

Computability models over categories

Iosif Petrakis

Mathematics Institute, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
petrakis@math.lmu.de

Abstract

Generalising slightly the notions of a strict computability model and of a simulation between them, which were elaborated by Longley and Normann in [8], we define canonical computability models over categories and appropriate **Set**-valued functors on them. We study the canonical total computability model over a category, and the partial one over a category with pullbacks. Our notions and results are generalised to categories with a base of computability, connecting, unexpectedly, Rosolini’s theory of dominions with the theory of computability models.

Keywords: computability models, category theory, dominions

1 Introduction

In their book [8] Longley and Normann not only give a comprehensive introduction to Higher-Order Computability (HOC) presenting the various approaches to HOC, but they also fit them into a coherent and unifying framework, making their comparison possible. Their main tool is a general notion of computability model¹ and of an appropriate concept of simulation of one computability model in another. Turing machines, programming languages, λ -calculus etc., are shown to be computational models, not necessarily in a unique way.

As it is remarked in [2], p. 3, computability theory has “still not received the level of categorical attention it deserves”. It seems though, that the “categorical spirit” of the notions of a computability model and a simulation between them is behind the remarkable success of the framework of Longley and Normann. E.g., their, completely categorical in nature, notion of equivalence of computability models (see Definition 2.2) is deeper than the one suggested by the standard presentations of computability theory, according to which different notions of computability are equivalent if they generate the same class of partial computable functions from \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{N} (see [8], Section 1.1.5). Longley and Normann associated in a canonical way to a computability model² \mathcal{C} its category of assemblies $\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C})$, and showed that the computability models \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} are equivalent if and only if the categories of assemblies $\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{D})$ are equivalent. The category of computability models and the corresponding functor $\mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C})$ are studied extensively in [7].

In this paper we associate in a canonical way a computability model to a category \mathcal{C} , given an appropriate **Set**-valued functor on \mathcal{C} . For that we slightly generalise the definition of a computability model, allowing the classes of type names T and of partial functions $C[\sigma, \tau]$ in a computability model to be proper classes. The computability models considered in [8] are called *small* in Definition 2.1, and working solely with them we can only define the computability model of a small category. The notion of a simulation between computability models is also slightly generalised, as the function between the corresponding classes of type names is, generally, a class-function. Although Longley and Normann usually work with *lax* computability models, to our needs the so-called *strict* computability models suit best³.

¹This notion is rooted in previous work of Longley in [5]-[7], and is influenced by the work of Cockett and Hofstra in [3] and [4] (see [8], p. 52).

²In [8] this category is defined for lax computability models, but, as it is remarked in [8], p. 91, the definition makes sense for an arbitrary computability model.

³For a discussion on “strict vs. lax” see [7], section 2.1.

In section 2 we include all basic notions and facts necessary to the rest of this paper. In section 3 we study the canonical total computability model over a category \mathcal{C} and a functor $S: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. In section 4 we study the canonical (partial) computability model over a category \mathcal{C} with pullbacks and a functor $S: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ that preserves pullbacks. In section 5 we define the notion of a base of computability for a category \mathcal{C} , and the canonical (partial) computability model over a category \mathcal{C} with a base of computability for \mathcal{C} and a functor $S: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ that preserves pullbacks. The first two constructions are shown to be special cases of the last one. All computability models defined here have their dual form e.g., the computability model over a category \mathcal{C} with a cobase of computability for \mathcal{C} and a functor $S: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ that sends pushouts to pullbacks is also defined.

For all categorical notions and facts mentioned here we refer to [1].

2 Computability models

Definition 2.1. *Let T be a class, the elements of which are called type names. A computability model \mathbf{C} over T is a pair*

$$\mathbf{C} = ((\mathbf{C}(\tau))_{\tau \in T}, (\mathbf{C}[\sigma, \tau])_{(\sigma, \tau) \in T \times T}),$$

where $|\mathbf{C}| = (\mathbf{C}(\tau))_{\tau \in T}$ is a family of sets $\mathbf{C}(\tau)$ over T , called the datatypes of \mathbf{C} , and $(\mathbf{C}[\sigma, \tau])_{(\sigma, \tau) \in T \times T}$ is a family of classes $\mathbf{C}[\sigma, \tau]$ of partial functions $\mathbf{C}(\sigma) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}(\tau)$ over $T \times T$, such that the following hold:

(CM₁) *The identity function $\text{id}_{\mathbf{C}(\tau)}: \mathbf{C}(\tau) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}(\tau)$ is in $\mathbf{C}[\tau, \tau]$, for every $\tau \in T$,*

(CM₂) *For every $f \in \mathbf{C}[\rho, \sigma]$ and $g \in \mathbf{C}[\sigma, \tau]$, the composite partial function $g \circ f$ is in $\mathbf{C}[\rho, \tau]$, for every $\rho, \sigma, \tau \in T$.*

If the classes $\mathbf{C}[\sigma, \tau]$ are sets, for every $\sigma, \tau \in T$, we call \mathbf{C} locally small. If T is also a set, we call \mathbf{C} small. If every element of $\mathbf{C}[\sigma, \tau]$ is a total function, for every $\sigma, \tau \in T$, then \mathbf{C} is called total.

