

Positive Strong Amalgamations

Mohammed Belkasm

March 18, 2022

Abstract

In this paper, we present the notions of positively complete theory and general forms of amalgamation in the framework of positive logic. We explore the fundamental properties of positively complete theories and study the behaviour of companion theories by a change of constants in the language. Moreover, we present a general form of amalgamation and discuss some forms of strong amalgamation.

1 Positively complete theories

1.1 Positive logic

The positive logic in its present form was introduced by Ben Yaccov and Poizat [3], following the line of research of Hrushovski [4] and Pillay [5].

Broadly speaking, the positive model theory is considered as a part of the eastern model theory introduced by Abraham Robinson, which is concerned essentially with the study of existentially closed models and model-complete theories in the context of incomplete inductive theories. The main tools in the study of incomplete inductive theories are: embedding, existential formulas and inductive sentences. Keep in consideration homomorphisms and positive formulas, the positive logic offers a wider and simpler framework as compared to the eastern model theory.

In this subsection we summarise the basic concepts of positive logic which will be used throughout the paper.

Let L be a first order language. we stipulate that L includes the symbol of equality and the constant \perp denoting the antilog.

The quantifier-free positive formulas are built from atomics by using the connectives \wedge and \vee . The positive formulas are of the form: $\exists \bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, where φ is quantifier-free positive formula.

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

$$\forall \bar{x}(\varphi(\bar{x}) \rightarrow \psi(\bar{x}))$$

where φ and ψ are positive formulas.

The h-universal sentences are the sentences that can be written as negation of a positive sentence.

Let A and B be two L -structures and f a mapping from A into B . f is said to be

- a homomorphism, if 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 $B \models \phi(f(\bar{a}))$. In this case we say that B is a continuation of A .
- an embedding, if f is a homomorphism such that for every atomic formula ϕ ; $A \models \phi(\bar{a})$ if and only if $B \models \phi(f(\bar{a}))$.
- an immersion whenever $\bar{a} \in A$ and $f(\bar{a})$ satisfy the same L -positive formulas, for every $\bar{a} \in A$.

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

We denote by $Diag^{+*}(A)$ the set of positive sentences true in A over the language L .

Definition 1 *A L -structure (resp. model) M of a class Γ (resp. of an h -inductive L -theory T) is said to be pc in Γ (of T) if every homomorphism from M into a member of Γ (resp. into a model of T) is an immersion.*

In [3] it is shown that the pc models exist for any consistent h -inductive theory. We have the useful following fact.

Lemma 1 ([3, Théorème 1, lemme 12]) :

- Every member of an h -inductive class is continued in a pc member of the class.
- The class of pc models of an h -inductive theory T is h -inductive.

1.2 Positively complete and T-complete theories

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

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 h -inductive theory of the pc models of T . Likewise, T has a minimal companion denoted $T_u(T)$, formed by its h -universal consequences sentences.

Note that if T' is an h -inductive theory such that $T_u(T) \subseteq T' \subseteq T_k(T)$ then T' and T are companion theories.

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.

Let A be a L -structure and B a subset of A . 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 $T_i^*(A)$).
- $T_i(A|B)$ (resp. $T_u(A|B)$) denote the set of h-inductive (resp. h-universal) $L(B)$ -sentences satisfied by A .

Definition 4 Let A and B two L -structures and f a homomorphism from A into B . f is said to be a strong immersion if B is a model of $T_i(A)$ in the language $L(A)$.

Definition 5 • An h-inductive theory T is said to be positively complete (or it has the joint continuation (in short JC) property) if any two models of T have a common continuation.

- Let T_1, T_2 and T three h-inductive L -theories. T_1 and T_2 are said to be T -complete if for every models A of T_1 and B of T_2 , there is C a common continuation of A and B such that $C \vdash T$.

The following remark lists some simple properties which will be useful in the rest of the paper.

Remark 1 Let A and B two L -structures and T an h-inductive L -theory.

