

IMPLICATIVE ASSEMBLIES

FÉLIX CASTRO, ALEXANDRE MIQUEL, AND KRZYSZTOF WORYTKIEWICZ

ABSTRACT. *Implicative algebras*, recently discovered by Miquel, are combinatorial structures unifying classical and intuitionistic realizability as well as forcing. In this paper we introduce *implicative assemblies* as sets valued in the separator of an underlying implicative algebra. Given a fixed implicative algebra \mathcal{A} , implicative assemblies over \mathcal{A} organise themselves in a category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ with *tracked* set-theoretical functions as morphisms. We show that $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a quasitopos with NNO.

1. INTRODUCTION

As for other parts of the logical apparatus, it is quite practical to handle structural aspects of realizability and those of forcing in terms of toposes or categories with similar features. It is fair to say that sheaf models of intuitionistic logic [7] (used as environment for constructive analysis [5]) were a precursor of sorts here, as further study of the phenomenon lead to the discovery of the *effective topos* [11]. It was the first of an array of toposes encompassing diverse notions of intuitionistic realizability [31]. In a different direction, sheaf models were also the starting point for topos-theoretical versions of forcing. While topos-theoretical independence proofs for the continuum hypothesis [20, 30] or for Suslin’s hypothesis [2] were post factum, other independence proofs were carried out directly by means of topos-theoretic techniques [6, 9]. On the other hand, classical realizability’s origin is quite distinct. The observation that extending the λ -calculus with control operators yields proof terms for classical logic [10] lead to the concept of Krivine’s machine, the computational device underpinning classical realizability [15] and its topos-theoretical counterpart [29].

It has been observed every now and again that realizability and forcing exhibit common traits, yet a unified foundation for these anything but similar topics has remained elusive for decades. Still, recent years have witnessed a significant change in this state of things with the discovery of implicative algebras [22], which turned out to be the basic combinatorial structures providing the missing link. An implicative algebra is a complete lattice (\mathcal{A}, \leq) equipped with a (non-necessarily Heyting) implication operator \rightarrow and a subset \mathcal{S} called separator. The meaning of its elements is twofold: they can be thought of as (generalised) realizers on one hand and as truth values on the other. The fragment $(\mathcal{A}, \leq, \rightarrow)$ of an implicative algebra, called implicative structure, is a model and a Curry-style type system for a λ -calculus with constants in \mathcal{A} , possibly extended by the control operator `call/cc`.

The order \leq can be thought of as a (sub)typing relation, so a deduction establishing a type is tantamount to the construction of a realizer. However, with this infrastructure alone *any* element of \mathcal{A} can be thought of as a realizer, which is not really an option given the Curry-Howard correspondence. It is here where the separator \mathcal{S} comes into play: it is the device which carves out the *correct* realizers. Implicative algebras are in their essence abstract versions of classical realizability algebras [16], yet their additional layers of abstraction also allow to accommodate intuitionistic realizability. What is more, forcing fits into the framework as well.

Competing interests: The authors declare none.

Since implicative algebras unify the notions of (intuitionistic and classical) realizability and forcing, to ask how they translate into categorical logic is a rather natural question. Similarly to the intuitionistic case [11], an implicative algebra $(\mathcal{A}, \leq, \rightarrow, \mathcal{S})$ gives rise to *non-standard predicates*, that is functions $\phi : I \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. The set \mathcal{A}^I of non-standard predicates on I equipped with the pointwise implication gives rise to a preorder $\vdash_{\mathcal{S}[I]}$ given by

$$\phi \vdash_{\mathcal{S}[I]} \psi \Leftrightarrow \left(\bigwedge_{i \in I} \phi(i) \rightarrow \psi(i) \right) \in \mathcal{S}$$

This preorder is Heyting. The non-standard predicates neatly organise themselves in a tripos [25] when varying the index set I . It is a truly outstanding fact that *any* (set-based) tripos is equivalent to one built from an implicative algebra [22]. Applying the functor $\mathbf{Set}[-]$ (colloquially known as *tripos-to-topos construction* [26]) to such an *implicative tripos* gives rise to an *implicative topos*. Analysing the construction unveils the objects of an implicative topos as sets equipped with an \mathcal{A} -valued *non-standard equality*, symmetric and transitive but not necessarily reflexive in the internal language of the underlying implicative tripos (the lack of reflexivity is perhaps the main point of the construction). We call such sets *implicative*. Morphisms among implicative sets are functional relations in the internal language of the underlying tripos.

The non-standard equality $|\sim| : X \times X \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ on an implicative set X is reflexive when $|x \approx x| \in \mathcal{S}$ for all $x \in X$. As the latter condition generally fails, $\mathbf{E}_X(x) := |x \approx x|$ acts as an *existence predicate*. We call *ghosts* elements $x \in X$ such that $\mathbf{E}_X(x) \notin \mathcal{S}$. Within an implicative topos sits the subcategory of *implicative assemblies*, which are implicative sets with no ghost elements. For this reason, morphisms of implicative assemblies amount to plain set-theoretical functions verifying a *tracking condition*. It is possible to construct the category of implicative assemblies from scratch independently of the implicative topos. The construction itself is all but obvious: objects are pairs (X, \mathbf{E}_X) with X a set and $\mathbf{E}_X : X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ an existence predicate while morphisms $f : (X, \mathbf{E}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mathbf{E}_Y)$ are set-theoretical functions $f : X \rightarrow Y$ verifying the tracking condition

$$\bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_Y(f(x))) \in \mathcal{S}$$

All the same, it is not immediate from the onset that the category of implicative assemblies is a quasitopos. In this paper we address the question and show that it is a quasitopos with NNO, leaving the intriguing questions related to the nature of associated completions [27, 21] for the follow-up one.

Section 2 contains a thorough introduction to implicative algebras, section 3 defines the category of implicative assemblies, section 4 details its structure of quasitopos with NNO while section 5 addresses the particular case of implicative quasitoposes built from an implicative algebra of forcing type.

2. IMPLICATIVE ALGEBRAS: A PRIMER

2.1. Implicative structures. The notion of implicative algebra is based on the notion of implicative structure, that it is now time to present. Formally, an *implicative structure* is a triple $(\mathcal{A}, \leq, \rightarrow)$ where (\mathcal{A}, \leq) is a complete lattice (whose ordering \leq represents *subtyping*), and where \rightarrow is a binary operation on \mathcal{A} (the *implication* of \mathcal{A}) such that

- (1) If $a' \leq a$ and $b \leq b'$, then $(a \rightarrow b) \leq (a' \rightarrow b')$ $(a, a', b, b' \in \mathcal{A})$
- (2) $a \rightarrow \bigwedge_{b \in B} b = \bigwedge_{b \in B} (a \rightarrow b)$ $(a \in \mathcal{A}, B \subseteq \mathcal{A})$

Examples 2.1. There are many examples of implicative structures, mostly coming from the theory of forcing and from intuitionistic and classical realizability. For instance:

- (1) Each complete Heyting (or Boolean) algebra (\mathcal{A}, \leq) is an implicative structure, whose implication \rightarrow is derived from the ordering \leq using Heyting’s adjunction:

$$c \wedge a \leq b \quad \text{iff} \quad c \leq a \rightarrow b \quad (a, b, c \in H)$$

- (2) If (P, \cdot) is a (total) applicative structure, then the triple $(\mathcal{A}, \leq, \rightarrow)$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &:= \mathfrak{P}(P) \\ a \leq b &:= a \subseteq b && (a, b \in \mathcal{A}) \\ a \rightarrow b &:= \{x \in P : \forall y \in q, x \cdot y \in b\} && \text{(Kleene’s implication)} \end{aligned}$$

is an implicative structure.

- (3) Each *classical realizability algebra* [16] (also called *abstract Krivine structure* in [29]) induces an implicative structure as well, and even a classical implicative algebra [22].

Elements of \mathcal{A} as truth values. The elements of an implicative structure \mathcal{A} are primarily intended to represent “truth values” according to some semantic of (intuitionistic or classical) logic. Although implicative structures focus on implication (modeled by the operator \rightarrow) and universal quantification (modeled by arbitrary meets), they also provide all the standard connectives and quantifiers of logic, using the standard second-order encodings:

(Absurdity)	$\perp := \min \mathcal{A}$
(Triviality)	$\top := \max \mathcal{A}$
(Negation)	$\neg a := a \rightarrow \perp$
(Conjunction)	$a \sqcap b := \bigwedge_{c \in \mathcal{A}} ((a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c) \rightarrow c)$
(Disjunction)	$a \sqcup b := \bigwedge_{c \in \mathcal{A}} ((a \rightarrow c) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow c) \rightarrow c)$
(Universal quantification)	$\bigvee_{i \in I} a_i := \bigwedge_{i \in I} a_i$
(Existential quantification)	$\bigexists_{i \in I} a_i := \bigwedge_{c \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\left(\bigwedge_{i \in I} (a_i \rightarrow c) \right) \rightarrow c \right)$

(for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, $(a_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathcal{A}^I$).