For the rest of this paper T, U, W are classes, and $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{E}$ are computability models over T, U, W , respectively.

Definition 2.2. *A simulation γ of \mathbf{C} in \mathbf{D} , in symbols $\gamma: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$, is a pair*

$$\gamma = (\gamma, (\Vdash_{\tau}^{\gamma})_{\tau \in T}),$$

where $\gamma: T \rightarrow U$ is a class function, and $\Vdash_{\tau}^{\gamma} \subseteq \mathbf{D}(\gamma(\tau)) \times \mathbf{C}(\tau)$, for every $\tau \in T$, such that the following hold:

$$\text{(Siml}_1) \quad \forall \tau \in T \forall x \in \mathbf{C}(\tau) \exists x' \in \mathbf{D}(\gamma(\tau)) (x' \Vdash_{\tau}^{\gamma} x),$$

$$\text{(Siml}_2) \quad \forall \sigma, \tau \in T \forall f \in \mathbf{C}[\sigma, \tau] \exists f' \in \mathbf{D}[\gamma(\sigma), \gamma(\tau)] (f' \Vdash_{(\sigma, \tau)}^{\gamma} f),$$

where the relation “ f is tracked by f' through γ ” is defined by

$$f' \Vdash_{(\sigma, \tau)}^{\gamma} f := \Leftrightarrow \forall x \in \mathbf{C}(\sigma) (x \in \text{dom}(f) \Rightarrow \forall x' \in \mathbf{D}(\gamma(\sigma)) (x' \Vdash_{\sigma}^{\gamma} x \Rightarrow x' \in \text{dom}(f') \ \& \ f'(x') \Vdash_{\tau}^{\gamma} f(x))).$$

The identity simulation $\iota_{\mathbf{C}}: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ is the pair $(\text{id}_T, (\Vdash_{\tau}^{\iota_{\mathbf{C}}})_{\tau \in T})$, where $x' \Vdash_{\tau}^{\iota_{\mathbf{C}}} x \Leftrightarrow x' = x$, for every $x', x \in \mathbf{C}(\tau)$. If $\delta: \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}$, the composite simulation $\delta \circ \gamma: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}$ is the pair $(\delta \circ \gamma, (\Vdash_{\tau}^{\delta \circ \gamma})_{\tau \in T})$, where the relation $\Vdash_{\tau}^{\delta \circ \gamma} \subseteq \mathbf{E}(\delta(\gamma(\tau))) \times \mathbf{C}(\tau)$ is defined by

$$z \Vdash_{\tau}^{\delta \circ \gamma} x \Leftrightarrow \exists y \in \mathbf{D}(\gamma(\tau)) (z \Vdash_{\gamma(\tau)}^{\delta} y \ \& \ y \Vdash_{\tau}^{\gamma} x).$$

We denote by $\mathbf{CompMod}$ the category of computability models with simulations. If $\gamma, \delta: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$, then γ is transformable to δ , in symbols $\gamma \leq \delta$, if

$$\forall \tau \in T \exists f \in \mathbf{D}[\gamma(\tau), \delta(\tau)] \forall x \in \mathbf{C}(\tau) \forall x' \in \mathbf{D}(\gamma(\tau)) (x' \Vdash_{\tau}^{\gamma} x \Rightarrow x' \in \text{dom}(f) \ \& \ f(x') \Vdash_{\tau}^{\delta} x).$$

The simulations γ, δ are equivalent, in symbols $\gamma \sim \delta$, if $\gamma \leq \delta$ and $\delta \leq \gamma$. The computational models \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{D} are equivalent, if there are simulations $\gamma: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ and $\delta: \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ such that $\delta \circ \gamma \sim \iota_{\mathbf{C}}$ and $\gamma \circ \delta \sim \iota_{\mathbf{D}}$.

If $f' \Vdash_{(\rho, \sigma)}^{\gamma} f$ and $g' \Vdash_{(\sigma, \tau)}^{\gamma} g$, then $g' \circ f' \Vdash_{(\rho, \tau)}^{\gamma} g \circ f$. Similarly, if $\gamma \leq \gamma'$ and $\delta \leq \delta'$, then $\delta \circ \gamma \leq \delta' \circ \gamma'$, where $\gamma, \gamma': \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ and $\delta, \delta': \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}$.

