$$(*) \{a_{d,k} \colon k < \omega, d \in P_2^{M_\beta}\} \cup \{b_\nu \colon (\exists d \in P_2^{M_\beta}) \nu \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_d}\} \cup P_{4,1}^{M_*} \cup P_4^{N_2}$$

is included in the subalgebra of M_* generated by the

$$\{b_\rho \colon \exists \beta \in U_\alpha, \rho(0) = \beta\} \cup \{b_{\langle\rangle}\} \cup P_{4,1}^{M_*}.$$

Choose $\langle \alpha_i, \eta_i \rangle$ for $i < m = |P_2^{N_2}| - |P_2^{N_1}|$ with $\eta_i(0) = \alpha_i$ and each α_i in $\lambda - U_\alpha$. Let M_α extend $P_2^{M_\beta}$ by adding new $\langle d_i : i < m \rangle$ from $P_2^{M_*}$ to form $P_2^{M_\alpha}$. For simplicity we write $\langle \alpha_{d_i}, \eta_{d_i} \rangle = \langle \alpha_i, \eta_i \rangle$.

Since $N_2 \in \boldsymbol{K}_{<\aleph_0}$, $P_1^{N_2}$ is decomposed as a union of the finite free Boolean algebras[6] $\langle B_i^{N_2} : i \geq {n_*}^{N_2} \rangle$ where, writing b_* for $b_*^{N_2}$ and[7] n_* for $n_*^{N_2}$, N_2 is freely generated over $B = B_{n_*}$ mod $P_4^{N_2}$. We first identify a copy B' of B. For this, map atoms $a \in P_{4,1}^{N_2} - P_{4,1}^{N_1}$ 1-1 into atoms a' in $P_{4,1}^{M_\beta} - P_{4,1}^{N_1}$. Choose an increasing sequence of β_j, not in $U_\alpha \cup \{\alpha_i : i < m\}$, for $j < s$, the cardinality of a basis for B, and sequences $\rho_j \in \mathcal{T}_{\beta_j}$ such that the $b_{\rho_j \restriction 2}$, i.e. $b_{\langle \beta_j, \rho_j(1) \rangle}$, chosen from the free (mod the atoms) generators, determine exactly same subsets of the a' as the corresponding elements of B do of the associated a. This is possible as any collection of such subsets is realized by λ many collections of generators. This enforces relations on b_{ρ_j} making $B' \approx B$. But the $\{b_{\rho_j \restriction k} : j < m, k \geq n_*\}$ are independent from B' mod $P_4^{M_\alpha} = P_4^{M_*}$. In particular the image of b_*, $b'_* = b_*^{M_\alpha}$, is a finite union of atoms a' in B'.

Recall that the domain of M_α is a subset of M_*, but M_α is not a substructure of M_* with respect to P_2 and the F_k. Since the $b_{\eta_i} \restriction k$ for $k \geq n_*$ are independent mod $P_4^{M_*}$ and, as for the f_i in Remark 4.10.1, we can define h_β to embed the Boolean algebra $P_1^{N_2}$ into $P_1^{M_*}$ over $P_1^{N_1}$ such that for $k \geq n_*$

$$h_\beta(F_k^{N_2}(c_i)) = b_{\eta_i \restriction k ^\frown 0} \vartriangle b_{\eta_i \restriction k ^\frown 1}$$

and make h_β a τ-map by setting (with each $a_{d,k} = 0_{M_*}$):

$$F_k^{M_\alpha}(d_i) = (b_{\eta_i \restriction k ^\frown 0} \vartriangle b_{\eta_i \restriction k ^\frown 1} \vartriangle 0_{M_*} = b_{\eta_i \restriction k ^\frown 0} \vartriangle b_{\eta_i \restriction k ^\frown 1}).$$

To clarify notation, by setting[8] $a_{d_i,k} = 0$ for $i < m$, we declared:

$$F_k^{N'_2}(d_i) = F_k^{M_\alpha}(d_i) = (b_{\eta_i \restriction k ^\frown 0} \vartriangle b_{\eta_i \restriction k ^\frown 1}) \vartriangle 0_{P_1^{M_*}},$$

[6]While the domain of $N_2 \subseteq \lambda$, the interpretation under N_2 of relation symbols in τ on ordinals not in the domain of N_1 has nothing to with the interpretations in M_* or M_β.

[7]Technically, we are defining $n_*^{M_\alpha}$. But the value is set once and for all at stage α so just call it by the final name.

[8]The $a_{d,n}$ are dummies in this case to provide uniformity with case 4 in proving Lemma 4.13.

By Lemma 4.12, for some n, for all $k \geq n$, $a \not\leq_{P_1^{M_*}} F_k^{M_\alpha}(d_i)$ so condition 4.11.B.2 holds.