1. $T_u(A)$ and $\text{Diag}^+(A)$ (resp $T_u^*(A)$ and $\text{Diag}^{+*}(A)$) are subsets of $T_i(A)$ (resp. $T_i^*(A)$).
2. A is a pc model of $T_i(A)$, and $T_i(A) = T_k(A)$.
3. $T_u(T)$ (resp. $T_u(A)$) is the h-universal part of $T_k(T)$ (resp. $T_i(A)$). The same is true for $T_u^*(A)$ and $T_i^*(A)$.
4. $T_i(A) \subseteq T_i(B) \Rightarrow T_u(A) \subseteq T_u(B)$.
5. $T_i^*(A) \subseteq T_i^*(B) \Rightarrow T_u^*(A) \subseteq T_u^*(B)$.
6. If T is positively complete and A a pc model of T , then $T_k(T) = T_i^*(A)$ and $T_u(T) = T_u^*(A)$.
7. If A and B are pc models of T and B is a continuation of A then $T_i^*(A) = T_i^*(B)$.
8. If A is continued in B then $T_u^*(B) \subseteq T_u^*(A)$.
9. If A is immersed in B then $T_u^*(A) = T_u^*(B)$ and $T_i^*(B) \subseteq T_i^*(A)$.

10. $T_u^*(A) = \{\neg\exists\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x}) \mid \exists\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x}) \notin \text{Diag}^{+*}(A)\}$.
11. $\text{Diag}^{+*}(A) \subseteq \text{Diag}^{+*}(B) \Leftrightarrow T_u^*(B) \subseteq T_u^*(A)$.
12. If $T_u^*(A) \subseteq T_u^*(B)$ (resp. $T_i^*(A) \subseteq T_i^*(B)$), then $T \cup \text{Diag}^+(A) \cup \text{Diag}^+(B)$ is consistent in the language $L(A \cup B)$.
13. If $T_u^*(A) \subseteq T_u^*(B)$ then $\text{Diag}^+(A) \cup \text{Diag}^+(B)$ is consistent over the language $L(A \cup B)$.
14. For every pc models A and B of T , if $T_u^*(A) = T_u^*(B)$ then $T_i^*(A) = T_i^*(B)$.
15. T_1 and T_2 are T -complete if and only if for every $A \vdash T_1$ and $B \vdash T_2$, $\text{Diag}^+(A) \cup \text{Diag}^+(B) \cup T$ is $L(A \cup B)$ -consistent.
16. Let (T_1, T_2) be a pair of T -complete theories. For every T'_1, T'_2 and T' companion theories of T_1, T_2 and T respectively, the pair (T'_1, T'_2) is T' -complete.

Lemma 2 Let A be a pc model of an h -inductive L -theory T , then

1. $T_u^*(A)$ is minimal in the set $\{T_u^*(B) \mid B \models T\}$.
2. $T_i^*(A)$ is maximal in the set $\{T_i^*(B) \mid B \models T\}$.

Proof.

1. Let B a model of T such that $T_u^*(B) \subseteq T_u^*(A)$. By the property 13 of the Remark 1, there exists C a model of T that is a common continuation of A and B . Given that A is a pc model, from the properties 8 and 9 of the Remark 1 it follows that

$$T_u^*(A) = T_u^*(C) \subseteq T_u^*(B).$$

2. Let B a model of T such that $T_i^*(A) \subseteq T_i^*(B)$. We claim that $\text{Diag}^+(A) \cup T_i(B)$ is consistent in the language $L(A \cup B)$. Indeed, if not, by compactness there exists $\psi(\bar{a}) \in \text{Diag}^+(A)$ such that $T_i(B) \models \neg\exists\bar{x}\psi(\bar{x})$. Given that $T_i^*(B)$ is the part of $T_i(B)$ without parameters of B , then $T_i^*(B) \models \neg\exists\bar{x}\psi(\bar{x})$. On the other hand since

$$\exists\bar{x}\psi(\bar{x}) \in \text{Diag}^{+*}(A) \subset T_i^*(A) \subseteq T_i^*(B),$$

we obtain a contradiction. Thereby $\text{Diag}^+(A) \cup T_i(B)$ is consistent in the language $L(A \cup B)$, which implies the existence of a model D of $T_i(B)$ in the language $L(A \cup B)$, such that

$$A \xrightarrow{f} D \xleftarrow{g} B.$$

where f is an homomorphism and g an immersion.