Definition 2.3. The category $\mathcal{A}sm(\mathbf{C})$ of assemblies over \mathbf{C} has objects triplets (X, τ_X, \Vdash_X) , where X is a set, $\tau_X \in T$, and $\Vdash_X \subseteq \mathbf{C}(\tau_X) \times X$ such that

$$\forall x \in X \exists x' \in \mathbf{C}(\tau_X) (x' \Vdash_X x).$$

A morphism $(X, \tau_X, \Vdash_X) \rightarrow (Y, \tau_Y, \Vdash_Y)$ is a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$, such that there is $\bar{f} \in \mathbf{C}[\tau_X, \tau_Y]$ that “tracks” f , in symbols $\bar{f} \Vdash_X^Y f$, where

$$\bar{f} \Vdash_X^Y f := \Leftrightarrow \forall x \in X \forall y \in \mathbf{C}(\tau_X) (y \Vdash_X x \Rightarrow y \in \text{dom}(\bar{f}) \ \& \ \bar{f}(y) \Vdash_Y f(x)).$$

The forgetful functor $\text{Frg}^{\mathbf{C}}: \mathcal{A}sm(\mathbf{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is defined, as usual, by $\text{Frg}_0^{\mathbf{C}}(X, \tau_X, \Vdash_X) = X$ and $\text{Frg}_1^{\mathbf{C}}(f) = f$.

Clearly, the forgetful functor $\text{Frg}^{\mathbf{C}}$ is injective on arrows.

3 Total computability models over categories

For the rest of this paper \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} are categories, \mathbf{Cat} is the category of categories, \mathbf{Set} is the category of sets, $[\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{Set}]$ is the category of functors from \mathcal{C} to \mathbf{Set} , and $\mathbf{Cat}/\mathbf{Set}$ is the slice category of \mathbf{Cat} over \mathbf{Set} . Let C_0, C_1 be the classes of objects and morphisms in \mathcal{C} , respectively. If $a, b \in C_0$, let $C_1(a, b)$ be the class of morphisms f in C_1 with $\text{dom}(f) = a$ and $\text{cod}(f) = b$.

Definition 3.1. Let $S: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ a (covariant) functor. The total computability model $\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S)$ over \mathcal{C} and S is the pair

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S) &= ((S_0(a))_{a \in C_0}, (S[a, b])_{(a, b) \in C_0 \times C_0}), \\ S[a, b] &= \{S_1(f) \mid f \in C_1(a, b)\}. \end{aligned}$$

If $T: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is contravariant, the total computability model $\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; T)$ over \mathcal{C} and T is defined dually i.e., $T[a, b] = \{T_1(f) \mid f \in C_1(b, a)\}$.

Clearly, $\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S)$ satisfies conditions (CM_1) and (CM_2) . With replacement, if \mathcal{C} is locally small, then $\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S)$ is locally small, and if \mathcal{C} is small, then $\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S)$ is small. Next we describe an “external” and an “internal” functor in the full subcategory TotCompMod of total computability models. The corresponding proofs are omitted, as these are similar to the included proofs of Propositions 4.3 and 4.4.

Proposition 3.2. There is a functor $\mathbf{CM}^t: \mathbf{Cat}/\mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \text{TotCompMod}$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{CM}_0^t(\mathcal{C}, S) &= \mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S), \\ \mathbf{CM}_1^t(F: (\mathcal{C}, S) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, T)) &: \mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S) \rightarrow \mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{D}; T), \\ \mathbf{CM}_1^t(F) &= \gamma_F = (F_0, (\Vdash_a^{\gamma_F})_{a \in C_0}), \\ \Vdash_a^{\gamma_F} &\subseteq T_0(F_0(a)) \times S_0(a), \quad y \Vdash_a^{\gamma_F} x \Leftrightarrow y = x. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.3. There is a faithful functor ${}^t\mathbf{CM}^{\mathcal{C}}: [\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{Set}] \rightarrow \text{TotCompMod}$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} {}^t\mathbf{CM}_0^{\mathcal{C}}(S) &= \mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S), \\ {}^t\mathbf{CM}_1^{\mathcal{C}}(\eta: S \Rightarrow T) &: \mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S) \rightarrow \mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{D}; T), \\ {}^t\mathbf{CM}_1^{\mathcal{C}}(\eta) &= \gamma_{\eta} = (\text{id}_{C_0}, (\Vdash_a^{\gamma_{\eta}})_{a \in C_0}), \\ \Vdash_a^{\gamma_{\eta}} &\subseteq T_0(a) \times S_0(a), \quad y \Vdash_a^{\gamma_{\eta}} x \Leftrightarrow y = \eta_a(x). \end{aligned}$$

By Definition 2.3 the category $\mathcal{A}sm(\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S))$ of assemblies of the total computability model $\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S)$ has objects triplets (X, a_X, \Vdash_X) , where X is a set, $a_X \in C_0$, and $\Vdash_X \subseteq S_0(a_X) \times X$ such that $\forall x \in X \exists x' \in S_0(a_X) (x' \Vdash_X x)$. A morphism $(X, a_X, \Vdash_X) \rightarrow (Y, a_Y, \Vdash_Y)$ is a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$, such that there is $\bar{f} \in S[a_X, a_Y]$ i.e., $g: a_X \rightarrow a_Y \in C_1$ and $\bar{f} = S_1(g): S_0(a_X) \rightarrow S_0(a_Y)$ tracks f , where in this case $\bar{f} \Vdash_X^Y f$ if and only if $\forall x \in X \forall y \in S_0(a_X) (y \Vdash_X x \Rightarrow [S_1(g)](y) \Vdash_Y f(x))$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $F^t: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}sm(\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S))$ be defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} F_0^t(a) &= (S_0(a), a, \Vdash_{S_0(a)}); \quad a \in C_0, \\ y \Vdash_{S_0(a)} x &\Leftrightarrow y = x; \quad y, x \in S_0(a), \\ F_1^t(f: a \rightarrow b): (S_0(a), a, \Vdash_{S_0(a)}) &\rightarrow (S_0(b), b, \Vdash_{S_0(b)}), \quad F_1^t(f) = S_1(f). \end{aligned}$$

- (i) F^t is a full functor, injective on objects.
(ii) If S is injective on arrows, then F^t is an embedding.

