

Algebraically closed structures in Positive Logic.

Mohammed Belkasmi

*Maths Department
Qassim University
PO Box 6644 Buraidah 51452
Saudi Arabia*

Abstract

In this paper we extend of the notion of algebraically closed given in the case of groups and skew fields to an arbitrary h-inductive theory. The main subject of this paper is the study of the notion of positive algebraic closedness and its relationship with the notion of positive closedness and the amalgamation property.

Keywords: Positive logic, h-inductive theory, h-universal theory positively existentially closed, positively closed, positively algebraically closed, e-elementary extension.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 03C95; Secondary 03C48, 03C10

1. Positive logic

1.1. Introduction

The main technical tools developed by Abraham Robinson in the study of the notions of model-complete theories, existentially closed models and inductive theories in the framework of first order logic with negation, are the notions of inductive sentence, embedding, existential formula and universal sentences which are precisely negations of existential sentences.

The positive logic provides a simpler framework than that of the logic with negation, in the sense that only positive existential formulas and h-inductive sentences are considered. The inductive theories in Robinson's

Email address: belkasmi@math.univ-lyon1.fr (Mohammed Belkasmi)

sense become a special positive case, by a partial morleysation adding a new relation symbol for the negation of each atomic formula of the language.

Positive logic offers really new situations; it permits the extension to homomorphisms the model-theoretic notions which are classically associated to embeddings, in particular the notion of existentially closed models. It permits also the restriction of the set of formulas to the positive ones.

The present paper provides an exposition of the positivisation of the notions of existentially and algebraically closed structures. This approach turns out to be compatible with some algebraic notions, and create new opportunities.

The plan of this paper is as follows. In the section 1, after revising the foundation of the positive logic, we give a generalized form of amalgamation called the amalgamation embedding-immersion, which turns out to be very useful in the study the properties of the notions introduced in the section 2. The section 2 is divided into two parts. In the first part, we introduce the notion of positively algebraically closed structure, we analyse the preservation of this notion by various type of extensions, and by passing to substructures. Afterwards we give a syntactic characterisations of positively algebraically closed structures and the theories with algebraic model-companion. we finish this part by analysing the relation between the classes of positively algebraically closed and existentially closed structures. In the second part, we define the notion of e-elementary algebraic extension and prove some fundamental properties of this notion.

1.2. Pc models

Our terminology and notations will be consistent with [1] and [6]. Let L be a first order language. The positive formulas are formulas which are obtained from the atomic formulas by the use of \wedge, \vee and \exists . They are of the form $\exists \bar{x} \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, where ψ is positive quantifier-free; the variables \bar{y} are said to be free.

A sentence is said to be h-inductive if it is a finite conjunction of sentences of the form:

$$\forall \bar{x} \exists \bar{y} \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \rightarrow \exists \bar{z} \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$$

where ψ, φ are positive quantifier-free formulas.

The h-universal sentences represent a special case of h-inductive sentences; they are the sentences that can be written as negation of a positive sentence.

Let A and B be two L -structures. By an homomorphism h from A to B we mean a mapping h from A to B such that, for every tuple \bar{a} from A ($\bar{a} \in A$ by abuse of notation) and for every atomic formula ϕ . $A \models \phi(\bar{a})$ implies $B \models \phi(h(\bar{a}))$. In such a case, B is said to be a continuation of A .

By an embedding of A into B we mean an homomorphism $h : A \rightarrow B$ such that for every atomic formula ϕ , $A \models \phi(\bar{a})$ if and only if $B \models \phi(h(\bar{a}))$. The homomorphism $h : A \rightarrow B$ is an immersion whenever for every $\bar{a} \in A$ and $h(\bar{a})$ satisfy the same L -positive formulas.

A class of L -structures is said to be h -inductive (resp. e -inductive, i -inductive) if it is closed under inductive limits of homomorphisms (resp. embeddings, immersions). It is easy to verify that the class of models of an h -inductive theory is h -inductive. The theorem 23 of [6] shown that this is indeed a characterization of the h -inductive classes of models of a first order theory.