Given that D is also a model of T and A pc model of T , then f is an immersion. By the property 9 of the remark 1 we obtain

$$T_i^*(B) \subseteq T_i^*(D) \subseteq T_i^*(A) \subseteq T_i^*(B).$$

Lemma 3 *Let T_1, T_2 and T three h -inductive L -theories. T_1 and T_2 are T -complete if and only if one of the following holds:*

1. *For every free-quantifier positive formulas $\varphi(\bar{x})$ and $\psi(\bar{y})$, If $T \vdash \neg\exists\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x}) \vee \neg\exists\bar{y}\psi(\bar{y})$ then $T_1 \vdash \neg\exists\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x})$ or $T_2 \vdash \neg\exists\bar{y}\psi(\bar{y})$.*
2. $T_u(T) \subseteq T_u(T_1) \cap T_u(T_2)$.

Proof.

1. Suppose that T_1, T_2 and T satisfy the following:

- T_1 and T_2 are T -complete.
- $T \vdash \neg\exists\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x}) \vee \neg\exists\bar{y}\psi(\bar{y})$.
- $T_1 \not\vdash \neg\exists\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x})$.
- $T_2 \not\vdash \neg\exists\bar{y}\psi(\bar{y})$.

Then there are A and B models of T_1 and T_2 respectively, such that $A \models \varphi(\bar{a})$ for some $\bar{a} \in A$, and $B \models \psi(\bar{b})$ for some $\bar{b} \in B$. Let C be a common continuation of A and B that is a model of T , then $C \models \exists\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge \exists\bar{y}\psi(\bar{y})$, contradiction.

Conversely, suppose that T_1, T_2 and T satisfy the property 1. Let A and B models of T_1 and T_2 respectively. We claim that $Diag^+(A) \cup Diag^+(B) \cup T$ is $L(A \cup B)$ -consistent. If not, there are $\varphi(\bar{a}) \in Diag^+(A)$ and $\psi(\bar{b}) \in Diag^+(B)$ such that $T \vdash \neg(\exists\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge \exists\bar{y}\psi(\bar{y}))$. Thereby $T_1 \not\vdash \neg\exists\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x})$ and $T_2 \not\vdash \neg\exists\bar{y}\psi(\bar{y})$, contradiction.

2. Suppose that T_1 and T_2 are T -complete, it is clear that $T_u(T) \subseteq T_u(T_1) \cap T_u(T_2)$.

The proof of the other direction is the same as the second part of the proof of 1 applies at the theories $T_u(T_1), T_u(T_2)$ and $T_u(T)$, knowing that T_1 and T_2 are T -complete if and only if $T_u(T_1)$ and $T_u(T_2)$ are $T_u(T)$ -complete.

Lemma 4 *An h -inductive T theory has the JC property if and only if one of the following holds:*

1. *For any free-quantifier positive formulas $\varphi(\bar{x})$ and $\psi(\bar{y})$, if $T \vdash \neg\exists\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x}) \vee \neg\exists\bar{y}\psi(\bar{y})$ then $T \vdash \neg\exists\bar{x}\varphi(\bar{x})$ or $T \vdash \neg\exists\bar{y}\psi(\bar{y})$.*
2. *For every positive formulas $\varphi(\bar{x})$ and $\psi(\bar{y})$, if $T \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x})\}$ and $T \cup \{\psi(\bar{y})\}$ are consistent sets then $T \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}), \psi(\bar{y})\}$ is a consistent set.*
3. $T_u(T) = T_u^*(A)$ for some model A of T .
4. $T_k(T) = T_k^*(A)$ for some model A of T .
5. *For every pc models A and B of T we have $T_u^*(A) = T_u^*(B)$.*

Proof.

1. Well known for complete theories in first order logic.
2. Clear
3. Let T be an h-inductive theory and A a model of T such that $T_u(T) = T_u^*(A)$. Let B and C two pc models of T . Given that $T_u(T) = T_u^*(A) \subseteq T_u^*(B) \cap T_u^*(C)$, by the minimality of the h-universal theory of the pc models, we obtain

$$T_u^*(A) = T_u^*(B) = T_u^*(C).$$

From the property 13 of the Remark 1, we deduce the existence of a common continuation of B and C by a model of T . Thereby T is positively complete.

The other direction follows from 6 of the remark 1.

