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Abstract

Assuming GCH and that there is a measurable cardinal, we give a topos-theoretic proof of Shelah’s eventual categoricity conjecture for abstract elementary classes (AEC’s). We also show that the large cardinal assumption can be spared assuming instead that the AEC satisfies the amalgamation property. This improves the state of knowledge about the open problems stated by Shelah, including one for $L_{\omega_1, \omega}$ sentences, dating back to the 1970’s. Using results of Kueker about the axiomatization of AEC’s in infinitary logic, we then use the machinery of categorical logic to study the problem of eventual categoricity. By means of a topos-theoretic characterization of $\kappa$-categorical theories, together with some results on $\kappa$-classifying toposes, we then prove under our assumptions that if an AEC is categorical in two cardinals, it is also categorical in all cardinals in between. As a corollary we get information about the categoricity spectrum of an AEC, and using Hanf numbers, we also get eventual categoricity.
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1 Introduction

Shelah’s eventual categoricity conjecture asserts that for any AEC there is a cardinal $\kappa$ such that if the AEC is categorical in some $\lambda > \kappa$, it is categorical in all $\lambda > \kappa$. This general conjecture was stated in [She09], while the version for the particular case of sentences in $L_{\omega_1, \omega}$ was conjectured circa 1977. Both conjectures are still open so far, though several approximations are known (for an account of these see, e.g., [Vas17a] and [Vas17b]). For example, when the AEC has amalgamation and a weak version of the Generalized Continuum Hypothesis (GCH) holds, the conjecture was proven to be true (see [SS18]). We will here assume GCH and amalgamation, this latter being provably assuming in addition the existence of a measurable cardinal above the Löwenheim-Skolem number (see [SO96]), so that the result can be cast entirely within $ZFC + GCH + \{ \text{“there is a measurable cardinal”} \}$. The proof runs through categorical methods that rely on a completeness theorem for $L_{\kappa^+, \kappa}$ (see [Esp19]). This theorem allows to generalize to the infinitary case the omitting types theorem, by means of which a topos-theoretic characterization of categoricity is possible. We then use results about $\kappa$-classifying toposes (introduced in [Esp17]) to derive the eventual categoricity result.

The structure of this paper is as follows: we first prove an omitting types theorem for infinite quantifier languages. Through the machinery developed in [Esp19], the basic facts about $\kappa$-classifying toposes are subsequently explained, including a topos-theoretic
characterization of categoricity. Finally, we then apply these results to AEC’s, axiomatized in infinitary logic, to derive information about their categoricity spectrum of AEC. Eventual categoricity follows then from an easy observation about Hanf numbers.

2 The omitting types theorem for infinite quantifier languages

We will assume from now on that $\kappa^\kappa = \kappa$. A $\kappa$-fragment of $L_{\kappa^+,\kappa}$ will be a subset of formulas formed in a language with a signature of cardinality at most $\kappa$ and a supply of $\kappa$ many fresh variables, that in addition is closed under $\kappa$-small conjunctions, disjunctions and quantification, negation and formal negation, subformulas and substitution. It follows that for any sentence $\phi$ of $L_{\kappa^+,\kappa}$ there is a smallest $\kappa$-fragment containing $\phi$, and it has $\kappa$ many formulas.

By a type we understand a consistent set of formulas in a given tuple of variables. It is complete when the set is maximal. The goal of this section is to prove the following:

**Theorem 2.1. (Omitting types theorem for infinite quantifier languages)** Let $\kappa$ be a regular cardinal such that $\kappa^\kappa = \kappa$. Let $F$ be a $\kappa$-fragment of $L_{\kappa^+,\kappa}$ (resp. $L_{\kappa,\kappa}$) containing a consistent theory $T$ and let $\{p_i : i < \kappa\}$ be a set of non-isolated types. Then there is a model of $T$ that simultaneously omits all the types.

Note that this version of the omitting types theorem can be expressed in an entirely semantical way:

**Theorem 2.2.** Let $T$ be a satisfiable theory in a $\kappa$-fragment of $L_{\kappa^+,\kappa}$ and let $p_i$, for each $i < \kappa$, be a set of formulas of the fragment. Suppose that whenever $\psi$ is such that $T \cup \exists x \psi$ is satisfiable, there is $\phi$ in $p_i$ such that $T \cup \exists x (\psi \land \neg \phi)$ is satisfiable. Then the theory:

$$T \cup \bigwedge_{i < \kappa} \forall x \bigvee_{\phi \in p_i} \neg \phi(x)$$

is satisfiable.