Proof. (i) Clearly, $S_1(f)$ tracks itself, and hence $S_1(f)$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{A}sm(\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S))$. Clearly, F^t is a functor, injective on objects. Let $g: (S_0(a), a, \Vdash_{S_0(a)}) \rightarrow (S_0(b), b, \Vdash_{S_0(b)})$ a morphism in $\mathcal{A}sm(\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S))$ i.e., a function $g: S_0(a) \rightarrow S_0(b)$ such that there is $\bar{g} = S_1(h)$, for some $h: a \rightarrow b$ in C_1 , with $S_1(h) \Vdash_{S_0(a)}^{S_0(b)} g$ i.e., $\forall x \in S_0(a) \forall y \in S_0(a) (y = x \Rightarrow [S_1(h)](y) = g(x))$, hence $\forall x \in S_0(a) ([S_1(h)](x) = g(x))$ i.e., $F_1^+(h) = S_1(h) = g$ and F^t is full.

(ii) If S is injective on arrows, then F^t is also injective on arrows, hence faithful, and since it is also full and injective on objects, it is an embedding. \square

Let \mathcal{C} be a small, and $\text{Frg}^{\mathcal{C}}$ the forgetful functor on $\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C})$. If $\bar{X} = (X, \tau_X, \Vdash_X)$ and $\bar{Y} = (Y, \tau_Y, \Vdash_Y)$, the computability model $\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C}); \text{Frg}^{\mathcal{C}})$ over $\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C})$ and $\text{Frg}^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the pair

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C}); \text{Frg}^{\mathcal{C}}) &= \left((X)_{\bar{X} \in \mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C})_0}, (\text{Frg}^{\mathcal{C}}[\bar{X}, \bar{Y}])_{\bar{X}, \bar{Y} \in \mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C})_0} \right), \\ \text{Frg}^{\mathcal{C}}[\bar{X}, \bar{Y}] &= \{f: X \rightarrow Y \mid \exists \bar{f}: C(\tau_X) \rightarrow C(\tau_Y) (\bar{f} \Vdash_X^Y f)\}. \end{aligned}$$

I.e., from a small, and, in general, partial computability model \mathcal{C} , we get the locally small and total computability model $\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C}); \text{Frg}^{\mathcal{C}})$. Due to lack of space, the proof of the following proposition is omitted.

Proposition 3.5. (i) *If \mathcal{C} is small, there is a simulation*

$$\delta^t: \mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C}); \text{Frg}^{\mathcal{C}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C},$$

where $\delta^t = (\delta^t, (\Vdash_{\bar{X}}^{\delta^t})_{\bar{X} \in \mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C})_0})$, with $\delta^t: \mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C})_0 \rightarrow T$, defined by $\delta^t(\bar{X}) = \tau_X$, and $\Vdash_{\bar{X}}^{\delta^t} \subseteq C(\tau_X) \times X$ defined by $\Vdash_{\bar{X}}^{\delta^t} = \Vdash_X$.

(ii) *If \mathcal{C} is total and small, there is a simulation*

$$\gamma^t: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C}); \text{Frg}^{\mathcal{C}}),$$

where $\gamma^t = (\gamma^t, (\Vdash_{\tau \in T}^{\gamma^t})_{\tau \in T})$, with $\gamma^t: T \rightarrow \mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C})_0$, defined by $\gamma^t(\tau) = (C(\tau), \tau, \Vdash_{C(\tau)})$ and $\Vdash_{C(\tau)} \subseteq C(\tau) \times C(\tau)$ is the equality on $C(\tau)$, and $\Vdash_{\tau}^{\gamma^t} \subseteq C(\tau) \times C(\tau)$ is also the equality on $C(\tau)$.

(iii) *If \mathcal{C} is total and small, then $\delta^t \circ \gamma^t = \iota_{\mathcal{C}}$.*

If \mathcal{C} is total and small, then $\gamma^t \circ \delta^t \sim \iota_{\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C}); \text{Frg}^{\mathcal{C}})}$. Similarly, if $\mathcal{A}^t = \mathcal{A}sm(\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S))$ and $\text{Frg}^{\mathcal{A}^t}$ is the forgetful functor on \mathcal{A}^t , the computability models $\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S)$ and $\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{A}^t, \text{Frg}^{\mathcal{A}^t})$ are expected to be equivalent.