The positively closed structures are the central objects of study in positive model theory. The corresponding notion in the model theory with negation are the existentially complete structures. Broadly speaking, the positively closed structures are the structures for which the h -universal sentences are persistent under homomorphisms in the sense that, if a positive formula is satisfied in any continuation of the structure, then it is satisfied in the structure itself.

Definition 1. *Let L be a first-order language and Γ a class of L -structures. A member M of Γ is said to be positively closed (pc from now on), if every homomorphism from M into an element of Γ is an immersion.*

The following facts give fundamental properties of pc models. They will be used without mention in the rest of this paper.

Lemma 1. *(Théorème 2, [6]) Every member of an h -inductive class has a pc continuation in the same class.*

Lemma 2. *(Lemme 14, [6]) A model B of an h -inductive L -theory T is a pc model of T if and only if for every $\bar{a} \in A$ and φ a positive L -formula, if $A \not\models \varphi(\bar{a})$ then there is ψ a positive L -formula such that,*

$$\begin{cases} A \models \psi(\bar{a}) \\ T \vdash \neg \exists \bar{x} (\varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge \psi(\bar{x})). \end{cases}$$

For every formula ϕ , we denote by $Ctr_T(\phi)$ the set of positive formulas ψ such that $T \vdash \neg \exists \bar{x}(\phi(\bar{x}) \wedge \psi(\bar{x}))$.

Given A be a L -structure, we let $L(A)$ be the language obtained from L by adjoining the element of A as constants. We denote by:

- $Diag(A)$ the set of atomic and negated atomic $L(A)$ -sentences satisfied by A .
- $Diag^+(A)$ the set of positive quantifier-free $L(A)$ -sentences satisfied by A .

Definition 2. • *Two h -inductive theories are said to be companion if they have the same pc models.*

- *An h -inductive theory T is said to be positively complete (or it has the joint continuation property) if any two models of T have a common continuation.*

Every h -inductive theory T has a maximal companion denoted $T_k(T)$, called the Kaiser's hull of T . $T_k(T)$ is the set of h -inductive consequences of the pc models of T . Likewise, T has a minimal companion denoted $T_u(T)$, formed by its h -universal consequences.

Remark 1. *Let T_1 and T_2 be two h -inductive theories. The following propositions are equivalent:*

- T_1 and T_2 are companion.
- $T_k(T_1) \equiv T_k(T_2)$.
- $T_u(T_1) \equiv T_u(T_2)$.

Definition 3. *Let T be an h -inductive theory.*

- *T is said to be model-complete if every model of T is a pc model of T .*
- *We say that T has a model-companion whenever $T_k(T)$ is model-complete.*
- *An n -type is a maximal set of positive formulas in n variables that is consistent with T . We denote by $S_n(T)$ the space of n -types of the theory T .*

Example 1. Let L be the language consisting of one unary function f .

1. Let T be the h -inductive L -theory

$$\{\forall x, y (f(x) = f(y) \longrightarrow x = y)\}.$$

Every model of T can be viewed as directed graph formed by union of cycles, two-sided and one sided chains. The elements of the model are the vertices of the graph, and two elements a and b of the model are connected by a directed edge pointing from a to b , if the model satisfies the formula $f(a) = b$.

T has a model-companion, and the class of pc models of T is reduced to the structure $A_e = \{x\}$.

2. Let T' be the h -universal L -theory

$$\{\neg\exists x f \circ f(x) = x\}.$$

Every model (A, f) of T' can be represented by a directed graph as in the previous example. T' has a unique pc model formed by one cycle of order 4 and one cycle of order p for every prime $p > 2$. Thereby the class of pc models is not elementary.