**Proof.** Consider the (Boolean) syntactic category of $T$ in $L_{\kappa^+,\kappa}$ and the subcategory $C_T$ given by those formulas in context $[x, \phi]$ belonging to the $\kappa$-fragment $F$. For each type $p_i = \{\phi_i(x)\}_{i < \kappa}$ consider the family of arrows $U_i = \{[x, \neg \phi_i] \longrightarrow [x, T]\}_{i < \kappa}$. Put a $\kappa$-Grothendieck topology $\tau$ on $C_T$ (see [Esp17]) generated by:

1. all $\kappa$-small jointly epic families of arrows and the $\kappa^+$-small jointly epic families of arrows corresponding to axioms of (the $\kappa$-geometric Morleyization of) $T$

2. the families $U_i$ for each type $p_i$

It follows that a $\kappa$-flat continuous functor $C_T \longrightarrow \text{Set}$, i.e., a $\kappa$-point of the corresponding $\kappa$-topos of sheaves, is exactly a model of $T$ omitting all of the $p_i$. This topos is clearly $\kappa$-separable, so that as proven in [Esp17], it will have enough $\kappa$-points. However, we need to verify that it is non-degenerate to guarantee that there will be at least one non-trivial such model (it is easy to see that, if one of the types is isolated, the topos is degenerate, but we will see that this is the only obstruction).
It is enough to verify that the representable functor $[-, 0]$ is a sheaf for any $\tau$-covering family, since then the conservativity of Yoneda embedding will imply that $\mathcal{S}h(\mathcal{C}_\tau, \tau)$ is non-degenerate. Now any such $\tau$-covering family is built via pullbacks and transfinite composites from the two types of covers specified above. Clearly, $[-, 0]$ is a sheaf for the first type of covers. The covering $U_i$ becomes, in the $\kappa$-classifying topos $E$ of $T$ (that is, when sheafifying with respect to only the first type of covers) a family $\{\neg C_i \to A\}$, not necessarily epimorphic. But since the type $p_i$ was non-isolated, it follows that $\bigwedge_{i<\kappa} C_i = 0$ in $E$, or, what is the same, $A = \neg \bigvee_{i<\kappa} \neg C_i$ there. This means that the family $\{\neg C_i \to A\}$, while not necessarily covering, is covering up to a double negation.

The same is, of course, true for pullbacks of such families, and in fact for a transfinite composite of such families (for this latter fact we use the transfinite transitivity rule from [Esp17] and the fact that $\mathcal{C}_T$ is Boolean). In particular, this means that if the domains of the arrows in a $\tau$-covering family are 0, so is the common codomain. This says precisely that $[-, 0]$ is a sheaf for the $\tau$-covering family, as we wanted.

\[ \square \]

### 3 Categoricity and the $\lambda$-classifying topos

We will prove now a connection between $\lambda$-categoricity and $\lambda$-classifying toposes which will be useful. It is essentially a consequence of the omitting types theorem we proved before (Theorem 2.1), and is inspired by model-theoretic arguments of Vaught on atomic and prime models and topos-theoretic results from Blass and Ščedrov on Boolean classifying toposes.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let $\kappa$ be a regular cardinal such that $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa$. Let $T$ be a theory in a $\kappa$-fragment of $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa^+, \kappa}$. Then for any $\lambda \geq \kappa$ such that $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$, $T$ is $\lambda$-categorical if and only if the $\lambda$-classifying topos of the theory $T \cup \{ \text{"there are } \lambda \text{ distinct elements"} \}$ is two-valued and Boolean (alternatively, atomic and connected).

**Proof.** ($\implies$) Suppose $T$ is $\lambda$-categorical and consider the syntactic category $\mathcal{C}$ of the theory $T \cup \{ \text{"there are } \lambda \text{ distinct elements"} \}$, axiomatized in an appropriate fragment of $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+, \lambda}$. This latter theory is clearly complete, since by (downward) Löwenheim-Skolem theorem it follows that all models are $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+, \lambda}$-elementarily equivalent to the model $\mathcal{M}$ of cardinality $\lambda$. Therefore, its $\lambda$-classifying topos must be two-valued. To see that it is Boolean, we will prove first that $\mathcal{C}$ is atomic, i.e., each Boolean algebra of subobjects of a given object is atomic.

Let $[x, \psi(x)]$ be non-zero in $\mathcal{C}$; then it is satisfiable in a model of cardinality $\lambda$ by the completeness theorem for $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+, \lambda}$, so that there is $a$ in $\mathcal{M}$ with $\mathcal{M} \models \psi(a)$. Let $p$ be the type $\{ \phi(x) : \mathcal{M} \models \phi(a) \}$. If $p$ was non-isolated, there would be a model omitting it, i.e., there would exist a model $\mathcal{N}$ of:

$$T \cup \{ \text{"there are } \lambda \text{ distinct elements"} \} \cup \{ \forall x \bigvee_{\mathcal{M} \models \phi(a)} \neg \phi(x) \}$$

This is impossible since by hypothesis $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{N}$. Therefore, $p$ must be isolated by some $\theta(x)$, which must then be an atom in the Boolean algebra of subobjects of $[x, \top]$. It follows from this that such algebra is atomic.

Let us now see that the $\lambda$-classifying topos must be Boolean. Such a topos is built by considering sheaves on $\mathcal{C}$ when equipped with the $\kappa$-topology $\tau$ generated by those
jointly epic families of cardinality at most \( \lambda \) that corresponds to axioms of (the \( \kappa \)-geometric Morleyization of) the theory. Let \( \mathcal{C}' \) be the full subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \) consisting of non-zero objects, and \( \tau' \) the \( \kappa \)-topology induced by \( \tau \). Then the topos \( \text{Sh}(\mathcal{C}', \tau') \) is still the \( \lambda \)-classifying topos, but now the \( \kappa \)-topology \( \tau' \) coincides with the coverage \( \rho \) consisting of stable nonempty sieves. Indeed, the nontrivial part is showing that a \( \rho \)-covering sieve \( \mathcal{R} \) on an object \([x, \phi]\) of \( \mathcal{C}' \) is also \( \tau' \)-covering. Since \( \phi \) is a union of at most \( \lambda \) atoms, for each atom there is an arrow in \( \mathcal{R} \) factoring through it, and since its domain is nonzero, its image must be the whole atom. Choosing one such morphism of \( \mathcal{R} \) for each atom we get a jointly epic family from \( \tau \) contained in \( \mathcal{R} \). Finally, it follows that the \( \lambda \)-classifying topos is equivalent to the topos of sheaves on \( \mathcal{C}' \) for the double negation topology, which is Boolean.