Elements of \mathcal{A} as generalized realizers. However, the salient feature of implicative structures is that their elements can also be used to models proofs—or better: realizers—using an interpretation of the (pure) λ -calculus that is defined as follows:

- Given elements $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, we define their *application* $ab \in \mathcal{A}$ by:

$$ab := \bigwedge \{c \in \mathcal{A} : a \leq (b \rightarrow c)\}.$$

- Given an arbitrary function $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, we define its *abstraction* $\lambda f \in \mathcal{A}$ by:

$$\lambda f := \bigwedge_{a \in \mathcal{A}} (a \rightarrow f(a)).$$

Fact 2.2 (Properties of application and abstraction). *For all elements $a, a', b, b', c \in \mathcal{A}$ and for all functions $f, f' : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$:*

- (1) If $a \leq a'$ and $b \leq b'$, then $ab \leq a'b'$ (Application is monotonic)
(2) If $f \leq f'$ (pointwise), then $\lambda f \leq \lambda f'$ (Abstraction is monotonic)

- (3) $(\lambda f)a \leq f(a)$ (β -reduction)
(4) $a \leq \lambda f(x \mapsto ax)$ (η -expansion)
(5) $ab \leq c \iff a \leq (b \rightarrow c)$ (Adjunction)

Thanks to the above two operations, we can interpret each closed λ -term t with parameters¹ in \mathcal{A} as the element $(t)^\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}$ defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} (a)^\mathcal{A} &:= a \\ (tu)^\mathcal{A} &:= t^\mathcal{A} u^\mathcal{A} \\ (\lambda x. t)^\mathcal{A} &:= \lambda(a \mapsto (t[x := a])^\mathcal{A}) \end{aligned}$$

Fact 2.3. For all λ -terms t, t' with parameters in \mathcal{A} :

- (1) If $t \rightarrow_\beta t'$, then $(t)^\mathcal{A} \leq (t')^\mathcal{A}$ (β -reduction)
(2) If $t \rightarrow_\eta t'$, then $(t)^\mathcal{A} \geq (t')^\mathcal{A}$ (η -reduction)

Note that the interpretation function $t \mapsto (t)^\mathcal{A}$ is not necessarily injective. For example, in the particular case where \mathcal{A} is a complete Heyting algebra (Example 2.1 (1)), it is easy to check that application collapses to the meet (namely: $ab = a \wedge b$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$), and that all pure λ -terms t (without parameters) are interpreted as the top truth value: $(t)^\mathcal{A} = \top$. On the other end of the spectrum, when \mathcal{A} is induced by a non-degenerated (total) applicative structure (Example 2.1 (2)) that is also a combinatory algebra, the interpretation of pure λ -terms (without parameters) is necessarily injective on $\beta\eta$ -normal forms.

The ambivalence of the ordering $a \leq b$. From what precedes, it is clear that both the terms and the types of a polymorphic λ -calculus such as Curry-style system F (possibly enriched with finite intersection types) can be interpreted in any implicative structure \mathcal{A} . In this setting, it is easy to check that if some pure λ -term t has some type U in the aforementioned type system, then we have $(t)^\mathcal{A} \leq (U)^\mathcal{A}$, independently from the implicative structure \mathcal{A} . (Technically, this result is proved by introducing a suitable notion of *semantic subtyping*, see [22], § 2.5.)

The above observation shows that the partial ordering \leq at the core of implicative structures (and implicative algebras) can be given different meanings depending on whether we consider its arguments as types or realizers. So that $a \leq b$ may actually read:

- a is a subtype of b , if we view both a and b as types;
- a has type b , if we view a as a realizer and b as a type;
- a is more defined than b , if we view both a and b as realizers.

In what follows, we shall frequently mention the (semantic) combinators $\mathbf{K}^\mathcal{A} = (\lambda xy. x)^\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbf{S}^\mathcal{A} = (\lambda xyz. xz(yz))^\mathcal{A}$, observing that both combinators actually coincide with their respective principal types in \mathcal{A} , in the sense that:

Fact 2.4 (Combinators \mathbf{K} and \mathbf{S}). In any implicative structure \mathcal{A} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}^\mathcal{A} &= \bigwedge_{a,b \in \mathcal{A}} (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow a) \\ \text{and} \quad \mathbf{S}^\mathcal{A} &= \bigwedge_{a,b,c \in \mathcal{A}} ((a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow a \rightarrow c) \end{aligned}$$

¹Recall that a λ -term with parameters in \mathcal{A} is a term of the pure λ -calculus possibly enriched with (computationally inert) constants taken in the set \mathcal{A} .

Interpreting the control operator ‘call/cc’. The above interpretation of λ -terms in the implicative structure \mathcal{A} extends to the operator \mathbf{cc} (‘call/cc’, for ‘call with current continuation’), provided we identify the latter with Peirce’s law:

$$(\mathbf{cc})^{\mathcal{A}} := \bigwedge_{a,b \in \mathcal{A}} (((a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a) = \bigwedge_{a \in \mathcal{A}} ((\neg a \rightarrow a) \rightarrow a).$$

Note however that in most implicative structures (typically those coming from intuitionistic realizability), the above definition collapses to \perp .

2.2. Separators and implicative algebras. Implicative structures do not come with a fixed criterion of truth, telling us which elements of \mathcal{A} are considered to be true. Technically, such a criterion is provided by a *separator*, that is a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ such that:

- (1) If $a \in \mathcal{S}$ and $a \leq b$, then $b \in \mathcal{S}$ (upwards closed)
- (2) $\mathbf{K}^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathbf{S}^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S}$ (Hilbert axioms)
- (3) If $a \rightarrow b \in \mathcal{S}$ and $a \in \mathcal{S}$, then $b \in \mathcal{S}$ (modus ponens)

writing $\mathbf{K}^{\mathcal{A}} = (\lambda xy. x)^{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathbf{S}^{\mathcal{A}} = (\lambda xyz. xz(yz))^{\mathcal{A}}$. A separator \mathcal{S} is *consistent* (resp. *classical*) when $\perp \notin \mathcal{S}$ (resp. when $\mathbf{cc}^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S}$). An *implicative algebra* is just an implicative structure $(\mathcal{A}, \leq, \rightarrow)$ equipped with a separator $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. An implicative algebra $(\mathcal{A}, \leq, \rightarrow, \mathcal{S})$ is *consistent* (resp. *classical*) when the underlying separator $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is.

Separators enjoy the following closure properties:

Fact 2.5. *For all elements $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ and for all separators $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$:*

- (1) If $a \in \mathcal{S}$ and $b \in \mathcal{S}$, then $ab \in \mathcal{S}$
- (2) If $a \in \mathcal{S}$ and $b \in \mathcal{S}$, then $a \times b \in \mathcal{S}$
- (3) If $a \in \mathcal{S}$ or $b \in \mathcal{S}$, then $a + b \in \mathcal{S}$
- (4) If t is a closed λ -term with parameters in \mathcal{S} , then $(t)^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S}$.

(Last item intuitively expresses that all ‘proofs’—possibly with ‘axioms’ in \mathcal{S} —are ‘true’.)

In the particular case where the implicative structure \mathcal{A} is a complete Heyting algebra (Example 2.1 (1)), it can be shown that a separator is the same as a filter. However, in the general case, separators are *not* filters, for that they are not closed under binary meets (in general).

2.3. The implicative tripos. In any implicative algebra $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}, \leq, \rightarrow, \mathcal{S})$, the separator \mathcal{S} induces a preorder of *entailment* on the set \mathcal{A} , written $a \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} b$ and defined by

$$a \vdash_{\mathcal{S}} b := (a \rightarrow b) \in \mathcal{S} \quad (a, b \in \mathcal{A})$$

It follows from the definition of the notion of a separator that the preordered set $(\mathcal{A}, \vdash_{\mathcal{S}})$ is a pre-Heyting algebra (and even a pre-Boolean algebra when the separator \mathcal{S} is classical).

More generally, for each set I the separator \mathcal{S} induces a preorder of entailment on the set \mathcal{A}^I of I -indexed families of truth values, written $\vdash_{\mathcal{S}[I]}$ and defined by

$$a \vdash_{\mathcal{S}[I]} b := \bigwedge_{i \in I} (a_i \rightarrow b_i) \in \mathcal{S} \quad (a, b \in \mathcal{A}^I)$$

Again, the preordered set $(\mathcal{A}^I, \vdash_{\mathcal{S}[I]})$ is a pre-Heyting (or pre-Boolean) algebra. Moreover it can be shown [22] that:

Theorem 2.6 (Implicative tripos). *For each implicative algebra $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}, \leq, \rightarrow, \mathcal{S})$, the correspondence mapping each set I to the pre-Heyting algebra $(\mathcal{A}^I, \mathcal{S}[I])$ is functorial and constitutes a **Set**-based tripos, in the sense of Hyland, Johnstone and Pitts [12].*

As shown in [22], the above construction encompasses all known triposes known so far: forcing triposes (induced by complete Heyting algebras), intuitionistic realizability triposes (induced by total and even partial combinatory algebras, using some completion trick) as well as classical realizability triposes (induced by abstract Krivine structures).

Actually, we can even prove [23] that:

Theorem 2.7 (Completeness). *Each Set-based tripos (in the sense of Hyland, Johnstone and Pitts [12]) is isomorphic to an implicative tripos.*

3. CONSTRUCTION OF THE CATEGORY $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$

From now on, $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}, \leq, \rightarrow, \mathcal{S})$ denotes a given implicative algebra.

3.1. Definition of the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$. From the implicative algebra \mathcal{A} , we define the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of *assemblies* on \mathcal{A} as follows:

- The objects of $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ are the *assemblies* on \mathcal{A} , namely: the pairs $X = (\underline{X}, \mathbf{E}_X)$ formed by an arbitrary set \underline{X} , called the *carrier* of X , and a function $\mathbf{E}_X : \underline{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$, called the *existence predicate* of X , that associates to each element $x \in \underline{X}$ a truth value $\mathbf{E}_X(x)$ (in the separator $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$) that intuitively ‘certifies’ the existence of x in the assembly X .
- Given two assemblies $X = (\underline{X}, \mathbf{E}_X)$ and $Y = (\underline{Y}, \mathbf{E}_Y)$, the morphisms from X to Y are the set-theoretic functions $f : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ satisfying the *tracking condition* for f :

$$\bigwedge_{x \in \underline{X}} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_Y(f(x))) \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Note that in order to prove the above condition, it is sufficient (and obviously necessary) to exhibit an element $s_f \in \mathcal{S}$ —which we shall call a *tracker* of f — such that

$$s_f \leq \bigwedge_{x \in \underline{X}} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_Y(f(x))).$$

(In practice, we shall provide most trackers as ‘proofs’ of the form $s_f := (t)^{\mathcal{A}}$, where t is a pure λ -term constructed following the Curry-Howard correspondence.)