4. Let A be a model of T such that $T_k(T) = T_i^*(A)$. Let B and C be two pc models of T . Since

$$T_i^*(A) = T_k(T) \subseteq T_i^*(B) \cap T_i^*(C)$$

then $T_u^*(A) \subseteq T_u^*(B) \cap T_u^*(C)$. Given that $T_u^*(B)$ and $T_u^*(C)$ are minimal, we obtain

$$T_u^*(A) = T_u^*(B) = T_u^*(C).$$

By the property 13 of the Remark 1, we get a common continuation of B and C by a model of T . Thereby T is positively complete.

The other direction results from the property 6 of the remark 1.

Lemma 5 *Let A be a L -structure. The theories $T_u^*(A)$ and $T_i^*(A)$ are companion and positively completes.*

Proof. It is clear that every model of $T_i^*(A)$ is a model of $T_u^*(A)$.

In the next step we will show that every model of $T_u^*(A)$ is continued into a model of $T_i^*(A)$. Let B be a model of $T_u^*(A)$, we claim that $Diag^+(B) \cup T_i^*(A)$ is consistent in the language $L(B)$. Indeed, if not, by compactness there exists $\psi(\bar{b}) \in Diag^+(B)$ such that $T_i^*(A) \models \neg \exists \bar{x} \psi(\bar{x})$, then $\neg \exists \bar{x} \psi(\bar{x}) \in T_u^*(A)$. Given that $T_u^*(A) \subseteq T_u^*(B)$ and $\exists \bar{x} \psi(\bar{x}) \in Diag^{+*}(B)$, we obtain a contradiction. Thereby $Diag^+(B) \cup T_i^*(A)$ is consistent, so B is continued in a model of $T_i^*(A)$.

The second part of the lemma results from the properties 2 and 3 of the lemma 4. \square

Remark 2 • *We have the same results of the lemma 5 for the theories $T_u(A|B)$ and $T_i(A|B)$, where B is a subset of A .*

- *Let A_e be a pc model of an h-inductive theory T . Let A be a subset of A_e . Every pc model of $T_u(A_e|A)$ in the language $L(A)$ is a pc model of T in the language L .
Indeed, Let B_e be a pc model of $T_u(A_e|A)$, since $T_u(A_e|A)$ is positively*

complete, there is a common continuation C of A_e and B_e in the language $L(A)$ which in turn can be continued in a pc model C_e of T . As A_e is immersed in C_e , so C_e is a model of $T_u(A_e|A)$, then B_e is immersed in C_e , which implies that B_e is a pc model of T .

Lemma 6 *Let T be a positively complete h -inductive L -theory and A_e a pc model of T that is also a pc model of an h -inductive L -theory T' . Then every pc model of T is a pc model of T' , and every pc model of T' that is a model of T is a pc model of T .*

Proof. Given that A_e is a pc model of T' , then $T' \subset T_k(T) = T_i^*(A_e)$. Let B be a pc model of T , since $T_i^*(A_e) = T_i^*(B)$ then B is a model of T' . Let f be a homomorphism from B into B' a pc model of T' , from the property 8 of the remark 1 we have

$$T_u^*(B') \subseteq T_u^*(B) = T_k(T) = T_u^*(A_e).$$

Now by the property 12 of the remark 1, we obtain the consistency of $T' \cup \text{Diag}^+(A_e) \cup \text{Diag}^+(B')$, which gives the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & A & \\ & \searrow i_m & \\ B & \xrightarrow{f} B' & \xrightarrow{f'} C \end{array}$$

where C is a model of T' that we can take it pc model. We deduce the following equalities:

$$T_k(T) = T_i^*(B) = T_i^*(A_e) = T_i^*(C) = T_i^*(B').$$

Thereby f is an immersion, and B is a pc model of T' .