And for each i, applying Remark 4.10.1 to $f_i = b_{\eta_i \restriction k \frown 0} \triangle b_{\eta_i \restriction k \frown 1}$ the $\{F_k^{M_\alpha}(d_i) : k_1^Y \leq k < \omega\}$ are independent and form a basis for a subalgebra N_2' of $P_1^{M_*}$ over N_1. Thus, $N_2' \in \boldsymbol{K}^1_{<\aleph_0}$ and we have verified that task $\mathbf{t}_{\beta+1}$ is satisfied.

case 4 $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and $\mathbf{t}_\beta \in \boldsymbol{T}_2$; say, $\mathbf{t}_\beta = c$.

We define M_α. Define U_α as in Case 3, but extending U_α by the ordinal named by c if $c \notin M_\beta$. This extension guarantees that the $F_k^{M_*}(c)$ are in $\mathbb{B}_Y^0$. Now choose an even ordinal γ in $\lambda - U_\alpha$. that

$$\langle\{b_\eta : \eta(0) = \gamma\}\rangle \cap \langle U_\alpha \rangle = \emptyset.$$

To show $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_{-1}$ note that countable incompleteness (Definition 3.1.2.vii), for every $a \in P_{4,1}^{M_\alpha}$, for all but finitely many n, $F_n^{M_\alpha}(d_{\eta^D}) \wedge a = 0_{P_1^{M_\alpha}}$, follows immediately from Lemma 4.12,

To define $F_k^{M_\alpha}(d_\eta)$, for each $\eta \in \lim \mathcal{T}_\gamma$ and $k < \omega$, choose $i_0 < i_1 \leq 2$ that are different from $\eta(k)$. Recalling $c = \mathbf{t}_\beta$, let

$$F_k^{M_\alpha}(d_\eta) = (b_{\eta \restriction k \frown i_0} \triangle b_{\eta \restriction k \frown i_1}) \triangle (F_k^{M_*}(c)).$$

Thus, for the $d \in P_2^{M_\alpha} - P_2^{M_\beta}$, chosen towards satisfying $\mathbf{t}_\beta = c$, we have set $\langle a_{d,k}, \eta_d^\alpha, \alpha_d \rangle = \langle F_k^{M_*}(c), d_\eta, \gamma \rangle$. That is, $a_{d,k} = F_k^{M_*}(c)$.

Task: We must show M_α satisfies task $\mathbf{t}_\beta$. Since $\mathrm{uf}(M_*) = \emptyset$, for any non-principal ultrafilter D, there is an $e \in P_2^{M_*}$ such that the set $S_e^{M_*}(D) = \{n\colon F_n^{M_\alpha}(e) \in D\}$ is infinite (Definition 3.2.2). By the definition of the task $\mathbf{t}_\beta = c$, there is a D where the given c witnesses for D in $\mathrm{uf}(M_*)$. We show task $\mathbf{t}_\beta$ is satisfied for D by one of the d_η, which thus is a witness to $D \notin \mathrm{uf}(M_\alpha)$.

Define $\eta^D \in \lim(\mathcal{T}_\gamma)$ by induction[9]: $\eta^D(0) = \gamma$. By Remark 4.10.2 one of the three elements $b_{\langle\gamma,i\rangle} \triangle b_{\langle\gamma,j\rangle}$, for $i \neq j$ and $i, j < 3$, must not be in D. Let $\eta^D(1)$ be the other member of $\{0, 1, 2\}$. For $k \geq 1$, suppose $\nu = \eta^D \restriction k$ has been defined. Again, by Remark 4.10.2 one of the three elements $b_{\nu \frown i} \triangle b_{\nu \frown j}$, for $i \neq j$ and $i, j < 3$, must not be in D. Let $\eta^D(k)$ be third of the symmetric differences, which by Remark 4.10.2.c must be in D. For the infinitely many n with $F_n^{M_\alpha}(c) \in D$, we have $F_n^{M_\alpha}(d_{\eta^D}) \in D$.

Goal: $M_\alpha \in \mathbb{M}_2$**:** We show M_α satisfies Definition 4.11. The descriptive portions of Conditions A and B.i) of Definition 4.11 are clearly satisfied by the construction; Condition B.ii) was shown in the proof of each case.

For condition C, choose any finite $Y \subset P_2^{M_\alpha}$ and partition Y into $Y_1 = Y \cap P_2^{M_\beta}$ and $Y_2 = Y - Y_1$. Set k_Y^1 as the least integer[10] such that for all $\eta_d \neq \eta_e$ with $d, e \in Y$, $\eta_d \restriction k_Y^1 \neq \eta_e \restriction k^1$.

[9] This argument is patterned on the simple black box in Lemma 1.5 of [She], but even simpler.

[10] Naturally this is only relevant when $\alpha_d = \alpha_e$ but than can happen in case 3 and must happen in case 4.