Given assemblies X, Y, Z and morphisms $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ respectively tracked by elements $s_f, s_g \in \mathcal{S}$, we easily check that

$$(\lambda x . s_g(s_f x))^{\mathcal{A}} \leq \bigwedge_{x \in \underline{X}} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_Z((g \circ f)(x))),$$

so that $g \circ f : X \rightarrow Z$ is also a morphism. Finally, we have

$$(\lambda x . x)^{\mathcal{A}} \leq \bigwedge_{x \in \underline{X}} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_X(\text{id}_X(x))),$$

hence $\text{id}_X : X \rightarrow X$ is a morphism as well. This makes clear that $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a category.

Recall that in the category of assemblies, morphisms are just set-theoretic maps satisfying the corresponding tracking condition. Therefore, two morphisms are equal *as morphisms* in the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ if and only if they are equal as set-theoretic functions.

3.2. The adjoint functors $\Gamma : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ and $\Delta : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$. The category of assemblies on \mathcal{A} naturally comes with a forgetful functor $\Gamma : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ mapping each assembly X to its carrier $\Gamma X := \underline{X}$ and each morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to itself as a set-theoretic function, that is: $\Gamma f := f : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$. (So that by construction, the functor Γ is faithful.)

The functor $\Gamma : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is actually the left adjoint of a functor $\Delta : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ that can be defined as follows:

- For each set X , we define ΔX as the assembly whose carrier is $\underline{\Delta X} := X$ and whose existence predicate is the constant function $\mathbf{E}_{\Delta X} := (_ \mapsto \top)$ mapping each element of X to the truth value $\top \in \mathcal{S}$.
- For each set-theoretic map $f : X \rightarrow Y$, we define the morphism $\Delta f : \Delta X \rightarrow \Delta Y$ as the map f itself, observing that such a map is tracked by the truth value $\top \in \mathcal{S}$.

By construction, the functor $\Delta : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is full and faithful.

Proposition 3.1. *We have the adjunction:* $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}} \begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ \perp \\ \Delta \end{array} \mathbf{Set}$.

Proof. Given objects $X \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $Y \in \mathbf{Set}$, it suffices to observe that each set-theoretic map $f : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{\Delta Y}$ is tracked by the truth value $\top \in \mathcal{S}$, hence we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}}(X, \Delta Y) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\Gamma X, Y). \quad \square$$

From the above adjunction, it is clear that $\Gamma : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ preserves all colimits that turn out to exist in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$, whereas $\Delta : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ preserves all limits in \mathbf{Set} .

3.3. Characterizing monomorphisms and epimorphisms.

Proposition 3.2 (Monos and epis in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$). *In the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$, an arrow $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is mono (resp. epi) if and only if it is injective (resp. surjective) as a set-theoretic map.*

Proof. Let X and Y be assemblies. Since each morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is also a set-theoretic map $f : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$, it is clear that if f is injective (resp. surjective), then it is mono (resp. epi) as a morphism in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Let us now prove the converse implications:

- Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is mono in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Given $x_1, x_2 \in \underline{X}$ such that $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$ ($\in \underline{Y}$), we want to prove that $x_1 = x_2$. For that, we write $1 = \{*\}$ the terminal object of \mathbf{Set} , and consider the morphisms $h_1, h_2 : \Delta 1 \rightarrow X$ defined by $h_1(*) = x_1$ and $h_2(*) = x_2$. (The maps $h_1, h_2 : 1 \rightarrow \underline{X}$ are tracked by the truth values $(\top \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_X(x_1)) \in \mathcal{S}$ and $(\top \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_X(x_2)) \in \mathcal{S}$, respectively.) Since $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$, we get $f \circ h_1 = f \circ h_2$ hence $h_1 = h_2$ in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ (since f is mono) and therefore $x_1 = x_2$.
- Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is epi in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$. We want to prove that $f : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ is surjective, which amounts to prove that f is epi in \mathbf{Set} . For that, consider a set Z with set-theoretic maps $h_1, h_2 : \underline{Y} \rightarrow Z$ such that $h_1 \circ f = h_2 \circ f$. Using the equality $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\underline{Y}, Z) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}}(Y, \Delta Z)$ (cf proof of Prop. 3.1), we observe that these set-theoretic maps are also morphisms $h_1, h_2 : Y \rightarrow \Delta Z$ in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$, hence $h_1 = h_2$ in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ (since f is epi), and therefore $h_1 = h_2$ in \mathbf{Set} . \square

However, the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not balanced in general, since there are morphisms that are both mono and epi without being isomorphisms. For a counter-example, consider the two-point assembly $\mathbf{2}$ defined by²

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbf{2}} &:= \mathbf{2} = \{0, 1\} \\ \mathbf{E}_2(0) &:= (\lambda xy. x)^{\mathcal{A}} = \bigwedge_{a, b \in \mathcal{A}} (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow a) \in \mathcal{S} \\ \mathbf{E}_2(1) &:= (\lambda xy. y)^{\mathcal{A}} = \bigwedge_{a, b \in \mathcal{A}} (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow b) \in \mathcal{S} \end{aligned}$$

²The reader is invited to check that in the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$, the object $\mathbf{2}$ is the coproduct $\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{1}$ (i.e. the type of Booleans), writing $\mathbf{1} := \Delta 1$ the terminal object of the category.

as well as the morphism $i : \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \Delta 2$ whose underlying set-theoretic function $i : 2 \rightarrow 2$ is the identity function (tracked by $\top \in \mathcal{S}$).

Proposition 3.3. *The morphism $i : \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \Delta 2$ is always mono and epi (independently from the implicative algebra \mathcal{A}), but it is an isomorphism if and only if the separator $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is a filter.*

Proof. It is clear that the morphism $i : \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \Delta 2$, that is both mono and epi in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ (since bijective in \mathbf{Set}), is an isomorphism if and only if the inverse set-theoretic function $\text{id}_2 : 2 \rightarrow 2$ is tracked as a morphism of type $\Delta 2 \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$ in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$. For that, we observe that

$$\bigwedge_{x \in 2} (\mathbf{E}_{\Delta 2}(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_2(x)) = \top \rightarrow \bigwedge_{x \in 2} \mathbf{E}_2(x) = \top \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^{\mathcal{A}},$$

writing $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathcal{A}} := \bigwedge_{a, b \in \mathcal{A}} (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow a \wedge b) = (\lambda xy. x)^{\mathcal{A}} \wedge (\lambda xy. y)^{\mathcal{A}}$ the non-deterministic choice operator in \mathcal{A} [22, § 3.7]. We conclude observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \bigwedge_{x \in 2} (\mathbf{E}_{\Delta 2}(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_2(x)) \in \mathcal{S} & \quad \text{iff} \quad \top \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S} \\ & \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathfrak{h}^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S} \\ & \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{S} \text{ is a filter (from [22, Prop. 3.27])}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.4. Recall that in implicative algebras, separators are in general not filters. A typical counter-example is the (intuitionistically consistent) implicative algebra defined by:

- $\mathcal{A} := \mathfrak{F}(\Lambda)$ (writing Λ the set of closed λ -terms up to β -conversion)
- $a \leq b := a \subseteq b$ (inclusion of sets of λ -terms)
- $a \rightarrow b := \{t \in \Lambda \mid \forall u \in a, tu \in b\}$ (Kleene arrow)
- $\mathcal{S} := \{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid a \text{ inhabited}\}$

To show that the separator \mathcal{S} is not a filter, take $a := \{\lambda xy. x\} \in \mathcal{S}$ and $b := \{\lambda xy. y\} \in \mathcal{S}$, and observe that $a \cap b = \emptyset$ (from the Church-Rosser property), hence $a \cap b \notin \mathcal{S}$.

4. STRUCTURE OF QUASI-TOPOS

The aim of this section is to prove that the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of assemblies is a quasi-topos, namely: that the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ has all finite limits (§ 4.1) and colimits (§ 4.2), that it is locally Cartesian closed (§ 4.3) and has a strong subobject classifier (§ 4.4). Moreover, we shall prove that this quasi-topos has a natural numbers object (§ 4.5).

4.1. Finite limits. Let us first prove that $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ has all finite limits.

Proposition 4.1. *The assembly $\mathbf{1} := \Delta 1$ (where $1 = \{*\}$) is the terminal object of $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Indeed, for each assembly X , we observe that

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}}(X, \Delta 1) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\Gamma X, 1) = \{(- \in \underline{X} \mapsto *)\}. \quad \square$$

Now, given assemblies A and B , we define the *product assembly* $A \times B$, letting:

- $\underline{A \times B} := \underline{A} \times \underline{B}$;
- $\mathbf{E}_{A \times B}(a, b) := \mathbf{E}_A(a) \sqcap \mathbf{E}_B(b) \ (\in \mathcal{S})$ for all $(a, b) \in \underline{A \times B}$.

We easily check that the set-theoretic projections $\pi_1^{A, B} : \underline{A \times B} \rightarrow \underline{A}$ and $\pi_2^{A, B} : \underline{A \times B} \rightarrow \underline{B}$ are actually morphisms of types $A \times B \rightarrow A$ and $A \times B \rightarrow B$ (respectively) in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$, since they are tracked by the truth values $(\lambda z. z(\lambda xy. x))^{\mathcal{A}}, (\lambda z. z(\lambda xy. y))^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S}$ (respectively).

Proposition 4.2 (Binary product). *For all assemblies A and B , the product assembly $A \times B$ equipped with the two morphisms $\pi_1^{A, B} : A \times B \rightarrow A$ and $\pi_2^{A, B} : A \times B \rightarrow B$ is the binary product of A and B in the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Given an assembly X and morphisms $f : X \rightarrow A$ and $g : X \rightarrow B$, we want to show that there is a unique morphism $h : X \rightarrow A \times B$ such that $\pi_1^{A,B} \circ h = f$ and $\pi_2^{A,B} \circ h = g$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & X & & \\
 & f \swarrow & \vdots & \searrow g & \\
 & A & A \times B & B & \\
 & \xleftarrow{\pi_1^{A,B}} & & \xrightarrow{\pi_2^{A,B}} & \\
 & & \downarrow h & & \\
 & & Y & &
 \end{array}$$

Existence of h . Consider the map $h : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{A} \times \underline{B}$ defined by $h(x) := (f(x), g(x))$ for all $x \in \underline{X}$. Given trackers $s_f, s_g \in \mathcal{S}$ of the morphisms $f : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{A}$ and $g : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{B}$ (resp.), we observe that

$$(\lambda x z. z(s_f x)(s_g x))^{\mathcal{A}} \leq \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_{A \times B}(h(x))),$$

which proves that h is a morphism of type $X \rightarrow A \times B$. And from the definition of h , it is clear that $\pi_1^{A,B} \circ h = f$ and $\pi_2^{A,B} \circ h = g$.