For the second part of the lemma. Let B_e be a pc model of T' such that $B_e \vdash T$, let f be a homomorphism from B_e into a pc model B of T . Given that B is also a pc model of T' , then f is an immersion, and so B_e is a pc model of T . \square

Corollary 1 *Let T be an h -inductive theory and A a pc model of T . Every pc model of the L -theory $T_i^*(A)$ is a pc model of T , and every pc model of T which is a model of $T_i^*(A)$ is a pc model of $T_i^*(A)$.*

Proof. The corollary follows directly from the fact that $T_i^*(A)$ is positively complete and A is a common pc of T and $T_i^*(A)$. \square

Remark 3 • *If the language of theory T' in the lemma 6 contains the language of T , we obtain a similar result. We have the possibility of interpreting a pc model of T in the language of T' .*

- Let A be a subset of A_e a pc model of T , let $\langle A \rangle$ be the subset of A_e generated by A . It follows from the second property of the remark 2 that every pc model of $T_u(A_e | \langle A \rangle)$ in the language $L(\langle A \rangle)$ is a pc model of $T_u(A_e | A)$ in the language $L(A)$.
Conversely, every pc model of $T_u(A_e | A)$ is a pc model of $T_u(A_e | \langle A \rangle)$.
Indeed, let B_e be a pc model of $T_u(A_e | A)$, since A_e is a pc model of the positively complete theory $T_u(A_e | A)$, there exist a pc model C_e which is a common continuation of A_e and B_e . thereby the substructures generated by A in A_e, B_e and C_e are isomorphic, which implies that B_e is a model of $T_u(A_e | \langle A \rangle)$. Therefore B_e is a pc model of $T_u(A_e | \langle A \rangle)$.

Lemma 7 Let T be a positively complete h -universal theory over a language containing a non empty set of constants C . If for every model A of T we have $T_u^*(A) = T$, then there exist a model M of T such that the class of pc models of T is equal to the class of pc models of $T_u(M)$ in the language $L(M)$.

Proof. Let A be a pc model of T , denote by C_A the set of interpretation of C in A and by $\langle C_A \rangle$ the substructure of A generated by C_A .
Given that T is positively complete, then for every pc models A and B there exists a pc model C of T that is a common continuation of A and B , thereby the structures $\langle C_A \rangle, \langle C_B \rangle$ and $\langle C_C \rangle$ are isomorphic. Consequently, every pc model A of T is a pc model of $T_u(\langle C_A \rangle)$ in the language $L(\langle C_A \rangle)$.
Conversely, let A be a pc model of T , we will show that $\langle C_A \rangle$ is a pc model of T . Considering that the elements of $\langle C_A \rangle$ are the terms of the language L (modulo T) and $\langle C_A \rangle$ is a model of T , we can suppose that $T_u(T) = T_u(\langle C_A \rangle)$ in the language $L(\langle C_A \rangle)$. Since $\langle C_A \rangle$ is embedded in A and A is a model of $T_u(\langle C_A \rangle)$ then $\langle C_A \rangle$ is immersed in A , thereby $\langle C_A \rangle$ is a pc model of T . \square

The following example list some anomaly situations in the positive logic that we will try to deal by some changes focused on the language and the theories.

Example 1 1. Let T_{pos} the h -inductive theory of posets in the relational language $L = \{\leq\}$. T_{pos} is positively complete and has only one pc model which is the trivial structure $(\{x\}, \leq)$.

2. Let L be the language formed by the functional symbol L .

- (a) For every integer n , let T_n be the h -inductive theory $\{\exists x f^n(x) = x\}$. For every n , the theory T_n is positively complete and has only one pc model which is the structure $(\{x\}, f)$ such that $f(x) = x$.
- (b) For every integer n , let T_n be the h -inductive theory $\{\neg \exists x f^n(x) = x\}$. For every integer n , we can view the models of T_n as directed graphs such that the vertexes of the graph are the element of the model, and two vertexes a and b are jointed by an edge pointed from a into b if $f(a) = b$. The theory T_n is positively complete and has only one pc formed by the graph that contains for every prime p that not divide n , one cycles of length p .

3. Let T_g the h -inductive theory of groups in the usual language L_g of groups. The trivial group is the unique pc model of T_g .

In order to rectify the anomaly observed in the last example, we propose two distinct methods which we will apply to the theory T_g .

the first method consists to define positively the inequality by adding a binary relation symbol R to L_g interpreting by $R(a, b) \leftrightarrow a \neq b$. The pc model of the new theory so defined are the existentially closed groups in the context of logic with negation.

The second method consists to discard the trivial groups by adding a symbol of constant a to L_g and consider the theory $T_g^+ = T_g \cup \{a \neq e\}$. In the following we will draw some features of the class of pc models of T_g^+ . Let G be a pc model of T_g^+ and a_G the interpretation of the new constant in G , let L^+ the language of T_g^+ .