4 Computability models over categories with pullbacks

Definition 4.1. Let $C_1(a \hookrightarrow b)$ be the subclass of monos in $C_1(a, b)$, let $C_1(a \hookrightarrow)$ be the subclass of monos in C_1 with domain a , and $C_1(\hookrightarrow a)$ the subclass of monos in C_1 with codomain a . If \mathcal{C} has pullbacks, a partial morphism⁴ $(i, f): a \rightarrow b$ is a pair (i, f) , where $i \in C_1(\hookrightarrow a)$ and $f \in C_1(\text{dom}(i), b)$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} s & \xrightarrow{i} & a \\ & \searrow f & \downarrow (i, f) \\ & & b \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} S_0(s) & \xrightarrow{S_1(i)} & S_0(a) \\ & \searrow S_1(f) & \downarrow S_1(i, f) \\ & & S_0(b). \end{array}$$

If $(j, g): b \rightarrow c$, where $j: t \hookrightarrow b$ and $g: t \rightarrow c$, their composition is the partial morphism $(i \circ i', g \circ f'): a \rightarrow c$, where $i': s \times_b t \hookrightarrow s$ and $f': s \times_b t \rightarrow t$ is determined by the corresponding pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} s \times_b t & \xrightarrow{i'} & s & \xrightarrow{i} & a \\ & \searrow f' & & \searrow f & \downarrow (i, f) \\ & & t & \xrightarrow{j} & b \\ & & & \searrow g & \downarrow (j, g) \\ & & & & c \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} (i \circ i', g \circ f') \end{array}$$

If $S: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a functor that preserves pullbacks, hence monos, and if $(i, f): a \rightarrow b$, let $S_1(i, f) = (S_1(i), S_1(f)): S_0(a) \rightarrow S_0(b)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(S_1(i, f)) &= \{[S_1(i)](x) \mid x \in S_0(s)\}, \\ [S_1(i, f)](y) &= [S_1(f)](x); \quad y = [S_1(i)](x) \in \text{dom}(S_1(i, f)). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 4.2. If \mathcal{C} has pullbacks, and $S: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ preserves pullbacks, the (partial) computability model $\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S)$ over \mathcal{C} and S is the pair

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S) &= ((S_0(a))_{a \in C_0}, (S[a, b])_{(a, b) \in C_0 \times C_0}), \\ S[a, b] &= \{S_1(i, f) \mid i \in C_1(\hookrightarrow a) \ \& \ f \in C_1(\text{dom}(i), b)\}. \end{aligned}$$

If \mathcal{D} has pushouts, and $T: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ sends pushouts to pullbacks, the (partial) computability model $\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{D}; T)$ over \mathcal{D} and T is defined dually i.e., $T[a, b] = \{T_1(i, f) \mid i \in C_1(a \hookrightarrow) \ \& \ f \in C_1(b, \text{cod}(i))\}$.

The fact that $\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S)$ is a computability model depends crucially on the preservation of pullbacks by S . If \mathcal{C} is small, then $\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S)$ is small, but if \mathcal{C} is locally small, $\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S)$ need not be locally small. Next we describe the corresponding ‘‘external’’ and ‘‘internal’’ functors.

Proposition 4.3. Let $\mathbf{Cat}^{\text{pull}}$ be the category of categories with pullbacks with morphisms the functors preserving pullbacks, and let $\mathbf{Cat}^{\text{pull}}/\mathbf{Set}$ the slice category over \mathbf{Set} . If $\mathbf{Cat}^{\text{pull}}/\mathbf{Set}$ is the subcategory of $\mathbf{Cat}^{\text{pull}}/\mathbf{Set}$ with morphisms the morphisms in $\mathbf{Cat}^{\text{pull}}/\mathbf{Set}$ that preserve monos⁵, then

$$\mathbf{CM}^s: \mathbf{Cat}^{\text{pull}}/\mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{CompMod}$$

is a functor, where $\mathbf{CM}_0^P(\mathcal{C}, S) = \mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S)$, and $\mathbf{CM}_1^P(F): \mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S) \rightarrow \mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{D}; T)$ is defined as the simulation $\mathbf{CM}_1^P(F) = \gamma_F$ in Proposition 3.2.

⁴As here we don't define categories of partial morphisms, we avoid the equivalence relation between them. A partial function between sets is a partial morphism in \mathbf{Set} . This is in accordance with the notion of partial function between sets in Bishop set theory see [9] and [10].

⁵If $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that $T \circ F = S$, where $S: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ and $T: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, we cannot show, in general, that F preserves monos. It does, if, e.g., T is injective on arrows.