Uniqueness of h . Obvious from the equalities $\pi_1^{A,B} \circ h = f$ and $\pi_2^{A,B} \circ h = g$. \square

Finally, given parallel arrows $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ (in the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$), we define a new assembly $\text{Eq}(f, g)$, letting:

- $\underline{\text{Eq}(f, g)} := \{a \in \underline{A} \mid f(a) = g(a)\}$;
- $\mathbf{E}_{\text{Eq}(f, g)}(a) := \mathbf{E}_A(a)$ ($\in \mathcal{S}$) for all $a \in \underline{\text{Eq}(f, g)}$.

We also consider the monomorphism $k : \text{Eq}(f, g) \rightarrow A$ induced by the inclusion $\underline{\text{Eq}(f, g)} \subseteq \underline{A}$ and tracked by the truth value $(\lambda x. x)^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S}$.

Proposition 4.3 (Equalizer). *For all parallel arrows $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$, the assembly $\text{Eq}(f, g)$ equipped with the arrow $k : \text{Eq}(f, g) \rightarrow A$ is the equalizer of f and g in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Given an assembly X and a morphism $h : X \rightarrow A$ such that $f \circ h = g \circ h$, we want to show that there is a unique morphism $h' : X \rightarrow \text{Eq}(f, g)$ such that $k \circ h' = h$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & X & & \\
 & & \vdots & \searrow h & \\
 & h' \downarrow & & & \\
 & \text{Eq}(f, g) & \xrightarrow{k} & A & \xrightarrow[f]{g} B
 \end{array}$$

Existence of h' . Since $f \circ h = g \circ h$ (set-theoretically), we have $\text{Im}(h) \subseteq \underline{\text{Eq}(f, g)}$. Hence we can define $h' : X \rightarrow \text{Eq}(f, g)$ letting $h'(x) := h(x)$ for all $x \in \underline{X}$, and taking the same tracker as for $h : X \rightarrow A$. We obviously have $k \circ h' = h$ by construction.

Uniqueness of h' . Obvious from the equality $k \circ h' = h$. \square

From Prop. 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, it is clear that:

Proposition 4.4 (Finite limits). *The category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ has all finite limits.*

Moreover, it is clear from the above constructions in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ (that are based on the equifunctional constructions in \mathbf{Set}) that the forgetful functor $\Gamma : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ preserves the terminal object, binary products (together with the corresponding projections) and equalizers (together with the corresponding inclusions). Therefore:

Proposition 4.5 (Γ preserves all finite limits). *The forgetful functor $\Gamma : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ preserves all finite limits in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

4.2. **Finite colimits.** Let us now prove that $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ has all finite colimits.

Proposition 4.6. *The assembly $\mathbf{0} := \Delta\emptyset$ is the initial object of $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Indeed, for each assembly X , we observe that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}}(\Delta\emptyset, X) = \{i_X\},$$

where i_X is the inclusion of \emptyset into X (tracked by $\top \in \mathcal{S}$). \square

Now, given assemblies A and B , we define the *direct sum assembly* $A + B$, letting:

- $\underline{A + B} := \underline{A} \uplus \underline{B} = (\{0\} \times \underline{A}) \cup (\{1\} \times \underline{B})$;
- $\mathbf{E}_{A \times B}(0, a) := (\lambda xy. x)^{\mathcal{A}} \sqcap \mathbf{E}_A(a) \in \mathcal{S}$ for all $a \in \underline{A}$;
- $\mathbf{E}_{A \times B}(1, b) := (\lambda xy. y)^{\mathcal{A}} \sqcap \mathbf{E}_B(b) \in \mathcal{S}$ for all $b \in \underline{B}$.

We easily check that the coproduct injections $\sigma_1^{A,B} : \underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{A + B}$ and $\sigma_2^{A,B} : \underline{B} \rightarrow \underline{A + B}$ are actually morphisms of types $A \rightarrow A + B$ and $B \rightarrow A + B$ (resp.) in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$, since they are tracked by the truth values $(\lambda x_0 z. z(\lambda xy. x) x_0)^{\mathcal{A}}$, $(\lambda y_0 z. z(\lambda xy. y) y_0)^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S}$ (resp.).

Proposition 4.7 (Binary coproduct). *For all assemblies A and B , the direct sum assembly $A + B$ equipped with the two morphisms $\sigma_1^{A,B} : A \rightarrow A + B$ and $\sigma_2^{A,B} : B \rightarrow A + B$ is the binary coproduct of A and B in the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Given an assembly X and morphisms $f : A \rightarrow X$ and $g : B \rightarrow X$, we want to show that there is a unique morphism $h : A + B \rightarrow X$ such that $h \circ \sigma_1^{A,B} = f$ and $h \circ \sigma_2^{A,B} = g$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\sigma_1^{A,B}} & A + B & \xleftarrow{\sigma_2^{A,B}} & B \\ & \searrow f & \vdots h & \swarrow g & \\ & & X & & \end{array}$$

Existence of h . Consider the map $h : \underline{A + B} \rightarrow \underline{X}$ defined by $h(0, a) := f(a)$ for all $a \in \underline{A}$ and $h(1, b) = g(b)$ for all $b \in \underline{B}$. Given trackers $s_f, s_g \in \mathcal{S}$ of the morphisms $f : A \rightarrow X$ and $g : B \rightarrow X$ (respectively), we observe that

$$(\lambda z. z(\lambda uv. u(s_f v)(s_g v)))^{\mathcal{A}} \leq \bigwedge_{c \in \underline{A+B}} (\mathbf{E}_{A+B}(c) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_X(h(c))),$$

which proves that h is a morphism of type $A + B \rightarrow X$. And from the definition of h , it is clear that $h \circ \sigma_1^{A,B} = f$ and $h \circ \sigma_2^{A,B} = g$.

Uniqueness of h . Obvious from the equalities $h \circ \sigma_1^{A,B} = f$ and $h \circ \sigma_2^{A,B} = g$. \square

Finally, given parallel arrows $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ (in the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$), we define a new assembly $\mathrm{Coeq}(f, g)$, letting:

- $\underline{\mathrm{Coeq}(f, g)} := \underline{B}/\sim$, where \sim is the smallest equivalence relation on the set \underline{B} such that $f(a) \sim g(a)$ for all $a \in \underline{A}$.
- $\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{Coeq}(f, g)}(c) := \bigvee_{b \in c} \mathbf{E}_B(b) = \bigwedge_{v \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\bigwedge_{b \in c} (\mathbf{E}_B(b) \rightarrow v) \rightarrow v \right)$ for all $c \in \underline{\mathrm{Coeq}(f, g)}$.

(Given an equivalence class $c \in \underline{B}/\sim = \underline{\mathrm{Coeq}(f, g)}$, and writing $s_0 := \mathbf{E}_B(b_0)$ for some $b_0 \in c$, we observe that $(\lambda z. z s_0)^{\mathcal{A}} \leq \bigvee_{b \in c} \mathbf{E}_B(b)$, which proves that $\bigvee_{b \in c} \mathbf{E}_B(b) \in \mathcal{S}$.)

We also consider the epimorphism $k : B \rightarrow \text{Coeq}(f, g)$ induced by the canonical surjection from \underline{B} to $\underline{\text{Coeq}(f, g)} = \underline{B}/\sim$ and tracked by the truth value $(\lambda xz. zx)^{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proposition 4.8 (Coequalizer). *For all parallel arrows $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$, the assembly $\text{Coeq}(f, g)$ equipped with the arrow $k : B \rightarrow \text{Coeq}(f, g)$ is the coequalizer of f and g in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Given an assembly X and a morphism $h : B \rightarrow X$ such that $h \circ f = h \circ g$, we want to show that there is a unique morphism $h' : \text{Coeq}(f, g) \rightarrow X$ such that $h' \circ k = h$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f} \\ \xrightarrow{g} \end{array} & B & \xrightarrow{k} & \text{Coeq}(f, g) \\ & & & \searrow h & \downarrow h' \\ & & & & X \end{array}$$

Existence of h' . Since $h \circ f = h \circ g$, we have $h(b) = h(b')$ for all $b, b' \in B$ such that $b \sim b'$ (from the definition of the equivalence relation \sim). Therefore, the map $h : \underline{B} \rightarrow \underline{X}$ factors through the quotient \underline{B}/\sim into a map $h' : \underline{B}/\sim \rightarrow \underline{X}$ such that $h' \circ k = h$. Given a tracker $s_h \in \mathcal{S}$ of the morphism $h : B \rightarrow X$, we then observe that

$$(\lambda z. z s_h)^{\mathcal{A}} \leq \bigwedge_{c \in \underline{B}/\sim} (\mathbf{E}_{\text{Coeq}(f, g)}(c) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_X(h'(c))),$$

which proves that h' is a morphism of type $\text{Coeq}(f, g) \rightarrow X$.

Uniqueness of h' . Obvious from the equality $h' \circ k = h$. □

From Prop. 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8, it is clear that:

Proposition 4.9 (Finite colimits). *The category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ has all finite colimits.*

4.3. LCCC structure.

4.3.1. *LCCC's.* We first recall some basic facts about *locally cartesian closed categories*, commonly known as *LCCC's*.

Definition 4.10. Let \mathbb{B} be a category.