3. This example is given in [2]. Let T'' be the h -universal theory $\{\neg\exists x f(x) = x\}$. T'' has a unique pc model formed by a cycle of order p for every prime p .
4. Let T_G be the theory of groups in the usual language of groups. The class of pc model of T_G is reduced to the trivial group.

Let A be a L -structure. We shall use the following notations:

- $T_i(A)$ (resp. $T_u(A)$) denote the set of h -inductive (resp. h -universal) $L(A)$ -sentences satisfied by A .
- $T_i^*(A)$ (resp. $T_u^*(A)$) denote the set of h -inductive (resp. h -universal) L -sentences satisfied by A .
- $T_k(A)$ (resp. $T_k^*(A)$) denote the Kaiser's hull of $T_i(A)$ (resp. of $T_i^*(A)$).

Remark 2. Let A and B be two L -structures such that A is immersed in B , then $T_i^*(B) \subseteq T_i^*(A)$.

Lemma 3. *Let B a model an h -inductive. If B is a continuation of a pc model A of T , then A is a pc model of $T_i^*(B)$.*

Proof: Since A is immersed in B then A is a model of $T_i^*(B)$. Given that $T \subseteq T_i^*(B)$ it follows that A is a pc model of $T_i^*(B)$. \square

The following lemma provides a generalized form of asymmetric amalgamations called embedding-immersion amalgamation, inspired by other forms of asymmetric amalgamations given in [6] and [1]. This form of amalgamation turns out to be a very useful technical tool in the next section.

Lemma 4. (*embedding-immersion amalgamation*)

Let A, B be two L -structures and C a model of $T_i(A)$. Let e an embedding from A into B and i the natural immersion from A into C . Then there exists D a model of $T_i(B)$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{e} & B \\ i \downarrow & & \downarrow i' \\ C & \xrightarrow{e'} & D \end{array}$$

where e' is an embedding and i' is an immersion.

Proof: Consider the language L^+ formed by the language L and the elements of A, B and C , so that the elements of A are interpreted by the same symbol of constants in B and C . The proof consists to show that the set of h -inductive L^+ -sentences $T_i(B) \cup \text{Diag}(C)$ is consistent.

Let Δ be a finite fragment of $\text{Diag}(C)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\Delta = \{\neg\psi(\bar{a}, \bar{c}), \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{c})\}$ where ψ and ϕ are positive quantifier-free formulas, $\bar{a} \in A$ and $\bar{c} \in C$. To show the consistency of $T_i(B) \cup \text{Diag}(C)$, we will give an interpretation of Δ in B .

We claim that $A \not\models \forall \bar{y} (\varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{y}) \rightarrow \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{y}))$. Indeed, if $A \vdash \forall \bar{y} (\varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{y}) \rightarrow \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{y}))$, given that $C \vdash T_i(A)$ then C satisfies $\forall \bar{x}\bar{y} (\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \rightarrow \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}))$, contradiction with $\{\neg\psi(\bar{a}, \bar{b}), \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})\} \subset \text{Diag}(C)$. Thereby there is $\bar{a}' \in A$ such that $A \not\models \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{a}')$ and $A \models \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{a}')$. Now since A is embedded in B , we can interpret $\varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{a}')$ and $\neg\psi(\bar{a}, \bar{a}')$ in B . \square

2. Positively Algebraically closed structures

Algebraically closed structures plays an important part in the study of algebraic theories in the framework of model theory with negation. The notion

of positively algebraically closed structures presented here is the outcome of the extension to an arbitrary h-inductive theory of the notion of algebraically closed groups introduced by Scott [5], and considered in [4] by A. Robinson in the case of groups and skew-fields.

In the first part of this section, after having presented the notion of positively algebraically closed structures in adequate setting, we establish the fundamental properties of the class of positively algebraically closed structures of an h-inductive theory.