(\( \iff \)) Suppose that the \( \lambda \)-classifying topos of the theory \( T \cup \{ \text{“there are } \lambda \text{ distinct elements”} \} \) is two-valued and Boolean. Since it is also \( \lambda \)-separable, it has enough \( \lambda \)-points (see [Esp17]), and in particular it must be atomic. Hence, \( \mathcal{C} \) is also atomic. Let

\[
p_i = \{ \neg \theta(x_i) : \theta(x_i) \text{ is an atom in } \text{Sub}([x_i, \top]) \}
\]

where for each \( i < \kappa \), \( x_i = x_0 x_1 \ldots \) up to (but excluding) \( i \). Then \( p_i \) is a non-isolated type for each \( i < \kappa \), and so (by the proof of Theorem 2.1) the family \([x_i, \theta] \rightarrow [x_i, \top]\) is sent by Yoneda embedding to a family in the \( \lambda \)-classifying topos that is covering up to a double negation. Since the topos is Boolean, this family must be actually covering. Therefore, any \( \lambda \)-point of the topos corresponds to a model of the theory omitting each \( p_i \), i.e., to an atomic model of \( T \) of cardinality at least \( \lambda \). Since the topos is also two-valued, all such atomic models are \( \mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+, \lambda^+} \)-elementarily equivalent. Hence, a back and forth argument shows that any two such models of cardinality \( \lambda \) must be isomorphic.

To complete the proof, notice that atomic toposes are Boolean, while a Boolean topos with enough points must be atomic, and Boolean toposes are two-valued if and only if they are connected.

Using Theorem 3.1 we can now get rid of the Booleanness assumption on \( \mathcal{C} \):

**Corollary 3.2.** A \( \kappa \)-separable topos has a unique \( \kappa \)-point of cardinality at most \( \kappa \) (up to isomorphism) if and only if it is two-valued and Boolean (alternatively, atomic and connected).

**Proof.** As explained in [Esp17], the topos \( \kappa \)-classifies a \( \kappa \)-geometric theory \( T \). If we let \( T_B \) be the theory obtained from \( T \) by adding all instances of excluded middle over \( \mathcal{L}_{\kappa^+, \kappa^+} \) by the completeness theorem for \( \mathcal{L}_{\kappa^+, \kappa^+} \) it follows that \( T_B \) is a conservative extension of \( T \), and so we have a surjection \( s : \text{Set}[T_B] \rightarrow \text{Set}[T] \) in the category of Grothendieck toposes. Since two-valued Boolean toposes are atoms in the lattice of subtoposes of a given topos, it is enough to show that \( \text{Set}[T] \) has no proper non-degenerate subtoposes if and only if it has a unique point (at most) countable, up to isomorphism. Consider a subtopos \( i : \mathcal{E} \hookrightarrow \text{Set}[T] \), and pull it back along \( s \). We get a geometric morphism \( t : T \rightarrow \text{Set}[T_B] \) and a surjection \( s' : T \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \) (indeed, if \( \mathcal{E} \) classifies the geometric theory \( \mathcal{S} \), then \( T \) will classify the theory \( \mathcal{S}_B \) obtained by adding instances of excluded middle
over \( \mathcal{L}_{\omega,\omega} \). Now \( \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}] \) has a unique point of cardinality at most \( \kappa \) if and only if \( \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_B] \) has it, which is by Theorem 3.1 equivalent to being Boolean and two-valued, equivalent in turn to having no proper non-degenerate subtoposes. Therefore, by considering the surjection-embedding factorization of \( t \), this is equivalent to either \( t \) being a surjection or \( T \) being degenerate. In the first case, it follows that the composite \( st \) is a surjection, and since \( st \simeq is' \), that \( i \) must be a surjection, in which case \( \mathcal{E} \) is equivalent to \( \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}] \). In the second case, since \( s' \) is a surjection, it follows that \( \mathcal{E} \) must be degenerate. This completes the proof. \( \square \)

4 The \( \lambda \)-classifying topos of a \( \kappa \)-theory

In this section fix \( \kappa < \lambda \) such that \( \kappa \) is regular and \( \lambda^{\kappa^+} = \lambda \). Let \( \mathbb{T} \) be a \( \kappa \)-coherent theory in \( \mathcal{L}_{\kappa^+,\kappa} \), \( C_T \) be its syntactic category and \( \text{Mod}_\lambda(\mathbb{T}) \) be the full subcategory of \( \lambda \)-presentable models. Assume that the category of models of \( \mathbb{T} \) is \( \lambda \)-accessible (this is the case, e.g., if \( \lambda = \kappa^+ \) or, more generally, if \( \kappa^+ < \lambda \)). Let \( \mathbb{T}' \) be the theory in \( \mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+,\lambda} \) with the same axioms as those of \( \mathbb{T} \). An important result we will prove here is the following:

**Theorem 4.1.** The \( \lambda \)-classifying topos of \( \mathbb{T}' \) is equivalent to the presheaf topos \( \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_\lambda(\mathbb{T})} \).