1. Fix an object $X \in \mathbb{B}$. The *slice category* \mathbb{B}/X of \mathbb{B} over X (or simply *slice* when everything is understood) has morphisms of \mathbb{B} with codomain X as objects. A morphism

$$u : \begin{bmatrix} V \\ \downarrow^s \\ X \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} W \\ \downarrow^t \\ X \end{bmatrix}$$

is a commuting triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V & \xrightarrow{u} & W \\ & \searrow s & \swarrow t \\ & & X \end{array}$$

Composition is given by horizontal pasting of such triangles.

2. The *arrow category* \mathbb{B}^{\rightarrow} of \mathbb{B} has morphisms of \mathbb{B} as objects. A morphism

$$(g, f) : \begin{bmatrix} W \\ \downarrow^t \\ X \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} A \\ \downarrow^p \\ Y \end{bmatrix}$$

in \mathbb{B}^\rightarrow is a commuting square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{g} & A \\ t \downarrow & & \downarrow p \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \end{array}$$

in \mathbb{B} . Composition is given by horizontal pasting of such squares.

Remark 4.11. Let \mathbb{B} be a category.

1. There is the obvious functor $\text{cod} : \mathbb{B}^\rightarrow \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ sending an object $[t:w \rightarrow x]$ on its codomain X and a morphism

$$(g, f) : \left[\begin{array}{c} W \\ \downarrow t \\ X \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} A \\ \downarrow p \\ Y \end{array} \right]$$

on its *codomain morphism* f .

2. If \mathbb{B} has pullbacks, cod is a Grothendieck fibration with fibers the slice categories \mathbb{B}/X for all $X \in \mathbb{C}$. Reindexing an object $[p:A \rightarrow Y] \in \mathbb{B}/Y$ along a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in the base \mathbb{B} is given by pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p^*A & \longrightarrow & A \\ f^*p \downarrow \lrcorner & & \downarrow p \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \end{array}$$

A cleavage corresponds to a choice of pullbacks.

Definition 4.12. Let \mathbb{B} be a category with finite limits.

1. \mathbb{B} is cartesian closed (or simply CCC) if for all objects $A \in \mathbb{B}$ the functor $(-) \times A$ has a right adjoint $A^{(-)}$. This right adjoint is commonly known as *exponentiation*.
2. \mathbb{B} with finite limits is locally cartesian closed (or simply LCCC) if each slice \mathbb{B}/X is a CCC and reindexation functors in $\text{cod} : \mathbb{B}^\rightarrow \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ are cartesian closed (preserve binary products and exponentiation).

Theorem 4.13. Let \mathbb{B} be a category with finite limits. The following are equivalent

- i. \mathbb{B} is an LCCC;
- ii. The functor $f^* : \mathbb{B}/Y \rightarrow \mathbb{B}/X$ has a right adjoint $\prod_f : \mathbb{B}/X \rightarrow \mathbb{B}/Y$ for all morphisms $f : X \rightarrow Y$.

Theorem 4.13 (perhaps not the most general form of the statement) is part of the lore, see for instance [8], [28] or [1].

4.3.2. *Sets.* Assume a set-theoretical function $f : X \rightarrow Y$. We shall now carry out the proof that the functor $f^* : \mathbf{Set}/Y \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}/X$ has a right adjoint. This obviously implies that \mathbf{Set} is an LCCC by virtue of Theorem 4.13, which is largely irrelevant in itself since it is a well-known fact (true for any topos as it happens). The reason for the burden is that we shall need the constructions subsequently, in order to prove that $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an LCCC. We do not claim any originality here, yet were unable to locate a precise source for the technique we are using.

Definition 4.14. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a map and $y \in Y$ an element we shall call *basepoint*. An *f-section* of an object $[t:w \rightarrow x] \in \mathbf{Set}/X$ over the basepoint $y \in Y$ is a map $s : f^{-1}(y) \rightarrow W$ such that $t \circ s = \text{id}$.

Given $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and a basepoint $y \in Y$, an f -section s of $[t : W \rightarrow X]$ makes the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & W \\ & \nearrow s & \downarrow t \\ f^{-1}(y) & \hookrightarrow & X \end{array}$$

commute. An f -section of t over some basepoint does not need to be defined on *all* X , it is a *partial map* from X to W .

Notation. Given a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and an object $[t : W \rightarrow X] \in \mathbf{Set}/X$, we shall write

$$f \ni t := \{(y, s) \mid y \in Y, s \in \mathbf{Set}(f^{-1}(y), W), t \circ s = \text{id}\}$$

for the set of all f -sections of $[t : W \rightarrow X]$ taken over all basepoints and $\text{bp} : f \ni t \rightarrow Y$ for the first projection.

The fancy naming of the above first projection suggests that the latter sends a partial f -section on it's basepoint.

Proposition 4.15. *The map of classes*

$$\begin{array}{c} \square \\ f \end{array} : (\mathbf{Set}/X)_0 \longrightarrow (\mathbf{Set}/Y)_0$$

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} W \\ \downarrow t \\ X \end{array} \right] \mapsto \left[\begin{array}{c} f \ni t \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right]$$

extends to a functor $\square_f : \mathbf{Set}/X \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}/Y$ with action on morphisms given by

$$\begin{array}{c} \square \\ f \end{array}(u) : \left[\begin{array}{c} f \ni t \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} f \ni t' \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right]$$

$$(y, s) \mapsto (y, u \circ s)$$

Proof. Let

$$u : \left[\begin{array}{c} W \\ \downarrow t \\ X \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} W' \\ \downarrow t' \\ X \end{array} \right]$$

be a morphism in \mathbf{Set}/X and $s : f^{-1}(y) \rightarrow W$ be an f -section of t over the basepoint $y \in Y$. The map $u \circ s : f^{-1}(y) \rightarrow W'$ is an f -section of t' above the same basepoint $y \in Y$ since the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & W & \xrightarrow{u} & W' \\ & \nearrow s & \searrow t & & \nearrow t' \\ f^{-1}(y) & \hookrightarrow & X & & \end{array}$$

commutes. We thus have a map

$$\begin{array}{c} \square \\ f \end{array}(u) : \left[\begin{array}{c} f \ni t \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} f \ni t' \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right]$$

$$(y, s) \mapsto (y, u \circ s)$$

It is immediate that the above are the data of a functor $\square_f : \mathbf{Set}/X \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}/Y$. □

Lemma 4.16. Assume $f : X \rightarrow Y$, a basepoint $y \in Y$ and $v : f^{-1}(y) \rightarrow p^{-1}(y)$. The canonical map

$$\langle \text{id}, v \rangle : f^{-1}(y) \longrightarrow X \times_Y A$$

is an f -section of $p_1 : X \times_Y A \rightarrow X$ over y .

Proof. Assume $x \in f^{-1}(y)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (f \circ \text{id})(x) &= y \\ &= (p \circ v)(x) \end{aligned}$$

hence the outer diagram in

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} f^{-1}(y) & \xrightarrow{v} & p^{-1}(y) & & \\ \parallel & \searrow \langle \text{id}, v \rangle & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & X \times_Y A & \xrightarrow{p_2} & A & \downarrow p \\ & \downarrow p_1 & \lrcorner & & \\ f^{-1}(y) \subset & \xrightarrow{\quad} & X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \end{array}$$

commutes, so $\langle \text{id}, v \rangle$ is the canonical map. \square

Proposition 4.17. The functor $\square_f : \mathbf{Set}/X \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}/Y$ is right adjoint to the reindexation functor $f^* : \mathbf{Set}/Y \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}/X$.

Proof. Assume $[p:A \rightarrow Y] \in \mathbf{Set}/Y$ and $a \in A$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} k_a : f^{-1}(p(a)) &\longrightarrow p^{-1}(p(a)) \\ x &\mapsto a \end{aligned}$$

be the constant map. The map $\langle \text{id}, k_a \rangle : f^{-1}(p(a)) \rightarrow X \times_Y A$ is an f -section over $p(a)$ (c.f. Lemma 4.16) so the map

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_p : A &\longrightarrow f \circlearrowleft p \\ a &\mapsto (p(a), \langle \text{id}, k_a \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

is well-defined. Moreover, it is (trivially) a morphism

$$\eta_p : \left[\begin{array}{c} A \\ \downarrow p \\ Y \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} f \circlearrowleft p \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right]$$

in \mathbf{Set}/Y . Assume $[p:A \rightarrow Y] \in \mathbf{Set}/Y$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\square_f \circ f^* \right) \left[\begin{array}{c} A \\ \downarrow p \\ Y \end{array} \right] &= \square_f \left[\begin{array}{c} X \times_Y A \\ \downarrow p_1 \\ X \end{array} \right] \\ &= \left[\begin{array}{c} f \circlearrowleft p_1 \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right] \end{aligned}$$

and claim that the morphism η_p is universal from $[p:A \rightarrow Y]$ to \square_f .