- Unlike T_G , the theory T_g^+ is not positively complete.
- For every integer n there exists an element of G of order n (just embed G into a group that satisfy $\exists x x^n = e$).
- The pc models of T_g^+ are simple. Indeed, suppose that G is not simple, let N be a normal subgroup of a pc model G and f_N the canonical homomorphism defined from G into G/N . To make f_N an immersion, it is necessary that $a_G \in N$, thereby a_G must belong to every normal subgroup of G .
Given that every L^+ -homomorphism is an homomorphism of groups, it follows that $f(a_G) = e$ for every homomorphism of groups, contradiction.
- (G, b_G) is a pc model for every $b \neq e$ in G . Indeed, if f is an $L_g(b_G)$ -homomorphism then f is an $L_g(a_G)$ -homomorphism (since $f(a_G) \neq e$), thereby f is an $L_g(b_G)$ -immersion.

2 General forms of amalgamation

For our needs, we adopt the following notations:

Let A and B are two L -structures and f a mapping from A into B . We say that f is:

- h – *hom* if f is a homomorphism.
- e – *hom* if f is an embedding.
- i – *hom* if f is an immersion.
- s – *hom* if f is a strong immersion.

Definition 6 Let Γ be a class of L -structures and A a member of Γ . Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ members of $\{h\text{ -- hom}, e\text{ -- hom}, i\text{ -- hom}, s\text{ -- hom}\}$. We say that A is an $[\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta]$ -amalgamation basis of Γ if for all B, C in Γ , f a α – *hom* from

A into B and g a β – hom from A into C , there exist $D \in \Gamma$, f' a γ – hom from B into D and g' a δ – hom from C into D such that the following diagram commutes:

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

We say that Γ has the $[\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta]$ -amalgamation property if every element of Γ is an $[\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta]$ -amalgamation basis of Γ .

We say that A is an $[\alpha, \beta]$ -asymmetric amalgamation basis of Γ , if A is $[\alpha, \beta, \alpha, \beta]$ -amalgamation basis of Γ .

We say that A is $[\alpha, \gamma]$ -pregeneric amalgamation basis of Γ , if A is $[\alpha, \alpha, \beta, \beta]$ -amalgamation basis of Γ .

We say that A is an $[\alpha]$ - amalgamation basis of Γ , if A is $[\alpha, \alpha, \alpha, \alpha]$ -amalgamation basis of Γ .

We say that A is $[\alpha, \gamma]$ -strong amalgamation basis of Γ , if A is $[\alpha, \gamma]$ -pregeneric amalgamation basis of Γ , and for every B, C members of Γ ; if A is continued into B and C by α – hom, then there exist $D \in \Gamma$, f' and g' γ – hom such that the following diagram commutes:

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

and $\forall (y, z) \in B \times C$, if $g'(y) = f'(z)$ then $y \in g(A)$ and $z \in h(A)$.

We say that A is an $[\alpha]$ - strong amalgamation basis of Γ , if A is a $[\alpha, \alpha]$ - strong amalgamation basis.

In the following remark, We observe that the most forms of amalgamations given in the previous definition, can be characterized by the notions of completeness and positive completeness which are given in the previous section.

Remark 4 Let T be an h -inductive L -theory and A a model of T . We have the following properties:

1. A is an h -amalgamation basis of T if and only if $T \cup \text{Diag}^+(A)$ is positively $L(A)$ -complete theory.
2. A is an e -amalgamation basis of T if and only if $T \cup \text{Diag}(A)$ is positively $L(A)$ -complete theory.
3. A is an i -amalgamation basis of T if and only if $T \cup \text{Diag}^+(A) \cup T_u(A)$ is positively $L(A)$ -complete theory.

4. A is an $[h, e, h, h]$ -amalgamation basis of T if and only if the theories $T \cup \text{Diag}^+(A)$ and $T \cup \text{Diag}(A)$ are T -complete.

In the following example, we will list some facts on amalgamation with the notations and terms given in the definition 6.