Definition 4. *Let T be an h-inductive theory, a model A of T is said to be positively algebraically closed (pac from now on) if every embedding from A into a model of T is an immersion.*

Remark 3. • *Every pc model of T is a pac model of T , thereby every model of T is continued in some pac model of T .*

- *Let T be an h-inductive theory such that, the negation of every positive quantifier-free formula is equivalent modulo T to a positive formula. Then every pac model of T is a pc model, and an existentially closed model of T .*
- *Let L be a language without relation symbols. Let T be an h-inductive theory such that the inequality is positively defined. Then the negation of every positive quantifier-free formula is positively defined. Thereby every ac model of T is a pc model of T and an existentially closed model of T .*

The content of the notions of pc and pac models are best seen by considering the following examples.

Example 2. 1. *Let T be the h-inductive theory given in the example 1.*

A model (A, f) of T is pac if and only if f is bijective and has a fixed point. Thereby the class of pac models of T is elementary.

2. *Let T' be the h-inductive theory given in the example 1. A model of T' is pac if and only if it contains a 4-cycle and a p -cycle for each prime $p > 2$. Thereby the pac models of T' form an elementary class.*

However, in the framework of model theory with negation, a model of T' is an existentially closed model if and only if contains the set of n -cycles for each integer $n > 2$.

3. Every L -structure A is a pac model of the theory $T_u(A)$ over the language $L(A)$.
4. Let T_{ag} the theory of abelian groups in the usual language of groups. Every divisible abelian group is a pac model of T_{ag} . However, the class of existentially closed models of T_{ag} is the class of all divisible abelian groups that contain for each prime number p an infinite number of elements of order p .
5. Given that the language of the theory of fields is without relation symbols, and the negation of the formula $x = y$ is defined by the positive formula $\exists z((x - y).z = 1)$. Then, every pac field is pc and an existentially closed field.

Lemma 5. *Let T be an h -inductive theory. The class of pac models of T is e -inductive (inductive under embeddings).*

Proof: Let A be the inductive limit of the inductive sequence $(A_i, p_{i,j})_{i,j < \omega}$, where A_i are pac models of T and $p_{i,j}$ embeddings. Consider B a model of T and p an embedding from A into B . In order to show that A is a pac model of T , we will show that p is an immersion.

Suppose that $B \models \exists \bar{x} \psi(p(\bar{a}), \bar{x})$ where ψ is a positive quantifier-free formula, and $\bar{a} \in A$. Let $i < \omega$ such that $\bar{a} \in A_i$, let p_i be the natural homomorphism from A_i into A . Given that A_i is a pac model and $p \circ p_i$ is embedding then $p \circ p_i$ is an immersion. Since $p(\bar{a}) = p \circ p_i(\bar{a})$, it follows that $A_i \models \exists \bar{x} \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{x})$. Thereby $A \models \exists \bar{x} \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{x})$, so p is an immersion. \square

Lemma 6. *Every model of an h -inductive theory T is embedded in a pac model of T .*

Proof: The proof is similar to the classic one for the existence of existentially closed models, except that the existential formulas must be replaced by the positive formulas.

Let A_0 be a model of T . Let $\Gamma_0 = \{\varphi_i \mid i < \alpha_0\}$ be the set of positive $L(A_0)$ -formulas enumerated by an ordinal α_0 . first, we construct an inductive sequence $(M_i)_{i < \alpha_0}$ of models of T as follows; if the first formula $\varphi_0 \in \Gamma_0$ is satisfied in some model B of T in which A_0 is embedded, we take $M_1 = B$, if not we take $M_1 = M_0 = A_0$. We continue in this manner, if the second formula of Γ_0 is satisfied in some model C of T in which M_1 is embedded, we take $M_2 = C$, if not we take $M_2 = M_1$. If $\beta < \alpha_0$ is a limit ordinal, one defines M_β as the inductive limit of $(M_i)_{i < \beta}$.