Assume $[q:B \rightarrow X] \in \mathbf{Set}/X$ and

$$w : \left[\begin{array}{c} A \\ \downarrow p \\ Y \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \square_f \left[\begin{array}{c} B \\ \downarrow q \\ X \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{c} f \circlearrowleft q \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right]$$

a morphism in \mathbf{Set}/Y . We have in particular

$$w(a) = (p(a), s_{w,a})$$

for some f -section $s_{w,a}$ of q over the basepoint $p(a)$. Now $(x, a) \in X \times_Y A$ implies that $x \in f^{-1}(p(a))$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w} : X \times_Y A &\longrightarrow B \\ (x, a) &\mapsto s_{w,a}(x) \end{aligned}$$

But $s_{w,a}$ is an f -section of $[q: B \rightrightarrows X]$, so $q \circ s_{w,a} = \text{id}$ hence

$$\bar{w} : f^* \left[\begin{array}{c} A \\ \downarrow p \\ Y \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{c} X \times_Y A \\ \downarrow p_1 \\ X \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} B \\ \downarrow q \\ X \end{array} \right]$$

is a morphism in \mathbf{Set}/X . We have the map

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_f(\bar{w}) : f \mathfrak{S} p_1 &\longrightarrow f \mathfrak{S} q \\ (y, s) &\mapsto (y, \bar{w} \circ s) \end{aligned}$$

which is a morphism

$$\prod_f(\bar{w}) : \left[\begin{array}{c} f \mathfrak{S} p_1 \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} f \mathfrak{S} q \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right]$$

in \mathbf{Set}/Y (c.f. Proposition 4.15) so in particular

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\prod_f(\bar{w}) \circ \eta_p \right)(a) &= \prod_f(\bar{w})(p(a), \langle \text{id}, k_a \rangle) \\ &= (p(a), \bar{w} \circ \langle \text{id}, k_a \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

We further have

$$\begin{aligned} (\bar{w} \circ \langle \text{id}, k_a \rangle)(x) &= \bar{w}(x, k_a(x)) \\ &= \bar{w}(x, a) \\ &= s_{w,a}(x) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in f^{-1}(p(a))$, hence $w = \prod_f(\bar{w}) \circ \eta_p$. In other words, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \left[\begin{array}{c} A \\ \downarrow p \\ Y \end{array} \right] & \xrightarrow{\eta_p} & \left(\prod_f \circ f^* \right) \left[\begin{array}{c} A \\ \downarrow p \\ Y \end{array} \right] \\ & \searrow w & \downarrow \prod_f(\bar{w}) \\ & & \prod_f \left[\begin{array}{c} B \\ \downarrow q \\ X \end{array} \right] \end{array}$$

in \mathbf{Set}/Y commutes. It is straightforward to verify that $\prod_f(\bar{w})$ is the unique map with this property. \square

4.3.3. *Existence and Tracking.* Assemblies are basically sets with bells and whistles while the functor $\Gamma : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ creates and preserves finite limits (c.f. section 3). Our strategy to prove that $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an LCCC is thus to add realizers to the set-theoretical constructions above. In order to retrieve some of the latter we need to trace the relevant proofs. We first introduce some human readable notation for λ -calculus as we shall systematically exploit the fact that any λ -term with parameters in \mathcal{S} is in \mathcal{S} [22].

Notation. We shall systematically use the following λ -calculus macros

$$\begin{aligned} v \odot \sigma &:= \lambda x. v(\sigma x) & x \notin \text{FV}(v) \cup \text{FV}(\sigma) \\ \langle \theta, \sigma \rangle &:= \lambda s. s\theta\sigma & s \notin \text{FV}(\theta) \cup \text{FV}(\sigma) \\ \pi_1 &:= \lambda z. z(\lambda xy. x) \\ \pi_2 &:= \lambda z. z(\lambda xy. y) \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.18. Recall that $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ has finite limits (c.f. Section 4.1). Consider the pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times_Y A & \xrightarrow{p_2} & A \\ p_1 \downarrow \lrcorner & & \downarrow p \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \end{array}$$

We have

- $\underline{X \times_Y A} = \underline{X} \times_Y \underline{A}$ with $\mathbf{E}_{X \times_Y A}(x, a) = \mathbf{E}_X(x) \sqcap \mathbf{E}_A(a)$;
- the first projection $p_1 : \underline{X} \times_Y \underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{X}$ tracked by $(\pi_1)^{\mathcal{A}}$;
- the second projection $p_2 : \underline{X} \times_Y \underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{A}$ tracked by $(\pi_2)^{\mathcal{A}}$.

Assume $u : Z \rightarrow X$ tracked by $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}$ and $v : Z \rightarrow A$ tracked by $\psi \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $p \circ v = f \circ u$. The canonical morphism $\langle u, v \rangle : Z \rightarrow X \times_Y A$ is given by

- $\underline{\langle u, v \rangle} = \langle \underline{u}, \underline{v} \rangle$;
- the tracker $(\lambda x. \langle \varphi x, \psi x \rangle)^{\mathcal{A}} = (\lambda x. z(\varphi x)(\psi x))^{\mathcal{A}}$.

The fiber $f^{-1}(y)$ of $y \in Y$ can be seen as a particular case, its existence predicate being

$$\mathbf{E}_{f^{-1}(y)}(x) = \mathbf{E}_X(x) \sqcap \mathbf{E}_Y(y)$$

Definition 4.19. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$, $[t : w \rightarrow x] \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/X$ and a basepoint $y \in Y$. An f -section of t is a morphism $s \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}(f^{-1}(y), W)$ such that $t \circ s = \text{id}$.

An f -section in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is thus just an f -section admitting a tracker, which is rather unsurprising.

Notation. Given a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and an object $[t : w \rightarrow x] \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/X$, we shall overload notation and write

$$f \mathfrak{S} t := \{(y, s) | y \in Y, s \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}(f^{-1}(y), W), t \circ s = \text{id}\}$$

for the set of all f -sections of $[t : w \rightarrow x]$ taken over all basepoints and $\text{bp} : f \mathfrak{S} t \rightarrow Y$ for the first projection.

Lemma 4.20. Let $[t : w \rightarrow x] \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/X$.

1. $f \mathfrak{S} t$ is an assembly with existence predicate given by

$$\mathbf{E}_{f \mathfrak{S} t} := \mathbf{E}_Y \sqcap \bigwedge_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_W(s(x)))$$

2. $(\pi_1)^{\mathcal{A}}$ is a tracker for the basepoint map $\text{bp} : f \mathfrak{E} t \rightarrow Y$.

Proof. Assume $(y, s) \in f \mathfrak{E} t$ with s tracked by σ . We thus have

$$\sigma \leq \bigwedge_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_W(s(x)))$$

by hypothesis, hence

$$(\langle \mathbf{E}_Y(y), \sigma \rangle)^{\mathcal{A}} \leq \mathbf{E}_Y(y) \sqcap \bigwedge_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_W(s(x)))$$

where

$$(\langle \mathbf{E}_Y(y), \sigma \rangle)^{\mathcal{A}} = (\lambda z. z \mathbf{E}_Y(y) \sigma)^{\mathcal{A}}$$

hence

$$\mathbf{E}_Y(y) \sqcap \bigwedge_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_W(s(x))) \in \mathcal{S}$$

The second item is obvious (c.f. Section 4.1). \square

Proposition 4.21. *The map of classes*

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_f : (\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/X)_0 &\longrightarrow (\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/Y)_0 \\ \left[\begin{array}{c} W \\ \downarrow t \\ X \end{array} \right] &\mapsto \left[\begin{array}{c} f \mathfrak{E} t \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right] \end{aligned}$$

extends to a functor $\prod_f : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/X \rightarrow \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/Y$ with action on morphisms given by

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_f(u) : \left[\begin{array}{c} f \mathfrak{E} t \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right] &\longrightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} f \mathfrak{E} t' \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right] \\ (y, s) &\mapsto (y, u \circ s) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that we overload notation here as well.

Proof. $[\text{bp} : f \mathfrak{E} t \rightarrow Y] \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/X$ while $[\text{bp} : f \mathfrak{E} t' \rightarrow Y] \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/Y$ (c.f. Lemma 4.20). Moreover, $\prod_f(u)$ is the action of a functor on the carriers (c.f. Proposition 4.21). Assume v tracks u . We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda \langle \theta, \sigma \rangle. \langle \theta, v \circ \sigma \rangle)^{\mathcal{A}} &\leq \mathbf{E}_Y(y) \sqcap \bigwedge_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_W(s(x))) \\ &\rightarrow \mathbf{E}_Y(y) \sqcap \bigwedge_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} (\mathbf{E}_X(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_W((u \circ s)(x))) \end{aligned}$$

so

$$(\lambda \langle \theta, \sigma \rangle. \langle \theta, v \circ \sigma \rangle)^{\mathcal{A}} = (\lambda w. \lambda s. s((\lambda z. z(\lambda xy. x))(w))(\lambda x. v(((\lambda z. z(\lambda xy. y))(w))x)))^{\mathcal{A}}$$

is a tracker of $\prod_f(u)$. \square

Scholium 1. Assume $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$, a basepoint $y \in Y$ and $v : f^{-1}(y) \rightarrow p^{-1}(y)$ in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$. The pairing map

$$\langle \text{id}, v \rangle : f^{-1}(y) \longrightarrow X \times_Y Y$$

is an f -section of $p_1 : X \times_Y A \rightarrow X$ over y in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proof. Consider the diagram in the proof of Lemma 4.16, seen as a diagram in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$. All the reasoning at the level of the carriers is still valid, in particular that $\langle \text{id}, v \rangle$ is an f -section of the carrier $p_1 : \underline{X} \times_Y \underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{X}$. But now all the objects are equipped with existence predicates while all the maps are tracked (c.f. Remark 4.18). \square

Scholium 2. The functor $\prod_f : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/X \rightarrow \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/Y$ is right adjoint to the reindexation functor $f^* : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/Y \rightarrow \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/X$.

Proof. We trace the proof of Proposition 4.17 and equip the relevant maps with trackers. Assume $[p : A \rightarrow Y] \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/Y$ with p tracked by ϖ . Assume $a \in A$. The map

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_p : A &\longrightarrow f \circledast p \\ a &\longmapsto (p(a), \langle \text{id}, k_a \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

is well-defined with respect to $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ (c.f. Scholium 1). We further have

$$(\lambda s. \langle \varpi s, \langle \lambda x. x, \lambda x. s \rangle \rangle)^{\mathcal{A}} \leq (\mathbf{E}_A(a) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_{f \circledast p}(p(a), \langle \text{id}, k_a \rangle))$$

so

$$(\lambda s. \langle \varpi s, \langle \lambda x. x, \lambda x. s \rangle \rangle)^{\mathcal{A}} = (\lambda s. \lambda t. t(\varpi s)(\lambda xz. zxs))^{\mathcal{A}}$$

is a tracker for η_p , hence η_p is a morphism in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$. It follows that

$$\eta_p : \left[\begin{array}{c} A \\ \downarrow p \\ Y \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} f \circledast p \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right]$$

is a morphism in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/Y$, this since bp admits a tracker (c.f. Lemma 4.20.2) while the relevant triangle of carriers commutes (c.f. Proposition 4.17).