Proof. First we show that $\gamma_F = (F_0, (\Vdash_a^{\gamma_F})_{a \in C_0})$, where $\Vdash_a^{\gamma_F} \subseteq T_0(F_0(a)) \times S_0(a)$ is defined by $y \Vdash_a^{\gamma_F} x \Leftrightarrow y \Leftrightarrow x = x$, is a simulation $\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S) \rightarrow \mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{D}; T)$. To show (Sim1₁), if $a \in C_0$ and $x \in S_0(a)$, then $S_0(a) = T_0(F_0(a)) \ni x = \Vdash_a^{\gamma_F} x$. To show (Sim1₂), if $a, b \in C_0$ and $(S_1(i), S_1(f)): S_0(a) \rightarrow S_0(b) \in S[a, b]$, for some $s \in C_0$, we find an element of $T[F_0(a), F_0(b)]$ that tracks $(S_1(i), S_1(f))$. Let $(T_1 \circ F_1)(i, f) = (T_1(F_1(i)), T_1(F_1(f))): T_0(F_0(a)) \rightarrow T_0(F_0(b))$, as F preserves monos. If $x \in \text{dom}(S_1(i, f))$ i.e., there is a (unique) $x' \in S_0(s)$ with $x = [S_1(i)](x')$, then if $y \in T_0(F_0(a) = S_0(a))$ such that $y \Vdash_a^{\gamma_F} x$, then $y = x$. We show that $x \in \text{dom}((T_1 \circ F_1)(i, f))$, which by Definition 4.1 means that $x = [T_1(F_1(i))](x'')$, for some $x'' \in T_0(F_0(s)) = S_0(s)$. Clearly, $x'' = x'$ works. By Definition 4.1 the equality obtained unfolding the relation $[(T_1 \circ F_1)(i, f)](x) \Vdash_b^{\gamma_F} [S_1(i, f)](x)$ follows immediately. Clearly, $\mathbf{CM}_1^P(1_{(\mathcal{C}, S)}) = \iota_{\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}, S)}$, and if $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, $G: \mathcal{D} \Rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, then $\gamma_{G \circ F} = \gamma_G \circ \gamma_F$. \square

Proposition 4.4. *If \mathcal{C} has pullbacks and $[\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{Set}]^{\text{pull}}$ is the category of functors from \mathcal{C} to \mathbf{Set} preserving pullbacks, then*

$${}^p\mathbf{CM}^{\mathcal{C}}: [\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{Set}]^{\text{pull}} \rightarrow \mathbf{CompMod}$$

is a faithful functor, where ${}^p\mathbf{CM}_0^{\mathcal{C}}(S) = \mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S)$, and the simulation ${}^p\mathbf{CM}_1^{\mathcal{C}}(\eta): \mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S) \rightarrow \mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; T)$ is defined as ${}^t\mathbf{CM}_1^{\mathcal{C}}(\eta) = \gamma_\eta$ in Proposition 3.3.

Proof. First we show that $\gamma_\eta = (\text{id}_{C_0}, (\Vdash_a^{\gamma_\eta})_{a \in C_0})$, where $\Vdash_a^{\gamma_\eta} \subseteq T_0(a) \times S_0(a)$ is defined by $y \Vdash_a^{\gamma_\eta} x \Leftrightarrow y = \eta_a(x)$, is a simulation $\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S) \rightarrow \mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; T)$. To show (Sim1₁), if $a \in C_0$ and $x \in S_0(a)$, then $T_0(a) \ni y = \eta_a(x) \Vdash_a^{\gamma_\eta} x$. To show (Sim1₂), if $a, b \in C_0$ and $(S_1(i), S_1(f)): S_0(a) \rightarrow S_0(b) \in S[a, b]$, for some $s \in C_0$, we find an element of $T[a, b]$ that tracks $(S_1(i), S_1(f))$. Let $T_1(i, f) = (T_1(i), T_1(f)): T_0(a) \rightarrow T_0(b)$. We show that

$$(T_1(i), T_1(f)) \Vdash_{(a, b)}^{\gamma_\eta} (S_1(i), S_1(f)).$$

Let $x \in S_0(a)$ such that $x \in \text{dom}(S_1(i, f))$ i.e., there is a (unique) $x' \in S_0(s)$ with $x = [S_1(i)](x')$. Let $y \in T_0(a)$ such that $y \Vdash_a^{\gamma_\eta} x \Leftrightarrow y = \eta_a(x)$. First we show that $y \in \text{dom}(T_1(i, f))$ i.e., $y = [T_1(i)](y')$, for some $y' \in T_0(s)$. If $y' = \eta_s(x')$, then by the commutativity of the following left diagram we have that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_0(s) & \xrightarrow{S_1(i)} & S_0(a) \\ \eta_s \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_a \\ T_0(s) & \xrightarrow{T_1(i)} & T_0(a) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} S_0(s) & \xrightarrow{S_1(f)} & S_0(b) \\ \eta_s \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_b \\ T_0(s) & \xrightarrow{T_1(f)} & T_0(b) \end{array}$$

$$[T_1(i)](y') = [T_1(i)](\eta_s(x')) = \eta_a([S_1(i)](x')) = \eta_a(x) = y.$$

Next we show that $[T_1(i, f)](y) \Vdash_b^{\gamma_\eta} [S_1(i, f)](x)$ i.e., $[T_1(f)](y') \Vdash_b^{\gamma_\eta} [S_1(f)](x')$. By the commutativity of the above right diagram we have that