Let A_1 be the inductive limit of $(M_i)_{i < \alpha_0}$. We repeat the previous construction for A_1 and Γ_1 the set of positive formulas with parameters in A_1 . We obtain an inductive sequence (under embeddings) $(A_i)_{i < \omega}$. The inductive limit C of $(A_i)_{i < \omega}$ is a pac model of T , and A is embedded in C . \square

We use A_T and E_T to denote respectively the classes of pac and pc models of an h-inductive theory T . We have $E_T \subseteq A_{T_k(T)} \cap A_{T_u(T)}$.

Definition 5. *Two h-inductive theories are said to be e-companion if every model of one of them can be embedded into a model of the other.*

Lemma 7. *Two h-inductive theories are e-companions if and only if they have the same class of pac models.*

Proof: Let T_1 and T_2 be two h-inductive theories with the same class of pac models. By the lemma 6, every model of one of them can be embedded into a model of the other.

For the other direction, assume that T_1 and T_2 are e-companions theories. Let A be a pac model of T_1 . By the lemma 6, we obtain the following diagram:

$$A \xrightarrow{e_1} B \xrightarrow{e_2} C \xrightarrow{e_3} D$$

where e_1, e_2, e_3 are embeddings, B a model of T_2 , C a pac model of T_2 and D a model of T_1 . Given that A is a pac model of T_1 , then $e_3 \circ e_2 \circ e_1$ is an immersion, so e_1 is an immersion. Consequently A is a model of T_2 and a pac model of T_2 . Likewise every pac model of T_2 is a pac model of T_1 . \square

Lemma 8. *If A is a substructure of a pac model B of T and B a model of $T_i^*(A)$, then A is a pac model of T .*

Proof: Suppose that $B \models T_i^*(A)$, let p be an embedding from A into a model C of T . By the lemma 4, we have the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{i} & B \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow p' \\ C & \xrightarrow{i'} & D \end{array}$$

where D is a model of T , p' an embedding and i' an immersion. Given that B is a pac model of T then p' is an immersion, and so does p . Thereby A is a pac model of T . \square

The following theorem gives a syntactic characterisation of pac model, based on a formal description of the positivation of negative formulas in a pac model.

Theorem 1. *Let A be a model of an h -inductive theory T . A is a pac model of T if and only if for every $\bar{a} \in A$, and ψ a positive formula such that $A \not\models \psi(\bar{a})$, there exist $\bar{b} \in A$ and two positive quantifier-free formulas θ_1, θ_2 such that:*

1. $A \models \theta_1(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$, and $A \not\models \theta_2(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$.
2. $T \vdash \forall \bar{x} \bar{y} ((\psi(\bar{x}) \wedge \theta_1(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow \theta_2(\bar{x}, \bar{y}))$.

Proof: Let A be a pac model of T , $\bar{a} \in A$, and ψ a positive formula such that $A \not\models \psi(\bar{a})$. Since every embedding from A into a model of T is an immersion, then the set of h -inductive sentences $\{T, \text{Diag}(A), \psi(\bar{a})\}$ is inconsistent. By compactness, there exist $\theta_1(\bar{a}, \bar{b}), \neg\theta_2(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \in \text{Diag}(A)$ such that $\{T, \theta_1(\bar{a}, \bar{b}), \neg\theta_2(\bar{a}, \bar{b}), \psi(\bar{a})\}$ is inconsistent, thereby we obtain

$$T \vdash \forall \bar{x} \bar{y} ((\psi(\bar{x}) \wedge \theta_1(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow \theta_2(\bar{x}, \bar{y})).$$

For the other direction, let A be a model of T that satisfies the properties (1) and (2) of the theorem. Let p be an embedding from A into a model B of T . Let ψ be a positive formula and $\bar{a} \in A$ such that $A \not\models \psi(\bar{a})$. By hypothesis, there exist θ_1, θ_2 a pair of positive quantifier-free formulas and $\bar{b} \in A$ that satisfy the following properties:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} A \models \theta_1(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \\ A \not\models \theta_2(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \\ T \vdash \forall \bar{x} \bar{y} ((\psi(\bar{x}) \wedge \theta_1(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow \theta_2(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \end{array} \right.$$