- Example 2** 1. Every L -structure A is an $[i, h, s, h]$ -amalgamation basis in the class of L -structures (lemma 4, [1]). Since every strongly immersion is an immersion, it follows that every L -structure A is an $[s, h]$ -asymmetric amalgamation basis in the class of L -structures.
2. Every L -structure A is an $[s, i]$ -asymmetric amalgamation basis in the class of L -structures (lemma 5, [1]).
3. Every L -structure A is an $[e, s]$ -asymmetric amalgamation basis in the class of L -structures (lemma 4, [?]).
4. Every L -structure A is an $[i, h]$ -asymmetric amalgamation basis in the class of L -structures (lemma 8, [3]).
5. Every pc model of an h -inductive theory T is an $[h]$ -amalgamation basis in the class of model of T .
6. The class of $[h]$ -amalgamation basis of the theory of rings are the class of local rings (example 3, [2]).
7. Every L -structure A is an $[s]$ -amalgamation basis in the class of L -structure. Indeed, suppose that A is strongly immersed in two L -structures B and C . Let $L(B \cup C)$ the language in which we interpret the element of A by the same symbol in B and C . It is easier to prove that $T_i(C) \cup T_i(B)$ is $L(B \cup C)$ -consistent.

Theorem 1 Every L -structure A is a $[s, i, s, i]$ -strong amalgamation basis in the class of L -structures.

Proof. Let A be a L -structure, Suppose that A is immersed in a L -structure B , and strongly immersed in a L -structure C . Suppose that the set

$$T_i(B) \cup T_u(C) \cup \text{Diag}^+(B) \cup \text{Diag}^+(C) \cup \{b \neq c \mid b \in B - A, c \in C - A\}$$

is $L(B \cup C)$ -inconsistent. Then there are $\neg\psi(\bar{a}, \bar{c}) \in T_u(C)$, $\varphi_1(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \in \text{Diag}^+(B)$ and $\varphi_2(\bar{a}, \bar{c}) \in \text{Diag}^+(C)$ such that

$$T_i(B) \cup \{\neg\psi(\bar{a}, \bar{c}), \varphi_1(\bar{a}, \bar{b}), \varphi_2(\bar{a}, \bar{c}), \bigwedge_{i,j} b_i \neq c_j\}$$

is $L(B \cup C)$ -inconsistent, thereby

$$T_i(B) \vdash \forall \bar{y} ((\varphi_1(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \wedge \varphi_2(\bar{a}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow (\psi(\bar{a}, \bar{y}) \vee \bigvee_{i,j} b_i = y_j)). \quad (1)$$

Now, since $C \not\models \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{c})$ and $C \models \varphi_2(\bar{a}, \bar{c})$, then there is $\bar{a}' \in A$ such that $A \models \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{a}')$ and $A \models \varphi_2(\bar{a}, \bar{a}')$, because otherwise we obtain

$$A \vdash \forall \bar{x} (\varphi_2(\bar{a}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{x})).$$

and given that $C \vdash T_i(A)$, we get a contradiction.

So, we obtain $B \models \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{a}')$ and $B \models \varphi_2(\bar{a}, \bar{a}')$. From (1) we obtain $B \models \bigvee_{i,j} b_i = a'_j$. Since $b_i \notin A$, we obtain a contradiction. Then

$$T_i(B) \cup T_u(C) \cup \text{Diag}^+(B) \cup \text{Diag}^+(C) \cup \{b \neq c \mid b \in B - A, c \in C - A\}$$

is $L(B \cup C)$ -consistent. \square

Theorem 2 *Let T be an h -inductive theory. Every model A of T is a $[i, i, h, h]$ -strong amalgamation basis of T .*

Proof. Let A be a model of T , let f and g two immersion from A into B and C respectively. We claim that the set

$$T \cup \text{Diag}^+(B) \cup \text{Diag}^+(C) \cup \{b \neq c \mid b \in B - A, c \in C - A\}$$

is $L(B \cup C)$ -consistent. Indeed, otherwise we could find $\bar{a} \in A, \bar{b} \in B - A, \bar{c} \in C - A$, and $\varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \in \text{Diag}^+(B), \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{c}) \in \text{Diag}^+(C)$ such that

$$T \cup \{\varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b}), \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{c}), \bigwedge_{i,j} b_i \neq c_j\}$$

is $L(B \cup C)$ -inconsistent. Which implies that

$$T \vdash \forall \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z} ((\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \wedge \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow \bigvee_{i,j} y_i = z_j).$$