$$\eta_b([S_1(f)](x')) = [T_1(f)](\eta_s(x')) = [T_1(f)](y').$$

It is straightforward to show that ${}^p\mathbf{CM}_1(1_S: S \Rightarrow S) = \iota_{\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}, S)}$, and if $\tau: S \Rightarrow T$, $\eta: T \Rightarrow U$, then $\gamma_{\eta \circ \tau} = \gamma_\eta \circ \gamma_\tau$. To show that ${}^p\mathbf{CM}^{\mathcal{C}}$ is faithful, let $\eta, \theta: S \Rightarrow T$ such that $\gamma_\eta = \gamma_\theta$ i.e., $\Vdash_a^{\gamma_\eta} = \Vdash_a^{\gamma_\theta}$, for every $a \in C_0$. If we fix some $a \in C_0$, let $y \in T_0(a)$ and $x \in S_0(a)$. Then $y \Vdash_a^{\gamma_\eta} x \Leftrightarrow y \Vdash_a^{\gamma_\theta} x$ i.e., $y = \eta_a(x) \Leftrightarrow y = \theta_a(x)$, hence $\eta_a = \theta_a$, and since $a \in C_0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $\eta = \theta$. \square

The category $\mathcal{A}sm(\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S))$ of assemblies of $\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S)$ has objects the standard triplets (X, a_X, \Vdash_X) , and a morphism $(X, a_X, \Vdash_X) \rightarrow (Y, a_Y, \Vdash_Y)$ is a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$, such that there is $\bar{f} \in S[a_X, a_Y]$ i.e., there is $s \in C_0$ and $i: s \hookrightarrow a_X, f: s \rightarrow a_Y$ such that $\bar{f} = (S_1(i), S_1(f))$ and $\bar{f} \Vdash_X^Y f$. One can define a functor $F^p: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}sm(\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S))$, as in Proposition 3.4. In this case the function $F_1^p(f: a \rightarrow b) = S_1(f)$ is tracked by the partial function $\overline{S_1(f)} = (S_1(1_a), S_1(f))$. This functor F^p though, is not, in general, full. If $\mathcal{A}^p = \mathcal{A}sm(\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S))$ and $\text{Frg}^{\mathcal{A}^p}$ is the corresponding forgetful functor, one can study the total computability model $\mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{A}^p; \text{Frg}^{\mathcal{A}^p})$ and the partial computability model $\mathbf{CM}^p(\mathcal{A}^p; \text{Frg}^{\mathcal{A}^p})$, and relate the latter to $\mathbf{CM}^P(\mathcal{C}; S)$.

5 Categories with a base of computability

Definition 5.1. A base of computability⁶ for \mathcal{C} is a family $B = (B(a))_{a \in C_0}$, where $B(a)$ is a subclass of the class $C_1(\hookrightarrow a)$ of monos with codomain a , for every $a \in C_0$, such that the following conditions are satisfied:

(Base₁) For every $a \in C_0$, we have that $1_a \in B(a)$.

(Base₂) For every $i: s \hookrightarrow a \in B(a)$, for every $b \in C_0$, for every $f: s \rightarrow b$ and for every $j: t \hookrightarrow b \in B(b)$ a pullback $s \times_b t$ exists and $i \circ i': s \times_b t \hookrightarrow a \in B(a)$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 s \times_b t & \xrightarrow{f'} & t \\
 \swarrow & \downarrow i' & \downarrow j \\
 a & \xleftarrow{i} & s \xrightarrow{f} b.
 \end{array}$$

A cobase of computability for \mathcal{C} is a family $C = (C(a))_{a \in C_0}$, where $C(a)$ is a subclass of the class $C_1(a \hookrightarrow)$ of monos with domain a such that (Base₁) and the dual of (Base₂) are satisfied.

Notice that the intersection of two bases need not be a base, if different pullbacks are considered in them.

Proposition 5.2. (i) If $I(a) = \{1_a: a \hookrightarrow a\}$, for every $a \in C_0$, then $I = (I(a))_{a \in C_0}$ is a base and a cobase of computability for \mathcal{C} .

(ii) If $\text{Iso}(a) = \{i \in C_1(\hookrightarrow a) \mid i \text{ is an iso}\}$, for every $a \in C_0$, then $\text{Iso} = (\text{Iso}(a))_{a \in C_0}$ is a base of computability for \mathcal{C} .

(iii) If \mathcal{C} has pullbacks, and $B(a) = C_1(\hookrightarrow a)$, for every $a \in C_0$, then $B^{\hookrightarrow} = (B(a))_{a \in C_0}$ is a base of computability for \mathcal{C} .

(iv) If \mathcal{C} has pushouts, and $C(a) = C_1(a \hookrightarrow)$, for every $a \in C_0$, then $C^{\hookrightarrow} = (C(a))_{a \in C_0}$ is a cobase of computability for \mathcal{C} .