Now since p is an embedding then $B \models \theta_1(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ and $B \not\models \theta_2(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$. Consequently $B \not\models \psi(\bar{a})$, so p is an immersion. \square

Definition 6. *Let T be an h -inductive theory and ψ a positive formula. We denote by $\text{Alc}_T(\psi)$ the set of pairs of positive quantifier-free formulas (θ_1, θ_2) that satisfy the following property:*

there exist a pac model A of T , \bar{a} and \bar{b} tuples from A such that:

$$(\star) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A \not\models \psi(\bar{a}) \\ A \models \theta_1(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \\ A \not\models \theta_2(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \\ T \vdash \forall \bar{x} \bar{y} ((\psi(\bar{x}) \wedge \theta_1(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow \theta_2(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \end{array} \right.$$

- *Let Δ be a subset of $\text{Alc}_T(\psi)$. We say that $\text{Alc}_T(\psi)$ is equivalent to Δ and we write $\text{Alc}_T(\psi) \equiv \Delta$ if for every pac model A of T and $\bar{a} \in A$; if $A \not\models \psi(\bar{a})$ then there are $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \Delta$ and $\bar{b} \in A$, that satisfy the property (\star) above.*

- Let Δ be a subset of $\text{Ctr}_T(\psi)$. We say that $\text{Ctr}_T(\psi)$ is equivalent to Δ and we write $\text{Ctr}_T(\psi) \equiv \Delta$ if for every pc model A of T and $\bar{a} \in A$; if $A \not\models \psi(\bar{a})$ then there are $\phi \in \Delta$ and $\bar{b} \in A$ such that $A \models \phi(\bar{a})$.

Remark 4. • If $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), (\beta_1, \beta_2) \in \text{Alc}_T(\psi)$, we have $(\alpha_1 \vee \beta_1, \alpha_2 \vee \beta_2) \in \text{Alc}_T(\psi)$.

- An h -inductive theory T has a model-companion if and only if for every positive formula ψ there exists $\psi^c \in \text{Ctr}_T(\psi)$ such that $\text{Ctr}_T(\psi) \equiv \{\psi^c\}$. In this case the class of pc models is axiomatized by $T_k(T)$ the following h -inductive theory:

$$T \cup \{\forall \bar{x} (\psi(\bar{x}) \vee \psi^c(\bar{x})) \mid \psi \text{ ranges over the set of positive formulas}\}.$$

Definition 7. Let T be an h -inductive theory. We say that T has an algebraic model-companion if the class of pac models of T is axiomatized by a first order theory.

Theorem 2. An h -inductive theory T has an algebraic model-companion if and only if for every positive formula ψ , $\text{Alc}_T(\psi)$ is equivalent to a pair (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) of $\text{Alc}_T(\psi)$. In this case the class of pac models of T is axiomatized by T_h the following inductive theory:

$$T \cup \{\forall \bar{x} \bar{y} ((\psi(\bar{x}) \wedge \phi_1(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow \phi_2(\bar{x}, \bar{y})), \forall \bar{x} (\psi(\bar{x}) \vee (\exists \bar{y} (\phi_1(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \wedge \neg \phi_2(\bar{x}, \bar{y}))))\}$$

where ψ ranges over the set of positive formulas.

Proof: Suppose that the class of pac models of T is axiomatized by a first order theory T^* . Let ψ be a positive formula such that $\text{Alc}_T(\psi)$ is not equivalent to any of its finite subset. Then, for every finite subset of $\text{Alc}_T(\psi)$ (which by the remark 4 can be represented by a pair $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \text{Alc}_T(\psi)$) there are a model A of T^* and $\bar{a} \in A$, such that

$$\begin{cases} A \not\models \psi(\bar{a}) \\ A \models \exists \bar{x} (\theta_1(\bar{a}, \bar{x}) \wedge \theta_2(\bar{a}, \bar{x})). \end{cases}$$