Let $[q : B \rightarrow X] \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/X$ with q tracked by χ . Let

$$w : \left[\begin{array}{c} A \\ \downarrow p \\ Y \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \prod_f \left[\begin{array}{c} B \\ \downarrow q \\ X \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{c} f \circledast q \\ \downarrow \text{bp} \\ Y \end{array} \right]$$

be a morphism in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}/Y$ where

$$w(a) = (p(a), s_{w,a})$$

for some f -section $s_{w,a}$ of q over the basepoint $p(a)$. Assume ξ tracks w .

Recall that the canonical map on the carriers with respect to η_p is $\prod_f(\bar{w})$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w} : X \times_Y A &\longrightarrow B \\ (x, a) &\longmapsto s_{w,a}(x) \end{aligned}$$

All we need to complete the proof is thus a tracker for \bar{w} , which is of type

$$\bigwedge_{(x,a) \in X \times_Y A} \mathbf{E}_{X \times_Y A}(x, a) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_B(\bar{w}(x, a))$$

Suppose χ realises $\mathbf{E}_X(x)$ and α realises $\mathbf{E}_A(a)$. Then $\xi\alpha$ realises $\mathbf{E}_{f \circledast q}(p(a), s_{w,a})$, hence $\pi_2(\xi\alpha)$ tracks $s_{w,a}$ by definition of $\mathbf{E}_{f \circledast q}$. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda \langle \chi, \alpha \rangle. \pi_2(\xi\alpha)\chi)^{\mathcal{A}} &\leq \mathbf{E}_{X \times_Y A}(x, a) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_B(s_{w,a}(x)) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{X \times_Y A}(x, a) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_B(\bar{w}(x, a)) \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda \langle \chi, \alpha \rangle. \pi_2(\xi\alpha)\chi)^{\mathcal{A}} &= (\lambda v. \pi_2(\xi(\pi_2 v))(\pi_1 v))^{\mathcal{A}} \\ &= (\lambda v. (\lambda z. z(\lambda xy. y))(\xi(v(\lambda z. z(\lambda xy. y))))((\lambda z. z(\lambda xy. x))v))^{\mathcal{A}} \end{aligned}$$

is a tracker for \bar{w} . □

Theorem 4.22. $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an LCCC.

Proof. Scholium 2 and Theorem 4.13. □

4.4. Strong subobject classifier. Let us consider the assembly $\mathbf{\Omega} := \Delta\mathcal{P}(1)$ and the morphism $t : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathbf{\Omega}$ defined by $t(*) := 1$ and tracked by \top .

As a tool to show that $\mathbf{\Omega}$ (equipped with t) is a strong subobject classifier, we note that every morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ (tracked by s_f) of $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ can be factorized into an epimorphism $\hat{f} : A \rightarrow \text{Im}(f)$ followed by a monomorphism $m_f : \text{Im}(f) \rightarrow B$ where $\text{Im}(f)$ is the assembly defined by :

- $\underline{\text{Im}(f)} := \{f(a) \mid a \in B\}$
- $\mathbf{E}_{\text{Im}(f)}(b) := \mathbf{E}_B(b)$ for all $b \in \text{Im}(f)$

while \hat{f} and m_f are defined by $\hat{f}(a) := f(a)$ for all $a \in A$ and $m_f(b) := b$ for all $b \in \text{Im}(f)$, that are respectively tracked by s_f and $(\lambda x . x)^{\mathcal{A}}$. In particular, if f is an extremal monomorphism [13] then \hat{f} is an isomorphism.

Remark 4.23. Although the carrier of $\text{Im}(f)$ is constructed as the set theoretic image of f , the monomorphism $m_f : \text{Im}(f) \rightarrow B$ is in general not the image [24] of the morphism f . As for the epimorphism \hat{f} , it is in general not regular.

Proposition 4.24 (Strong Subobject Classifier). *The assembly $\mathbf{\Omega}$ equipped with the arrow $t : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathbf{\Omega}$ is a strong subobject classifier in the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a strong monomorphism. As a strong monomorphism, f is an extremal monomorphism and therefore $\hat{f} : A \rightarrow \text{Im}(f)$ is an isomorphism [13]. It follows that f and $m_f : \text{Im}(f) \rightarrow B$ represent the same subobject.

Finally, the classifying map of m_f is $\chi_f : B \rightarrow \mathbf{\Omega}$ defined by $\chi_f(b) := \{x \in 1 \mid b \in \underline{\text{Im}(f)}\}$ and tracked by \top . □

4.5. The natural numbers object. Let us now consider the assembly \mathbb{N} defined by:

- $\underline{\mathbf{N}} := \mathbb{N}$
- $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{N}}(n) := \bigwedge_{a \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}} (a_0 \rightarrow \bigwedge_{p \in \mathbb{N}} (a_p \rightarrow a_{p+1}) \rightarrow a_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(By induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we check that $(\lambda x f . f^n x)^{\mathcal{A}} \leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{N}}(n)$, hence $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{N}}(n) \in \mathcal{S}$.)

We also consider the morphisms $z : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ and $s : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ defined by $z(*) := 0$ and $s(n) := n + 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, that are respectively tracked by $(\lambda z x f . x)^{\mathcal{A}}, (\lambda n x f . f(n x f))^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S}$.

Proposition 4.25 (Natural Numbers Object). *The assembly \mathbf{N} equipped with the two arrows $z : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ and $s : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is a natural numbers object in the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Given an assembly A and two morphisms $q : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow X$ and $f : X \rightarrow X$, we want to show that there is a unique morphism $u : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow X$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathbf{1} & \xrightarrow{z} & \mathbf{N} & \xrightarrow{s} & \mathbf{N} \\
 & \searrow q & \vdots u & & \vdots u \\
 & & X & \xrightarrow{f} & X
 \end{array}$$

Existence of u . Consider the map $u : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$ defined by $u(0) = q(0)$ and $u(n + 1) = f(u(n))$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Given trackers $s_q, s_f \in \mathcal{S}$ of the morphisms $q : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow X$ and $f : X \rightarrow X$ (resp.), we

observe that $s_q \top \leq \mathbf{E}_X(u(0))$ and $s_f \leq \bigwedge_{p \in \mathbb{N}} (\mathbf{E}_X(u(p)) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_X(u(p+1)))$ (from the definition of the map u), from which we deduce that

$$(\lambda m . m (s_q \top) s_f)^{\mathcal{A}} \leq \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\mathbf{E}_N(n) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_X(u(n)))$$

using techniques of semantic typing. Therefore u is a morphism of type $\mathbf{N} \rightarrow X$.

Uniqueness of u . Obvious from the equalities $u \circ z = q$ and $u \circ s = f \circ u$. \square

5. THE PARTICULAR CASE OF FORCING

5.1. Implicative algebras and forcing. As mentioned in § 2, complete Heyting (or Boolean) algebras (H, \leq) are particular cases of implicative structures, namely: the implicative structures whose implication ‘ \rightarrow ’ is derived from the ordering ‘ \leq ’ using Heyting’s adjunction:

$$c \leq (a \rightarrow b) \quad \text{iff} \quad (c \wedge a) \leq b \quad (\text{for all } a, b, c \in H)$$

Such implicative structures are immediately turned into implicative algebras, just by endowing them with the trivial separator $\mathcal{S} := \{\top\}$. The corresponding tripos $\mathbf{P} : \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{HA}$ is then (naturally) isomorphic to the forcing tripos $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(-, H) : \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{HA}$.

However, there are many cases of implicative algebras \mathcal{A} whose associated tripos turn out to be isomorphic to a forcing tripos (i.e. of the form $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(-, H)$ for some complete Heyting algebra H) although the complete lattice underlying \mathcal{A} is not a Heyting algebra. In [22], this situation is captured by the following theorem (Theorem 4.13, § 4.5):

Theorem 5.1 (Characterizing forcing triposes). *For each implicative algebra \mathcal{A} (writing \mathcal{S} its separator), the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The tripos induced by \mathcal{A} is isomorphic to a forcing tripos.*
- (2) *The separator $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is a principal filter of \mathcal{A} .*
- (3) *The separator $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is finitely generated and contains the non-deterministic choice operator $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathcal{A}} := \bigwedge_{a, b \in \mathcal{A}} (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow a \wedge b) = (\lambda xy . x)^{\mathcal{A}} \wedge (\lambda xy . y)^{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Recall that the separator $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is a principal filter when $\mathcal{S} = \uparrow\{s_0\}$ for some $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ or, equivalently, when \mathcal{S} has a smallest element $s_0 = \min(\mathcal{S})$. In this case, the Heyting algebra $H := \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{S}$ induced by the implicative algebra \mathcal{A} is complete, and the corresponding tripos is isomorphic to the forcing tripos $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(-, H)$. (Let us insist on the fact that this does not imply that the lattice underlying \mathcal{A} is a complete Heyting algebra.)

However in practice, most implicative algebras come with a separator \mathcal{S} that is *finitely generated*, in the sense that \mathcal{S} is the smallest separator containing some finite subset of \mathcal{A} . This is typically the case:

- (1) In intuitionistic realizability, when the implicative algebra \mathcal{A} is induced by an ordered combinatory algebra (OCA) whose elements are generated by finitely many combinators (via application). The archetypal example of such an OCA is the combinatory algebra formed by all closed λ -terms (or combinatory terms) up to β -conversion, that is generated by the two terms $\mathbf{K} \equiv \lambda xy . x$ and $\mathbf{S} \equiv \lambda xyz . xz(yz)$ (via application).
- (2) In classical realizability, when the implicative algebra \mathcal{A} is induced by an abstract Krivine structure (AKS) whose set of proof-like terms is generated by finitely many instructions (via application). As a matter of fact, all the examples of AKSs presented by Krivine in [15, 17, 18, 19] are of this form.