Now, since $C \models \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{c})$ and A is immersed in C , then there is $\bar{a}' \in A$ such that $A \models \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{a}')$. Consequently, $B \models \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{a}') \wedge \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$. Given that $T \vdash \forall \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z} ((\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \wedge \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow \bigvee_{i,j} y_i = z_j)$, $\bar{b} \in B - A$, and B is a model of B , we obtain $B \models \bigvee_{i,j} b_i = a'_j$, contradiction, which implies that $T \cup \text{Diag}^+(B) \cup \text{Diag}^+(C) \cup \{b \neq c \mid b \in B - A, c \in C - A\}$ is consistent. Thereby A is a $[i, i, h, h]$ -strong amalgamation basis of T . \square

Corollary 2 *Every pc model of an h -inductive theory T is an $[h]$ -strong amalgamation basis of T .*

Lemma 8 *Every model of an h -inductive theory T is an $[i, h, i, h]$ -strong amalgamation basis of T .*

Proof. We proceed as in the proof of the theorem 2. Let A, B and C three models of T , such that A is immersed in B and continued in C by a homomorphism f . The proof consists of showing the $L(B \cup C)$ -consistency of the set

$$T_i(C) \cup \text{Diag}^+(B) \cup \text{Diag}^+(C) \cup \{b \neq c \mid b \in B - A, c \in C - f(A)\}.$$

Suppose that is not the case, then

$$T_i(C) \vdash \forall \bar{y} \ ((\varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{c}) \wedge \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow \bigvee_{i,j} y_i = c_j).$$

Given that $B \models \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ and A is immersed in B , there is $\bar{a}' \in A$ such that $A \models \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{a}')$. Which implies $C \models \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{c}) \wedge \psi(\bar{a}, \bar{f}(\bar{a}'))$, thereby $C \models \bigvee_{i,j} f(\bar{a}')_i = c_j$, contradiction. \square

Lemma 9 *Let B be a $[h]$ -strong amalgamation basis of T and A a model of T that is immersed in B , then A is a $[h]$ -strong amalgamation basis of T .*

Proof. Suppose that A is continued into C and D two models of T by f_1 and f_2 respectively. Given that A is immersed in B , and every L -structure is an $[i, h, s, h]$ -strong amalgamation basis in the class of models of T (lemma 8), we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & C & \xrightarrow{i_1} & C' \\ & f_1 \nearrow & & & \nearrow f_2 \\ A & \xrightarrow{i} & B & & \\ & g_1 \searrow & & & \searrow g_2 \\ & & D & \xrightarrow{i_2} & D' \end{array}$$

where i_1 and i_2 are immersions, f_2 and g_2 homomorphisms and C', D' two models of T . Now since B is a $[h]$ -strong amalgamation basis of T , we complete the previous diagram and we get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & C & \xrightarrow{i_1} & C' & & \\ & f_1 \nearrow & & & \nearrow f_2 & & \\ A & \xrightarrow{i} & B & & & & \\ & g_1 \searrow & & & \searrow g_2 & & \\ & & D & \xrightarrow{i_2} & D' & & \\ & & & & & \nearrow g_3 & \\ & & & & & & E \end{array}$$

where E is a model of T , f_3 and g_3 homomorphisms such that

$$\forall c \in C' - f_2(B), \forall d \in D' - g_2(B); \quad f_3(c) \neq g_3(d).$$

Given that the diagram is commutative. A , C and D are immersed in B , C' and D' repetitively. Then

$$\forall c \in C - f_1(A), \forall d \in D - g_2(A); \quad s_1 \circ f_3(c) \neq s_2 \circ g_3(d).$$

References

- [1] Belkasmı, M.: *Positive model theory and amalgamations. Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*. Vol 55. Number 2. (2014)
- [2] Belkasmı, M.: *Positive amalgamations. Logica Universalis* preprint.
- [3] Ben Yaacov, I., Poizat, B.: *Fondements de la logique positive. Journal of Symbolic Logic*. 72. 1141–1162. (2007)
- [4] Hrushovski, E.: *Simplicity and the Lascar group. Preprint*. (1998)
- [5] Pillay, A.: *Forking in the category of existentially closed structure. In connection between model theory and algebraic and analytic geometry. Quaderni di Matematica. University of Napoli*. vol 6. 23-42. (2000)