By compactness, there exist B a model of T^* and $\bar{b} \in B$ such that for every $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \text{Alc}_T(\psi)$ we have:

$$\begin{cases} B \not\models \psi(\bar{a}) \\ B \models \exists \bar{x} (\theta_1(\bar{a}, \bar{x}) \wedge \theta_2(\bar{a}, \bar{x})). \end{cases}$$

Contradiction from the syntactic characterization of pac models. Thereby, there is $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in Alc_T(\psi)$ such that $Alc_T(\psi) \equiv \{(\theta_1, \theta_2)\}$. It is clear that T^* is logically equivalent to the theory T_h given in the theorem.

For the other direction, suppose that for each positive formula ψ there is $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in Alc_T(\psi)$ such that $Alc_T(\psi) \equiv \{(\phi_1, \phi_2)\}$. Let T_h be the theory

$$T \cup \{\forall \bar{x} \bar{y} ((\psi(\bar{x}) \wedge \phi_1(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow \phi_2(\bar{x}, \bar{y})), \forall \bar{x} (\psi(\bar{x}) \vee (\exists \bar{y} \phi_1(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \wedge \neg \phi_2(\bar{x}, \bar{y})))\}$$

where ψ runs through the set of positive formulas.

It is clear that every pac model of T is a model of T_h . Conversely, let A be a model of T_h and e an embedding from A into B a model of T . Let $\bar{a} \in B$ and ψ be a positive formula such that $A \not\models \psi(\bar{a})$. By hypothesis, there exist (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) a pair of positive quantifier-free formulas and $\bar{b} \in A$, such that $A \models \phi_1(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ and $A \not\models \phi_2(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$. Given that e is an embedding it follows that $B \models \phi_1(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$, and $B \not\models \phi_2(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$. Since $T \vdash \forall \bar{x} \bar{y} ((\psi(\bar{x}) \wedge \phi_1(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow \phi_2(\bar{x}, \bar{y}))$ we obtain $B \not\models \psi(\bar{a})$, thus e is an immersion and A is a pac model of T . Thereby the class of pac models of T is axiomatized by the theory T_h . \square

Remark 5. *If the class of pac models of an h -inductive theory is axiomatized by an h -inductive theory, then every model of $T_k(T)$ is a pac model of T .*

Lemma 9. *Let A be a model of T which is immersed in a pac model C of T . If A has the amalgamation property for embeddings then A is a pac model of T .*

Proof: Let e be an embedding from A into B a model of T . since A has the amalgamation of embeddings, we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{e} & B \\ i_m \downarrow & & \downarrow e_2 \\ C & \xrightarrow{e_3} & D \end{array}$$

where D is a model of T , e_2 and e_3 embeddings. Given that C is a pac model of T and D a model of T , then e_3 is an immersion. Since $e_3 \circ i_m = e_2 \circ e$ and $e_3 \circ i_m$ is an immersion, then $e_2 \circ e$ is an immersion, so e is an immersion. Thus A is a pac model of T . \square

Remark 6. *Note that if T is an inductive theory in Robinson's sense, and a structure A immersed in some model of T , then A is not necessary a model*

of T . Given that the the characterization of pac models of an h -inductive theory is made by inductive sentences. So it is natural to ask the question whether the condition of amalgamation of embeddings in the lemma 9 is a necessary and sufficient condition.

2.1. E -elementary extension

In this section, we introduce and make preliminary study of the notion of e -elementary extension inspired by the the notion of elementary extension given by Poizat in [3].

Recall that B is an elementary extension of B in the the sense of Poizat if and only if B is a pc model of $T_i(A)$.

Let A be a L -structure. We use the notation T_A for the h -inductive $L(A)$ -theory $\{T_u(A), \text{Diag}^+(A)\}$.