For those $d \in Y_1$, we just leave $\mathbf{w}_\alpha = \mathbf{w}_\beta$. For $d \in Y_2$, the two cases differ slightly.

In case 3, $d \in P_2^{M_\alpha} - P_2^{M_\beta} = Y_2$, we (implicitly) defined $\mathbf{w}_d(\alpha) = \langle 0, \eta_d, \alpha_d \rangle$. In case[11] 4 the elements of Y_2 are among the $2^{\aleph_0}$ d_η with $\eta(0) = \gamma$. For them, $\mathbf{w}_d(\alpha) = \langle F_n^{M_*}(c), \eta_d, \gamma \rangle$.

For Condition 4.11.C, note, every element of W is in the $\langle \{b_\nu; \nu(0) \in U_\alpha\} \rangle$ and so in $\mathbb{B}_Y^0$. For $d \in Y_1$ this follows since $d \in P_2^{M_\beta}$ implies $\alpha_d \in U_\alpha$. In case 3, the $a_{d_i,n}$ are all 0 and the $F_n^M(d)$ for $i < n$ and $n < \omega$ are all Boolean combinations of elements b_ν with $\nu \trianglelefteq \eta_i \restriction k_1$.

The difference for case 4 is in verifying the $a_{d,n}$ are in U_α. Now if $a_{d_\eta,n}[\mathbf{w}_\alpha] = F_n^{M_*}(c)$ is b_ν then $\nu(0) \in U_\alpha$ by the revised definition of U_α in case 4 and so $a_{d,n} \in \mathbb{B}^0$.

Now, let $M = \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} M_\alpha$. Then, $M \in \mathbb{M}_2$, $|P_2^M| = \lambda$, and each task has been satisfied. So $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_2$.

$\square_{4.18}$

Now by Claim 4.9, we finish.

Conclusion 4.19 *The $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_2$ constructed in Theorem 4.18 P_0-maximal and all $|P_i^M| = \lambda$. As in [BS2x, Corollary 3.3.14], for every λ less than the first measurable, since $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_2$ implies $|M| \leq 2^{P_0^M}$, there is a maximal model $M \in \boldsymbol{K}_2$ with $2^\lambda \leq |M| < 2^{2^\lambda}$.*

Question 4.20 *1. Is there a $\kappa < \mu$, where μ is the first measurable, such that if a complete sentence has a maximal model in cardinality κ, it has maximal models in cardinalities cofinal in μ?*

2. Is there a complete sentence that has maximal models cofinally in some κ with $\beth_{\omega_1} < \kappa < \mu$ where μ is the first measurable, but no larger models are maximal. Could the first inaccessible be such a κ?

References

[BB17] John T. Baldwin and William Boney. Hanf numbers and presentation theorems in AEC. In Jose Iovino, editor, *Beyond First Order Model Theory*, pages 81–106. Chapman Hall, 2017.

[BKS09] John T. Baldwin, A. Kolesnikov, and S. Shelah. The amalgamation spectrum. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 74:914–928, 2009.

[BKS16] John T. Baldwin, M. Koerwien, and I. Souldatos. The joint embedding property and maximal models. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 55:545–565, 2016.

[11] Note that in case 3, $a_{d,n}$ is constant, while in case 4 it depends on n.

[BS19] John T. Baldwin and Ioannis Souldatos. Complete $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}$ with maximal models in multiple cardinalities. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 65(4):444–452, 12 2019.

[BS2x] John T. Baldwin and S. Shelah. Hanf numbers for extendibility and related phenomena. submitted: Shelah number 1092; first posted 2016; `http://homepages.math.uic.edu/~jbaldwin/pub/ahanfmaxoct3118.pdf`, 202x.

[BU17] W. Boney and S. Unger. Large cardinal axioms from tameness in AECs. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 145:4517–4532, 2017.

[Grä79] George Grätzer. *Universal Algebra*. Springer-Verlag, 1979.

[GS05] R. Göbel and S. Shelah. How rigid are reduced products. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 202:230–258, 2005.

[Hjo02] Greg Hjorth. Knight's model, its automorphism group, and characterizing the uncountable cardinals. *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, pages 113–144, 2002.

[KLH16] Alexei Kolesnikov and Christopher Lambie-Hanson. The Hanf number for amalgamation of coloring classes. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 81:570–583, 2016.

[Mag16] M. Magidor. Large cardinals and strong logics: CRM tutorial lecture 1. `http://homepages.math.uic.edu/~jbaldwin/pub//MagidorBarc.pdf`, 2016.

[Mor65] M. Morley. Omitting classes of elements. In Addison, Henkin, and Tarski, editors, *The Theory of Models*, pages 265–273. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1965.

[She] S. Shelah. Black boxes. paper 309 archive.0812.0656.

[She13] S. Shelah. Maximal failures of sequence locality in a.e.c. preprint on archive: Sh index 932, 2013.