In the particular (but frequent) case where the separator \mathcal{S} is finitely generated, it is easy to see that \mathcal{S} is a principal filter of \mathcal{A} as soon as \mathcal{S} is a filter, or equivalently: as soon as \mathcal{S} contains the *non-deterministic choice operator*

$$\mathfrak{h}^{\mathcal{A}} := \bigwedge_{a,b \in \mathcal{A}} (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow a \wedge b) = (\lambda xy. x)^{\mathcal{A}} \wedge (\lambda xy. y)^{\mathcal{A}}.$$

(Intuition: since $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathcal{A}} a b \leq a$ and $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathcal{A}} a b \leq b$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, the truth value $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathcal{A}}$ can be viewed as a program taking two arguments and non-deterministically returning any of them.)

The above discussion recalls us that in (intuitionistic or classical) realizability, under the realistic assumption that the language of realizers is generated by finitely many primitives (via application), the simple fact of enriching the programming language with a non-deterministic choice operator has actually a dramatic impact on the corresponding realizability models, that turn out to be isomorphic to forcing models.

5.2. Assemblies and forcing. Coming back to the category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of assemblies on \mathcal{A} , the situation of forcing is captured by the following theorem:

Theorem 5.2. *For each implicative algebra \mathcal{A} , the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is balanced.*
- (2) *The category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an elementary topos*
- (3) *The category $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a Grothendieck topos*
- (4) *The forgetful functor $\Gamma : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is full.*
- (5) *The adjunction $\Gamma \dashv \Delta$ is an equivalence of categories between $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and \mathbf{Set} .*
- (6) *The tripos $\mathbf{P} : \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{HA}$ induced by \mathcal{A} is (isomorphic to) a forcing tripos.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (6). Consider the assembly S defined by $\underline{S} := \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathbf{E}_S(s) := s$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, as well as the morphism $f : S \rightarrow \Delta \mathcal{S}$ defined as the set-theoretic identity map tracked by $\top \in \mathcal{S}$. From Prop. 3.2, it is clear that f is both monic and epic in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$. If we now assume that $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is balanced (1), then f is an isomorphism too, which means that the inverse morphism $f^{-1} : \Delta \mathcal{S} \rightarrow S$ fulfills the tracking condition

$$\bigwedge_{s \in \mathcal{S}} (\mathbf{E}_{\Delta \mathcal{S}}(s) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_S(s)) = \bigwedge_{s \in \mathcal{S}} (\top \rightarrow s) = \top \rightarrow \bigwedge \mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Hence $(\bigwedge \mathcal{S}) \in \mathcal{S}$ (by modus ponens), which means that \mathcal{S} is a principal filter, or equivalently, that the tripos induced by \mathcal{A} is isomorphic to a forcing tripos (6).

(6) \Rightarrow (4). If the tripos induced by \mathcal{A} is isomorphic to a forcing tripos (6), then the separator $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is a principal filter of \mathcal{A} , generated by its smallest element $s_0 := \min(\mathcal{S})$. Given any two assemblies X and Y , we observe that each set-theoretic map $f : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ is tracked by the truth value $(\top \rightarrow s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$, hence $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}}(X, Y) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\underline{X}, \underline{Y}) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\Gamma X, \Gamma Y)$. This proves that the forgetful functor $\Gamma : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is full (4).

(4) \Rightarrow (5). Regarding the adjunction $\Gamma \dashv \Delta$, we observe that:

- The counit $\epsilon_X : \Gamma(\Delta X) \rightarrow X$ ($X \in \mathbf{Set}$) is the identity map (in \mathbf{Set}), that is always a natural isomorphism, independently from the implicative algebra \mathcal{A} .
- The unit $\eta_X : X \rightarrow \Delta(\Gamma X)$ ($X \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$) is the set-theoretic identity map tracked by the truth value $\top \in \mathcal{S}$ (as a morphism in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$). It is always a natural transformation, but in general not a natural isomorphism.

However, if we now assume that the forgetful functor $\Gamma : \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is full (4), we have that $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Asm}}(\Delta(\Gamma X), X) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\Gamma(\Delta(\Gamma X)), \Gamma X) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\underline{X}, \underline{X})$ (by fullness), which proves that the map $\zeta_X := \text{id}_{\underline{X}} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\underline{X}, \underline{X})$ is a morphism of type $\Delta(\Gamma X) \rightarrow X$ in $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$. By

construction we have $\zeta_X \circ \eta_X = \text{id}_X$ and $\eta_X \circ \zeta_X = \text{id}_{\Gamma(\Delta X)}$. Therefore the unit $\eta_X : X \rightarrow \Delta(\Gamma X)$ ($X \in \mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$) is a natural isomorphism too, which proves that the adjunction $\Gamma \dashv \Delta$ is an equivalence of categories between $\mathbf{Asm}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and \mathbf{Set} (5).

The remaining implications (5) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (1) are obvious. □

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Awodey. *Category theory*. Oxford university press, 2010.
- [2] M.C. Bunge. Topos theory and souslin’s hypothesis. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 4(2):159–187, 1974.
- [3] P. J. Cohen. The independence of the continuum hypothesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 50(6):1143–1148, December 1963.
- [4] P. J. Cohen. The independence of the continuum hypothesis II. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 51(1):105–110, January 1964.
- [5] M.P. Fourman and J.M.E. Hyland. Sheaf models for analysis. In *Applications of Sheaves: Proceedings of the Research Symposium on Applications of Sheaf Theory to Logic, Algebra, and Analysis, Durham, July 9–21, 1977*, pages 280–301. Springer, 2006.
- [6] M.P. Fourman and A. Ščedrov. The “world’s simplest axiom of choice” fails. *Manuscripta mathematica*, 38(3):325–332, 1982.
- [7] M.P. Fourman and D.S. Scott. Sheaves and logic. In *Applications of Sheaves: Proceedings of the Research Symposium on Applications of Sheaf Theory to Logic, Algebra, and Analysis, Durham, July 9–21, 1977*, pages 302–401. Springer, 2006.
- [8] P. Freyd. Aspects of topoi. *Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 7(1):1–76, 1972.
- [9] P. Freyd. The axiom of choice. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 19:103–125, 1980.
- [10] T.G. Griffin. A formulae-as-type notion of control. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*, pages 47–58, 1989.
- [11] J. M. E. Hyland. The effective topos. In A. S. Troelstra and D. Dalen, editors, *The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium*, volume 110 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, pages pp. 165–216. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1982.
- [12] J. M. E. Hyland, P. T. Johnstone, and A. M. Pitts. Tripos theory. In *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, volume 88, pages 205–232, 1980.
- [13] G. M. Kelly. Monomorphisms, epimorphisms, and pull-backs. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 9:124 – 142, 1969.
- [14] S. C. Kleene. On the interpretation of intuitionistic number theory. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 10:109–124, 1945.
- [15] J.-L. Krivine. Realizability in classical logic. In *Interactive models of computation and program behaviour*, volume 27 of *Panoramas et synthèses*, pages 197–229. Société Mathématique de France, 2009.
- [16] J.-L. Krivine. Realizability algebras : a program to well order R. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 7:1–47, 2011.
- [17] J.-L. Krivine. Realizability algebras II : new models of ZF + DC. *Logical Methods for Computer Science*, 8(1:10):1–28, 2012.
- [18] J.-L. Krivine. Bar recursion in classical realisability: Dependent choice and continuum hypothesis. In Jean-Marc Talbot and Laurent Regnier, editors, *25th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2016, August 29 - September 1, 2016, Marseille, France*, volume 62 of *LIPICs*, pages 25:1–25:11. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016.
- [19] J.-L. Krivine. Realizability algebras III : some examples. *Math. Struct. in Comp. Sc.*, 28(1):45–76, 2018.
- [20] F.W. Lawvere. Quantifiers and sheaves. In *Actes du congrès international des mathématiciens, Nice*, volume 1, pages 329–334, 1970.
- [21] M. Menni. *Exact completions and toposes*. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2000.
- [22] A. Miquel. Implicative algebras: a new foundation for realizability and forcing. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*, 30(5):458–510, 2020.
- [23] A. Miquel. Implicative algebras ii: completeness w.r.t. set-based triposes, 2020.
- [24] B. Mitchell. *Theory of Categories*. Pure and applied mathematics : a series of monographs and textbooks. Academic Press, 1965.
- [25] A. Pitts. Tripos theory in retrospect. *Mathematical structures in computer science*, 12(3):265–279, 2002.
- [26] A. M. Pitts. *The theory of triposes*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1981.

- [27] E. Robinson and G. Rosolini. Colimit completions and the effective topos. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 55(2):678–699, 1990.
- [28] R.A.G. Seely. Locally cartesian closed categories and type theory. In *Mathematical proceedings of the Cambridge philosophical society*, volume 95, pages 33–48. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- [29] T. Streicher. Krivine’s classical realisability from a categorical perspective. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 2013.
- [30] M. Tiernay. *Sheaf theory and the continuum hypothesis*, volume 274 of *LNM*. Springer, 1972.
- [31] J. van Oosten. *Realizability, an Introduction to its Categorical Side*. Elsevier, 2008.

INSTITUT DE RECHERCHE EN INFORMATIQUE FONDAMENTALE (IRIF), UNIVERSITÉ PARIS CITÉ, BÂTIMENT SOPHIE GERMAIN, CASE COURRIER 7014, 8 PLACE AURÉLIE NEMOURS, 75205 PARIS CEDEX 13, PARIS, FRANCE & INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA Y ESTADÍSTICA RAFAEL LAGUARDIA (IMERL), FACULTAD DE INGENIERÍA, UNIVERSIDAD DE LA REPÚBLICA, JULIO HERRERA Y REISSIG 565, C.P. 11300 MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA Y ESTADÍSTICA RAFAEL LAGUARDIA (IMERL), FACULTAD DE INGENIERÍA, UNIVERSIDAD DE LA REPÚBLICA, JULIO HERRERA Y REISSIG 565, C.P. 11300 MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY

LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES (LAMA), UNIVERSITÉ SAVOIE MONT BLANC, BÂTIMENT LE CHABLAIS, CAMPUS SCIENTIFIQUE, 73376 LE BOURGET DU LAC, FRANCE