Moreover, the canonical embedding of the syntactic category \( C_{\mathbb{T}'} \hookrightarrow \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_\lambda(\mathbb{T})} \) is given by the evaluation functor, which on objects acts by sending \( (x, \phi) \) to the functor \( \{M \mapsto [[\phi]]^M \} \).

**Proof.** By hypothesis every model of \( \mathbb{T}' \) is a \( \lambda \)-filtered colimit of models in \( \text{Mod}_\lambda(\mathbb{T}) \). Note first that the following diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{C}_T & \xrightarrow{e^v} & \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_\lambda(\mathbb{T})} \\
\downarrow_{\text{M} \cong \varprojlim_{i} M_i} & & \downarrow_{\text{M'} \cong \varprojlim_{i} e^vM_i} \\
\text{Set} & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} & \text{Mod}_\lambda(\mathbb{T})
\end{array}
\]

commutes up to invertible 2-cell. Here \( e^v \) and \( e^vM_i \) are the evaluation functors, defined on objects as \( e^v((x, \phi)) = \{M \mapsto [[\phi]]^M \} \) and \( e^vM_i(F) = F(M_i) \), respectively, while \( \varprojlim M_i \) is the canonical \( \lambda \)-filtered colimit of \( \lambda \)-presentable models associated to the model \( M \). Note also that since \( \lambda \)-filtered colimits commute with \( \lambda \)-small limits, \( M' \) will preserve, in addition to all colimits, also \( \lambda \)-small limits.

Let now \( \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}']_{\lambda} \) be the \( \lambda \)-classifying topos of \( \mathbb{T}' \). We shall prove that this latter is equivalent to \( \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_\lambda(\mathbb{T})} \) by verifying in this presheaf topos the universal property of \( \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}']_{\lambda} \), i.e., that models of \( \mathbb{T}' \) in a \( \lambda \)-topos \( \mathcal{E} \) corresponds to \( \lambda \)-geometric morphisms from \( \mathcal{E} \) to the presheaf topos. It is enough to prove this universal property in the particular case in which \( \mathcal{E} = \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}']_{\lambda} \).

Given then the \( \lambda \)-classifying topos \( \mathcal{E} \) of \( \mathbb{T}' \), by the completeness theorem of [Esp17] it will have enough \( \lambda \)-points. Hence, there is a conservative \( \lambda \)-geometric morphism with inverse image \( E : \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \text{Set}^I \) such that composition with the evaluation at \( i \in I \), \( e^v(i)E \) gives a \( \lambda \)-point of \( \mathcal{E} \). Now each model of \( \mathbb{T}' \) in \( \mathcal{E} \), \( N : C_T \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \) gives rise to models in \( \text{Set} \) by considering their images through each \( e^v(i)E \). These correspond to unique (up to isomorphism) \( \lambda \)-geometric morphisms with inverse image \( \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_\lambda(\mathbb{T})} \longrightarrow \text{Set} \), which
in turn induce a $\lambda$-geometric morphism with inverse image $G : \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_\lambda(T)} \to \text{Set}^I$ and with the property that the composition $G \circ \text{ev} : \mathcal{C}_T \to \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_\lambda(T)} \to \text{Set}^I$ is the same (up to isomorphism) as $\text{EN} : \mathcal{C}_T \to \text{Set}^I$. In other words, considering $\mathcal{E}$ as a subcategory of $\text{Set}^I$, the image of $G \circ \text{ev}$ belongs to $\mathcal{E}$.

On the other hand, every object $F$ in $\text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_\lambda(T)}$ can be canonically expressed as a colimit of representables, $F \cong \lim_{\longrightarrow} [M_i, -]$. In turn, each $M : \mathcal{C}_T \to \text{Set}$ is a colimit of representables $M_i \cong \lim_{\longrightarrow} [\phi_{ij}, -]$; since $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$, $\mathcal{C}_T$ has size at most $\lambda$ and the latter limit is $\lambda$-small. It follows that:

$$F \cong \lim_{\longrightarrow} \lim_{\longrightarrow} [\phi_{ij}, -]_{\text{Mod}_\lambda(T)} \cong \lim_{\longrightarrow} \lim_{\longrightarrow} [\phi_{ij}, -]_{\text{Mod}_\lambda(T)} \cong \lim_{\longrightarrow} \lim_{\longrightarrow} \text{ev}(\phi_{ij})$$

where the last isomorphism follows from Yoneda lemma. Now $G$ preserves $\lambda$-small limits and colimits, and so we will have:

$$G(F) \cong \lim_{\longrightarrow} \lim_{\longrightarrow} G \circ \text{ev}(\phi_{ij})$$

and similarly on arrows. Therefore, $G$ is completely determined (up to isomorphism) by its value on the objects $\text{ev}(\phi_{ij})$. Since the value of $G$ on such objects belongs to $\mathcal{E}$, and $E$ preserves $\lambda$-small limits and colimits, it follows that $G$ itself factors through $\mathcal{E}$. Moreover, it is the unique (up to isomorphism) inverse image of a $\lambda$-geometric morphism corresponding to the given model in $\mathcal{E}$. This finishes the proof. 