Lemma 10. *Let A be a L -structure. The theories T_A and $T_i(A)$ are e -companions $L(A)$ -theories.*

Proof: Let B_1 be a pac model of T_A and B_2 a pac model of $T_i(A)$. Given that B_2 is a model of $T_i(A)$ and A is immersed in both B_1 and B_2 , then by the lemma 4, we obtain the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{i_m} & B_2 \\ i_m \downarrow & & \downarrow i \\ B_1 & \xrightarrow{e} & D \end{array}$$

where D is a model of $T_i(B_2)$. Therefore B_1 is embedded in a model of $T_i(A)$, and B_2 is embedded in a model of T_A . \square

Definition 8. *Let A and B be two L -structures. B is said to be an e -elementary extension of A , in symbols $A \prec_e B$, if B is a pac model of T_A .*

Remark 7. *From the lemma 10 and the definition 8 it follows that $A \prec_e B$ if and only if B is a pac model of $T_i(A)$. Since every pc model of an h -inductive theory is a pac model, it follows that the notion of e -elementary extension is weaker than the notion of elementary extension given by Poizat.*

The following lemma gives some properties of the notion of e -elementary extension.

- Lemma 11.**
1. For every L -structure A we have $A \prec_e A$.
 2. Let T be an h -inductive theory, A a pac model of T , and B an elementary extension of A . Then B is a pac model of T .
 3. Let A, B, C three L -structures such that, $A \prec_e B \prec_e C$. Then $A \prec_e C$.
 4. If $A \prec_e B$ then $T_i(A) = T_i(B)$ in the language $L(A)$.
 5. If $A \prec_e C$, $B \prec_e C$ and A is embedded in B . Then $A \prec_e B$.

Proof:

1. Clear.
2. Consider the following diagram

$$A \xrightarrow{i_m} B \xrightarrow{p} C,$$

where C is a model of T and p an embedding. In order to prove that B is a pac model of T it suffices to show that p is an immersion.

Given that A is a pac model of T then $p \circ i_m$ is an immersion, so C is a model of T_A , which implies that p is an immersion.

3. Suppose that C is embedded in a model D of T_A . We have the following diagram:

$$A \xrightarrow{i_1} B \xrightarrow{i_2} C \xrightarrow{p} D$$

where p is an embedding, i_1 and i_2 are immersions. Since $A \prec_e B$, $p \circ i_2$ is an immersion, so D is a model of T_B . As $B \prec_e C$ then p is an immersion.

4. Since A is immersed in B then $T_i(B) \subseteq T_i(A)$ over the language $L(A)$. On the other hand, as T_A and $T_i(A)$ are e-companions theories and $A \prec_e B$ then $B \models T_i(A)$, which implies $T_i(A) \subseteq T_i(B)$.
5. According to the hypothesis of the proposition (5) we have the following diagram:

$$A \xrightarrow{p} B \xrightarrow{i} C$$

where p is an embedding and i an immersion.

Given that $A \prec_e C$, then $i \circ p$ is an immersion, so p is an immersion. By the proposition (4) we have $T_i(A) = T_i(C) = T_i(B)$ over the language $L(A)$. Since C is a pac model of T_A , B is immersed in C and C is a model of $T_i(B)$ in the language $L(A)$, it follows from the lemma 8 that B is a pac model of T_A . \square

References**References**

- [1] Mohammed Belkasmi. Positive model theory and amalgamations. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 55(2), 2014.
- [2] Almaz Kungozhin. Existentially closed and maximal models in positive logic. *Algebra and Logic*, 51(6), 2013.
- [3] Bruno Poizat. Univers positifs. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 71(3), 2006.
- [4] Abraham Robinson. On the notion of algebraic closedness for noncommutative groups and fields. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 36:441–444, 1971.
- [5] W.R. Scott. Algebraically closed groups. *Proceedings AMS*, 2(1), 1951.
- [6] Itai Ben Yaacov and Bruno Poizat. Fondements de la logique positive. *Symbolic Logic*, 72(4):1141–1162, 2007.