Proof. (i) We fix $a \in C_0$, $b \in C_0$ and $f: a \rightarrow b$. The only element of $I(b)$ is $1_b: b \hookrightarrow b$, and the following is a pullback square with $1_a \circ 1_a = 1_a \in I(a)$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 a & \xrightarrow{f} & b \\
 \swarrow & \downarrow 1_a & \downarrow 1_b \\
 a & \xleftarrow{1_a} & a \xrightarrow{f} b.
 \end{array}$$

(ii) In this case $a = s \times_b t$. Cases (iii) and (iv) are trivial. □

Definition 5.3. If $B = (B(a))_{a \in C_0}$ is a base of computability for \mathcal{C} and $S: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ preserves pullbacks, the computability model $\mathbf{CM}^B(\mathcal{C}; S)$ over \mathcal{C} and S with respect to B is the pair

$$\mathbf{CM}^B(\mathcal{C}; S) = ((S_0(a))_{a \in C_0}, (S[a, b])_{(a, b) \in C_0 \times C_0}),$$

$$S[a, b] = \{S_1(i, f) \mid i \in B(a) \ \& \ f \in C_1(\text{dom}(i), b)\}.$$

If $C = (C(a))_{a \in C_0}$ is a cobase of computability for \mathcal{C} and $T: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ sends pushouts to pullbacks, the computability model $\mathbf{CM}^B(\mathcal{C}; T)$ over \mathcal{D} and T is defined dually i.e., $T[a, b] = \{T_1(i, f) \mid i \in C(a) \ \& \ f \in C_1(b, \text{cod}(i))\}$.

⁶Having defined this notion independently, it was a nice surprise, and a posteriori not that surprising, to find out that a base of computability is Rosolini's notion of dominion, defined in [11], section 2.1.

If $B(a)$ is a set, for every $a \in C_0$, and \mathcal{C} is locally small, then $\mathbf{CM}^B(\mathcal{C}; S)$ is locally small. By Proposition 5.2, if $B = I$, then $\mathbf{CM}^I(\mathcal{C}; S) = \mathbf{CM}^t(\mathcal{C}; S)$. Actually, any functor preserves the pullbacks related to the base I . If $B = B^{\leftrightarrow}$, then $\mathbf{CM}^{B^{\leftrightarrow}}(\mathcal{C}; S) = \mathbf{CM}^p(\mathcal{C}; S)$. Consequently, the results shown in the previous two sections can be seen as special cases of the corresponding results for categories with a base of computability.

6 Concluding comments

The notions and results presented here form the very first steps in the study of canonical computability models over categories and **Set**-valued functors on them. Next we include some topics that could be investigated in the future.

To study more examples of computability models over categories with a given base of computability coming from Rosolini's theory of dominions. To study the computability models over a locally small category with pullbacks and the pullback preserving, covariant representable functors $\text{Hom}(a, -)$. To find interesting conditions on a computability model \mathcal{C} such that its category of assemblies $\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C})$ has a base of computability B , and relate \mathcal{C} with $\mathbf{CM}^B(\mathcal{A}sm(\mathcal{C}); \text{Frg}^{\mathcal{C}})$. To study the computability models over cartesian closed categories, as these are computability models over a *type world*, in the sense of [8], p. 66. To relate the various constructions in categories to their canonical computability models. To examine the impact of a Grothendieck topology on \mathcal{C} to some computability model over \mathcal{C} . To generalise the notions of a computability model and of a simulation between them so that the datatypes $C(\tau)$ are not necessarily in **Set**, but elements of some topos \mathcal{S} , and then study \mathcal{S} -computability models over a category \mathcal{C} and an \mathcal{S} -valued functor on \mathcal{C} . But most importantly, to relate the theory of **Set**-computability models over categories, introduced here, to concrete case studies from the theory of Higher-Order Computability, as this is developed in [8].

References

- [1] S. Awodey: *Category Theory*, Oxford University Press, 2010.
- [2] R. Cockett: *Categories and Computability*, Lecture Notes, 2014.
- [3] R. Cockett, P. Hofstra: Introduction to Turing categories, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 156(2-3), 2008, 183-209.
- [4] R. Cockett, P. Hofstra: Categorical simulations, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 214(10), 2010, 1835-1853.
- [5] J. Longley: *Realizability Toposes and Language Semantics*, PhD Thesis ECS-LFCS-95-332 University of Edinburgh, 1995.
- [6] J. Longley: On the ubiquity of certain total type structures, *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 17(5), 2007, 841-953.
- [7] J. Longley: Computability structures, simulations and realizability, *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 24(2), 2014, Find 49 pages.
- [8] J. Longley, D. Normann: *Higher-Order Computability*, Springer 2015.
- [9] I. Petrakis: Dependent sums and dependent products in Bishop's set theory, in P. Dybjer et. al. (Eds) *TYPES 2018, LIPIcs*, Vol. 130, Article No. 3, 2019.
- [10] I. Petrakis: *Families of Sets in Bishop Set Theory*, Habilitation Thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität 2020.
- [11] G. Rosolini: *Continuity and effectiveness in topoi*, PhD Thesis, University of Oxford, 1986.