In the case of an AEC which is categorical in a cardinal $\lambda \geq \kappa = \text{LS}(\kappa)^+$, with $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$ and $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa$, it is possible to find an axiomatization in infinitary logic. Indeed, by a result of Kueker (see Theorem 2.11 and section 7 of [Kue08]), such AEC is axiomatizable in $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+, \kappa}$, and through a Morleyization process we can assume that we use the $\kappa$-geometric fragment. Moreover, by Fact 2.13 (1) in [Vas17b], any $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \kappa}$-elementary embedding is a morphism of the AEC. Since such embeddings between models of cardinality $\kappa$ coincide in turn with $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa^+, \kappa}$-elementary embeddings, using the properties of the AEC we get that $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+, \kappa}$-elementary embeddings between arbitrary models of size at least $\kappa$ are morphisms of the AEC. Conversely, by Fact 2.13 (2) in [Vas17b], every morphism of the AEC between models of cardinality $\lambda$ is a $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+, \kappa}$-elementary embedding, so that using again the properties of AEC’s, it follows that morphisms between
arbitrary models of the AEC of cardinality at least $\lambda$ coincide precisely with the $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+,\kappa}$-elementary embeddings, i.e., $(\mathcal{K},\prec)$ will coincide with the $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+,\kappa}$-elementary class in all models of size at least $\lambda$. We note this important observation in the following:

**Remark 4.2.** Given any AEC categorical in a cardinal $\lambda \geq \kappa = LS(K)^+$, where $\lambda^\kappa = \lambda$ and $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa$, there is a $\lambda$-coherent theory $T^m$ in a signature $\Sigma^m$ which extends $\Sigma$ by adding new relation symbols, whose interpretation is uniquely determined by the interpretation of $\Sigma$, which has exactly the same models of the AEC and where the $\Sigma^m$-homomorphisms between models of cardinality at least $\lambda$ coincide exactly with the morphisms of the AEC between such models. In practice, this fact shows that the methods of categorical logic apply to AEC’s, in particular the results of this and the previous sections become now applicable. This will be of use in the next section.

## 5 Eventual categoricity

Throughout this section we will assume $GCH$. It follows that each regular $\kappa$ satisfies $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa$. If $T$ is a $\kappa$-geometric theory, we will denote by $T_\lambda$ the theory:

$$T \cup \{ \text{“there are } \lambda \text{ distinct elements”} \}$$

axiomatized in an appropriate fragment of $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+,\lambda}$ for each $\lambda \geq \kappa$ (observe as well that each $T_\lambda$ is a $\lambda$-coherent theory, for such $\lambda$). Likewise, we will denote by $\text{Set}[T]_\lambda$ the $\lambda$-classifying topos of $T$, i.e., the $\lambda$-classifying topos of the theory in $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+,\lambda}$ which has the same axioms as $T$.

Consider now an arbitrary AEC $(\mathcal{K},\prec)$ which is $\lambda$-categorical for a cardinal $\lambda$ above the Hanf number of $\mathcal{K}$ for model existence and also for (non-)categoricity, say, $\mu$; i.e. with the property that if the AEC is (non-)categorical in some $\nu \geq \mu$, it is (non-)categorical in arbitrarily large $\nu$. By Remark 4.2, $(\mathcal{K},\prec)$ is axiomatized by a sentence $\phi$ of $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda^+,\lambda}$ over a signature $\Sigma$. Consider the syntactic category $C_T$ of the theory so axiomatized. We will assume that $T$ has been properly Morleyized (cf. Remark 4.2), so as to be axiomatized by $\lambda$-coherent sequents over a signature $\Sigma^m$ in such a way that the models are precisely the unique expansions of models of the AEC and the $\Sigma^m$-homomorphisms are precisely the morphisms of the AEC between models of size at least $\lambda$. Note in particular that the models and morphisms will satisfy the Tarski-Vaught chain axioms. We denote in this section by $\text{Mod}_\lambda(T)$ the full subcategory of models of size $\lambda$. Our goal is to prove the following:

**Theorem 5.1.** Assume $GCH$. Suppose the AEC $(\mathcal{K},\prec)$ is categorical in $\lambda$ and $\lambda' = \lambda^+\alpha$, where $\lambda$ is above a cardinal where amalgamation holds. Then $\mathcal{K}$ is also categorical at any $\delta$ with $\lambda \leq \delta \leq \lambda'$.

**Proof.** Take any $\delta = \lambda^{+\beta}$ for some $\beta < \alpha$. By Corollary 3.2, it is enough to show that the embedding $Sh(\text{Mod}_\delta(T)^{op},\tau_D) \rightarrow \text{Set}[T_\delta|\delta]$ is an isomorphism.

Again, since we have started with a classical theory, after Morleyization each atomic formula will be complemented, and hence we can assume without loss of generality that any sequent valid in $Sh(\text{Mod}_\delta(T)^{op},\tau_D)$ is of the form $\vdash \bigvee_{i<\delta} \theta_i$, where the $\theta_i$ are of the form $\exists y_1 \phi_i$ and the $\phi_i$ are $\delta$-small conjunctions of atomic formulas. Each $[-,\theta]$ will be complemented by some $c_i$ in $\text{Set}[T_\delta|\delta]$, and hence $[-,\theta]$ for $\theta = \bigvee_{i<\delta} \theta_i$ will be complemented in $\text{Set}[T_\delta|\delta]$ due to the $\lambda'$-distributivity property, its complement being $\bigwedge_{i<\delta} c_i$. 


Consider the following diagram:

\[
\text{Set}[\mathcal{T}_{\delta}]_{\delta+} \cong \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_{\delta}(\mathcal{T})} \quad \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}_{\delta+}]_{\delta++} \cong \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_{\delta+}(\mathcal{T})} \quad \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta+} \cong \text{Set}^{M_1}\]

\[
\text{Set}[\mathcal{T}_{\delta+}]_{\delta+} \xrightarrow{g^*} \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}_{\delta++}]_{\delta++} \xrightarrow{t^*} \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta++} \xrightarrow{r^*} \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta++}
\]

\[
\text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta+} \cong \text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_{\delta}(\mathcal{T})^{\text{op}}, \tau_D) \quad \xrightarrow{r^*} \text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_{\delta+}(\mathcal{T})^{\text{op}}, \tau_D) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(M_1^{\text{op}}, \tau_D)
\]

By Theorem 4.1, \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta+} is equivalent to the presheaf topos \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_{\delta}(\mathcal{T})}. The \(\delta^+\)-classifying topos of the theory \(\mathcal{T}_{\delta^+}\) (which is a quotient of \(\mathcal{T}_\delta\)) will be a subtopos \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+} \hookrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta^+}. \text{Let us see that this embedding is dense. For this purpose, it is enough to show that if an object } \phi \text{ in } (\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{T}_\delta})_{\delta^+} \text{ is non-zero, its image } \bar{\phi} \text{ in } (\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{T}_{\delta^+}})_{\delta^+} \text{ is non-zero as well. Now, the image in } \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+} \text{ of any non-zero } \phi \text{ is in turn the result of mapping the image } Y(\phi) \text{ (via Yoneda embedding) in } \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+} \text{ of (the class of) of the formula } \phi, \text{ through the inverse image of the embedding } \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\lambda^+} \hookrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta^+}. \text{ By Theorem 4.1, } Y(\phi), \text{ which by hypothesis is non-zero, can be identified with the evaluation } ev(\phi) \text{ in } \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_{\delta}(\mathcal{T})}, \text{ so that for at least one model } N \text{ of size } \delta, \lceil [\phi] \rceil_N \text{ is non-empty. By the amalgamation property applied to } M_\lambda \rightarrow M_\lambda, \text{ we get a morphism } N \rightarrow M_\lambda, \text{ and so by Löwenheim-Skolem there is an embedding } N \rightarrow M \text{ into some model } M \text{ of } \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+}. \text{ It follows that } [\lceil [\phi] \rceil]_M \text{ is non-empty, and so the image in } \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta^+} \text{ of (the class of) } \phi \text{ is non-zero, as we wanted to prove.}

It follows that the double negation subtopos of \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta^+} \text{ will be also a subtopos of } \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta+}. \text{ The double negation subtopos is in turn given by the tops of sheaves with the dense topology } Sh(\text{Mod}_{\delta}(\mathcal{T})^{\text{op}}, \tau_D). \text{ Because of Tarski-Vaught chain axioms, any } \delta^+\text{-small chain of morphisms in } \text{Mod}_{\delta}(\mathcal{T}) \text{ gives rise to a model of cardinality } \delta. \text{ This readily implies that the dense topology } \tau_D \text{ is a } \delta^+\text{-topology in the sense of } [\text{Esp17}], \text{ and so, as proved in } [\text{Esp19}], \text{ the sheaf topos will be a } \delta^+\text{-topos and the sheafification functor } a \text{ will preserve } \delta^+\text{-small limits. Therefore, the sheafification functors } \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta^+} \rightarrow Sh(\text{Mod}_{\delta}(\mathcal{T})^{\text{op}}, \tau_D), \text{ being the composite of } a \text{ and the embedding } \text{Set}[\mathcal{T}]_{\delta^+} \rightarrow \text{Set}^{M_0}, \text{ will also preserve } \delta^+\text{-small limits.}

Since the amalgamation property readily implies the right Ore condition for \text{Mod}_{\delta}(\mathcal{T})^{\text{op}}, \text{ it follows that the dense topology there coincides with the atomic topology, and is thus generated by single morphisms. This shows that the site of } Sh(\text{Mod}_{\delta}(\mathcal{T})^{\text{op}}, \tau_D) \text{ is } \delta^+\text{-separable, and thus as proven in } [\text{Esp17}], \text{ the sheaf topos, being non-degenerate, will have a } \delta^+\text{-point } M_1 : Sh(\text{Mod}_{\delta}(\mathcal{T})^{\text{op}}, \tau_D) \rightarrow \text{Set}.\]
Assume first that $\beta$ is a successor cardinal and $\lambda'$ is regular, and consider the following diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Set}_{\lambda'}^{\delta} \\
\downarrow f^* \\
\text{Set}_{\lambda'}^{\delta^+} \\
\end{array}
\]

Observe that given a nonzero object $(x, \phi)$ in $\text{Set}_{\lambda'}^{\delta} \cong \text{Set}^{\text{Mod}_{\lambda'}(T)}$ (we identify the syntactic category with its image in the topos through Yoneda embedding), it follows that for some $\lambda'$-presentable model $M$ with $|M| = \mu$ ($\delta \leq \mu < \lambda'$) we have that $[[\phi]]_M$ is non-zero (since $(x, \phi)$ can be identified with the evaluation functor $ev_\beta$). By applying the amalgamation property to the pairs $M_\lambda \rightarrow M_{\lambda'}$ and $M_\lambda \rightarrow M$ we get a morphism $M \rightarrow M_{\lambda'}$. Thus, $[[\phi]]_{M_{\lambda'}}$ is non-zero, forcing $[-, \phi]$ to be also nonzero in $\text{Set}_{\lambda'}^{\delta}$. Therefore, $f^*(x, \phi))$ is nonzero, and since $(x, \phi)$ is arbitrary, this readily implies that $f_\ast(0) = 0$.

It follows that, taking now any complemented subobject $(x, \vartheta) \rightharpoonup (x, \top)$ in $\text{Set}_{\lambda'}^{\delta}$, the squares of the following diagram are pullbacks of $i, j$ along $\eta_{(x, \top)}$:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(x, \vartheta) \\
\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarro
As a consequence, each subtopos $\text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_\delta(\mathbb{T})^{op}, \tau_D) \hookrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_\delta]_{\delta^+}$ is two-valued and Boolean and hence an atom in the lattice of subtoposes, so that by Corollary 3.2 the theory $\mathbb{T}\uparrow$ classified by the sheaf topos $\text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_\delta(\mathbb{T})^{op}, \tau_D)$ (which corresponds to a quotient of $\mathbb{T}_{\delta^+}$) will be $\delta^+$-categorical, $M_1$ being its unique model up to isomorphism. Note as well that $M_1$ is also a model of $\mathbb{T}$.

Consider now the topos $\text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_\delta]_{\delta^+}$, which by Theorem 4.1 is equivalent to the presheaf topos $\text{Set}^{M_1^\circ}$, which is two-valued (here $M_1^\circ$ is the monoid of endomorphisms of $M_1$). There are two cases: either the monoid $M_1^\circ$ is a group or not. In the second case, we claim that the subtopos $\text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_\delta]_{\delta^+} \hookrightarrow \text{Set}^{M_1^\circ}$ is non-degenerate, for which it is enough to show that $\mathbb{T}_1$ has a model of cardinality $\delta^+$. Now, if $\mathbb{T}$ had no model of size $\delta^+$, $\text{Set}^{M_1^\circ}$ would have only one model up to isomorphism (namely, $M_1$), which by (the proof of) Theorem 3.1 would imply that it is two-valued and Boolean. In particular, $M_1^\circ$ would be a groupoid, which is contrary to our hypothesis. It follows then that indeed the subtopos $\text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_\delta]_{\delta^+} \hookrightarrow \text{Set}^{M_1^\circ}$ is non-degenerate, so that by an argument similar as before, we deduce it must be dense. Now, since the embeddings $j_x : \text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_\delta(\mathbb{T})^{op}, \tau_D) \hookrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+}$ and $t_{x,r} : \text{Sh}(M_1^{m+\circ}, \tau_D) \hookrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+}$ are atoms, either they are disjoint or they are equivalent. But it is easy to see that $t_{x,r}(0) = j_x(0) = 0$. Indeed, the only other possibility is that $t_{x,r}(0) = 1$, which would imply that $1 = gs_t{r}(0) = h_s(0) = 0$, since $h$ is conservative (as $\text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_\delta(\mathbb{T})^{op}, \tau_D)$ is an atom). This absurd shows that indeed both atoms intersect, and hence there is an equivalence $s^* : \text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_\delta(\mathbb{T})^{op}, \tau_D) \longrightarrow \text{Sh}(M_1^{m+\circ}, \tau_D)$ such that $jxs = t_{x,r}$. This allows us to define $l^* = s\cdot r^*h^*$ in such a way that $j^*g^* \cong l^*k^*$. In the first case, it follows that $u_* : \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_1]_{\delta^+} \hookrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+}$ is an atom in the lattice of subtoposes, and, furthermore, $u_* (0) = 0$. Indeed, there are conservative morphisms $x^* : \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_1]_{\delta^+} \longrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+}$ and $y^* : \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+} \longrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+}$ such that $x^*k^* \cong u^*g^*$, and since $\text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+}$, if $u_* (0) = 1$ we would have $1 = y_*u_* (0) \cong k_*x^*(0) = 0$, which is absurd. Hence, by similar arguments to the above, the atom $v_* : \text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_\delta(\mathbb{T})^{op}, \tau_D) \hookrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+}$ and $u_* : \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_1]_{\delta^+} \hookrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+}$ must be equivalent, i.e., there is an $s_* : \text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_\delta(\mathbb{T})^{op}, \tau_D) \longrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_{\delta^+}]_{\delta^+}$ such that $v_*s_* \cong u_*$. Defining now $l^* = s^*x^*$, we do get $j^*g^* \cong l^*k^*$ as well.

Thus, in either case there is a morphism $l^*$, and it is now clear how to continue this, as suggested by the picture (there, only the inverse images of the geometric morphisms are depicted). Continuing in this manner we define successive theories $\mathbb{T}_n$, each categorical in $\delta^{+n}$, with a model $M_n$ of size $\delta^{+n}$, and that is $\delta^{+n}$-classified by the topos $\text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_{\delta^{n-1}}(\mathbb{T})^{op}, \tau_D)$. Consider at the limit cardinal $\delta^{+\omega}$ the theory $\mathbb{T}_\omega = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathbb{T}_n$. Since $\delta^{+\omega}$ is singular, $\mathbb{T}_\omega$ is by definition $\lambda^{+\omega}$-classified by the (2-)colimit (in the opposite of the 2-category of toposes) of the chain:

$$\text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_{\delta^{\omega-1}}(\mathbb{T})^{op}, \tau_D) \longrightarrow \text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_{\delta}(\mathbb{T})^{op}, \tau_D) \longrightarrow \text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_{\delta^+}(\mathbb{T})^{op}, \tau_D) \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \text{Set}[\mathbb{T}_\omega]_{\delta^{+\omega}}$$

We claim that $\mathbb{T}_\omega$ is $\lambda^{+\omega}$-categorical. Indeed, each topos in the colimit diagram is atomic and connected and has a point, hence it is equivalent (see [Moe88]) to the topos of equivariant sheaves over the topological group of automorphisms of its model, with the topology of pointwise convergence. By the duality theory of [For12] between geometric theories with enough models and groupoids of models, the morphisms between the corresponding syntactic categories correspond to maps between the corresponding topological groups, whence the colimit topos, which has enough points, will be the topos of equivariant sheaves on the limit topological group, in particular, it will
also be atomic and connected, i.e., two-valued and Boolean. This allows us to define $M_\omega := \lim M_n$ as the unique model of $T^\omega$ of size $\lambda+\omega$, and continue along the same lines, since we will have that the induced morphism $m_* : \text{Set}[T^\omega]_{\delta+\omega} \longrightarrow \text{Set}[T_{\delta+\omega}]_{\delta+\omega}$ will be a dense embedding.

To conclude the proof, assume first that $\lambda'$ is a successor. We now have the following situation:

\[ \text{Set}[T_{\delta}]_{\lambda'} \xrightarrow{f_\ast} \text{Set}[T_{\delta}]_{\delta} \xrightarrow{f_*} \text{Set}[T_{\lambda'}]_{\lambda'} \]

Any sequent valid in $\text{Sh}(\text{Mod}_\beta(T)^{\text{op}}, \tau_D)$ is of the form $\top \vdash \theta$, as before, and inspection of the diagram above shows that it has to be valid also in $\text{Set}[T_{\lambda'}]_{\lambda'}$. Since $\theta$ is complemented in $\text{Set}[T_{\delta}]_{\lambda'}$, by what we have already proven, $\theta$ has to be valid there as well, and also in $\text{Set}[T_{\delta}]_{\delta}$ by conservativity. Whence, $\text{Set}[T_{\delta}]_{\delta}$ is two-valued and Boolean.

If $\lambda'$ is a limit cardinal, simply put in the argument above $\text{Set}[T_{\delta}]_{\lambda'+\delta}$ in place of $\text{Set}[T_{\delta}]_{\lambda'}$.

Finally, the case in which $\beta$ is a limit cardinal is easily handled knowing that the AEC will be categorical at all $\lambda^{+\gamma}$ for successors $\gamma < \alpha$. Indeed, choose a sequence of successor cardinals $\gamma_i$ whose limit is $\beta$. Since the AEC is $\lambda^{+\gamma_i}$-categorical, the $\lambda^{+\gamma_i}$-classifying topos of $T_{\gamma_i}$ will be $\text{Sh}(M_{\lambda^{+\gamma_i}} \times \tau_D)$. We can then consider the (2-)colimit of the following chain:

\[ \text{Set}[T_{\beta}]_{\lambda+\beta} \]

Since each $T_{\gamma_i}$ coincides with $T_{\lambda^{+\gamma}}$, it follows that $T^\beta = \bigcup_{i < \beta} T_{\gamma_i} = T_{\lambda^{+\beta}}$ and this colimit is precisely the $\lambda^{+\beta}$-classifying topos of $T_{\lambda^{+\beta}}$. Therefore, the AEC is $\lambda^{+\beta}$-categorical also for this case.

We finally get to the following:

**Corollary 5.2.** (Shelah’s eventual categoricity conjecture for AEC’s) Assume GCH and amalgamation. There exists a cardinal $\mu$ such that if $\mathcal{K}$ is categorical in some $\lambda \geq \mu$, it is categorical in all $\lambda \geq \mu$.

**Proof.** Let $\mu$ be the first cardinal above the Hanf numbers of $\mathcal{K}$ for model existence, categoricity and non-categoricity, and above which amalgamation holds. If the AEC is categorical in some $\lambda_0 \geq \mu$, then it is categorical in unboundedly many cardinals. By Theorem 5.1, it will be categorical in all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. On the other hand, for every $\lambda$ with $\mu \leq \lambda < \lambda_0$ the AEC is necessarily $\lambda$-categorical, since if it was not, by assumption
it would be non-categorical in unboundedly many cardinals, which we have just ruled out. Therefore, the AEC is categorical in every $\lambda \geq \mu$.
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